JENS SCHRÖTER
translated by WAYNE COPPINS

from JESUS *to the* NEW TESTAMENT

EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY *and the* ORIGIN *of the* NEW TESTAMENT CANON

From Jesus to the New Testament

BMSEC

BAYLOR–MOHR SIEBECK

Studies in Early Christianity

Wayne Coppins and Simon Gathercole

Series Editors

From Jesus to the New Testament

Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon

Jens Schröter

Translated by
Wayne Coppins

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PRESS

Mohr Siebeck

© 2013 by Baylor University Press, Waco, Texas 76798-7363
All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing of Baylor University Press.

Cover Design by Natalya Balnova

Originally published in German as *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament* by Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Tübingen, 2007 with the ISBN 978-3-16-149611-0.

This English edition is published in Germany by Mohr Siebeck with the ISBN 978-3-16-152802-6.

eISBN: 978-1-60258-824-0 (e-PDF)

This E-book was converted from the original source file by a third-party vendor. Readers who encounter any issues with formatting, text, linking, or readability are encouraged to notify the publisher at BUP_Production@baylor.edu. Some font characters may not display on older Kindle devices.

To inquire about permission to use selections from this text, please contact Baylor University Press, One Bear Place, #97363, Waco, Texas 76798.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schröter, Jens, 1961–
[Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament. English]
From Jesus to the New Testament : early Christian theology and the origin of the New Testament canon / Jens Schröter ; [translated by] Wayne Coppins.
431 pages cm. — (Baylor-Mohr Siebeck studies in early Christianity)
"Originally published in German as Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament by Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Tübingen, 2007"--T.p. verso.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Summary: "Traces the historical rationale for the development of the Christian canon, rooted in the life, preaching, and teaching of Jesus"—Provided by publisher.
ISBN 978-1-60258-822-6 (hardback)
1. Bible. N.T.—History of Biblical events. 2. Bible. N.T.—Theology. 3. Bible. N.T.—Canon. 4. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30–600. I. Title.
BS2407.S3613 2013
225.1'2—dc23

2013002247

Contents

Editors' Introduction		vii
Preface to the English Edition		xi
Preface to the German Edition		xiii
Introduction		1

Part I
Recollection and History in Early Christianity

1	New Testament Science beyond Historicism	9
2	Reflections on the Relationship between Historiography and Hermeneutics in New Testament Science	21
3	Construction of History and the Beginnings of Christianity	33
4	History in Light of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ	49

Part II
Jesus—Paul—Luke

5	Beginnings of the Jesus Tradition	73
6	On the Historicity of the Gospels	95
7	The Unity of the Gospel	133
8	The Universalizing of the Law in Galatians	155
9	Metaphorical Christology in Paul	185
10	Luke as Historiographer	205
11	Salvation for the Gentiles and Israel	227

Part III
On the Way to the New Testament

12	Jesus and the Canon	249

13 The Acts of the Apostles and the Emergence of the New Testament Canon 273
14 "The Church Has Four Gospels, the Heresy Many" 305

Part IV
What Is "Theology of the New Testament"?

15 Particularity and Inclusivity in Early Christianity 317
16 The Meaning of the Canon for a Theology of the New Testament 329

Bibliography 351
Index of Ancient Sources 393
Index of Modern Authors 407
Subject Index 413

Editors' Introduction

The new series Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity aims to facilitate increased dialogue between German and Anglophone scholarship by making recent German research available in English translation. In this way, we hope to contribute to the advancement of our common field of study. The target audience for the series is primarily scholars and graduate students, though some volumes may also be accessible to advanced undergraduates.

Rather than remaining in the abstract, let us further unpack the rationale and larger vision of the series in relation to the present volume, namely Jens Schröter's book *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament*, or *From Jesus to the New Testament*. As with subsequent volumes, this work was primarily selected because of the editors' conviction that it represents a substantial contribution to scholarship in the specific areas that it addresses. In this case, we were particularly impressed by Schröter's remarkable combination of methodological sophistication, exegetical precision, and participation in broader intellectual discourse, which enables him to sharpen and advance the discussion of many classic issues in the field, such as, *inter alia*, the historicity of the Gospels (chap. 6), the universalizing of the law in Galatians (chap. 8), and the meaning of the canon for a theology of the New Testament (chap. 16). At the same time, we were also attracted to Schröter's work because of the extent to which it fulfills a second desideratum, namely that (most) contributions to the series should also serve as windows into the wider world of German-language scholarship. In Schröter's case, the resulting view is exceptional in several ways. In the first place, the multidisciplinary character of his treatment of recollection and history in early Christianity (chaps. 1–4; cf. esp. 6, 10) places the reader in dialogue with a wide range of (German) scholars outside the field of early Christianity, as does his chapter on metaphorical Christology in Paul (chap. 9). Within the field, the impressive scope of Schröter's expertise is such that the reader

gains insight into multiple focal points in the study of early Christianity, namely Jesus (chaps. 5–6; cf. 12), Paul (7–9; cf. 4), Luke/Acts (10–11; cf. 3, 13), the emergence of the canon in the context of early Christian history and literature (12–14; cf. 4), and New Testament theology (15–16). Finally, in addition to gaining access to recent German research, the reader is also brought into critical and constructive conversation throughout the volume with many of the towering German figures of the past, such as Johann Gustav Droysen, Ferdinand Christian Baur, David Friedrich Strauss, Adolf von Harnack, William Wrede, Albert Schweitzer, Rudolf Bultmann, and Ernst Käsemann. Readers who are interested in consulting the full range of Jens Schröter's publications are encouraged to consult his webpage (http://zope.theologie.hu-berlin.de/exegesent/schroeter) at the Humboldt University of Berlin. In order to facilitate such engagement, see the publications at the end of this introduction.

While it is sometimes said—to the great relief of the translator—that the original work is seldom consulted once a translation appears, the rationale and purpose of this series is such that we wish to resist this tendency. Accordingly, in order to facilitate close comparison with the German original, the English translation of each volume will always include the German pagination in square brackets. With regard to the translator's divided allegiance to the source and target languages, priority has sometimes been given to preserving the German idiom at the expense of English readability. For example, regarding it as significant that German does not restrict the terminology of *Wissenschaft*/*wissenschaftlich* to the natural sciences, Wayne Coppins has chosen to reflect this phenomenon by consistently employing the terminology of science/scientific, despite the fact that it is customary in English to speak of "New Testament scholarship" or "history" rather than "New Testament science" or "the science of history."

The editors especially wish to express their thanks to Henning Ziebritzki at Mohr Siebeck and Carey Newman at Baylor University Press for their exceptional support and guidance in the establishment and development of this series. Likewise, we are thankful to the many people at Baylor University Press who have given us concrete guidance and assistance along the way, especially Jordan Rowan Fannin, Jenny Hunt, Diane Smith, Jonathan Perry, Joseph Dahm, and Billy Collins. Finally, Wayne Coppins would like to thank Ronald Herms, Simon Gathercole, Samuel Vogel, Ingie Hovland, and Jens Schröter, for their advice in relation to specific points of translation.

Wayne Coppins and Simon Gathercole
Athens, Georgia, and Cambridge, England
September 2012

Jens Schröter's English-language publications

1996 "The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research." *Neotestamentica* 30: 151–67.

2001 "The Son of Man as the Representative of God's Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q." Pages 34–68 in *Jesus, Mark and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and Its Early Records.* Edited by A. Schmidt and M. Labahn. JSNTSup 214. Sheffield: Sheffield.

2006 "Jesus and the Canon: The Early Jesus Traditions in the Context of the Origins of the New Testament Canon." Pages 104–22, 222–28 in *Performing the Gospel. Orality, Memory, and Mark.* Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber. Edited by R. A. Horsley, J. A. Draper, and J. M. Foley. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Press.

2006 "New Horizons in Historical Jesus Research? Hermeneutical Considerations Concerning the So-Called 'Third Quest' of the Historical Jesus." Pages 71–85 in *The New Testament Interpreted. Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*. Edited by C. Breytenbach, J. C. Thom, and J. Punt. NovTSup. Leiden: Brill.

2008 "The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony? A Critical Examination of Richard Bauckham's 'Jesus and the Eyewitnesses.'" *JSNT* 31: 195–209.

2008 "Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases." Pages 233–55 in *Matthew, James and the Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings.* Edited by H. van de Sandt and J. Zangenberg. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature.

2009 "Jesus of Galilee: The Role of Location in Understanding Jesus." Pages 36–55 in *Jesus Research. An International Perspective. The Proceedings of the Biennial Princeton–Prague Symposium on the Current State of Studies on the Historical Jesus.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and P. Pokorný. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2010 "The Gospel of Mark." Pages 272–95 in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament.* Edited by D. E. Aune. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

2010 "Kingdom of God. III. New Testament." Pages 188–91 in *RPP* 7.

2010 "Logia/Sayings Source/Q." Pages 581–83 in *RPP* 7.

2010 "Memory. II. Bible." Pages 235–36 in *RPP* 8.

2010 "Remarks on James D. G. Dunn's Approach to Jesus Research." Pages 129–43 in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered*. Edited by R. B. Stewart and G. R. Habermas. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group.

2012 "The Criteria of Authenticity in Jesus Research and Historiographical Method." Pages 49–70 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity.* Edited by C. Keith and A. Le Donne. London: T&T Clark.

2012 "Gnosis: Concept, Origin and Context of the 'Gnostic Movement.' " *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 37: 9-27.

2012 "Paul the Founder of the Church: Reflections on the Reception of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and the Pastoral Epistles." Pages 195–219 in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Paul and Israel's Legacy.* Edited by D. Moessner, D. Marguerat, M. C. Parsons, and M. Wolter. London: T&T Clark.

2012 "Tradition III. New Testament." Pages 42–43 in *RPP* 13.

2012 "Trinitarian Belief, Binitarian Monotheism, and the One God: Reflections on the Origin of Christian Faith in Affiliation to Larry Hurtado's Christological Approach." Pages 171–94 in *Reflections on Early Christian History and Religion—Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte.* Edited by C. Breytenbach and J. Frey. AJEC 81. Leiden: Brill.

Forthcoming. *Jesus of Nazareth: Jew from Galilee—Savior of the World.* Translated by Wayne Coppins and Brian Pounds. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.

Preface to the English Edition

It is a great joy to me that the English translation of my book *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament* will inaugurate the new series Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. The research communication across linguistic and confessional borders, which has now been firmly established in New Testament science for many years, thereby receives further confirmation and strengthening.

This cooperation will be all the more successful if the specific characteristics of the German-language and English-language discourses are mutually recognized. Recent developments can easily illustrate this: it is no accident that the discourses about Jesus and Paul that have been initiated in recent decades have English designations: "Third Quest of the Historical Jesus" or "New Perspective on Paul." In both cases the concern is with discussions that were initiated in English-language scholarship. In both cases, however, the discourses have deep roots in German-language scholarship, and a recognition of this is also beneficial for current discussions on these questions. In the current research situation, in which international cooperation has become a matter of course, knowledge of the respective research constellations and their backgrounds in the history of ideas and culture should especially be made fruitful for the work on the questions of our discipline. The new series founded by the publishers Baylor University Press and Mohr Siebeck will undoubtedly make a significant contribution here.

The chapters of the present volume deal with areas that appear to me to be of fundamental importance for New Testament science as the discipline that investigates the emergence of Christianity in its ancient context. The hermeneutical and epistemological framework is formed by engagement with the science of history. The question of how we appropriate the past as history has been discussed since antiquity. In the modern period it has come into view in a new way under specific epistemological conditions.

How can—so it must now be asked—the remains of the past be joined together into a picture of history that satisfies current historical-critical history research and makes possible an access to the past that is based on this? How do the remains of the past relate to the critical interpretation of the male or female historian? What then is the relation between historical materials and the "constructive imagination" in the conception of a picture of history?

These questions, which have been intensively discussed in recent research in the science of history, are also significant for the question of the emergence of a Christian view of history. In the present volume they are considered from various perspectives: with respect to the quest for the historical Jesus, the theology of Paul, the Acts of the Apostles as the first conception of a Christian picture of history, and finally with respect to the emergence of the New Testament canon as the document with which the Christian church obligated itself to a specific corpus of writings. In this way some aspects of the process that led from Jesus to the New Testament will be illuminated.

Special thanks are due first to the translator of the book, Wayne Coppins. With great care and an astonishing sensitivity to my German text, he has produced an English edition that required not only an excellent knowledge of the German language but also a profound understanding of the subject matter in relation to questions of content. The rigorous and knowledgeable work of translation is an achievement that deserves my greatest respect. At the same time I thank the two editors of the series, Wayne Coppins and Simon Gathercole, for deciding to begin the new series with the English edition of my book. It is a great joy for me to intensify in this way the contact between Anglophone and German-language exegetical and historical scholarship.

Last but not least, I thank the publishers Baylor University Press and Mohr Siebeck for the initiative of this new series and the possibility of publishing my book in an English version.

Jens Schröter
Berlin, September 2012

Preface to the German Edition [V–VI]

The studies presented here were written between 2000 and 2006. For their publication together they were all revised and coordinated with one another. Here the focus was especially on emphasizing the overarching perspectives that linked the individual contributions together. These studies aim to set important early Christian conceptions in relation to one another in terms of tradition history and theology and in this way to illuminate the relationship between the diversity and theological unity of the New Testament and contribute to further discussion on this central question of New Testament science.

The common point of reference is the question of what the Christian understanding of reality is founded on and how this understanding, which has its foundation in the writings of the New Testament, can claim a place in the discussion of the interpretation of reality. This line of questioning is developed in four areas of focus. In part I, an access to history from the perspective of Christian faith is brought into conversation with the science of history. Building on this, part II is devoted to three central areas of the history of early Christian theology: the Jesus tradition, the theology of Paul, and Luke's Acts of the Apostles. Through the aspects that are considered, it is shown, by way of example, how, from the initial beginnings of Christianity, which still moved in the framework of a Jewish discussion, the formation of a distinctive Christian view of reality emerged. Part III then thematizes the development from individual early Christian writings to the New Testament as the collection of writings that is binding for the Christian church. This moves beyond the temporal framework of the origin of these writings, and processes come into view in which early Christianity secured its identity through such a collection of binding "canonical" writings. Finally, part IV thematizes the resulting question of how to conceptualize a "theology of the New Testament."

These are areas that have been at the center of my work on the New Testament and the history of early Christian theology for some time. The

studies are therefore simultaneously situated in the context of larger projects as continuations or preparatory work: the early Christian Jesus tradition and the quest for the historical Jesus have constantly accompanied me since my [VI] habilitation thesis[1] and continue to do so. I have recently submitted a summary of my current view in my Jesus presentation in the series "*Biblische Gestalten.*"[2] Furthermore, I have taken on the commentary on Acts for the series *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* and the volume on theology of the New Testament for the *Neue Theologische Grundrisse.* Some of the contributions gathered here are understood not least as steps on the path to these more comprehensive projects.

I wish to thank all the people who have worked on the preparation of this volume. Astrid Hotze, who was then still a research assistant for my chair in Leipzig, prepared the first formatting of the contributions. The further oversight of the volume then rested in the hands of my current research assistant Christine Jacobi, who accompanied it with great dedication and reliability until the final version. The index was compiled by Lisa Fuchs, Friederike Gerlach, Sebastian Kropp, and Katharina Zeth and the bibliography by Denny Wermann. Marlies Schäfer, secretary at the Institute for New Testament of the theological faculty of the University of Leipzig, also participated in the proofreading of the manuscript. I would like to express warm thanks to all those mentioned for the dedication, diligence, and care that they devoted to the manuscript.

Jörg Frey, editor of the *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,* immediately accepted my suggestion to publish the volume in this series without reservation. For this I wish to thank him (also) here. As usual, the collaboration with Mohr Siebeck, especially with Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and Ms. Tanja Mix, was congenial and uncomplicated. For this I am also extremely thankful.

Jens Schröter
Leipzig/Berlin, January 2007

[1] Schröter 1997.
[2] Schröter 2010 [2006].

[1–5]

Introduction

From Jesus to the New Testament—this signals a development that led, in the first three centuries of the history of Christianity, to the formation of a distinct religious self-understanding. This was bound up with the emergence of a specific view of reality and history. With this we have already named an initial focal point of the studies presented here.

In recent decades, an intensive discussion has been conducted in the science of history on how the past is appropriated as history and becomes a common point of reference for a community—how it becomes their "cultural memory" (Jan Assmann). History—it thus became clear—emerges not simply through the passing of time but through formative events of the past becoming the foundation of the self-understanding of communities through interpretation, placement in larger contexts, and differentiation from competing interpretations.

Part I of this volume explores the relevance of this discussion for the history of early Christianity from a methodological perspective. In recent discussion within the theory of history, reference is often made to the identity-creating function of conceptions of history. In the process the key word "constructivism" has sometimes been brought into play. This should underline the fact that it is always thinking and acting human beings who appropriate the past—who "construct" it as history—in order to better understand better their present. The "constructivist" approach, however, has also led to irritations and misunderstandings, not least within theology. Therefore I will begin with a few observations in order to contextualize the remarks in the corresponding chapters of this book (in particular, see chapters 1–4).

I must first stress that the expressions "constructivism" and "construction of history," which are only used sparingly in this volume, in no way deny that in the early Christian texts events and experiences are reflected, in many different ways, that were extremely important to their authors

and are also indispensible for today's engagement with the beginnings of Christianity. [2] Thus, in the aforementioned approach it is decidedly *not* a matter of wanting to relativize the value of the early Christian texts as historical witnesses, let alone to deprive them of such a value.

With this, however, the question of the *appropriation of the past as history* has not even begun to be answered, neither with regard to the events underlying these texts nor with respect to their later reception. For this we need instead to reflect on the process by which living history comes into being from the "historical material" (Droysen) through our engagement with it. If this process is reflected upon epistemologically and hermeneutically—this applies to antiquity just as it does to the modern science of history—then the interpretive character of historical work, which makes the witnesses of the past its own from the point of view of the respective present, comes into view. Therefore, it becomes evident that the appropriation of the historical material only reaches its goal when it learns to understand the present in light of the past. The concern then is with reflection on the process that always takes place, consciously or unconsciously, when we turn to the witnesses of the past—and therefore with an epistemological question that is fundamental for the science of history.

The first four chapters of this volume deal with this theme. Here the link to Johann Gustav Droysen, who reflected on the methodology of historical work in a fundamental way at the beginning of the modern science of history, plays an important role. According to Droysen, historical work is precisely not exhausted in the examination and critical evaluation of the material (for him these steps are called "heuristic" and "criticism"), but first comes to its goal in the "interpretation." This insight of Droysen into the character of historical work—which he simultaneously regarded as the fundamental difference from the approach of his historian-colleagues[1]—is still relevant today.

Chapters 3 and 4 identify concrete areas in which this understanding is significant for a history of early Christianity. Here, consideration is given to the Gospels and Acts, writings that are dealt with in greater detail in part II of the volume. But the event of Jesus' death and resurrection as an event that is fundamental for a Christian understanding of history and reality also comes into view (chapter 4). The goal is to reflect in a manner informed by a hermeneutics of history on the beginnings of Christianity on the basis of these texts. [3]

From Jesus to the New Testament—this outlines a span of time that begins with the activity and fate of Jesus, then leads in the theology of Paul to a

[1] Droysen 1977, 22.

programmatic conception that had a lasting impact on the developments that followed, and is brought for the first time in the Lukan *Doppelwerk* (double work) into the form of a distinctive presentation of history that links Jesus and Paul with each other.

The contributions of part II are devoted to these three areas. Chapters 5 and 6 deal with the role of the Jesus tradition in early Christianity. First, the sayings tradition is considered; secondly, the biographical presentation of the activity of Jesus in the Gospels is taken into consideration. The sayings of Jesus show themselves to be part of a paraenetic-catechetical sphere of early Christianity, which also included quotations from the writings of Israel and the early Jewish tradition. Building on this, the Jesus narratives of the Gospels present "representations" (Ricoeur) of the activity and fate of Jesus, which they "stand for" through their narratives and thus bring into their own present.

Chapters 7 to 9 deal with Paul. In two studies on Galatians, which is perhaps the most important writing of Paul for the self-understanding of a community of Jews and Gentiles, it becomes clear how he defines the place of the believers in Christ beyond Judaism and Hellenism. The "New Perspective on Paul" (Dunn) has emphasized that Paul must be understood within a Jewish discourse, into which he intervenes with a pointed position, namely that the Christ event means a universalizing of the promises of God. Paul thereby develops the notion of respectively distinct ways for Jews and Gentiles to come to the community in Christ, but simultaneously holds fast to the unity of the gospel for Jews and Gentiles. The contribution on metaphorical Christology in Paul (chapter 9) then examines a few central christological metaphors from his letters.

The two following chapters are devoted to the Acts of the Apostles. For the line of questioning pursued here, two aspects in particular are of interest. First, the opposition "Luke as trustworthy historian or Luke as theologian of salvation history?" which for a long time played a (much too) determinative role in scholarship, has receded into the background in favor of a more differentiated view. Martin Dibelius had already quite rightly pointed out that Luke shows himself to be the "first Christian historian" precisely in the fact that he places a stamp on his material that permits it to be understood as the history of the earliest period of Christianity. This may not, however, be played off against his knowledge of events from the early period of Christianity or against his cultural knowledge about places and circumstances in the regions of the Roman Empire. Instead, Luke has reworked his historical and cultural [4] knowledge into a conception that allows the developments about which he reports to appear as a coherent complex of events directed by God.

According to Luke, the meaning of this complex of events—and this is the second aspect—consists in the implementation of the plan, which was conceived by God from time immemorial, of an opening up of the people of God for the Gentiles. The Gentiles do not thereby replace Israel as a "new people of God." Rather, the *form* of the people of God changes so that now both Jews and Gentiles can belong to it. The regulations of the apostolic decree thereby present the basis for the people of God made up of Jews and Gentiles. However, at the time of Luke, on account of the rejection of the Christ message by the Jews, (almost) only Gentiles are still found in the people chosen by God (cf. Acts 15.14). As the end of Acts makes clear, precisely this was thus intended in the plan of God itself.

With this theology-of-history conception, Luke is situated in clear proximity to Paul. This again places the occasionally claimed disjunction between Luke and Paul (possibly also the so-called "we-reports") in another light.

From Jesus to the New Testament—this refers to a process within which early Christianity created a binding collection of writings, a "canon," which subsequently became the basis of its identity as a distinct faith community. The chapters in part III are devoted to this development. They consider once again from this perspective the Jesus tradition as well as Acts. The scope of the "authentic" Jesus tradition was not firmly delineated for quite some time. Both the sayings of Jesus quoted in the so-called "Apostolic fathers" and in the "Apocrypha" show this, but the tradition of the New Testament texts themselves also point in this direction. From this arose the necessity of differentiating the Jesus tradition that was to be regarded as binding. This differentiation took place in the process of the emergence of the New Testament through the formation of the "fourfold gospel" (Irenaeus).

The book of Acts also played an important role in the emergence of the New Testament canon. It served to relate the Gospels and the Letters of Paul to each other and in addition created the basis for also receiving additional apostle-letters—the so-called "Catholic Letters"—into the binding collection of early Christian writings. This process is investigated in chapter 13.

From Jesus to the New Testament—this raises the problem of how far the writings composed over a fairly long period of time and by different authors can be interpreted from a unified perspective. Such a perspective first allows it to appear meaningful to speak of a "theology of the New Testament." How we might think of the way to the conception of such a theology is the theme of part IV. For this purpose the variety of the writings

gathered in the New Testament—a variety highlighted by historical-critical research—is made the starting point (chapter 15). Then the question of how to conceptualize a theology of the New Testament—starting from the discussion surrounding the meaning of the New Testament canon—is developed (chapter 16).

In this way the studies presented here especially aim to clarify the contribution of New Testament science to the overall theological discourse.

This page intentionally left blank

Part I

RECOLLECTION AND HISTORY IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

This page intentionally left blank

1 [9–22]

New Testament Science beyond Historicism

Recent Developments in the Theory of History and Their Significance for the Exegesis of Early Christian Writings[2]

One of the central tasks of New Testament science is to mediate to the respective present a picture of the beginnings of Christianity that is based on the early Christian witnesses. In this way it makes a fundamental contribution to Christian theology as a historically grounded science. The intellectual-historical presuppositions upon which it is based have taken form—at least for the European and North American cultural sphere—since the late eighteenth century, thus in a period that was decisively shaped by enlightenment, idealism, and historicism. The historical-critical consciousness, which emerged as part of these developments, was then—at the latest since Max Weber—itself subjected to critical reflection.[3] Above all there was a calling into question of the assumption that historical events—and accordingly also "history" itself—carry their meaning in themselves, which was therefore to be drawn out from them by historians, as well as the assumption that the historian has direct access to the objects investigated by him. The meaning of past events does not lie hidden in the witnesses of the past themselves but opens itself to the view of the interpreter, who places these in a broader [10] context.[4] From this follows the epistemological question of the relationship between past happening and historical imagination in the writing of history.

[2] The wording of the title follows Mommsen 1972. Mommsen's remarks are based on his inaugural lecture at the University of Düsseldorf on February 3, 1970, which had the goal of "determining more precisely the present-day position of the historical sciences both looking back to its great traditions and also with a view to its tasks in today's society" (5–6). The determination of the position of the historical sciences undertaken by Mommsen still points the way ahead for today's reflections on the foundations and relevance of historical work.

[3] Cf. Mommsen 1972, 18–24.

[4] This was already classically formulated—admittedly from an idealistic perspective—by von Humboldt 1969, 585: "But what has happened is only partly visible in the world of senses; the rest must be felt, inferred, guessed."

In light of these fundamental objections, which have led to a fundamental rethinking of the premises of historical work,[5] the question also arises of how we can arrive at a history based on the witnesses of early Christianity that can be brought in as a contribution to the theological conversation.[6] If New Testament science wants to perform its task in a methodologically considered manner, then it is referred thereby to the conversation with the science of history.[7] In light of this, the following presuppositions can be stated: the early Christian texts do not convey direct access to the reality to which they refer but relate to that reality in a selective and interpretive manner. They do this, as all other texts also do, in the medium of language, which structures our access to reality and mediates between present and past.[8] Through interpretation of these texts—thus as it were in a double refraction—a picture of the beginnings of Christianity is set forth. In what follows I will take up several aspects from the most recent theory-of-history discussion against this background, which then will be made fruitful for New Testament science. [11]

1. Methodological foundations of the modern concept of history

Recent theory-of-history discussion in the European sphere started in the 1970s[9] and has led since then to a wide-ranging discourse on the epistemological foundations of the access to the past under the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness.[10] Parallel to this development the works of

[5] See further chap. 2 in this volume.

[6] The theory-of-history considerations given in what follows would therefore have to be combined with theological-hermeneutical consequences. On this cf. recently Reinmuth 2002, 11–38.

[7] That the science of history, if it wants to do justice to its object, requires a consideration of the character of historical knowing was already recognized early and led to the formation of historics (*Historik*), which deals with the methodological, epistemological, and hermeneutical foundations of the science of history. The discipline was founded by J. G. Droysen, who shaped the concept and in whose tradition the most recent theory-of-history approaches also stand. Cf. Droysen 1977 (on the term "Historik," see 43–44). For more recent discussion, reference may be made to Rüsen 1983–1989; Lorenz 1997; Goertz 1995.

[8] A concise presentation of epistemological aspects bound up with the reference of texts to reality is found in Lategan/Vorster 1985, 67–93. Fried 1996, 295–300, has succinctly presented the consequences for the science of history. Fried 1996, 295, programmatically states that "no historian is able to view historical truth purely, not even the smallest part of it . . . everything can only be grasped as language pictures."

[9] Cf. the programmatic lecture of Koselleck 1971, which was given in 1970 at the German convocation of historians in Cologne.

[10] The following may be mentioned as examples: the six volume "Beiträge zur Historik" ["Contributions to Historics"] (Munich 1977–1990) published by the work group

Hayden White emerged in the USA, which considered nineteenth-century European historical thinking in light of the *linguistic turn*.[11] This takes into account the necessity of a discourse on the theoretical foundations of the science of history, which scarcely took place in Germany until about the middle of the twentieth century due to the lasting influence of historicism. It is true that in his lectures on historics Johann Gustav Droysen already submitted the foundations of historical knowing to a careful analysis in the second half of the nineteenth century.[12] The German science of history, however, did not at first make much effort to develop further this methodological foundation, but instead oriented itself on the working out of the nature of past epochs based on critical source study (an approach that was decisively inaugurated by Leopold von Ranke) without specifically thematizing the epistemological problems bound up with this.[13] The approaches for overcoming the problems of historicism developed by Ernst Troeltsch and Max Weber did not initially fundamentally change this situation either.

The discourse, which has now been underway for three decades, on the methodological foundations of the science of history must be placed in this broader horizon. It first became clear that historicism—notwithstanding its achievements, which have often [12] been underscored in differentiated statements[14]—must be charged with a "weakness in theory."[15] This consists in an individualizing hermeneutic oriented to a one-sided concept of understanding, to which corresponds a dismissal of social-scientific lines of questioning,[16] and in an inadequate differentiation between the history set forth by the historian and the past itself, which manifested itself in a positivistic model of explanation.[17]

By contrast, Droysen had already maintained that the past is not perceived in an act of direct empathy, but historical knowing is based instead

---

"Theory of History"; Rüsen 1976; 2003; Müller/Rüsen 1997; Goertz 2001; and more recently Ricoeur 2004a; 2004b.

[11] White 1973; 1978.

[12] Droysen gave this lecture a total of seventeen times in Jena and Berlin between 1857 and 1882/1883. Cf. the preface by P. Leyh in Droysen 1977, ix.

[13] An extension of the science-of-history discussion in the Federal Republic of Germany followed, however, through the reception of social-scientific lines of questioning from about the middle of the twentieth century. This, however, did not yet lead to a fundamental consideration of the methodological foundations of the historical process of knowing.

[14] By way of overview cf. Hertfelder 1998; Murrmann-Kahl 2001.

[15] Cf. Goertz 1995, 53–56.

[16] This first became visible in the Lamprecht controversy. On this cf. Murrmann-Kahl 1992, 123–26 n. 155, as well as the in-depth discussion of Lamprecht by his student Schönebaum 1955

[17] Cf. Mommsen 1972. For a presentation and criticism of the positivistic model, cf. Lorenz 1997, 65–87.

on an "understanding gained through criticism and interpretation.[18] Droysen thus criticized the view that the nature of history lies in the criticism of the sources that leads to "pure fact" and maintained against this that the interpretive activity in the engagement with the past restricts the notion of a historical objectivity from the start.[19] Consequently he specified the "nature of the historical method" not as the determination of pure fact but as an act of investigative understanding.[20] If the historical work was determined in this way from the perspective of the interpretation, which takes up the results of the criticism and takes them further,[21] then this represented the insight into the constructive character of the historical process of knowing through which the respective conception of history was already distinguished from past reality in the methodological approach.[22]

Even if Weber was critical of Droysen, he nevertheless expanded existing approaches epistemologically. Through his analysis of social-scientific and cultural-scientific knowledge[23] the notion of a direct relationship to the object of knowledge was further relativized through the distinction [13] between scientific lines of inquiry and personal value judgments as well as through the introduction of the heuristic category of the "ideal type." A fundamental deficiency of historicism was addressed with Weber's clear separation between reality as a chaotic, amorphous stream of events and the category of the ideal type, which first makes knowledge possible.[24]

The present-day theory of history stands in the tradition of these insights. As important as a critical penetration of the historical material is in dealing with the past, there is no way around Droysen's insight that even criticism does not seek the "actual historical fact."[25] Likewise, we must not fall behind Weber's epistemological insight that cultural-scientific knowledge is not able to ground value judgments and the past is always questioned from the interests and with the heuristic methods of the present. It is indisputable that the historical material first becomes a "source" about the past through the lines of inquiry and instruments of knowledge with which it is processed and through the presentation of investigated facts by the

[18] Droysen 1977, 57.

[19] Cf. Barth 1991, 194–203.

[20] Barth 1991, 423: "The nature of the historical method is to understand by investigating."

[21] Droysen 1977, 431: "The conscientiousness that will not go beyond the results of criticism errs in handing over all further work with them to fantasy instead of also finding rules for the further work that will secure their correctness." Cf. Droysen 1897, 25–26.

[22] Droysen 1977, 417; cf. also 239. In both places Droysen criticizes Ranke, whose presentations come too close to the historical novel.

[23] Thus especially in Weber 1988.

[24] On this cf. Kocka 1986.

[25] Droysen 1977, 428.

interpreter. Past facts and events are always only accessible in the form of various kinds of witnesses about them and are never, by contrast, directly accessible. The transfer of these witnesses into history therefore represents a complex process of analysis, evaluation, and ordering of the historical material into a coherent course of events. For this, the interpretive activity of the interpreter—the "historical imagination"—is indispensible, for it is only in this way that a "source" for history comes into being from the historical material. Thus, the sources alone do not lead to conceptions of history, but they guide the interpretations and simultaneously limit the possibilities for appropriating the past.[26]

It is this characteristic intertwining of construction and reconstruction that has characterized the modern science of history from its beginnings and has led more recently to a renewal of the conversation between historians and literary scientists on the relationship between [14] the science of history and literature.[27] With this a dimension has been rediscovered that was of central importance for the formation of modern historical thinking and that must now be reflected on with reference to historical criticism.[28]

These developments led to the dissolution—beginning already in the eighteenth century—of the Aristotelian opposition between history writing, which transmits what happened, and literature (or poetry), which fabricates what could have been.[29] Under the conditions of the modern historical consciousness this opposition is recognized as epistemologically inadequate and replaced through a concept of history that underlines the commonality—which culminates in the category of *narrated time*—with the literary narrative.[30] If the critical evaluation of the historical material first reaches

[26] Cf. Koselleck 1979, 206: "Strictly speaking a source can never tell us what we should say. It does, however, hinder us from making statements that we may not make. The sources have a power of veto. They prohibit us from venturing or allowing interpretations that can be plainly seen through as false or as not permissible . . . Sources protect us from errors but they do not tell us what we should say."

[27] The results of two important symposiums at which this relationship played a role are documented in Lämmert 1982 as well as Henrich/Iser 1983.

[28] At the beginning of the modern historical consciousness stood the new form of history *presentation* established by F. Schiller, not yet the *critical investigation* of the past—though that also certainly claimed to report on actual happenings! Building on Schiller's ideas, the latter, by contrast, was first called for by von Humboldt, and then systematically worked out by Droysen. For the aesthetic dimension, which is fundamental for modern history writing, see Süssmann 2000, 75–112.

[29] Aristotle, *Poet.*, 1415b. For discussion of this topos, cf. chap. 3 in this volume as well as Koselleck 1979, 278–84.

[30] The great work of Ricoeur 1988–1991; 1984–1988; is first and foremost to be mentioned. Ricoeur develops a model that views literary and historical narrative from the Aristotelian concept of the fable (or plot) and conceptualizes the access to past reality as *narrated time* (*erzählte Zeit*), which has to be distinguished from the *time of narration* (*Erzählzeit*).

its goal in the construction of history, which represents the past time in the present,[31] then the integration of the process of interpretation into the methodology of historical knowing is indispensible—the writing of history becomes the "theory problem of the science of history."[32]

In view of this, fictionality can no longer be restricted to free invention, which would have to be assigned to literature but kept out of history writing.[33] Rather, for the latter, precisely the reality-disclosing power that fictions possess as heuristic hypotheses [15] about reality is of interest because this first makes possible an access to the past that is oriented to the sources.[34] The *distinction* between history writing and literature does not thereby become invalid. Nevertheless, for the methodological foundation of the concept of history the insight into the not-to-be-*separated* processes of critical source study and historical imagination is indispensible, because only in this way can history come into being from sources in a methodologically considered manner.[35]

2. Theory of history and New Testament science

Protestant theologians were involved to a large extent in the formation of the modern concept of history.[36] The emergence of critical Bible science as an independent discipline over against dogmatics was therefore a fundamental consequence of this process. The development from the enlightenment history of the eighteenth century to the historicism of the nineteenth century found expression in the theological discussion just as the emergence of the philosophy of history did. This already points to the close relationship between the emergence of the modern historical consciousness and a theology reflected on from a historical-critical point of view. Therefore, New Testament science must also take into consideration the recent developments in the theory of history sketched above.

The breakthrough to historical thinking makes its presence felt at various points. An example is the discussion concerning an access to Jesus as the foundation of the Christian faith that is not obstructed by dogmatic

[31] Cf. Jauss 1982.

[32] Cf. Rüsen 1982b; Rüsen 1982a.

[33] In addition to Koselleck 1979 and Ricoeur 1988–1991; 1984–1988, cf. also the important article by Mommsen 1984.

[34] Cf. Baumgartner/Rüsen 1982, 691.

[35] Jauss 1982, 427–34, has pointed out the use of fictional methods in Ranke's "French History." It becomes clear through this that the notion of an "objective view" of history is combined with a manner of presentation that does not take into consideration its epistemological presuppositions.

[36] Important epistemological presuppositions of the historical point of view were already formulated by Herder 1774. Cf. Herder 1968; 1993, 38–48.

interventions. While Hermann Samuel Reimarus initially separated the teaching of Jesus from that of the apostles,[37] the nineteenth century was characterized by the search for an image of Jesus gained by the standards of historical criticism as the starting point for the history of Christianity. [16]

A second sphere in which the turn to a theology founded on historical criticism can be seen is the distinction, programmatically put forward by Johann Philipp Gabler, between biblical and dogmatic theology, which was followed by the distinction between Old Testament and New Testament theology as a next step, before William Wrede fundamentally called into question the legitimacy of the discipline "theology of the New Testament" and demanded that it be replaced by a history of early Christian religion or theology.[38] Both developments, which are situated in immediate proximity to each other in time,[39] complement one another to the extent that they champion the autonomous right of historical-critical theology over against dogmatic theology. For this reason they are of fundamental importance for the differentiation of the theological disciplines.

From a methodology-of-history perspective, the discussion was shaped by the controversy with the Tübingen School, in particular with David Friedrich Strauss and Ferdinand Christian Baur. Shortly after its publication, Christian Hermann Weisse critically engaged Strauss' "Life of Jesus," which appeared in 1835/1836. Against Strauss' thesis of the mythical shaping of the Jesus tradition, Weisse wanted to set a Jesus secured by historical research as the foundation for the Christian faith. The theory that he developed for this of two sources based on direct or indirect eyewitness testimony (the recollections of Peter recorded by Mark and the sayings source of the apostle Matthew), which was to gain great acceptance in Synoptic research as the "two-source theory," was originally intended to undermine the thesis of a freely circulating oral Jesus tradition by referring to the two oldest, historically reliable sources on Jesus. Notwithstanding the acceptance, which rightly followed, of the two-source theory as the most plausible Synoptic explanatory model, Weisse's approach hindered a reception of insights informed by a hermeneutics of history for a long time in Jesus research. By contrast, a further development of the approach of Strauss occurs when the Gospels as well as the traditions reworked in them are understood as interpretations of the activity of Jesus in the forms of expression of their time.[40]

[37] Cf. Reimarus 1984, 13.

[38] For further discussion of this topic, see chap. 16 in this volume.

[39] The edition of the aforementioned text of Reimarus by Lessing followed in 1778; Gabler's lecture on an independent biblical theology was given in 1787 and published two years later.

[40] Theissen 2000, 47 (cf. 1999, 21), fittingly speaks in this connection of a "peculiar combination of myth and history" at the beginning of Christianity.

From the side of theology Baur also experienced decisive rejection.[41] His historical criticism, in part overdrawn and untenable, also brought the productive [17] aspects of his approach into disrepute. Against his establishment of the priority of Matthew many arguments can be advanced that undermine his position. His disputing of the authenticity of many of Paul's letters also proved to be too radical. The impression arose—whether rightly or wrongly—that here decisions were made about the historical source findings on the basis of a certain philosophy of history. With such a general rejection of his approach, however, the impulses from Baur that were of lasting importance—in spite of undoubtedly necessary corrections—were pushed to the side.

For an approach to Jesus and the history of early Christianity that is informed by a hermeneutics of history the insights of Strauss and Baur that continue to be valid must therefore be taken up. However right it is that Strauss' myth criticism underestimates the historical value of the Gospels, his view that in the Gospels certain "myths" were drawn upon to explain a historical phenomenon continues to be valid for research on the Gospels and Jesus. Moreover, his model of Synoptic exegesis, which is close to Herder's tradition hypothesis, has been impressively confirmed by scholarship on the oral transmission of the early Jesus tradition. It has been clear for a long time that a purely literary model would be inadequate for explaining the tradition processes, and instead we must reckon with a coexistence of oral and written paths of tradition, even after the emergence of the first gospels.[42]

With regard to Baur, the teacher of Strauss, an analogous finding can be observed. Even if his notion of an opposition between a Jewish Christian and a Gentile Christian direction in early Christianity, which were then conciliated with each other in "early Catholicism," cannot be maintained in this schematic manner, he nevertheless accomplished pioneering work with the consistent application of historiographic principles to the history of early Christianity.[43] He saw clearly that the historian stands before the task of forming a history from the mass of individual data rather than remaining stuck in the details in a positivistic manner. With his inquiry into the tendency of the traditions, which the historian must take into account in the construction of a historical connection, he combined historical criticism of the sources and interpretation in a manner that corresponds to the aforementioned principles of historical research worked out by Droysen.

[41] Cf. Köpf 1992, 447–50.

[42] This is consistently taken into account in the Jesus presentation of Dunn 2003b. Cf. the relevant section "The Tradition" on pages 173–254.

[43] On this cf. Scholder 1961; Köpf 1992, 451–61.

His [18] methodology-of-history insights must therefore be taken up and developed further with regard to a history of early Christianity.

New Testament science has only received with reservation the approaches of Droysen, Baur and Weber, as well as the impulses of Herder and Strauss. When it became clear, at the turn from the nineteenth to the twentieth century, that the oldest Jesus presentation in the Gospel of Mark also may not be understood positivistically in a historical-biographical manner, but is an interpretation of history from the perspective of faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God, it instead developed other answers: Albert Schweitzer accused the life-of-Jesus research of not taking seriously the strangeness of the person of Jesus and demanded instead a turn to the "true, unshakable, historical foundation" of Christianity. At the same time, in his now famous lecture on "the essence of Christianity," Adolf von Harnack derived this in an analogous manner from the "proclamation of Jesus according to its main features."[44] Both models—which came to extremely different results despite the stated intention of a "purely historical" approach—sought a direct assurance about the historical foundation of Christianity, without reflecting on the character of historical knowledge. When Harnack in his subsequent investigation[45] set aside the Gospel of Mark, which had in the meantime become questionable as a historical source, and relied instead on the sayings source Q, one can already discern here the tendency to seek what is essential in the appearance of Jesus in his sayings, thus in his "proclamation"—a line that has consequences via Rudolf Bultmann's Jesus book into current Q and Jesus research, and one that wants to gain direct access, removed from historical provisionalities, to the origin of Christianity by establishing the authentic sayings of Jesus.[46]

Bultmann's engagement with the epistemological and hermeneutical problems pertaining to a relationship to early Christian history undoubtedly represents an important step forward within New Testament science.[47] Nevertheless, in his existential-philosophical approach, characterized [19]

[44] Von Harnack 1999, 41, wants to pose the question of what Christianity is as a "purely historical" question and in this way to make known, lift out, and make comprehensible "what is essential and lasting."

[45] Von Harnack 1907; 1908.

[46] Such tendencies can especially be observed in certain circles of North American Q and Jesus research. It is no accident that the *Gospel of Thomas*—which corresponds to the described approach in its concept of Jesus sayings without context—also plays an important role here.

[47] Reference should be made especially to his article "Das Problem der Hermeneutik" (1950), as well as "Ist voraussetzungslose Exegese möglich?" (1957). For the German original of these essays, see Bultmann 2002, 223–47, 258–66. For English translations, see Bultmann 1955 ("The Problem of Hermeneutics") and 1966 ("Is Presuppositionless Exegesis Possible?").

by concepts such as "de-historization," "highly personal encounter with history," and "being delivered over to history," the tendency to theologically exaggerate the perspectival and provisional nature of historical conceptions with reference to "authenticity" (*Eigentlichkeit*) is unmistakable.[48] The combination of form-critical methodology with an existential hermeneutic directed toward the concept of "decision" would therefore have to be specifically reflected upon from a theory-of-history perspective.

By contrast, an often-overlooked reception of insights informed by a hermeneutics of history is found in Emanuel Hirsch.[49] Hirsch explicitly follows on from Ranke, Droysen, and Baur and makes their insights fruitful for the engagement with the history of Christianity. More recently, reflections on a relationship to the beginnings of Christianity informed by a methodology of history have been formulated, e.g., by Bernhard Lategan,[50] Elisabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza,[51] and specifically in relation to Jesus research by Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter.[52] Recently, Udo Schnelle and Eckart Reinmuth have also taken up the recent discussion in the theory of history.[53] In these approaches the perspectival nature of historical knowledge is taken into account as well as the indispensability of fictional elements in the meaning-creating historical narrative. With this the first steps have been taken along a path that is of fundamental importance for the future discourse on the methodological foundations of the investigation of early Christianity.[54] In conclusion, I will make this concrete with a few pointers.

The texts of the New Testament relate to the reality of Jesus in that they—to take up an expression of Gerd Theissen—surround it with [20] an "aura of fictionality."[55] In this way they construct past reality in such a way that it obtains meaning for the respective present. The Gospels are witnesses that narratively rework and theologically interpret the events of

[48] This approach also underlies Bultmann's Jesus book, in which "Jesus proclamation" is placed in advance in a "temporal-historical framework" and is then understood evidently largely independently from this framework as what Jesus "actually wanted" (Bultmann 1926, 11). On this cf. Schröter 2007, 103–46 (chap. 6 in this volume).

[49] Cf. Barth 1991, 212–303, as well as Lüdemann 1991.

[50] Cf. e.g., Lategan 1985.

[51] Schüssler-Fiorenza 1991.

[52] Theissen/Winter 1997; 2001.

[53] Schnelle 2003, 2–8; 2005, 26–32.

[54] It should be explicitly noted that only works from the immediate circle of New Testament scholars have been mentioned here. The situation in the other theological disciplines would have to be judged separately. The references to the works from Murrmann-Kahl 1992 and Barth 1991 (see n. 16 and n. 19) already point to another state of discussion in systematic theology.

[55] Theissen/Merz 2001, 31 (cf. 1998, 13): "With its hypotheses the historical imagination creates an 'aura of fictionality' around the figure of Jesus just like the religious imagination of early Christianity [did]."

Jesus' activity and fate. As representations of the history of Jesus they are at the same time historical sources that provide information about their own time as well as the narrated time.[56] The letters of Paul can be understood analogously as creations of meaning that construct the present and past reality anew in light of the Christ event.[57] Finally, Acts—or the Lukan Doppelwerk as a whole—represents the first work in which Jesus, the apostles in Jerusalem, the Hellenists, and finally Paul are united with one another within a conception of history.

In what follows our concern will be with these early Christian witnesses' relation to reality. The reality construction of early Christianity thereby represents the starting point for a present-day relation to the beginnings of Christianity. These interpretations should not simply be repeated, but critically questioned in relation to the difference between reality and its representation. The goal of such a consideration of the early Christian texts is a theology of the New Testament that does not simply set the early Christian conceptions alongside one another but understands them in their collection into a "canon" of binding faith confessions as an expression of a specific understanding of reality and God. Thus the result of such an approach cannot be the reconstruction of a past reality behind the texts. Rather, what is to be strived for is a conception of an early Christian history and theology that allows the meaning of the New Testament witnesses for Christian theology and Christian faith in the present to become clear. [21]

3. Conclusions

When New Testament science draws pictures of the beginnings of Christianity, then we are dealing with conceptualizations of the historical imagination that are accountable to the sources and that interpret the historical material from the perspective of the respective present. The sources are thereby the building stones and the historical imagination is the architect who fits them together into a picture of history. The sources themselves do not yield history; they have, however, a "power of veto" with respect to interpretations that are not possible.[58]

New Testament science has the task of submitting the historical material to a careful philological-historical analysis and evaluating it accordingly. In

[56] Cf. Schröter 2001b, 6–61; Schröter 2007, 103–46 (chap. 6 in this volume).

[57] Concerning the question of the changeability of the image of the past through historical thinking, cf. in the first instance Rüsen 2003, 17–44. In Paul this becomes clear, for example, in the new construction of the history of Israel and the Gentiles in light of the Christ event. As the recourse to Abraham in Galatians 3 and Romans 4, and also to Adam in Romans 5, shows, for him the commonalities (sinfulness, addressees of the promise) predominate, which now make possible a community in Christ.

[58] Cf. the quotation from Kosselleck 1979, 206, cited in n. 26 above.

this area, designated "criticism" by Droysen, it has developed a heightened consciousness and a sophisticated methodology, which must also play a leading role in the future. By contrast, the epistemological reference—found in the theory formation of the modern science of history since Humboldt and Droysen and independently reflected upon once more by Weber—to the processes of meaning formation that are necessary for the emergence of history, which confront the historical material with heuristic, correctable, and falsifiable models, has had less of an impact. The shared sphere of historiography and literature, perceived in the modern theory of history from its beginnings, points to this as does the historical narrative's power of explanation, which has recently been emphasized again.

The areas in which these reflections have primarily found expression in New Testament science are New Testament theology, Jesus research, and the history of early Christianity. In all these areas the sources have to be linked to narratives that make the emergence of Christianity from the activity of Jesus comprehensible. Such conceptions should not be equated with the past itself, but represent hypotheses—obtained with the aid of the historical material—concerning the events underlying the sources, their causes and effects, and also their meaning for the respective present.

A consideration of the epistemological presuppositions of the modern science of history and their hermeneutical implications thus leads to a conception of New Testament science beyond historicism. In view of the task of displaying the beginnings of Christianity to the respective present in the form of a heuristic model, presentations on the initial period of Christianity [22] must be set forth as narratives that possess a claim to historical plausibility and are written at the same time with the awareness that we are dealing with models through which past reality is represented in the present.[59] In this way the past *as history* becomes accessible to the respective present. The orientation of Christian theology to its origins, which remains necessary, can thus take place in a form that corresponds to present-day conditions of knowledge.

[59] Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 222–93; 1984–1988, III, 142–79. In earlier generations—e.g., with A. v. Harnack, H. Lietzmann, or A. Deissmann—this form of presentation was still a matter of course. At present it has largely been lost in favor of a showing of the material.

2 [23–35]

Reflections on the Relationship between Historiography and Hermeneutics in New Testament Science

The reflections set forth in the previous chapter on the question of the epistemological presuppositions of the construction of history will be continued in what follows.

In the appropriation of the past as history it is also a matter of a community's identity foundations and ethical convictions of value, which Jürgen Habermas characterized as "postsecular" in his acceptance speech on the occasion of the awarding of the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade.[1] An important aspect of this speech given shortly after the attacks on the World Trade Center was that Habermas did not define the relationship between faith and knowledge—one could also say: between religion and postsecular society—as an antithesis. Rather, the enlightened society—thus Habermas—needs to translate religious contents rather than eliminate them if it does not wish to produce a loss of meaning and orientation. The hermeneutical question of the construction of history as a framework comprising past, present, and future directly touches upon this topic, for it concerns an aspect of our culture that decisively shapes the understanding of our past as well as our future orientation. It is a fundamental task of theology to contribute to this discussion about the value conceptions and the orienting frameworks of the societies in which we live.

I will begin with a few general observations on the foundations of modern historical consciousness. In the second part I will then relate these to New Testament science—specifically to the interpretation of the Gospels. Finally, I will formulate a few conclusions. [24]

[1] Habermas 2001.

1. Construction of history under the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness

The understanding of history decisively changed with the emergence of the historical-critical consciousness. This can initially be made clear with two observations.

(1) In the eighteenth century the collective singular "history" was developed, which summarized the individual "histories" or "narratives" as an overarching category. The concept combined *the past event* (*res gestae*) with its *representation* within an interpretive connection set forth from a later perspective. Finally, along with the event and its presentation, "history" referred thirdly to *the scientific investigation* of these events.[2] The connectedness of what has happened, which is established between the individual events and accounted for rationally, is therefore a fundamental characteristic of modern historical consciousness, which is thus based on the premise that the individual occurrences can be ordered into a meaningful whole. The production of this overall plan that connects the individual facts and events and simultaneously interprets them by the investigation of the particulars as well as the meaning connections inherent in them—called "ideas" by Wilhelm von Humboldt and "moral powers" by Johann Gustav Droysen—was now regarded as the task of the historian, since recourse to God as the meaning-providing instance had become obsolete for the modern-enlightened consciousness. Droysen summarized this modern relation to the past, which led to the establishment of history as an independent scientific discipline, in the well-known sentence: "over the (hi)stories is history."[3]

(2) If "history" presupposes an interpreting subject who establishes connections, then this means that what has happened cannot be thought of as identical with its presentation within a retrospectively constructed context of meaning. Rather, it is characteristic of modern historical consciousness to differentiate between the event and its later representation.[4] At hand for the first time in Johann Martin Chladenius' teaching of *Sehe-Punckt* (viewpoint), the conviction arose that there cannot be a turning to history without a standpoint from which one views the past and which determines its perception. Recently [25] this idea has appeared again in Arthur Danto's analysis of narrative sentences within presentations of history.[5] Danto emphasizes that in the subsequent description of events, information always enters in about what consequences these produced,

[2] Koselleck 1992, 657.
[3] Droysen 1977, 354.
[4] Koselleck 1997, 85–91.
[5] Danto 1965, 143–82.

how they relate to other events that could not have been known to the people involved at the time or in the place of their occurrence, and so forth. Hayden White developed this view of a later, interpretative access to the past into the thesis that it is first the fable (or plot) set forth by the historian that places the events in relation to one another and thereby confers to them a—changeable, falsifiable—structure of meaning.[6] Over against Humboldt and Droysen the point of view has thereby changed in recent theory of history: the concern is no longer with the quest for the "ideas" or "moral powers" active in the events; rather, it is the historian who first brings forth their meaning through the "constructive imagination."

The insight into the perspectival nature of historical presentations that comes to expression in these remarks means that the meaning of the past is not unchangeably fixed but changes through the respective references to it. Viewed epistemologically, every conception of history is therefore a hypothesis about the meaning of what happened in the past that is oriented to the surviving traces of the past, which it orders and interprets. Jörn Rüsen succinctly summed up the theory-of-history consequences in the title of an article: "Can yesterday become better? On the transformation of the past in history."[7] Rüsen gives a positive answer to this question: historical thinking is indeed in position to make the past "better"—whereby "better" means: "from the rigidity of a pre-given state of having become the past turns into the movement of human life-praxis, into the actual becoming—carried out in acting and suffering—of what has become through it."[8] If the relation to the events of the past handed on in the sources is an undertaking that is obligated to the prevailing perceptions of reality, which it simultaneously tests critically, then the past as history is present only in the form of such conceptions, which build upon the witnesses that still exist in the present and mediate them with the present. This leads to the question of the relation between the remains and the presentation of history in the methodology of historical work. [26]

In Droysen, the founder of modern historics (see chap. 1, n. 7), the relation between facts and events on the one hand and the historical presentation on the other hand is reflected on systematically for the first time. I will therefore elucidate a few aspects of the relationship between hermeneutics and historiography with reference to his conception. Droysen distinguished three steps in the methodology of historical work: heuristics, criticism, and

[6] White 1978, 81–100.

[7] Thus the title of the leading essay in Rüsen 2003, 17–44.

[8] Rüsen 2003, 36: "Die Vergangenheit wird aus der Starre eines vorgegebenen Gewordenseins in die Bewegung der menschlichen Lebenspraxis, in das aktuelle—handelnd und leidend vollzogene—Werden der durch sie Gewordenen hinein verflüssigt."

interpretation.[9] With this the finding of the historical material, its critical evaluation, and its interpretation from the perspective of the later viewer were integrated into the foundation of modern historical scholarship. Three points that are especially important for the direction of questioning pursued here may be mentioned from Droysen's approach.

First, Droysen's understanding of history is important. According to him, history is "not the sum of the events, not the whole course of all things but a knowledge of what has happened."[10] Accordingly, the amorphous torrent of past happening should not already be designated as history. Rather, an informed understanding of the concept presupposes a past appropriated through investigative understanding. From this the object of historical research follows in a second step: its given is not the past in itself but what is not past from it, that is, what is still accessible in the here and now.[11] For this reason historical work cannot, as Droysen critically objected against the historical positivism of his time, be dissolved into a fixation on the historical fact—thus into source criticism. Instead, it is identified as a hermeneutical process through which the historian gives meaning to the witnesses of the past. According to Droysen, this meaning does not reside in the sources themselves but is the result of the process through which the historian in the present seeks by investigating to understand the traces that are still available in the present. It is at this point that Droysen sees the actual point of difference between his own approach and those of his historian colleagues.[12]

Droysen's determination of the character of the historical material is also important. In the sources, so his definition, the past is thus transmitted, "as human understanding grasped and formed it [27] for the purpose of recollection."[13] This emphasizes the difference between the past and the sources that provide witness to it. With regard to texts, thus linguistic sources, the following consideration can be added to this: language is not a mirror of reality, but a perception-steering symbol system that emphasizes certain aspects of a phenomenon, whilst leaving others to the side. Linguistic statements about facts thus always place these facts before our eyes

[9] Droysen 1977, 425–35.

[10] Droysen 1977, 397.

[11] Droysen 1977, 67: "For only what is still present from the past is not past, in whatever form it may still be present, whether in the narrative of human beings[,] in writings, in monuments etc., or otherwise."

[12] Droysen 1977, 22: "The nature of the historical method is to understand by investigating, is the interpretation. Here is the point at which I consciously separate myself from the method now widespread among my colleagues in the field; they designate it as the critical, whereas I place the interpretation in the foreground. In the praxis of our historical work we go, of course, through the same steps."

[13] Droysen 1977, 427.

from a certain perspective. With the help of language the extra-linguistic reality is thus understood in a certain way and thereby interpreted at the same time.[14] Every historical text is therefore simultaneously an interpretation of the events that it transmits. It does not mediate a direct access to the past but one that is guided by the perception of its author. With Johnannes Fried one can therefore state that "the past made present is always a linguistic phenomenon."[15]

Finally, the meaning that Droysen attaches to the interpretation of the historical material is important. It is only through this that the historical materials are brought to expression, which is why the interpretation brings the criticism of the sources to its actual goal.[16] He objects therefore to a view that limits historical research to the criticism of sources, but will not go beyond the results of the criticism. Such a position hands over the results of historical criticism to an uncontrolled fantasy. Against this it is also necessary to develop rules for the step of interpretation, which first leads historical work to its goal and is therefore indispensible.[17] Droysen refers in this connection to the affinity between artistic and historical presentation and specifies the latter as mimesis of the outer course of things in contrast to its repetition: "This known historical truth is, of course, only relatively the truth; it is the truth as the teller sees it, it is the truth from his standpoint, his insight, his educational level; in a changed time it [28] can appear differently; one could say that each time has to work through the whole of history anew, in order to understand [it]."[18]

With the three aspects mentioned—the character of historical knowledge as productive recollection, the specification of historical sources as selective, interpretive witnesses, and the significance of interpretation as the completion of the historical work—important methodological foundations of a critical scholarship of history are laid. In recent discussion these have been worked out and modified. A few central aspects may again be mentioned.

In further development of the ideas of Droysen, the connection between historical research and hermeneutics has been more clearly worked out in

[14] Cf. Lorenz 1997, 28–33, who illustrates this with the example of various statements about the execution of Ludwig XIV, which simultaneously bring different interpretations of this event to expression.

[15] Fried 1996, 295–96.

[16] Droysen 1977, 158: "In sum, the historical materials first speak when they are rightly questioned; and criticism in its various forms is the next step to open their mouth. The next step after that is the interpretation: it gives language to the materials, the interpretation makes them speak."

[17] Droysen 1977, 431.

[18] Droysen 1977, 230–31.

the last decades. Today it can be regarded as capable of achieving consensus that the writing of history would be only highly inadequately described as the collection of facts. Rather, the occupation with the historical material represents from the beginning an interpretive, meaning-creating activity that does not first begin, as it still does in Droysen's conception, after the steps of the heuristic and criticism. Rather, the hermeneutical process must be defined more comprehensively than is the case with Droysen: the selection of the sources and their critical analysis are already interpretive activities and thus constituent parts of historical knowing.[19] The hermeneutical question of the presuppositions of understanding therefore affects the entire process of the construction of a conception of history.

In this context the relationship between facts and fiction also has to be newly determined. If in recent theory-of-history discussion the function of the narrative in its meaning for the historical process of knowing has been pushed more strongly to the fore than was the case with Droysen, then this has its cause in the clarification of the epistemological foundations of historical work: if Droysen had specified the narrative as a step that followed upon the finding and critical sifting of the remains, then the explanatory achievement, which is fundamental for the process of historical knowing, of the fictional narrative has been strongly emphasized in the recent discussion.[20] The historical narrative thereby proves to be the instance that first makes the past intelligible in that it interprets facts and events by putting them into language, establishes connections between them, and defines the beginning, the progression, and the end of historical epochs. The [29] fable (or plot) of the historical narrative can therefore be designated as "fictionalization of history."[21]

One of the important developments resulting from this in the modern science of history consists therefore in the dissolution of the Aristotelian opposition between historiography and literature (or poetry).[22] Historical and literary presentations do not simply stand in opposition to each other. While they do differ with respect to their referent, they nevertheless possess a common point of intersection. Unlike the literary narrative, the historical narrative understands itself to be obligated to the historical material and is verified or falsified by this. Nevertheless, it is also an explaining, meaning-creating instrument that cannot get by without constructivist elements.[23] The possibilities of bringing past time into our time are thus limited by the

[19] Cf., e.g., Mommsen 1984, 67–68; Goertz 1995, 113.

[20] Cf. Jauss 1982; Baumgartner/Rüsen 1982.

[21] Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 294–311; Ricoeur 1984–1988, III, 180–92.

[22] I will take up this aspect once again in the next chapter and make it concrete in relation to the ancient writing of history.

[23] Goertz 2001, 83–102.

commitment to the sources. The commonality with the literary narrative consists, however, in the *explanation through narration*, which takes place in both cases: the model of past happening that is set forth in the historical narrative is also a structure of meaning that is based on the skeleton of the events and shaped and accounted for by the historian.[24]

A further aspect builds on reflections on text interpretation. We should be able to reach a consensus that the meaning of words, sentences, and texts cannot be clearly fixed through interpretation but different—though not as many as one likes—interpretations are possible.[25] With regard to the historical sources this means that these also allow for different interpretations. For this reason, the meaning of historical texts is never clearly fixed, but is open for revisions, different applications and various conceptions of the past. Accordingly, "historical truth" can only be a regulative idea that is guiding in the interpretation of texts. It resides neither in the investigated facts nor is it grounded in their interpretation, but it is the attempt, subject to continuous revision, to understand reality as reality that has come into being. [30]

2. New Testament science and historical knowledge

In New Testament science the aspects just mentioned have only been taken up with hesitation thus far.

First, the hermeneutical question has been—at least in the German-speaking Protestant sphere—taken up, following Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer, and related to the understanding of life-statements or texts. By contrast, a reception of Droysen's hermeneutics of history and the subsequent theory-of-history discussion has been almost completely lacking. David Friedrich Strauss, Ferdinand Christian Baur, and Emmanuel Hirsch, mentioned already in the previous chapter, are exceptions here, who have had comparably little influence on the paradigms of New Testament science. This is all the more astonishing since Baur—completely in the spirit of the foundations of modern historical consciousness that were just sketched—saw it as the task of the historian to get to the bottom of *the connections of what has happened* and not stop with a positivistic identification of the transmitted particulars.[26]

Hirsch later built on both Baur and Droysen and emphasized the interplay between critical source analysis and the production of a context of

[24] Cf. White 1978, 81–100; Goertz 2001, 32–52.

[25] Cf. Eco 1994, 61–85, who illustrates this with reference to the necessary collaboration of the reader in the text interpretation.

[26] Köpf 1992, 452–61.

meaning as constitutive for the writing of history.[27] That these beginnings of a hermeneutically reflected consideration of history have thus far only sparingly played a part in New Testament science—and here especially in Jesus research—can be illustrated, by way of example, with the program of form criticism, whose lack of methodology-of-history reflection was not by chance sharply criticized by Hirsch.[28]

The foundation of the form-critical view of the Gospels was the—undoubtedly accurate—observation of Karl Ludwig Schmidt that the framework for the individual narratives reworked in the Gospels is a product of the evangelists; thus it does not present a reflection of the historical sequence of the history of Jesus. In order to come to judgments about the historical reality lying beyond this framework, the form critics therefore concentrated in the following period on the "small units" of the Synoptic tradition, whose prehistory they wanted to illuminate. Bultmann's Jesus book, at whose center stands the oldest level of the tradition as he had worked it out in the "History of the [31] Synoptic Tradition," is an impressive early example of the interpretation of the sayings of Jesus in detachment from their narrative contexts. In the process, the framework, which was judged to be historically secondary, was replaced by the sociological category of the *Sitz im Leben* (setting in life), with whose help historical knowledge was to be obtained about the early community and—though to a lesser extent—Jesus himself.

It is, however, thoroughly questionable whether one can attain to *historical* knowledge with such a category and whether the narrative reworking of the Gospels can be left out of consideration for this. The insight into their character as Jesus narratives based on faith convictions in no way disqualifies them as historical witnesses that are to be invalidated in favor of an orientation to the "*Sitz im Leben*." This applies all the more since with the "*Sitz im Leben*" we are not dealing with a *historical* category in the strict sense but with a *sociological* category that cannot take over the function of historical meaning formation. It is therefore not by chance that a significant difference of opinion can be observed between Bultmann and Dibelius at precisely this point.

Dibelius was considerably more reserved than Bultmann in the use of the category of "*Sitz im Leben*" and limited it to the (kerygmatically or paraenetically oriented) sermon, since he recognized that the "constructive method" was needed to infer from a genre the historical situation belonging to it.[29] This reference to "construction" as a necessary instrument for

[27] Barth 1991, 212–26.
[28] Barth 1991, 226–50.
[29] Dibelius 1929, 193–95.

the disclosure of historical situations in early Christianity can be brought into relationship with the aforementioned insights of Droysen and Baur. For wide stretches, however, research on the Gospels has followed Bultmann's division of the Synoptic material as well as his thesis of a disjunction between Jesus and the kerygmatic conceptions of the Gospels. His form-critical approach thus became—in a thoroughly consistent reception and continuation of his ideas—both the foundation for a history of early Christianity and the basis of a new version of the quest for the historical Jesus: the interpretation of the individual pieces of the tradition of the Gospels alongside extensive neglect of the historiographic implications of their literary context is an approach that has characterized Jesus research for a long time. By contrast, different insights into the character of the Gospels and the traditions reworked by them would be suggested from the standpoint of the "constructive method" favored by Dibelius. [32]

The above-sketched approach has made the understanding of the Gospels as *historical Jesus-narratives* more difficult for a long time. The mixing of literary and historical lines of questioning can be cited as a reason for this: by making inferences about the historical situation directly from genres, the reflection on the relationship between individual facts and historical connection and with it the hermeneutical question of the conditions of the construction of history were skipped over. The invalidation of the narrative "framework" of the Gospels does not lead, however, to the "actual" meaning of the traditions preserved in it. Rather, for every interpretation of these traditions a "constructed" context is needed, which represents the presupposition for a historical interpretation.[30] Moreover, the historical explanatory power of the Gospels should be estimated more highly than was often assumed in the wake of Bultmann.[31]

The reception of *narrative criticism* in research on the Gospels has reacted to this constellation and directed attention to the compositions as a whole, to narrative structures, and to the narrative particularities of the Gospels. The question of their *historical source value*, however, remained largely unconsidered here, since they were now viewed as writings that set forth their own story-worlds, whereas less attention was given to the question of the relationship of these worlds to the extra-linguistic reality to which they refer. As important as these approaches are, the question of the events that underlie the first Jesus narratives may not fall from view in their interpretation.[32]

[30] Liebenberg 2001 has shown this for the sayings and parables of Jesus.

[31] Cf. Theissen/Merz 2001, 98–120; 1998, 93–118. It is rightly pointed out there that the insight into the mythical character of a number of traditions in the Gospels does not invalidate their character as historical sources in principle.

[32] Rhoads 1999.

For an interpretation of the Gospels that incorporates the aspects mentioned in the first part, we are thus advised to understand these as Jesus narratives with historical reference and consequently not to answer the historical question without regard for the "framework" and not to restrict it to the individual units. In these writings the recollection of Jesus was brought into the form of narratives that simultaneously preserve and actualize: the authors of the Jesus narratives share a certain understanding of reality with their first readers. Into this they inscribe the history of Jesus—his activity, his fate, and his enduring meaning. In this way it is not only the present that is interpreted. Rather, the history of Jesus also implies a new understanding of the [33] past and future: the history of Israel appears in a new light; the future stands under the expectation of the coming again of Jesus as the Son of Man.

A relation to the person of Jesus under the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness cannot simply repeat these interpretations. This is prohibited by the difference inherent in the historical consciousness between sources and historical reality, which demands a *critical* engagement with the sources. At the same time, I must refer to the important restriction—which was already mentioned in the last chapter—of the function of historical criticism by Droysen: historical criticism also does not lead to the "actual historical fact."[33] The sources can never be compared with past reality but always only with other sources that are likewise interpretive and possibly flawed.[34] Accordingly, historical criticism does not serve to uncover the past again. Rather, its contribution consists in making historical constructions rationally comprehensible and thus plausible. Applied to Jesus research, this means that the concern cannot be with the search for the Jesus behind the Gospels but with a construction oriented to the early sources and accounted for rationally that satisfies the current conditions of knowledge. Applied to the person of Jesus, this means that the narratives of the Gospels are actualized in the act of reading and in this manner placed in relationship with the current understanding of reality. In this way the recourse to the historical Jesus can contribute to current interpretations of reality: the critically reflected appropriation of his activity portrayed in the Gospels can lead us to understand our own time anew, to test current perceptions of reality, and, if necessary, to revise them.

The second reason for the largely absent reception of theory-of-history aspects lies in the specific constellation between dogmatic and exegetical theology. Historical criticism was often regarded in theology as a correction of dogmatic interventions through scientific rationality. If, however,

[33] Droysen 1977, 428.
[34] Cf. Theissen/Winter 1997, 234; 2002, 227–28.

reference is made to the dependence of every construction upon the understanding of reality that is guiding in each case and the always-necessary constructive element of historical work is brought into play, then through this the reach of historical criticism is itself restricted epistemologically. This is not, of course, to promote a return to an uncritical engagement with the sources. Rather, it is reflection [34] on the reach of historical criticism that first brings out its contribution to a hermeneutically reflected engagement with the sources, whereas the identification of the results of historical criticism with historical *reality*—let alone historical *truth*—would ultimately mean a return to a historical positivism. Over against this, it is necessary to energetically advocate a reception of epistemological insights, which have also been incorporated into the theory-of-history discourse.[35]

3. Conclusions

(1) In New Testament science, the relation between historiography and hermeneutics presents itself concretely as the question of how we relate to the beginnings of Christianity. In the current intellectual-historical situation, such a reference, in order that it take place in a scientifically accountable manner, is subject to the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness.

(2) Important insights into the relationship between critical source analysis and the construction of historical connections are found with Johann Gustav Droysen. In recent theory-of-history discussion this was primarily developed with regard to the perspectival nature of every access to the remains of the past, the new specification of the relationship between historics and poetics, and the reality-interpreting character of language. Here both the narrative character of historiography and the interweaving of the reference of historical and fictional narratives were emphasized.

(3) Up to now the hermeneutical discussion within New Testament science has only received these impulses to a small extent. This can be seen paradigmatically in Jesus research, the hermeneutical foundations of which, primarily with regard to the historical evaluation of the Gospels, would need to be reconsidered. In this connection, it is advisable that we carry on from Droysen and the current theory-of-history discussion on the one hand and from the principles that Baur and Hirsch formulated for the reconstruction of a history of early Christianity and the activity of Jesus on the other hand.

[35] Cf. Goertz 2001, 103–18.

(4) Reflection on the scope of historical criticism is necessary. On the one hand, it cannot be in doubt that the historical material is to be subjected to criticism. On the other hand, this criticism may not be equated with the reestablishment of the past reality. The specific situation of the exegetical-historical theology, which [35] owes its independence to its liberation from dogmatic theology, may not therefore lead to an unconsidered view of the conditions of the construction of history.

(5) The consideration of the relationship between historiography and hermeneutics should help make clear the necessity of exegesis for a Christian theology that is accountable to its origins. In a time in which the relationship between enlightened zeitgeist and Christian faith confession must be thought through anew, a relation to the person of Jesus that is informed by reflections on the theory of history could help to profile an interpretation of reality that is grounded in a Christian manner. This would simultaneously ensure that the exegetical theology made its own contribution to the discourse with other interpretations of reality.

3 [37–54]

Construction of History and the Beginnings of Christianity

Reflections on the Christian Interpretation of History from a New Testament Perspective

"As long as something is, it is not what it will have been . . . When that was, about which we now say that it has been, then we did not know that it is. Now we say that it was thus and thus, although when it was we knew nothing then about what we now say."[1]

Martin Walser's novel *Ein springender Brunnen* (A Springing Well) begins with these sentences. They express a central insight into the engagement with the past that can be brought into contact with current discussions in the theory of history and should meet here with broad affirmation: events that take place—thus Walser as well as statements from the theory of history—are not identical with their later presentation within the historical narrative, for only through the latter do they obtain a meaning that mediates between present and past and allows the latter to appear meaningful. Only the active relationship to the past, which constructs a history, gives meaning to the events by putting them into language and placing them in connection with one another.[2]

The quotation, however, leads to yet another trail: that a writer places these sentences at the head of a novel points to a relationship between history writing and literature (or poetry), which is of decisive importance for an epistemological grounding of the science of history.[3] This relationship was discerned both in antiquity and in the beginnings of modern history writing,[4] and it has often been underscored again in recent theory-of-history discussion. [38] Hayden White especially has pointed to the constitutive character of language for the historical process of knowing and

[1] Walser 1998, 9.

[2] Cf. for instance, Rüsen 1997; 1983–1989, I, 58–84.

[3] On this point cf. also the overlapping of the reference of historical and literary narrative that was already noted in the previous chapter.

[4] Cf. Rösler 1980 and Süssmann 2000.

made the historian's "historical imagination" the object of his analysis of the European history writing of the nineteenth century.[5]

As with White, the putting into language of events and their interpretation through narrative as an indispensible instrument for historical knowledge play a central role in Frank Ankersmit's understanding of history: events have no meaning in themselves; they first become historically meaningful and contribute to the historical formation of meaning through their transfer into the medium of language and their placement within a narrative context that represents the past in the present.[6]

The problem—which is more strongly taken into account in Ankersmit than in White—of the connection between interpretive narrative and historical research was then taken up and reflected on epistemologically by Paul Ricoeur.[7] Ricoeur describes the reference modes of history and fiction as interweaving. Historical and literary narratives are thus neither to be equated in their intentionality nor set in opposition to each other. Rather, they respectively participate in the other mode of reference, insofar as the historical narrative represents a fictionalizing of the past, whereas the fictional narrative imitates the historical narrative.[8] The concept of *representation* (*Repräsentanz*), which Ricoeur employs in this context, expresses the fact that the historical narrative relates to the past through "analogizing apprehension,"[9] whilst remaining bound to the actual past and representing this in the present.

From these approaches, which can only be touched on here, I will take up the following aspects for the reflections that follow: on the one hand, every relation to the past remains directed to the fragmentary character of the remains as well as to the sources, which themselves already interpret the events;[10] on the other hand, it is characterized by the perspectival viewpoint of the historian [39], who interprets the sources and pieces them together with the other historical materials available to him into a picture. It is first this interpretation of the remains and sources as well as their placement in a context set forth by the historian that gives the remains of

[5] White 1973; 1978, 81–100.

[6] Ankersmit 1983; 1994; cf. also 1997.

[7] Ricoeur 1988–1991; 1984–1988.

[8] Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 253–311; 1984–1988, III, 157–92.

[9] Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 254; cf. Ricoeur 1984–1988, III, 157.

[10] For the differentiation of the historical material into remains, sources, and monuments, cf. Droysen 1977, 67–100. Cf. also the summarizing description on p. 400: "Historical material is partly what is still directly left over from that present whose understanding we are investigating (remains), partly what has passed into the notions of human beings and thus transmitted in reshaped form (sources), and partly a combination of both (monuments)."

the past meaning for the present. Apart from this interpretation[11] there is no history, but only dead material. Therefore, a text first becomes a historical "source" when it is read, interpreted, and placed in relation to other materials.[12] The goal of history writing is thus not *reconstruction of the past* but *construction of history*: it constructs a picture of the past that has relative validity, dependent on the plausibility of the interpretation of reality that is currently valid, determined by the state of knowledge of the researchers, and determined by the view that the interpreter sets forth with the aid of the known material.[13]

This specific relationship to reality of history writing was already discerned in antiquity[14] and plays a central role once again in current discussion in the theory of history.[15] In what follows I will introduce against this background a few thoughts that are important for the current discussion between theology and the science of history. At the outset I will consider the status of historical constructions with the help of a number of statements from antiquity and the modern period; in the second part I will discuss two examples from the sphere of the New Testament. Finally, the third section formulates a thesis on the relationship between the construction of history, historical criticism, and truth with regard to the beginnings of Christian history writing. [40]

1. How does one write history?

History writing emerged—both in Greece and in Israel—in close connection with mythical interpretations of the world.[16] In Israel, however, myth and presentations based on the investigation and interpretation of past events did not go their separate ways. Instead, the election of Abraham, the Exodus events, and the giving of the law at Sinai became, regardless of their status as events that actually happened, crystallization points for the identity of later generations of Judaism and also of Christianity.[17]

[11] As explained in the previous chapter, Droysen therefore ascribed a constitutive meaning for the historical process of knowing to interpretation.

[12] Cf. Fried 1996, 293–94: " 'Source' is, about this no one may indulge in illusions, a metaphor that leads people astray. It is associated with gushing life, directness, origin of pure knowledge, pure truth . . . if something actually gushes, then [it is the] questioning interest which washes around that left-behind-ness, which sets it free, leads it together, makes it into something, brings it to expression and gives it meaning. . . ."

[13] Cf. Goertz 2001.

[14] Cf. Treu 1984.

[15] Cf. Rüsen 1976; 2003.

[16] Cf. Schadewaldt 1991 [1934]; Meister 1990; Cancik 1970.

[17] Assmann 1992 worked out the founding function of history as recollection and memory.

By contrast, in Greece history writing emerged in the sharp displacement of the mythical worldview of Homer and Hesiod by Herodotus, who founded his presentation instead on what one investigated himself (ἱστορίης ἀπόδειξις), even if his history work then went far beyond this and turned out to be a proper cultural history of the peoples known to him.[18] As shown by the proem, for Herodotus what happens *among human beings* (τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων) is the object of history writing, whereby their glorious and admirable deeds, and especially the reason for the war of the Greeks against the barbarians, stand in the foreground.[19]

A comparable concentration on events happening among human beings is not found in the Israelite history writing. It is true that here too—e.g., in the Deuteronomistic History[20]—there are indeed reports of how humans act in history. Nevertheless, it is never in question that the God of Israel remains the Lord of what happens.[21] Christianity later attached itself to this understanding of history and developed it further in its own way.[22] It thereby entered [41] a field that is characterized both by differentiations within Greek history writing and by the encounter of Jewish and pagan Hellenistic views of history. Let us begin by considering the first of these.

It corresponds to the above-sketched Greek view of history that the relationship between history writing and literature (or poetry) was thematized in theoretical reflections. Aristotle placed the two in opposition to each other: the history writer remains with what actually happened (τὰ γενόμενα), whereas the author of literature presents what could have been (οἷα ἂν γένοιτο).[23] The higher form of the discovery of truth is ascribed thereby to the author of literature, for according to Aristotle literature is more philosophical and more serious (φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον) than history writing: it does not stop with the reporting of individual things (τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον) but inquires into the general (τὰ καθόλου).

Cicero later reverses this determination of the relationship: in the first book on the laws he distinguishes between history writing and literature so that the first is concerned with truth (*veritas*), whereas the latter is aimed

[18] Cf. Bockisch 1984; Bichler/Rollinger 2000.

[19] Herodotus, *Hist.* Proem.

[20] How the beginnings of the Israelite history writing are exactly to be described is a contentious issue at present. Here, I will not enter further into this discussion. On this cf. Kratz 2000. For the present context it is sufficient to point to the characteristic feature that the understanding of history in ancient Israel is indivisibly bound up with the conviction of the rule of God over the events.

[21] Cf. Molthagen 2003.

[22] On this cf. the remarks on the Acts of the Apostles below, section 2.

[23] Aristotle, *Poet.* 9.1451a: τούτῳ διαφέρει (sc. ὁ ἱστορικὸς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς) τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν.

at entertainment (*delectatio*).[24] Admittedly, Cicero concedes in the same context that one can also find innumerable invented stories (*innumerabiles fabulae*) in Herodotus, the *pater historiae*, as well as in Theopompus, the Greek historian of the fourth century BCE. Accordingly, precisely with Cicero's authority Herodotus, a strict separation between what actually happened and what was invented—between *veritas* and *fabula*—cannot be maintained. Instead, he detects in Herodotus a mixing of both, which stems from the effort to serve the *delectatio* also in the reporting of events that happened.

The relationship between event and interpretation is also what is at issue in the ancient "historian controversy" over the question of how history is to be written.[25] On the one side stands the "pragmatic" school of thought founded by Thucydides and then represented also by Polybius and Lucian.[26] It is concerned with an exact presentation of what actually took place, [42] whereas the interpretive judgment of the historian should be less important than this.[27] It is noteworthy, however, that with regard to the speeches of statesmen and generals that often occur in his work Thucydides formulates in his so-called methodological chapter (1.22) the famous dictum that he has not been able to keep in memory the exact content of what was said,[28] but oriented himself to the overall intention of what was actually spoken (ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων).[29]

A philological analysis of this sentence is faced with numerous individual problems.[30] For example, it is debated what exactly is to be understood by the "overall intention" of what was said (ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη): Does Thucydides indicate with this a summary of the content of the respective speech or does the expression refer to a characterization of the speaker and his political stance? What is meant with "what is said in truth" (τὰ ἀληθῶς λεχθέντα) is also contested: Does Thucydides mean here the actual wording, which he gives the gist of, or is he thinking of a speech that the person in question would have given according to his overall political outlook? A decision on these questions is definitely significant for a picture of Thucydides' manner of working and for the method

[24] Cicero, *Leg.* 1.5: *. . . alias in historia leges observandas putare, alias in poemate . . . cum in illa ad veritatem . . . <cuncta> referantur, in hoc ad delectationem pleraque; quamquam et apud Herodotum patrem historiae et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulae.*

[25] On the various schools of thought in Greek historiography, cf. Meister 1990.

[26] Cf., e.g., Polybius' polemical exchange with Phylarchos, 2.56–63, as well as Lucian, *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit.*

[27] Cf., e.g., Thucydides' criticism of the authors of literature and the writers of history who are intent on the joy of the hearers in *Hist.* 1.21.

[28] χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν.

[29] Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.22.1.

[30] On this cf. Gomme 1945, 139–50.

of historical reconstruction that underlies this—and thus for the relationship between event and interpretation.

A detailed treatment of these—and additional—questions pertaining to the interpretation of the Thucydidean principle cannot be carried out here.[31] It is, however, to be held that Thucydides explicitly thematizes the difference between speeches (ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον) and deeds (τὰ δ᾽ ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων): only the latter are subject to investigation by means of ἀκρίβεια; the speeches, by contrast, are composed by Thucydides himself in order to give expression to the respective historical situation.[32] The question of whether they were actually given—and if so, what their exact wording was—is secondary to this. I will return to the significance of this topos in the next section with regard to Acts.

The so-called mimetic historiography, founded by Duris of Samos, stands over against the pragmatic school of thought.[33] According to its view [43] the meaning of history can be elucidated precisely by an enlivening imitation (μίμησις) of the event. The restriction to the speeches is not thereby in view; rather the mimetic manner of presentation applies to past events in general. The aforementioned Aristotelian distinction between what actually happened and what could have been possibly stands in the background; it is, however—in contrast to Aristotle himself—applied to the writing of history: the μίμησις of the event is regarded as an authentic form of presentation that mediates between past and present. Should the mimetic historiography have oriented itself on the *Poetics* of Aristotle—which is not, however, uncontested—then for its view of history it would have modified in a revealing way Aristotle's strict distinction between literature (or poetry) and history writing.[34]

With regard to the various forms of the appropriation of the past, we can thus maintain for now that history writing may not be reduced to facticity if it wishes to make present reality understandable as reality that has come to be. Rather, the consciousness of the relation to the past from the perspective of the respective present can also be recognized when the attempt is made to distinguish clearly between event and interpretation

[31] On this point, cf. in detail Luschnat 1970 as well as the dispute with Luschnat in Egermann 1972. Cf. further Lendle 1992, 85–87.

[32] Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.22.1–2.

[33] On Duris cf. Lendle 1992, 181–89. Alongside Duris, an important representative of the mimetic (pathetic) writing of history is Phylarchos (Lendle 1992, 195–202).

[34] For discussion concerning the relation of the mimetic history writing to the Peripatos, cf. Walbank 1960. The application of Aristotelian principles to history writing is also assumed by Lendle 1992, 185–88, following E. Schwartz. Meister 1990, 95–102, comes to a different judgment. Fragment 1 from the ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΑ (ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΙ) of Duris of Samos (FrGH 76 F), which is decisive for this discussion, can at any rate be interpreted in such a way that Duris regards μίμησις and ἡδονή as indispensible for his presentation, without thereby giving up the claim to work out the truth of the event precisely in this way.

conceptually. The question of whether or to what extent the narratives of miracles and other supernatural events may claim a place in presentations of history also lies in the horizon of the discussion surrounding a past event and its interpretation. As the ironic dispute of Lucian with those historians who do not impartially orient themselves to what actually happened shows, the mimetic presentations of history, which inclined to the sensational, were probably the rule, whereas the "pragmatic" school of thought represented by Thucydides and Polybius was the exception.

The question of the relationship between event and interpretation, between history writing and literature, appears again at the beginnings of modern historical thinking, now, of course, under the conditions of the [44] emerging historical-critical consciousness. Here, I must refer especially to the aspects, mentioned already in the previous chapter, of the formation of the collective singular "history," the attachment of the investigation and presentation of the past to critical source study, and the difference between past event and its later representation, which is a characteristic feature of the modern historical consciousness. There cannot be a turning to history—so the conviction resulting from this—without a standpoint from which one views the past and by which its perception is determined. Recently, Paul Ricoeur has taken this insight further to the effect that it is the fable (or plot) set forth by the historian that places the events in relation to one another and thereby gives them a structure of meaning.[35]

Thus, in the founding of the modern science of history, the tension between event and interpretive narrative, which was virulent in antiquity, surfaces again, in modified form of course. Since Leopold von Ranke and Droysen, modern historical consciousness has been founded on the critical study of the sources, which pieced these together into a picture of the past under the conditions of knowledge that were currently in force. A conception of history based on critical examination is also, of course, a hypothesis about how it could have been that serves the interpretation of present reality. It is, however, never identical with the past itself: what is is different from what it will have been. Therefore, in the age of historical criticism also, it is not only the present that has come into being historically and is thus obligated to the past, but the past as historically appropriated is simultaneously a result of its retrospective viewing and interpretation. In the founders of the modern science of history—in Humboldt, Droysen, and Ranke; from the side of theology in Ferdinand Christian Baur[36] who

[35] Cf. chap. 2, n. 21 (Ricoeur 1984–1988, III, 180–92), as well as Ricoeur 1987, 239: "On the basis of . . . connections between history and the narrative the historian also forms fables which are either confirmed or excluded by the documents but which are never contained in them."

[36] Cf., however, Scholder 1961; Köpf 1992; Hodgson 1966.

has been given too little attention in this connection—this consciousness is clearly present; currently it has come to the fore again in the theory of history. In the next section we will turn our attention to the meaning of these insights for a picture of the beginnings of Christianity. [45]

2. Construction of history as a foundation for Christianity

As I have already indicated, early Christianity developed its view of history within the spectrum of Hellenistic-Jewish thinking on history. The encounter of both spheres had already taken place previously in historiography in 2 Maccabees; in the first century CE this happened yet again in Josephus.[37] Characteristic for the Christian view of history is first that it developed from the beginning within the Jewish horizon, according to which the God of Israel is the one who directs history. In light of the events around Jesus, this view now experienced a decisive modification.[38] For the concretization of the picture of history that emerged, we will concentrate in what follows on two areas: the Gospels and their relation to the person of Jesus and the presentation of Paul in Acts.

(1) After the traditions reworked in the Gospels, had attracted interest for quite some time with respect to their origin and linguistic form, recent research has turned to the story-world of these writings, their narrative structures and overarching compositional features.[39] They are perceived as texts that are comparable to ancient biographical presentations in many respects.[40] In them, however, Jesus of Nazareth stands at the center, the teacher and miracle worker gifted with the Spirit of God whose activity means the establishment of the rule of God. With regard to the picture of history that emerges, consideration must be given to the relation between the text-world and the extra-textual reality of the activity of Jesus. Both aspects must be taken into account for the interpretation of the Gospels and not played off against each other.[41] This will be made clear with the

[37] The fragments of the Jewish historians would also need to be mentioned. Cf. Attridge 1984a; 1984b.

[38] Cf. also Rowland 2000.

[39] Cf. already Petersen 1978; Powell 1990. For a more recent overview of approaches and problems of the integration of such approaches into New Testament scholarship, cf. Porter 1995. On narrative criticism in particular cf. Merenlahti/Hakola 1999.

[40] Cf., e.g., Dormeyer 1999.

[41] Cf. Merenlahti/Hakola 1999, n. 39: "The Gospels . . . repeatedly make truth claims that refer to the historical reality outside their exclusive storyworlds . . . Whether these claims are true or not, they exemplify what the evangelists aim at: they seek to assure their readers that their narratives mediate the truth about what happened in the past of the storytime."

aid of some narrative features of the [46] Gospel of Mark.[42] Mark characterizes his narrative at the outset as ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Mark 1.1). With this he takes up a term from the early Christian confession tradition and applies it to the presentation of the history of Jesus. Both the activity of Jesus himself and the events surrounding his person are the content of the εὐαγγέλιον: Jesus himself preaches the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (1.14); in the subsequent course of events that follows, the narrative about Jesus then becomes the εὐαγγέλιον that is to be proclaimed until he comes again.[43] Through this use of the concept εὐαγγέλιον, the activity of Jesus as well as its continuation in the time of his absence become the foundation of a narrative that integrates past, present, and future within an overall conception and thereby implies a new view of history.

The basis for this new view of history is the characterization of the person of Jesus, which coalesces in the expression "Son of Man."[44] His appearance makes clear his unique claim: Jesus commands the demons, he has the power to forgive sins that otherwise belongs to God alone, and thus he establishes the reign of God against that of Satan.[45] His death is sketched into this picture of his activity, for it is precisely this claim to be the decisive representative of God that leads to his execution: the accusation of blaspheming God (βλασφημεῖν) is made because Jesus claims to act in the name of God himself; this accusation ultimately leads to his execution.[46]

Christology is thus developed in a narrative manner here: the activity of the earthly Jesus forms the foundation for placing him in unsurpassable nearness to God. There can be no doubt that this has a basis in concrete events. Mark preserves recollections of people and incidents from Jesus' field of activity—of disciples, opponents, family—and gives them meaning through his narrative. The places of his activity—the sea, the house, the villages of Galilee and the surrounding regions, the temple—are by no means an unimportant framework but rather a conscious configuration that takes up historical information and converts it into a historical narrative.[47] In this way the presentation interprets the activity of Jesus [47] in the horizon of the history of Israel: his appearance is prepared through John, who is introduced with a quotation from the holy Scriptures of Israel

[42] From the research on the Gospel of Mark's manner of narration, the following works may be mentioned: Rhoads 1982; Hahn 1985a; P. Müller 1995.

[43] Cf. Dormeyer 1987.

[44] Cf. Schröter 2001b, 140–79.

[45] Mark 1.25; 5.6-10; 2.5-12; 3.22-27.

[46] Theobald 1988, 47–49, also calls attention to the *inclusio* between Mark 2.7 (βλασφημεῖν) and 14.64 (βλασφημία).

[47] Cf. Schröter 2007, 105–46 (chap. 6 in this volume).

(Mark 1.2-3); Jesus' activity is understood as the coming of God himself (7.37); his eschatological coming again as Son of Man is explicated in the horizon of Jewish-apocalyptic expectations (8.38; 13.24-27; 14.62).

The relationship between the person of Jesus and its presentation in the Gospels can thus be placed within the possibilities of the representation of past events in the interpretive narrative. By contrast, form-critical research had primarily concentrated on the question of the origin of individual pieces of tradition, whilst tying their meaning for the emergence of the Christian faith to the post-Easter confession with a certain onesidedness. In methodological connection with this, but now in reverse, the attempt is made in parts of current (primarily North American) Jesus research to discover the "real" Jesus without regard for the narrative configurations of the Gospels.[48] This approach appears unsatisfactory from a methodology-of-history perspective, because the relation between present horizon of interpretation and past event remains unconsidered. This leads, by contrast, to the insight that the activity of Jesus represents not only historically but also materially the starting point of the Christian faith and has transmitted important impulses for its emergence.

A reflection on the relationship between text-world and reality leads therefore to the insight that the Gospels place the events around Jesus at the center of a conception from which point meaning in history is revealed. Historical reality is never to be had apart from such interpretations, which piece together what is handed on, fill out gaps, and thus place past, present, and future in relation to one another.[49] In this the Gospels do not differ from today's Jesus presentations, even if they were written under different epistemological premises. Their special provocation consists in the fact that they make the—from their viewpoint: apparent—failure of Jesus on the cross the foundation of their interpretation of history.

(2) The second example deals with the Acts of the Apostles. Here too I must begin with an observation on the state of research. The direction of research that has especially prevailed in the German-speaking sphere in the past decades has judged the historical value of this writing [48] to be rather small and has instead worked out the narrative intention of its author.[50] The writer of Acts was regarded as an author who was concerned less with historical exactness than with edifying presentation and theological interpretation of history. Anglophone research as well as Martin Hengel and the works that have come from his milieu in the German-speaking sphere have always emphasized against this that Luke must be

[48] For a presentation and criticism of recent Jesus research, cf. du Toit 2002.

[49] Cf. now also the methodologically considered remarks of Dunn 2003b, 99–136.

[50] Above all the commentaries of Conzelmann 1972; 1987a, and Haenchen 1977; 1971 are representative of this view.

taken seriously as an ancient historian and have thus turned attention primarily to the historical value of Acts.[51]

Here a reflection, which lies in the direction of thought already indicated, on the relationship between event and narrative leads us further. For the Acts of the Apostles, the only early Christian writing that is to be counted as history writing in the narrower sense, one can observe in an analogous way what applies to the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: the narrative intention of Luke has to be distinguished from the question of the historical value of the events reported by him. Luke sets forth a picture of the beginnings of early Christianity that is necessarily selective, perspectival, and interpretative. With this he does not differ initially from the remaining ancient—and modern—historians. The tendency, which is increasing again in recent research, to regard Acts as a work of history must therefore be emphatically supported. More precisely, the Acts of the Apostles can be described as a writing that stands, on the one hand, in the Israelite-Jewish tradition and presents the history of Christianity as a continuation of the history of Israel, which is directed by God and which reaches its first goal in the emergence of the Gentile Christian church.[52] On the other hand, the second writing of Luke should be characterized as a work that belongs to Hellenistic historiography—more precisely to its mimetic manifestation. For example, the proem and the speeches link it with the tradition of Greek historiography, while the narration of supernatural events such as healings, miraculous liberations, and resurrections from the dead connect it with the mimetic tradition.[53]

In what follows I will elucidate the relationship between narration and historical referent by using the example of Paul's speech on the Areopagus (Acts 17.22-31). [49] In doing so I will first consider the relationship of Acts to the aforementioned tradition—founded by Thucydides—of speeches in historical works[54] and then examine the Paul presentation of Luke in a little more detail.[55]

The Areopagus speech has often been judged not only as yielding little historically but also as a foreign body within the Acts of the Apostles. Jakob Jervell can stand as an example of this view. In his recent commentary he judges that one would not even think of Paul if the speech were not

[51] For Acts research within ancient history, cf. Hemer 1989; see further Hengel 1979; Thornton 1991.

[52] Cf. Marguerat 2003, 123–79.

[53] Cf., e.g., Acts 3.1-10; 5.15; 19.11-12; 5.17-21; 12.6-10; 20.7-12. On this classification of the Acts of the Apostles, cf. Plümacher 2004, 33–83.

[54] Dibelius already pointed to the relationship between the speeches of Acts and ancient history writing, especially to Thucydides' methodological principle. Cf. Dibelius 1968, 120–62, 120–25; 1956, 138–91, 138–42. Cf. more recently Porter 1996.

[55] On this point cf. the contribution of Roloff 1979, which is very much worth reading.

placed in his mouth by Luke.[56] The speech not only reveals nothing about the historical Paul, but it also cannot be reconciled well with the picture of Paul that is sketched apart from it. Reasons can indeed be named that could support this hypothesis: Paul himself only mentions in passing his stay in Athens and says nothing about his activity there;[57] in Acts, by contrast, Paul's appearance among the philosophers becomes one of the most important stations of his mission in the Aegean sphere.[58]

In terms of content the speech is characterized by the combination of topoi recognized among educated Gentiles with a Jewish-Christian picture of history.[59] The Lukan Paul states that the God whom the Athenians unknowingly worship[60] is the creator of the world and human beings and thus related to them in nature.[61] This relatedness is simultaneously said to be the reason that [50] human beings seek after God as their source. By contrast, God may not be worshiped through works of architecture or art made with hands. This image of God is then interpreted in the framework of Jewish-Christian faith: the creation of human beings took place "from one" (ἐξ ἑνός); in the past God overlooked human ignorance (17.30); now[62] is the call to repentance; in the future the judgment follows through the one whom God has appointed as the judge of the οἰκουμένη and has resurrected from the dead (17.31).

Older scholarship often judged that the speech stands in a scarcely bridgeable contradiction to Paul's statements on the relationship of human beings to God and its new establishment through an act of God.[63] In Paul the relationship between God and human beings is said to be fundamentally destroyed by sin and re-established by declaring human beings righteous

[56] Jervell 1998, 452–56.

[57] The only mention occurs in 1 Thess 3.1: Paul has sent Timothy from Athens back to Thessalonica. Moreover, this information stands in contradiction to Acts 17.14. There Silas and Timothy remain behind in Berea, whereas Paul alone goes to Athens.

[58] The speech stands at the center of the mission of Paul portrayed in Acts 16–19 and corresponds thereby with the speech in Pisidian Antioch during the first missionary journey (Acts 13.16-41). Moreover, it is a programmatic speech before Gentiles, which only has an analogy in the speech of 14.15-17. With the speech on the Areopagus, the Christianity presented in Acts thereby reaches the center of the ancient intellectual world.

[59] On this cf. also the excellent presentation of Klauck 1996, 88–111.

[60] For the discussion surrounding the well-known problem of the altar inscription, cf. Van der Horst 1991.

[61] The formulation ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον (instead of τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν) in 17.24 is closer to a popular philosophical manner of expression than to the biblical one. On the Jewish side, cf. 2 Macc 7.23; Wis 9.9; on the Christian side, cf. *1 Clem.* 19.2; *Barn.* 21.5. On human beings' relatedness to God in nature, cf. further, e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Dei cogn.* (*Or.* 12), as well as Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, 4.

[62] Cf. the emphatic τὰ νῦν in v. 30!

[63] This view of the Lukan reception of Paul was given classic formulation by Vielhauer 1965.

and by the removal of sin bound up with this. When Paul—as in Romans 1.19-21—speaks of natural knowledge of God, then this happens exclusively with reference to the refusal to worship God.[64] But the speech is also conspicuous within the Paul presentation of Acts: the Lukan Paul is—apart from 14.15-17—constantly trying to move *Jews* to accept the Christ message, whereas he gives a speech before pagan philosophers here.

The emphasis on the special position of the Areopagus speech within Acts as well as its differences from the statements of Paul are often exaggerated. For the direction of questioning pursued here, however, it must be especially pointed out that Luke's reception of Paul is scarcely grasped accurately in this manner. First, one must take into account the fact that the Paul (re)constructed on the basis of his own letters also cannot simply be identified with the "historical Paul." In his letters Paul appears as the implied author who sets forth a specific picture of himself in concrete—frequently tense—situations. How far removed he is from a "neutral" presentation of his own person is shown especially by 2 Corinthians and Galatians. Paul wants to give the addressees of his letters instructions for the Christian way of life and presents himself thereby as an apostle who has been commissioned with the gospel by God and Christ. Luke, by contrast, pursues a different intention: for him Paul is of interest as a founder of communities who [51] brought the gospel into the Aegean sphere and through whose mission the separation of Jews and Christians took place. The speeches are also formulated from this perspective. In these Luke shows that he did possess knowledge of the contents of the Pauline proclamation, but he reworked them in the framework of his own perspective on Paul.[65]

Thus, it first becomes clear that the alternative "Paul of Acts versus *historical* Paul" makes little sense. In the early Christian writings various pictures of Paul were drawn, which are the result of different rhetorical strategies. Even if the letters written by Paul himself naturally possess a different status than writings *about* him, we must nevertheless take into account the fact that we are always dealing with presentations of the person of Paul that were set forth with specific intentions. In Acts' conception of history, Paul is given the function of confronting the Jews with the Christ message and preparing the Gentile mission at the same time.

In terms of content, the argumentative context in each case must be taken into account in the much-invoked comparison with Romans 1.18-32: in his letter to an already existing Christian community consisting of

[64] Cf., e.g., Roloff 1981, 267–68.

[65] On this perspective on the Lukan Paul and his relation to the Paul of the letters, cf. also Porter 1999; for the Areopagus speech in particular, see 118–24, 141–50.

former Jews and Gentiles, Paul explains why both stood equally under the wrath of God prior to Christ. By contrast, the Areopagus speech is a repentance sermon that is given before Gentiles about their ignorance of the true God and Jesus whom God raised and the necessity of repentance. Even if the differences between both texts should not be exaggerated,[66] a situation such as that to which Paul looks back in 1 Thessalonians 1.9-10 is better suited for comparison: "you have turned yourselves from idols in order to serve the living and true God and to await his Son from heaven, whom he has raised from the dead, Jesus, who will rescue us from the coming wrath." Here Paul addresses Gentiles who have converted on account of his preaching about God and his Son, whom he thus must have had to convince through his proclamation of the necessity of repentance and of turning to God and his Son who will play a decisive role in the future judgment.

This is not, of course, to claim that Paul actually delivered or would have delivered a speech such as that in Acts 17. In the sense of the aforementioned Thucydidean principle, the Areopagus speech can, however, be viewed as a composition that reproduces the ξύμπασα γνώμη of how Paul, according to the view of Luke, could have spoken [52] in such a situation.[67] Its programmatic character is emphasized thereby not only through the location, but also through its position at the center of the independent mission of Paul within the book of Acts.

The Areopagus speech thus shows itself to be a configuration of the historian Luke, who links the activity of Paul with its historical consequences—the hardening of Judaism and the emergence of the Gentile-Christian church. Only on this foundation can the Lukan Paul and the Paul of the Letters be placed in relation to each other in a meaningful manner. The assessment that Paul, if he gave the speeches reported by Luke at all, did not, in any case, give them in this way, would, by contrast, be a truncated understanding of historical reference—as would the opposite attempt, which is undoubtedly more difficult to carry out, to prove the actuality of the speech. Both models reduce historicity to facticity and thereby remain behind the aforementioned methodology-of-history insights.

The findings can be summarized as follows: the Areopagus speech represents a conception of a Pauline missionary sermon to Gentiles that Luke intentionally situates in Athens. This corresponds first to the abstraction that is necessary for every presentation of history. It corresponds secondly to the approach of Luke to use the speeches in particular for an interpretation of history that goes beyond the concrete situation. Here he stands in the praxis of ancient historiography founded by Thucydides. Luke uses this to characterize the speakers whom he has appear as well

[66] Porter 1999, 145–48.

[67] Along this line, cf. also Barrett 1994–1998, II, 825.

as the consequences of their activity. In the Areopagus speech, he uses for this purpose topoi of Jewish-Hellenistic religion critique, which he moves closer to Hellenistic popular philosophy: God is the creator of the world; he does not live in temples; he is not worshipped through works produced by human beings; human beings are related to him in nature. These topoi are combined with aspects that Luke exclusively sets in relation to the activity of Paul: only Paul decidedly turns to the Gentiles in Acts; only he expands the conception of God in the aforementioned manner; only he speaks before Gentiles of the necessity of repentance for all human beings. We are thus dealing with a presentation that starts from the expansion of the people of God beyond Israel and traces back its implementation to the activity of Paul. Its "historicity" resides precisely in this interplay between meaning-creating overall conception and preserving remembrance of what happened in the past. [53]

3. The beginnings of Christianity
Construction of history, historical criticism, and truth

History writing—this is suggested by the thoughts presented here—is only grasped adequately as the interplay between event and narration, for this is the only way that living history can emerge from dead material. It is bound thereby to the traces of the past—to recollections, sources, and documents. These materials become constituent parts of conceptions of history through questioning, interpretation, and integration into overarching connections. History writing as reality interpretation, which is by no means completed with the gathering and examination of facts, is therefore related to myth and tradition as identity-creating entities of communities. The aforementioned insights of antiquity and modern discussion should be developed in this direction, to which New Testament science has its own contribution to make on the basis of its particular understanding of history

With this a specific place is simultaneously assigned to historical criticism. The critical evaluation of the remains is an indisputable contribution of the modern science of history, for it places the occupation with the past on a rationally comprehensible foundation. Here reference may be made once again to the insight of Droysen—which was already mentioned in the previous chapters—that criticism does not seek the "actual historical facts" behind the historical material.[68] Rather, every interpretation of the material is a hypothetical, falsifiable conception for understanding reality; historical truth is therefore a regulative idea, which these conceptions seek to approach. If history thus proves to be the result of the past appropriated

[68] Cf. Droysen 1977, 431.

under the conditions of the respective present—what *is* is not what it will have been—then historical criticism serves to tie conceptions of history in a checkable manner to the traces of the past. Historical criticism can thus scrutinize the plausibility of meaning-creating conceptions, but it cannot prove or refute their truth.

With the aid of the examples discussed from early Christianity, it has become clear that we are dealing in both cases with presentations that interpret the activity of a historical person from a certain perspective. Mark orients himself to the activity of Jesus, which sets up a new framework for the interpretation of reality. Past, present, and future are joined with one another in a new way and the person of Jesus becomes the center of a conception of history. By contrast, a [54] quest for the "real Jesus" behind the sources that is detached from such presentations would be unsatisfactory from a methodology-of-history perspective, for it could not make comprehensible the emergence of the Christian interpretation of history from the connection to the activity and fate of Jesus.

The reception of the activity of Paul in Acts on the basis of the Areopagus speech shows how Luke ties the emergence of the—now Gentile Christian—people of God alongside the simultaneous hardening of the Jews to the person of Paul. The alternative "speech actually given by Paul or invention of Luke" falls short of what is required, for the underlying concept of what is to be designated as "historical" is not adequately reflected upon. Luke sets forth this speech in order to make clear how Paul, as missionary to the Gentiles, has laid the foundation for the encounter of the Christian proclamation with the pagan intellectual world.

The examples thus show that there is a specific Christian horizon of interpretation for the appropriation of the past as history. It goes without saying that from a methodological perspective Christian interpretation of history is bound to the same rules of historical work as every other occupation with the past. It orders reality, however, in the horizon of the history of Israel and its specific reception and continuation in the person of Jesus of Nazareth as well as in the horizon of the new access that is established by him to the history of God with human beings. The origins of this idea of history lie in the early Christian witnesses of the first and second centuries. The contribution of New Testament science consists in developing concepts of meaning on the basis of these witnesses and in bringing these concepts of meaning in conjunction with the other theological disciplines into conversation with competing interpretations of history. It cannot prove that the view of history that is thereby brought to light is true; it can, however, express the fact that there have been and still are human beings for whom it represents the foundation of their life and actions.

History in Light of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ

Remarks on the Discussion concerning Memory and History from the Perspective of Early Christianity

1. Memory, recollection, history
Spotlights on the current discussion

With the concepts "recollection" and "history" the subtitle of this contribution takes up a dynamic specific to the discourse in the human sciences of the last twenty years: when history is spoken about at present, then the key words "recollection" and "memory" also always crop up. In the meantime, the relevant research takes place in a variety of fields. Three examples may be mentioned:

- "Representations of the Past: The Writing of National Histories in Europe," a program supported by the European Science Foundation, is dedicated to the concept of the nation as a category that is fundamental for the self-understanding of European nation states and to its influence on European history writing. At an initial conference, which took place in May 2004 at the University of Glamorgan (GB), the areas of history writing, literature (historical novel), film, and visual arts as media of historical representation were taken into consideration. The formation of national consciousness as well as a shared European historical consciousness and the accompanying "formation of myths" were discussed here in a spectrum that can be outlined with the key words "identity," "recollection," "narrativity," and "representation of the past." It became clear that the writing of history has an identity-creating function and with this simultaneously a political function and therefore must always also be scrutinized in an ideological-critical manner. It became clear also that historical narratives must be situated within a broad spectrum of representations of the past. Both the concept of the nation and the notion of a European identity prove to be categories of interpretation that contribute to the structuring and interpretation of history and with this to the self-understanding of societies.
- At the *Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut Essen* (Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities), a "Center for Interdisciplinary Memory Research" was established a number of years ago, whose "Scientific Advisory Board" includes among others the literary scientist Aleida Assmann, the historian Norbert Frei, and the

neurophysiologist Hans J. Markowitsch. The research projects [56] include "transmission of historical consciousness," "comparative traditions-research," and "recollection and memory." In the last named project, which is led by Markowitsch and the social psychologist Harald Welzer (both from the University of Bielefeld), human recollection is to be investigated from various perspectives—neuroscientific, social-scientific, developmental-theoretical. Thus a special accent lies here on the question of the connection between neuronal aspects of information processing as well as the recollection contents based on them and the emergence of a cultural or collective memory. The questions of how recollection takes place and how the corresponding contents are organized in the brain are to be incorporated into the investigation of the connection between recollection and history.

- At the Justus Liebig University Giessen a special research area "recollection-cultures," funded by the German Research Foundation, was established, which deals with the contents and forms of cultural recollection from antiquity to the present. Here consideration is to be given to both science-of-history and science-of-literature aspects of the subject. A work group deals specifically with theories of memory and recollection. Here too theories of memory from various disciplines—philosophy, psychology, sociology, as well as sciences of art and culture—are brought into conversation with one another. Special attention is given to the question of the dependence of conceptions of the past on the respective acts of recollection and the relativity of constructions of history bound up with this.

As these examples show, the occupation with recollection, memory, and history currently moves within a broad interdisciplinary spectrum and is carried out in various large research projects. The integration of the concept of history into the context of memory research and the concept of recollection bound up with this indicates thereby a change of perspective on the past. By emphasizing the dependence of constructions of history on their cultural and physiological conditions, the appropriation of the past is simultaneously assigned to the sphere of human cognition and orientation functions. Thus, the occupation with the contents of history writing—with what was—is joined by the occupation with the intention with which these contents are transmitted and with the function that they fulfill for the self-understanding of a society.

If one inquires into the reasons that have led to the development sketched above, then one encounters the key words "linguistic turn" or "cultural turn." The new orientation of the human sciences referred to by this—which, as, for example, the connection with neurophysiological research shows, also opens a new form of collaboration with the natural sciences—is based on the insight that every perception of reality is conditioned by social, cultural, and physiological influences as well as by language and other media as forms of the representation of reality. As a result questions such as how the memory selects from reality [57] and how the representation of reality, which is always mediated by language, relates to the extra-linguistic

world come to the fore. That central topics for the science of history are also addressed with this is obvious: our picture of the past is dependent on what we recollect, what we forget or suppress, which information is selected, which is passed over, if history is written down or (hi)stories are told. The incorporation of the science of history into a more comprehensive paradigm of the (re)construction of reality—here specifically of past reality—and its representation in the present-making recollection has thereby become unavoidable. It is a point of contention here whether the idea of the *one* (hi)story (the metanarrative) breaks down and leads to a multiplicity of "(hi)stories," whose relation to each other is quite open.[1]

This discourse is significant for Christian theology as a historically grounded science because it deals with the emergence of specific cultures of recollection and their contents. Therefore, one must reflect theologically on what a Christian "culture of recollection" is founded upon and on the ways in which the corresponding contents are represented. I will return to this point in section 3. One would, however, also have to examine whether or in what way a relation to history can be joined with a truth claim. Since it is questionable to ground such a claim solely on the critical investigation of sources, one would have to examine whether other criteria can be found for this. That this is by no means irrelevant for Christian theology and Christian faith is obvious.

Finally, the significance of the subject matter outlined with the key words "recollection" and "history" also resides in the fact that other far-reaching theories on the character of religion and on current political discussion can also be connected with them. The former, for example, is evident from Jan Assmann's provocative thesis on the origin and consequences of Mosaic monotheism,[2] the latter from the debate surrounding the Holocaust memorial in Berlin as a recent example of the problems of the configuration of Jewish–Christian relations after the Shoa. An [58] understanding of history oriented to recollection and memory is—this is shown by these examples—always also oriented, through making one's own roots conscious, to influencing the self-understanding of one's own present and the consequences that result from this. This ethical impulse is a further consequence of an understanding of history oriented to the concept of recollection.

[1] We should recall once again the fact, mentioned already in the two preceding chapters, that the collective singular "the history," which unites the individual "histories" or "stories" as an overarching category was first developed in the eighteenth century. Cf. Koselleck 1992.

[2] Cf. Assmann 2001; 2003; 2010. I cannot deal here in greater detail with the discussion surrounding this thesis, which has encountered much opposition.

The current discussion can be focused on two lines of questioning, which will be addressed in what follows. The first can be elucidated with the aid of the thesis of an intensified constructivism: if, as occasionally happens in recent conceptions, past reality is tied to its existence in the recollection that makes present, the forming of the past into history through "historical imagination" is emphasized, and the selective, imprecise, and changeable manner in which the human memory appropriates the past is also stressed, then this leads to the question of how a history that is constructed like this can be distinguished from fiction and provide orientation in the respective present.[3] Accordingly, what is under discussion here is the question of what we refer to with the concept of "historical reality" and how this should be combined with the science of history's concern to assert the past in the present.[4]

The other question concerns the position of the so-called "memory-history" within the science of history. Recently this has occasionally been specified so that memory-history does not stand in opposition to a writing of history oriented to the critical source findings but represents an independent area whose intention is exhausted in the creation of meaning for the respective present.[5] This leads to the question of whether there can be constructions of history that possess their meaning in themselves, but are, by contrast, ultimately independent from the past to which they refer. [59]

In the following remarks I will discuss this circle of problems with reference to two recent conceptions. Following this, I will then consider the early Christian perspective on recollection and history. Finally, in a summary I will inquire into the contribution that can be derived from this for the theme of "recollection and history."

2. Two new conceptions on the theme "recollection and history"

In 2004 two great works on the topic "recollection and history" appeared. One originated from the Frankfurt medievalist Johannes Fried, the other from the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur who died on May 20, 2005.

[3] This discussion was especially triggered by the corresponding contributions of White. Cf. White 1973; 1978, 81–100.

[4] On the question of historical referentiality, cf. Goertz 2001, 32–52. On the problem of "historical reality," cf. also Goertz 2004.

[5] Cf. the description of "memory-history" in Assmann 2001, 26–37, esp. 27–28: "The goal of a memory-historical investigation does not consist in discovering the possible truth of traditions . . . but in studying these traditions themselves as phenomena of the collective or cultural memory. Recollections can be false, distorted, invented or artistically implanted . . . recollection cannot be regarded as a reliable source without being checked with objective 'facts.' "

Both conceptions deal with the question of how recollection and memory have an impact on the emergence of history. The approaches differ in important points with respect to both the methodological presuppositions and the conclusions with regard to engaging with the past. For the current discourse on the significance of memory and recollection for the science of history a critical engagement with these conceptions is therefore suggested.

2.1 Johannes Fried—The veil of recollection

Johannes Fried's conception[6] aims at a new theory of culture, which he calls "memorics" (*Memorik*) and whose special feature consists in the incorporation of brain-physiological and social-psychological investigations into the science of history. For this Fried starts, by way of introduction, from four examples, with the aid of which he demonstrates the "frightening unreliability and fallibility of all recollections."[7] Distortions and deformations of past events are said to be caused through recollections; moreover, every retelling is said to augment the flow of recollections around another river branch. In order to know how it was, the mechanisms in which the human memory preserves past reality must be grasped, and the corresponding distortions and deformations must be analyzed and taken into account in the construction of a picture of the past.[8] Oral recollection in particular, which is an important source for extensive areas of the science of history, is highly unreliable [60] and contradictory, whereas "rhetoric and categorizing" is said to have led to a stabilization of recollection and to have enabled "a new kind of turning to the past in conjunction with writing."[9]

In the chapter "Neuro-cultural Foundations of the Science of History,"[10] Fried addresses developmental-physiological processes as well as the neuronal functionality of the human memory. When new information is being processed, the memory always makes a selection between "relevant" and "irrelevant," and it conditions the reality taken in with the help of language, which possesses a memory-stabilizing effect; moreover, the decisive insight is said to be that due to the memory's manner of operation there can be no "comprehensively correct recollection," but rather memory performance is subject to constant transformations and errors.[11]

This results then in a certain perspective on the sources with which historians work. These sources are not "standing water" but branches

[6] Fried 2004.
[7] Fried 2004, 13–56.
[8] Fried 2004, 49.
[9] Fried 2004, 321.
[10] Fried 2004, 80–152.
[11] Fried 2004, 143.

within an ever-further-branching stream of recollections of past events. In the process, the traces of past reality disappear in an increasing manner. To this is added the fact that the brain itself is said to invent (hi)stories that never happened but that it nevertheless regards as reality.[12]

According to Fried, history is thus in extensive parts the result of a falsification of past reality by the memory. This is said to consciously and unconsciously select and manipulate the recollection data, to invent events that did not take place at all, and to establish connections that never existed. The connections which are present in the memory and which form the picture of the past must therefore be subjected to a "memory-criticism." For this the historian must "set forth a form-history of the deformation and apply a methodologically controlled memorics."[13] In addition, a "comprehensive analysis of the *context of emergence* of a recollection witness is required; furthermore a strict separation of the temporal strata of our sources is necessary; finally, it is indispensible that one include the manner of operation of the human memory according to the knowledge of psychology and neurology as well as ethnology to the extent that oral tradition is concerned."[14] Within such a cross-disciplinary approach, the conditions [61] under which the traditions came about are to be examined. With this comes a "re-evaluation of the sources" that is said to expose the deceptions and teach one to distinguish between recollections and the intended reality.[15]

An example with which Fried illustrates this is the accounts about the life and work of Benedict of Nursia.[16] As is well known, the only source that is available for this is the second book of the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great. Even if one does not agree with the recently renewed contestation of its derivation from Gregory and holds fast to their dating around 600 CE, the circumstances surrounding their emergence and transmission show that something certain about the person of Benedict can scarcely be extracted from them. It is true that they probably go back to actual conversations of Gregory with Benedict, but they emerged gradually in the circle of Gregory, were collected later, and were subjected to a final redaction. He is said to have held fast to the conversations that Gregory actually had with him in his memory; they were accordingly shaped by recollection and forgetting. Finally, the dialogues were arranged for the purpose of religious edification, which is also said to have influenced the description of the life of Benedict. Fried's conclusion is that we do not know who Benedict actually was. Rather, his figure appears "as a myth, a pious legend, a phantom, perhaps a projection, a product of edifying history."

[12] Fried 2004, 231.
[13] Fried 2004, 232.
[14] Fried 2004, 383.
[15] Fried 2004, 385–89.
[16] Fried 2004, 344–56.

In his approach, however, Fried is not simply concerned with destruction. Rather, the meaning of recollections—their contribution to the emergence of specific appropriations of the past, also and precisely through their reshaping and distortions—is recognizable precisely in this way. Thus the life description of Benedict as an ideal monk and abbot figure certainly has a symbolic meaning, but later its fictional character was no longer seen through and was regarded as reality. The "new theory of culture" that Fried imagines thus aims at distinguishing between reality as it actually happened and remembered reality, at examining the anthropological and societal processes in the emergence of recollections and cultural memory, and at carrying out "analyses of past, present, and future-planned cultures."[17]

The claim that Fried makes with his work is remarkable. His conception of a "neuro-cultural science of history" ultimately aims at a theory that gathers the entirety of the human sciences, social sciences, and natural sciences under the umbrella of a universal theory of culture. If we leave this broader horizon to rest, then with regard to the more specific question of the understanding of history and recollection Fried is undoubtedly to be credited with [62] critically examining a writing of history based on critical source analysis itself through the incorporation of neurological findings. How the witnesses, with which the science of history works in a conventional manner, came about must be taken into account—this is rightly pointed out by Fried—in order to distinguish between unreliable or even counterfeit witnesses and reliable witnesses. Here memory research can certainly render important services, for example, by shedding light on how past events are taken up, selected, and organized in the human brain. If mistakes of memory—forgetting, deceptions, or unreliable connections of events—are identified, this can contribute to the specification of the source findings as well as to the differentiation between event and recollection. Finally, one will also follow Fried in maintaining that recollections have a cultural value of their own and are not to be measured solely by their agreement with the past reality.

The questions for Fried's conception are directed first to the epistemological basis of his remarks. Fried wishes, with the help of the performed memory-criticism, to make transparent the deceptions to which a conventional orientation to the sources is subject in order to come closer, in this way, to the "historical reality." However, the discussion surrounding the standpoint-dependent-character of every interpretation of past reality, which has been carried out in European history writing since Chladenius, plays no role in his conception. Therefore, it would be necessary to ask

[17] Fried 2004, 393.

whether the model of a neuro-cultural–based science of history would not need to be reconsidered with regard to the underlying notion of "historical reality." That the past event must be distinguished from its representation in the memory and from its presentation in conceptions of history is not thereby in question. Whether, however, the task of history writing on a "neuro-cultural" foundation looks fundamentally different than in its traditional critical form or whether it is more likely that it is a matter of a certain accentuation that relates to the *function* of presentations of history would have to be reexamined.

Thus, for instance, to remain with the example given, the distinction between legendary and historical parts in the life-description of Benedict and the evaluation of the dialogue of Gregory as a hagiographical presentation is a long-accepted finding based on critical source research. Fried's remarks, however, direct our attention to the function of the presentation of Benedict as a type of a "holy man," which is precisely not measured by its agreement with the historical data.[18] [63]

Finally, the approach oriented to memory criticism also represents a form—even if in a specific manner, namely one oriented to the function of recollections—of critical engagement with the sources that is oriented to the difference between past reality and its representation.

In connection with this, Fried's evaluation of historical recollections would have to be reviewed. His observations on the unreliability of oral traditions, which he formulates following the investigations of *oral history* by Walter Ong and Jan Vansina, are undoubtedly to be taken into account, as are his remarks, which are illustrated by numerous examples, on the legendary, saga-like character of some sources, especially Medieval ones. It is less convincing, by contrast, when he starts from an "initial suspicion against recollection-witnesses" and describes the task of the historian accordingly as corrector of "mistakes of the memory."[19] Here there is an underlying distinction—which is also found in an analogous way in Jan Assmann—between a writing of history based on recollections and a critical writing of history.[20] In this way, recollections possess, according to Fried, a meaning in themselves—thus independent of the intended reality—which can be traced especially through deviations from this reality.[21]

However, the question of the epistemological status of such a distinction arises. If—as Fried rightly emphasizes—the representation of reality in the human memory must be distinguished from the represented reality

[18] Fried 2004, 335: "Whether and to what extent a lived life stood behind this picture was completely insignificant. The truth of the type remained untouched by this."

[19] Fried 2004, 367–83.

[20] Cf. n. 5 above.

[21] Fried 2004, 389.

itself, then the pejorative way of speaking about deformations, distortions, and mistakes of the memory, the correction of which is said to be the task of a new memorics, does not appear very convincing. For one, it forces Fried to separate the function of recollections from what is remembered and ultimately does not permit, if taken strictly, a positive function to be ascribed to memory and recollection. Finally, the notion, bound up with this concept, of a "historical reality" that is to be determined by memory criticism and critical source analysis does not take sufficient account of the fact that such conceptions of history also represent a linking of present and past.

The "memory-critical construction process"[22] undoubtedly looks different in ancient and medieval works than in works that were composed under the conditions of the modern historical-critical consciousness. The decisive difference consists in the fact that in the former [64] a distinction between present and past is not made in the manner of a "consistent historization of the past,"[23] as is the case in the latter. Both are connected, however, by the fact that they are representations of the past in the respective presents. The demand, which is rightly made by Fried, for an integration of historical source criticism into a comprehensive "theory of culture upon an anthropological basis"[24] would therefore have to be reconsidered epistemologically with regard to the relation between past reality and its representation in the memory. His memory-critical approach, which wishes to determine the value of recollections independently from the past reality, does not yet appear adequate in light of the linking of past event and its representation in the recollection.

2.2 Paul Ricoeur—Memory, history, forgetting

In his last great work, Paul Ricoeur turned once again to the subject of history.[25] The book picks up the thread of his three-volume investigation, *Time and Narrative*, and works out an aspect that was already touched on there. In *Time and Narrative* Ricoeur had occupied himself with the representation of the past in narrative and the resultant interweaving of the reference modes of the historical narrative and the literary narrative. With the memory Ricoeur now turns in his new work to the entity that is of fundamental importance for the representation of the past in the respective present. He is concerned to mediate between a position that attributes a picture of the past solely to the imagination and one that disregards the processes

[22] Fried 2004, 389.
[23] Fried 2004, 329.
[24] Fried 2004, 363.
[25] Ricoeur 2004a; 2004b.

of forgetting and forgiveness. If he sees an "excess of memory" in the latter, then through an "excess of forgetting"—for example, in the version that Hayden White has given to it—the former conjures up the danger of letting fiction and reality become indistinguishable, by which it plays, for example, into the hands of Holocaust deniers.[26] By contrast, Ricoeur describes his own position as "the idea of a policy of the just allotment of memory," which he wishes to bring into the public debate.[27]

For this he sets forth in the first part a phenomenology of memory oriented to Husserl ("On Memory and Recollection"), in the second part he turns to the significance of memory for the [65] writing of history, and in the third part he deals with the problem of the representation of time in history ("The Historical Condition"). This part also contains a section on the problem of forgetting, which Fried also made a subject of discussion. An epilogue is devoted to the subject of forgiveness ("Difficult Forgiveness").

For the development of his view of memory, Ricoeur introduces, at first with reference to Plato's image theory, various forms of the relation between an absent thing (*eikōn*) and its presence in the memory. The forms of mimesis, thus the relations of the memory to the *eikōn*, could be true or deceptive, depending on whether or not the memory deceives. A second point of contact lies in Aristotle's work *Memory and Reminiscence*, from which the sentence "the memory is connected with the past" is especially important.[28] The binding of the memory to the time that is past simultaneously means that the memory builds an active relationship to the past, which can be designated as recollection (*anamnēsis* in Aristotle).

Ricoeur then describes the work of the memory, which is related to the representation of the past and thus to history writing, in three steps: the documentary phase, the phase of explanation and understanding, and finally the phase of representation, thus the presentation in the historical narrative. Here, it is important to him that while "the historical representation is indeed a present picture of an absent thing," the past things actually happened and "no one can make it that they did not happen."[29]

For a phenomenology of memory, it follows from this that Ricoeur warns against "approaching the memory from its deficiencies, indeed from its dysfunctions."[30] Ricoeur sees the validity of such a position in the fact that it pays attention to the problem of forgetting and the "deletion of traces." These problems, however, cannot be reduced to neurophysiological

[26] Cf. e.g., Ricoeur 2004a, 114–46; 2004b, 56–92.

[27] Ricoeur 2004a, 15; 2004b, xv.

[28] Ricoeur 2004a, 38–46; 2004b, 15–21.

[29] Ricoeur 2004a, 433 (cf. 2004b, 280): "keiner machen kann, dass sie nicht gewesen sind."

[30] Ricoeur 2004a, 47; 2004b, 21.

findings. Rather, it must first be considered that forgetting is a constitutive form of recollection, thus "before the abuse, there was the use, namely the necessarily selective character of the narrative."[31] In this Ricoeur's approach differs fundamentally from that of Fried, who presented the memory as an entity that is deficient per se and ultimately applied the neurological findings in an arguably insufficiently differentiated manner to the epistemological and [66] science-of-history direction of questioning. For Ricoeur, by contrast, forgetting does not simply represent a dysfunction of the memory that is to be corrected. Rather, forgetting, which is therein related to forgiving, can also have a salutary function for the appropriation of the past. However, it may not be, as Ricoeur explicitly stresses, a "commanded forgetting." Rather, a "salutary identity crisis" as a constituent part of the work of the memory is essential for the reappropriation of the past.[32]

The strength of Ricoeur's conception consists in the retention of the distinction between fiction and past reality. As much as he himself emphasizes the interweaving of the two spheres, he nevertheless always stresses their own respective modes of reference. In *Time and Narrative* he had carried this out through the distinction between literary and historical narrative, which is now developed further through the epistemology of a representation of the past through history. A special accent lies here on the ethical dimension of the occupation with history. In the epilogue of his book Ricoeur illustrates this on the basis of the love commandment and the process of coming to terms with Apartheid in South Africa through the "Truth and Reconciliation Commission": in order to deal with the traumatic burden of the past, an appropriation of history oriented to the truth is directed to a unilateral gift, whose specific difficulty consists in not allowing any new inequality to emerge between giver and receiver.

The fruit of this condensed overview of two new approaches to the subject of "recollection and history" can be formulated as follows: for the recent science-of-history discussion, a fundamental role is played by the questions of how and what we remember, how these recollections are organized into a picture of the past, and how the representation of the past relates to the extra-linguistic reality. In the process both neurophysiological findings about the memory's manner of operation and philosophical and epistemological investigations on the historical relevance of the memory have been incorporated.

It appears to be especially important to clarify the question of how the affecting of the memory by things or events relates to their representation

[31] Ricoeur 2004a, 684; 2004b, 448.
[32] Ricoeur 2004a, 695–96; 2004b, 456.

in the memory itself and to their representation on the basis of the work of the memory. If Fried's remarks in this connection are based on a theory of deviance, which makes necessary the corresponding work of correction on the part of the historian, then Ricoeur proceeds [67] in a more differentiated manner with his distinction between truthful and deceptive mimesis. This theory allows one to distinguish recollections that are caused by actual things or events from illusions. It makes possible a theory of the presence of the absent past and can demarcate from this deceptive forms of mimesis as misuses or aberrations of the memory. This preserves the connection of the representations to the represented contents and leads to an ethic of recollection, which Ricoeur describes especially with the concept of forgiveness. With this model of representation, a theory that views the notions in the memory as distortions of the actual events is simultaneously rejected.

Against this background we will turn in the next section to the early Christian findings. We will ask how the representations of history encountered here relate to the events to which they refer. We will deal first with Paul, then with the Gospel of John, and finally with the *Apocalypse of Peter* from the Nag Hammadi Corpus.

3. Recollection and history based on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ *The perspective of early Christianity*

3.1 The death and resurrection of Jesus as a foundation for a specific view of recollection and history

That a view of history oriented to a concept of recollection can be made fruitful for the biblical traditions, both of the Old and the New Testaments, has been made clear in the past years in a variety of ways.[33] In the process both the relatedness of history writing and narrative and the interweaving of history and fiction connected with it were [68] incorporated into

[33] With regard to the Old Testament tradition, I refer to the lucid article of my Leipzig colleague Rüdiger Lux (Lux 1998). With regard to the Jesus tradition, I had already submitted a number of years ago in my habilitation thesis (Schröter 1997) the suggestion that its reception in the early sources of Mark, Q, and Thomas should be interpreted as respectively particular recollection phenomena. I then developed this approach further in studies on the character of historical knowledge and on the early Jesus narratives as conceptions of "productive recollection": Schröter 2001b; Schröter 2007, 105–46 (chap. 6 in this volume). At an interdisciplinary colloquium in the Evangelical Academy Loccum in October 2002, such an approach was then discussed in a broader framework. The essays are published in Schröter 2004a.

the exegetical discussion.[34] Source criticism and tradition criticism were thus embedded in the broader context of a perspective informed by epistemological and theory-of-history considerations.[35] It became clear that the engagement with the biblical texts cannot be limited to shedding light on their contexts of emergence and transmission but has to inquire into their contribution to an understanding of history oriented to the events surrounding Jesus of Nazareth. The basic principle is that in early Christianity, history is viewed from the perspective of the God of Israel.[36] This is already shown by the frequent references to the history of Israel as a sphere in which the same God has acted who stands behind the events surrounding Jesus Christ. A further fundamental characteristic is that the appearance of Jesus Christ is regarded as an action of God that determines the now-defining view of reality and history. In view of the approaches presented in section 2, the question of how the events surrounding Jesus Christ have influenced the understanding of recollection and history developed in early Christianity is especially suggested here.

A central role is played by the event(s) of Jesus' death and resurrection, which first makes possible an independent view of recollection and history. The execution of Jesus placed his adherents before a fundamental alternative inasmuch as they either had to abandon the conviction of the action of God in him or integrate his death into this conviction. The Easter events therefore possess a fundamental significance for a Christian view of history. In what follows I will explore further the manner in which this influenced the processing of the death of Jesus. In light of what was explained above about memory and recollection, this aspect is of interest not least because this is an event whose reinterpretation or suppression from the cultural memory of Christianity would have virtually offered itself on account of its negativity.

One must start first from the fact that in early Christianity the death of Jesus is constantly viewed from the perspective of his resurrection. The resurrection message, which belongs—as Romans 10.9; 1 Corinthians 15.3-5; Mark 16.6; Luke 24.34; for example, show—to the oldest level of the Christian confession tradition, gives rise to a variety of implications from itself. [69] One of the most important implications is undoubtedly that an interpretation of his death as falsifying his claim to work in the name of God and establish his kingdom is explicitly contested. Instead, the

[34] With regard to the Gospel of Mark and Acts, corresponding observations are found in chap. 3 of this volume. For Luke, cf. also chapter 10 below.

[35] Cf. chap. 1 in this volume.

[36] This first changes in those texts distinguish a foreign, otherworldly God from the creator God, who can also be called "demiurge," or distinguish between multiple divine figures.

confession of the resurrection declares the death of Jesus to be an integral part of his way and a presupposition of his exaltation and installation in the position of power at the right hand of God. Accordingly, the conviction that even through the death of Jesus God has shown his power toward him and explicitly vindicated his claim is the presupposition for setting forth a view of history from the perspective of the God who acts in Jesus Christ. This comes into effect most clearly in the expressions that speak of the necessity of the suffering and death of Jesus without further elaboration and set the resurrection as an act of God over against it.[37] It is a consequence of this that the suffering and death are thereby integrated into the divine plan of salvation and not attributed to a power that stands in opposition to God.

The anchoring of the death of Jesus in the action of God is all the more weighty since "heroic" aspects could in no way be obtained from the concrete circumstances of this event. Jesus was executed in a brutal manner and on top of that with the most shameful kind of death; his followers had fled, and one of them had even become his betrayer. Early Christianity confronted this and drew out consequences for its self-understanding in various ways. It is therefore an act of recollection work, which had constitutive meaning for emerging Christianity. I will illustrate the way in which this event was processed with three examples.

3.2 The cross as a critical subversion of worldly standards—Paul

Let us turn first to the text that emphatically moves the nature of Jesus' death—specifically his degrading execution on the cross—to the center and to which the expression "theology of the cross" can therefore undoubtedly be rightly applied.[38] 1 Corinthians 1.18-25 is what is meant.[39] In this text Paul confronts the problem of the formation of parties in the Corinthian community, which he had recently brought into connection with the theme of "wisdom": the proclamation of the gospel is [70] not to take place in wisdom of speech, so that the cross of Christ may not be emptied of meaning (1.17). This remark shows first that the Corinthian formation of groups and the theme of wisdom are connected with each other.[40]

Paul confronts this by introducing the expression "cross of Christ," which he places in opposition to that of wisdom. This already shows that

[37] Thus, e.g., in the synoptic passion predictions and the so-called "contrast scheme" of Acts.

[38] Not every interpretation of the death of Jesus should already be designated as "theology of the cross." Instead the expression should be reserved for the texts that use the word-field "cross/crucify" as a means of interpretation.

[39] Cf. Wolter 2001, 51, as well as the remarks in chap. 9 below.

[40] Cf. Schrage 1991–2001, I, 158; Lindemann 2000, 43.

"cross" is not merely a synonym for "death" here. Rather, it is emphatically the offensive and demeaning nature of Jesus' death that stands in contrast to wisdom and thereby functions as a model upon which the community should orient itself. The following remarks (1.18-25) then explain why a stance oriented to the cross of Christ stands in opposition to the wisdom of the world: God has made the wisdom of the world into foolishness (or: shown it to be foolishness) and declared the supposedly foolish to be true wisdom. The basis of this transposition is the reference to Christ, the Crucified One: this one is an obstacle and an offense to the world, but is for the called the power and wisdom of God. Thus it is not simply a matter of processing the death of Jesus. Rather, by having the concept of the cross function as a means of interpretation, the negative connotations of the circumstances of this death are consciously taken up and declared to be the basis of the self-understanding of the believers.

This argumentation has a double point: first, with this Paul redefines the categories of "wisdom" and "foolishness." In doing so he holds fast to the fact that possessing wisdom is positive whereas foolishness is negative. However, what human beings regard as wisdom is claimed to be foolishness in truth and vice versa. "True wisdom" is therefore, as the argumentation in 2.6-16 then makes clear, only accessible to the perfect, who do not have the spirit of the world but the Spirit of God and accordingly are not "psychics" but "pneumatics." In this context the concept of "power" (δύναμις) plays an important role. It occurs in 1.18, 24; 2.4-5; 4.19 and presents the counterconcept to foolishness or worldly wisdom and speech.

The other point is the direct connection that Paul establishes between the events of the resurrection of the Crucified One, the form of the proclamation, and the ethos of the community of believers. In 2.1-5 he grounds the nature of his appearance "in weakness and fear" in the Corinthian community with the fact that he has to proclaim Jesus Christ, *namely as the Crucified One* (2.2). A little later he can then present Apollos and himself as models for a manner of existence oriented to the word of the cross (3.5–4.13). The content of the message thus determines the form in which it is proclaimed and the appearance [71] of the one who passes it on. The message influences the form of the community in such a way that it places the orientation to what superficially counts as "wisdom" under a critical question mark. The social makeup of the community—the majority of them do not belong to the (supposedly) wise, powerful, and noble (1.26)—already points to the nature of God's call, which thereby represents an analogy to the resurrection of the Crucified One. This message does not result then in becoming "puffed up" (4.6, 18-19) but in a renunciation of superficial "worldly" status in a manner of existence that corresponds to the word of the cross.

For the discussion around recollection and history, it follows that Paul strongly emphasizes the contrast between the shameful execution of Jesus and the resurrecting act of God. This declares not only the resurrection of *Jesus* but the resurrection of *the Shamefully Executed One* to be a fundamental part of Christian recollection. This form of recollection thus places itself in a critical distance to worldly standards, which already earned Christians misunderstanding and ridicule in antiquity.[41]

3.3 The death of Jesus as part of his exaltation—John

Another form of dealing with the death and resurrection or exaltation of Jesus occurs in the Gospel of John.[42] Here the perspective on the exaltation of Jesus as his return into the sphere from which he came is present throughout and serves as a means of interpreting his death. The word-field "cross/crucify," however, is not used as an interpretative category, but only appears in the passion story as a description of the execution of Jesus.[43] Accordingly, from an exegetical perspective the expression "theology of the cross" cannot sensibly be applied to this conception.[44] Rather, the Johannine narrative develops the understanding of the [72] crucifixion as exaltation in the chapters prior to the passion account in its own manner: in chapter 3 Jesus also speaks to Nicodemus about his nature: he will, as the Son of Man, ascend into heaven just as he also descended from heaven (3.13). This "ascent" (ἀναβαίνειν) is then explained in more detail in 3.14-16: it will take place as a "being exalted" of the Son of Man, in analogy to the exaltation of the snake through Moses in the wilderness. The goal of this being exalted is eternal life for everyone who believes in the Son of Man. The sending of the Son by God is therefore a demonstration of his love toward the world through which he preserves believers from destruction.

With the metaphor of the exaltation (ὑψωθῆναι) of the Son of Man, the event of the death of Jesus is processed in a distinctive way. To begin with,

[41] Cf., e.g., Justin, *Dial.* 32.1; 90.1; Lucian, *Peregr.* 13.

[42] Recently the independence of John in the processing of the death of Jesus has often been stressed. Cf. now Schlund 2005 as well as Weidemann 2004. Reference should also be made to Belle 2007.

[43] The terms "cross" and "crucify" occur exclusively in chapter 19, thus within the passion narrative.

[44] If the Pauline theology, which uses "cross" and "crucify" as interpreting terms, is designated as "theology of the cross," then it would be appropriate to speak by analogy of "theology of exaltation" in relation to John. Whether this exegetically divergent finding can be subsumed under the concept of a "theology of the cross" in a systematic perspective would have to be discussed on its own. In any case, the concept would then no longer be oriented on the use [72] of the terms σταυρός/σταυροῦν/σταυροῦσθαι as means for interpreting the death of Jesus in the New Testament texts.

it is significant that crucifixion and exaltation are not—as, for example, in Philippians 2.6-11, but also in Luke 24.26—contrasted with each other, but understood as two aspects of *one event*: the crucifixion of Jesus *is* his exaltation[45] and, with this, part of his return to the Father.[46] If this can also be referred to in other passages as being glorified (δοξάζεσθαι), or going away (ὑπάγειν),[47] then this shows that John uses other metaphors in his processing of the death of Jesus and thereby sets other accents than Paul: for John it is decisive that Jesus is the revealer sent by God whose divine origin is also not changed at all by the fact of his execution. Thus, John defends the origin of Jesus from the Father and his divine nature against objections that are brought forward at the narrative level by the Jews.[48] This then also affects the presentation of the passion events. Jesus had already said previously that he gives his life [73] and will also take it up again (10.17-18). He also retains this sovereignty during his arrest, sentencing, and execution, which are portrayed—this has already often been emphasized—as paradoxical enthronement.[49]

Thus, John too does not avoid the event of the shameful death of Jesus. Here, however, it is made fruitful in another way for the understanding of his sending: arrest, mocking, and crucifixion only appear to be an abasement of Jesus, whereas "in truth" they are part of his exaltation and his divine origin. According to John, God does not act in such a way that he reverses the standards of wisdom and foolishness through the resurrection of the Crucified One. Rather, behind the events around Jesus there is a meaning that does not lie on the surface, which is only disclosed to the one who has learned to see Jesus as the revealer of God. Within the New

[45] Cf. 8.28: the Jews will "exalt" the Son of Man by bringing him to death; 12.32-33: Jesus will draw all to him when he is exalted—this he says in order to interpret his death.

[46] Cf. here also Straub 2002, 258: "The fact that Jesus in 12.32 does not make explicit the relation of ὑψόω to the specific kind of death and the fact that the verb σταυρόω does not come up in the two verses [sc.: in 12.32 and 33, J. S.] are already initial indications that the concern is not with combining ὑψόω and σταυρόω in a paradox but with interpreting Jesus' specific sort of death as exaltation—and not as anything else.

[47] In John 7.39; 8.54; 12.16, 23; 13.31-32; 16.14; 17.1, 5 there is talk of the "glorification" of Jesus; 7.33; 8.14, 21; 13.3, 33, 36; 14.4-5, 28; 16.5, 10 speak of his "going away"; 3.13; 6.62; 20.17 of his "ascending."

[48] Cf. e.g., 7.42: Jesus is the son of Joseph, thus he cannot come from heaven; 7.41-42: the Messiah does not come from Galilee but from the lineage of David and from Bethlehem; 9.13-34: the unclear origin and identity of Jesus lead to the Pharisees doubting his deeds of power.

[49] The process before Pilate especially brings this to expression: Jesus declares himself to be a king whose kingdom is not of this world; he is clothed by the soldiers with a crown of thorns and a purple mantle and mocked as "king of the Jews." The title "king of the Jews" plays an important role in the Johannine passion story on the whole, culminating in the cross inscription.

Testament the Gospel of John can therefore be seen as the most considered attempt to think together the divinity of Jesus with his true incarnation.

3.4 The detachment of the earthly from the "living" Jesus— The Apocalypse of Peter *(NHC VII, 3) as an example of docetic Christology*

As a third example we will examine the vision report from the Coptic-Gnostic *Apocalypse of Peter.*[50] This writing was probably composed in Greek in the third century and translated into Coptic in the fourth. The surviving manuscript appears as the third writing in Codex VII from Nag Hammadi.

Apocalypse of Peter describes the reception of a revelation by Peter, which is explained to him by the Savior. In terms of content, the concern is with an interpretation of the passion events, with which the writing differentiates itself from an "orthodox" interpretation of the suffering and death of Jesus. After a rather long teaching by the Savior, Peter sees his crucifixion in a vision:

> After he had said this I saw him as though he were seized by them, and I said: "What do I see, Lord? Is it you yourself, whom they hold fast, and do you reach for me? Or who is the one who is cheerful and laughs next to [or: above on] the wood, and do they strike another on the feet and the hands?" [74]
>
> The Savior said to me: "The one whom you see cheerful and laughing next to [or: above on] the wood, that is the living Jesus. The one, however, in whose hands and feet they strike the nails, that is his fleshly body, the substitute. They (only) destroy what has emerged according to his image. But look, however, at him and at me." (81.3-24)

The view of the crucifixion encountered here clearly differs once again from those in Paul and in John. The basis is a separation of the true, "living" Jesus from his fleshly body. Jesus is said, so the point of this interpretation, to have not really suffered; rather, a distinction must be made between his "real," heavenly nature and its earthly appearance, which is only a "substitute." The preservation of the divine nature of Jesus, which already had to be defended in the Gospel of John, can only be held fast to here at the expense of his earthly existence. The text thus fits into the line of thought whose representatives were already designated as "docetists" in antiquity.[51] They taught, as indicated, for example, by the letters of Ignatius

[50] For an introduction and translation, cf. Havelaar 2003.

[51] Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.6: "In a letter by the bishop Serapion it is stated

of Antioch, that Christ only appeared to suffer,[52] or another suffered in his place;[53] in any case the true nature of Jesus Christ remained untouched by suffering and death.

One of the fiercest controversies in early Christianity emerged around the docetic interpretation of the suffering and death of Jesus. The argument brought forward in the anti-heretical writings against the docetists mostly stated that the incarnation of Jesus Christ and the redemption bound up with it is only complete and effective if it includes his suffering and his death. This interpretation, which held fast to the compatibility of the divine origin of Jesus with his actual humanity—in later terminology: to the unity of the divine and human natures—largely established itself in Christianity.[54] The problem that [75] emerges in the three texts addressed, however, remains present. It consists in thinking together the spheres of the divine and the human, which are actually distinct from each other, in the person of Jesus Christ. This was the decisive challenge for the ancient church Christology, a challenge which continues to exist for a view of history founded on the events around Jesus.

Such an interpretation of history was programmatically carried out for the first time by Irenaeus. His picture of history is based on the notion of an order of salvation in which the fall of Adam and the incarnation of Christ correspond to each other and that is headed to a reestablishment (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις) of all things. Thus Irenaeus firmly contests the acceptance of an earthly sphere separated from God that would be excluded from the redemption set in motion by God. Rather, the incarnation of the Logos, which thereby gives human beings a share in the divine and to which the suffering and death of Jesus also belong, is a central part of this picture of history, according to which the redemption of human beings can also only take place through death and resurrection.[55] Irenaeus takes up here early Christian impulses, as they were presented above with

---

by Serapion that the *Gospel of Peter* was used by people 'whom we call docetists' (οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν)."

[52] Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 2: "And he truly suffered, as he also truly resurrected himself, not as certain unbelievers say that he only appeared to suffer (τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι)." Cf. Ignatius, *Trall.* 10.1.

[53] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.24.4, reports about Basilides that he taught that Christ as the nous of the Father appeared in human form on earth. He did not, however, suffer himself but rather Simon of Cyrene did, who was forced to carry his cross. A similar report about the crucifixion appears in the "Second Logos of the Great Seth" (NHC VII, 2), p. 55.16–56.19.

[54] It should, however, not be overlooked that the formula of Chalcedon, in which this was maintained, led to a lasting division in Christianity. The Armenian as well as parts of the Syrian and the Egyptian church have held fast to a notion of a unified divine nature of Jesus Christ and not accepted the Chalcedonian formula.

[55] Cf., e.g., the comments in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.20; 5.2 and 36.

reference to Paul and John, and makes them the foundation of a Christian picture of history.

The special challenge of a Christian view of recollection and history thus consists in understanding reality in light of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Early Christianity reacted to this in a variety of ways. Paul makes the offensive event of the crucifixion of Jesus the foundation of the self-understanding of believers. If God acted toward Jesus in exact opposition to human standards, then the recollection of this event means a critical subversion of common interpretations of reality. Thus, recollection here becomes the starting point for putting conventional standards of value and categories of interpretation to the test. The Gospel of John, by contrast, is endeavoring to hold fast to the divinity of Jesus even in the face of his death. In the "docetic" conceptions, by contrast, a radical consequence is drawn from the assertion of the divinity of the Savior, namely that his humanity and especially his suffering and death are incompatible with it. By opposing this interpretation Christianity simultaneously committed itself to understanding both Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection as anchored in God's plan of salvation and, with this, as events that disclose reality. [76]

At the beginning of this chapter it was stressed that the interpretation of the past serves the orientation in the present. Christianity developed two institutions that serve its obligation to its own roots and their representation in the respective present, namely the canon and the Lord's Supper/Eucharist. With the canon early Christianity created a corpus of writings that gave expression to its faith confession and from which writings that contradicted it—such as those that advocated a docetic Christology—were excluded.[56] From the beginning the Lord's Supper served to make present the salvation that came in Jesus in which the community symbolically shared in the celebration of this meal.[57] With this it simultaneously becomes clear that the worship service is the central place of recollection for the Christian community. Here there were readings from the accepted writings; here the shared meal was also celebrated.[58] Therefore, in Christianity the reference to its own history must not be separated from its ritual-making present in the celebration of the worship service.

[56] On the emergence and function of the canon, cf. Löhr 2005.

[57] For more detail on this point see Schröter 2006a.

[58] It is not possible here to deal further with the relationship between worship service and meal celebration. Cf., however, Bradshaw 1992.

4. The contribution of a Christian view of recollection and history—*A summary*

What contribution does Christian theology have to make to the current discussion around history and recollection? If we look back to the incorporation, mentioned at the very beginning, of the concept of history into the context outlined by the key words "memory" and "recollection" and to the two conceptions of Johannes Fried and Paul Ricoeur, then the following can be maintained.

The orientation function of the recollected past, which has come to the fore in recent discussion, can be brought into connection with the early Christian (and also Israelite) form of history writing. As shown by the Gospels and Acts, the presentation of the activity and fate of Jesus and the early Christian mission especially serves to make these events fruitful for the self-understanding of early Christianity. The combination of "myth" and "history" that is characteristic for these writings can be explained precisely against this background: the meaning of the history of Jesus and the movement that arose from it is only disclosed when one [77] understands it in the light of God's action. This is simultaneously where its truth claim lies, which cannot therefore be reduced to the "facticity" of the reported events. A separation of the actual historical events from interpreting recollections would not correspond to the self-understanding of these writings any more than would the evaluation of these recollections as deformations or distortions in the manner of memory-work described by Johannes Fried. If one nevertheless asks about the events under the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness, then one must remain conscious of the fact that such an approach also does not get to the reality behind the events. This has been clearly shown by recent discussion concerning the historical Jesus. For this reason the corresponding comments of Fried would have to be critically questioned.

The processing of the death of Jesus through the confession of his resurrection forms the foundation for the recollection of the activity and fate of Jesus, which is held fast to in interpretive conceptions. It is decisive for the development of a Christian understanding of history that the death of Jesus is held fast to as an event that forms the Christian understanding of history. The function of memory and recollection, which Paul Ricoeur emphasized, of resisting the effacement of traces, since only a history writing oriented on truthfulness leads to an ethically responsible interaction with the past, finds an impressive confirmation here. The strength of an understanding of history and recollection oriented to the death and resurrection of Christ consists in not striking out or reinterpreting what is resistant from one's own memory but integrating it into one's own self-understanding.

The high ethos of early Christian communities and the readiness to suffer martyrdom would be difficult to imagine without such a conviction. A specific contribution of Christian theology lies in keeping alive this function of memory and recollection for the formation of historical consciousness.

When the Christian understanding of history is oriented to the action of God in Jesus Christ, then the standards of science-of-history research are not thereby abandoned. Christian history writing has oriented itself to these standards all along and also does so in the present.[59] The biblical writings and church history are investigated with the same methodological presuppositions as other sources are. The proprium of the Christian interpretation of history must be brought into discussion with other views of history and must prove its viability ever anew.

[59] Cf. Markschies 2000; 2009.

Part II

JESUS—PAUL—LUKE

This page intentionally left blank

5 [81–104]

Beginnings of the Jesus Tradition

Tradition-Historical Observations on an Area of the History of Early Christian Theology

In the contributions of the first part, the question of the epistemological presuppositions of the conception of a history of early Christian theology stood at the center. In chapters 3 and 4, material aspects also came to expression: the interpretation of the activity and fate of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, the conceptualization of an early Christian history by Luke with the example of the Areopagus speech, and the reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus as fundamental datum of a Christian understanding of history and reality. In this part I will develop further the material aspect. The first two contributions (chaps. 5 and 6) will turn to the beginnings of the Jesus tradition or the Gospels as "representations" of the history of Jesus. The remaining chapters are devoted to Paul and Luke.

1. The two-source theory and the quest for the beginnings of the Jesus tradition

Where do the beginnings of the Jesus tradition lie? The critical research of the nineteenth century developed a cogent answer to this question. Mark and the sayings source, so Christian Hermann Weisse, are not only the oldest preserved sources of the Jesus tradition but lead back to mediated or direct eyewitness testimony—the recollections of Peter preserved in Mark and the sayings of Jesus gathered by the Apostle Matthew—for which reason they are simultaneously to be regarded as the decisive witnesses for the historical Jesus question.[1] Thus, characteristics of this model are first a direct linking of the oldest traditions with the quest for the historical Jesus and secondly the division of the oldest Jesus tradition into [82] sayings and narrative traditions. Both aspects continue to have an effect up to the present day and require revision.

[1] Weisse 1838.

The necessity of taking up again the question of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition arises not least from the fact that in segments of recent Jesus research these beginnings are searched for in the sayings tradition, where the oldest, most historically reliable traditions are supposedly to be found. The division into sayings tradition and narrative tradition is thus prolonged here; however, with regard to the beginnings of the Jesus tradition only one of the two "sources" of the two-source theory still remains, namely the sayings source, sometimes expanded through other writings concentrated on the sayings tradition, especially the *Gospel of Thomas.*[2] By contrast the narrative tradition is judged to be largely disregardable historically, since it is said to be secondary and "kerygmatically" reshaped.[3] This view of the processes of tradition does not, however, do justice to the findings, as is to be shown. It is true that with the sayings tradition and the narrative tradition, as Martin Dibelius already recognized,[4] two important forms of the processes of tradition are named, but these cannot be divided up to Q and to Mark. Both the beginnings of the Jesus tradition and the two-source theory must therefore be redefined.

To this day Weisse's model enjoys widespread, if not completely unanimous,[5] acceptance as a solution to the Synoptic Problem. By contrast, the evaluation of the processes of the early Jesus tradition has fundamentally changed. If Weisse wanted to undermine the assumption of an oral tradition preceding the oldest sources, then in the meantime the existence of an oral phase of tradition before and alongside the beginnings of its commitment to writing has (again) become widely accepted.[6] The questions of the earliest levels of the Jesus tradition and the sources that are decisive for this are therefore not yet [83] answered with the two-source theory, insofar as it remains in a literary paradigm.[7] Therefore, it is also only seldom viewed as an adequate answer to the question of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition.[8]

[2] This tendency is clearly recognizable in Robinson/Hoffman/Kloppenborg 2000 as well as in its German epitome, Hoffmann/Heil 2002, where the *Gospel of Thomas* is one-sidedly privileged for no reason in the citation of parallels.

[3] Thus recently again Heil 2002, 12–13, 27.

[4] Dibelius 1966 [1913], 233–34; 1971, 232.

[5] Markan priority is less contested thereby than the existence of Q. On this cf. recently the critical discussion with M. S. Goodacre's "Mark without Q" hypothesis by Kloppenborg 2003.

[6] By way of example, reference may be made to Kelber 1995.

[7] This becomes apparent, e.g., in the programmatic conception of Koester 1990, which has little left in common with the classical two-source theory.

[8] The position of Schmithals 1980; 1997 is such an exception, which disputes the assumption of an oral tradition that precedes the Synoptic Gospels in connection with Weisse, though with another thrust. For critical discussion with this approach cf. Schröter 2004b. The one sided preference of Q, sometimes expanded by the *Gospel of Thomas*, also belongs here, since it places *one*, at that only *hypothetically reconstructed*, source of the

The consideration of oral processes of tradition requires a fundamentally different view of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition than what had been intended by Weisse with his literary-critical–oriented model of the two oldest sources and is occasionally to be found up to the present. James D. G. Dunn referred to this in his 2002 presidential address for the 57th meeting of *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* (SNTS) in Durham and drew attention to the necessity of rethinking a "default setting" oriented to literary processes of mediation.[9] The consequences of this revision relate to the evaluation of the synoptic findings themselves as well as to the quest for the sources of the oldest Jesus tradition.

With regard to the synoptic question, the combination of oral and written processes of tradition does not build on Weisse but on Johann Gottfried Herder. In his interpretation of the synoptic findings Herder had explicitly pointed to the importance of the oral tradition, and yet at the same time—unlike form criticism and redaction criticism later—he attached importance to the fact that each evangelist has to be regarded as one who narrates freely.[10] The assumptions of the existence of an oral tradition, its respectively independent literary reworking, and a connection of the (older) Mark with Matthew and Luke have increasingly come into view at present through the reception of narrative-theoretical insights. It thereby becomes clear that the respectively specific compositional [84], linguistic, and thematic characteristics of the Gospels first make possible a methodologically controlled description of the relationship of narrative to reworked tradition as well as to historical connections.[11] Thus, the question of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition is directed, as far as the synoptic sphere is concerned, to the analysis of the Gospels as narratives.

Herder's model was made more precise through Karl Lachmann, who had advocated in his 1835 article,[12] which was fundamental for the acceptance of Markan priority, for the greater age of the Gospel of Mark in relation to Matthew and Luke, but had excluded a direct use of the Gospel

---

two-source theory at the center of the question of the oldest Jesus tradition and attempts to reconstruct this in a literary-critical manner.

[9] Dunn 2003a. Cf. now also Dunn 2003b, 173–254.

[10] Cf. Herder 1880, 214 (cf. 1993, 185): "In our three Gospels, e.g., the same parables, miracles, stories and speeches appear, from which one sees that the common tradition of these evangelical rhapsodists (if this name is permitted to me) superbly held to the stories [sc.: of the apostles, J. S.]. Often they are told with the same words: for this too is in the nature of the matter with an oral tale, especially an apostolic one, which is told again and again . . . But this uniformity never went so far that each evangelist became a mouthpiece for the other, as our three gospels once again attest . . . It is evident that each of the tellers recounted freely."

[11] Cf. already Petersen 1980; Breytenbach 1993. A recent overview of methodological aspects of narrative criticism is given by Merenlahti/Hakola 1999.

[12] Lachmann 1835.

of Mark by Matthew and Luke. As is widely recognized today, important indications speak for the fact that Matthew and Luke used Mark-texts that agree neither with one another nor with a text-critically reconstructed exemplar.[13] With regard to Q, it is also highly probable that different versions were available to Matthew and Luke and that these versions were developed further between an initial written fixation and their reception through Matthew and Luke in respectively independent ways. The fact that the second synoptic source, according to the discernible textual evidence, was a collection of episodes and speeches arranged under biographical and thematic viewpoints and variously expanded already makes it improbable that Matthew and Luke took up this document in exactly the same stage of tradition. The assumption, which is sometimes represented, that it is possible to reconstruct a text from Matthew and Luke in a methodologically controlled manner that reflects the same stage of the tradition history as that of Q is therefore not unproblematic. Such reconstructions have more the character of heuristic ideal types of an early collection of Jesus traditions alongside Mark than that of a text that actually existed. Thus, the literary character of the Gospels as episodic narratives shaped by various traditions and the consideration of the relationships of the synoptic traditions show that the early Jesus traditions are to be analyzed here as constituent parts of narrative reworkings. By contrast, the old form-critical thesis that these traditions can be understood and interpreted independently from [85] their contextualizations as units that have to be isolated is unconvincing.[14]

A second, corresponding aspect arises from the analogies to the synoptic texts in John, in the New Testament letters, and in the extracanonical writings. These parallel traditions also point to a juxtaposition of oral and written processes of tradition, which did not come to an end with the formulation of the first written accounts. Literary mediations in the sense of incorporating older writings into newer ones are only to be observed in the Synoptic Gospels—and there too only with qualifications—whereas they can no more be applied to the Gospel of John[15] or the *Gospel of Thomas* than to the parallels, for instance, between Paul, James, the *Didache*, and the Jesus tradition.

Thus, in light of the echoes of synoptic formulations in the New Testament epistolary literature, the latter is to be included in the tradition-historical question. The same applies for the writings of the so-called "Apostolic Fathers," where Jesus sayings are explicitly cited mainly in

[13] This has led to various Proto-Mark or Deutero-Mark theories, which cannot be discussed further here. A recent stocktaking that leads to a modified two-source theory with Deutero-Mark and various Q editions is found in Schnelle 2002, 190–98; cf. 1998, 161–97.

[14] On this cf. also the pointer in Dunn 2003a, 173–74.

[15] On this cf. now Theobald 2002.

1 and *2 Clement* and the *Didache* shows analogies to the synoptic tradition, without, however, designating them as Jesus tradition. Additionally, the apocryphal tradition, which for a significant part has first become well known in the last 120 years,[16] sometimes plays an important role at present and has modified and enriched the picture of the processes of tradition in the first centuries. While the contribution of these writings for the *beginning* of the Jesus tradition has often been overestimated, these hypotheses have been largely replaced in the meantime through more balanced viewpoints.[17] Nevertheless, it must be kept in view that old traditions are found in the extracanonical writings and in terms of genre can also continue tendencies whose origins reach back to the earliest stages of the processes of tradition.

If the search for the beginnings of the Jesus tradition is thus not to be limited to the synoptic sphere, then the division into canonical and extracanonical writings is also not a suitable criterion for this, since the canonization that did or did not take place is obviously not an argument for the tradition-historical and historical placement of a writing. Taking up the formulation of Dieter Lührmann, [86] it is therefore more appropriate to speak of writings that *have become* canonical or apocryphal.[18]

In what follows I will first make a few observations on the sayings tradition and afterwards on the narrative Jesus tradition. From the perspective of tradition history both spheres show characteristic features of their own that can be questioned according to the guiding intentions in each case. That this division is not to be understood in the sense of a strict separation and that Dibelius' aforementioned judgment also requires modification will become even clearer in the process.

2. Observations on the sayings tradition

2.1 Kyrios tradition in Paul

We start with the letters of Paul as the oldest texts that are available for the reception of Jesus traditions. It is first conspicuous that Paul limits himself almost exclusively to the sayings tradition, whereas Jesus' parables and deeds of power as well as biographical information are almost completely

[16] In this time period a number of texts were discovered and edited that were not yet available to earlier phases of Jesus research. Next to the sensational discovery from Nag Hammadi (1945), from which the *Gospel of Thomas* is especially of interest for the Jesus tradition, reference should be made, for instance, to the publication of the *Gospel of Peter* (1892, supplemented 1972/1994), Papyrus Egerton 2 (1935, supplemented 1985), the so-called *Unknown Berlin Gospel* (1999), or most recently the *Gospel of Judas* (2006).

[17] Cf. the recent overview of Klauck 2002; 2003a.

[18] Cf. already the titles of Lührmann 2000 and 2004.

lacking.[19] In research on the question, a position that only counts the sayings of the Lord in 1 Corinthians 7.10-11 and 9.14, which are characterized as explicit citations, as Jesus tradition taken up by Paul stands in opposition to one that also reckons with allusions to Jesus traditions beyond this—and sometimes with a considerable number of them.[20] The term "Jesus tradition," however, is already inappropriate for Paul since he speaks of κύριος with remarkable consistency in the places where an explicit reference to Jesus is found. This is an initial, important feature of his handling of such traditions. In what follows I first consider the sayings traced back to the κύριος in 1 Corinthians 7.10-11 and 9.14 and limit [87] myself to the tradition-historical aspects relevant to the line of questioning pursued here.[21]

(1) The prohibition of divorce traced back to the κύριος in 1 Corinthians 7.10-11 presents in indirect speech the general sense of a corresponding instruction of the κύριος, which is integrated into its context and formulated by Paul himself. It stands out syntactically that Paul begins with an instruction in the first person (παραγγέλω) in order to immediately correct himself and introduce the κύριος as subject.[22]

In the first place, the reference differs linguistically from the variants of a Jesus saying quoted in Mark 10.11-12/Matt 19.9; Matt 5.32/Luke 16.18, insofar as the latter are formulated as conditional participial or relative sentences (Luke 16.18/Matt 5.32a: πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων; Mark 10.11-12/Matt 5.32b: ὃς ἐάν). This could point to the influence of Semitic syntax, from which only Mark 10.12 (ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα) differs.[23] A terminological relationship exists to the prohibitively formulated statement in Mark 10.9,[24] in which χωρίζειν, which also appears in 1 Corinthians 7.10, is used, whereas the terms ἀπολύειν and μοιχᾶσθαι, which are characteristic for the other versions, are absent. Mark 10.9 is also the closest in terms of content, insofar as the legal components heard in ἀπολύειν and μοιχᾶσθαι are lacking there as they also are in Paul;[25] in addition, the saying in Mark 10.11-12 and Q 16.18 is aimed at a prohibition of *remarriage* and not *separation.*

[19] "Sayings tradition" is thereby understood *strictu sensu*, thus without including the parable tradition. This would have to be investigated separately, though in an analogous way methodologically.

[20] For the option mentioned first, cf. Neirynck 1986; 1996; Lindemann 1992b; for the latter position, cf. Wenham 1995; Dunn 1994.

[21] Cf. also the remarks in Zimmermann/Zimmermann 1996. An analogous analysis with regard to Mark is found in Breytenbach 1992.

[22] This is not adequately brought to expression by the rendering "The married I do not command but the Lord . . ." which is sometimes found. It would be necessary to translate: "The married I command—not I but the Lord . . ." Thus also Wolff 1996, 140.

[23] Cf. Beyer 1968, 145, 211–12.

[24] ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

[25] Thus, rightly Zimmermann/Zimmermann 1996, 94–95.

An additional feature that is specific to Paul consists in the interruption of the saying of the Lord through the parenthesis in verse 11, in which this saying is applied to the situation of the Corinthian community. Paul evidently felt compelled to modify the fundamental claim of the indissolubility of marriage in light of the concrete Corinthian circumstances and to give instructions—now in his own name—for the case of separation that has occurred. Here the saying of the Lord certainly possesses authority for Paul—as is shown by both the interruption οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ . . . and the remarks in 7.12 and 25, where he emphatically contrasts his own instruction with that of the κύριος or distinguishes his *opinion* (γνώμη) with the [88] *command* (ἐπιταγή) of the κύριος[26]—but it must be adapted to the concrete circumstances. The synoptic texts show different processes of interpretation with the fixing of an aphoristic-like Jesus saying in different variations as well as its integration into a dispute with the Pharisees in Mark or into Jesus' interpretation of the law in Matthew. These are oriented to a biographical recollection of Jesus, concretely to his stance toward the Torah, and therefore place the topic of divorce in the context of his earthly activity.[27] I will return to this branching out within the sayings tradition.

(2) The command of the κύριος cited in 1 Corinthians 9.14, namely that the ones who preach the gospel should also live from it, is an example of the early Christian topos of the missionaries' right to support. This also occurs in the synoptic mission discourse, in 2 John 10, and in the *Didache*. As in the previously discussed case, the Pauline formulation is syntactically and semantically embedded in the context of the argumentation and presents a thematic summary of the instruction of the κύριος.[28] It agrees with the other traditions in the statement that apostles have the right to support through the communities, but represents a free formulation without linguistic influences from an otherwise known Jesus saying. The foundation is the conviction that the early Christian missionaries are entitled to payment from the communities for their work. This topos occurs in Q in the form of a proverb-like justification (Matt 10.10c/Luke 10.7b: ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ [Matt: τῆς τροφῆς] αὐτοῦ)[29] as well as in *Didache* 13.1-2, where it is applied to prophets and teachers, and it is also heard in 1 Corinthians 9.17-18, where it is modified, however, in a specific way and

[26] Cf. Schrage 1991–2001, II, 97.

[27] The placement of the logion in Luke 16.18 is difficult and cannot be specially discussed here. On this cf. Schröter 2001b, 119–27. Verses 16 and 17, however, make clear that here too the discussion about the validity of the Torah represents the horizon of interpretation.

[28] Cf. also Lindemann 1992b, 685.

[29] The Matthean formulation probably already represents an adaption to the context of the mission discourse, whereas the Lukan version has the form of a general proverb.

related to the payment from God. Another feature that is distinctive to Paul is the explicit reference to the εὐαγγέλιον or the εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in verses 14, 16, and 18. If the command of the κύριος relates to the proclamation of the gospel, which for Paul is proclamation of the one who has died and has been raised, then it is clear that a distinction between Jesus' [89] sayings and those of the exalted κύριος is without meaning for Paul: the κύριος himself regulates the modalities for the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον.

The proverbial saying in Q is, however, also cited in *Didache* 13.1–2 as well as in 1 Timothy 5.18, but not as a saying of the Lord; moreover, in 1 Timothy it occurs in a different context from that of the Synoptics and Paul.[30] The synoptic logion is evidently known to the authors of the *Didache* and 1 Timothy. The *Didache* knows the Matthean version, which is certainly secondary in relation to Q; in 1 Timothy it is cited as γραφή together with the Scriptural proof from Deuteronomy 25.4, which is also drawn upon by Paul in 1 Corinthians 9.9, and it replaces the Pauline formulation through a Jesus saying from the synoptic tradition.[31] Taken on its own the proverb possesses no relationship to the missionaries' right to support, but is first interpreted in this sense through the context of the mission discourse.[32] The instruction of the κύριος cited by Paul is considerably more concrete in comparison and presupposes, in terms of content, the instruction of Jesus developed in the synoptic discourses. This instruction is confronted with the situation of Paul's own apostolic work, whereby the important thing for him is his right *not* to lay claim to the right to support for the sake of the gospel.[33] The synoptic discourses present, by contrast, forms of the corresponding command of Jesus that are specifically tailored to the Galilean Jesus movement.[34]

Beyond the direct citation, several terms and thematic aspects occur in 1 Corinthians 9 that could be understood as allusions to the context in which the Jesus saying originated according to the synoptic tradition. It is

[30] 1 Timothy, where the saying is applied to the Presbyter, agrees with the Lukan version, whereas the *Didache* agrees with the Matthean version.

[31] Cf. also Roloff 1988, 305–6 with n. 409. For a more in-depth discussion of the relationship between the *Didache* and Matthew, see now also Schröter 2008, 249–55, which takes a skeptical position toward the view that the *Didache* knows Matthew.

[32] Whether the logion goes back to Jesus and—if so—in what context Jesus used it can scarcely be established any longer. On the early Christian reception history of the logion cf. also the excursus in Schröter 1997, 182–84, as well as Harvey 1982.

[33] That this does not represent a general argument of Paul but rather a pragmatic argument oriented to the concrete situation is shown by 2 Cor 11.8 and Phil 4.15.

[34] Tradition-historical distinctions are even to be made within this, insofar as the Q discourse probably represents an older stage than the Mark version. Reference should also be made to the fact that Luke revokes the instruction in a later passage (22.35-36) and thereby designates it as only valid for a certain time. This, however, does not need to be explained further here. On this cf. Schröter 1997, 164–226.

especially striking that Paul, like Matthew and Luke, relates the instruction of the Lord to receiving food and drink (1 Cor 9.4; cf. Matt 10.10; Luke 10.7a, 8b). This has led to the supposition that Paul knew an early version, possibly even the Q version, of the mission discourse.[35] Attempts to prove this, however, have been rightly criticized.[36] The [90] parallels are limited to aspects of the logion in Luke 10.7b/Matt 10.10c and to the payment motif, whereas the rest of the supposed analogies prove to be purely formal agreements of terms that are used in different ways.

It can be gathered from 1 Corinthians 7.10-11 and 9.14 that Paul selectively refers to commands of the κύριος without thereby citing Jesus sayings in a version that is analogous to the synoptic tradition. It therefore makes little sense to want to lift out instructions of the Lord cited by Paul through a literary-critical comparison with the Synoptic Gospels and on this basis to specify the early Christian tradition that was received by him and traced back to the κύριος. Such an approach already fails because the two formulations just discussed show minimal or no terminological contacts but only thematic ones with the synoptic tradition. The reception of the synoptic logion in 1 Timothy and the *Didache* could also indicate that this was not known to Paul and was first taken up into the early Christian Jesus tradition and linked to the topic of support at a subsequent point in time.[37] Paul also shows no knowledge otherwise of the corresponding synoptic traditions but linguistically and thematically integrates the instructions of the κύριος into his own argumentation. They belong for him to early Christian tradition, which is authorized through the κύριος and which he implements in community paraenesis or mission practice.

The Lord's Supper paradosis in 1 Corinthians 11.23b-25 and the eschatological teaching designated as λόγος κυρίου in 1 Thessalonians 4.15-17 also belong to the tradition explicitly traced back to the κύριος.[38] These texts define more precisely the κύριος tradition that is to be presupposed for Paul insofar as he first reckons to this a tradition that cannot be traced back—at least in this form—to the earthly Jesus, but represents an early Christian reminiscence of the meaning of the Last Supper, and secondly a tradition that has no parallels or only distant ones in the synoptic tradition and is perhaps to be designated as a prophetically inspired reproduction of an early Christian tradition.[39] Accordingly, in analogy to the juxtaposition

[35] For the recent period cf. Wenham 1995, 190–200; Allison 1997, 104–19; 1982, 9–10, 12–13, 18.

[36] Cf. Tuckett 1984.

[37] The receptions in 1 Timothy and *Dial. Sav.* 53 (p. 139) show that this is not the only possible use of the saying in early Christianity.

[38] For discussion cf. Tuckett 1990; Kim 2002.

[39] If the expression ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου in 1 Thessalonians 4.15 were to be understood as

of pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus traditions in the Synoptic Gospels, [91] traditions that do not go back to the earthly Jesus are also to be found among the traditions designated by Paul as λόγοι κυρίου, without him marking a corresponding difference.[40] In Paul's understanding, the concern is thus with early Christian tradition that is authorized by the κύριος, who for Paul is the Exalted One, for which reason his instructions can claim validity.[41] If the relation to its pre-Easter origin is not retained here in the form of biographical recollection on the earthly Jesus, then this shows that the meaning of Jesus was retained in the application to their own post-Easter situation.[42] This then applies also in another way for the Gospels.

Finally, a further area to be mentioned here is the echoes that are often found in Paul of synoptic tradition without corresponding citation markers. The number of these allusions is debated, and it is sometimes probably estimated too highly. There are, however, a few formulations in which the relationship to the synoptic tradition is clearly recognizable, and therefore the assumption that Paul reaches back here to topoi from the early Christian tradition is most likely. These include

- 1 Thess 5.2-3—ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται, cf. Mark 13.34-36; Luke 12.39/Matt 24.43 (2 Pet 3.10; Rev 3.3; 16.15; *Gos. Thom.* 21.5-7). The combination of the parousia of Jesus, the metaphor of thief in the night, and the exhortation to γρηγορεῖν points to an old complex of the Jesus tradition that was taken up in respectively independent ways in Mark, Q, and in Paul.[43]
- 1 Thess 5.13 (cf. Rom 12.18)—εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, cf. Mark 9.50 (Matt 5.9).
- Rom 12.14—εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς], εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε, cf. Luke 6.28/Matt 5.44.
- Rom 14.14—οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ, cf. Mark 7.15/Matt 15.11. Paul introduces here an analogy to the logion on clean and unclean that is certainly pre-Markan.
- 1 Cor 13.2—ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάναι, cf. Mark 11.22-23/Matt 17.20 (Luke 17.6). The image of moving mountains also occurs in the Old Testament but not in connection with the power of πίστις.[44]

---

a pointer to prophetic inspiration through the κυρίος and not as an introduction to a saying of the Lord as is often assumed, then for the understanding with which Paul appeals to Jesus this would not mean a fundamental difference from the other passages.

[40] Cf. Walter 1989, 54.

[41] Therefore, Walter 1989, 54, rightly refers to the fact that in the understanding of Paul the saying of the Exalted One from 2 Cor 12.9 should also be counted among the words of the Lord. It remains incomprehensible, however, why this should not also apply to 1 Thess 4.15-17.

[42] Cf. von Lips 1991, 42–43.

[43] Cf. Holtz 1991, 387. Contrast Tuckett 1990, 168–76.

[44] Cf. Wolff 1996, 314; Hahn 1985b. In *Gos. Thom.* 48 and 106, which belong in a later stage of tradition, the motif of making peace or unity ("when you make the two into one") stands in the place of πίστις.

Unlike the previously mentioned texts these passages in Paul are not explicitly traced back to the κύριος. Thus, without the Synoptic Gospels [92] they would not be identifiable as early Christian tradition at all. This has led to the question of whether Paul knew these sayings at all as traditions coming from Jesus or attributed to him.[45] Here, one must consider first that this finding corresponds to the Pauline treatment of Scripture citations, which he likewise sometimes explicitly introduces as such, but elsewhere integrates into his argumentation without special emphasis.[46] The explicit reference to sayings of the Lord in the aforementioned passages therefore lies especially on a pragmatic level: in view of the problems discussed in each case it was natural for Paul to cite or discuss corresponding sayings of the Lord, whereby he clearly indicates in 1 Corinthians 7 that his own instructions do not simply stand equally alongside those of the κύριος and according to 1 Corinthians 9 his service to the gospel without charge corresponds to his special apostolic task.

It is also to be taken into account that in early Christianity the synoptic Jesus tradition could also be handed down elsewhere without being attributed to Jesus, and this could, in fact, also happen post-synoptically, as, for example, James, 1 Peter, and the *Didache* attest. The Pauline findings fall into line with this and are evidence for the fact that the tracing back of the early Christian sayings tradition to Jesus was not mandatory and was carried out in a thoroughgoing manner for the first time in the synoptic Jesus narratives. Thus, the question of whether a tradition originated from the earthly Jesus was not a pressing problem for Paul or elsewhere in early Christianity. Rather, it was important for Paul to answer for his own decisions with respect to the early Christian tradition known to him, which he regarded as a whole as authorized by the κύριος. With this a characteristic feature of the early Christian sayings tradition is grasped, which is not only true for Paul and which is of considerable importance for determining the relationship between sayings tradition and narrative tradition. The sayings tradition could also exist anonymously because without biographical integration it served as a living and variously applicable and extendable basis with which early Christianity created for itself a tradition of its own.

From this finding a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, the assumption of a connection between the letters of Paul and a certain area of the synoptic tradition—for instance Q or a pre-Q collection of wisdom sayings, which are also said to have played [93] a role in the

[45] Cf. Walter 1989, 56, 78; Neirynck 1986, 320–21.

[46] Dunn 1994, 175–76, also points to this. A difference to the Jesus sayings is, however, to be observed in the process insofar as Paul never makes Scripture words into the subject of the dispute and sets his own view against them as equal in value in a manner comparable to 1 Cor 7 and 9.

Corinthian community—has not been confirmed.[47] The noted analogies are neither limited to 1 Corinthians nor to Q, but occur in various letters of Paul—1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, Romans—and take up motifs that have parallels in the Q tradition, in Mark, and in the case of Romans 12.14 only in the Lukan version of the Q text. The findings show secondly that the reception of the kyrios tradition in Paul—with the exception of the Lord's Supper tradition, which represents a special case—takes place by the adaption of motifs and formulations to their respective argumentative contexts. By contrast, there is just as little evidence for the form of sayings as conditional participial and relative sentences and for the use of metrical forms such as *parallelismus* as there is for the related techniques of alliteration and catchword linking that occur in their arrangement elsewhere. A third conclusion is that the early Christian sayings tradition could be traced back to the exalted κύριος without a difference to the sayings of the earthly Jesus being marked. Fourthly, it is clear that the early Christian sayings tradition was only handed down in part as kyrios tradition, whereas from an early period it was also characterized by its combination with early Jewish traditions of wisdom-paraenetic provenance and could be handed down as general paraenesis. Finally, a fifth observation says that Paul, like other early Christian authors also, shows no interest in making this material biographical but takes it up with the goal of deriving standards from it for the early Christian community and mission praxis. Therefore, the early Christian sayings tradition, considered separately, could not be more unsuitable to serve as a starting point for the historical Jesus question. I will need to return to this point.

2.2 Romans 12.14-21 as an example of a pre-synoptic composition of sayings

Since the rise of form-critical research, the assumption of the existence of smaller collections, which are to have preceded the early Christian writings, has also played a role for the question of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition.[48] This supposition was extended with the incorporation of extracanonical writings and has led to hypotheses of various kinds of collections, which are said to lie equally behind canonical and extracanonical writings.[49]

The collection of Jesus traditions into smaller collections is undoubtedly an important tendency of the tradition process. The relevant texts,

[47] Cf. Tuckett 1983.

[48] Cf. already Dibelius 1966 [1913], 219–34; 1971, 218–32, as well as Bultmann 1995 [1921], 348–55; 1963, 322–28.

[49] This model especially underlies the conception of Koester 1990.

designated as λόγοι κυρίου, for instance in [94] *1 Clement* 13.2 or similarly in Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 2.3 (εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων), are clear examples of this, but the sayings compiled in Mark 9.42-47 or Q 11.9-13 also show characteristic features of such collections. To define this tendency more precisely in terms of tradition history, it is not enough, of course, to make note of parallel traditions and postulate early collections on this basis. Rather, the tradition history must be scrutinized in each case. Collections of sayings of the Lord, parables, or apothegms in extracanonical writings could have arisen subsequently under the influence of the Gospels. Since the oral and written processes of tradition stand in close relation to each other, one must also consider the possibility that the Gospels themselves created such compositions.[50] Finally, one must pay attention to the fact that the exact scope as well as the linguistic form of such collections outside of their respective literary contexts can no longer be reconstructed. In what follows I will present the tradition-historical findings, by way of example, with a comparison of the complex on the renunciation of revenge and love of enemy in Romans 12.14-21 with the corresponding synoptic tradition.[51]

The Pauline text belongs to the paraenetic series of sayings in 12.9-21, in which directives are given for behavior among one another and toward those outside.[52] It is held together by the opposition between ἀγαθόν (vv. 9, 21) or καλόν (v. 17) and πονηρόν (v. 9) or κακόν (vv. 17, 21). In verse 14, which takes up the key word διώκειν from verse 13, an imperative formulation occurs for the first time after the participial expressions in verses 9-13.[53] In verses 14 and 17-21 the aspect of the behavior [95] toward adversaries additionally comes into view. Guiding here are the exhortations to bless the persecutors (v. 14), to think on what is good and keep peace in relation to all human beings, and thus to overcome evil through good (v.

[50] This could be the case, e.g., in Mark 2.1–3.6 as well as in the parable discourse in Mark 4.1-34. Both complexes are clearly shaped by the hand of the author in terms of both language and composition and therefore could also have been arranged by Mark himself.

[51] Here the tradition-historical question stands again at the center. For further aspects, especially thematic ones, cf. the corresponding reflections in Schröter 2003b.

[52] Internal and external perspectives are sometimes distinguished so that the former are present in vv. 9-13 and the latter, by contrast, in vv. 14-21. Thus Cranfield 1998/2001, II, 629; Dunn 1988, 738. Such a division, however, cannot be sustained, for in vv. 15 and 16 the internal-community aspect is in view again. By contrast, Cranfield 1998/2001, II, 641–45, wishes to understand these statements as also directed outward; Dunn 1988, 738–39, wishes to relate them to tensions in the Roman community. Such a division, however, does not do justice to εἰς ἀλλήλους, which occurs in both v. 10 and v. 16, and cannot explain the explicit reference to persecutors (v. 14) and the enemy (v. 20), which hardly relate to internal-community conflicts, and probably ultimately brings more systematization into the text than is appropriate to it.

[53] Cf. also the pointer in Zeller 1985, 210.

21). With the exhortations to co-rejoicing and co-suffering (v. 15) and to contentment with lowly things (v. 16), the formulations of the section take up topoi of Jewish-Hellenistic ethics, in which at times expressions from Scripture are heard.[54] The citation marker γέγραπται γάρ in verse 19 then introduces two Scripture passages (Deut 32.35; Prov 25.21) that are linked with each other by λέγει κύριος, ἀλλά and name the judgment reserved for God as a rationale for loving one's enemy. Finally, motifs are found in this section that have their nearest analogies in the Jesus tradition. I will now address these.

The tradition-historical question has to begin with the already mentioned, oft-noted analogy between Romans 12.14 and Luke 6.28/Matt 5.44. If we consider this more closely, then it becomes clear that in its first part the Pauline formulation εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε has an analogy in Matthew 5.44c: προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, whereas in the second part it has an analogy in Luke 6.28a: εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς. The exhortations to love of enemies (Matt 5.44b/Luke 6.27b) and to prayer for the persecutors/revilers are secured for Q by the agreement of Matthew 5.44c with Luke 6.28b (προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς). As Romans 12.14 additionally shows, in Luke 6.28a we are dealing with a traditional formulation.[55] Since the last beatitude is taken up with the exhortation [96] in Luke 6.27c (καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς),[56] and Luke additionally uses ἀγαθοποιεῖν instead of καλῶς ποιεῖν in verses 33 and 35, this sentence probably also goes back to his tradition.[57] This would thus have consisted

[54] In the former the exhortation to solidarity with the needy is predominant in the Jewish texts. Cf. Sir 7.34: μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαιόντων καὶ μετὰ πενθούντων πένθησον; *T. Iss.* 7.5; *T. Zeb.* 7.3-4; *T. Jos.* 17.7. The aspect related to joy is found in *Der. Er. Rab.* 7 (End): "A person shall not be joyful among those who are weeping and shall not weep among the joyful . . . The general rule of the matter is: a person shall not let his disposition appear different from that of his companions." (Strack/Billerbeck 1994 [1926], 298) as well as in Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.5.23: ὅπου γὰρ τὸ χαίρειν εὐλόγως ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ συγχαίρειν. On v. 16c cf. Prov 3.7: μὴ ἴσθι φρόνιμος παρὰ σεαυτῷ, which is converted into community paraenesis in Paul; on v. 17a cf. *Apoc. Sedr.* 7.7 (κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ μὴ ἀποδώσῃς), *Jos. Asen.* 23.9; 28.5, 14; 29.3; on v. 17b cf. Prov 3.4: προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων, which Paul universalizes here through the πάντων (contrast 2 Cor 8.21 where the quotation is taken up word-for-word: προνοοῦμεν γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων). Verse 21 has analogies in *T. Benj.* 4.3; *T. Jos.* 18.2.

[55] A different use of καταρᾶσθαι in Paul and Luke can be established here: in Paul the addressees should not curse their persecutors; in Luke the ones cursing, together with the enemies, the hating ones and the revilers, are the enemies of the Christians. Despite this difference, the tradition-historical relationship is beyond dispute and is supported also by the analogy in Matt 5.44c.

[56] Μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι . . . (Luke 6.22).

[57] Contrast Hoffmann 1995, 5–6. But the linking of beatitude and call for love of enemies through μισεῖν (Luke 6.22, 27) is scarcely first established by Luke (the διώκειν

of four imperatives, in which the first two exhort to works of love toward the enemies,[58] whereas the latter exhort to a God-directed doing good for the adversary.[59]

This (hypothetical) construction of a pre-Lukan text does not mean that we must be dealing here with a Q text common to Matthew. It is just as possible—and is also often assumed precisely in the case of the Q discourse lying behind the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain—that the texts that were immediately accessible to Matthew and Luke were not identical but had each passed through their own tradition history after their first stage of composition.[60] That Luke did not first create the series of four in 6.27b-28b is also suggested by the fact that the exhortation to bless the persecutor probably already stood prior to Luke in a complex underlying the Sermon on the Plain, as the following observations show.

Beyond the aforementioned logion, the paraenesis in Romans 12.14-21 comes into contact at multiple points with the Q complex on love of enemies and renunciation of retaliation.[61] The exhortation in 12.17 not to repay evil with evil but to do good to all human beings has a parallel in Luke 6.27c. In addition, there is an analogy between the reference to the judgment reserved for God in Romans 12.19b and the exhortation, which follows love of enemies and renunciation of retaliation in Luke and probably already in Q, not to judge, which is likewise grounded with reference to God's judgment.[62] In 12.20 the exhortation to give food and drink to the enemy in need and thereby shame him is cited from Proverbs 25.21. This has a parallel in the command to love one's enemies in Luke 6.27b/Matt 5.44b, which in Luke [97] introduces the composition 6.27-36 and presumably already opened the corresponding Q complex. Finally, the appeal to overcome evil with good in Romans 12.21 is thematically related to the summons to demonstrative renunciation of retaliation in Luke 6.29-30/Matt 5.39-42. To this can be added the echo of the exhortation to keep peace from Mark 9.50 in Romans 12.18 with the analogy in 1 Thessalonians 5.13, which likewise points to a traditional motif from the early Christian tradition.[63]

---

in Matt 5.11 and 44 is surely redactional). καλῶς ποιεῖν and ἀγαθοποιεῖν are surely to be understood as synonyms in Luke. Nevertheless, the tradition-historical findings indicate that Luke took the former from his tradition.

[58] For such a use of ἀγάπη/ἀγαπᾶν in early Christianity, cf. Spicq 1978 as well as Danker 2000.

[59] Cf. Schürmann 1969, 346.

[60] In the present case Zeller 1977, 102, reckons with a pre-Lukan supplementing of the Q text.

[61] Cf. Sauer 1985, 24–25; Talbert 1969, 87.

[62] Luke 6.38/Matt 7.2. The same connection is also found in 1QS 10.17-18.

[63] Cf. Breytenbach 1992, 735.

The aforementioned agreements point to a complex in which blessing of persecutors, love of enemies, renunciation of retaliation, and reference to the judgment of God were linked with one another.[64] This group of sayings, whose clearest common point of adhesion was the deeply rooted exhortation to bless the persecutors, was reworked in Paul to a paraenesis for the community in Rome, whereas in the Jesus tradition it was brought into the form of a Jesus discourse that refers to the situation of the Galilean Jesus movement and then reworked by Matthew, Luke, and the *Didache* in their own respective ways and connected with their own respective situations.[65]

The tradition-historical findings thus point to an early Christian paraenesis that was expanded by Paul and in the synoptic tradition in their own respective ways.[66] This is supported not least by the fact that the linking of love of enemies and God's judgment can be explained as a Jewish topos that was already disseminated in an early stage with the early Christian dictum on blessing the adversary, which is also attested in 1 Corinthians 4.12 and 1 Peter 3.9, and was expanded with thematically related material such as the positive cast of mind toward all human beings.[67] Thus, the most plausible explanation of the findings is probably that at an early stage of tradition topoi from the Jesus tradition were linked with motifs from Jewish-Hellenistic ethics and with Scripture quotations.[68] This could also pertain to the love of enemies. Love of enemies is introduced in Paul as a quotation from Proverbs 25.21; in the synoptic tradition, by contrast, it programmatically stands at the beginning as a Jesus saying; [98] finally, in the *Didache*, which probably presupposes the synoptic texts,[69] as well as on POxy 1224 and in *To the Philippians* 12.3 and Justin, *Apologia I* 15.9, it occurs as an exhortation to *pray* for one's enemies, which already points to a later situation.[70]

[64] Cf. Dunn 1988, 750–51: "The spirit of the Sermon on the Mount breathes through these verses."

[65] Cf. Theissen 1989, 176–91; 1992, 130–49; Hoffmann 1995, 22–48.

[66] Cf. Käsemann 1980a, 335; 1980b, 347, who therefore wishes to let a new section begin in v. 14, and Talbert 1969, who surmises two different pieces of tradition that Paul is said to have expanded.

[67] Contrast Sauer 1985, 21; Wilckens 1987–1989, III, 18–19, who understands the Paul text as composed by Paul himself on the basis of traditional motifs. But then the analogy to the synoptic tradition is more difficult to explain.

[68] Cf. Käsemann 1980a, 334–35; 1980b, 347. Similarly Dunn 1988, 755.

[69] Cf. Koester 1957, 220–39; Tuckett 1989, 214–30.

[70] Cf. Koester 1957, 223–24.

3. On the relationship between sayings tradition and Jesus narrative

The presented findings have shown that a distinction between the earthly and the exalted κύριος was not significant for Paul since both equally possessed authority as instructions of the Exalted One. Further, it has become apparent that the sayings tradition has held fast to important themes of the activity of Jesus in the sayings without, however, these being tied—with the exception of the Lord's Supper tradition—to a biographical situation. Rather, the sayings were passed on as instructions of the κύριος—thus in part in Paul as well as in the later strings of sayings in *1 Clement* 13.2 and *To the Philippians* 2.3—but could also be handed down without being attributed to Jesus and become part of early Christian paraenesis—as in other passages in Paul, James, 1 Peter, and the *Didache*. The combination with Scripture quotations and topoi of Jewish-Hellenistic ethics that took place shows that in the framework of early Christian paraenesis Jesus traditions could be put into a broader context without being specially set apart from this.[71]

In light of this, the question of how the sayings tradition should be placed in the beginnings of the Jesus tradition must be taken up anew. It would not be plausible, as sometimes occurs, to pursue the historical Jesus question as a reconstruction of the oldest sayings. Taken on its own the sayings tradition does not lead to a picture of the activity of Jesus. Rather, it serves to make impulses of Jesus fruitful for the formation of an early Christian ethos. Both the combination with topoi from Jewish-Hellenistic ethics and the partly anonymous tradition are explained in this way. By contrast, it is first the synoptic Jesus narratives that link the sayings tradition with the activity of Jesus in a thoroughgoing manner and thereby establish the foundation for its historical evaluation. Against this background I will therefore take a look in conclusion at the meaning and [99] explanatory achievement of the narrative tradition for the beginnings of the Jesus tradition.

First a preliminary remark of a methodological nature. Through the taking up of narrative criticism into Gospel scholarship, the insight—already found in Herder—that the Gospels are to be interpreted as narratives that interpret the activity and fate of Jesus from their own respective perspectives has gained acceptance. It is not disputed that they reach back for this to older tradition, which they integrate linguistically and compositionally

[71] Cf. von Campenhausen 1968, 141–42 (cf. 1977, 119): "But the 'commands of the Lord' in no way need to include only sayings of Jesus. They encompass the whole of the Christian moral tradition, which did not at all sharply separate its sayings and instructions according to their origin." Cf. also chap. 12, §III, with n. 68.

into their respective concepts of the making present of Jesus. The intention of the presentation of the activity and fate of Jesus in narrative form can thereby be described as "representation" (*Repräsentanz*) or "standing for" (*Vertretung*).[72] Through the narrative representation the "sting of temporal distance"[73] is taken from the past by transferring it into the form of a "fable (or plot)"[74] and making it accessible to the present through the historical imagination. This function of the *repraesentatio per narrationem* can be grasped in Mark and in the Q texts, then in Matthew and Luke and in its own way in John, whereas in the *Gospel of Thomas* the exact opposite process of a "de-biographization" is to be observed, in which narrative contextualization is avoided and the present meaning of Jesus is drawn out through a philosophical concept of knowledge that is concentrated on the meaning of the individual sayings and parables.

If we look against this background at the two oldest synoptic sources, then ways of explicating the meaning of Jesus are revealed that are respectively distinct, even though closely related to one another. Common first is the consistent attribution of the early Christian tradition to Jesus. Common additionally is the integration into a biographical context that retains recollections of places, times, and circumstances of the activity of Jesus and is based, in turn, on individual episodes that portray paradigmatic scenes of his activity. Bultmann accurately grasped this with the designation of these episodes as "ideal scenes," but he underestimated their biographical-representing function in the framework of the mediation between present and past when he [100] judged them merely as "community products" without a claim to history.[75] The insight that the overall narrative structure as well as the presentation of individual episodes goes back to a later configuration does not at all speak against the historicity of these narratives, though it is, of course, to be taken into account in their evaluation.

Finally, an additional characteristic feature is the interpretive compilation of traditions into biographical texts about the Son of Man Jesus, with whom the establishment of the reign of God has begun and whose call to repentance and discipleship must be followed absolutely. The two sources differ in the fact that through overarching narrative structures

[72] The concept of representation is borrowed from Ricoeur. Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 222–52; 1984–1988, III, 142–56. For the importance of this approach for research on the Gospels, cf. the corresponding comments in Schröter 2007, 105–46 (chap. 6 in this volume).

[73] Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 225; 1984–1988, III, 144.

[74] Following the Aristotelian concept of μῦθος, "fable" (or plot) designates the sequence and presentation of what is reported, through which a narrative sets the events in relation to one another and unifies them to a "meaningful totality." Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, I, 104–13; 1984–1988, I, 64–70.

[75] Bultmann 1995 [1921], 39–73.

Mark develops main themes such as the hiddenness of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and the mystery surrounding the Son of Man Jesus, whereas the Q texts are oriented more strongly to an explication of his teaching as a call to repentance for Israel.

The narrative tradition is thus oriented around a linking of the activity of Jesus with the authors' own situation in each case—of narrated time (*erzählte Zeit*) and the time of narration (*Erzählzeit*)—and distinguished thereby from collections of sayings that are oriented in either a paraenetic manner or—as in the case of the *Gospel of Thomas*—in a philosophical-esoteric manner. This can be effectively demonstrated with the example of the group of sayings on love of enemies and renunciation of retaliation discussed above. The respective texts were already composed into a larger Jesus discourse in the tradition preceding Matthew and Luke and, as the introductions in Matthew and Luke show, addressed to the disciples.[76] In addition, this discourse was linked at an early stage with that of the centurion of Capernaum, as the agreement of Luke 7.1 with Matthew 7.28a and 8.5 shows.[77] The context can probably be expanded a little more. The Jesus discourse behind the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain belongs to an extensive complex of traditions, which Matthew and Luke have taken up in addition to Mark and which also included at least the Baptist traditions, the temptation story, the coming of Jesus to Nazareth, and the sending out of the disciples. How these traditions were ordered at an initial stage is no longer clearly [101] recognizable.[78] It is clear, however, that they cannot be reduced to a collection of sayings but belong to the biographical recollection of Jesus.

Weisse's two-source theory in its early stage, however, can no more explain this than can hypotheses that judge the second source as a collection of sayings and consequently the narrative of the centurion, together with additional texts, as later additions.[79] This is a matter of circular reasoning, for this genre-based allocation is presupposed and then "proved" by dividing the texts accordingly. It is more probable, however, to assume that the aforementioned complex formed an old part of the narrative Jesus tradition, which anchored the themes that are also found in Romans 12 in

[76] Matt 5.1-2: ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων . . . ; Luke 6.20a: καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν . . .

[77] Luke 7.1: ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ; Matt 7.28a: καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους . . . ; 8.5a: εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

[78] Hultgren 2002 has recently made an interesting attempt to draw out a narrative basic-pattern that underlies the Synoptic Gospels (including "Q").

[79] In his later investigation Weisse 1856, 156, sifted out both the Jesus discourse and the episode about the centurion of Capernaum from the sayings collection.

the activity of Jesus and thus made them part of the biographical recollection of Jesus. Thus, Mark and Q belong together to a sphere of narrative reworking of the activity of Jesus, within which they each set their own accents.

With such a specification of Mark and Q one of the most serious problems of Weisse's theory can solved at the same time, namely the fact that the two oldest sources cannot be characterized as sayings collection and narrative that stood independently alongside each other at the beginning of the Jesus tradition.[80] Precisely this, however, must have been the case according to Weisse's model, which he justified—as Schleiermacher already did before him—with reference to the testimony of Papias and combined with a scarcely-to-be-upheld understanding of the term λόγια as "sayings of the Lord."[81] That such a division cannot, however, be sustained already became apparent to Weisse himself, who therefore withdrew this insight in his later investigation and henceforth replaced it with the hypothesis that those texts that do not fit the character of a sayings collection, even if they are non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke, already belonged to a preceding Mark narrative.[82] Another solution, however, is more likely: sayings tradition and narrative tradition can certainly [102] be distinguished in a tradition-historical manner. This distinction cannot, however, be transferred to the two "sources" of the two-source theory. Insofar as the sayings tradition existed independently of the narrative tradition it served other purposes than that of biographical recollection. By contrast, it was first its combination with the narrative tradition that led to its historical-concretizing formation, which let it become usable for a historical recollection on Jesus. It would therefore be inappropriate to make the sayings tradition the decisive, let alone the only starting point for the historical Jesus question and set it over against a supposedly "kerygmatic" narrative tradition. With regard to their usability for a picture of the historical Jesus, one would even have to consider whether one would need to reverse the weighting and begin with the narrative-biographical recollection in order to situate the sayings tradition *historically*.[83]

Dibelius' aforementioned observation on the respectively particular tendencies of sayings tradition and narrative tradition must thus be reformulated to the effect that precisely in the texts that are to be reckoned to Q we can apprehend the earliest stage of the integration of the sayings

[80] This is also rightly criticized by Hultgren 2002 as a "false dichotomy." Cf. his presentation of the history of research that led to this opposition: 5–61.

[81] Cf. Weisse 1838, I, 34–36. For criticism, cf. Schröter 2003a, 52–53; Hultgren 2002, 12–18.

[82] Weisse 1856, 155–65.

[83] On this cf. Sanders 1991, 10–22; Evans 1995, 14–15.

tradition into a concept of biographical recollection, which is prior to the Gospel of Mark in terms of tradition history in many passages. To think of a literary dependence of Mark on Q is in no way necessary. But one can discern here ways by which the early sayings tradition was converted into biographical narratives and in this manner was set in relation to recollections of places, persons, and concrete circumstances of the activity of Jesus. By contrast, the paraenetic tendency of the sayings tradition worked out by Dibelius can be grasped better in those texts in which it was not reworked in a narrative manner and was in part even transmitted anonymously.

4. Conclusion

The considerations presented here lead to the following conclusions. That the question of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition must be distinguished from the resolution of the Synoptic Problem is widely recognized and has been underlined once more through what has been presented here. Early stages of the Jesus tradition can be found in various writings that became canonical or apocryphal. Consideration of the letters of Paul as the oldest Christian texts showed further that here the Jesus tradition was traced back, in part, to the exalted Lord and [103] taken up, in part, in anonymous form. Moreover, it was linked with Scripture citations and topoi of Hellenistic-Jewish ethics and handed down as early Christian paraenesis. The same tendency appears in James, 1 Peter, and the *Didache*, whereby, however, the shaping by already fixed Jesus traditions can be discerned. This suggests that the sayings tradition, after it was first committed to writing, influenced later receptions, without this having to be traced back in every case to literary dependence.

With regard to the two-source theory—so runs a further conclusion—we must distance ourselves from the opposition between sayings collection and *narratio*. If this hypothesis already had little probability in itself and would presumably never have been proposed without the questionable interpretation of the Papias witness, then it becomes completely obsolete in light of a comparison of Mark with the non-Markan material in Matthew and Luke. This material does not have the form of a sayings collection; in a number of passages it touches on traditions in Mark. Moreover, it repeatedly shows the character of a distinct—though related to Mark—form of biographical recollection. The literary and thematic character of the second synoptic source can therefore not be separated from Mark through a genre-based distinction and characterized as a fundamentally different form of the reworking of the Jesus tradition than the synoptic narratives. Rather, at this point the two-source theory must be subjected to a revision. The texts assigned to Q should be included in the narrative reworking of

the Jesus tradition within the synoptic sphere and be distinguished from paraenetic strings of sayings, such as those found in Romans 12 or later in *1 Clement* 13, as well as from the "hidden words" of the *Gospel of Thomas*, which is based on an independent concept of redemption through knowledge. With regard to speculations on the second synoptic source that go beyond this, research until around the middle of the twentieth century was probably well advised to evaluate this material thematically with respect to the early Jesus tradition, whilst refraining for methodological reasons from a reconstruction of the exact extent and wording of a source from which it originated.

The expositions have finally shown that in a historical perspective the beginnings of the Jesus tradition are not to be drawn out through an isolated concentration on the sayings tradition. The distinction, which is sometimes encountered, between the old Palestinian Jesus tradition, which is supposedly preserved in the sayings, and a narrative tradition, which is allegedly shaped kerygmatically, must be revised. The integration of the sayings tradition in the biographical-recollecting Jesus tradition distinguishes itself by the fact that it narratively unpacks the meaning of Jesus and thereby [104] mediates between the time of Jesus and the authors' own time. It interprets his activity as the breaking in of the rule of God and portrays him as the decisive representative for the coming of God. It is not in question that from today's viewpoint these narratives are not simply to be taken over, but are to be evaluated in a historical-critical manner when one inquires into the beginnings of the Jesus tradition. It is, however, indispensible to hold fast to the linking of sayings tradition and narrative tradition in order to attain to a historically plausible picture of the beginnings of the Jesus tradition.

6 [105–146]

On the Historicity of the Gospels

A Contribution to Current Discussion on the Historical Jesus

1. The Gospels and the historical Jesus

With respect to its methodological presuppositions and the approach based upon them, historical Jesus research belongs to the science of history: it analyses the historical materials[1] that are available and on this basis draws pictures of the historical person of Jesus. The new orientation in recent years has stressed this character of Jesus research. It has distinguished between a theological interest in Jesus and the method that a historical presentation has to follow.[2] This presents a new approach over against earlier phases insofar as in earlier analysis the *theological* dimension of the Jesus question mostly stood at the center.[3] In contrast with this, recent Jesus research has rightly insisted that the theological and historical questions have to be distinguished: a theology that is critically accountable to its origins remains directed to its relationship to the science of history, whereas a historical presentation of the person of Jesus must take place independently [106] from the question of how this relates to the grounding of the Christian faith and Christian theology.

[1] These could have differing character depending on whether they provide direct witness about the past or alternatively are formed by human beings "for the purpose of recollection." Cf. the reference to Droysen 1977, 67–100, in chap. 3, n. 10 above (the quotation is from Droysen 1977, 426). From the first category archaeological witnesses from Galilee, which help to disclose the living space of Jesus, are, for example, important for Jesus research; from the latter the presentations of the Gospels are especially important.

[2] Cf., e.g., Meier 1999; Crossan 1997; Theissen/Winter 1997, 175–232; 2002, 172–225 (Part III: The Criterion of Historical Plausibility as a Correction of the Criterion of Dissimilarity).

[3] In the nineteenth century this became clear, for example, in the dispute between Strauss and Weisse on the dogmatic foundation of the Christian faith, in the twentieth century especially in the discussion prompted by Bultmann concerning how a presentation of the teaching and activity of Jesus and a theology of the New Testament are to be set in relation to each other. Cf. the in-depth discussion of the latter problem by Lindemann 1975.

This methodological placement of the Jesus question produces two consequences that are equally important for the current discussion. The first consequence relates to the evaluation of the Gospels as presentations that bear witness to the activity and fate of Jesus.[4] In recent research one can discern a clear tendency to grant them the status of historical sources, thus to view their Jesus narratives—beyond the faith convictions that undoubtedly come to expression in them—as also relevant in *historical* perspective.[5] This signifies a turning point in Jesus research to the extent that they were denied this status for quite some time.[6] The judgment that the Gospels are ultimately unfruitful for a historical presentation of the activity of Jesus due to their kerygmatic character or their literary presentation can, however, no longer convince. Instead, they are [107] perceived as narratives that are interwoven in diverse ways with the underlying events of the life and fate of Jesus of Nazareth.[7]

[4] Here I mean the gospels included in the New Testament—thus the ones that became canonical—and among these again primarily the Synoptic Gospels. With this, the view that precedence is to be given to these for the historical Jesus question is taken up without thereby denying a source value to the Gospel of John. The question of which writings beyond this should be drawn upon for a Jesus presentation will not be specifically discussed here. It may, however, be noted that the significance of extracanonical texts for historical Jesus research is sometimes overestimated at present. Some of these writings were not interested in a recollecting preservation and interpretation of the activity of Jesus, but present this mostly in interpretative frameworks of mythological or philosophical provenance. Moreover, most of these texts are of a later date than the gospels that made it into the New Testament and in historical perspective secondary in relation to these. In relation to the Nag Hammadi writings, cf. Schröter 1998c; on the whole topic, cf. also Schröter 2010 [2006], 40–68. It should, by contrast, be uncontested that the gospels included in the canon represent the earliest narrative reworkings of the activity and fate of Jesus and simultaneously possess a historically preserving character. They are *therefore*—and not because of their later canonization—the decisive sources for a historical presentation of the activity and fate of Jesus.

[5] Cf. Evans 1995, 8–10; Charlesworth 1989, 9–18; Ellis 1999, who presents this in dispute with the historiographical deficiencies of form criticism.

[6] While form criticism started from the assumption that in the Gospels traditions were gathered that decisively owed their character to the convictions and interests of the post-Easter community, redaction criticism especially directed its attention to the methods of composition and theologies of the evangelists. This approach, which was placed once again upon a new methodological foundation through *narrative criticism*, has brought to light important insights for the interpretation of the Gospels. The question of their historical reference, however, remained largely unconsidered. The direction of questioning pursued here is oriented to this.

[7] On this cf. Theissen/Merz 2001, 41–48, 103–16; 1998, 24–32, 93–117. There the "objections of historical skepticism" against the historicity of the Gospels are presented in summary and examined in relation to their validity. It is rightly stressed thereby that the post-Easter interpretive perspective is not to be invoked in principle against the character of the Gospels as historical sources, although it is to be taken into account in their historical evaluation.

It is, however, clear that Jesus research under the conditions of the historical consciousness cannot *uncritically* appeal to the Gospels. Rather, as with all other sources, the Gospels must be examined to see how past events and their presentation relate to each other in them. In the process, one must take into account the evangelists' intention to present the earthly activity of Jesus in the light of the conviction that he is simultaneously the one who has been resurrected and exalted to God, as well as the Gospels' character as narratives about the activity of a historical figure in a concrete place at a concrete time.[8] Every Jesus picture that wishes to satisfy the conditions of the historical consciousness must therefore permit itself to be measured by its critical engagement with the Gospels as the earliest sources for the historical Jesus. Only such a critical engagement with the Gospels can make clear to what extent the Gospels can be evaluated as *historical sources.*[9]

Furthermore, in such an approach the cultural, religious, and social conditions of Palestine—and here once again especially Palestinian or more precisely Galilean Judaism—play an important role for the presentation of a historically plausible picture of Jesus. These must be drawn out from the literary and archaeological materials that are available. Recent research has made clear that a historical conception of the person of Jesus has to place the presentations of the Gospels in relation to these materials and combine them into an [108] overall picture.[10] With this a new path is also taken in comparison with earlier phases, to the extent that in earlier phases Jesus' temporal-historical context only came into view—if it did so at all—at the periphery.[11]

[8] It may be called to mind that this insight can already be found in an essay by Perrin from 1966 (!). Cf. Perrin 1966, 299: "Instead of providing a hellenistic form, such as was provided by the myths of hellenistic religion, or a Jewish form, such as the apocalyptic vision, Mark has chosen to express a message of the risen Lord of his Christian experience in terms of a story about the earthly Jesus . . . The synoptic tradition as a whole is, in fact, neither pure myth nor interpreted historical narrative but a remarkable mixture of these two things."

[9] This critical engagement with the sources is required in every occupation with the past. With regard to the Gospels, it especially applies that they are to be evaluated as biographical narratives within the ancient writing of history, more specifically within the framework of its Jewish-Hellenistic expression.

[10] On this cf. Reed 2000, 1–22, who provides a concise yet instructive overview of the archaeological investigations of Galilee as well as their contribution to Jesus research. Cf. also the presentations of Galilee by Chancey 2002; 2005. This is taken into account in an excellent way in the presentations of Dunn 2003b and Ebner 2003.

[11] Thus we find that a terminological characteristic of older scholarship is the concept of "framework" in which the "proclamation of Jesus" is then placed. Therefore, Freyne 1994, 75, quite rightly states with regard to a necessary present-day orientation of Jesus scholarship: "Perhaps we are better placed today to undertake again the quest for Jesus within a specific social and cultural world."

The second consequence is epistemological in nature. The reflection on the science-of-history foundations mentioned at the outset means that Jesus research is subject to the presuppositions and limits of the historical consciousness. A fundamental conviction of this consciousness says that the sources of the past mediate selective, interpretative pictures. They are composed by human beings who with their presentations interpret the reality that they experience, combine specific interests with these interpretations, and are themselves bound to the limits of their knowledge and their language. It is therefore a methodological presupposition of the historical-critical consciousness not to simply identify the sources with the reality to which they relate but to critically scrutinize what they reveal about the past.

The fragmentary, interpretive character of the sources already prevents the results of historical research from being equated with the past. This is also ruled out because historical research is not only characterized by the nature of the sources but also by the necessarily perspectival viewpoint of the historian, who interprets, in turn, the sources and fits them together with the historical materials available to him or her. Thus, historical research always represents a process of interaction in which witnesses of the past are mediated with the current conditions of knowledge. Thus, the goal of historical scholarship is not *reconstruction of the past* but *construction of history.*[12] [109]

The term "construction"—this is to be stressed against a number of misunderstandings and unjustified objections against "constructivism"—is emphatically not being used to mean that conceptions of history would be denied a connection to events and experiences or that the relation to the past would be handed over to arbitrariness. Rather, what is stressed in such an approach is that every picture of the past possesses relative validity, depending on the prevailing plausibility of the interpretation of reality, determined by the historian's state of knowledge and by the view that the historian sets forth on the basis of the known material. This insight is, however, by no means insignificant, for it makes clear that the past is never available and important in itself but only in the interpretation of the respective present.

It follows from this that a Jesus picture oriented on the Gospels cannot be equated with the person of Jesus, as he was active in the first century in

[12] In contrast to what Lorenz 1997 does in the title of his introduction to the theory of history, it is therefore not advisable to speak of construction of the *past,* but rather of construction of *history,* through which we appropriate the past. This terminological differentiation expresses the epistemologically relevant insight that past and [109] history are not simply identical with each other, but rather history represents a perspectival, selective relation to the past. On this cf. now the important comments of Goertz 2001, 37: "Also, the past is not constructed as if it otherwise would not exist; what is constructed is history."

Galilee.[13] Rather, a Jesus presentation is a hypothetical, falsifiable conception that attempts to make the available sources comprehensible as effects of the events to which they refer. An important feature of present-day Jesus research lies precisely in this insight into the character of historical knowledge.[14] Until now, however, this way has only been minimally worked out, as a closer look at the evaluation of the Gospels as historical sources shows.

The described approach to the historical Jesus question has by no means been uncontested in New Testament science for a long time. Rather, from the beginnings of historical Jesus research to the most recent publications, one can observe the tendency to judge the Gospels as historically *unreliable* sources: in them [110] the underlying events are said to have been reshaped to such an extent through the faith convictions and manner of presentation of their authors that they can claim no value as historical sources. Consequences of varying nature were drawn from this: one resigned oneself to the fact that a historical Jesus presentation could not be written because the available sources did not permit this. Instead one is referred to the Christ attested in the Gospels, beyond which no presentation of the person of Jesus with a claim to plausibility could be given.[15] Another conclusion runs as follows: on the basis of the historical unreliability of the Gospels, the historical Jesus can only be found *behind* them. If in the Gospels we are dealing with kerygmatic narratives whose historical reference must be rated as very small, then at best one occasionally encounters authentic traditions, which must be liberated from their "framework" in order to penetrate to Jesus himself. A necessary consequence of this approach is the reduction of the historical Jesus to a number of sayings that are regarded as authentic, which are then subsequently placed in a "framework" set forth independently from them.[16]

[13] In this sense Meier 1991, 21–31, distinguishes between "the historical Jesus" and "the real Jesus."

[14] Cf. esp. Dunn 2003b, 99–136. Recently, Porter 2000, 28–59, has fundamentally called into question the division of historical-critical Jesus research into three phases. In his tracing of the history of research, important observations appear that differentiate this schematic division. However, there are characteristic features that justify distinguishing the three stages from one another, namely the liberal Jesus research, the so-called "new quest" and the "third quest," which is currently underway. Present-day discussion could carry previous Jesus research forward by laying an epistemologically sound foundation and thereby opening up a way to interpret the Gospels as historical narratives.

[15] As is well known, this was the conclusion drawn by Kähler 1956. A similar judgment was then made by Bultmann 1967 and more recently by Johnson 1996.

[16] The already-mentioned division into a "temporal-historical framework" and the "proclamation of Jesus" separated from it first appears in Bultmann's Jesus book, which will be addressed below. It then influences the parts of present-day Jesus research that base themselves primarily on Jesus' sayings, whereas they regard the narrative framework

Thus, both viewpoints are mirror-image consequences of the view that the Gospels do not permit themselves to be interpreted as historical sources. This, however, fails to recognize their character as simultaneously historical-preserving and actualizing Jesus narratives. This prohibits one from judging them as historically irrelevant with reference to the convictions that come to expression in them. Instead, for the historical Jesus question a *historical-critical analysis* of their narrative reworkings of the activity and fate of Jesus is necessary. In order to demonstrate this, the objections against the Gospels as historical narratives will first be classified and subjected to a more precise examination in what follows. With the aid of several concretizations, the third part will then discuss the question of the usability of the Gospels for a historical presentation of the person of Jesus. A concise summary stands at the end. [111]

2. Two objections against the usability of the Gospels as historical sources

2.1 The argument of material discrepancy

The problematization of the character of the Gospels as sources for the history of Jesus falls together with the rise of historical-critical Jesus research. It can be traced back to two objections, which occur in different variations. The first argument can be designated as the argument of *material discrepancy.* It says that the interpretations of the person of Jesus can only be explained in a highly inadequate manner with reference to impulses going forth from his appearance. Rather, this has only provided the external impetus; but through the categories that were drawn upon for its interpretation it has been overlaid in a way that made the historical starting point appear unclear and secondary in its material content.

The discrepancy argument was applied to the Gospels for the first time by David Friedrich Strauss.[17] According to his view the Gospels are based

as historically secondary. It will become clear that this judgment is untenable from a methodology-of-history perspective.

[17] In another way the claim of material discontinuity already plays a role with Reimarus, who distinguishes between the moral message of Jesus and the teaching of the apostles concerning a redeemer who suffers, rises from the dead, and comes again from heaven that replaced it. He does not, however, apply this argument to the Gospels, but rather regards their authors as reliable writers of history. Therefore, with Reimarus there is a distinction between the presentation of Jesus in the Gospels and the interpretation of his person developed in the letters of the apostles, which precisely do not appeal for this purpose to the sayings and deeds of Jesus. This model has a certain analogy in the later differentiation between the Messiah-dogmatic of the Palestinian early community and the Kyrios-cult of the Hellenistic early community. Thus, in contrast to Strauss, the discrepancy argument in Reimarus does not lead to a problematization of the historical value of the Gospels.

on traditions that are to be described as "early Christian ideas enveloped in history-like clothing, formed in the unintentionally inventing saga."[18] The traditions[19] gathered in them did possess their historical starting point in the person of Jesus, but [112] they have been shaped through myths—the religious ideas drawn upon for their interpretation—in a way that makes it impossible to separate historical core and mythical interpretation from each other. Therefore, a "mythical standpoint" must be adopted for their interpretation, with whose help their content can be drawn out.[20]

Strauss identifies various myths of this kind, the majority of which come from the Old Testament and have their center in the Messiah myth. This has its ideational foundation in the conceptions of the Messiah in the Old Testament, whereas it has its historical point of reference in Jesus' messianic consciousness. It is decisive here, however, that the resurrection faith first provided the decisive impulse for interpreting the whole life of Jesus in mythical categories.

With the mythical point of view the question of the historical foundation of the Christian faith was posed in the strongest terms. It is true that Strauss did not deny that actual events underlie the Gospels and that the messianic self-understanding of Jesus also provided a historical impulse for the emergence of faith in him.[21] In his view, however, these impulses are not sufficient to make the narratives about him comprehensible. Rather, for this the inclusion of the resurrection faith[22]—which for Strauss ultimately cannot be illuminated in its origin—is needed on the one hand, and the consideration of the mythical character of the tradition brought about by

[18] Strauss 1835/36, I, 75: "geschichtsartige Einkleidungen urchristlicher Ideen, gebildet in der absichtslos dichtenden Sage."

[19] While Strauss supported the priority of Matthew, with regard to the origin of the Gospels his connection to Herders' tradition hypothesis is fundamental, since this enabled him to assume a phase in which the Jesus tradition was handed down before it was written down and thereby mythically formed. Cf. Strauss 1835/36, I, 62–74. With this Strauss advocated a model that surfaced again in form criticism, which questioned the historical value of the Gospels with an analogous model of explanation. Cf. Tuckett 1979, esp. 32. Weisse 1838, I, 3–137, recognized this very well in his dispute with Strauss and did not fight against the Griesbach hypothesis but rather against the tradition hypothesis.

[20] With this Strauss built on Eichhorn, Gabler, Bauer, and de Wette, who had already drawn on the myth concept to explain the biblical narratives. He is also aware that he is by no means the first to apply the mythical standpoint to the "evangelical history," but he claims to be the first to apply it in a thoroughgoing manner to the *whole* history of Jesus. Cf. Strauss 1835/36, I, IV–VII, 27–51 (cf. 1892, xxix–xxxi), as well as Hartlich/Sachs 1952, esp. 134–37.

[21] Strauss 1835/36, I, 469 (cf. 1892, 284): "That the disciples held fast to the one who died as the Messiah cannot be comprehended if the living one had not already planted this conviction in them through specific explanations."

[22] Strauss 1837, I, 99 (cf. 1892, 85): There "was in the faith in his resurrection, by whatever means it arose, more than adequate powers of persuasion for his messiahship."

this faith on the other hand. Finally, both aspects culminate in a separation of the historical from the dogmatic foundation of the Christian faith. The basic outline of the life of Jesus[23] retained by Strauss becomes a starting point that ultimately has only an insignificant influence on the thematic form of the interpretations built upon it. Rather, these were shaped by the mythical viewpoint, which clothes the ideas in a history-like manner but does not itself have a foundation in historical facts. With this Strauss had claimed a disjunction between the activity of Jesus [113] and the presentation of it based upon the resurrection faith, a disjunction that continues to have effects wherever one sees no material correspondence between Jesus and the emergence of the Christian faith.

Strauss thus views myth as a category with whose help the accidental historical individual phenomenon is elevated to the rank of a super-temporal truth. The undeniable service that he thus rendered in Jesus research consists in the fact that he carried out for the first time a consistent interpretation of the Gospels that attempted to specify their content through a combination of historical event and interpretative category. His view led, however, to viewing the concrete event only as an expression of a super-temporal idea.[24] Therefore, the tension-filled unity of myth and history that characterizes the Gospels is ultimately not retained by him. The "concluding dissertation" of his work bears the revealing title "The Dogmatic Meaning of the Life of Jesus."[25] In this section it becomes clear once again that the religious ideas stand at the center for Strauss, whereas the historical concretion recedes behind them. Despite the undeniable progress that the investigation of Strauss presents, it thus remains ultimately unexplained *why* the myths identified by him were applied to the life of Jesus. To put it another way: the presentation of Strauss suffers from the fact that it does not link the myths with a historical analysis. Therefore, the "dogmatic content of the life of Jesus" stands unconnected alongside the narrative about Jesus in the Gospels, insofar as it does not become clear that the corresponding interpretative categories were not simply transferred to Jesus but were drawn upon for the interpretation of concrete events.

Strauss' conception led to an intensive inquiry into the historical value of the Gospels in the subsequent period in opposition to his critical position. The two-source theory, which was worked out as a methodological foundation for this, was developed in direct dispute with Strauss: Christian

[23] Strauss 1835/36, I, 72.

[24] Strauss 1835/36, I, vii (cf. 1892, xxx): "The author knows that the inner core of the Christian faith is completely independent of his critical investigations. Christ's supernatural birth, his miracles, his resurrection and ascension remain eternal truths however much their reality as historical facts may be called into question."

[25] Strauss 1835/36, II, 686–744; cf. Strauss 1892, 757–85.

Hermann Weisse (whose investigation of the "evangelical history" already called itself "critical and philosophical" in the subtitle and thereby took up the gauntlet thrown down by Strauss) contested Strauss' thesis of the mythical character of the Jesus tradition, which he instead attributed to two sources that were mediated by eyewitnesses or directly handed down—the recollections of Peter preserved in the Gospel of Mark and the sayings source of the apostle Matthew—and [114] with this formulated the theory for the specification of the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels that has remained fundamental to this day. Thus the ground was to be cut from under the assumption, advocated by Strauss, of a phase in which the Jesus tradition was handed down orally and thereby mythically formed. With this Weisse granted an important role in the emergence of the Christian faith to the "evangelical history," which was to be acquired through historical criticism; thus he specified the relationship between historical foundation and subsequent development of the Gospels in precisely the opposite way to Strauss.

With Weisse we encounter insights into the form of the Synoptic Gospels that have lasted to this day. These not only include the priority of Mark and the attribution of Matthew and Luke's non-Markan material to a second common source. They also include the distinction between a historical core of the Jesus tradition that is to be critically secured and its subsequent mythical development. Finally, they include the insight—still justified by Weisse with recourse to the witness of Papias—that one cannot directly infer a course of the activity of Jesus from the Gospel of Mark.

Despite these insights, in his emphasis upon a direct relation to the person of Jesus, Weisse also tended, in a different way than Strauss, to isolate the person of Jesus from its concrete historical relationships and to ascribe a quasi-archetypal meaning to it. If with Strauss the relationship between historical event and its effects ultimately remains unresolved because his concept of myth is based on an opposition between history and idea, then the opposite model of Weisse, who seeks the Christian faith in the relation to a personality of Jesus detached from its historical concretion, is no less problematic. Neither succeeds in working out a reference to the historical person of Jesus that establishes a connection between the historical recollections present in the early Christian conceptions and the impulses that went forth from his activity with their subsequent elaboration and substantive further development.

An analogous view to the position of Strauss occurs again in the history-of-religions school and its thesis of the post-Easter emergence of Christology, which is represented in various forms. This is first significantly within reach in William Wrede's investigation of *The Messianic Secret in the Gospels*, which is dedicated to the problem of the messianic

self-consciousness of Jesus. On the basis of his analysis, especially of the Gospel of Mark, Wrede came to the view that the messiahship of Jesus was "in any case not an idea of Jesus, but an idea of the community,"[26] which was [115] transferred to his earthly activity after the fact. This idea is to be specified as "theological" or "dogmatic" and did not arise from a historical consideration of the life of Jesus.

Wrede's position can thus be understood as an intensification of the viewpoint that was already found in Strauss, insofar as he now also severs the connection, which still existed in Strauss, between the self-consciousness of Jesus and the conviction of his messiahship that emerges among his adherents.[27] Nevertheless, the question of how they could come to this conviction requires, of course, a historical explanation, which Wrede does not provide in his book. With this the question emerges—here to be mentioned briefly for the time being—whether Wrede's contribution to the conception of the Gospel of Mark can actually claim to possess *historical* explanatory power. That the hidden identity of Jesus possesses an important function for the narrative concept of the Gospel of Mark is evident.[28] It is, of course, another question whether this justifies the conclusion that the conviction of the messiahship of Jesus is a theory that first emerged after Easter, with no basis in his earthly activity.

In Rudolf Bultmann's view of the emergence of Christology this line reaches a certain conclusion. In his article on the Christology of the New Testament, Bultmann firmly opposes the view that the Christology of the New Testament can be explained by effects that went forth from the personality of Jesus. Instead he refers—in dependence on Wilhelm Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*—to the Kyrios-cult "as the actual backbone of the Christian religion," which from the human being Jesus formed the God-being Jesus Christ and the preexistent Son of God.[29] [116]

[26] Wrede 1969 [1901], 218; cf. 1971, 220.

[27] Cf., however, his statement in the letter to Harnack on January 2, 1905, in Rollmann/Zager 2001, 315–17, 317: "I am more inclined than earlier to believe that Jesus regarded himself as designated to be the Messiah." Admittedly Wrede then continues, "Certainly existing ideas about the Messiah also now joined themselves easily with the impression of the person. But that would nevertheless be a displacement (*Verschiebung*), even if it adapted itself in the most natural manner." With this an important modification vis-à-vis his investigation of the messianic secret is indicated, insofar as one would now need to inquire more precisely into how this displacement from the self-understanding of Jesus to the faith in him is to be represented. On this cf. Hengel/Schwemer 2001, IX–XV, as well as the pointer by Frey 2002, 301.

[28] Whether, however, this is to be explained in the sense of a "messianic secret," and whether Wrede does not combine into a concept here aspects that have thoroughly different functions in Mark, would need to be specifically queried once again. Cf. the concise but instructive remarks of Lindemann in Conzelmann/Lindemann 2004, 322–24.

[29] Bultmann 1993 [1933], 218. Cf. Bousset 1965 [1913]; 1970.

This view forms then also the foundation for Bultmann's evaluation of the Jesus tradition, in which two significant analogies to Strauss and Wrede can be observed.[30] The first analogy concerns the genesis of the synoptic material itself, in regard to which the category of *Sitz im Leben*, which Bultmann took up, plays an important role. If Karl Ludwig Schmidt (to whom the second objection against the historical value of the Gospels, which will be explained in greater detail in the next section, goes back) characterized the Jesus tradition as "cultic," "pictorial," and "superhistorical" and assigned it to the milieu of nonliterary popular tradition,[31] then in Bultmann its historical situation of emergence is sought through the *Sitz im Leben* in the needs of the post-Easter community and thereby divested of its historical value for the presentation of the activity of Jesus. In this view of Bultmann, one can see an analogy to the mythical form of the material rooted in the "messiah myth" that Strauss assumed, for here too a severe reshaping of the tradition over against its situation of emergence is assumed.

A second analogy consists in the view of the theological shaping of the Jesus tradition. As in Strauss, in Bultmann the resurrection faith—which he called "early Christian kerygma"—also plays a decisive role. According to Bultmann this faith did not emerge on the ground of the community that handed down the Jesus tradition, but independently from it in the Hellenistic community. The subsequent combination with the Jesus tradition then led to a situation in which the Jesus tradition now served to illustrate the kerygma.[32] Bultmann thus sees no material relationship between the post-Easter shaping of the material through the community that handed it down and its subsequent combination (in Mark) with the Hellenistic Christ kerygma. Rather, in regard to this he envisages [117] two independent developments in the Palestinian and the Hellenistic communities.[33]

[30] It is revealing that Bultmann originally wanted to dedicate his *History of the Synoptic Tradition* to Strauss and only refrained from doing so under the advice of Heitmüller. Still, in the first edition Strauss remains the first (before Wrede and Wellhausen) "of the older scholars" named, from whom he "primarily learned for this work." Cf. Evang 1988, 71, with n. 53, as well as Schmithals 1983, 389.

[31] Schmidt 1919, 19: "The narratives from the history of Jesus passed from mouth to mouth in the first period. When the Christians were together they narrated to one another the sayings and deeds of the Lord, one replacing another, one supplementing the other. And if the Bible of the Jews was also the holy book in the worship-service gatherings, then all that one knew to say about Jesus also played a significant role from the beginning. We know nothing specific about these things. We cannot, however, imagine such speech and narrating about the history of Jesus in a lively enough manner."

[32] Bultmann 1995 [1921], 370–76.

[33] Bultmann 1995 [1921], 371–72 (cf. 1963, 346–47), depending on Wrede's messianic secret theory: "In any case the author [Mark is meant, J. S.] has succeeded with his means in moving the tradition into a certain light, in imposing upon it the interpretation that it

Thus, as with Strauss and Wrede, the material connection between the activity and self-understanding of Jesus on the one hand and the emergence of the Christian faith on the other hand also becomes problematic. With Strauss he shares the view of the post-Easter shaping of the material, though for Bultmann the sociological category of *Sitz im Leben* takes the place of the mythical ideas in Strauss. With Wrede he shares the view that the belief in the messiahship of Jesus first emerged after Easter. In his view the interpretative categories that were imposed on the material in its combination with this belief (called "dogmatic motifs" by Bultmann) came from Hellenistic or Gnostic religiosity, which decisively influenced the emergence of the Christology. That Bultmann saw the problem that emerged with this double dissolution of the material continuity between Jesus and the Christology will soon be shown below.

The discrepancy argument has continued to make its influence felt right down to current Jesus research. The result is that in presentations of the person of Jesus a question mark is placed over the historical value of the Gospels from the very beginning with reference to their kerygmatic character. At the root of this lies the view, already found in Strauss, that through the conviction of his messiahship grounded in the resurrection faith the material of the Jesus tradition was reshaped in a way that makes a historical continuity improbable.[34] For the most part such a continuity is then seen—as already with Bultmann himself—in Jesus' sayings, since these are said to be most easily regained from their interpretive reworking.[35] Here [118] a thoroughly questionable distinction between the sayings tradition and the narrative tradition appears with regard to their value for historical inquiry. This is already difficult to follow since with the sayings we are also dealing with traditions that were selected and interpreted by later tradents, which must be included in a historical presentation as traditions spoken by a certain person to certain addressees in certain situations.

---

needed in the Hellenistic communities of the Pauline sphere; in linking it with the christological kerygma of this Christianity, in anchoring the Christian mysteries, namely Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in it and thus for the first time in providing a presentation of the life of Jesus that could rightly be called εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Mark 1.1)."

[34] Cf. for instance, Crossan 1991, xxx: "The Gospels are neither histories nor biographies, even within the ancient tolerances for those genres. They are what they were eventually called, Gospels or good newses . . ." First, this assessment is to be questioned (the Gospels can very well be understood as biographies). Secondly, it says nothing about their value as historical narratives, which cannot simply be pushed to the side with such a statement.

[35] A continuation of this approach is found in the concentration on Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* in recent (mainly North American) Jesus research, which wants to discover original Jesus sayings here and sets this over against the post-Easter kerygma; so, for example, in Robinson who explicitly appeals to Bultmann for this. See Robinson 2001, 34 with n. 14 and 45–47 with n. 31.

The discrepancy argument is not to be denied legitimacy across the board. First, it is evident that the conviction of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus have also influenced the Gospels' accounts of his earthly activity.[36] Secondly, the reference to the interpretive categories that are applied to his person is also legitimate. It is clear that the activity of Jesus—his calling of followers, his healings, his interpretation of the Torah—were presented with recourse to Scripture and to the messianic expectations of Judaism. This took place, however, in such a way that he remained recognizable as a person who was active in a concrete temporal and geographical sphere and in contact with the people of his surroundings.

The problem with the discrepancy argument, however, is that it starts from the assumption that the activity of the earthly Jesus was overlaid by resurrection faith and messianic convictions in such a way that historically usable recollections can be discovered at best by removing them from this interpretive framework.[37] That Jesus' activity and fate were presented from a certain perspective, however, by no means necessarily leads to the acceptance of a material break between the concrete events and their subsequent interpretation, for which reason the much-evoked talk of the "Easter gulf," which is said to lie between the Jesus tradition [119] and its interpretation, is also misleading.[38] Rather, the Gospels present the person of Jesus in precisely such a way that *in light of* his activity and fate the categories of interpretation applied to him are transformed and filled with new content. The interpretive narratives are thus prompted by historical recollections and stand therefore in connection with Jesus' activity. A present-day Jesus presentation must make this relation between event and interpretation

[36] On the one hand, these events present the presupposition for the reference to the one who is presently exalted to God as well as the expectation of his future coming again. On the other hand, it becomes clear, for instance in the passion predictions or the presentation of the earthly Jesus as κύριος in Matthew and Luke, that his earthly activity is already portrayed in the light of these events.

[37] On this cf. Kelber 1999, 85–94, as well as the revised version in German, i.e., Kelber 2002. Kelber shows a line, leading from Kähler via Bultmann to Johnson in which recourse to the historical Jesus is supposed to be shown to be theologically illegitimate and replaced through the reference to the biblical Christ. Kelber argues with complete justification that in this line the shaping by the Easter faith is wrongly invoked against the historical value of the Gospels, since these—unlike the dialogues of the risen one among the Nag Hammadi writings—know themselves to be bound to the earthly history of Jesus.

[38] Reference may again be made (cf. n. 27 above) to Wrede's letter to Harnack. Wrede mentions the above-cited aspects of the Messiah idea as well as the resurrection faith as the spheres in which a displacement from Jesus to the post-Easter faith took place. In both cases, however, he understands this displacement not as a breaking off of a relation to the historical person of Jesus: the messianic consciousness is anchored in Jesus himself; the "resurrection visions" are viewed in connection with a "reflex from the impression of the person of Jesus." Wrede sees the actual discrepancy between Jesus and Paul, whom he cannot recognize "as an interpreter and continuer of Jesus."

plausible and may not eliminate one of these poles. In conclusion I will therefore clarify the problem of the discrepancy argument with reference to two aspects of Bultmann's position through which it has become influential in current Jesus research.

When Bultmann decidedly restricts his Jesus book to the presentation of the *proclamation* of Jesus,[39] then as justification he refers first to the failure of the liberal life-of-Jesus research disclosed by Albert Schweitzer and secondly to the claim that it is only via his teaching that one comes upon what Jesus himself wanted.

The reference to Schweitzer, however, is problematic because he by no means shared Bultmann's view that we "can now know almost nothing about the life and personality of Jesus, since the Christian sources did not show an interest in either, are moreover very fragmentary and overgrown with legend, and since other [120] sources do not exist."[40] Instead, Schweitzer's criticism is directed against a naïve assimilation of the presentations of Jesus to the respective present, which had not really taken seriously his strangeness. That one could know "almost nothing any longer" about him was, however, not at all Schweitzer's view, even if he formulated certain reservations—for example in relation to the life of Jesus prior to his official appearance or the length of time that Jesus spent in the group of John the Baptist.[41] In this respect, Schweitzer's criticism of the life-of-Jesus research is not quite correctly taken up by Bultmann: the argument of Schweitzer ultimately leads to the view that historical knowledge cannot

[39] Cf. his programmatic formulation in Bultmann 1983 [1926], 13 (cf. Bultmann 1962, 12): "Its [sc.: the following presentation, J. S.] object is thus not the life or the personality of Jesus but only his 'teaching,' his proclamation." Correspondingly, after the presentation of the "temporal-historical framework," "Jesus' proclamation" is then dealt with under various aspects in three parts: "the coming of the rule of God," "the will of God," and "the far and near God." In light of the aforementioned declaration of intent by Bultmann, I cannot follow the comment of Lindemann 2002, 6: "It is significant that in this book Bultmann does not simply present the proclamation of Jesus as if Jesus is simply to be seen as a 'teacher,' " who refers as justification to the introductory reflections and the chapter on the temporal-historical framework.

[40] Bultmann 1983 [1926], 10; cf. Bultmann 1962, 8. According to Lindemann 2002, 5, Bultmann's criticism of the quest for the historical Jesus is "not the product of historical skepticism let alone a consequence of a fundamental lack of interest in historical questions." But how else should one understand a statement such as that cited above than as historical skepticism? The problem with Bultmann is ultimately that over against his criticism of the liberal life-of-Jesus research he wants to set a conception that leads, independently of the provisional nature of historical knowledge, to a direct encounter with the past and thereby does not take sufficient account of the relative nature of every conception of history.

[41] On this cf. the chapter "The Solution of Thoroughgoing Eschatology" in Schweitzer 1984 [1906/1913], 402–50 (cf. 2000, 315–54), where he provides an overview of those aspects that cannot, in his view, be established for the historical Jesus.

really penetrate to Jesus and thus to the true foundation of the Christian faith because it always adjusts him for the present. In contrast it is said that we should directly penetrate to the true history without such a detour via the historical Jesus.[42] This—from a methodology-of-history perspective thoroughly questionable—viewpoint of Schweitzer, which does not take account of the not-to-be-gone-behind connection between source investigation and reality construction in every engagement with the past, is found again in Bultmann's—just as problematic—idea of a personal encounter with history.[43] When it surfaces again in current [121] Jesus presentations, then it reflects the same problem of an approach that wishes to find the "real" Jesus *behind* the narrative reworking of his activity and fate. The underlying disjunction between kerygma and history is, however, epistemologically deficient in that it cannot illuminate the relationship between event and historical presentation and traces back the emergence of the Gospels to categories of interpretation that are not connected to the (hi)story of Jesus.

By contrast, Bultmann's restriction to the teaching of Jesus, which is supposed to enable an approach to Jesus, is not in keeping with Schweitzer. Rather, the inclusion of the recollections of places, followers, and opponents, as well as the political and social constellations of Galilee in the first century that are preserved in the Gospels is indispensible in order to attain to a historical view—and there is no reason to deny the Gospels a historical source value in this respect.[44] By contrast, the Jesus picture set forth by Bultmann—as well as the concentration, which is indebted to this approach, on his sayings in parts of present-day Jesus research[45]—is

[42] Schweitzer 1984 [1906/1913], 621 (cf. 2000, 479): "We thought we must have our time make the detour through the historical Jesus, as we understood him, in order that they might come to Jesus who is a spiritual power in the present. This detour has now been closed by the true history." This is a completely untenable statement from a methodology-of-history perspective. It remains completely unclear how one should attain to a "true history" amidst the renunciation of constantly relative historical knowledge. In dealing with the historical Jesus the concern can never be—in contrast to what Schweitzer thinks—with setting the "true Jesus" over against deficient historical knowledge, but always only with sketching a provisional picture that satisfies the respective conditions of knowledge.

[43] Bultmann 1983 [1926], 9 (cf. 1962, 6): "Thus I will not in principle lead the reader to a 'view' of history, but to a highly personal encounter with history." On this point Lohmeyer 1927, 438, already aptly commented in his review: "In other words, the question of the object of history is one of the most difficult questions of methodology, which cannot at all be resolved with fleeting remarks about personal [121] encounters, since these do not even touch on the complexity of the problems, as these are outlined in catchword form, for instance, in the concept of the historical past, the historical time, the necessity of the historical presentation, etc."

[44] On this cf. the relevant works of Freyne on Galilee, which have impressively emphasized this. E.g., Freyne 1980; 1988; 2000; 2004. Cf. also Reed 2000.

[45] Cf., e.g., Robinson 2001, who sets the narrative gospels aside with a reference to

an ultimately nonhistorical undertaking, which calls to mind in a certain way the above-sketched position of Weisse, who sought a relation to the personality of Jesus that was removed from the historical concretizations.[46] Bultmann also divests his Jesus presentation of such concretions and separates his "teaching" in a thoroughly questionable manner from an overall picture of his person.[47] [122]

It is clear, however, that it would be historically unsatisfactory and hermeneutically problematic to concentrate a historical Jesus presentation on sayings (supposedly) spoken by him, as this takes place in Bultmann and in parts of recent Q research and Jesus research. Such an approach is based on the premise that the "actual nature" of his activity can be seen in the proclamation of Jesus and that this can be transferred into the present independently from its temporal contingencies. The one-sided preference for Q and the *Gospel of Thomas*—which in the process are also incorrectly assigned to the same genre[48]—in Jesus presentations such as that of John

---

Schmidt and wishes to confine the historical Jesus quest to the layer of Q that, in his view, is the oldest. This supposedly oldest layer of the sayings tradition thus replaces what Bultmann viewed as the "proclamation" leading back to Jesus. This identification is already problematic because Q also sets forth a Jesus picture based on selection and interpretation, which is by no means to be given a special place for the historical question a priori.

[46] This problem also comes to expression in Bultmann's view that "Jesus' God idea is de-historized" as is "the human being viewed under this God idea," which means "the relation between God and human beings is removed from the ties to world history." Cf. Bultmann 1984 [1948–1953], 25; cf. 2007, 25. How can the God idea of Jesus as a historical person be removed from his historical concretizations and contingencies?

[47] Lohmeyer 1927, 434, clearly named this deficit of Bultmann's Jesus book in his review: "All remarks about person and appearance fall under [122] the heading of 'temporal-historical framework'; would then the work that the following chapters depict, if one may continue the parable, be the 'image' of remaining validity that is no longer determined in a temporal-historical manner? . . . but the question indeed arises whether in such a viewing his singularity and historicalness threaten to be truncated." 437–38: "What then the book wants to provide and only provides is nothing other than 'the work'; and in the case of historical figures, with work is 'meant from their viewpoint what they actually wanted' . . . one does not know what the 'actually' is supposed to mean; one can also say, as Max Weber did, that such specters as actual will do not drive their being in history. But if one accepts the right of this definition then precisely this fundamentally requires the unity of person and work; for it is specific figures, who 'actually wanted' . . . i.e., the personality is not unimportant but solely important in the matter that it drives." With these objections Lohmeyer named central problems of the restriction to the "teaching" of Jesus, which also must be taken into consideration in present-day research.

[48] The *Gospel of Thomas* is a sayings collection that gathers various kinds of material that originated from different sources—including also the Synoptic Gospels. By contrast, Q is a Jesus presentation along the lines of the Synoptic Gospels, even if the narrative-biographical features stand out less in the discernible text. This may be in part because the text can only partially be reconstructed and in part because Q sets other accents than Mark. That we are dealing, however, in this case with a presentation that—to a certain extent in analogy to Mark—presents a preliminary stage to the great Gospels of Matthew

Dominic Crossan or the methodologically completely untenable plea for the historical preference for a supposedly oldest layer of Q by James M. Robinson are indebted to a perspective that disregards the historical concretion and is not adequate to the sources.

By contrast, every historical presentation of the person of Jesus has to take its orientation from the fact that his sayings were spoken in concrete situations to concrete human beings, that they only present *one* aspect of his activity and stand alongside the others—such as the constitution of a circle of followers, his healings and meal-fellowships, and the controversies [123] with opponents, to name only a few—and that in the sources that are available, whole pictures of his activity and fate are provided and not collections of sayings.[49] It is by no means insignificant where Jesus was active and to which human beings he turned. It is not unimportant why he moved, according to the Gospel of Mark, into the regions that bordered on Galilee, whereas he avoided the Galilean cities of Sepphoris and Tiberias. For a historical presentation it is of decisive importance that the sources from the first century present his activity in such a context. The reduction of a Jesus picture to the "proclamation" divested of its narrative embedding, which is placed secondarily into a "temporal-historical framework," is therefore a methodologically deficient approach in which aspects of his activity that are fundamental for a historical presentation are edited out without a convincing rationale.[50] [124]

---

and Luke is already evident from the fact that Q begins in an analogous manner to Mark. Only thus does it also become comprehensible that Matthew and Luke took up and integrated this source—just as they did the Gospel of Mark. On this cf. also Schröter 2003a.

[49] This is not altered at all by the fact that with the *Gospel of Thomas* we have a writing concentrated on the presentation of isolated sayings and parables. Such a collection is an artificial product that already presupposes the narrative presentation of the activity of Jesus and takes this path in contrast to another path in order to explicate the significance of Jesus. The thesis of the ancient character of such a collection is refuted by observations pertaining to the secondary character of the *Gospel of Thomas* over against the Synoptic Gospels, as well as by the fact that with the philosophical biographies of Diogenes Laertius and the *Apophthegmata Patrum* we have parallel works from about the same time or even later in which the collection character of the material has just as little to do with antiquity. On this cf. also Hezser 1996, 393.

[50] In 2001 Crossan published a book on the archaeological findings in Galilee together with Reed (Crossan/Reed 2001). Three years later an analogous book on Paul followed (Crossan/Reed 2004). As much as the inclusion of archaeology in Jesus scholarship is to be welcomed, the archaeological findings in both books are not combined with the literary witnesses into a plausible historical presentation, but in the case of the Jesus book fit into the picture of a "Mediterranean [!] Jewish Peasant" (so the subtitle of Crossan's Jesus book). Freyne's criticism (2001, 213) of Crossan's Jesus presentation thus remains valid despite and precisely in light of this new book: "One must deal with Galilee directly and not easily abandon it for a Mediterranean atopicality which Crossan's Jesus

When Bultmann appeals secondly in another place to the Kyrios-cult of the Hellenistic community in order to claim a discrepancy between earthly Jesus and post-Easter Christology,[51] then something correct is undoubtedly grasped with regard to the (pre-)Pauline strand of the Christology.[52] Even if one should not draw the borders too sharply here,[53] the observation remains valid that for the confession statements that Paul draws upon, as well as for Paul's own interpretation of the person of Jesus, the contents of the proclamation of Jesus preserved in the Gospels do not play a central role. It is, however, another question whether it can be presupposed that this confession tradition also decisively influenced the reception of the Jesus tradition and should be interpreted as material discontinuity between the activity of Jesus and the emergence of the Gospels. With this, however, the question of the relation between the activity of Jesus and the emergence of

finds more congenial." The methodological problem is that in Crossan and Reed's book the interpretation of texts is placed in a direct analogy to archaeological excavations and their evaluation: chapter 1 is entitled "Layers upon Layers" and applies the stratification model of layers lying over one another equally to texts and archaeological findings (Crossan/Reed 2001, 15–50). With regard to this also Freyne 2001, 209, already said what was necessary prior to the appearance of this book: "I would prefer to query the very model that is being used—stratification—that is drawn from archaeology and shows a predilection for so-called hard facts. In dealing with a living and oral tradition I suspect that it is an unhelpful, and in the end distorting model in identifying literary sources for [124] historical writing . . . Indeed if one were to follow Crossan's methodology to its logical conclusion, that is, use only material from stratum one, it would be difficult to locate Jesus anywhere in particular, certainly not in Galilee." This problem continues to exist, for it is not clear why one should locate the postulated earliest literary layer in Galilee of all places and bring it into connection with the archaeological findings there.

[51] Cf. Bultmann 1993 [1933], 252–56; as well as Bultmann 1967, 446–50.

[52] In passing it may be noted that in Bultmann's approach an unresolved tension remains present. When he says on the one hand that in Jesus' proclamation the kerygma is already contained *in nuce*, then it is not evident why he, on the other hand, disputes a material continuity to the post-Easter form of this kerygma. With regard to this Schmithals refers in the epilogue to the paperback edition of the Jesus book to the fact that according to Bultmann's conviction the kerygma "transformed the 'once' of the historical Jesus into the 'once and for all' " by demanding, beyond the proclamation of Jesus, faith in the Jesus present in the kerygma (Bultmann 1983 [1926], 156–57). Apart from the fact that it is a thoroughly plausible possibility to bring the conviction of the singular significance of his person already in connection with the historical Jesus himself, it remains difficult to understand how this transformation of the kerygma from the proclamation of Jesus to the post-Easter faith is compatible with the fact that in another place Bultmann 1967, 458, explicitly writes that he does not want to know anything about the earthly Jesus and that his claim proves "no material unity between the activity and proclamation of Jesus and the kerygma." If this claim were actually historically insignificant, it would also be unimportant whether or not the "Kerygma *in nuce*" comes to expression in it.

[53] Paul also mentions the origin of Jesus from the line of David (Rom 1.3; cf. 9.5; 11.26), knows the institution of the Lord's Supper connected with the passion events (1 Cor 11.23), and occasionally echoes synoptic tradition.

the Christian faith is simultaneously up for discussion. If Bultmann formulates here a criterion of discontinuity to Christianity—Jesus is to be understood within Judaism, the emergence of faith in him is, by contrast, a phenomenon that is not explainable from his activity[54]—then the fact that the [125] Gospels cannot simply be interpreted as post-Easter faith witnesses without historical reference stands against this view. Also the criterion of discontinuity to Christianity must therefore be replaced by a view that makes the emergence of the Gospels from the connection to Jesus historically plausible.[55]

Before this question is taken up again, let us turn to the second argument that has been formulated against the historical usability of the Gospels.

2.2 The argument of literary fiction

The second argument that has been advanced against the historical value of the Gospels relates to the differentiation of the literary line of questioning from the historical one. Wrede had already criticized the fact that the "ground of the evangelical report" was prematurely abandoned in order to make use of it for the history of Jesus.[56] Taking up Wrede, Schweitzer objected a little later against the use of the Markan hypothesis by the life-of-Jesus theology that "the material with which one has soldered together the individual narratives into a life-of-Jesus . . . does not withstand the temperature test."[57] This argument then became influential especially through Karl Ludwig Schmidt's investigation *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (The Framework of the History of Jesus),[58] in which he shows that the view that the actual course of the public activity of Jesus is reflected back in the Synoptic Gospels (especially in Mark) fails to grasp their character. Therefore, no direct *historical* conclusions may be derived from the assumption that Mark is the oldest *literary* work. If instead the presentation of Mark also proves to be a subsequently set forth connection of individual stories, then no chronological outline of the history of Jesus can be drawn from it.

The insight into the literary character of the Gospel of Mark formulated here—and analogously into that of Matthew and Luke—is taken up in a certain way by redaction criticism, but especially deepened by the application of narrative-theoretical insights since the 1970s. It is indisputable that the

[54] Similarly Holmén 1998.
[55] Cf. Dunn 1999a, 36–44.
[56] Wrede 1969 [1901], 2; cf. 1971, 5.
[57] Schweitzer 1984 [1906/1913], 385; 2000, 299.
[58] A comparable formulation is found in Schmidt 1919, 17: "Historical and literary ways of viewing are in general mixed up too much with each other in the research."

chronological and geographical outline of the activity of Jesus owes itself to narrative concepts that are based on the respective interpretation of this activity and should not [126] be understood as reflecting back his actual course of activity. At this point one would have to go beyond Schmidt who stopped at a negative result—the non-usability of the narrative conceptions for the historical question. However, by not specifically inquiring into the interpretation of the narrative conceptions (which already comes to expression in the image of "framework" for the individual narratives) he provided no real alternative to the—rightly criticized—mixing of literary and historical lines of questioning by the liberal life-of-Jesus research, but instead paved the way for the concentration on the "small units" in form criticism.

This criticism of Schmidt means that the insight into the difference between the two lines of questioning does not simply nullify the historical value of the Gospels. This is already recognizable in the fact that the supposed "cultic" character of the Jesus stories (significantly also called "pericopes") and Schmidt's assumption of its "use in church worship" appears to be less indebted to a literary analysis than to his own experience of its ecclesial use.[59] If, however, one sets aside this premise, then another view of the relation of the narrative conceptions of the Gospels and the underlying events presents itself. That is to say, the fact that the individual narratives of the Jesus tradition were integrated into narrative concepts in no way means an abandonment of the reference to the reality to which these concepts refer.[60] Rather, precisely at this point the question of the relationship between the activity and fate of Jesus and its subsequent representation in historically remembering conceptions—or [127] formulated more generally: of the relationship between past reality and its narrative representation—enters in.[61]

[59] Cf. Schmidt 1919, 19: "It is possible that one wrote down such complexes for use in church worship in order to read multiple stories after one another. Then, however, once again only one story, one pericope, was presented. With this the καί survived, exactly as today we read the Sunday gospel in our churches and begin with an 'and.' "

[60] It is therefore not at all evident why Robinson 2001, 31, can say with reference to Schmidt: "Thus the preference for Narrative Gospels rather than Sayings Gospels seems to be no more than a preference for an unhistorical itinerary—a story but not history." Apart from the fact that one would have to inquire specially into what advantage the sayings gospels should actually have over narratives from a historical perspective (why should collections of sayings mediate historically more accurate pictures of Jesus than narratives about him?), the underlying concept of history breaks down on the opposition between "story" and "history," which is completely untenable methodologically (how should there be history other than in the form of narratives?). In any case, the relation of the Gospels to the historical events reworked in them cannot be explained in this manner.

[61] On the historizing-recollecting character of the Gospels cf. Theissen/Merz 2001, 106–8; 1998, 102–4.

2.3 Summary

With the arguments of material discrepancy and literary fiction, the historical value of the Gospels was contested in a double manner by critical research. The theses of the mythical clothing of the events of the life of Jesus, as well as the literary connection of the individual stories after the fact, caused the historical connection of the Gospels to these events to become problematic. With this a line can be discerned that begins with Strauss, who was the first to call into question the historical value of the Gospels in a thoroughgoing manner, and leads via Wrede and Schmidt on to Bultmann. If Strauss already inquired into the "dogmatic foundation of the life of Jesus," then this can—despite all variation in the concrete carrying out and material content—be seen to thoroughly correspond with the idea of the "messianic secret" in Wrede, which is said to have reshaped the earthly life of Jesus after the fact, as well as with the idea of a cultic shaping of the Jesus tradition in Schmidt, which is said to have replaced a concrete view of the life of Jesus, and finally with the idea of an early Christian kerygma in Bultmann, which is said not to stand in material continuity with the activity of the earthly Jesus. The consequence is that the activity of Jesus and the emergence of the Christian faith fall apart, which results in the fact that a presentation of the historical Jesus is no longer oriented to the narrative reworkings of his activity but on the individual traditions, which are evaluated with regard to their authenticity and placed in a historical "framework" constructed independently from them.

It is not at all to be contested that both arguments developed in the critical Jesus research have decisively advanced our insight into the literary and thematically distinctive character of the Gospels. In opposition to a naïve equation of the Gospels with the events that actually happened, they have drawn attention to religious convictions and premises involving the interpretation of reality that shape these Jesus presentations. Moreover, they have brought forth important findings concerning the literary character of the Gospels and thereby underlined the necessity of differentiating between literary and historical questions. In research on the Gospels, these approaches were [128] developed further through form and redaction criticism as well as through narrative criticism. No historical-critical engagement with the person of Jesus may fall back behind these results.

In spite of the basic legitimacy of both arguments, the relationship of the Gospels to the events of the activity and fate of Jesus is not yet adequately described. That the life of Jesus was interpreted with "mythical" categories does not yet answer the question of the relation to the events to which these interpretations refer. In the same way, the category of *Sitz im Leben* is a thoroughly unsuitable instrument for drawing conclusions with regard to the historical foundation of the Gospels in the history of Jesus.

Form-analytical observations could possibly illuminate aspects of the sociology of early Christianity. That they can be advanced as an argument against a historical connection between the literarily formed Jesus tradition and the activity of Jesus himself is, by contrast, thoroughly questionable.[62]

Regarding this, a curious tension can be observed in Bultmann insofar as he holds fast, on the one hand, to the material correspondence between the proclamation of Jesus and the post-Easter kerygma, and, on the other hand, disputes such a correspondence at the same time. A comparable ambivalence can be established in Wrede, who introduces important differentiations over against his own strict opposition between the activity of Jesus and the post-Easter faith in his letter to Adolf Harnack cited above (see n. 27). It appears as if an attempt is made here to mediate between the positions that clearly came into opposition with each other for the first time in Strauss and Weisse: the Christian faith is based in the messianic ideas and in the resurrection faith of the post-Easter community; or the Christian faith is based in the historical person of Jesus.

A consequence of these observations is that it would in no way be justified to orient a historical presentation of the person of Jesus exclusively or primarily on his sayings. This tendency—which can be detected since the time of Bultmann's Jesus book and has led in parts of present-day research to a one-sided prioritization of Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* for the historical question[63]—is already [129] implausible because the narrative reworkings of Jesus' activity and fate may not simply be shoved aside as "frameworks" that are unimportant for the historical question.[64] Moreover, this tendency is based on a methodologically deficient concept, since it does not consider the connection between past reality and its subsequent narrative representation. Regarding this, however, it must be made clear that *no* representation of past events simply reflects these events back, but rather every presentation relates to them in an interpretive manner. This means again that the historical value of the Gospels can only be measured in relation to how event and interpretation relate to each other in them.

In the same way, the insight into the literary fiction that the narratives of the Gospels present does not yet give an answer to the question of their

[62] It may be recalled (cf. chap. 2 above) that Dibelius formulated an objection to Bultmann at precisely this point by referring to the fact that Bultmann's own analytical methods did not manage without a constructive moment. Cf. Dibelius 1929, 193–95. This draws attention to the fact that the inference from the Jesus tradition to the history lying behind it is by no means to be limited to the post-Easter community through the category of the *Sitz im Leben*.

[63] With this a negative judgment is in no way passed on the value of the two documents for the Jesus question. However, the historical evaluation cannot be based on the fact that they primarily contain sayings of Jesus.

[64] On this cf. the methodologically important remarks of Freyne 2000, 5–30.

historical value. The insight that the narrative outline of the Gospels cannot simply be transferred to the history of Jesus is undoubtedly accurate. It does not follow from this, however, that they are exclusively determined by the kerygmatic forming of the material or are to be understood exclusively from their time of origin.[65] Rather, it cannot at all be doubted that historically usable information was reworked in the Gospels, which is to be taken into account in their interpretation. In what follows I will make this concrete by examining the connection between past event and its representation in the historical narrative.

3. The "representation" of Jesus in the historical narrative
The Gospel of Mark as a source for the historical Jesus

After the fundamental remarks of the first part, in what follows I will pursue by way of example the question of the usability of the Gospels for an image of the historical Jesus. For this we will use, in dependence on Paul Ricoeur, the concept of representation (*Repräsentanz*) in order to thereby bring to expression that the presentation of past events in the historical narrative—as explained above—does not simply *reestablish* [130] these but *stands for* them through selection and refiguration.[66] Thus, the concept of representation grasps the relationship between past and narrative as one of analogy by equally involving commonalities and differences. With it a naïve understanding of reference is left behind, according to which the historical narrative is *directly* related to the past. By contrast, the concept of representation expresses that through the composition of a fable (or plot),[67] the historical narrative mediates between the events and the narrated story; it thus relates to the past in the mode of "seeing as" and necessarily contains a fictionalizing moment.[68] The Gospels fulfill this representing function with regard to the person of Jesus just as today's Jesus presentations

[65] Form criticism and redaction criticism have interpreted the Gospels in this way and thereby largely detached them from the events about which they report. With this, however, the character of these writings as *historical* narratives is insufficiently taken into account.

[66] Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 253–57 and elsewhere; 1984–1988, III, 157–60. Cf., e.g., Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 254 (cf. 1984–1988, III, 157): "Representation, so we said, means by turns the reduction to the Same, the recognition of Otherness, and analogizing apprehension."

[67] With fable (or plot) is thereby understood—in dependence on Ricoeur who refers for this to the related expression μῦθος, which Aristotle used in the *Poetics*—the sequence of events that constitutes the one narrative. Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, I, 104–13; 1984–1988, I, 64–70.

[68] With "fictionalizing" is not meant something like free invention, but the establishment of a relation between present and past that is necessary for that "intending of the past" (Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 295; 1984–1988, III, 181).

do. The difference lies, however, in the fact that current presentations are governed by the premises of the historical-critical consciousness, whereas for the Gospels different conditions of knowledge apply.[69]

For such an approach we will focus on the Gospel of Mark as the oldest narrative presentation of the activity of Jesus and here especially on three facets with which the work of Jesus in Galilee and the surrounding regions is illuminated. A sidelong glance will also be cast on Q as the second early source within the synoptic sphere. In doing so I will build first on the insight of scholarship, worked out in the previous decades, that the Gospels are narratives, for which reason narrative-theoretical approaches should be drawn upon.[70] This literary character of the Gospels was first developed in research on Mark and then also [131] extended to the other gospels.[71] According to this, the Gospel of Mark is a carefully composed narrative that sets forth a text world within which the activity and fate of Jesus are placed. It is assumed further that the Gospels take up traditions that predate them and combine them with information about people and events from the time of the activity of Jesus into a historical narrative.[72] For Q both points apply in an analogous way: although the identifiable narrative elements are considerably sparser than in Mark, the person of Jesus is also found here within a concrete time and a concrete space, and here too there is a reaching back to traditions and historical information in order to portray this world.[73] Taken together these insights mean that a historical evaluation of the Gospels should start from the worlds set forth here and

[69] Theissen/Merz 2001, 31 (cf. 1998, 13), also formulate in this sense: "Historical imagination creates with its hypotheses an 'aura of fictionality' around the figure of Jesus, just like the religious imagination of early Christianity. For here as there a creative power of imagination is at work, ignited through the same historical figure."

[70] For a broad overview of approaches and problems involving the integration of literary-theoretical approaches into New Testament scholarship, cf. Porter 1995. On narrative criticism specifically, cf. already Powell 1990 as well as more recently Merenlahti/Hakola 1999, 13–48.

[71] Cf. Rhoads 1982; the contributions in Hahn 1985a; P. Müller 1995; Dormeyer 1999. On Matthew cf. further Kingsbury 1986; Luz 1993; 1995. On Luke cf. Tannehill 1986/1990; Löning 1997. Recent contributions on the application of *narrative criticism* to the Gospels can be found in Rhoads/Syreeni 1999.

[72] The extent to which *written* texts also belonged to the material reworked by Mark is uncertain and does not need to occupy us further here. In any case, these sources do not allow themselves to be literary-critically reconstructed, since Mark has linguistically and thematically integrated them into his narrative. That the wording cannot be drawn out from oral tradition has been shown through research on oral tradition processes, which have also been taken up in New Testament science. On this cf. also Hollander 2000. This means that one should take the reception of traditions by Mark as one's starting point, even if the *concrete form* of this tradition is no longer accessible.

[73] Cf. Kloppenborg 1990; Järvinen 1999; Schröter 2001b, 62–89, 140–79.

should analyze these with the methods of historical research and inquire into their historical plausibility.

(1) The Markan narrative begins with the account of the appearance of John and Jesus. Here, the different localization and temporal ordering first stands out: John is active at the Jordan; Jesus belongs to Galilee. The first activity of Jesus that is reported is therefore the coming of Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee to the Jordan, in order to be baptized there by John (1.9), as well as his return to Galilee after the handing over of John (1.14).

The Markan presentation emphasizes the importance of these first events through quotations and echoes of biblical motifs and expressions: The [132] appearance of John is introduced by an Isaiah quotation;[74] the place of his appearance (ἡ ἔρημος) is taken from this quotation and applied to John as the God-sent forerunner of Jesus.[75] The description of his food and clothing reinforce this by presenting John as a prophet. The coming of Jesus is introduced with the biblical expressions καὶ ἐγένετο and ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις and his baptism, as well as his temptation, is presented with allusions to passages and motifs from Scripture.

Thus, Mark already combines at the beginning of his narrative the historical information about the different locations and times of the activity of John and Jesus with an interpretation that makes both appearances appear in a certain light: as forerunner of Jesus John is the eschatological prophet, Jesus the Son of God. The narrative thereby receives a biblical coloring, which inserts the reported events into the horizon of the history of Israel. At the same time it is clear that Mark has preserved concrete historical memories about the location of the activity of John, the origin of Jesus, and also his baptism by John. That this historical information is not unimportant is shown by the subsequent course of the narrative, for the activity of Jesus takes place in connection to and demarcation from that of

[74] It is well known that it actually involves a mixed quotation (Exod 23.20/Mal 3.1/Isa 40.3). According to the Markan presentation, however, it is a quotation ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ (Mark 1.2).

[75] According to Pesch 1976, 79, we are dealing here with a "historical piece of information from the tradition . . . not a symbolic addition of Markan redaction." This is, however, unlikely in light of the combination of the quotations Exod 23.20/Mal 3.1 and Isa 40.3, which are separately cited in Matthew and Luke and are applied to John, as well as the divergent localizing of John in the Jordan region in Q, which given 1.5 (ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ) and 1.9 (ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου) would also be more likely for Mark: Mark depicts the baptizing activity, which presupposes the Jordan, whose mentioning would therefore have suggested itself more than the wilderness. Lührmann 1987, 34–35, therefore rightly comments: "Through this [sc.: identification of John with the one who calls in the wilderness from the Isaiah quotation, J. S.] it comes to the curious idea that he who needs the water of the Jordan to baptize preaches in the wilderness."

the Baptist; moreover, it is only comprehensible from the perspective of the geographical and religious context of Galilee.

The Q-texts confirm and supplement this picture. Here too the appearance of John and his message is first portrayed; here too John and Jesus are set off from one another geographically.[76] The [133] beginning of Q thus presents an analogy to the Markan narrative in that here also an ordering of John and Jesus and a localization of the events takes place. This ordering is even extremely important for Q, as is shown by Q (Luke) 7.18-35, where the relation between John and Jesus is thematized once again. The historical finding that prior to the beginning of his public activity Jesus belonged to the circle of the Baptist is preserved in the memory of him and placed in relation to his self-understanding that he himself, not John, is the decisive representative of God's rule.

In what follows Galilee becomes the scene of the action.[77] The author thereby reveals a notion of the concrete circumstances of the appearance of Jesus: The Sea of Galilee is a location to which Jesus often comes (1.16; 2.13; 3.7; 4.1), and there are synagogues in Galilee, in which Jesus teaches (1.39).[78] As locations, Capernaum (1.21; 2.1) as well as the home town [134] of Jesus (ἡ πατρίδα αὐτου, 6.1; according to 1.9 this is Nazareth) come

[76] Even if the beginning of Q can no longer be fully reconstructed, it is recognizable that with the expression πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Matt 3.5/Luke 3.3) John is located in the Jordan region, whereas Jesus belongs to Nazareth (Matt 4.13/Luke 4.6: Ναζαρά). The remark in Luke 4.16 (καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά) could present the beginning of an episode in Q that reports the appearance of Jesus in Nazareth after the baptism of John. On this cf. Schröter 2003a.

[77] Cf. Freyne 1988, 34–68. The Johannine presentation admittedly deviates here: according to John 3.22, Jesus baptizes—after the beginnings in Galilee—simultaneously with John "in the Jewish land." Behind this could stand a historical memory of an initial baptizing activity of Jesus, which he would not, however, have continued later.

[78] The discussion concerning the origin and function of synagogues is controversial at present. Cf. for this the (somewhat schematic) overview of McKay 1998. In recent discussion the existence of synagogues as religious institutions and buildings prior to 70 was disputed by Kee in a programmatic article from 1990. Kee advocates here—and in subsequent articles—the position that the designation of *buildings* with the term συναγωγή can first be demonstrated from the late first century or early second century, whereas previously *gatherings* of varying character were designated with this term. In the Gospels, however, a later development is said to have been retrojected into first-century Galilee. Cf. Kee 1990; 1992; 1999.

This thesis has been widely debated and in the process rejected by the majority of scholars. For this cf., e.g., Oster 1993, 187, who refutes Kee's thesis, among other arguments, with the help of an inscription from Berenice (pre-70), in which the term is used twice, one time meaning the gathering and the other time the building. See further Atkinson 1997 and Strange 1999, who challenges Kee's thesis with the help of three frequently cited archaeological findings for synagogues prior to 70 (Gamla, Masada, and Herodium) as well as Magdala.

Cf. also the stocktaking of Foerster 1992; Levine 1996; 1993; 1999, 139–79; 2000, 42–159; as well as Claussen 2002. In addition, it may be pointed out that the dating of the

into view. And with regard to people, the disciples who are called to follow and the family of Jesus appear, as well as the Pharisees and scribes as his opponents. In the Markan *chreia*—unlike, for example, in those of Diogenes Laertius or the *Gospel of Thomas*—many biographical details are also preserved; moreover, they are often combined with one another, so that a connected narrative emerges.[79] This is a clear indication for the historical-recollecting character of the Gospels.[80]

Although Nazareth is the hometown of Jesus, Capernaum especially stands out as the place of his activity: in contrast to the summary manner of presentation in other parts, in 1.21-34 the course of a Sabbath in Capernaum is described during which Jesus first goes to the synagogue, then to the house of Simon and Andrew (1.23, 29), and in the evening heals many sick and possessed (1.32-34). Shortly thereafter Jesus is again in the house in Capernaum in 2.1 and in 3.1 again in the synagogue there. Capernaum thus becomes the place from which Jesus goes to the surrounding villages and to the sea and the place to which he always returns again. In 2.1 and 9.33, perhaps also in 3.20 and 7.17, [135] an allusion is made to the house of Peter mentioned in 1.29, in which Jesus evidently stays when he is in Capernaum.[81]

Theodotus inscription in the second or third century by Kee is very questionable. [134] On this cf. the criticism of Riesner 1995, 192–201, as well as the in-depth analysis of the inscription and dispute with Kee in Kloppenborg Verbin 2000.

From this discussion it is important for the question in view here that with the mention of synagogues in Galilee Mark is not guilty of an anachronism, but refers to a historically accurate circumstance. Here too it is again in no way stated that the Markan narratives of scenes in synagogues are therefore "historically trustworthy" in a naïve sense. But it shows that Mark *narrates in a historically plausible way.*

[79] On the chreia, cf. the informative contribution of Hezser 1996.

[80] By way of example, reference may be made to the double chreia on the calling of the pair of brothers in Mark 1.16-20. It is clear on the one hand that the prophet-calling of Elisha by Elijah from 3 Βασ [1 Kings] 19.19-21 stands in the background as a model. It is also clear that we are dealing with two variations of an "ideal scene" on Jesus' callings, in which a special aspect (becoming fishers of people, leaving one's father) is emphasized in each case (cf. Mark 2.14; Q 9.57-60). With regard to its historical usability it is nevertheless of interest that a concrete location for the events is provided (ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας); the name of the called as well as their occupations (fishermen) and family relationships (brothers, father) are mentioned; the activity they were engaged in when Jesus meets them (casting out or mending nets) is named; and a detail such as the day laborers of the father of the second pair of brothers is mentioned. There can be no real doubt that this manner of presentation does not go back to a legendary development of Jesus' sayings but to historical-recollecting preservation of persons and circumstances of his activity. From a narrative perspective it is of interest that both scenes are linked with each other (καὶ προβὰς ὀλίγον), through which the impression of a closed sequence of events arises.

[81] In 3.20 and 7.17 the localization is uncertain. The expression ἔρχεται (or εἰσῆλθεν) εἰς οἶκον can also be understood as "he goes/went into *a* house." Possibly, however, the meaning "home" is likely on the basis of the other passages (at least for 3.20).

> Here Mark has at his disposal the historical information that there was a house in Capernaum that the family of Peter inhabited and that was a place at which Jesus taught and healed. Irrespective of whether one identifies this house with the "House of Peter" excavated by the Franciscans,[82] it is clear that the excavations at Capernaum mediate an impression of what such a residential building in the first century looked like. With this they also shed light on a scene such as the one described in Mark 2.1-12, which speaks of a space before the door[83] and of digging up (ἐξορύσσειν) the roof.[84] These data can be set in relation to the archaeological findings insofar as these have uncovered houses that were built around an inner courtyard and had mud roofs. It is evidently presupposed in 2.2 that not only the house itself but also the courtyard that belonged to it were overcrowded, for which reason those who brought the lame man climbed up on the roof by the steps and dug it up.[85]

This is by no means to say that the events in Galilee took place as they are depicted by Mark. Such an identification of narrated events and events that took place would contradict on the one hand the fundamental difference between text and reality and disregard on the other hand the specific way that Mark presents the [136] activity of Jesus. Mark narrates episodically,[86] schematically,[87] and by taking up Scripture citations and interpretive

[82] Between 1968 and 1986, nineteen excavation campaigns were carried out in Capernaum by Corbo and Loffreda. The synagogue from the fourth century as well as the *Insula sacra* located ca. 30 meters south of the synagogue were of special interest. The previously named archaeologists brought the Domus-Ecclesia from the fourth century, which was discovered under the octagonal church from the fifth century, into connection with the house of Peter mentioned in the Gospels, which was changed to a gathering place of the Christian community at the end of the first century. Cf. Loffreda 1994, 50–66; 1997, 418–19; Loffreda/Tzaferis 1993, 295; Corbo 1992, 867. Contrast Taylor 1993, 268–94.

[83] The expression μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν (Mark 2.2) is to be interpreted as an *Accusativus Graecus* (i.e., an accusative of respect): "Not even at the space before the door"; cf. 1.33.

[84] Cf. Breytenbach 1999, esp. 80–85.

[85] Two house types were excavated in Capernaum that belong to the Hellenistic-Roman period: individual houses and community houses. The so-called "House of Peter" belongs to the latter type. These houses possessed two or three inner courtyards. The entrance from the street passed through one of these courtyards. In the case of the "Peter House" the northern courtyard possessed an eastern entrance through which one got from the cardo (i.e., the main north–south street) to the house. In the inner courtyards were steps by which one could climb onto the roofs of the houses. Cf. Corbo 1992, 867.

[86] On the episodic character of the Markan narrative, cf. Breytenbach 1985.

[87] It is well known that Mark often places episodes that have the same character together. Thus, e.g., in 2.1–3.6 various conflict scenes are reported in which it is not a question of chronological sequence. In a comparable way, in 4.35–6.6a Jesus' various deeds of power are reported, which illuminate an aspect of his appearance. It is not necessary to trace these complexes back to pre-Markan collections. It is more likely that they go back to Markan arrangement, which is designed from the perspective of the overall portrayal of Jesus as it is drawn in the Gospel of Mark.

motifs. At the same time, it is nevertheless unmistakable that the representation of the activity of Jesus takes place in such a way that through the description of places, people, and concrete circumstances of the narrated actions it is placed in a clearly identifiable historical context. This context is not a matter of a secondary "framework" that could be disregarded in a presentation of the historical Jesus. Nor would it be any more plausible to set forth a temporal-historical context without reference to the literary presentation of the activity of Jesus.[88] Rather, a historical presentation can only rest on a linking of the findings that can be drawn from the literary reworking of the activity of Jesus with the remaining historical material.[89]

(2) An additional facet: it has always stood out as peculiar that the presentation of the activity of Jesus remains limited to the villages of Galilee, whereas the important cities of Galilee—Sepphoris and Tiberias—do not come into view. One attempt to explain this phenomenon runs as follows: Jesus visited these cities—Sepphoris, which is located in the immediate vicinity of Nazareth, is especially in mind—but the Gospels passed over his activity there [137] because it remained unsuccessful.[90] This explanation cannot satisfy. It is based on an *argumentum e silentio*, which is additionally weakened by the fact that Jesus' lack of success in his hometown (Mark 6.1-6; Matt 13.54-58; Luke 4.22-29) is no more concealed than the rejection that comes to expression in the woes against Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum.

A more plausible possibility is therefore to regard the social and cultural differences between the Hellenistic cities and the rural regions of Galilee as the background of the activity of Jesus directed to the villages.[91]

[88] This procedure is found in Crossan/Reed 2001. Their picture of the activity of Jesus in Galilee is not oriented to the literary presentation of the evangelists but to Crossan's stratigraphy model, which also presents the foundation for the evaluation of the archaeological findings. No reference to the historical concretizations of the activity of Jesus, however, can be gathered from this postulated first level, for which reason the presentation of Crossan/Reed also remains in very general categories.

[89] Overman 1993, 49, formulates quite rightly in this sense: "Archaeology will not help one to know what Jesus said or did, or what the Gospel of Mark fabricated. It will and does help us to describe and understand the world and context into which we must place our texts and reconstructions."

[90] So Bösen 1998, 69–75. According to Batey 1984, Jesus' proclamation reveals knowledge of the Greek theatre in Sepphoris. This, however, is already rendered doubtful by the fact that according to more recent archaeological investigations the theatre dates from the second half of the first century at the earliest (so Reed 2000, 119), or possibly not until the beginning of the second century (so Meyers/Meyers 1997, 533). Contrast, however, Z. Weiss 1993, 1325: "early first century CE, possibly in the reign of Antipas."

[91] Cf. Freyne 1980, 155–207; 2000, 45–58, 183–207; 1994, 104–21; Theissen/Merz 2001, 162–67; 1998, 169–75.

> Sepphoris was developed into a Hellenistic city by Antipas. He had a theatre and palace built and divided the city into a lower city and an upper city, each with its own market.[92] Tiberias was established by him about 20 CE on the location of a Jewish cemetery.[93] It likewise received the form of a Hellenistic πόλις, and according to Josephus now became the capital city of Galilee.[94] The relation of these πόλεις to the surrounding villages—as with other ancient cities also—was determined on the one hand by trade relations, inasmuch as the agrarian regions made up the life-basis of a πόλις. On the other hand, the πόλις possessed the administrative and political sovereignty over the villages that belonged to their territory.[95] These relations could lead to social conflicts if the tensions between the rich aristocracy in the cities and the poorer rural population came to a head. Even if there is no documentation of unrest for the region of Galilee under the rule of Antipas and it was more likely a time of economic upswing, we should reckon with social tensions between the rich and [138] poor segments of the population. This has also found expression in the presentations of the Gospels.

The picture mediated by the Gospels clearly points out that with his message of the dawning rule of God, Jesus turned to the population in the villages, whereas he avoided the cities. If one takes into account the aforementioned social and cultural differences as well as the political tensions between city and land, then this orientation can be interpreted as a conscious decision of Jesus to move in the environment from which he himself came, which he regarded as a central part of the land that God gave to his people, and whose people he therefore viewed as addressees of his message.[96] At the same time, the rule of Antipas, which already confronted Jesus as a danger through the arrest and beheading of the Baptist, could also have played a role.[97] The assumption that Jesus appeared in Sepphoris must therefore be characterized as an improbable historical hypothesis. It

[92] On Sepphoris, cf. Schürer 1973–1987, 2:172–76; Meyers 1992, 321–38; Meyers/Meyers 1997; Strange 1992a; Reed 2000, 108–36. Strange 1992b, 339–55, provides an overview of the excavation campaigns from 1983–1989.

[93] Josephus, *A.J.* 18.37f.

[94] Josephus, *Vita* 37: Βουληθέντος αὐτοῦ (sc.: Ἡρώδου) τὴν Σεπφωριτῶν πόλιν τῇ Τιβεριέων ὑπακούειν.

[95] Cf. for instance Josephus, *Vita* 346; cf. *B.J.* 2.252: πόλεις σὺν ταῖς τοπαρχίαις. Cf. also the expression αἱ κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου in Mark 8.27.

[96] Cf. Freyne 2004, 60–91; Schröter 2010 [2006], 142–49. In passing it may be noted that this finding speaks against the analogy with the Cynics, which is occasionally evoked again in Jesus research. Even if one can establish similarities (for instance in the appearance of the itinerant missionaries who do not need much), the intellectual-cultural environment is nevertheless clearly different: the Cynic movement is concentrated in the cities, whereas the mission initiated by Jesus especially avoids cities—with the (explainable) exception of Jerusalem. Cf. also Eddy 1996, 463–67.

[97] Freyne 2000, 139–40, and Reed 2000, 137–38, explain Jesus' avoidance of contact with Sepphoris in this sense.

is much more plausible, by contrast, that the picture set forth by the Gospels of an activity of Jesus focused on the rural regions, which can be supported by both sociological considerations and the archaeological findings in Sepphoris, has a basis in the actual events.

This is supported again by the findings in Q. Sepphoris and Tiberias are not mentioned here either; in addition to those places mentioned in Mark, however, Chorazin and Bethsaida come into view (Luke 10.13/Matt 11.21). These too are villages in the vicinity of the Galilean sea, which confirms the picture obtained from Mark of a concentration of the geographical perspective on this region.[98] Thus, this observation also indicates that important historical information about the geographical and social context of the appearance [139] of Jesus can be gathered from the Gospels. Here too it would be questionable to negate such a context or to construct it independently of these literary witnesses.

(3) A final facet of the Markan account to be mentioned here is the portrayal of the three journeys that Jesus undertakes in the neighboring regions—the land of the Gerasenes, the region of Tyre, Sidon, and the Decapolis, as well as the villages of Caesarea Philippi. In explanations oriented to redaction criticism, these accounts have been interpreted as auspices of the later Gentile mission, which Mark presupposes for his own time and joins in this way to the activity of Jesus.[99] Recently, however, it has been asked how these reports can be understood *in historical perspective*, that is, what they also reveal about the activity of Jesus himself.[100] This line of questioning is appropriate to the Gospel of Mark because in this the narrated time is distinguished from the time of writing and first becomes relevant in this distinction between past and present.[101]

If one considers the texts from a historical perspective, then there arises first the question of the geographical plausibility of the journeys of Jesus.

[98] Whereas Chorazin was located in the territory of Antipas, Bethsaida belonged to the tetrarchy of Philip, who renamed it Julias and elevated it to the rank of a πόλις (Josephus, *A.J.* 18.28; cf. *B.J.* 2.168). For one thing, this could have first taken place after the activity of Jesus; for another, even then it may not have involved a fundamental alteration of the character of this place.

[99] Thus, e.g., Lang 1978, esp. 155–59, who sees the theme of "participation of the Gentiles in salvation" dealt with from three different perspectives in the complex of Mark 7.24–8.9—without, however, suggesting that the author is therefore ignorant of the geographical circumstances.

[100] Cf. Schmeller 1994.

[101] Schmeller 1994, 53, therefore rightly objects against a purely redaction-critical explanation: "In my view, for him [sc.: Mark, J. S.] and his community/communities the past must have been more closely linked with the present than solely via the theological question of the incorporation of Gentiles into the salvation brought by Christ."

> The expression ἡ χώρα τῶν Γερασηνῶν in 5.1 presents an initial problem, for the region of Gerasa, which belongs to the Decapolis, does not border on the sea, but was a considerable distance away from it.[102] The difficulty can hardly be resolved via textual criticism, for the variants Γαδαρηνῶν (so also Matt 8.28) and Γεργεσηνῶν (this is possibly concerned with Kursi on the eastern shore of the sea) already represent attempts to solve the problem. Other possibilities consist therefore in reckoning with a geographical incorrectness on the part of Mark or applying the expression χώρα τῶν Γερασηνῶν to the Decapolis as a whole.[103] It is conspicuous, however, [140] that there is no mention at all of the region (ὄρια) belonging to Gerasa but of a χώρα of the Gerasenes. This designation thus stands in contrast to 7.24 (τὰ ὅρια Τύρου; cf. 7.31); 7.31 (τὰ ὅρια Δεκαπόλεως), as well as 8.27 (αἱ κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου). Moreover, the term χώρα is used in 6.55 as a designation for the territory of Γεννησαρέτ (Γεννησάρ), which extends on the northwest shore of the sea of the same name between Tiberias and Capernaum.[104] If one starts from this use of χώρα in contrast to ὅρια, then a further possibility is that Mark knows of a region on the eastern shore of the sea that was in possession of the Gerasenes, but did not lie within the region belonging to Gerasa.[105]

The geographic information in Mark 5.1 thus remains difficult, but it does not necessarily indicate a lack of knowledge of the actual circumstances on the part of the author.

A further problem is presented by the travel route described in 7.31: Jesus goes from the region of Tyre via Sidon to the Galilean sea ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως. There can be no doubt that we are not dealing with a description of an actual travel route of Jesus here. Rather, with this route Mark describes the northern extent of the activity of Jesus. This does not necessarily mean, however, that we are dealing with a geographical impossibility.[106]

[102] Cf. McRay 1992; Bietenhard 1977.

[103] So Schmeller 1994, 46, following Lührmann and Theissen. It is correct that for Mark Gerasa is—as shown by 5.20—the place from which the news of the activity of Jesus spreads to the entire Decapolis. A problem with this solution lies, however, in the fact that in the Gospel of Mark it is not simply any old city that is selected for orientation, but the healing of the possessed is [140] located directly on the eastern shore of the sea (5.2). Gerasa, however, is not otherwise attested as a general designation for the region east of the sea.

[104] Josephus provides a description of this area in *B.J.* 3.516–21.

[105] So Breytenbach 1999, 79. This too is admittedly not attested apart from Mark and must therefore remain hypothetical.

[106] Schweizer 1978, 82, starts from such an impossibility. As an illustration he states that the route is comparable to a peregrination "from Darmstadt via Frankfurt to Manheim right through the Neckar Valley." Because Schweizer writes that one must "make clear the impossibility of the travel route with an example from one's own region," this example was replaced in the edition of the commentary for the German Democratic Republic (Schweizer 1981) with "from Halle on the Saale river to Leipzig via Magdeburg through the

With τὰ ὅρια Τύρου and Σιδών Mark describes the region northwest of Galilee.[107] The expression ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως can mean "right *in* the middle of" or "right *into* the region of the Decapolis." By contrast, it would be more difficult to interpret it as a route description, that is, in the sense of "right *through* the region of the Decapolis."[108] In the first [141] case we would be dealing with a piece of place information that refers to θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας. This would indeed make little sense, since the sea does border the Decapolis in the east, but it definitely did not lie "in the middle of the Decapolis." In the second case, by contrast, it would be a piece of information concerning the goal that Jesus reaches at the end of his journey.[109] This geographical information is then not particularly problematic. Even if Pliny the Elder already observed that there are some uncertainties concerning which cities belonged to the Decapolis,[110] the list that he named exclusively contains cities east of the Jordan, which—apart from Damascus, which represents a certain special case[111]—also form a coherent

---

Ore Mountains" and in the English edition (1970, 154) with "going from New York to Washington by way of Boston down the Mohawk Valley."

[107] Cf. Matt 15.21: τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.

[108] So e.g. Lührmann 1987, 131, although in the commentary he then writes that Jesus goes "back to the Sea of Galilee, although in the middle of the Decapolis" (132, what is meant is evidently: "right *into* the Decapolis," since according to Lührmann this is the scene of the following narrative). The travel route reconstructed by Lang 1978 likewise leads Jesus *through* the region of the Decapolis, although he translates Mark 7.31 with "right *into* the region of the Decapolis." Schweizer's illustration of the Markan Jesus route with examples from West and East German regions is also based on the translation "right through the region of the Decapolis" (which—it may be noted in passing—would not be as absurd as he suggests). The interpretation of ἀνὰ μέσον presupposed here is, however, questionable. First, [141] it would be more probable syntactically to relate the place information ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως to εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας and not to διὰ Σιδῶνος. Secondly, while the preposition ἀνά can admittedly be used in the sense of "through/right through" (e.g., in the expression ἀνὰ χρόνον), the composite adverb ἀνὰ μέσον always designates the thing/person found in the middle of something, as does the adjective ἀνάμεσος, which is derived from it. Cf. Mayser 1935, 206; 1934, 403. Since one can hardly assume that in this passage Mark suddenly wanted to give information about where the (previously already oft-mentioned) Sea of Galilee was located (whose location he would then also describe incorrectly), the most likely possibility remaining is that we are dealing with information that more precisely explains the goal of Jesus' journey, which is described with εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Then the translation would be: "to the Sea of Galilee, (namely) into the Decapolis," thus, on the sea's eastern shore. A more appropriate analogy than the one mentioned in Schweizer would therefore be: "from Basel via Strasbourg to Lake Constance, (namely) into Switzerland" or "from Chicago via St. Paul to Lake Huron, (namely) into Canada."

[109] Schmeller 1994, 47 n. 21, is therefore right to emphasize that the "difference of meaning . . . is not insignificant," since the second variant can be "more easily reconciled with the historical-geographical situation."

[110] Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 5.74: *Iungitur ei latere Syriae Decapolitana regio, a numero oppidorum, in quo non omnes eadem observant . . .*

[111] Damascus was possibly first assigned to the Decapolis later (possibly under Nero). Cf. Bietenhard 1977, 226. Contrast Lang 1978, 148–50, who thinks that Damascus as

region. This also includes at any rate those cities whose region bordered on the eastern shore of the Galilean sea (namely Hippos and Gadara). That Mark thus has Jesus' journey end ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως is understandable, when with τὰ ὅρια Δεκαπόλεως the region east of the sea is indicated.

The travel route described by Mark is thus not as absurd as is sometimes assumed. Rather, with the regions that are named, it marks out in a summary manner the geographical horizon of the activity of Jesus outside of Galilee by referring to the region lying to the north-northwest with Tyre and Sidon and then having Jesus go again (cf. 5.1) into the region east of the sea. Thus, the geographical specifications of the Jesus journeys in the Gospel of Mark are neither indications of the author's lack of knowledge nor can they be understood as exact journey descriptions. Instead, they summarily designate the regions in which Jesus was active outside of Galilee. [142]

In terms of content one should not too quickly see an exclusively redactional interest in the legitimation of the Gentile mission in this geographical expansion of the sphere of activity. In Mark Gentile mission is not a theme of the activity of Jesus in Galilee and the neighboring regions. Rather, in the aforementioned texts we are dealing in the first instance with a seeking out of areas that do not belong to the Jewish heartland. In the process it is never said that Jesus turned to Gentiles with his proclamation or his healing activity, but only that he was active in *a Gentile region*. The narrative of the Syrophoenician woman in 7.24-30 confirms this picture. First, it is the woman who turns to Jesus at her initiative; second, both her request to receive help for her daughter from Jesus and also the healing that eventually follows are firmly presented as an unforeseen, exceptional case, in which the order of precedence between the children of Israel as addressees of Jesus' activity and the Gentiles is not, for example, programmatically broken through but rather precisely upheld.[112]

That the activity of Jesus in the regions bordering Galilee should be understood as a seeking out of the Jewish settlements there is confirmed by the fact that Jewish population segments can be shown for both Tyre and Sidon as well as for the Decapolis.[113] Moreover, unhindered travel between

---

"suburb and model of the others constitutively belonged to the cities of this federation from the beginning [thus since Pompey, J. S.]."

[112] The Q narrative of the centurion of Capernaum (Luke 7.1-10/Matt 8.5-13) presents an analogy to this episode. In this too the concern is with the faith of a Gentile, who additionally stands here in contrast to the faith that Jesus has found in Israel. Here too the concern is not with Gentile mission but with the astonishing fact of the trust that the non-Israelites have in Jesus.

[113] In *B. J.* 2.466–80 Josephus describes conflicts between Jews and the non-native population of the surrounding area in the run-up to the Jewish war and also mentions the

Galilee and the surrounding regions is much easier to imagine for the time of Jesus than for the time of the composition of the Gospel of Mark in which the relation between these areas was extremely tense because of the events in the run-up to the Jewish war.[114] Here too the Markan narrative clearly reveals that it distinguishes between its own time and the narrated time. [143]

Thus, the three facets of the Markan narrative addressed here show that the geographical, religious, and cultural context in which the activity of Jesus is placed is of decisive importance for the interpretation of the Markan narrative. Beyond this, it is also extremely important in historical respect and should not be regarded as a secondarily created "framework" without a basis in the reported events. The—undoubtedly accurate—insight that the literary context of the activity of Jesus is a product of the author of the Gospel of Mark means that the presentation of the course of the activity of Jesus as well as a number of interpretations of individual events cannot simply be repeated in a historical-critical presentation. On the other hand, numerous historical details concerning the geographical, cultural, and religious context of the activity of Jesus are reworked in the Markan narrative, which would not be recognizable without them.[115]

It is further to be held that the view advanced by Ernst Lohmeyer, and thereafter developed in various ways,[116] of a theological pattern of interpretation bound up with the names of Galilee and Jerusalem requires modification insofar as the historical perspective thereby remains underexposed. Mark narrates the history of Jesus as activity that took place several decades earlier; he thus consciously distinguishes between his own time and the narrated time, which is significant for the historical character of his narrative.[117] The places not only have symbolic meaning but localize

---

Jewish population segments there. Epigraphically, Jews are documented for Tyre on CIJ II 879 and 880, and in addition ἀρχισυνάγωγοι is attested for Sidon and Tyre on CIJ 991. Cf. further the references in Schmeller 1994, 57–58; Freyne 2000, 160–82, 169–70, points out in addition that the discovery of Jewish household objects speaks for an active commerce between the Galilean Kefar Hanania and the surrounding (Jewish and non-Jewish) cities. Moreover, the mention of products from Kefar Hanania and Shikhin in rabbinic literature can possibly be interpreted as an indication of "halachic concerns of some of the inhabitants of these places" (Freyne 2000, 170).

[114] Freyne 2000, 187–88, also refers to this.

[115] The reflections presented here have taken their orientation from the Gospel of Mark as the oldest narrative reworking of the activity of Jesus. This is not to say that historical insights could not likewise be gained from the other narratives. This would be a topic for further studies.

[116] Cf. Lohmeyer 1936; Marxsen 1959 [1956]; 1969; Kelber 1997, 96–116; Malbon 1982.

[117] Roloff 1970 had already presented this in his investigation. It remained largely unheard, however, in the phase characterized by redaction criticism. For present-day Jesus research the combination of narrative and history of Jesus must again be moved anew into the field of vision.

the activity of Jesus where they actually took place. In doing so, concrete circumstances of his activity are taken up, which then are admittedly made transparent for the time of writing. The disjunction Jerusalem–Galilee is therefore just as reductive as the disjunction of Jews and Gentiles. This dimension of the Markan Jesus narrative must be taken into account in order to interpret it as a *historical* narrative. [144]

4. The Gospels as historical Jesus narratives and the Jesus narrative as historical task

The starting point for the considerations set forth here was the observation that present-day research has rightly highlighted the historical character of the Jesus question. This leads to a different perspective on the Gospels in comparison to earlier phases. If these were often viewed in historical-critical Jesus research as faith witnesses, which at best possessed minor value for a historical presentation of Jesus' activity, then this judgment, which is first found in David Friedrich Strauss and has continued to have effects via Rudolf Bultmann into current Jesus research, is now receding into the background. The alternative, however, does not lie in returning to an unconsidered identification of narrative and reality, as was characteristic for the liberal Jesus research of the nineteenth century. Rather, central to current Jesus research is the methodology-of-history insight that *every* appropriation of the past rests on a combination of event and narrative. The enduringly valid insights into the fictional character of the Gospels, which were worked out by Strauss and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, do not then devaluate these as historical Jesus narratives. Rather, it becomes clear that they are narratives that are based on a *combination* of historical memory and myth, in which the events thus neither completely disappear behind the interpreting myth nor can they be regained as they once actually took place.[118] The insight into the character of history as presentation, which applies to presentations of history in general and in a specific way to the Gospels as ancient religious biographies that are based on Israelite-Jewish faith convictions, is therefore guiding in current Jesus research. Their relation to the underlying events must therefore be grasped by a methodology-of-history-informed concept of "recollection" that combines events and interpreting categories with one another—concretely the [145] events

[118] In a manner comparable to the approach presented here, Theissen 2000, 47–70; 1999, 21–40, speaks of a unity of history and myth in early Christianity that should not be dissolved in favor of one side. In contrast to Theissen, I would, however, speak of a unity of myth and *event* or *past*, since history always already presents a conception that is based on such a combination. In a comparable manner, Moxter 2002, 67–88, speaks of event and narrative and Goertz 2001, 53–82, following Foucault, of discourse and reality.

surrounding the person of Jesus and the religious convictions and expectations of Judaism.

An orientation of the historical Jesus question to the sayings tradition, which is then placed secondarily into a "temporal-historical framework" constructed independently from it, is therefore methodologically and historically unsatisfactory. This "pericope-model" developed by form criticism neglects the narrative profile of the evangelists by raising the expectation that one can distinguish between a "framework" and a "proclamation of Jesus" abstracted from it, whereby the information concerning location and time are regarded as secondary and historically fruitless. The sayings of Jesus, however, present—not in a different way than his healings, his establishment of a circle of followers, his appearance in the synagogues of Galilee, his journeys in the neighboring areas, and his conflicts with opponents—elements of his activity that took place in a certain time and in certain places, which were preserved in the Gospels. A historical presentation must therefore take these seriously, for they present the information upon whose foundation a picture of the person of Jesus is to be constructed. In this way it can then also be made historically plausible how the view that Jesus is the Anointed of God could arise, which avoids the thesis of a "non-messianic character" of the activity of Jesus, which has occasionally appeared in Jesus research since Wrede. The emergence of the Gospels as historical Jesus narratives based on this view [of Jesus' identity] becomes comprehensible in this way, so that they can be drawn upon as such for present-day presentations of the activity of Jesus.

The spotlights of the second part have shown in this sense that the Markan narrative represents the person of Jesus in such a way that the past is illuminated from a certain perspective in the process. There can be no doubt that this representation is not simply identical with the past. This is already made clear by the fact that the course of the narrative was designed by Mark himself, that many of the reported events are interpreted in the light of Old Testament-Jewish traditions, and finally that recourse is made to literary forms—for instance in the *chreiai* and the healing narratives—with the help of which paradigmatic scenes are set forth. On the other side, the examples given have shown that the Gospel of Mark presents a historical narrative that is based on a combination of event and narrative. A dissolving of this combination would have the consequence that the historical value of the narrative would no longer be perceived and this would be explained as a nonhistorical myth. Such a dissolving would also have the consequence that a Jesus presentation would be detached from the sources, [146] which would no longer be interpreted as historical witnesses but would be drawn upon for interpretations formed independently from them. If, however, *every* historical presentation presents a combination of event

and narrative, including the kind that is composed under the conditions of the historical-critical consciousness, then a present-day Jesus presentation also cannot simply disregard the narrative representations of the person of Jesus in the Gospels. Instead, it has to orient itself to them and put them together anew under today's conditions of knowledge. The result is not the "real" Jesus *behind* the Gospels. The result is a historical presentation that claims to be plausible under current conditions of knowledge.

The Unity of the Gospel

Reflections on the Christological Controversy of Galatians and Its History-of-Theology Background

1. Introduction

In his study "The Emergence of Christology"[1] Petr Pokorný comes, in the section on "the oldest faith-witnesses," to the conclusion that it is "scarcely possible to argue with the different confession-like statements for the existence of different early Christian Christologies that were contradictory. The firmly formed statements differ from one another through their different *Sitz im Leben*, but it is not a matter of theological alternatives." A little later this relationship between unity and diversity of the early Christian Christology is specified as follows: "What has been said does not mean that the Christian theology was uniform. It means only that the cause of the conflict was not differences in the forms of the christological statements but differences in the application and interpretation." As justification Pokorný points to the "difference between the Pauline interpretation (Rom 1.17) of the common gospel (Rom 1.3-4) and its application by Peter (Gal 2.11-14), by James (2.12), by the Hellenistic Jewish Christians in Antioch (Barnabas), and in the circle of Stephen," as well as later in Johannine and Pauline circles and by Apollos in Alexandria.[2]

To pursue these brief remarks in greater detail would be worthwhile not least because they lead to the trail of the "presuppositions of a theology of the New Testament" mentioned in the subtitle. According to Pokorný, a line leads from the emergence of the oldest faith witnesses via their different developments up to the formation of the canon. Pokorný's comments in the immediate context point to this: "Much later the commonalities made possible the formation of the Christian canon. It only came to a division when the new interpretations [148] effectively meant the denial of the existing faith statements."[3]

[1] Pokorný 1985.
[2] Pokorný 1985, 81.
[3] Pokorný 1985, 81.

In what follows I will single out a detail from this larger perspective.[4] We are interested in the distinction suggested by Pokorný between christological statements and their application in concrete situations, which I investigate here with reference to Galatians. That this epistle, on account of the controversy with Peter that is argued out by Paul in 2.11-21, is an important witness for the history of early Christian Christology is self-evident and is underlined by the above-quoted sentences of Pokorný that refer to it. One can even take the christological controversy of Galatians as the classic example for the difference between common faith conviction and respectively distinctive applications, for the disagreement between Paul and Cephas is not grounded in the christological confession itself but in the consequences that are to be drawn from it.

At present, an engagement with this question stands in the context of the discussion surrounding the so-called "New Perspective on Paul."[5] This approach, initially discussed especially in the Anglophone sphere, has in the meantime also received attention in German research.[6] The following points can be named as its most important insights: (1) Paul's thinking should not be understood as an answer to individual plights of conscience but has a salvation-historical orientation and revolves around the question of the status of the Gentiles in the people of God.[7] (2) The picture of Judaism as a religion of "works righteousness" is a negative foil for the interpretation of Pauline theology that in no way does justice to ancient Judaism and therefore also distorts the stance of Paul toward the Judaism of his time.[8] (3) Paul does not fundamentally polemicize against the doing of good works but criticizes Israel's appeal to [149] identity markers that demarcate it from other peoples and ground its status as the chosen people.[9]

Even if one can exercise criticism in relation to individual aspects and a more differentiated point of view is sometimes suggested,[10] it is an

[4] In the next chapter I will place this in the broader horizon of the discussion of the law in Galatians.

[5] As is well known, the expression comes from the programmatic article of Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," now reprinted in Dunn 2005b, 89–110 (initially 1983). In "The New Perspective: Whence, What and Whither?," Dunn 2005b, 1–88, provides an overview of the discussion surrounding his approach and also addresses objections. Concise, informative overviews of the (in itself quite varied) "New Perspective on Paul" are found in Wolter 2004b and Frey 2006, 35–42.

[6] Cf., e.g., Bachmann 2005.

[7] This viewpoint was asserted by Stendahl 1963, who is therefore rightly regarded as the first proponent of the new view of Paul.

[8] Sanders 1977 emphasized this aspect. Cf. also Sanders 1983.

[9] Dunn has pointed this out in numerous essays, some of which are collected in Dunn 2005b.

[10] This applies, e.g., to Sanders' view that Paul has fundamentally broken with the

indisputable merit of the "New Perspective on Paul" that it understands the thinking of Paul from his concrete historical circumstances. With this, the inaccurate negative picture of Judaism, against which Paul allegedly takes the field, has been corrected. As a result Paul himself is understood as a Jew, who even with his calling did not simply leave his Jewish identity behind him but rather wrestled for the rest of his life with the problem of the leveling out of the differences between Jews and Gentiles in light of the Christ event while simultaneously holding fast to the special position of Israel.[11] With this the New Perspective on Paul presents an analogy to the so-called "Third Quest" for the historical Jesus, which emerged at around the same time and to whose most outstanding characteristics belongs the fact that it understands Jesus from his Jewish context.

It is no accident that Galatians plays an important role in the New Perspective on Paul.[12] Paul is confronted here with the problem that competing missionaries have called into question his view that the Gentile mission did not require circumcision. In this situation Paul reaches back to fundamental statements on the agreement reached between himself and the Jerusalem apostles, the behavior of Cephas that followed, and the consequences that derive, in his view, from his calling and the Jerusalem agreement. In doing so, he explains first wherein the "gospel of Christ" (1.7) has its unswerving basis and makes clear secondly that this basis represents a common foundation between himself and the Jerusalem apostles, from which Cephas and Barnabas as well as the Galatian opponents have deviated in their own respective ways. In what follows our concern will be with this endeavor for the *unity of the gospel*. As we shall see, the formulation in Galatians 1.6-7 plays a decisive role here. [150]

When Paul, following his portrayal of the meeting with Cephas in Antioch (Gal 2.11-14), transitions to the christological argument, he begins with the distinction between "us Jews" (thus Peter, Barnabas, and Paul himself, as well as other Jewish Christians) and the "sinners from the Gentiles" (2.15), in order to then anchor the shared conviction of the Jewish Christians[13] in the opposition between righteousness ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and

---

"Jewish religion" or Dunn's thesis that Paul's criticism of the law is to be interpreted in the first place sociologically. A wide-ranging discussion has developed since then around these (and additional) aspects.

[11] Cf. on the one hand Gal 3.28; 1 Cor 12.13; and on the other hand Rom 3.1-8; 9.1-5; 11.11-32.

[12] Dunn develops his view starting from Gal 2.16. Cf. Dunn 2005b, 95ff. A number of additional contributions by Dunn and others on the new perspective on Paul also deal with Galatians.

[13] That it is these who are spoken of follows from the εἰδότες, which is then continued by the ἐπιστεύσαμεν. The twice emphasized καί (καὶ ἡμεῖς and καὶ αὐτοί) in vv. 16-17 thereby stresses the fact that *even Jews* such as Paul, Cephas, and Barnabas have come

διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus, the point of contention (at least for him) does not yet lie at this point,[14] but rather—as the continuation shows—in the question concerning which consequences are to be drawn from it.[15]

Starting from here the question arises of how the relationship between shared basic conviction and different consequences relates to the overall christological argument of the letter. This is often described so that Paul denies the legitimacy of the proclamation of the opponents who appear in the letter and only grants validity to his own position as εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1.7). From there the accusation against Cephas also finds its explanation: his "hypocrisy" (2.13) and that of the other Jew(i)s(h) (Christians), which is condemned by Paul as deviating from the "truth of the gospel" (2.14), does not do justice to the principle of justification by faith alone without works of the law that is formulated in 2.16 and instead reactivates the separation of Jews and Gentiles that has been overcome in Christ.

An important role here is played by the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον mentioned in 1.6, which is characterized further in what follows through ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο. With this expression, Paul makes clear, thus a frequently encountered view, that there could not be another gospel alongside his;[16] therefore both the Galatian [151] opponents and Jewish Christians such as Cephas must accept the accusation that they preach a gospel that is in truth no gospel.

This reconstruction of the Pauline argument, however, falls short of the mark, as is now to be shown. For this we begin with an analysis of verses 1.6, 7. Despite the consensus of recent scholarship,[17] the interpretation just mentioned is by no means certain. It is undoubtedly accurate that Paul denies the legitimacy of his opponents' message. The intention of the sentence, however, is not adequately described thereby. Paul formulates here a statement about the unity of the Gentile Christian gospel proclaimed by him and the gospel that is to be made known to Jews. It is first on this basis that the activity of his opponents becomes manifest as a deviation from the gospel of Christ.

---

to the realization that apart from Christ no righteousness can be attained, thus that prior to their conversion they too, just as the Gentiles, were to be judged as sinners that needed to be justified in Christ. Thus, the double emphasizing καί takes up the ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι from v. 15 and develops it further. On this cf. also chap. 8, §1.1.

[14] Cf. Burchard 1996, 406–7, 409, and more recently Böttrich 2002, 235.

[15] It can remain open whether Paul cites a recognized principle in 2.16 or formulates ad hoc. He starts from the assumption, in any case, that the sentence represents a shared basis that Cephas also cannot really contradict, even if he would perhaps not have expressed it in such a pointed manner.

[16] Cf. for instance Grässer 1969; Mussner 1988, 55–59.

[17] This consensus did not always exist. Ramsay 1899 and Zahn 1922 [1905] advocated a view that deviated from the one that prevails today, which since then has largely fallen into oblivion—wrongly, as we shall see.

There are also additional indications. It is conspicuous that in Galatians Paul often speaks of *a specific form* of the gospel. It is therefore no accident that Hans Dieter Betz already judged that a "strange disagreement" exists between the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ and the distinction between εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας and τῆς περιτομῆς in 2.7.[18] The question of how the double form of the εὐαγγέλιον mentioned there is to be placed in relation to its unity emphasized in 1.6-7 is, as Betz rightly stressed, of decisive importance for understanding the position advocated by Paul. Finally, in chapter 3 Paul grounds the Gentile Christians' status as children of Abraham on the one hand and speaks on the other hand of the redemption from the curse of the law, which can scarcely apply to former Gentiles but rather describes the liberation of Jewish Christians through Christ. This too must be taken into account for the question of the controversy that lies behind the letter. These various aspects have their common center in the specific strategy of argumentation in Galatians, which has its basis in the conviction of the one gospel in twofold form.

In order to expound this, we begin with the interpretation problem of verses 1.6-7 (§2), then place this in the broader context of the letter (§3), and finally, formulate a conclusion that follows from this with regard to the unity of the gospel for Jews and Gentiles (§4). We shall see that an opposition between the truth of the gospel on the side of Paul and its distortion by his [152] rivals does not adequately grasp the christological perspective developed in Galatians. This is in no way to suggest—I must stress this point in order to oppose corresponding objections from the outset[19]—that Paul would make concessions to his opponents! Rather, what is decisive is the way in which he expounds his view of the gospel of Christ.

2. On the interpretation of Galatians 1.6-7

Immediately after the prescript, Paul turns to the Galatians with the accusation that they would turn away from the one who called them (μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς). It thereby becomes clear that he regards the behavior of the Galatians as surrendering their belonging to the community of Abraham and Christ for which they were chosen as Gentiles by God.[20] If they were evidently prepared to follow the demands of Paul's rivals and

[18] Betz 1979, 49. Cf. Martyn 1997a, 110: "A significant problem emerges when he seems at a later point to speak in fact of two gospels (2.7)."

[19] Cf. n. 52 below.

[20] The argumentation in 3.6-29 comes down then to this: the Galatians are as Gentiles just as much heirs of the Abraham promise fulfilled in Christ as the Jews are. With this the distinction between Jews and Gentiles, which time and again plays a role in chapters 1–4, is nullified.

implement the integration into Judaism through circumcision as a seal of their belonging to Christ, then Paul conversely regards this as betraying their calling, which would amount to a relapse into their pagan past.[21]

The turning away from God corresponds to the turning εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, which is explained further through the relative sentence ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο. Finally, this process of change from the position of their calling to another gospel,[22] is caused, as the conditional sentence εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ indicates, by people who are seeking to lead the Galatians away again from their already-reached faith position.[23] [153]

The sentence formulated by Paul in 1.6-7 with which he describes this situation contains a number of problems of interpretation. As we shall see more clearly, the understanding of the christological controversy of the letter depends not least on how these problems are resolved. In what follows I will therefore clarify (1) the reference of the relative pronoun, (2) the semantic relationship between ἕτερος and ἄλλος, and (3) the interpretation of the conditional sentence εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν κτλ.

(1) With regard to the relative pronoun, three syntactical references are possible: the ὃ can refer (1) to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, (2) only to εὐαγγέλιον, or (3) to the entire process described with the ὅτι-sentence of the μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ . . . εἰς.[24] Grammatically, the first option is suggested since the relative pronoun can best be understood as taking up the composite expression and not only a part of it or the whole preceding sentence. It is therefore also favored by the overwhelming majority of interpreters. The second possibility was advocated in the ancient church and in medieval interpretation (e.g., by John Chrysostom, Martin Luther, and Theodor Beza), and subsequently by Johann Albrecht Bengel, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, and Adolf Hilgenfeld.[25] It is, however, less probable than the first

[21] For this reason he parallels the enslavement of the Jews under the law (3.10-14) and that of the Gentiles under the idols (4.8) as special cases, which have been overcome in Christ, of the existence under the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4.3, 8).

[22] μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ . . . εἰς or ἐπί denotes the change from one conviction to another. Cf. *Mart. Pol.* 11.1: καλὸν δὲ μετατίθεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν χαλεπῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δίκαια. In Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 7.37, Dionysius is designated as μεταθέμενος because he as a student of Zeno relocates the goal of philosophy to lust (ἡδονή).

[23] That the Galatians, according to the view of Paul, were already in the "correct" position of faith is clear through both the aorist καλέσας and through the μετατίθεσθε.

[24] The various possibilities are discussed by Sieffert 1899, 43–44; Burton 1964 [1921], 22–24; Zahn 1922 [1905], 46–47. Subsequently, they are occasionally still mentioned (thus in Oepke 1984, 49; Schlier 1965, 38 n. 1; Betz 1979, 49 n. 60; Mussner 1988, 56); they have completely disappeared from the more recent commentaries (so, e.g., in Martyn 1997a; Vouga 1998; Longenecker 1990).

[25] Cf. Sieffert 1899, 43.

possibility, since in this case Paul would pass directly from the mention of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον of the opponents to a description of the "true gospel" without taking up the ἕτερον again. The following conditional sentence can also be better integrated when the relative pronoun refers to the entire expression ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον. Nevertheless, it is rightly seen in this view that with this expression Paul actually speaks of another form of the gospel that differs from his own.

The third possibility was advocated in the commentaries of Hugo Grotius and Heinrich Rückert and also lies behind the translation of the Zürcher Bible: "Which [however] comes down to nothing other . . ." In this case the relative sentence would refer to the ὅτι sentence dependent upon θαυμάζω, which has the behavior of the Galatians as its content, whereas Paul would first deal with the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον and its difference to the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ in the following εἰ μή sentence. This [154] interpretation is more conceivable but is ultimately also unlikely. One would expect first the relative ἅ or ἅτινα and secondly a formulation such as οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἔστιν or alternatively a τοῦτο γάρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο κτλ. Also the εἰ μή construction would have to be introduced in this case by a ὅτι. In addition, it is more plausible to assume that Paul prepares here his view of the one gospel that is then unpacked in greater detail in 2.11-21, for which reason the reference of the relative pronoun to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is also more likely. Finally, the suggested relationship between ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ also speaks for this interpretation.

The reference of the relative pronoun to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is therefore the most likely possibility and is assumed in what follows.

(2) It is also necessary to discuss the conspicuous juxtaposition of ἕτερος and ἄλλος. The relationship of the two terms can again be specified in three different ways.

In the first view, which is mostly advocated today, the two terms are understood as synonyms: Paul hypothetically acknowledges the existence of another εὐαγγέλιον alongside his own in order to immediately take it back again, since there can be—numerically and qualitatively—only one single gospel. The ἄλλο is understood here as a pleonasm that helps to correct what was previously said in verse 7, and it is now denied that the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is εὐαγγέλιον at all. The formulation would then have to be understood as "another gospel, which in reality does not exist at all" or "which is in truth no gospel at all."[26] In this interpretation the following

[26] Thus the translations in most German-language commentaries. Martyn 1997a, 106, goes in this same direction: "not that there really is another gospel." Against this Dunn 1993, 38 with n. 2, wishes to give expression to the presence of two Greek terms in his translation: "another gospel . . . which is not an other . . ."

sentence introduced by εἰ μή should be understood as the positive side of an alternative "there is no . . . but only." In terms of content, this interpretation amounts to having Paul already make clear at the beginning of the letter that there is only one form of the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ—namely the one advocated by Paul himself. By contrast, with the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον the message of the opponents is characterized, which is not gospel but confusion. As philological justification it is pointed out that ἕτερος and ἄλλος are no longer strictly distinguished in Koine Greek but are effectively used synonymously. This corresponds with the view that is also mentioned in standard theological lexica and grammars in relation to this passage.[27] [155] Therefore, so one often reads, the relative sentence can also be translated in the aforementioned way—although, as Brigitte Kahl has already rightly pointed out, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο does not, strictly speaking, mean "which does not exist" but "which is not different."[28]

If one understands the terms in Galatians 1.6-7 as synonyms, then the opposition between the calling by God and the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον can be easily explained. However, other difficulties arise through this. An initial problem is that the ἄλλο becomes superfluous in this interpretation and must therefore be explained as a pleonastic form of expression.[29] This is, however, by no means the most obvious explanation for the juxtaposition of the two terms. If Paul were really concerned with a principle disputation of the legitimacy of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον as εὐαγγέλιον he would have left out the ἄλλο or alternatively formulated ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν εὐαγγέλιον. With the ἄλλο, however, it is not the *existence* but the *differentness* of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον that is contested.

It speaks further against the aforementioned interpretation that ἕτερος and ἄλλος stand in syntactical opposition to each other here. If one interprets them as synonyms, then one must start from the assumption that Paul

[27] Cf. Büchsel 1933 (*TWNT*); 1964 (*TDNT*); Beyer 1935 (*TWNT*); 1964 (*TDNT*); K. Weiss 1992 (*EWNT*); 1990 (*EDNT*); Blass/Debrunner 2001 (= BDR), §306.4 with n. 8; Bauer 1988, ἕτερος. In the third edition of the English language version of this dictionary attended to by Danker (Danker 2000) there is reference, however, to other possibilities of interpretation with reference to Moulton/Milligan 1997 (on this see further below). With regard to the conditional sentence, reference is made in BDR to the Latin *nihil aliud nisi* as an analogy—which indeed represents a correspondence to οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μή, but not in the translation given there, namely "which does not at all exist, except that."

[28] Kahl 1998, 605: "In the Greek text it does not at all say that the 'other gospel' does not exist. But there it literally says that it 'is not a different (one).' The translation of the relative sentence ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο' in 1.7 is completely uncomplicated grammatically. Theologically, however, what is said is evidently so unthinkable that as a rule the commentaries impute a *lapsus linguae* to Paul."

[29] Cf., e.g., Mussner 1988, 57: "ἄλλο is therefore actually superfluous in the relative sentence and appears to only be pleonastic in order to be able to better introduce the following εἰ μή sentence." Schlier 1965, 38 n. 1, is similar.

first designates the message of the opponents as gospel in order to immediately take this back again afterwards with a formulation that is at any rate not unambiguous.[30] A different interpretation, however, is suggested by the syntactical findings. [156]

Finally, a third problem is that the evidence drawn upon as examples for the synonymous meaning of ἕτερος and ἄλλος is only suitable to a limited extent for the interpretation of the sentence in question. That the fields of meaning of the two terms should not be sharply separated from one another is no more in question than the fact that they can be used in Koine Greek as referential synonyms.[31] This interchangeable use is shown by the textual variants in which one term can replace the other,[32] as well as by those passages in which they are juxtaposed in the immediate context or in lists and thus express the same content in varying ways. This is also found in Paul himself, who uses the terms synonymously in 1 Corinthians 12.8-10 and 15.39-41, and probably also in 2 Corinthians 11.4.[33] In these cases the particular characteristic features of meaning of ἕτερος and ἄλλος are ignored.

However, the exchangeability of ἕτερος and ἄλλος, even if it occurs in Paul himself, does not yet prove that the meaning-specific characteristics of the terms were lost, thus that one is to start not merely from a referential but also from a lexical synonymity.[34] This is already shown by the fact that ἕτερος is replaced by an ordinal number in some New Testament textual variants,[35] whereas this never takes place with ἄλλος. In these cases

[30] This difficulty was felt clearly by Rohde 1989, 41: "Possibly Paul himself immediately felt that a problematic formulation had escaped him . . . Two ideas were thus joined together here: on the one hand the [156] preaching of the opponents is no gospel and on the other hand there is no gospel except the one which Paul preached." Whether Paul wanted to bring this to expression here is certainly to be questioned.

[31] With regard to the New Testament usage, this is shown by the concise overview of Elliot 1969. It is, of course, problematic when this article is cited as evidence for the synonymity of the two terms in Gal 1.6-7, as sometimes occurs. Elliot deals with this passage in only a sentence: "Similarly, commentators on the importance of ἕτερον at Gal 1.6 (no v. l.) cannot argue from the word that a definite alternative Gospel was in the author's mind." The relationship of the two terms in Gal 1.6-7 is not specified with this remark, let alone in the sense that is most commonly encountered today, of a denial of the existence of another gospel.

[32] Thus, e.g., in Matt 10.23; 16.14; Luke 3.18; 10.1; 14.20; 16.18, and frequently.

[33] 1 Cor 12.8-10: ᾧ μὲν . . . λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλῳ δὲ λόγος γνώσεως . . . ἑτέρῳ πίστις . . . ; 1 Cor 15.39-41: ἄλλη μὲν . . . ἄλλη δὲ . . . ἑτέρα μὲν . . . ἑτέρα δὲ . . . ἄλλη . . . καὶ ἄλλη; 2 Cor 11.4: ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν . . . ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον . . . ἢ εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον.

[34] Cf. Barrett 1973, 275: "That Paul could distinguish between *other* and *different* is shown by Gal. i. 6 f.; it does not however appear that he does so here [sc.: in II Cor xi. 4, J. S.]."

[35] Matt 21.30: δευτέρῳ for ἑτέρῳ in ℵ² B C² L Z and others; Luke 14.19-20: δεύτερος or τρίτος for ἕτερος in 1675; Luke 16.7: δευτέρῳ for ἑτέρῳ in 157. Cf. Elliot 1969, 140.

ἕτερος thus has the meaning "another one, an additional one." While this could also be expressed in other passages through ἄλλος [157], this does not mean that the lexical meaning of ἄλλος has thereby become identical with that of ἕτερος. Especially when the two terms, as in Galatians 1.6-7, are juxtaposed outside of a list in order to express different matters one cannot assume a synonymity. Rather, only an analysis of the concrete use can give information about the actualized characteristic features of meaning in these cases.

With regard to the sentence in question, one should start from the syntactical observation that ἕτερος is negated through ἄλλος. This speaks against assuming a synonymous relation or *de facto* replacing ἄλλο through εὐαγγέλιον in the interpretation. That in this case the semantic difference is instead to be taken seriously has indeed been established by a few interpreters who therefore advocate the second possibility of interpretation that is to be mentioned here.

A difference in meaning was first noted in the English language sphere by John B. Lightfoot and specified so that ἕτερος serves for differentiation and ἄλλος, by contrast, for enumeration.[36] Subsequently Friedrich Sieffert,[37] Ernest de Witt Burton,[38] and following him Richard N. Longenecker[39] made statements in this same direction. In the German-language sphere Klaus Haacker advocated this position in the article on ἕτερος in *EWNT/EDNT*.[40] In this interpretation it is initially emphasized correctly that the two terms are to be distinguished semantically in their use in Galatians 1.6-7. This difference is then defined in such a way that ἄλλος is to be specified as additive and ἕτερος, by contrast, as adversative. According to this view, Paul would be arguing that the message of the opponents is different (ἕτερον) from his in terms of content and therefore cannot represent an additional, supplementing form of the gospel proclamation (οὐκ ἄλλο).

The decisive problem of this view is that it specifies the lexical meaning of the two terms in diametrical opposition to the semantic difference that can be established between them. This says that ἕτερος originally belonged to the dual pronouns through which the other/corresponding of two things

[36] Lightfoot 1887, 76: "thus ἄλλος adds, while ἕτερος distinguishes."

[37] Sieffert 1899, 44: "In opposition to ἕτερος, different in kind, ἄλλο is thus here another in terms of number."

[38] Burton 1921, 421: ". . . in so far as here is a distinction between the words ἄλλο is enumerative and ἕτερος differentiative."

[39] Longenecker 1990, 15: "Generally speaking, ἕτερον [*sic*] and ἄλλος are synonyms, with both words, usually denoting an enumerative sense ('an additional one') rather than a differentiative sense ('another of a different kind') . . . Yet here in context there seems little doubt that he means to suggest a qualitative difference, with ἕτερος signaling 'another of a different kind' and ἄλλος 'another of the same kind.' "

[40] Haacker 1992; 1991; similarly Windisch 1924, 327.

[158] is expressed (corresponding with the Latin *alter*);[41] this dual meaning, however, wore off in the later usage.[42] ἄλλος is distinguished from this by the fact that with it the difference in kind is definitely expressed (in correspondence to the Latin *alius*); thus "anotherness" is only one possibility of expression, which is based on the neglect of the difference to ἕτερος.[43]

The difference between the two words consists accordingly in the fact that ἕτερος is a relational, comparative term, whereas ἄλλος is an absolute term for the designation of difference in kind. Thus, the specific problem of the interpretation of Galatians 1.6-7 is how the meaning of the two terms is to be specified against this background within the syntactical construction found there. The fact that they are placed in opposition to each other makes it appear improbable that their meaning-specific characteristic features are to be neglected. It is even more improbable that these have been changed into their opposite.[44]

The [159] objection of William M. Ramsay against Lightfoot,[45] which has evidently remained unnoticed in the German-language sphere, therefore leads to the trail of the correct semantic interpretation of the findings. Ramsay emphasized the fact that while both terms can take on the meaning "different," this does not answer the question of which of the two expresses

[41] Cf. Pape 1954, ἕτερος: "1) one of a pair, one of two . . . especially of things appearing in a pair . . . 2) as already in the listing of multiple things ἕτερος means the second, so with this it also becomes one taken from a larger mass and set against another so that a duality simultaneously enters in again . . . therefore it also corresponds to ἄλλος and becomes more undetermined without the addition of τις."

[42] Cf. Mayser 1934, 88: "ἕτερος belongs to the few dual pronouns that survived until late in the Hellenistic period (alongside ἀμφότεροι, ἑκάτερος, μηδέτερος, ὁπότερος). However, it has almost completely lost the meaning of the duality and hardly distinguishes itself any longer from ἄλλος." "One or the other of two" is also given as the first meaning for ἕτερος in Liddell/Scott 1992. This meaning has found expression in terms such as οἱ ἕτεροι (the opposition party = the enemies), ἑτερόφθαλμος (one-eyed) or ἑτέρωθι (on the other side).

[43] The evidence mentioned by Burton from the LXX and the NT, with which he wishes to show that ἄλλος has enumerative and ἕτερος differentiative meaning, only documents, by contrast, the fact that the meanings of the two terms, *when they appear individually*, could converge toward each other. That their meaning specific characteristic features are to be specified in the way that Burton claims does not, however, follow from this evidence.

[44] The findings presented in Moulton/Milligan 1997 [1930], ἕτερος, also point to this: "ἕτερος and ἀμφότεροι are claimed by Blass . . . as the only surviving words in the Hellenistic age which denote *duality* as distinct from plurality, and abundant evidence can be cited from the Κοινή of the correct use of ἕτερος in this sense." A number of examples from papyri follow, which document the use of ἕτερος in a dual meaning for Koine Greek.

[45] Ramsay 1899, 260–66. Cf. also Moulton/Milligan 1997, ἕτερος. There a short presentation of the positions of Lightfoot and Ramsay is found at the end of the article on ἕτερος, which supports the view of Ramsay on the basis of the previously cited material.

the higher degree of difference when they are placed in syntactical opposition to each other.[46] According to Ramsay, the findings present themselves in this case exactly the other way around from what was assumed by Lightfoot.[47] This follows from a consideration of those uses in which the meaning-specific characteristics of both terms come to expression.[48]

In the German-language sphere, Theodor Zahn submitted an interpretation that does justice to the findings that have been presented. According to his view, the opponents proclaimed in the Galatian communities another gospel that replaced the proclamation of Paul, which Paul then opposed with the argument that what they had to proclaim as legitimate gospel did not deviate from his, whereas everything else is no gospel.[49] Zahn thus observes very precisely the semantic difference between ἕτερος and ἄλλος when he distinguishes between an *additional* gospel and the question of its *difference in kind.*

As far as I can see, among recent interpretations a correct semantic description of the findings is found—besides the already mentioned statement of Brigitte Kahl on the relative sentence in 1.7[50]—only with François Vouga. He writes, "unlike Gal 1.19, but as in 2 Cor 11.4, ἕτερος and ἄλλος are precisely distinguished: the alternative message (*alter*), to which the Galatians turn cannot be gospel because there [160] cannot be a different (*alius*) gospel at all."[51] According to Vouga one thus cannot simply start in the case of the present construction, in contrast to other cases, from the assumption that Paul uses ἕτερος and ἄλλος synonymously. Rather, with the two expressions he associates their respectively distinctive aspects. Despite this accurate appraisal, Vouga also does not come to a different solution from the previously mentioned suggestions when he concludes that with the relative sentence Paul would contest the *existence* of the εὐαγγέλιον

[46] Ramsay 1899, 262: "But the point is: When ἕτερος and ἄλλος are pointedly contrasted with one another, which of the two indicates the greater degree of difference?"

[47] Ramsay 1899, 262: "On the contrary, the truth is precisely the opposite. When the two words are pointedly contrasted with one another, ἕτερος means 'a second' 'another of the same kind' 'new' (e.g., 'a new king succeeds in regular course to the throne'), while ἄλλος implies difference of kind."

[48] A significant example is the example from Plato, *Prot.* 330A–B, which is cited by Ramsay 1899, 263. The question whether the individual parts of virtue relate to one another as different parts of gold reads οὐδεν διαφέρει τὰ ἕτερα τῶν ἑτέρων, whereas the respectively specific features through which they differ from one another is formulated as ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτωῖ ἐστιν . . . ἄλλο, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο.

[49] Zahn 1922 [1905], 48: "as long as the Judaists preach gospel, this is nothing else than what Paul preached, and as long as they teach something else than he did, this is not gospel."

[50] See n. 28 above.

[51] Vouga 1998, 22. Whether this semantic difference is also to be accepted for 2 Cor 11.4, as Vouga assumes, can be left open here.

proclaimed by the opponents. He can, however, only get this into the interpretation through the addition of a causal sentence that is not in the text—"because a different (*alius*) gospel cannot exist at all." Paul, however, does not say that a different (*aliud*) gospel could not exist but that the alternative (*alterum*) gospel is not a different one (*aliud*)! For this reason, the point of his argument has to be specified somewhat differently.

Through the syntactically imprecise specification of ἕτερος and ἄλλος, the focus of the Pauline sentence is thus displaced, as it also is through the semantically inaccurate assumption that ἕτερος expresses a qualitative and ἄλλος, by contrast, an enumerative difference. Rather, these positions are already directed by the assumption that in Galatians Paul would fundamentally dispute the existence of another gospel. By contrast, the interpretations of Ramsay and Zahn as well as the statements of Kahl and Vouga lead to the right interpretation, which also allows the point of the Pauline argument to appear somewhat different. First, it is rightly emphasized in these interpretations that with ἕτερος, when it stands in opposition to ἄλλος, it is not a greater degree in difference that is expressed but an enumerative sense; secondly, it is pointed out that ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο can hardly be interpreted as a negation of the existence of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον.

Thus Paul's concern in Galatians 1.6 is not to dispute the existence of a second form of the εὐαγγέλιον. Rather, he grants that there is such an additional form of the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον (a ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον) alongside his own. This is not, of course, to be understood in the sense of a concession to his rivals![52] Instead, it follows from [161] verse 7 that it is only through the distortion of the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ that the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον becomes an ἄλλο εὐαγγέλιον, the following of which represents a turning from God.

(3) This interpretation leads to the third question to be addressed here, namely the interpretation of the conditional sentence. In the interpretation just presented, this fits in such a way that Paul now expresses that the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, which is in truth not a different one (ἄλλο) at all, is first made

[52] In an article on the argumentation strategy of Galatians, Sänger 2002, 388 n. 52, attempted to refute my interpretation—which was suggested in the article mentioned (cf. below chap. 8) but not further grounded there—by designating the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον as "no equally valid variant," since it stands in competition to the εὐαγγέλιον proclaimed by Paul himself. This criticism rests on a complete misunderstanding of my argument and therefore comes to nothing. No one is claiming that Paul would characterize the proclamation of his opponents as an equally valid alternative. Moreover, my position is completely misinterpreted with the sentence "against the view advocated by the majority [161] J. Schröter interprets the relative sentence ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο as a positive concession . . ." Rather the question is *with which arguments* does Paul reject the position of the opponents?! In relation to this question Sänger's article does not offer any insights that advance the discussion.

into such by his opponents. The distortion of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is thus the exception from the οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο because it is now made into a form of the proclamation that deviates from the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus, by disputing the unity of the gospel, the opponents distort the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. With this last-named expression, Paul characterizes the "true gospel" as the legitimate message of Christ, which thus presents the standard by which every form of its proclamation must be allow itself to be measured. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is accordingly the decisive qualification of the εὐαγγέλιον, which the opponents misconstrue by deriving a fundamental difference in content from the different forms in which it can manifest itself. Paul, by contrast, maintains that despite the different forms in which the gospel takes place in the proclamation there is no doubt concerning its fundamental unity. By disputing this unity, the opponents abandon the fellowship in Christ opened up through the calling ἐν χάριτι by God and even attempt to convince others to follow them in this.

A paraphrase of the analyzed sentence thus reads: "I am amazed that you are so quickly turning from the one who called you in the grace of Christ to another gospel. This would not at all stand in contradiction to the one that I proclaimed to you if certain people would not confuse you and distort the gospel of Christ."

As the result of this section the following can thus be maintained: the argument of Paul in Galatians 1.6-7 is that his opponents wrongly claim that there is another (ἕτερον, *alter*) legitimate form of the gospel that is materially different (ἄλλο, *alius*) from his own. With this he does not fundamentally deny that there is another form [162] of gospel proclamation *altogether*. It is decisive, however, that this other gospel (ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον) stands on the same basis as his own. Thus the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον may not be an ἄλλο εὐαγγέλιον because it would then no longer be εὐαγγέλιον. The contestation of this unity of the gospel makes the alternative form of its proclamation a distortion of the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ and thus misleads the Galatians to turn away from God. Thus, Paul is concerned to emphasize the unity of the *one gospel in two forms*. What this unity consists in will be investigated in the next section.

3. The one gospel in two forms

The point of Galatians 1.6-7 is that in addition to the form of the gospel proclaimed by Paul there is a second form of the gospel that does not stand in contradiction to his. Thus, the accusation against the opponents—and the Galatians who follow them—is that they abandon the unity of the gospel by failing to recognize the respectively specific forms in which the gospel takes shape, thus abandoning the calling through God and distorting the gospel of Christ. Wherein the concern lies with the respectively

specific forms into which the gospel takes shape is defined more precisely in the subsequent course of the letter. I will present this first with reference to a few formulations in 1.10–2.21 and then with a consideration of 3.10-14.

When Paul comes to speak of the εὐαγγέλιον again in 1.11, he elucidates it further through the expression τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. As the syntactical context shows, this is not an introduction of a statement about the content of the gospel (as in 1 Cor 15.1-2) nor a reminiscence of his initial proclamation to the Galatian communities but a statement about the origin of his gospel: this was not bestowed upon Paul through human instruction but through a revelation of Jesus Christ.[53] The concern then is with the specific way in which the gospel that Paul brought to the Galatian communities was delivered to Paul himself. When he emphasizes its divine origin, then this aims at the legitimation of his proclamation: the gospel proclaimed by him has its origin in God himself, for which reason its truth as well as the integrity of its herald stands beyond question. [163]

Thus, with the statement in 1.12 Paul introduces his remarks about a specific form of the gospel, namely the one made known to him through an ἀποκάλυψις from God. This is materially filled in 1.16: the content of the revelation to Paul is the Son of God and the task of making him known ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. The concern is again with a statement that refers to a specific manner of the revelation of the gospel through God and to its proclamation among human beings: the gospel of Paul is characterized by the fact that the Son of God is proclaimed among the Gentiles. A characteristic feature that catches one's eye and becomes more important for the qualification of the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ in terms of content is the conspicuous emphasis on the contrast between the exceptional zeal for the Jewish traditions and the persecution of the community of God by the "pre-Christian" Paul on the one hand and the proclamation of the gospel among the Gentiles on the other hand. This points ahead to 2.15-16 where Paul will invoke the new self-understanding that results from the gospel as a general conviction that is also shared by Cephas and the other Jewish Christians.

The term Ἰουδαϊσμός—which is only used by Paul at this point (and also not found otherwise in early Christianity prior to Ignatius), supplemented in 2.14 through the expressions Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν and ἰουδαΐζειν, which belong to the same word-field—points to a direction of thought that interpreted the identity markers of Judaism as exclusive and as demarcating the Jewish people from other peoples.[54] If even Paul, as a Jew belonging

[53] With Mussner 1988, 68, and elsewhere, the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be read in the context with 1.16 and understood as an objective genitive (contrast e.g., Vouga 1998, 28).

[54] This is documented by the use of this terminology in Jewish writings. On ἰουδαΐζειν cf. Esth 8.17 LXX (περιετέμοντο καὶ ἰουδαίζον); Theodotus, frag. 4 (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.4-6: περιτεμνομένους ἰουδαΐσαι); Josephus, *B.J.* 2.454 (μέχρι περιτομῆς ἰουδαΐσειν),

to this view, was called by God to be the missionary to the Gentiles, then it is exceedingly clear that the confession to Jesus Christ means at the same time a nullification of the separation of Jews and Gentiles. The gospel entrusted to Paul by God is thus simultaneously prefigured thematically.

The fact, which is thus emphasized, of a specific form of the proclamation of the gospel—its making known among the Gentiles, which simultaneously contains a reformulation of the relationship to the Jewish traditions[55]—ultimately leads to the juxtaposition of two forms of the gospel in the report about the meeting with the [164] Jerusalem authorities. According to Galatians 2.2, Paul goes to Jerusalem in order to report about "his" gospel. As already in 1.12, the more precise description as εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν also appears here. That there is, alongside this, yet a second way in which the gospel takes place is shown by the fact that that according to 2.7-9 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας and τῆς περιτομῆς are recognized by all the apostles as equally valid forms of the one gospel. The gospel of Paul is thus not a second, competing proclamation. Rather, it is found to be in material agreement with the gospel proclaimed by the Jerusalem apostles and is therefore accepted by them without reservation. In its concrete form it is, of course, a manner of the manifestation of the one gospel that differs from their form of the proclamation.

Thus, the remarks of Paul about "his" gospel make clear that the concern here is with a *specific form* of the proclamation of the Son of God that makes this one known *among the Gentiles.* Through his autobiographical report Paul then explains that this form of the gospel is authorized by God himself and therefore stands as equally valid alongside the form represented by Peter[56] and the rest of the Jerusalem apostles. From this it follows that the twofold form in which the one gospel is proclaimed, which already surfaced in 1.6-7 in the mention of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον that stands alongside his own, refers to its taking form among Jews and Gentiles. Therefore,

---

cf. also 463; on Ἰουδαϊσμός see 2 Macc 2.21; 8.1; 14.38; 4 Macc 4.26 as well as the synagogue inscription from Stobi (on this: Lietzmann 1933, 93–95; Hengel 1996 [1966], esp. 122–23). If Jewish and Gentile identity are set over against each other here, then Ignatius confronts Ἰουδαϊσμός and Χριστιανισμός with each other in a similar manner. Cf. Ignatius, *Magn.* 10.3 (cf. 8.1); *Phld.* 6.1.

[55] Cf. Dunn 1999b.

[56] The puzzling use of this name in distinction to Cephas, which otherwise always occurs in Paul (so already again in 2.9, 11) has led to the supposition that Paul cites here from a decree agreed upon in Jerusalem (so first Dinkler 1967, 279 [originally 1953/1955]); then also Cullmann 1954, 100 n. 6; 1968). The hypothesis has often met with opposition and is, of course, ultimately not able to be proven (for discussion cf. Wehr 1996). The supposition that Paul introduces here a quotation that is, in a sense, "official"—or gives his formulation an official air himself—definitely has in its favor the fact that the concern is with a formal presentation of the agreement about the ways of making the gospel known.

the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς mentioned in 2.7 also cannot be the proclamation of his opponents in the Galatian communities,[57] but it is the form of the gospel that is directed to the Jews, which is, however, falsified by his opponents. [165]

The line of argument that is central for the position of Paul in the christological controversy of Galatians emerges more clearly when he refers to the behavior of Peter in 2.15-16. When he starts with the distinction between Jews on the one hand and sinners from the Gentiles on the other hand and then claims a realization for the Christ-believing Jews that places them *de facto* on the same level with the Gentiles, then this continues his argument that has been worked out to this point:[58] Paul has explained that the proclamation of the Son of God to the Gentiles is a manner of the spread of the gospel initiated by God himself. This leads him to the christological—in its consequences then also ecclesiological—insight of the nullification of the separation between Jews and Gentiles in the Christ community. In 2.15-16 this fact is described as a process of realization from a Jewish Christian perspective: not only Paul but Jewish Christians altogether[59] have realized that only faith in Christ leads to righteousness; consequently they themselves are also found to be sinners in Christ.[60] Thus the foundation of the fellowship of Jews and Gentiles in Christ in terms of content consists in the fact that their common past as sinners also places them on equal footing as partners in the Christ community.

[57] The formulation of Dunn 1993, 42, in this connection is therefore misleading. In relation to Galatians 1.6 Dunn writes: "It is not immediately apparent how this 'gospel' relates to 'the gospel of the circumcision' (ii.7): either it was the same . . . or the incoming missionaries in Galatia represented a more traditional understanding of the gospel, a more strongly 'judaized' version of the gospel agreed at Jerusalem . . ." If with the "gospel" of the opponents we were dealing with the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς from 2.7, then the emphasis on the fact that his own gospel was recognized as equally valid in relation to this would not only be counterproductive for the argumentation of Paul but would be absolutely destructive.

[58] The sentence in 2.15 ("We are Jews and not sinners from the Gentiles") stands for itself. A new sentence is introduced with εἰδότες in v. 16, which especially stresses the contrast between the difference in v. 15 and the new insight. Cf. Sieffert 1899, 142–43.

[59] It is extremely significant that Paul describes here the re-evaluation of the Jewish identity markers, which is still tied to his calling in 1.13-16, as a process of realization, which he also claims for Cephas, Barnabas, and indeed for Jewish Christians altogether. Whether this is historically accurate can hardly be verified. One can indeed, however, start from the assumption that Paul had reason to assume that the situation was as he describes it in 2.15-16, since the basis of his argument would otherwise be invalid.

[60] With the view that righteousness cannot be established by human beings themselves Paul stands in Jewish tradition, which is documented, for example, by Ψ 142.2; 1QS 11.12–15; 1QH 4.30–32, 36–37; 7.30–31 and frequently; *1 Enoch* 81.5. Admittedly, it is never programmatically set over against the instructions of the Torah there.

The recognition of the equal value of the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας at the Jerusalem meeting represents then a logical consequence of this realization, for the Jewish Christians had already attained to the insight that they themselves also—just as the Gentiles—could only attain to righteousness through Christ. Paul extends this in 2.15-17 to the effect that he judges the difference between Jews and Gentiles to be fundamentally invalid in Christ. With this he probably goes beyond the intention of the principle formulated in 2.16. This was [166] scarcely formulated originally as a description of the relationship between Jewish and Gentile Christians, for which it is now drawn upon by Paul.[61] At this point the difference between common conviction and different concretization thus appears.

With this we come to the last question to be dealt with here, namely the question of what Paul concretely envisages with the different forms of the one gospel. For this one can start from section 3.1–4.10 in which Paul describes the Abraham and Christ community of Jews and Gentiles. Through πίστις both are bound together with Abraham and with the promise made to him. Its fulfillment takes place in Christ, for which reason the reckoning of the righteousness εἰς δικαιοσύνην now takes place.

In the context of the argument pursued here, it is of particular interest that Paul starts from respectively particular ways into the Christ fellowship for Jews and for Gentiles. He draws the basis for this from Scripture. The curse over those from the law and the blessing for the ἔθνη are prefigured there as is the liberation of the former from the curse.[62] In 3.10-14 it then becomes clear that the redemption from the curse of the law and the obtaining of the Abraham blessing by the Gentiles represent two ways to the Christ-community that correspond to each other. This mainly becomes clear in the switch between ἡμεῖς and τὰ ἔθνη in 3.13-14: Christ redeemed *us* from the curse of the law in order that the Abraham blessing may come to *the Gentiles,* in order that we may obtain the promise of the Spirit through faith. This change can be best explained so that Paul first

[61] The thesis possibly belongs in an early phase of the controversy of Jesus adherents with their Jewish compatriots. This could be indicated by the formulation ἔργα νόμου, which has analogies in 1QS 5.21, 23, 24; 4 Q258 (= 4QS^{d}), frag. 1, col. 2.1, 3, as well as in 4Q394–99 (= 4QMMT). The regulations established in 1QS 5–7 for the keeping of the law possibly give insight into a form of the obligation to the law that Paul criticizes in Gal 2.16. Gal 2.16 could then demarcate itself from a view that connected a strict observance of the instructions of the Torah with the attainment of righteousness and ground this with the new insight of the righteousness resulting from πίστις.

[62] Paul appeals explicitly to the Scripture in 3.8, 10, and 13. Thus, with this the blessing for the Gentiles, the curse over those from the law, and the curse over Christ that means redemption are grounded with Scripture arguments. It is true that Scripture passages are also quoted in vv. 11 and 12, but these are not designated as such (unless one understands the ὅτι in v. 11 as recitative) and therefore lie on another level pragmatically.

speaks of Jewish Christians who have come free from the law through Christ, then passes over to the Gentiles, to whom the Abraham blessing has thereby come, in order to finally unite both in the faith community. With this the [167] distinction between Jews and Gentiles from 2.15 is taken up and now related to the respective ways to the Christ-community.[63]

Paul thus continues the line indicated in 1.6-7 in the first two lines of argumentation of Galatians. This is characterized by the fact that there are two forms in which the one gospel of Christ is proclaimed. The gospel of Paul goes back to a revelation of God, was acknowledged without reservation by the Jerusalem apostles, and thus stands as equally valid alongside the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς. The material foundation of the unity of the gospel consists in the fact that "we Jewish Christians" have come to the realization of the nullification of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles in Christ, a realization that Paul not only connects with his calling but claims as a view that is fundamentally accepted by Jewish Christians. Therefore, the two forms of the gospel also do not differ with respect to substance but through the addressees to which they are directed, namely Jews and Gentiles. From this arises the differences in the respective form taking of the gospel inasmuch as Jews and Gentiles have a past in Christ that is comparable and yet must still be distinguished: for the Jews, who were enslaved under the law, the gospel means the redemption from the curse of the law. For the Gentiles, who served gods who in truth are not gods (4.8), the gospel means the fulfillment of the promise that they too are to become partakers of the blessing of Abraham. From these respectively particular ways to the Christ-community it follows that it would speak against the gospel of Christ to want to force on one of the two groups the identity markers that were determinative for the past of the other.

The point of criticism that Paul asserts against his rivals in the Galatian congregations and against Cephas is not therefore directed against the fact that they proclaim another form of the gospel as such. By claiming, however, that their form of the gospel is materially different from his they abandon the unity of the gospel of Christ in two forms and contest the legitimacy of the form of the Pauline Gentile mission without adoption of the Jewish identity markers, a form that goes back to a calling of God and was recognized at the apostolic council. What this looks like concretely emerges first from the accusation against Cephas, who deviated from the truth of the one gospel through his withdrawal from the table fellowship with the Gentile Christians, and secondly from the accusation against the Galatians that they would let themselves be misled by the opponents to be circumcised or to observe certain times. [168]

[63] On this cf. also Donaldson 1986.

4. The unity of Jews and Gentiles in Christ

From the observations provided, the following conclusion can be drawn: in Galatians Paul does not simply contrast his gospel as "gospel of Christ" with the opponents' message as "non-gospel." Rather, his argumentation is much more differentiated and traces back to a common foundation two forms in which the gospel of Christ is proclaimed. The goal of his remarks is to show the original unity of this double taking shape of the gospel, which is legitimately proclaimed by him, the Gentile apostle, but is distorted by the opponents and Cephas. With this they commit an offense not only against the Jerusalem agreement but also against the gospel itself, which is authorized by God. Thus, the point of the Pauline argument is not that there is no other gospel but that the other form of the gospel, when it is rightfully proclaimed, does not differ in substance from his.

This can be strengthened by further aspects. Paul nowhere speaks so clearly of *a specific form* of the gospel that he proclaims as he does in Galatians; nowhere does he emphasize so incisively that there are *respectively particular ways* for Jews and Gentiles to the common childship of Abraham. A specific characteristic of Galatians can therefore be seen in this directedness of the argumentation of Paul to the unity of the gospel. He is at pains to not allow the double form in which the gospel manifests itself to break apart but rather to preserve the unity of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian forms of the gospel. This is, however, only possible in his view if the principle set forth in Galatians 2.16 continues to be accepted without reservation by Jewish Christians; consequently the upholding of Jewish identity markers within the community of believers is suspended. One will have to start from the assumption that Paul rightly appeals to the fact that this principle was shared by Cephas and the other Jewish Christians, even if they presumably did not formulate it in the sharp alternative between ἔργα νόμου and πίστις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. They, however, drew different consequences from this principle than Paul did and did not assert it in the same way against the preservation of Jewish identity markers within the community of believers.

The christological controversy of Galatians can thus be understood as a difference between shared fundamental conviction and difference in the concretization. In Galatians Paul did not reflect on how this living together of Jews and Gentiles within a community of believers in Christ [169] was to obtain concrete form. He is certainly at pains, however, in other places to develop criteria for the fellowship of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Here, one would especially have to mention his exhortation for Gentile Christians to have consideration in relation to Jewish Christians who feel themselves bound to food regulations in Romans 14. The unfolding process of early

Christian faith statements established at the outset can thus be observed in Paul himself, who holds fast to the unity of the gospel in Galatians against the its falsification, which he fears, whereas at other points he is concerned with its concretization within the lived fellowship of believers.

At the conclusion of this chapter we return to the meaning of the Pauline conviction of the unity of the gospel in the framework of current discussion surrounding the "New Perspective on Paul." It has become clear that Paul regards the Christ-proclamation among the Gentiles as a form of the proclamation of the gospel, alongside which the proclamation to the Jews stands. This shows that he is not, for example, endeavoring to separate the gospel of Christ from its rootedness in Israelite-Jewish traditions but to find a basis that applies equally for Gentiles as well as Jews and with this he nullifies the difference between them. With this we have already come to the theme of the next chapter, which deals with the understanding of the law in Galatians.

This page intentionally left blank

The Universalizing of the Law in Galatians

A Contribution to Paul's Understanding of the Law

In connection with the remarks of the previous chapter, the concern in what follows will be with the view that Paul developed in Galatians concerning the Jewish law's function and area of jurisdiction.[1] That this letter—alongside the letter to the community in Rome—represents the most important witness for this central question of Pauline theology is uncontroversial.[2] It is also uncontroversial that here Paul sets forth his view in conflict with rivals who also require orientation to the ritual regulations of the Jewish νόμος—whereby circumcision and the keeping of food commands and specific times become the primary focus of attention—for Gentiles who have converted to Christ. The concern therefore is with early Christian missionaries who established, in contrast to Paul, a direct connection between the acceptance of the Christ message by Gentiles and their integration into Judaism. Through the reaction of Paul in Galatians one therefore obtains insight into a central controversy of an initial phase of early Christianity.

Other matters, such as the position of the letter within the chronology of the Pauline correspondence, the related question of the placement of the location of the addressees, as well as the relationship between the view of the law developed here and the one in Romans, are by contrast under discussion.[3] We will have to return to them to the extent that they

[1] The literature on this topic, even from the past decade alone, cannot possibly be discussed here *in extenso*. I will therefore attempt to make visible a few central questions of the recent exegetical discussion. Explicit references to the literature will only be made when they—in the view of the author of this contribution—bring to light important insights that advance the discussion, or when I enter into explicit debate with them.

[2] With this is not said that the issue of the law is the main theme of Galatians. An analysis of the statements regarding the law in the context of the overall line of argumentation can first give information about this. However, the letter can be read under this line of questioning.

[3] The question of the addressees of the letter was initiated again especially by Breytenbach 1996, who advocates the South Galatian hypothesis. [172] Criticism of the attempt to renew this hypothesis is found in Koch 1999a.

are significant for the view developed here. [172] The focus of the following comments, however, is on the question of how Paul, starting from the conviction, which was evidently capable—at least in Antioch—of reaching a consensus, concerning the righteousness tied to Christ, developed a solution of his own to the question of how Gentiles were incorporated into this event. In the process he also reflects on the role of the law as an institution that demarcates the Jewish people from the Gentiles and attains to a view that can be characterized in two respects as a "universalizing of the law." I will start by first commenting on the placement of the thesis that is to be developed in relation to the current state of research.

In the discussion on Paul's understanding of the law several important changes have arisen in connection with the New Perspective on Paul (which was already mentioned in the previous chapter) over against an earlier view in which the Pauline position was set in opposition to a supposedly "Jewish" view of the law in a rather sweeping manner.[4] Three aspects of this change may be mentioned, which are presupposed in the following comments: (1) By now we should be able to reach a consensus that an adequate picture of Jewish views on the meaning and function of the law given by God to his people cannot be obtained from the statements of Paul, which were often developed in fierce controversies and therefore are strongly polemical. Rather, in order to obtain a representative picture of the perspectives regarding this within the Judaism of Paul's time, which by no means appears as a homogenous entity, it is necessary to consult the Jewish sources themselves so that one does not produce a caricature that fails to do justice to Judaism and that is also guilty of weighing the accents set by Paul in a one-sided manner.[5] (2) This means further that Paul has to be understood as a participant in a discourse that must be grasped in the first place as an intra-Jewish one.[6] In the initial period, Judaism and Christianity did not yet stand over against each other as two independent "religious communities"; rather, in the first years the concern was especially with the question of how far the Christ event implied a reform of Jewish identity markers such as covenant, law, and circumcision. If Paul participates in this discourse from a clearly [173] accented perspective, which in its consequences was no longer acceptable for all those who—whether Jews or Jewish Christians—could not or would not give up their identity within the Jewish people,[7] then this insight may not obscure the fact that in its

[4] Cf. Schröter 2007, 147–52 (chap. 7, §1, in this volume).

[5] Cf., e.g., the overview of Lichtenberger 1996.

[6] Cf. Dunn 1999b; Niebuhr 1994. A comparison of the Pauline statements on becoming righteous with those in the Psalms of Solomon and in the Qumran writings can also shed light on this. On this cf. Schröter 1998a.

[7] Lindemann 2006, 351, aptly described the reason for this: "Precisely insofar as he

beginnings the discussion concerning the jurisdiction of the law can only be understood in relation to its complex Jewish background. (3) This also includes the consideration of the social function that the law possessed for the Judaism that predominantly existed in the Diaspora and was exposed to massive cultural influences through the Hellenization of the Mediterranean sphere.[8] The fierce controversies that ensued precisely around the Pauline mission can scarcely be adequately grasped apart from this aspect, which was of fundamental importance for the preservation of Jewish identity and the self-understanding of Judaism within the Roman Empire.[9]

These three moments are important for what follows here insofar as they outline the horizon in which this contribution is placed. In an initial—more lengthy—section, Paul's statements on the νόμος are analyzed; in a second—shorter—section, they are summarized and placed in the situation of argumentation that can be hypothesized behind the letter.

1. The Pauline statements on the νόμος in Galatians

Since the important commentary of Hans Dieter Betz,[10] increased attention has been given to rhetorical categories, especially for the question of the structure of Galatians. Other exegetes who [174] have considered the writing from this viewpoint have also been convinced that we are dealing in this letter with a composition whose individual sections follow a well-thought-out plan.[11] While it is true that Betz's hypotheses, especially on the rhetorical placement and intention of the writing as a whole, have not gone unchallenged,[12] his analyses have sharpened our attention to Paul's manner

---

was a Jew educated as a Pharisee, Paul could not accept a compromise between faith-righteousness and Torah-righteousness—and this he simply could not do because he took both, the Christ-faith and the Torah, equally seriously."

[8] Dunn has repeatedly pointed this out explicitly. Cf., e.g., Dunn 2005b, 111–30. Cf. also Heiligenthal 1984.

[9] Cf. the important pointers in Theissen 1996.

[10] Betz 1979; 1988. Cf. also Betz 1992, as well as Betz 1975.

[11] Cf., e.g., Becker 1998; 1989, 288–94, who follows Betz in the view that Galatians is constructed according to the model of an ancient judicial speech. Contrast, e.g., Kennedy 1984, 144–52; Vouga 1988; 1998, 5–6.

[12] His evaluation of the writing as an "apologetic letter" that is to be assigned to the *genus iudicale* has not been able to establish itself. Cf., e.g., the critical remarks of Smit 1989. The view that Paul wishes to provide the Galatians with arguments for why they as Gentiles, even without acceptance of the Jewish identity marks, belong to the chosen people of God and must also correspond to this in their life is to be preferred to the view that Paul defends his apostleship over against the Galatians. Important in this connection is his explanation that the εὐαγγέλιον proclaimed by him—as well as his apostleship—is not κατὰ ἄνθρωπον but comes from an ἀποκαλύψις. On this cf. Lategan 1988. In principle it must be asked how far analogies can be established between a letter and the teachings of

of argumentation. With regard to the question pursued here, it should first be upheld from this discussion that the characterization of 2.15-21 as the *propositio*, which announces the goal of the following demonstration, can be confirmed insofar as here Paul indeed formulates the result to which the biographical sections from 1.13 on lead and which is developed in the following sections 3.1–5.12 and 5.13–6.10.[13] These too are adequately understood with their characterization as demonstration (*probatio*) and subsequent exhortation (*exhortatio*). The decisive statements on the law are also concentrated in these three sections.[14]

1.1 The starting point: Righteousness does not come from the law— On 2.16, 19

Thus, Paul first comes to speak of the topic of the νόμος within the fundamental thesis of the letter, which he develops in the framework of the presentation of his response to Peter in the incident at Antioch. In 2.16 the syntagma ἐξ ἔργων νόμου appears three times in the context of the terminology of δικαιοῦσθαι and [175] πίστις; in 2.19 he formulates elliptically ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Here fundamental statements on the function of the νόμος appear in advance, which will be explained in greater detail in what follows. The antithesis from verses 16 refers to the argument developed in 3.1–5.12; verses 19-20 look ahead to the life in Christ, which is thematized from 5.13 on. The thesis in 2.15-21 thus corresponds to the following sections to the extent that it can, in turn, be subdivided into the sections 2.15-17 and 18-21, which deal with the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως and the life of the baptized[15] that follows from it.[16] From this it already follows that the statements on the νόμος in Galatians belong to two different perspectives, namely, first to the question of the origin of righteousness and secondly to the life for God.

The decisive aspects from these verses for the argumentation pursued here are as follows: (1) In 2.16 Paul invokes a fundamental thesis

---

ancient rhetoric on the *dispositio* of a *logos*, as found, for example, in Cicero or Quintilian. On this cf. the critical comments of Classen 1991.

[13] In contrast to Betz, most scholars today have the ethical paraenesis first begin in 5.13 and thus view 5.1-12 as the conclusion of the preceding section.

[14] In 6.13 a statement on the νόμος is once more found in the framework of the concluding warning when Paul says there that the circumcised do not themselves keep this, but wish to compel the Galatians to be circumcised in order to boast in their flesh.

[15] That the perfect συνεσταύρωμαι in 2.19 presents an analogy to Rom 6.3-7 on account of the participation in the fate of Christ and therefore can imply a connection to baptism has already often been highlighted. Cf., e.g., Becker 1998, 44; Mussner 1988, 181.

[16] Cf. Lambrecht 1996.

concerning the gospel, whose acceptance he also presupposes by Peter and the other Jewish Christians of the church at Antioch, for which reason Paul levels an accusation of hypocrisy against Peter, since from his perspective Peter infringes upon it afterwards. (2) The principle asserts an opposition between the ἔργα νόμου and the πίστις Χριστοῦ with regard to the process of the δικαιοῦσθαι. (3) From the perspective of Paul the principle applies to all people, irrespective of whether they are Jews or Greeks. (4) According to Paul, the consequence of the radical antithesis between νόμος and πίστις implies the opposition of two ways of existence, in which the latter is characterized by an orientation to the Christ event. The first two points thus refer to a common Jewish Christian basis, the latter two to their interpretation by Paul. In what follows I will explain all four aspects. Since verses 2.16 and 19 play a fundamental role in this connection, they will be presented first in order to provide an understanding of the textual meaning that is taken as a basis here.

Galatians 2.16:
(aα) εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι
(aβ) οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου
(aγ) ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [176]
(bα) καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν,
(bβ) ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου,
(c) ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.

Explanation: The εἰδότες in (aα) refers to the principle formulated in what follows. Part (b) continues the participle with a *verbum finitum* and gives, introduced with a consecutive καί the consequence of this insight as well as its goal. Part (c) leads back to (aβ) in the form of an *inclusio*, through which the sentences about justification by faith are framed by the negation in a substantiating way.

Galatians 2.19:
(aα) ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον,
(aβ) ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω.
(b) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι·

Explanation: Being dead through the law for the law had the life for God as its goal. The statement in verse 19b is connected asyndetically and describes the process once again, now from a christologically oriented perspective.

(1) As the introductory εἰδότες shows, the thesis formulated in verse 16 involves a conviction that is recognized in the church at Antioch. That a person does not become righteous through an orientation to the Torah is thus an older principle that goes back at least to the Antioch period—and

perhaps even further.[17] Therefore, when Paul invokes it here, he does not place his gospel over against that of Peter but integrates the two under the shared conviction regarding the δικαιοῦσθαι. This casts a light via 2.7, 9 back to 1.6-7.[18] If Paul distinguished between the two forms of the proclamation of the gospel to the circumcised and to the uncircumcised in 2.7, 9, then according to 2.16 both have in common that they no longer seek righteousness through an orientation to the ἔργα νόμου. He appeals here to this commonality between Peter and himself, which is important for the overall argument of the letter inasmuch as this is based on a fundamental conviction that Paul thinks he can presuppose at least for Peter and in Antioch, but whose acceptance he also hopes to have obtained from James (cf., 2.2: μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον).

This is important with regard to the question discussed here insofar as it shows that Paul does not fundamentally contest the possibility of another form of gospel proclamation, but argues [177] that the opponents interpret this falsely and that even Peter became unfaithful to the commonly established principle.

(2) For the interpretation of the content of the antithesis, the meaning of the expressions ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ must be clarified. With regard to the former it can first be held that ἔργα νόμου refers to deeds that correspond to what is required by the Jewish law.[19] Presumably we are dealing with a conventional usage, whose meaning can be made concrete from the Jewish texts. Analogies in the Greek-language sphere are lacking; however, a comparable Hebrew formulation appears in several texts from Qumran.[20] Here, the 1994 edited text 4Q394–99 (= 4QMMT)[21] stands nearest, and it has therefore also been drawn upon

[17] It can possibly be traced back to Jerusalem. It could then reflect a common position of Peter and Paul, which perhaps even James shared. Cf. on this point Gathercole 2005.

[18] Cf. the interpretation of 1.6-7 in Schröter 2007, 152–67 (chap. 7, §2, in this volume).

[19] Schreiner 1991 presents an overview of the discussion. Contrast Bachmann who wants to understand ἔργα νόμου as *regulations* of the law and not *actions* corresponding to the law. Cf. Bachmann 1993; 2005, 69–134. Dunn has repeatedly entered into dispute with Bachmann's view and called into question both its semantic prerequisite that the expression "works of the law" can solely be assigned a meta-ethical meaning and also the value of this rigorous limitation of the meaning. Cf. Dunn 2005b, 407–22, 412–16; 2005a, 397–401. Cf. also the critical dispute with Bachmann on the part of Hofius 2006; 2008, 49–88, 89–94. In my view, the objections against Bachmann's view are justified; the limitation of the expression to a meta-ethical meaning is therefore not plausible.

[20] 4Q174 (= 4QFlor) 1.7 is not applicable according to the correction of the earlier reading. Cf. however 1QS 5.21, 23, 24, as well as the parallels in 4Q258 (= 4QS^{d}), frag. 1, col. 2.1, 3. The regulations for the keeping of the law laid down in 1QS 5–7 might perhaps give insight into a form of obligation to the law that Paul criticizes in Gal 2.16.

[21] Qimron/Strugnell 1994, 43–63.

for the interpretation of the Pauline expression.[22] In this writing, the author explains to outsiders the interpretation of Jewish laws by the group living in Qumran, which he sums up in conclusion with the expression מקצת מעשׂי התורה. This expression does not represent an exact correspondence to the Greek expression ἔργα νόμου;[23] however, the text can [178] contribute to the illumination of the thrust of the principle insofar as it documents how a Jewish group characterized itself through its thoroughgoing orientation to the Torah.[24] The thesis from verse 16 thus differentiates itself from a view that joins a strict following of the instructions of the Torah with the obtainment of righteousness and grounds this with the new insight of the righteousness that results from πίστις. The jurisdiction of the Torah in itself is not thereby disputed, but its function is now determined differently in light of the newly obtained conviction.

Thus, the thesis is probably a view developed by Jesus adherents in dispute with non-Jesus-believing Jews, with which they pointedly summed up their view of the Christ event. It marks in this respect a central point of conflict between Jews and Jewish Christians. When Paul invokes it in Galatians, then it is because its interpretation among Jewish Christians—namely between Paul on the one side and Peter, Barnabas, and other Jewish Christians on the other—had itself become controversial in the meantime.[25] We are thus dealing with a discourse about the relationship between Torah observance, righteousness, and πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which was argued out among Jewish Christians (here: Paul and Peter) in the face of the concrete problem of Gentile members of the community.[26] The stated principle thereby develops a—previously most likely unimagined—dynamic. In light of his opponents' demand for circumcision, Paul thinks it through in Galatians with regard to the place of the Gentiles in the Christian community and thereby creates the foundation for *a*—namely his own—view of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity as competing religious convictions.[27] [179]

[22] Cf. esp. Dunn 2005b; 1998, 354–66; Bachmann 1999, 33–56 (originally 1998).

[23] Cf. the translation in Maier 1995, 375: "etliches von den Torah-Praktiken" (a number of things from the Torah-practices) as well as the comments in Hofius 2006, 274–79; 2008, 52–57. There Hofius [178] enters into critical dispute with the rendering of the expression in Qimron/Strugnell 1994 as "some of the precepts of the Torah." This rendering, as well as Bachmann's understanding of it as "regulations of the Torah," is said to lack "a sound philological foundation" (278; 56).

[24] Cf. Burchard 1996, 410–11.

[25] Cf. in this sense also the comments of Dunn 1993.

[26] Expressed differently: originally the principle was scarcely put forward as a regulation for the question for which it is now drawn upon by Paul. Otherwise the position of Peter in the incident at Antioch can scarcely be made comprehensible.

[27] With this the concern is not only with circumcision, food commands, and keeping

In direct opposition to ἐξ ἔργων νόμου stands ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Whereas both expressions are directly confronted with each other in 16bβ, the preposition in 16aγ is διά. Recently the voices who argue for a *genitivus subjectivus* here have increased, especially in the Anglophone sphere: thus they wish to understand the πίστις as a characteristic of Christ and not as a stance shown to him by the human being.[28] On the basis of the parallelism to the expression ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, the formulation ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν in 16bα, and the absolute formulation οἱ ἐκ πίστεως in 3.7 it seems more plausible, however, to see an alternative orientation to the directedness to the ἔργα νόμου described here and to understand the genitive as an objective genitive. Then the opposition expresses the fact that the orientation to the πίστις directed to Christ stands in contradiction to the orientation to the ἔργα νόμου and with this to the Jewish identity markers.

(3) The impossibility of being made righteous through the orientation to the ἔργα νόμου is asserted by Paul as fundamental, thus not only with regard to the Jewish people. This becomes evident from the inclusive ἄνθρωπος in 16aβ as well as from the general formulation in 16c and is an insight that follows from the Christ event. For Paul this aspect is of fundamental importance.[29] In 2.15 he already unites Peter and the remaining Jewish Christians with himself with the expression ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι and sets the sinners from the Gentiles over against this. In verse 17, however, he will then dissolve this antithesis to the effect that with regard to being made righteous in Christ the Jews themselves are also to be regarded as sinners.[30] Here a certain view of Jewish identity comes to light that is of decisive [180] importance for the Pauline interpretation of the common Jewish Christian basis and thereby for the argument developed in Galatians.[31] As the

---

the Sabbath, but with the whole Torah. Dunn later conceded this. Cf., e.g., Dunn 2005b, 207–20 and 1–88, esp. 22–26. His observation remains correct, however, that the concern is with a view of the law that *de facto* has an excluding effect, and in the Galatian situation (and probably also otherwise) this has primarily materialized in the things mentioned (cf. Dunn 1993, 136–37). This is therefore probably also the view that Paul has in his sights when he characterizes the behavior of the opponents in 4.17 as ἐκκλεῖσαι.

[28] Cf. especially the in-depth treatment of this question by Hays 1983, esp. 139–91; further Longenecker 1996, 79–84; Martyn 1997a, 270–71.

[29] By contrast, whether it was already implied in the fundamental thesis that is taken up and therefore can also be presupposed for Peter is not so certain. Presumably the controversy was sparked off at precisely this point!

[30] On this interpretation of v. 17, which is correct in my view, cf. Lambrecht 1996, 57–58. Contrast, e.g., Mussner 1988, 176–77.

[31] As noted already in the previous chapter, Dunn therefore chose Gal 2.16 as the starting point for the "New Perspective on Paul." Cf. Dunn 2005b, 89–110, 95ff.

terminology Ἰουδαϊσμός, Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν, Ἰουδαΐζειν,[32] which is only used in this writing (and also does not appear elsewhere in early Christianity prior to Ignatius), already shows, he understands the Christ event as an event which shows the identity markers of Judaism to be exclusive and therefore dividing[33] and which establishes from itself over against this new criteria for the constitution of the community. With this a certain interpretation of the aforementioned conviction of the δικαιοῦσθαι οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is already suggested insofar as Paul understands this as a fundamental opening up of the Christ community and not—this would be the alternative—as the integration of the Gentiles into the childship of Abraham (*Abrahamskindschaft*) that is tied to the Torah. Consequently this means the falling away of the Jewish identity markers as the framework for the communities founded on faith in Christ, although with this Paul does not simply abandon the categories with which the relationship between God and his people was formulated but transfers them to the new communities.[34] In Galatians this takes place in the form of a double universalizing of the law. It will be necessary to return to this point.

(4) In the second part of the *propositio*, 2.18-21, Paul changes to the first-person singular. As in Philippians 3.7-14 and Romans 7.14-25, he applies this not only autobiographically but as generally applicable to the Christian existence.[35] Here the concern is with the description of the life in accordance with the justification that has taken place in Christ. The *dativi incommodi* or *commodi* νόμῳ and θεῷ formulate the difference in the orientation of the life between then and now; in between stands the change of existence expressed with the metaphor of being dead. Paul looks ahead here to the life ἐν Χριστῷ, which he will deal with from 5.13 on. He makes clear that a new life corresponds to being justified, which [181] is likewise determined by Christ and described in 6.15 as καινὴ κτίσις. With this he wards off the

[32] Gal 1.13-14; 2.14.

[33] Cf. chap. 7 n. 54.

[34] This applies, e.g., to the childship and covenant of Abraham, especially in Romans, then also to law (as written in the hearts) and circumcision (as circumcision of the heart). This transfer becomes possible by means of a distinction between the Israel at hand and the "true" Israel, as this appears in Rom 9.6: οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. Cf. also Theissen 1996, 337, 349–50.

[35] It probably remains correct, however, that an apologetic note is also bound up with this: Paul defends himself, as v. 17 shows, against a possible misunderstanding and appeals to his own existence. Cf. Martyn 1997a, 255, 258; Burchard 1996, 406 (contrast Betz 1988, 227–28, who rules out a personal moment: "Das 'ich' (ἐγώ) ist kein persönliches, sondern ein paradigmatisches"; but cf. Betz 1979, 122: "The 'I' (ἐγώ) to which Paul refers is not so much the personal 'I' but the paradigmatic 'I,'" and 121 n. 74: "One should not deny that it is a rhetorical feature, by which Paul uses himself as the example").

accusation that Christ could be called a servant of sin. The Christ event is thereby not only the constitutive presupposition for the process of justification, but intervenes in a much more comprehensive manner into the life of the believer. For precisely this reason Paul has an ethical paraenesis follow the exposition of justification by faith, namely from 5.13 on.

> A difficulty is presented by the formulation διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον. Paul formulates here in an abbreviated manner, for which reason one must make the connection accessible through an addition. What is meant is presumably that the function of the law consisted in locking up under sin, thus it possessed not a life-creating but a death-bringing function, but that this death, when it is a dying with Christ, simultaneously means a liberation from the enslaving function of the law. This is also made plausible by the fact that with the statement about being crucified with Christ, 2.19b explains more closely how this death is to be understood. In that case Paul already looks ahead here to what he will then explain in 3.15–4.11.

In the framework of his reply to Peter, which was communicated to the Galatians, Paul thus appeals in Galatians 2.15-21 to an already old principle and also obligates Peter to its validity. This principle states negatively that no person is made righteous by works of the law and positively that righteousness comes from faith in Jesus Christ. Paul appeals to this in order to present *his* interpretation of this principle to the Galatians. Even if the concern was in the first instance with a difference of opinion among Jewish Christians, with the consequence that he drew from it, Paul forced the parting—which was probably unavoidable if this premise was taken seriously—of Judaism and Christianity.[36]

1.2 The ransom of Jewish Christians from the curse of the law—On 3.10-14

In 3.1–5.12 Paul provides the Galatians with the decisive justification for why they, even without integration into the Jewish people, belong to the inheritors of the promise to Abraham and with this to Christ. In this context the law plays a decisive role in two respects. First, it must be explained for what purpose the law was given at all, if one does not become righteous through it; secondly, the question arises whether the Jewish Torah can possess relevance at all for the Gentile Galatians. Three passages are to be considered. In 3.10-14 the concern is with the connection between law and Christ event; in 3.15-29 it is with the function of the law in light of its previously demonstrated negative effect; finally, in 4.1-7 (or 1-11) it is with the

[36] This has been rightly asserted by Räisänen 1985.

demonstration that the Galatians as Gentiles were also enslaved—even if it was not under the law. [182]

We begin with 3.10-14. The opposition from 2.16 ἐξ ἔργων νόμου—ἐκ πίστεως with regard to the δικαιοῦσθαι is taken up here and now joined with the opposition curse—blessing (κατάρα—εὐλογία). Those from the law thus stand under a curse; due to the previously explained bond with Abraham, those from faith obtain the promise issued to him. The presupposition for this is that they were ransomed from the curse of the law. Christ brought about this ransom through his hanging-on-wood.

Paul derives the basis of his argumentation from Scripture. Thus, the curse over the ones from the law and the blessing for the ἔθνη are just as prefigured as the liberation of the former from the curse.[37] Two aspects are important for the question pursued here. First, one must clarify wherein the curse consists, which according to Paul the Scripture speaks over the ones ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. Secondly, it must be asked who the ones ransomed from this curse are; whether the concern is only with Jews, which would indeed suggest itself at first, or whether the Gentile Galatians are already in view here.

One can begin with the already often-noted peculiarity that the curse thesis in v. 10a appears to be refuted rather than grounded by the Scripture quotation that follows: according to Deuteronomy 27.26[38] those who do *not* do what stands in the book of the law are cursed, thus precisely not the ones ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. There are two possibilities for explaining this incoherence: either Paul starts from the implicit premise that it is impossible to keep the law entirely, but that precisely this is necessary in order to become righteous through it, or the curse consists in the fact that it is not at all the function of the law to make righteous. A choice has often been made for the first possibility;[39] however, it has also often been opposed, especially in the more recent period.[40] It is important first that [183] Paul nowhere explicitly formulates this—alleged—premise. That no one is made righteous from

[37] Attention must be paid to the fact that Paul explicitly appeals to Scripture in 3.8, 10 and 13. With this then the blessing for the Gentiles, the curse on those from the law and the curse on Christ, which stands for the redemption, are grounded with Scriptural arguments. It is true that Scripture passages are also cited in v. 11 and v. 12, but these are not designated as such (unless one understands the ὅτι in v. 11 as *recitativum*) and therefore lie on another level pragmatically.

[38] Paul takes up the passage in a modified form. Instead of πᾶς ἄνθρωπος he writes only πᾶς; the second part (ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου) appears in Paul in a form that is adjusted to expressions from Deut 28.58; 30.10.

[39] The article by Wilckens 1974, e.g., is well known. Cf. also Hübner 1973; 1982, 19–20; 1986, 18–20; Rohde 1989, 141–42.

[40] Cf. already Schlier 1965, 132–33; then Sanders 1983, 17–27; Hays 1983, 206–7; Stanley 1990; Cranford 1994; Burchard 1997; Dunn 1993, 171; Martyn 1997a, 309–11.

works of the law (Gal 2.16; 3.13; Rom 3.20; and the positive version in Rom 3.28) is not the same as the impossibility of keeping the whole law, but a statement about the factual insufficiency of the law with regard to what can only be attained through faith in Jesus Christ. Attention should be given further to the fact that in 3.11-12 (now with an implicit recourse to Lev 18.5 and Hab 2.4) the ζῆν on the basis of the ποιῆσαι is set over against the ζῆν ἐκ πίστεως. The two are thus competing ways of attaining to life, which Paul confronts with each other here,[41] whose relation to each other, however, can really first be explained through the addition of the argumentation from 3.15 on. Here it can, however, be held that it is the task of the law to guide to the doing but not to lead to righteousness.[42] If Paul does not explicitly introduce the Scripture passages that he draws on here as Scripture, then the reason for this could be that he places them alongside one another as equally valid; thus his argument does not derive from the Scripture's authority but from the opposition of ζῆν ἐκ πίστεως, which leads to the δικαιοῦσθαι, on the one hand, and the ζῆν from the ποιεῖν, on the other hand.[43] The contradiction between the thesis from verse 10 and its grounding can then be explained in such a way that the "true" curse consists in being obligated to the ποιῆσαι by the law under the threat of being cursed, through which the access to the εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ is hindered.[44]

On the second problem: the possibilities of interpretation with regard to the "we" in 3.13-14 are as follows: (1) Either Paul switches between two groups and (a) designates with the ἡμᾶς in 13a and 14b Jews who [184] were redeemed by Christ but in 14a, by contrast, Gentiles who could receive the blessing of Abraham in this way or (b) joins both together in 14b through the λάβωμεν after the switch between Jews and Gentiles; or (2) he designates the same group throughout; thus from 13a he integrates himself (and

[41] On this cf. Vos 1992.

[42] This implies that ζήσεται in 3.11-12 is qualified differently in each case, namely once as eternal life and once as earthly life, in correspondence to the instructions of the law. So also Burchard 1997, 348–49.

[43] It is true that it cannot be ruled out that with these passages Paul also presupposes that they will be identified as Scripture quotations by his readers, but in my view the fact that they—in contrast to the ones from vv. 8, 10, and 13—are not designated as such is often passed over too quickly (cf., however, Rohde 1989, 140). This is also not changed by pointing out that the concern is with Scripture passages that are often used in Judaism, for which reason a quotation formula is unnecessary. (In Rom 1.17, Hab 2.4 is also introduced with καθὼς γέγραπται—but hardly because one was less familiar with Scripture there.)

[44] In Gal 3.10 one can also already see implied the idea, which is then worked out in Romans, that one could not fulfill the law prior to Christ. This is especially suggested by 2.17: the conviction that righteousness can only be obtained ἐν Χριστῷ implies that "we (Jews)" are also sinners. This is here, however, not the point that matters for Paul, since the universal perspective is not as developed here as it is then in Romans.

other Jewish Christians) into the ἡμᾶς with the Galatians as redeemed and as receivers of the blessing.

The question has consequences for the context of the argumentation up to 4.31; thus it cannot be answered in isolation. Rather, the switch between the first- and second-person plural,[45] which is frequently encountered there, must be explained in the overall context of the view that Paul develops on the connection between Christ event and law. The concern is with the question of whether he parallels the ways of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians to the childship of Abraham or assumes that each has its own way to this. This then also has consequences for the question of the extent to which Gentiles are incorporated into the Christ event at all.[46]

The problem will be discussed first on the basis of an interpretation of 3.13-14. Possibility (1a) can be excluded because it is unthinkable that Paul views the Gentiles (thus also the Galatians) as *not* being recipients of the promise of the Spirit, since the argumentation from 3.6 is aimed at proving this very thing. Variant (1b) can claim important philological arguments in its favor.[47] First, the clear distinction between ἡμᾶς and τὰ ἔθνη is conspicuous and a clear obstacle to seeing the same group named in both formulations. Secondly, the meaning of ἔθνη can be better explained in this way, with regard to which, from the perspective of 2.15 and 3.8, the meaning "Gentiles" (thus non-Jews) is much more likely than the general "peoples." Consequently, Jews would, on the one hand, not be thought of in 14a, and on the other hand only the Jewish Christians would have been redeemed from the curse of the law, with the goal that through this the childship of Abraham would also stand open to the Gentiles. This also makes plausible why Jews such as Paul but not the pagan Gentiles stood under the curse of the law, with which, from the perspective of 2.15-16, nothing else but the Torah of Israel can be intended.

Finally, possibility (2)[48] can claim in its favor the fact that the repeated switching of personal pronouns is to be understood on a pragmatic level [185] as a change between presentation and address, that Paul understands the Christ event as a universal event and not one that is only valid for Israel, which corresponds to an enslavement through the law understood to be just as universal, and finally, that Paul is concerned, as the universally understood principle from 2.16 already shows, with anthropological orientations and not with salvation-historical differentiations.

[45] Thus in 3.25-26; 4.5-6; 4.28, 31. 5.1-2 lies on another level pragmatically.

[46] On this cf. Donaldson 1986.

[47] In addition to Donaldson 1986 it is advocated, e.g., by Hays 1983, 113; Betz 1979, 148–49 with n. 101; Lietzmann 1971, 19.

[48] It is advocated, e.g., by Burchard 1997, 343–44 with n. 13; Martyn 1997a, 317–18, 334–36; Vouga 1998, 75; Mussner 1988, 224–25; Schlier 1965, 136–37.

The arguments for the last view are not to be dismissed across the board. It will indeed become clear that Paul incorporates Gentiles and Jews in the Christ event, as he also assumes a comparable past for both. The problem with this position consists in the fact that it flattens out differentiations that are clearly discernible in Galatians and reads it more strongly in the light of statements in Romans where these do indeed retreat. An indication of this is the fact that the aforementioned linguistic indications from 3.13-14 can hardly be explained with the assumption that Paul constantly speaks of the same group. Another indication is the fact that this reading can only with difficulty be brought into line with the argumentative slope from 2.15 forward. Paul designates the behavior of Peter as hypocrisy because Peter upholds the distinction between Jews and Gentiles even in the light of the Christ event and is not prepared to acknowledge that this has become invalid subsequent to the coming of the πίστις. In 3.6–4.7 Paul traces out why the latter is the case by describing the obtainment of the blessing by the Gentiles and the redemption of the Jews from the law as two parallel ways to the childship of Abraham and with this to the community in Christ. Possibility (1b) thus appears as the most plausible option. This means simultaneously that the concrete communication situation of Galatians must be specifically taken into account and should not be pushed into the background in favor of general anthropological considerations that Paul is said to advance here.[49]

Thus, Paul takes up here the interpretation of the common Jewish Christian basis, which was begun in 2.15-17, in such a way that he now deals with the problem of how Gentiles and Jews get to the community in Christ in which the previous differences are nullified. With regard to the Gentiles, he begins with a combination of Genesis 15.6 and 12.3, with the help of which he explains that the Gentiles attain to the childship of Abraham through the πίστις, for this is a way that is already shown in Scripture. In 3.10-14 he changes the perspective and now comes back to the problem of the law. He explains that this represents a curse insofar as it obligates one to the ποιῆσαι and is not oriented to [186] the πίστις. ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are first those who continue—despite the insight from 2.16—to define themselves through the Jewish identity markers. That pertains to Peter and the others named in 2.13; it pertains to the opponents of Paul; it would also pertain to the Galatians if they went along with this. According to 3.13-14, however, Christ has redeemed those who stand under the curse produced through this—whereby according to the argumentative context only Jewish Christians can be meant. Therefore, the Abraham blessing could first reach now to the Gentiles so that Jewish Christians and

[49] This is emphasized, also with regard to 3.10-14, by Bonneau 1997.

Gentile Christians are now united through the πίστις and the reception of the πνεῦμα bound up with this.

Paul assumes then—this is important for the view developed in Galatians—that Gentiles and Jews each have their own way to the childship of Abraham. Gentiles did not stand under the curse of the law, though they—this is still to be explained—were, nevertheless, enslaved and needed liberation through Christ (cf. 5.1, 13). The special feature of the Jewish people consists, however, in the fact that it received a standard from God according to which transgressions are reckoned[50] and in this respect was obligated to him in a special way as his chosen people. By contrast, the way of the Gentiles to the community in Christ did not pass through the law. Their blessing, founded in Abraham, first comes into effect, however, with the redemption of the Jewish Christians from the curse of the law. Paul reaches back here to the idea that salvation for the Gentiles is tied to God's eschatological action toward Israel—here the coming of the Messiah. One can perhaps imagine this concretely in such a way that for Peter, Barnabas, Paul, and others, the confession to Jesus Christ was connected with the proclamation among the Gentiles so that the Gentiles obtained the opportunity through this to join the people of God. Therefore the question now arose of how a community of Jewish and Gentile Christians should concretely be designed. In Galatians, Paul develops for this the model of the nullification of previously dividing differences.

On the basis of this argumentation, outlines of the position of the opponents of Paul are revealed. It is to be hypothesized that the Galatians wanted to get the Gentiles to be circumcised with the argument that the obtainment of the childship of Abraham, understood as integration into the Jewish people, was tied to this. This definition of Christian identity within the context of the synagogue must have possessed—not least for sociological reasons—an attractiveness for the Gentiles, as conversely the Pauline position necessarily ends up in competition with the synagogue community, [187] because he sets forth a model that offers an alternative way to the childship of Abraham to those ἐν Χριστῷ. This must have greatly contributed to the sharpness of the conflict between the different options of how to define Christian identity in relation to Jewish identity.

1.3 The temporally limited role of the law—On 3.15-29

According to the previously exclusively negative statements about the law (it does not make righteous and places under a curse) the question

[50] Gal 3.19 should probably be interpreted in this sense: the law was given τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν, which probably means: because of the transgressions, thus in order to make them able to be reckoned (thus as Rom 4.15; 5.13, but not as their cause).

formulated in verse 19 now arises τί οὖν ὁ νόμος. Thus, this section is concerned with the question of the purpose for which the law was given. To answer it, Paul first uses a metaphor from the law on testaments and then the image of the law as an upbringer. This passage is held together with the following section, 4.1-11, by the fact that both the use of examples from the sphere of law and the description of successive phases of history are continued there. Viewed in this way, a larger connection emerges up to 4.11, in which Paul deals with the question of the placement of the law in the history of God with Israel and the role of the Gentiles in this history.[51] A more detailed subdivision can be made on the basis of the two sections 3.15-22 (the law as later addition of the angels) and 3.23-25 (the law as παιδαγωγός).

1.3.1 The law as a later addition of the angels: On 3.15-22

In 3.15-18 the law is first limited to the phase between Abraham and Christ as the two recipients of the promises and thereby distinguished from these in terms of function.[52] The explicit mention of the 430 years[53] directs one's view to a temporal distinction between [188] the two entities. Paul appeals for this to the fact, which can be deduced from Scripture, that the promises issued to Abraham took place when the law from Sinai did not yet exist. In order to also be able to use this temporal difference in a material respect he reaches for an example from the law on testaments, according to which a testament (here: the Abraham promise) cannot be made invalid through a subsequent disposition (the law). With this the law is specified as secondary in relation to the promise.

The terminology from the sphere of law includes first the term διαθήκη. In terms of the metaphor this allows the source and target domains to be connected with each other, since it appears both in verse 15 in the context of the legal institution and in verse 17 in the clarification of the relation between promise and law. Thus, with the use of this term Paul moves

[51] On the use of imagery from the sphere of law in the entire passage cf. Conrat 1904. To this can be added the term μεσίτης from 3.20, which is not yet placed in the context of legal language by Conrat but is by Selb 1974, 192.

[52] Here it is also already necessary to pay attention to v. 19: the law was given ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται.

[53] With this Paul stands in the Jewish tradition of interpretation of Exod 12.40 where the addition καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν was made already in the LXX to the statement of the Hebrew text that Israel's stay in Egypt lasted 430 years (contrast, however, Gen 15.13: 400 years). Demetrius (in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.21.18) also evidently presupposes this, for he calculates the period of time from Abraham's election to the coming of Jacob and his seed to Egypt as 215 years. Cf. also Josephus, *A.J.* 2.318: 430 years from the arrival of Abraham in Canaan and 215 years from Jacob's coming to Egypt to the departure (contrast, however, *A.J.* 2.204 and *B.J.* 5.382: 400 years of oppression in Egypt).

the Abraham promise into the sphere of a disposition of God that is to be grasped with legal categories.[54] The legal terminology also includes the terms κυροῦν, προκυροῦν, ἀκυροῦν, ἀθετεῖν, ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι, and κληρονομία.[55] Thus, the premises of the argumentation are that the example from the law on testaments allows a conclusion by analogy to the two establishments of God and that the legal principle described in verse 15 and applied in verse 17 is correct from a legal perspective.

A problem with regard to the second premise consists in the fact that neither Roman nor Hellenistic law is acquainted with the specification that the testator may no longer alter his testament prior to his death.[56] Since with the promise and the law, however, the concern is with two dispositions of God, the example used does not initially appear to be very convincing.[57] There are two possibilities for clearing up this problem. According to the [189] first variant, Paul refers back here to the Jewish regulation of מתנת בריא.[58] According to this, the object of the disposition passes over immediately to the beneficiary, thus not only after the death of the testator; moreover, the disposition cannot be rescinded. The question, however, arises of whether this oriental legal institution, which is primarily documented in rabbinic sources in Judaism, can be made probable as a model upon whose foundation Paul constructs his argument. For this it is necessary in my view to pay closer attention to the fusion of the metaphor's source and target domains, for the concern is not simply with the transfer of a case from one sphere to another, but with the sketching in of a legal case into a situation that only corresponds to it in part.

If one views Galatians 3.15-18 from this perspective, then one must first pay attention to the fact that after the introduction of the comparison

[54] On this cf. the remarks of Selb 1974, *passim*. He shows that it is questionable to want to trace back the term via the LXX to the Hebrew ברית and to understand its meaning from there. Cf. Selb's methodologically important remarks on pp. 184–85: "In order to understand διαθήκη we do not need to immerse ourselves in the etymology and in the salvation historical understanding of *berith* at different times, to investigate the legal character of this term and its possible precursors in ancient oriental law and thereby to test how traditionally or revolutionarily the translator of the LXX understood *berith* in its origin and development with διαθήκη. Only the conception of the translator himself is of interest here."

[55] Cf. Eger 1917/1918; Schlier 1965, 143 n. 8.

[56] Cf. Selb 1974, 191.

[57] That οὐδείς means that no one else (thus apart from the testator) may alter the testament once it is fixed (so Conradt 1904 and Eger 1917/1918) robs, by contrast, the Pauline argumentation of its point. Instead, this can only be explained under the presupposition that Paul assumes the same "testator" in both cases, namely God, from whom both promise and law originate. Cf. also the criticism by Selb 1974, 191 n. 38.

[58] This solution goes back to Bammel 1959/1960, whose suggestion has met with much approval. It has been taken up, e.g., by Schlier 1965; Betz 1979; Mussner 1988; and Selb 1974.

in verse 16 Paul returns to the initial level of the Abraham promise and now presents this as aiming at Abraham *and Christ.* With this the model introduced in verse 15 is altered insofar as three participants (namely God, Abraham, and Christ) now stand over against the testator and the recipient; there are thus *two* recipients of the testament, who are clearly contrasted with each other both temporally and functionally, insofar as the implementation of the testament disposition is tied from the beginning to the descendant.[59] This modification of the legal case from verse 15 is thus constitutive for adequately tracing Paul's argument. In verse 17 he then returns to the legal sphere and now incorporates the law as a later disposition into the reflection, which does not make the promises invalid, thus cannot replace them, for which reason the inheritance—thus the fulfillment of the promise—also cannot come from the law (v. 18).

Thus, Paul interlocks the legal example—a testator legally establishes a will, this may no longer be altered—with a more complex situation: God gives Abraham a promise, 430 years afterward the law emerges as a competing disposition.[60] The [190] fulfillment of the promise first takes place much later when Abraham has not been alive for a long time but the law is still in force. For this there is a need for an invalidation of the later disposition through the testator, which is possible because it does not come directly from him (vv. 19-20), thus it is secondary to the establishment of the first not only temporally but also in relation to its origin. The use of the example from the law on testaments thus implies that the law is to be differentiated from the promise in two respects. In this way Paul explains that the two dispositions differ in their relevance. One should not conclude from this that he contests the divine origin of the law.[61] Rather, the decisive point is the functional specification in each case, with regard to which Paul does, however, argue that the law possesses a lesser status than the promise.

[59] To this extent it is indispensible for Paul's argumentation that he interprets the expression καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου from Gen 15.18 LXX (also 13.15; 17.8; 22.18; 24.7) individually and relates it to Christ.

[60] Even if God is ultimately to be thought of as the originator here, it cannot be overlooked that this recedes into the background in Gal 3. An initial indication of this is that in v. 17 the odd impersonal participle γεγονώς with reference to the law stands over against the προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ with reference to the promise. Paul probably wishes to extricate himself in this way from the difficulty of having to explain why God [190] cannot indeed replace or supplement an earlier disposition through a later one. This is then—second indication—strengthened by the fact that with regard to the law the ordaining through angels is described (v. 19), with which the qualitative difference between ἐπαγγελία and νόμος is established.

[61] So Schlier 1965, 155; Oepke 1964, 82. Against this speaks, however, not only the δι' (and not ὑπ') ἀγγέλων, which lets God appear as the logical subject of the *passivum* διαταγείς, but also v. 21: the law is not a disposition that is directed against the promises.

Thus, the force of the legal example only comes to light if one pays precise attention to the sketching in of the legal case into the line of Pauline argumentation. In the process, modifications enter in, namely that it is a matter of *two* testament recipients—whereby the establishment pertains to the first and the actual implementation to the second—that the "inheritance case" is not tied to the death of the "testator" but to the coming of the descendant, and that a disposition *that is in force during the time in between* is nullified again with the coming into force of the testament. These are important changes to the source domain of the metaphor in light of the goal of the Pauline argumentation. Thus, the legal case only applies in the specific application to the relationship between promise and law, in which the former is understood as an entity that is qualitatively superordinate to the latter.[62] Thus, the recourse to a specific Jewish legal institution turns out to be unnecessary, and it also creates further problems.[63] By contrast, it is more likely that Paul cites a common [191] regulation from legal practice here, the knowledge of which he presupposes among his (Gentile) addressees, and that he takes this up from the perspective of his argumentation about promise and law.

To summarize: in 3.15-22 the law is subordinated to the promise in two respects. First, it is characterized as a *later* disposition, which therefore cannot claim the same importance as a legal institution as the promise. Second, it is presented as ordained[64] through angels and mediated through the μεσίτης (Moses) and with this claimed to be not found on the singular line that runs from the one God via Abraham to Christ and to the one community in Christ (v. 28: πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).[65] The

[62] Cf. also Dunn 1993, 182–83.

[63] One must ask whether Paul could have introduced a specifically Jewish regulation pertaining to testament law in relation to the Galatians as a generally comprehensible and plausible example. Moreover, whether one can already assume that it was in force in the Judaism of the first century (this is by no means indicated by the references that Bammel 1959/1960 provides for this) and that it was practiced in Jewish Diaspora communities must remain uncertain. Cf. also the considerations of Betz 1979, 155–56; Rohde 1989, 147.

[64] The participation of the angels in the giving of the law is Jewish tradition. Cf. Deut 33.22 LXX; *Apoc. Mos.* 1; *Jub.* 1.27–2.1; 4Q521; Philo, *Somn.* 1.141–43; Acts 7.53; Heb 2.2; Josephus, *A. J.* 15.136.

[65] Whether one relates ἑνός in v. 20 to the angels (so the most commonly encountered interpretation) or to Israel (so Bachmann 1999, 81–126) does not change much. In the first case the law would be detached from the εἷς θεός with regard to its origin and thereby contrasted with the promise; in the latter case the differentiation would relate to the recipients (the many from Israel would stand over against the unity in Christ). Both are grammatically possible, but the first variation is probably more likely because the mention of the εἷς θεός in v. 20 immediately follows and thus forms the direct opposition, whereas the one community in Christ is first mentioned in v. 28. Moreover, it must be taken into account that God is always associated with the promise in Gal 3, but never explicitly named as the originator of the law.

previously made differentiation between law and promise is thus supported by a further one: the law, in contrast to the Abraham promise, was not a disposition aimed at Christ, which can be seen in the opposition between unity and multiplicity. Thus the question arises of the function of the law in the phase of its validity between Moses and Christ.

1.3.2 The law as παιδαγωγός: On 3.23-25

In 3.23, 25, the temporal limit of this phase is first made clear through the correspondence of two temporal expressions: πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν—ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως. In the first of these two segments of time, thus before the coming of the πίστις, the law served as παιδαγωγός, whereas "we," since the coming of the πίστις, are no longer ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν. What does the metaphor of the law as παιδαγωγός signify?[66] [192]

> The institution of the παιδαγωγός comes from the Greek sphere and is attested there since Herodotus.[67] In Judaism, by contrast, the term is first found in Philo, who places it alongside other persons or institutions responsible for bringing up children,[68] then also in Josephus.[69] The function of the παιδαγωγός consisted in accompanying, upbringing, and supervising a child in the phase between being cared for by a nurse or nanny (τίτθη or τροφός) and the completion of adolescence.[70] It thus lies in the sphere of the tasks that are to be observed in relation to children who are growing up, for which reason the designation is to be situated semantically in the spectrum of γονεῖς, διδάσκαλος, τροφός, τίτθη, νουθητής, ἐπίτροπος and παιδευτής.[71] In particular, he was given the task of protecting the child for whom he is responsible from harassments and maltreatments and of accompanying him during the day.[72] Beyond this, however, he also participated in the education of the child. The concern was not with school education but with forms of social interaction such as proper speech, correct wearing of clothing, behavior at the table or courtesies,[73] but also with controlling one's own desires (ἐπιθυμίαι).[74] The texts occasionally sketch a picture of the παιδαγωγός as a

[66] For what follows cf. Young 1987; Belleville 1986, 59–63; Schuppe 1942; Spicq 1978, II, 639–41.

[67] Herodotus, *Hist.* 8.75.

[68] Philo, *Migr.* 116, together with διδάσκαλοι, γονεῖς, πρεσβύτεροι, ἄρχοντες and νόμοι. Comparable listings in *Legat.* 27, 115; *Her.* 295. Additional appearances in *Legat.* 53; *Sacr.* 15 and 51; *Det.* 145; *Flacc.* 15; *Virt.* 178; *Spec.* 2.233; *Mut.* 217.

[69] Josephus, *A.J.* 1.56: Cain is not Abel's παιδαγωγὸς καὶ φύλαξ. Cf. further *A.J.* 9.125–26; 10.186; 18.212; 20.183; *Vita* 429.

[70] Xenophon, *Lac.* 3.1; Plutarch, *Mor.* 439F; cf. Philo, *Legat.* 26; Seneca (the Younger), *Ep.* 25.6; Schuppe 1942, 2378.

[71] Plato, *Prot.* 325C; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.11; Plutarch, *Mor.* 36E; Philo, *Sacr.* 51; *Spec.* 2.233; *Legat.* 27.53.

[72] Plato, *Symp* 183C; Epictetus, *Diatr* 3.19; *Fragment* 97.

[73] Plutarch, *Mor.* 439E-F.

[74] Plutarch, *Mor.* 37C–E.

rough, tyrannical upbringer who availed himself of the right to mete out punishment in a heavy-handed manner.[75] Over against this, however, stands the praise and respect expressed in other texts.[76] At a later time, this was also connected with the fact that the παιδαγωγοί (*paedagogi*) were now regarded as mediators of Greek language and education to Roman children, by which means they could take over tasks for which the *praeceptor* or *magister* was traditionally responsible. This also includes the finding that *paedagogi* are mentioned in Latin tomb inscriptions,[77] as well as the fact that in a letter to her son a mother asks him to give her regards to τειμιώτατον παιδαγωγόν σου.[78] Thus, a negative or positive evaluation of the law by Paul does not yet emerge from these findings.

Paul builds on the possibility—which is found in Plato, Hellenistic popular philosophy, and Philo—of using the term figuratively.[79] The starting point for this [193] is the observation, which is connected with the function of the παιδαγωγός, that children need an upbringer in order to direct their unbridled passions.[80] Starting from here this function was then also transferred to the philosophers,[81] particularly to the Cynic,[82] as an upbringer of human beings. In a comparable way Plato, Philo, and Diogenes Laertius list the παιδαγωγός among the people or institutions who are upbringers, within which the νόμοι are also found.[83] This is revealing for the use of the metaphor in Galatians insofar as with it Paul designates the status of the Jewish people under the law as one that is comparable to a minor under an upbringer and thus not to be distinguished from that of a slave;[84] moreover, he will later explain that the orientation of the human being that is determined by the Spirit and no longer by the flesh is able to direct the passions themselves, thus a person, as one who walks in the Spirit, is no longer ὑπὸ νόμον (5.18)—and therefore also no longer ὑπὸ παιδαγωγός.[85] Here then the law has fulfilled its upbringing task insofar as the Christians correspond to it in the life κατὰ πνεῦμα, whereas they no longer need its restrictions.

Thus, in Galatians 3.23-25 there are evidently two aspects that led Paul to apply the metaphor of the παιδαγωγός to the Jewish law, namely the temporally limited role and the function of guiding those who are still minors.

[75] Plato, *Prot.* 325C; for this reason Philo describes the upbringing as punishment, *Leg.* 2.89–93; *Congr.* 94; *Post.* 97.

[76] Euripides, *Ion* 725–34; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.11.

[77] CIL VI 2210; 3898–99; 6327–30; 9741–51; 9753–57.

[78] POxy 6.930; cf. Moulton/Milligan 1997 [1930].

[79] Besides the present passage cf. in addition 1 Cor 4.15.

[80] Cf., e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 7.808E.

[81] Seneca (the Younger), *Ep.* 89.13.

[82] Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.17; Pseudo-Diogenes, *Ep.* 29.

[83] Plato, *Prot.* 325C–26E; Philo, *Her.* 295; *Virt.* 178; Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 3.92.

[84] Cf. Gal 4.1-2.

[85] Cf. Gal 5.18 as well as Lull 1986, 494–95.

With this he characterizes the law as an institution that watched over and guided the people of Israel in a specific phase—namely from Moses until Christ. This phase is thus simultaneously characterized as one of unfreedom, in which one needed such a upbringer, and one which has reached its end with the coming of the πίστις.[86] Paul will take up and develop both aspects in the next section.

1.4 Law and stoicheia: The universalizing of the law—On 4.1-7 (or 8-11)

In this part, Paul brings the argumentation about law and childship of Abraham, which he began in 3.6, to a temporary conclusion. It also becomes clear how the ways of Jewish and Gentile [194] Christians, in spite of the distinctiveness of each, nevertheless have commonalities. In addition, as in 3.23, 25, two phases of time are contrasted once again: ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον—ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν (4.1, 4). The characterization of the first phase as one of minority status, over against which the second stands as one of majority status, is also taken up. In the process, the inheritance imagery is taken further when two stages of development, namely νήπιος and υἱός, are now contrasted with each other, whereby the first is characterized by the fact that one stands under a guardianship and therefore is not different from a slave.[87]

The decisive change in relation to the previous section resides first in the replacement of the παιδαγωγός by ἐπίτροποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι and secondly in the exchange of νόμος for στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Grammatically this means first a replacement of singular with plural forms; semantically it means a use of more general terms.

Ἐπίτροπος can designate the manager in general or the guardian in particular.[88] In the present context the term belongs to the inheritance terms.[89] The οἰκονόμος

[86] The expression παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν is clearly to be interpreted as temporal. By contrast, the possibility of understanding the law as an upbringer "unto Christ" is ruled out.

[87] This is not an exaggeration (thus Mussner 1988), but corresponds to Roman legal practice. Paul himself emphatically emphasizes the difference to the slaves, who did not possess a family legal status: κύριος πάντων ὤν. With this the decisive difference is named, for slaves were not heirs. He refers, by contrast, to the fact that children—just as slaves (and also wives)—stood under the control of the *pater familias.* Cf. Gaius, *Inst.* 1.55, where the *potestas* of the father over his children is described as a specifically Roman right and equated with the right over the slaves (1.52). Cf. further Kaser 1955, 50–57, 99, 294–97.

[88] The latter already in Herodotus, *Hist.* 9.10; Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.80; then POxy 265.28; PRyl 109.18; 2 Macc 11.1; 13.2; 14.2; Philo, *Somn.* 1.107.

[89] In the Roman law concerning the guardian (*tutela*), which probably stands in the background here, the *tutor testamentaris* corresponds to it. Cf. Kaser 1955, 299–311.

was responsible for the management of the holdings but did not have the power of disposition over the inheritance.[90] By placing them together, Paul thus underlines the situation of various dependencies in which the not-of-age inheritor finds himself until the establishment of a time by the father that ends this phase. Moreover, through the use of the plural forms a connection is established to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which take over the function of the ἐπίτροποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι after verse 3.

The στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου designate either the four (or five) world elements: fire, water, air, earth (and if applicable ether)[91] or alternatively supernatural powers [195] envisaged as animated (such as, e.g., the elements, the stars, spirits, or angels).[92] For some time a wide-reaching consensus has formed regarding the first interpretation, which is based on the fact that all the evidence for other interpretations comes from the second century at the earliest, whereas only the aforementioned meaning is attested in the first century.[93] If one transfers this directly to Galatians 4.3, then with this expression Paul would describe the existence ὑπὸ νόμον as enslavement by the world and with this prepare for the use in verse 9, where he characterizes the pagan existence of the Galatians as such a time.[94] If one argues, by contrast, for the second interpretation,[95] then Paul would place the Jewish law and the pagan idol service on the same level in the fact that both are directed not to God but to other powers, whereby the concrete nature of these powers would once more be different for each (in the case of the Jews, the angels, which ordained the law according to 3.19, in the case of the Gentiles, the supposed gods).

The exegetical problem consists in the fact that on the one hand evidence for the designation elemental spirits, stars, demons, or angels is lacking for the time up to Paul, but on the other hand the meaning "world-elements" is not adequate for the interpretation of the passages in Galatians, since Paul obviously does not wish to say that Jews and Gentiles served fire, water, air, and earth prior to Christ.[96] Rather, the context of his argumentation makes it more likely that he uses the expression in a generalizing way for powers that place regulations on human beings that keep them from access to God. In support of this idea one can

[90] Cf. Liddell/Scott 1968, *ad loc.*

[91] The expression has this meaning in the ancient cosmology, where it first surfaces in Plato, *Tim.* 48B; 56B; 57C, which designates with this the physical raw material that is called ῥιζώματα by Empedocles, Fragment 6 (cf. also Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 3.24). Cf. then Philo, *Aet.* 109; *Cher.* 127; *Her.* 134 and 140; *Sib. Or.* 2.206; 3.80–81; 8.337; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.183; Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 7.136–37 (Zeno).

[92] Other possible meanings for στοιχεῖον, such as letters, foundations of a science, or supports of the all, are, by contrast, ruled out for Gal 4.3, 9, the first two already because of the addition τοῦ κόσμου.

[93] On this cf. Delling 1964, 672–85; 1971; Vielhauer 1979; Blinzler 1961; Schweizer 1988; 1989; Rusam 1992.

[94] Schweizer 1988; 1989, and Rusam 1992 interpret in this sense.

[95] Amidst differences in particulars this is done by Lietzmann; Schlier; Oepke; Betz; Mussner; Arnold 1996.

[96] This is also noted by Delling 1964, 684–85; 1971; Blinzler 1961.

put forward the fact that in Wisdom 13 there is talk of the foolish human being who is unable to perceive the one who is (τὸν ὄντα) from the good things that could be seen and to infer the artist from the work, but regards the works themselves (fire, wind, air, the stars, water, and the lights of heaven are listed) as gods. The term στοιχεῖον does not occur in this context,[97] but the treatment of the subject matter is nevertheless instructive. In addition Philo argues, in a way that is certainly illuminating for the Pauline passage, that it involves a rejection of God to worship the things that have come to be instead of the creator (τοὺς γεγονότας πρὸ τοῦ πεποιηκότος) and illustrates this with the worshipping of earth, water, air, and fire as the στοιχεῖα τοῦ παντός, whereupon he lists sun, moon, planets and fixed stars, the entire heaven as well as the world, and finally images from wood and stone that were created by mortal artisans.[98] In Philo this stands in the context of the view that unity is a principle that is superior to multiplicity, for which reason the one [196] God as creator stands over the many powers which serve him and which created the spiritual, bodiless world as an archetype of the perceptible world. This had, in turn, the consequence that some human beings worshipped the world as a whole as well as individual parts of it (sun and moon are mentioned separately).[99] Finally, Philo mentions in this context the angels as bodiless souls who serve God so that demons and angels can be equated.[100] With this the step to the Pauline argumentation in Gal 4 is no longer all that large.[101]

The passages show first that the confusion of creator and creatures—to which the gods of the Gentiles were also reckoned—was a topos of Jewish-Hellenistic philosophy of religion in dispute with pagan religion within which the στοιχεῖα could also be mentioned as things that were wrongly worshipped as divine. This explains first the usage in Galatians 4.9. In addition, one must consider the fact that Paul describes the Jewish law here as an institution that is comparable to the extent that it—mediated through angels—likewise stands between God and the recipients of the promise. Thus, the point of his argumentation consists in asserting that both the pagan gods and the angels are variations of the στοιχεῖα, to whom worship is given that belongs only to God. The fact that the designation of the idols and the angels as στοιχεῖα is not attested prior to Paul is not a weighty counterargument, for the presuppositions for this, in light of the aforementioned texts, were given, and Paul himself established this connection on account of the goal of his argumentation. His double use of the expression shows, however, that he stands in a Jewish tradition in which worship given to the powers of the world was presented as a confusion of creator and creation. What is new and

[97] In Judaism prior to Philo it is only found in Wis 7.17; 19.18; then also in 4 Macc 12.13. Cf. also the fragment to *Jub.* 2.8 in George Cedrenus, *Hist. Comp.* (Denis 1970, 71).

[98] Philo, *Spec.* 2.255.

[99] Philo, *Conf.* 170–73.

[100] Philo, *Conf.* 174; *Somn.* 1.137–41; *Gig.* 6 and 16.

[101] This is not, of course, to claim that Paul knew the writings of Philo. However, his remarks show that the presuppositions for the presentation of Paul were already prepared in the Jewish-Hellenistic philosophy of religion.

provocative in Paul is the fact that he also ranks the angels and the law mediated through them among these powers. Accordingly, the *stoicheia* service that competes with the worship of the one God (cf. 3.20 where the oneness of God is contrasted with the multiplicity of the angels!) is made concrete in the obligation to regulations of the Torah, as they are named in verse 10, or to the pagan idol service. For the Galatians, turning to the Jewish law would therefore only mean the replacement of one *stoicheia* service by another.

If with the image of the νόμος as παιδαγωγός Paul had emphasized the necessary supervision in the time of minority status, then now those of the prospective right to inheritance and the final obtainment of it move into the foreground. In connection with the case pertaining to the law of testaments in 3.15, the existence prior to Christ is then expressed as one of having a prospective right to inheritance in which one was dependent upon guardians (ἐπίτροποι) and managers (οἰκονόμοι). In the application of this example (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς) these are then designated as στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, under which "we" were enslaved. Here too, with this "we" the Jewish Christians are still meant as those to whom the redemption from the [197] νόμος, mentioned in verses 4-5, applied. The more general terminology, however, now permits the Jewish existence ὑπὸ νόμον to be presented as a special case of a general enslavement. This follows not least from the fact that in verse 9 the Galatians are warned against turning back again (πάλιν) under the slavery of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which they consequently also stood under previously when they still served gods that are in truth no gods (v. 8). When Paul mentions the keeping of days, months, times, and years, then he refers to Jewish regulations, which he now places on a level with the earlier idol service of the Galatians. The basis for this is the fact that he understands the law as an orientation framework that is comparable to others—such as, e.g., that of the Galatians—insofar as it summarized the regulations that were in force for the Jewish people and thereby defined its specific existence among the nations.[102] With this he has come—starting from the thesis in 2.16—to an understanding of the law that allows for a comparability of Jewish and Gentile Christians with regard to their previous existence, which additionally allows Christian existence to be understood fundamentally as a liberation from such regulations, which are characterized as enslaving by Paul.

The expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is thus used by Paul because with it he can describe a dependence on the κόσμος, which can manifest itself both in the form of an obligation to the Jewish νόμος issued by angels and in the pagan idol service. What makes the two comparable is the unfreedom that stands in opposition to Christian existence, for which the κόσμος

[102] On this, cf. also Lührmann 1980.

has been crucified (6.14). Accordingly, with the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are designated those powers to which the regulations of the law and of the pagan idol service are to be traced back, thus the angels or the pagan gods.

With this, the way is finally leveled out to use the concept of the law within the ethical instruction, to characterize it positively there as summed up in the love command, and to designate it in this new understanding as "law of Christ" (6.2). The presupposition for this is the fact that it no longer functions as the institution that watches over the Jewish people and enslaves it through the angels as a variant of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Paul can start from here because he understands the liberation through Christ as a liberation from a minority status, whereas he understands the Christian existence as a liberation in which one rules over the negative passions and promotes the positive ones in freedom. [198]

2. The universalizing of the law in Galatians— From Antiochene principle to the basis of a Christian community composed of Jews and Gentiles

(1) According to the suggestion advanced here, the argumentation of Galatians can only be adequately traced when one starts from the thesis that is summarized in the *propositio* and expressed especially in 2.16. This describes a shared conviction of the Antiochene community and is then interpreted by Paul with regard to the Galatian problem—namely the status of Gentiles within the Christian community. The principle of justification by faith without works of the law could not, however, decide this question alone but could—as demonstrated by the Galatian conflict, the incident at Antioch mentioned in Galatians, and also the apostolic decree—be interpreted differently. Paul's solution aims at a formulation of the identity ἐν Χριστῷ, which is, in part, not able to view the Jewish identity markers as binding at all and is in part only able to view them as binding in a radically transformed manner. Circumcision, food regulations, and the observance of Jewish festival times are classified as no longer necessary, whereas the content of the law is explicated with the help of fundamental principles of Jewish-Hellenistic ethics and taken over in a form that is oriented to the love command and no longer to the ritual specifications and in this way universalized.

(2) In the situation in which Paul writes Galatians, he is confronted for the first time with the problem of having to theologically ground the status of the Gentiles within the Christian community. He was forced to do so by his rivals, who advocated an alternative model and who could themselves start with the same right from the principle

mentioned in 2.16.[103] When Paul develops his argumentation starting from this principle, then this shows that he holds fast to the shared basis and struggles for its interpretation as well as the consequences that follow from this. By contrast, he wishes to show that the interpretation of this principle advocated by his rivals is a false understanding that wrongly claims that the other gospel proclamation—namely the one directed to the Jews—is opposed to his in content.[104] Against this, Paul presents the two ways mentioned in 2.7, 9, as [199] equally legitimate mission forms that start from the same presupposition. This struggle for the shared Antiochene basis explains first why it is precisely in this letter that Paul deals so extensively with the events surrounding his calling, the Jerusalem agreement, and the behavior of Peter, which was not adequate in his view. It could also be an argument for not moving Galatians too far from these events in time.

(3) Paul resolves the problem of the integration of the Gentiles through a qualitative distinction between promise and law with the help of recourses to analogies from the law of inheritance and the institution of the παιδαγωγός. He comes to the solution that the law was a disposition that is secondary to the promise to Abraham and Christ, which is shown in the fact that it was given later and mediated through angels and Moses. With this the law is interpreted as an institution that exercised an upbringing, preserving, but also restrictive function for the people of Israel in the phase between Moses and Christ, which is unnecessary in Christ since those who were previously minors have come of age. In this respect, the resolution of the problem of the law is not the actual main theme of the letter but it obtains its meaning within the angle of questioning about how Jews and Gentiles are equally children of Abraham and thus can gain access to the community in Christ.

(4) With regard to the Gentiles, Paul comes to the solution that their access does not pass through the law. Rather, the Christ event obtains validity for them in another way than it does for the Jews. It is true that their past under the idols is comparable to the Jewish existence under the law that was issued by angels, but the Gentiles attain to freedom only by the "detour" that the Jewish Christians were redeemed from the curse of the law and the Gentiles were incorporated into this event. In this respect, one encounters for the first time in Galatians a thoroughgoing theological treatment of the question of how

[103] We do not know, of course, whether they explicitly appealed to this. But the fact that Paul starts with this once again for the presentation of his view shows that it was for him a matter of the correct understanding of this principle.

[104] Cf. the remarks on 1.6-7 in chap. 7: The *other* gospel (ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον) is not *substantively* different (οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο) from his gospel.

the Christ event can obtain meaning for human beings outside of the Jewish people.

(5) In Galatians we thus have a first attempt of Paul to mediate the particular validity of the Jewish law with the universal validity of the Christ event. He will develop this further in Romans and in many respects—for example, in the anthropological reflection on human beings under sin or with regard to the universal validity of the law as an orientation given to all human beings—will judge more fundamentally than what takes place here in Galatians. Also the question—which here stands at most in the background but is not treated as a topic in its own right—of how the law as holy will of God and its factual nonobservance by (pre-Christian) human beings relate to each other, is formulated there as an anthropological question and [200] resolved through the Christians' walking in the Spirit.[105] Here in Galatians this anthropological component appears as an opposition between minority status *before* Christ and freedom *in* Christ, whereby the latter enables one in an analogous way to live according to the Spirit—and thus not in opposition to the (or a) law.[106] The question of an institution for Gentiles that is analogous to the Jewish law is answered in Galatians, however, with the help of a placement of the νόμος into the category of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which denies the Jews access to the promise of the one God just as the idol service denies access to the Gentiles. By contrast, it says in Romans that the Gentiles are law to themselves or have received the law written in their hearts.[107] Here the conflict is thus anchored less in the nature of the law as an institution than in the coming together of God's instruction, which the human being affirms with his νοῦς, and the ἕτερος νόμος, which leads him to sin.[108] Viewed in this way, Romans can be understood as an early interpretation of Galatians.[109]

(6) In Galatians, Paul deals for long stretches with the question of how the law as the basis of identity and orientation framework for the Jewish people can be understood anew in light of the Christ event. He develops a creative theological solution in which the Gentile Christians as children of Abraham likewise obtain their place. The sharpness of the confrontation with his Jewish rivals is shown in the devaluation of the law in relation to the promise. The divine origin is not thereby fundamentally contested, but it is placed on a level that lets

[105] Rom 7.14-25; 8.1-11.
[106] Cf. 5.23: κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.
[107] Rom 2.14-15.
[108] Rom 7.23.
[109] Cf. Martyn 1997b.

it appear comparable to the regulations of pagan idol service, which must no longer be observed subsequent to the freedom reached in Christ. Christians are therefore neither under the angels nor under the idols and should instead make use of the freedom reached in Christ. Finally, the sharpness is also shown in the fact that according to Gal 4.21-31 the "true" childship of Abraham is established not through bodily descent but through belonging to the one covenant of the two covenants going forth from Abraham that leads into freedom and not into slavery.[110] [201]

(7) Paul, however, does not only speak of the law in this negative manner.[111] When he opens the paraenesis with the love command as a summary of the law (5.14) and speaks of the "law of Christ" in 6.2, then this shows that the law—now understood as a standard of orientation for the community formed from Jews and Gentiles—has not simply become irrelevant. It is, however, placed on a new basis, a basis whose foundation for Paul presents a thoroughgoing inclusive interpretation of the Antiochene principle from Galatians 2.16, and which leads in its consequences to a material filling through topoi of Jewish-Hellenistic popular ethics. In this respect Paul develops a double universalizing of the law in Galatians. First, it was analogous to pagan regulations prior to the "coming of the faith" (cf. 3.23) and in this respect lets the pre-Christian time of Jews and Gentiles appear comparable from the perspective of the Christ event. Secondly, it is now presented as a summary of standards that are equally valid for Jews and Gentiles within the Christian community and are unpacked in 5.19-21 or 22-23.

With this tension-filled solution, which does not simply take leave of the Jewish law but nevertheless defines Christianity beyond the identity markers of Judaism (and, of course, all the more beyond those of paganism), Paul developed one of the most profiled theological answers of early Christianity to the question of the law, an answer that must always be thought through anew in its creativity and intellectual penetration of one of the central problems of the Christianity of the first century.

[110] On this cf. Sellin 1999.
[111] Cf. Dunn 2005b, 259–77.

This page intentionally left blank

Metaphorical Christology in Paul

Reflections on the Contribution of a Theory-of-Metaphor Approach to Christology with Reference to a Number of Christological Metaphors in the Letters of Paul

1. Metaphorical and historical Christology

In the investigation of concepts and ideas that early Christianity used for the interpretation of the person of Jesus, research has occupied itself for a long time and intensively with historical and tradition-historical questions. Thus the relationship between the activity and fate of Jesus on the one hand and the emergence of the christological convictions of early Christianity on the other hand was—and is—discussed;[1] moreover, the orientation to the designations of majesty applied to Jesus and their tradition-historical background have played—and play—an important role.[2] By contrast, the discussion of metaphor was—which may be surprising—made less fruitful [204]. Rather, it has been conducted to a large extent within parables research[3] and beyond this has left its mark in the investigation of image

[1] In the nineteenth century this question played an important role in the framework of the grounding of the Christian faith in the historical personality of Jesus. Prominent here is the conception of Schleiermacher 1864, the position of C. H. Weisse developed in dispute with D. F. Strauss, and the liberal life-of-Jesus research, which for a large part also stood in dispute with Strauss. If, by contrast, the developments at the end of the nineteenth and in the early half of the twentieth century (collapse of the life-of-Jesus research, history of religions school, form criticism) shifted the accents to the post-Easter confession formation, then at present inquiry is increasingly being made again into the lines of connection between the activity and fate of Jesus and the emergence of the Christology.

[2] Here the investigation of Boussett 1965 [1913]; 1970, was guiding. On this orientation cf. further—amidst all the difference of the presentations—Kramer 1963; Fuller 1965; Cullmann 1975 [1957]; 1986; Hahn 1995 [1965]; 1969. This approach brought to light important history-of-religion insights with regard to the emergence of the Christology and therefore possesses—despite the qualifications about to be named—its enduring validity. This is documented not least through more recent works that are devoted to the meaning of designations applied to Jesus. Cf., e.g., Schnelle 2000; Karrer 2002.

[3] Cf. more recently the investigations of Meurer 1997; Massa 2000; Liebenberg 2001.

fields in the New Testament[4] and in the exegesis of Paul and John.[5] If, however, in the presentation of the events around Jesus of Nazareth we are dealing with processes of the ascription of meanings to historical events, then these interpretations are not accessible from the historical findings in themselves—even though they can be explained in their genesis—but only from the interplay of event and interpretation. If these ascriptions of meaning—as will become increasingly clear—often possess metaphorical character, then the starting point for a metaphorical Christology lies here: as a constituent element of language, metaphor possesses reality-structuring and reality-disclosing power. The analysis of its use within Christology therefore illuminates an important area of the construction of the world of meaning of early Christian faith.

The importance of historical and tradition-historical questions on the emergence of Christology is not thereby relativized. Rather, the question of the connection between the activity and fate of Jesus on the one hand and the early Christian faith statements on the other side makes plausible in their emergence aspects of early Christology that were already begun with Jesus himself.[6] Recent discussion has shown that more connecting lines can be shown here than scholarship was inclined to accept for quite some time.[7] One would have to mention, for example, [205] the tying of the breaking in of the rule of God to his own activity,[8] the use of the Son of Man expression as a self-designation,[9] and an integration of his

[4] Cf. von Gemünden 1993; Zimmermann 2001.

[5] As examples reference may be made to Kitzberger 1986; Röhser 1987; Martin 1990; C. G. Müller 1995; Schwankl 1995.

[6] On this cf. also Schröter 2010 [2006], esp. §B. 5: Jesus and the beginnings of the Christian Faith (300–23).

[7] Cf., e.g., Luz 1996, 715: "But it remains the case that the early Christian Christology is already founded in considerable parts with Jesus"; Hengel/Schwemer 2001, 1–80, 81–131; De Jonge 1996, 193–221. In Karrer 1998, the tracing of the emergence of christological statements as reception and development of the activity and fate of Jesus occupies a large part of his work (Part 4: The Son and His Earthly Activity, 174–334). The conclusion of his "concluding reflections" runs as follows: "the earthly Jesus, it has become clear, not only belongs in the Christology. His understanding gives fundamental impulses to it" (327). Working in the opposite direction are those tendencies within the so-called "Third Quest" that argue in the tradition of Bultmann and the history of religions school for a discrepancy between Jesus and the early faith statements.

[8] Cf., e.g., Merklein 1984; 1989, 51–91; Karrer 1998, 221–35. In the Jesus book of Becker 1996, the activity of Jesus is developed from the rule of God (122–275) as the "central concept of the proclamation of Jesus" (122). Cf. also Schröter 2010 [2006], 190–215.

[9] This is admittedly disputed. Cf. more recently Theissen/Merz 2001; 1998; Schröter 2010 [2006], 246–56, on the one hand and Becker 1996, 249–67, on the other hand. Even if, as is sometimes suggested, Jesus is to have expected a person distinct from himself as the coming Son of Man and the identification with him was first made after Easter (which, however, seems improbable to me), then this could only be understood in such a way

approaching death into his activity.[10] By contrast, the statements found in early Christian texts concerning Jesus' equality with God (Phil 2.6: ἴσα θεῷ), the sending of the Son of God (Gal 4.4; Rom 8.3; 1 John 4.9), and the designation of Jesus as ἱλαστήριον (Rom 3.25) or προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία (Eph 5.2) surround his person with fields of interpretation that go far beyond an orientation to his earthly activity.

The orientation to the so-called titles of majesty can shed light on the eschatological bringers of salvation and notions of redemption with which the early Christians brought Jesus into relation. Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked—and this has already often been emphasized—that this approach is fraught with a number of problems. Through investigations, for example, of the expressions Anointed One and Son of Man it has become doubtful that the designations classified as "titles of majesty" were terms with which a fixed concept was bound.[11] Instead it has become clear that we are dealing with expressions that were used in different ways within Judaism and not with fixed notions that would then simply have been transferred to Jesus. Rather, their [206] application to Jesus represents a special case of their reception, in which certain semantic features were actualized and connected with his activity and fate. Thus, the statement, for example, that the Anointed One died, was buried, and was raised is a use—intelligible only in light of the fate of Jesus—of the Jewish idea of the Anointed One, which represents an innovation and which expands, in turn, the semantic spectrum of this term.[12] What differentiates the expressions subsumed under the "titles of majesty" from other designations applied to Jesus—such as σωτήρ,[13] εἰκὼν θεοῦ,[14] θεοῦ σοφία,[15] or λόγος[16]—is not quite clear in view of these findings.[17] Moreover, the designations usually

---

that he viewed himself as the earthly counterpart to the heavenly Son of Man, so that his exclusive claim to majesty would also be held fast to in this solution. Becker 1996, 267–75, classifies Jesus in this sense as "eschatological prophet of salvation" of the rule of God. Merklein 1989, 152–64, comes to a similar judgment: Jesus as "a kind of earthly counterpart of the heavenly Son of Man" (164).

[10] Cf. Luz 2002. Understanding the death of Jesus as an integral part of his activity as a whole was, beyond this, an important concern of Schürmann. Cf. Schürmann 1994, 157–315.

[11] On the Messiah title cf., e.g., De Jonge 1986; the contributions in Charlesworth 1992; Zimmermann 1998; Schreiber 2000; on the Son of Man expression cf. Perrin 1974; M. Müller 1984; Lindars 1983; Collins 1992; Vögtle 1994.

[12] Cf. Dahl/Juel 1992.

[13] Phil 3.20; Eph 5.23; 2 Tim 1.10; Tit 1.4; 2.13; 3.6; 2 Pet 1.1, 11; 3.2, 18; 1 John 4.14; Luke 2.11; Acts 5.31; 13.23; John 4.42.

[14] 2 Cor 4.4; Col 1.15.

[15] 1 Cor 1.24; cf. 1.30.

[16] John 1.1.

[17] The lack of clearly differentiating criteria for distinguishing between "titles" and

reckoned among the titles of majesty[18] only grasp certain aspects, whereas fields of interpretation that are characterized by other linguistic images remain unconsidered, and the narratively developed Christologies of the Gospels come into view at most in passing.[19]

These observations make clear first that an inquiry into the christological conceptions of early Christianity should not be limited to the historical and tradition-historical aspects. Rather, one must inquire into the ascriptions through which the activity and fate [207] of Jesus became the center of a specific interpretation of reality. If one considers the early Christian writings from this perspective, then numerous images and image fields come into view, which show a broad spectrum in which the person of Jesus refracts. To present metaphors as a specific form of the language of images represents an important sphere of this "Christology of images."[20] The contribution of a "metaphorical Christology" can therefore consist in drawing out the notions associated with the metaphors and in emphasizing in this way the gain to language that its use for the interpretation of the events surrounding Jesus involves. This leads to a few remarks on metaphor as a phenomenon of language.

2. Theory-of-metaphor clarifications

In what follows the concern is not with an evaluation of the recent discussion of metaphor[21] but with a number of aspects that are relevant for the considerations advanced here.

---

other designations for Jesus also finds telling expression in the fact that in the various presentations the designations treated as "titles" are by no means always the same. The view advocated by Hahn in his introduction that "the christological views of the oldest communities have, however, largely found expression in levels of tradition that are characterized by a certain title of majesty" (Hahn 1995 [1965], 9; cf. 1969, 11) is clarified by Hahn in the fifth edition, due to various forms of criticism, with the statement that for a Christology of the New Testament, the titles of majesty play "a not insignificant role" but are "only decisive in part" and are to be supplemented by an investigation of the "various aspects of christological statements of confession and their theological explications" (Hahn 1995 [1965], 449). In such an overall view, an incorporation of the titles of majesty remains, of course, an important contribution to a Christology of the New Testament.

[18] In his investigation Hahn 1995 [1965]; 1969, deals with the designations Son of Man, Lord, Christ, Son of David, and Son of God. In light of the designations used in early confessions other expressions—such as teacher, prophet, or Savior—could definitely be added.

[19] Cf. Keck 1986; Hahn 1995 [1965], 449–50; Karrer 1998, 18.

[20] On the placement of metaphor in the phenomenon of the language of images, which is to be understood more broadly, cf. R. Zimmermann 2000.

[21] Reference may be made to Danneberg/Graeser/Petrus 1995 and from the side of theology to Bernhardt/Link-Wieczorek 1999.

Recently, cognitive approaches have directed attention to the metaphor as a general feature of human language. Fundamental here is the conviction—already asserted by H. Weinrich and M. Black[22]—that it is inadequate to divide the metaphor from everyday language and to restrict it to semantic innovation and consciously produced tensions. If Weinrich pointed to the context determination and Black to the importance of the process of reception as indispensable aspects for determining the nature of metaphor, then cognitive theories of metaphor direct attention to the place of metaphor in the system of language. Considerations that point in this direction are found already with E. Cassirer, who understands the transfer of ideas or feelings into sounds as a transfer process into another medium (μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος) and specified this process as the nature of the "radical metaphor," which thereby becomes equally the source of language and of myth.[23]

A comparable approach is found with E. Jüngel, who criticizes the understanding of metaphor as "non-actual" (*uneigentlich*) and in contrast [208] advocates the view of the fundamentally metaphorical character of language.[24] Jüngel disputes the appropriateness of the view that assigns metaphor to rhetoric and regards it as *ornatus* (ornament or embellishment).[25] Building on Nietzsche's investigation *On Truth and Lies in an Extra-Moral Sense* he argues instead that the μεταφορά be understood as a double process of transference, namely first as an "anhropological process of orientation,"[26] with which the human being reacts to the world that affects him or her and obtains an image of it, and secondly as a conversion of this image into language. According to Jüngel language thus does not possess a *direct* relationship to extra-linguistic reality but structures this with the help of the ascription of meanings. With regard to metaphor this means that it is not understood as transference of meaning between various linguistic concepts—thus as a phenomenon *within* language—but as a theory-of-language category for the description of the nature of language in general. If the use of metaphor is understood as a process of transference that is inherent in the use of language per se, then the concern is no longer with an intra-linguistic process of the allocation of meanings through transference but with the nature and manner in which human knowing of reality is carried out in general.

[22] Weinrich 1976 (reprinted in Haverkamp 1996, 316–39); Black 1977 (translated into German in Haverkamp 1996, 379–413).

[23] Cassirer 1983 (originally published in 1956).

[24] Jüngel 1974; 1989.

[25] Jüngel 1974, 74–81; 1989, 20–27.

[26] Jüngel 1974, 84; 1989, 31.

With this position Jüngel has provided an important pointer insofar as he emphasized the inadequacy of restricting metaphor to the function of *ornatus* and defined it instead as a general phenomenon of language. By contrast, it is questionable whether his nullification of the distinction between metaphorical and non-metaphorical language use can be sustained.

In the cognitive theory of metaphor, a comparable view of language can be observed insofar as it starts from the assumption that metaphorical language use is not to be separated from everyday language but is based upon it. Here language is first judged—as with Cassier and Jüngel—as an instrument with the help of which human beings disclose and order reality by setting forth specific concepts. According to the cognitive view, however, the metaphor consists in elucidating one concept through another, thus in transporting meaning via at least two semantic fields. Unlike in Cassier and Jüngel, a distinction is indeed made between metaphorical and non-metaphorical language use. [209] A metaphorical use of language is present in the moment when a concept with which we structure reality is used to grasp another sphere. This theory was fundamentally introduced in the study of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson *Metaphors We Live By* and has been worked out in various ways since then.[27] Despite the criticism that has been advanced in the meantime,[28] this concept can be regarded as bringing us further, since it reflects on metaphor against the background of a cognitive theory of language and can thereby explain how transfers of meanings from one sphere to another one function.

It is thus common to the above-sketched approaches that they do not see the nature of metaphor, in the first place, in the production of tension, or in being semantically innovative. Beyond this, the cognitive approach opens up first the possibility of differentiating between different degrees of innovation for metaphorical language use and secondly of describing the cognitive foundation of the concepts that are employed for the structuring of reality. Thus the formulations in the preceding sentences of this contribution, namely "to divide the metaphor from everyday language," "insights play a role," or "to obtain an image," are not semantic innovations but they explain certain matters by drawing on another concept (scholarly description as a conquering of a region, discourse as drama, knowledge of reality as securing a possession). These concept metaphors can then be assigned to additional individual metaphors: to assert a position, to enter the scene, to appropriate knowledge. Finally, in this way the contribution of metaphorical concepts to the structuring of reality becomes just as recognizable as its programmatic calling into question. This is to be kept in view for the investigation of metaphorical concepts in Paul.

[27] Lakoff/Johnson 1980. Cf. further Lakoff/Turner 1989; Turner 1992.
[28] Cf., e.g., Baldauf 2000.

Thus, according to the cognitive approach, the nature of metaphorical language use consists in structuring reality by placing concepts in relation to one another and thereby establishing similarities. The difference between conventional and new metaphors is at first not yet important here. Rather, this distinction first comes into play at the moment when metaphors that expand the concepts of our everyday reality or bring forth new concept-metaphors are formed. The cognitive metaphor theory can thus be understood as an epistemological foundation for those models that define the nature of metaphor primarily or exclusively from the standpoint of semantic innovation or produced tension. The cognitive theory confronts these approaches with a model that integrates the metaphor into an overall view of the character of language, [210] which is understood as rooted in the structure of human thinking and as an instrument for disclosing reality that is shaped by this thinking. The innovative power of metaphor is not thereby called into question; it is, however, evaluated within a more comprehensive theory as a feature inherent in language. With these observations we turn in the next step to metaphorical aspects in the Christology of Paul.

3. Metaphorical Christology in Paul

The remarks in the first section suggest that we not deduce the Pauline Christology via the use of fixed designations but that we examine those language fields with whose help Paul brings the significance of the person of Jesus to expression. In connection with the observations of the second section, attention will also have to be given to which concepts Paul draws upon and where his own innovation lies. In doing so, it is not advisable to distinguish sharply between pre-Pauline tradition and Pauline interpretation. It is well known that Paul adopted from the early Christian tradition a number of interpretations that were also fixed in language. On the one hand, these include designations of majesty such as χριστός, κύριος and υἱὸς θεοῦ, statements about the death of Christ for our sins (1 Cor 15.3; cf. Gal 1.4), his designation as ἱλαστήριον established by God (Rom 3.25), the sending of the Son through God (Rom 8.3; Gal 4.4), statements about the resurrection of Jesus (e.g., 1 Thess 1.10; Rom 4.24-25; 10.9), and his installation as Son of God through the resurrection (Rom 1.3-4) to name only a few.[29] This traditional material was taken up by Paul, reworked linguistically, and fit into his own argumentation. If Paul thus stands here within an early Christian process of development, then his own voice is to be drawn out of the interplay between the adoption of tradition and its further development.

[29] In the German-language sphere, F. Hahn and M. Hengel have above all rendered a great service to the illumination of the early Christology, to which Paul already refers back, in developing further—in part critically—the approaches especially of W. Heitmüller and W. Bousset. Cf. Hahn 1995 [1965]; 1969; Hengel 1972 as well as the contributions in Hengel 1995.

A distinction can be made, however, between metaphors that Paul takes over from the tradition without interpreting them further and metaphors in which his own christological views crystallize. Thus the designation of Jesus as χριστός, for example, is a christological metaphor that Paul takes over without developing it further. For him this is an established designation for Jesus [211] that has already faded in the pre-Pauline tradition from being a title to being part of Jesus' name, and it is not used by Paul to enrich with additional metaphorical statements the image field of being anointed or being the kingly Anointed One.[30] By contrast, the situation is different with the predications of Jesus as υἱὸς θεοῦ and κύριος. These also occur in pre-Pauline traditions,[31] but they are used by Paul to explicate central contents of the Christ event.[32] The situation is also different with the metaphor of the resurrection of Jesus. While Paul also takes this over from the tradition, he creatively develops it further. Starting from these observations, I will consider two spheres of Pauline Christology more closely in what follows and question them with a view to their metaphorical basis. In starting with the reevaluating metaphors we begin with a central area of Paul's use of christological metaphors.

3.1 Reevaluating metaphors as an expression of Pauline Christology

The first area is characterized by metaphors that call conventional orientations of value into question by turning the realization of these values into their opposite. This comes to expression most clearly in the paradoxical reversal of wisdom and foolishness in 1 Corinthians 1.18–2.16. The conventional view according to which wisdom is viewed positively and foolishness negatively is retained by Paul; with regard to their realization, however, a contra-factual relation to their common evaluation is established: true wisdom is foolishness before the world and vice versa, for God

[30] On the Pauline use of the Christ designation and its tradition-historical backgrounds cf. Hengel 1982; 1983. Paul knows, of course, the tradition of the origin of Jesus from the line of David (Rom 1.3) and stresses that the Anointed One κατὰ σάρκα comes from Israel (Rom 9.5; cf. 11.26).

[31] υἱὸς θεοῦ: 1 Thess 1.9-10; Rom 1.3-4; 8.3; Gal 4.4; κύριος: Rom 10.9; 1 Cor 8.6; 12.3 (cf. 16.22); Phil 2.11.

[32] The Son of God is the one who was revealed to Paul (Gal 1.16) with whom important soteriological functions such as preservation from the wrath of God (1 Thess 1.9-10), the redemption of those enslaved under the law (Gal 4.4) and the judgment of sin through God (Rom 8.3) are also associated. Cf. the justified correction of the older view, which assigned no fundamental meaning for the Pauline Christology to the Son of God title, by Labahn 2000. That the *kyrios* title as a designation of the Exalted One, who rules over all (Rom 10.12; 14.9) and whom the Christians call upon (Rom 10.9; 1 Cor 1.2; 16.22; Phil 2.11) occupies a central position within the Pauline Christology requires no additional justification.

has turned the wisdom of the world into foolishness (1.20) and chosen the foolishness of the world (1.27). This reversal has its basis in the [212] resurrection of the crucified Christ, which shows that the action of God stands in opposition to the earthly standards of value. The proclamation of Jesus Christ is therefore called here λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ and is referred to in a paradoxical manner as foolishness through which God saves the believing ones (1.22). What Paul proclaims is therefore only apparent foolishness, whereas in truth it is the wisdom of God that *appears* as foolishness to the world and is only accessible to the perfect (2.6-7).

This reevaluation of accepted conceptions of value represents a central area of Pauline Christology, which I will examine more closely with reference to a number of metaphors with which Paul interprets the death of Jesus.

3.1.1 Jesus Christ as ἱλαστήριον (Rom 3.25)

An initial area in which reevaluating metaphors are found is the use of cultic metaphors. This occurs in Paul in the first place in the designation of Jesus as the ἱλαστήριον set up by God in Romans 3.25. It is debated whether the tradition that Paul cites here alludes with this term to the cover of the ark,[33] which is designated in the LXX translation of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers as ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθημα (thus Exod 25.17) and then in an abbreviated manner as ἱλαστήριον, and whether this is also intended as a reference by Paul himself.[34] Should this be the case,[35] then we would

[33] Attention is to be paid to the fact that already in the LXX the concern in this connection is with a metaphorical ascription, which is taken over from the Hebrew text where the cover is designated as כפרת. This was already pointed out by Deissmann 1903, 270–71: "It is not superfluous to stress with particular emphasis that the word ἱλαστήριον in the LXX neither *means* the cover of the ark nor was it normally *used* merely for the cover of the ark" (emphasis in original).

[34] The exegetical controversy around this question has a venerable tradition and is not to be taken up again here. For a concise presentation of the philological findings as well as the possible meanings of the term, reference may be made instead—alongside Deissmann 1903—to Breytenbach 1989, 166–68. Here it is sufficient to maintain that the point of the metaphorical conceptualization of this text consists in designating the previous ways for the cleansing of sins—whether bound to the temple cult or removed from it—as surpassed in light of Jesus' death on the cross: if the cross is specified by God as the place for the removal of sins then this has consequences for the previous possibilities for the cleansing of sins.

[35] This reference is not certain. The term ἱλαστήριον is already used in the LXX outside of the Pentateuch for other places (Ezek 43.14, 17, 20; Amos 9.1; cf. Gen 6.15: Symmachus). Moreover, an allusion to the cover of the ark cannot be clearly evidenced from Rom 3.25. It is well known that in addition such a reference has its difficulties because the cultic process described in Lev 16 serves the cleansing of the sanctuary and therefore is suited only with difficulty as a metaphor source domain for the interpretation of Jesus' death on a cross. Whether one restricts the metaphor to this depends on which background

be dealing with an [213] interpretation of the death of Jesus against the background of the ritual on the Day of Atonement according to Leviticus 16: Jesus Christ publicly set up by God—presumably the publicly visible cross is in mind—takes the place that the top of the ark previously occupied and becomes the place where the purification of sins now occurs. If, however, one does not accept this reference,[36] then with the expression ἱλαστήριον the death of Christ is interpreted as an event through which God has opened up the possibility through faith[37] of breaking free from their sins without the concrete focus on the temple cult. Thus, in this case ἱλαστήριον would be understood generally as a gift, which is presented to the gods in order to thank them, to ask them for help, or to propitiate them.

Philologically and tradition historically the question of which possibility is to be favored cannot be answered with ultimately certainty. It is clear, however, that in Paul the ἱλαστήριον is set up *by God himself*, who has created a possibility for removing sins through the cross of Christ.[38] Therein lies simultaneously the decisive difference from the Jewish texts in which cultic ideas for the interpretation of the death of martyrs are found.[39] The appropriation of the offer of the removal of sins διὰ πίστεως and the change of state bound up with it can then be described as the way from being sinners to being people cleansed from sin. [214]

Independent of which tradition-historical reference is favored, it is thus clear that in Romans 3.25 we are dealing with a *metaphorical*

---

one draws upon in order to ascribe meaning to the terms ἱλαστήριον and αἷμα. The *necessity* of drawing only on the aforementioned LXX use for this can only be justified with difficulty thereby.

[36] Thus recently Schreiber 2006 who understands Rom 3.25-26a as a genuine Pauline formulation, thus not as a piece of tradition, and interprets ἱλαστήριον as a gift of consecration with recourse to the material presented by Deissmann 1903. Cranfield 1998/2001, I, 214–18, and Haacker 1999, 90–91, previously spoke out in favor of a meaning not determined by Lev 16.

[37] The prepositional supplement διὰ πίστεως is often regarded as a Pauline addition to the formula. Thus already Bultmann 1984, 49; Käsemann 1964b, 96–100, 100; more recently Wilckens 1987–1989, I, 193–94. Then it would especially stress the Pauline understanding of ἱλαστήριον: The cleansing of sins made possible through Christ's death on the cross is appropriated through faith.

[38] Schreiber 2006, 105, also points clearly to this.

[39] The analogies from 2 and 4 Maccabees, which are sometimes put forth, must therefore be made more precise: in 2 Macc 7.37-38; 4 Macc 6.28-29; 17.22 the concern is with—as also, by the way, in Dan 3.38-40—the fact that the death of the martyrs should propitiate God. In Daniel and 4 Maccabees this is expressed with the help of the cultic idea of the cleansing offering. It is true that the ἵλεως/ἱλαστήριος terminology also appears here, but the substantive ἱλαστήριον is not used (in 4 Macc 17.22 the better attested reading τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν is to be read against Rahlfs). Schreiber 2006, 98, rightly points to these findings. Cf. also Breytenbach 2000, 240–42.

statement[40]—and indeed with a very bold one: with the sentence "God publicly displayed him [namely Jesus Christ] as a place for the cleansing of sins, which is appropriated in faith and brought about through his blood . . ." a meaning is ascribed to the crucifixion of Jesus that can only be understood under the presupposition of the action of God through Jesus Christ. By contrast, it is directly evident that the pure event of the execution of Jesus does not contain this meaning—and also does not exactly suggest it.

The metaphorical process of Romans 3.25 can thus be described in such a way that a general ancient concept (the removal of guilt through a cultic act in which blood is shed) in its Israelite-Jewish form (God removes the sins of Israel) is transferred to the historical event of Jesus' death on the cross. In order for this transference to function, certain identifications must be made by the recipients, whereas other aspects are blended out. It is decisive that the cross of Jesus is understood against the horizon of the other place, which is designated as ἱλαστήριον, as an institution set up by God for the removal of sins. In addition, the cultic metaphor must be brought into connection with the death of a human being, which is not suggested by the biblical tradition.[41] It is at this point therefore that the greatest boldness of the metaphor lies, for it insinuates that the death of Jesus should be understood within a cultic frame of interpretation. For the process of reception it is thus decisive that both the sin-removing effect of the blood[42] and the locus at which this process takes place is transferred to Jesus. By contrast, the objection, which is sometimes raised, that Jesus could not simultaneously be the one whose blood is shed and the place of the removal of sin fails to recognize that the metaphorical process consists precisely in the fact that both are understood from the perspective of the death of Jesus and for this reason are grouped together.

In his interpretation, Paul places this cultic metaphor into the horizon of the simultaneous revelation of the wrath and righteousness of God [215] and thereby into a context that is characterized by judgment metaphors. God hands over the human beings (παραδοῦναι, Rom 1.26); the human beings are without excuse (ἀναπολόγητος, 2.1); the concern is with judging, judgment, recompense, and righteousness (2.1-2, 6, 12-16; 3.5, 10), for which the νόμος is the standard (3.19-20) or which is established through

[40] This aspect is rightly emphasized by Schreiber 2006, 99.

[41] As is well known, the only biblical text in which sin removal and the death of a human being are set in relation to each other is Isa 53. This is, however, not formulated against a cultic background and can therefore be left out of view here. Cf. Janowski 1997.

[42] That the ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι refers to the violent death of Jesus, as Röhser 2002, 118, recently suggested, appears improbable to me on account of the fact that the prepositional expression is to be read as appositional to ἱλαστήριον. It is more likely that the cultic metaphor also extends to this expression.

the grace of God (χάρις) (3.24). Through the joining of cultic and judgment metaphors there emerges in this way the complex metaphor "God establishes righteousness through the death of a human being."

3.1.2 Christ as τὸ πάσχα (1 Cor 5.7)

The designation of Jesus as slaughtered Passover lamb in 1 Corinthians 5.7 also belongs to the sphere of cultic metaphors. In this case we are dealing with a reception of a cultic metaphor that is to be distinguished from Romans 3.25. The blood of the Passover lamb did not serve to cleanse from sins nor was the killing of this lamb in any way a sacrificial process.[43] Therefore, the θύειν in 1 Corinthians 5.7 should also not be rendered as "sacrifice" but as "slaughter."[44]

Rather, the function of the Passover lamb was to preserve from destruction. The Passover tradition is received in this way in *Jubilees* 49.3 and later in the Rabbinic literature and in Melito of Sardis.[45] In each case what is at issue is that the blood of the Passover lamb preserves from the adversary the ones on whose door it is applied.[46] Paul takes up this tradition in 1 Corinthians 5 in order to insist on the preservation of the purity of the community: the community of those who belong to Christ has put aside the wickedness and immorality of this world and belongs to a sphere in which one is preserved from the wrath of God.[47] The use of the Passover metaphor[48] in 1 Corinthians 5 thus serves to describe the Christian community [216] as a fellowship protected from sin and uncleanness through the death of Jesus, which may not let Satan penetrate into their sphere again. Instead, they must preserve their purity by removing the sexually immoral sinner from their midst. Here too the concern is thus with a metaphor that can

[43] Cult, removal of sins, and sacrifice are not necessarily connected with one another. Rather, it is necessary to inquire in each case into which process is in view. Cf. Willi-Plein 2000, 170–71: "Not every cultic process is a sacrifice, not every sacrifice serves the expiation, let alone every ritual that resembles a sacrifice. The one who does not only wish to assume a sacrificial character and an expiating effect of the death of Christ but also to ground it biblically cannot draw upon the Passover for this. Neither the Passover lamb nor Christ is sacrificed according to the biblical witnesses."

[44] The formulation should be understood against the background of the fixed expression θύειν τὸ πάσχα, which occurs in Exod 12.21 (cf. v. 27); Deut 16.2, 5-6; 1 Esd 1.6.

[45] Cf. Ostmeyer 2002, 39–40, as well as the detailed investigation of Israelite, early Jewish, and early Christian Passover traditions in Schlund 2005.

[46] In Jubilees this is Mastema, in Melito the angel of death, in Paul it is the κακία καὶ πονηρία (v. 8) that endanger the community.

[47] Cf. Rom 5.9; 1 Thess 1.10; 5.9-10.

[48] This includes further the mention of ζύμη and ἄζυμος, the handing over of the sexually immoral sinner εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (cf. Exod 12.15 LXX: πᾶς ὃς ἂν φάγῃ ζύμην ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐξ Ισραηλ), [216] the uncompromising removal of the leaven (Exod 12.15; 1 Cor 5.7: ἐκκαθάρατε) as well as the ἑορτάζειν in v. 8.

be assigned to the overarching concept metaphor "death leads to life." As with the ἱλαστήριον metaphor, the transference consists in the fact that in both cases the concern is with death that effects life: there by the removal of sins, here through the preservation of purity.

The metaphor of Christ as Passover lamb thus has a different focus than Romans 3.25: if in Romans 3.25 life is obtained through the fact that the death of Jesus brings about cleansing from sins through faith, then in 1 Corinthians 5.7 it is through the fact that this death has constituted a community that is preserved from destruction when it preserves its purity. The image field drawn upon in each case is determined in the process by the intention of the statement: in Romans 3 the possibility of the cleansing of sins is presented in light of the sinfulness of all human beings; in 1 Corinthians 5, by contrast, the concern is with the preservation of the community brought about through this death and its survival in the eschatological judgment.

3.1.3 Christ's death as redemption

The reevaluating metaphors also include the metaphor of death as redemption, expressed through the word-field (ἐξ)ἀγοραζειν, λυτροῦσθαι, λύτρον or ἀντίλυτρον, τιμή, ἐλευθερία, ἐλευθεροῦν, δοῦλος, δουλεύειν. In Paul it occurs in Gal 3.13; 4.4-5; 1 Cor 6.20; 7.23; in early Christian writings beyond this in 2 Pet 2.1; Rev 5.9-10; 14.3-4. Here another concept, namely that of the redemption of slaves is transferred to the death of Jesus.[49] The joining of the two spheres is even bolder here than in the use of cultic metaphors, since redemption of slaves, unlike the cultic actions standing in the background in Romans 3.25 and 1 Corinthians 5.7, is not associated with death. The metaphor "Christ's death is redemption" thus corresponds to the metaphor "life is being enslaved." This is [217] primarily explicated in Galatians, where Paul subsumes the enslavement of the Jews through the law and the Gentiles through the idols under the common category of the στοιχεῖα service.[50] This metaphor therefore also attracts to itself then the interpretation of the Christ event as liberation (Gal 5.1, 13; Rom 6.18, 22; 8.21; cf. 2 Cor 3.17).

[49] For the origin of the image there are, as is well known, various suggestions: sacred redemption of slaves (Deissmann); *redemptio ab hostibus* (Elert); liberation of Israel from Egypt or from Babylonian Exile (Pax). The Pauline use of the corresponding terminology cannot be seamlessly fit into any of these spheres. This is not surprising insofar as Paul employs them from a certain perspective (the believer belongs to Christ and no longer stands under other powers). The use of the imagery is to be explained from here, not from the exclusive attribution to one of the metaphor source domains.

[50] On this cf. chap. 8 above.

By contrast, with the term τιμή reference is made in 1 Corinthians 6.20 and 7.23 to the value that was paid for the community. Thus, here it is not the past that forms the foil for the metaphor of redemption but the price that was paid. The Corinthian Christians are thereby made aware of the high price that was paid for them and thus obligated to the preservation of their status (τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε· μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων).

Thus, with the metaphor of redemption the concern is also with an interpretation of Jesus' death that is aimed at the new life of the Christians as well as the responsibility that arises from this. As with the cultic metaphors, the opposition between then and now stands in the foreground here, now expressed as the opposition between enslavement and freedom. It is thus common to all the metaphors discussed up to now that they bring to expression the new status brought about through the death of Christ. The variety of the metaphors with which Paul describes the positive effects of the death of Christ thereby leads to a considerable gain in language and meaning for this event within early Christian Christology.

3.1.4 Participation in Christ

The metaphor of participation in Christ also belongs to the reevaluating metaphors since it fits death and life into a new value system: the death with Christ leads to resurrection and therefore preserves from the final death; only the being in Christ is real life that can stand before God.

Terminologically characteristic for the participation metaphor are the σύν compounds συμμορφίζεσθαι (Phil 3.10; Rom 8.29: σύμμορφος), συμπάσχειν (Rom 8.17; 1 Cor 12.26), συνθάπτεσθαι (Rom 6.4), σύμφυτος τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ (Rom 6.5), συσταυροῦσθαι (Rom 6.6; Gal 2.19), but also μετέχειν (1 Cor 10.17, 21, 30), κοινωνία (1 Cor 1.9; 10.16; Phil 3.10), as well as the syntagmata σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι (Phil 1.23) and ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός (Gal 2.20). That the participation conception belongs to the christological concept metaphor "death leads to life" becomes clear in the fact that the negatively connoted σύν compounds are often directly tied to positive ones, for instance with συζῆν [218] (Rom 6.8; cf. 1 Thess 5.10: σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν), συνδοξάζεσθαι (Rom 8.17), and σύμφυτος τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ (Rom 6.5).

The participation metaphor is developed by Paul in various ways. It is found paradigmatically compressed in 2 Corinthians 5.14-15. There Paul explains that as a consequence of the death of Christ all have died and the ones who live (οἱ ζῶντες) no longer live to themselves but for the one who died and was resurrected for them. The idea of the co-participation in the death of Christ is thus fundamental, which already leads in the present to

a proleptic sharing in his resurrection.[51] This represents the foil against which Paul interprets the existence of those who belong to Christ. In Philippians 3.10 the belonging to Christ can therefore be described as becoming conformed (συμμορφιζόμενος) to his death, which will then also lead to resurrection. This "Christ-formed" existence then draws further spheres to itself: the existence of the apostle is interpreted in 2 Corinthians 4.8-12 against the background of the death and resurrection and referred to as "carrying around the dying of Jesus";[52] baptism is interpreted as becoming immersed into the death, being buried with as well as becoming grown together with the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom 6.3-5). However, by postponing until the future the complete application to the Christians of the second part, namely the life, they exist in a kind of "interim condition" between the already realized death and the future life with Christ. Thus, according to Philippians 3.10-14, the character of being formed by the death is already a present reality, whereas the sharing in the resurrection first stands at the end of the way that still lies ahead of Paul. In 2 Corinthians 4.16–5.10 Paul describes in an analogous manner his own Christ-determined existence as a process of being destroyed and renewed daily, which ultimately leads him to the Lord.[53] [219]

The participation metaphor also includes the conception of the existence ἐν Χριστῷ or ἐν κυρίῳ. This is based on the incorporation into the death and resurrection of Christ but goes beyond this insofar as it implies a nullification of the religious, social, and sexual distinctions and as a result of this a new identity. The passages in which this comes to expression are in the first place Galatians 3.26-28; 6.15; 2 Corinthians 5.17; the images used are the image of putting on Christ (Gal 3.27; Rom 13.14) and the image of the existence in Christ as new creation. In these passages a connection between the individually oriented and the community-related Christ metaphors can be observed: when the baptized "grow together" in Christ into a person (Gal 3.28: πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), then a

[51] It is well known that Paul does not speak of a co-resurrection with Christ with regard to the present of the believing ones: συνεγείρειν is absent in Paul and first occurs in the post-Pauline literature (Col 2.12; Eph 2.6). However, the designation οἱ ζῶντες in 2 Cor 5.15 points to the already present new way of existence of the believing ones as does the expression καινὴ κτίσις, which occurs shortly thereafter (5.17; cf. Gal 5.15).

[52] On this text cf. Schröter 1996 as well as now Krug 2001, 212–22; Grässer 2002, 164–70.

[53] C. Strecker 1999 has reflected on this structure of the Pauline theology against the background of V. Turner's theory of ritual and society and analyzed the aforementioned texts from this perspective. In doing so, the transformation of believers and participation in Christ have been (re)discovered as central elements of the theology of Paul.

specific form of the Christ fellowship results from the bond with Christ.[54] This leads to the second metaphor sphere to be addressed here.

3.2 The notion of the body of Christ (1 Cor 12; Rom 12)

Continuing from the participation metaphor I will examine in what follows the body-of-Christ notion, which is unfolded in 1 Cor 12.12-27 and occurs again in Rom 12.4-8. In the context of 1 Corinthians 12 an appeal is made to the community with the help of this metaphor to hold fast to the unity of the fellowship in Christ despite the variety of the gifts of the Spirit. It is well known that with the σῶμα metaphor Paul reaches back to a widespread motif, which has analogies, for instance, in Plato, Aristotle, Dionysus of Halicarnassus, Livy, Plutarch, Seneca, and Epictetus, and on the Jewish side in Philo, Josephus, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[55] The metaphor could be used in different ways, in which the benefit of every single member for the whole organism, the subordination of the individual to the overall welfare, the relation of the members among one another, or the relationship between head and members could stand at the center, depending on the respective goal of the argumentation.[56]

The innovation of Paul obviously consists in interpreting the organism christologically and thereby presenting the communities of Corinth and Rome with a model on which they could orient their identity as Christian fellowships. As the equal ordering of all members in 1 Corinthians 12 clearly shows, this model is oriented in an egalitarian manner, thus not [220] interested in the ordering to Christ as the head of the body.[57] Rather, ecclesiology is christologically grounded here in a specific way: the community as an organism composed of different members portrays the body of Christ, which obligates it to unity in a special way. This statement can also be interpreted as a christological metaphor, for the community is not only designated as an organism (so 12.14-16) but as σῶμα Χριστοῦ (thus explicitly in v. 27: ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ, cf., though already vv. 12-13), thus as a fellowship that represents Christ in the world.[58]

[54] C. Strecker 1999, 189–211, 351–58, also works out this connection.

[55] Cf. M. Walter 2001, 70–104.

[56] Cf. Lindemann 1999a, 134–38.

[57] This aspect is especially emphasized by C. Strecker 1999, 345–48. That the concern here is with an "anti-structural, inversive conception" (347) because Paul ascribes honor precisely to the inferior body parts goes, however, beyond the text (and would ultimately even go against the argument). The point does not consist in the fact that special honor is due to the inferior members but that all members are equally important and have their respectively specific task for the functioning of the entire organism.

[58] According to Lindemann 1999a, 144, the step from the body metaphor to the body *of Christ* metaphor first occurred to Paul during the composition, thus was not yet

Thus, the representation metaphor has an orientation that is different in character from the first sphere, which was oriented to the death and resurrection. It is not oriented to the individual determination of the person ἐν Χριστῷ but to the representation of Christ through the community. The organism metaphor is not directly correlated with the death and resurrection of Christ here but represents the egalitarian fellowship as an appropriate form of the representation of Christ. It is not necessary here to reckon with pre-existing concepts that Paul employed ecclesiologically. The aforementioned analogies point instead to the fact that we are dealing here with a metaphor that was given as part of [221] the general knowledge of antiquity and was taken up by Paul in a way that corresponded with the goal of his argumentation.

4. Summary

The excerpts from the Pauline use of metaphor considered here have illuminated two important spheres of his interpretation of the Christ event. The first sphere has its center in the reevaluation of conventional orientations of value. It is fundamental here that on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus Paul can assign positive meaning to his death—including the co-participation in it. This works itself out concretely in such a way that the spheres of the cult and the redemption from enslavement are drawn upon in order to describe the positive effects of the death of Christ. The participation in this death, which also extends to the resurrection, is thus a metaphor that applies to the self-understanding of those who belong to Christ insofar as they escape the final death through the co-dying and instead become the "living ones" or a "new creation." This sphere of Paul's christological use of metaphor thus leads to an identity of the ones belonging to Christ that deviates from the common conceptions of value and is, in part, even diametrically opposed to them. When they are to deduce from the cross event

---

presupposed during the composition of 12.13-26. The argumentation is thus based on the organism-metaphor and not on an ecclesiological body-of-Christ conception (similarly Merklein 1987; Wolff 1996). This exactly reverses the argumentation of Käsemann 1933 who starts from a body-of-Christ conception, which Paul applies ecclesiologically here. This objection is an important and justified correction, for such a concept cannot, in fact, be demonstrated (and is also, as Lindemann and Merklein rightly stress, not to be presupposed in 1 Cor 1.13; 6.15; 12.17). With regard to 12.12-27, however, it appears justified to speak of a *christological* interpretation of the organism idea: the image of the body and the members is already applied to Christ and the baptized in vv. 12-13 (one is baptized εἰς ἓν σῶμα, *therefore* [cf. the γάρ in v. 13] the situation is the same with Christ as with the one body and the many members, for which reason the idea of the body of Christ is already presupposed here, even if the expression does not yet appear explicitly. Therefore, one can understand v. 27 better as a clarifying appeal to vv. 12-13 than as a new idea. Schrage 1991–2001, III, 210–17 also interprets in this direction.

that God has chosen the lowly and weak; that the cross is the exclusive place for the removal of sins and the fellowship of believers is a space of purity in which the old impurity may not gain entry again; when they are to view dying with Christ as gain and the suffering apostle as mediator of the Christ event, then an understanding of existence ἐν Χριστῷ is set forth here that institutes a value system of its own against the established orders and therefore also produces consequences for the social structures within the Christian community. We thus encounter here a dimension of christological metaphor usage that is characterized by its exclusivity:[59] belonging to the fellowship of believers is exclusively made possible through the incorporation into the Christ event, which mediates the existence as new creation and pure fellowship.

The second sphere of christological metaphor usage is characterized by the notion of the Christ fellowship as an organism. This use of metaphor thus has an ecclesiological point. It expands the [222] christological notions tied to the use of death and participation metaphors by emphasizing the ecclesiological dimension of the Christ event (the community is to understand itself as σῶμα Χριστοῦ in which all members are equally important). Here, the metaphor of the community as a body has a more strongly conventional character. The exhortation to a community to understand itself as an organism is an idea that is prepared for in the general knowledge of antiquity, which therefore would also not evoke an ethos corresponding to the exclusive bond to Christ.[60]

The Pauline Christology—this is shown by the examples put forward here—is oriented in the use of metaphorical concepts to deriving consequences from the Christ event with regard to the self-understanding of believers and their fellowship. Its special creativity consists in developing from the concentration on the death and resurrection and from the orientation to the representation of Christ through his fellowship fields of interpretation that extend both to the individual belonging to Christ and to the concrete form of the Christ fellowship. Building on the theory-of-metaphor remarks of the second section it can thus be stated that the contribution of a metaphorical Christology can consist in understanding the fields of interpretation with which early Christianity surrounded the person of Jesus,

[59] The following thoughts come into contact with observations in Wolter 1997a. The juxtaposition of exclusive identity and inclusive ethos that is taken up here is also encountered there.

[60] In 1 Cor 5 the situation is somewhat different insofar as Paul is concerned here to declare certain ways of behaving that were unproblematic for Gentile Christians (the formulation ἥτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in 5.1 would then be a hyperbolic allegation of Paul) as incompatible with belonging to Christ. However, not an exclusive ethos but a Jewish (or Jewish Christian) ethos would be guiding thereby.

beyond the question of their historical and tradition-historical presuppositions, as—to express it with a metaphor—the building stones of the structure of the Christian interpretation of reality.

This page intentionally left blank

10 [223–246]

Luke as Historiographer

The Lukan Doppelwerk and the Discovery of Christian Salvation History

1. The Lukan Doppelwerk and Luke as historian
On the relation between the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles

The following two chapters are devoted to the Acts of the Apostles. With this a third focal point within the writings of the New Testament is brought into view. In part III we will then come back once more to this writing from another perspective, namely the role of Acts in the formation of the New Testament canon.[1]

The special character of Acts within the early Christian literature lies first in the fact that in it we encounter for the first time a presentation of history from a Christian perspective. With this Acts (or the Lukan work as a whole) contributes, over against the approaches discussed thus far—the Gospels and the Letters of Paul—in its own way to the formation of a Christian understanding of history and reality. Here and in the next chapter we will be concerned with this contribution. In this chapter the character of Acts as a historical work stands at the center; in the next the focus is on the specific connection between Christology and people of God.

In order to deal with Luke as a historiographer one must consider the works associated with his name, namely the identically named Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.[2] On the basis of size alone, Luke belongs to the most important New Testament authors, for [224] his writings make up

[1] Cf. chap. 13.

[2] Today the titles are mostly regarded as added secondarily. In the case of Acts the tension with the content, which is scarcely described adequately with πράξεις (τῶν) ἀποστόλων or *acta* (*omnium*) *apostolorum*, especially speaks for this view (contrast, however, Jervell 1998, 56–58, and already Wikenhauser 1921, 105–6). It is, however, probable that the titles were added with the circulation of the writings, thus for the Gospels up to the middle of the second century and for the book of Acts presumably somewhat later. For the Gospels, cf. Hengel 1984.

about a fourth of the New Testament and with this more than the Letters of Paul or the *Corpus Johanneum*.

As is well known, the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles do not directly follow each other in the ordering of the New Testament writings;[3] moreover, the Acts of the Apostles does not possess an author name.[4] The origin of both works from the same author was, however, already accepted in the early church and has only seldom been called into question.[5] It is first made conspicuous by the fact that a proem stands at the head of both books, in which the author addresses himself to a certain Theophilus[6] and explicitly refers back to the first book at the beginning of the second. In addition, linguistic and conceptual observations show that we are dealing with two works that build on each other and are characterized by a unified view of the narrated events.[7]

> Both works were first traced back to an author with the name of Luke in Irenaeus and at approximately the same time in the Canon Muratori, thus toward the end of the second century.[8] Irenaeus evidently appeals to a tradition that is already older and possibly stems from the Roman church about the four gospels and their authors.[9] If Marcion and Justin should already know of the attributions of the Gospels to the apostles Matthew and John and to the apostle-students Mark and Luke[10] and if the supposition [225] of T. C. Skeats should also prove correct,

[3] There is not a single canon list in which the Gospel of Luke and Acts stand directly next to each other. The idea of a "Lukan Doppelwerk" can thus be shown nowhere in the ancient church. Rather, the Gospel of Luke belongs from the beginning to the four-gospel collection, which is already presupposed by Irenaeus; Acts enters somewhat later into the circle of generally accepted writings and functions then as an introduction to the writings of the apostles, thus the so-called Catholic Letters, with which it builds together the third part of the canon alongside the Gospels and the Letters of Paul. On this point, cf. also chap. 13 below.

[4] The common titles are (αἱ) πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων or *acta* (*omnium*) *apostolorum*. Simply πράξεις (so B and ℵ^2) or πράξεις ἀποστόλων (D) are also attested. Designations such as Λουκᾶ εὐαγγελίστου πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων or the like first occur in later manuscripts.

[5] Irenaeus already presupposes the origin of the Gospel of Luke and Acts from the same author, namely Paul's companion Luke (cf. *Haer.* 3.14.1–3). It was disputed, however, by Clark 1933, 393–408, as well as by Argyle 1973/1974.

[6] On the person of Theophilus, cf. Alexander 2000; Heil 2005.

[7] On the language and style of Luke cf. Cadbury 1925, 214–17; 1919; 1966. On the perspective on history cf. Löning 1997, 19–57.

[8] Cf. the discussion of the ancient church witnesses by Cadbury 1922b, 209–64.

[9] Thornton 1991, 10–22.

[10] In *Dial.* 103.8 Justin distinguishes between the ἀπομνημονεύματα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι. In 106.3 he mentions the ἀπομνημονεύματα of Peter, with which, as the context shows, the Gospel of Mark is meant. Marcion possibly referred to the Gospel of Luke because its authority was vouched for by Paul. Cf. also Hengel 1984, 15–16.

according to which the Papyri P^{64}, P^{67}, and P^{4} come from the same codex, which would document the compilation of the four gospels already for the late second century,[11] then the witness for the Gospel of Luke would have to be placed even a little earlier.[12] The ancient church tradition identifies the author with the Luke who is mentioned as a coworker of Paul in Phlm 24; Col 4.14; 2 Tim 4.11; and is referred to as a physician in Col 4.14.[13] Whether this takes place rightly must remain open.[14] It is probable, however, that the name Luke already adhered to the Gospel at an early date and from there was also transferred to Acts.[15]

That with this Luke we are dealing with an intermittent companion of Paul could be suggested by the so-called "we-reports" in which the author presents himself as a person who is directly involved in the reported events.[16] Whether these passages should be traced back to the eyewitness character of the author himself[17] or to the reworking of the source of an eyewitness,[18] or whether they should be interpreted as a literary stylistic device with which the author wishes to underline the trustworthiness of his report[19] is, of course, controversial. The possibility cannot at any rate be excluded that both writings of Luke were written by one author [226], who—as the proem of the Gospel of Luke indicates—could already reach back to pre-existing presentations in the portrayal of the events surrounding the activity and fate of Jesus, but was in the case of Acts not only the first to bring the events of the first decades of the emerging church into a connected presentation but had also experienced it himself in part.[20]

[11] Skeat 1997. Head 2005 has expressed skepticism toward this assumption.

[12] In view of the Papias note on Matthew and Mark the assumption that the Gospel of Luke was already known by an author name in the first half of the second century certainly has quite a bit of probability in its favor.

[13] Canon Muratori; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.1 (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.8.3); Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.4.6.

[14] Specifically medical vocabulary in the language of Luke cannot be demonstrated at any rate. Cf. the critical examination of the pertinent hypotheses by Cadbury 1926.

[15] Cf. Thornton 1991, 78: "In general it is conspicuous that the name of Luke adheres much more strongly to the Gospel than to Acts. A transfer in the other direction is nowhere to be found." Jervell 1998, 80, is similar: "It is completely unthinkable that the authors of the oldest witnesses came of their own accord specifically upon Luke by making inferences [sc.: from Acts, J. S.]. There were, in fact, many travel companions and coworkers of Paul and many who . . . appear much more suitable than Luke who was not very prominent." By contrast, the often-advocated thesis—in recent time cf., e.g., Pesch 1986, 25–27; Wehnert 1989, 54–66—that the attribution of Acts to Luke took place via the "we-reports" and from there was transferred also to the Gospel is scarcely plausible.

[16] Acts 16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-18; 27.1–28.16.

[17] So, e.g., Dibelius 1968, 92–93, 119; 1956; 104–5, 136; Hengel 1979, 60–61; 1980, 66–67; Fitzmyer 1989; Thornton 1991, 364–67; Jervell 1998, 66.

[18] So, e.g., Porter 1999, 10–66; Koch 1999b; Wedderburn 2002. The extent of the "we-source," however, is specified differently.

[19] Thus Robbins 1978; Plümacher 2004, 85–108; Wehnert 1989; Kurz 1993, 111–24; Marguerat 2003, 40–41.

[20] Cf. the authors mentioned in n. 17. Contrast, e.g., the commentaries of Schneider 1980, Roloff 1981, and Barrett 1994/1998.

In the twentieth century great attention was devoted to the analysis of the Lukan work as a unified presentation of history. This initially found expression in the designation—which though not invented by Henry Joel Cadbury became well known decisively through him[21]—"Luke-Acts,"[22] which corresponds to the expression "*lukanisches Doppelwerk*" in the German-speaking sphere. With this the close interrelatedness of the Gospel of Luke and Acts is stressed, and it is simultaneously emphasized that Luke's picture of history can only be drawn out through a shared interpretation of *both* works.[23] In the subsequent period the specific features of Lukan theology have been increasingly investigated through studies that refer to *both* works.[24] More recently, running commentaries have even been carried out that understand the Lukan work as a *narrative unity*.[25]

The working out of the unified perspective of the Lukan history work is an important advance of twentieth-century Luke research. It has become clear that by linking the Jesus story with the emergence of the first phase of the spread of Christianity Luke has put forward an overall conception [227] with a historiographical claim.[26] The Lukan Doppelwerk can therefore be designated as a "founding history of Christianity." It may not, however, be overlooked that this is realized in its two parts in respectively specific ways. This is already shown by a consideration of the genre selected for each. Whereas the Gospel of Luke follows the combining of Jesus traditions, already given by the Gospel of Mark and the sayings source Q, into a presentation of biographical character,[27] the Acts of the Apostles is

[21] This is pointed out by Shauf 2005, 1 n. 1.

[22] Cf. Cadbury 1919; 1925; 1926; 1927.

[23] This was also stressed—after Cadbury—by Conzelmann 1972, 10–13; 1987a, xlv–xlviii. As is well known, he thereby presupposes an "overall-picture of salvation history and its division into three epochs: the time of Israel, the time of Jesus (as the center), and the time of the church" (1972, 10; cf. 1987a, xlv).

[24] Thus, e.g., a number of the contributions to the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* of 1998, which appeared under the revealing title "The Unity of Luke-Acts," were devoted to themes that concern the Lukan Doppelwerk as a whole and in this way to bringing out the unified perspective of the two works: Verheyden 1999. Cf., e.g., the contributions on the texts of Luke and Acts (J. Delobel), on the Abrahamic covenant (R. Brawley), on the Christology (C. M. Tuckett), on the role of the Spirit (J. A. Fitzmyer), on the Jews (M. Rese), or on the stance toward the Roman state (F. W. Horn).

[25] Cf. Löning 1997, which represents the first of three planned volumes on the Lukan overall work as well as Tannehill 1986/1990. J. Fitzmyer and L. T. Johnson have commented on the Gospel of Luke and Acts within the same commentary series (Anchor Bible and Sacra Pagina). The unity, however, is seen here more strongly at the thematic level than the narrative level.

[26] Barrett 1996 therefore designated the Gospel of Luke and Acts as the "first New Testament," in which everything that the early Church needed was already present.

[27] In Luke 1.1 he explicitly refers to the πολλοί, who have already undertaken to write a διήγησις about the πράγματα transmitted by the eyewitnesses. The remark is a literary

characterized by a number of features that suggest that it belongs to history writing, more specifically to Hellenistic historiography.[28]

This includes first the fact that Luke takes a certain segment of the history of emerging Christianity into view here, namely its spread from Jerusalem to Rome, and describes it as a self-contained epoch with a unified theme—the transition from the Israel mission to the Gentile mission.[29] It includes further the speeches which Luke has his protagonists give and in which we are dealing not with the reproduction of addresses that were actually given but with compositions of the author with which he brings his interpretation of the reported events to expression.[30] Luke uses here a stylistic device of ancient history writing that has numerous analogies both in pagan Greek and Roman works and also in the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus and was reflected on theoretically in the methodological principle of Thucydides, which was already discussed in chapter 3.[31] Finally, this includes the [228] Septuagint mimesis.[32] In Acts, Luke often imitates—primarily in its first part, by taking up individual terms and syntactical expressions—the style of the Greek translation of the writings of Israel. With this he uses a device that also appears in pagan historians, who imitate the ancient style of earlier historians. In clothing the events in the colors of biblical language, he already makes clear through the manner of presentation that the concern is with a continuation of the history of Israel narrated in the biblical writings.

On the basis of these characteristics, Acts can be designated as a historical monograph,[33] to which the Gospel of Luke cannot be assigned without further ado. The occasionally undertaken search for a common genre to which both writings can be assigned leads, by contrast, either to assigning Luke to history writing[34] or conversely to assigning Acts to the

---

convention (cf., e.g., Josephus, *B.J.* I 6, §17), with which Luke refers to his predecessors. That with this it was actually a matter of "many" is therefore scarcely to be taken literally. Nevertheless, it is clear that Luke refers here to predecessors.

[28] Cf. Dibelius 1968, 108–9; 1956, 123–24; Plümacher 1974, 235–36.

[29] The epoch concept was—after Conzelmann—recently used by Wolter 2004a, who applies it, however, to the Lukan work *as a whole.*

[30] Soards 1994.

[31] Cf. Cadbury 1933; Dibelius 1968, 120–62; 1956, 138–91; Plümacher 1974, 244–50; Porter 1996.

[32] Plümacher 1972, 38–79; Rosner 1993.

[33] Conzelmann 1972, 7, had related this term to the Lukan work as a whole (contrast the impression given in Conzelmann 1987a, xl). In the original edition of Plümacher 2004, 85–108, Plümacher had designated the Gospel of Luke *and* Acts as historical monographs, but he changed this position in the revision of the article to the effect that only Acts is to be designated as a historical monograph. On this classification of Acts, cf. also Palmer 1993.

[34] So Aune 1987, 77 ("general history"); Sterling 1992, 331–39 ("apologetic historiography"); Mount 2002, 163–80 ("two parts of one narrative of Christian origins" [169]).

biographical literature,[35] or alternatively to postulating a special character for the Lukan work as a whole without direct literary analogies.[36] However, it is more plausible to assume that Luke has made use of different genres in the two parts of his work and has let a history of early Christianity, which has been set forth for the first time by him, follow the Jesus presentation, which was written in dependence upon his predecessors.[37]

Luke, however, also uses historiographic devices in the first part and surrounds the Jesus story with a historical aura more strongly than Mark and Matthew.[38] [229] Moreover, he connects the two parts of his overall work with dramatic devices such as narratives of deeds of power or meal reports[39] and adjusts them to each other in terms of content, for example through the synkrisis of Jesus, Stephen, and Paul or the problem of purity, which is absent in Luke and first addressed in Acts. These relationships, however—apart from the backwards reference in the proem of Acts—are not established through explicit forward or backward references from one work to the other.[40] Rather, the Jesus story is already narrated with a view to the subsequent spread of the Christ witness: what begins with Jesus—the proclamation of the rule of God, which is no longer bound exclusively to Israel but to which the Gentiles now also have access—finds its continuation through the apostles, the Hellenists, and Paul. It leads to a new form of the people of God that is no longer obligated to the law but to the apostolic decree; it leads as well to a separation of the church from Judaism, which refuses this opening up of the people of God. The unity of Luke and Acts is thus *thematic in nature* and must be established by the recipients in the process of reading.[41] It is realized on the level of the *story*, the content

[35] So Talbert 1974 ("biography"). Alexander 1993a understands the Paul presentation of Acts against the background of ancient biographical traditions.

[36] So Marshall 1993, 182: "Luke's work appears to be unique among Christian writings and to have no close secular precedents in its combination of the stories of a religious leader and of his followers."; Wedderburn 1996.

[37] Cf. Plümacher 2000, 808 (cf. 2009, 165): "In the early Christian literature only a single writing is to be assigned to history writing: the Acts of the Apostles, which was written toward the end of the first century."

[38] This includes, alongside the literary claim that comes to expression in the proem, especially the placement of the narrated events in world-historical contexts through the information in 2.1-2 and 3.1, the mentioning of historical events that are not otherwise documented such as the murder of the Galileans by Pilate and the collapse of the tower of Siloam (Luke 13.1-9), or the allusion to the events around Archelaus in Luke 19.12, 14.

[39] Cf., e.g., Lindemann 1999b.

[40] By contrast, this can very well happen within Luke and Acts: in Luke 22.35 there is a reference back to the equipment rule in 10.4, and in Acts 11.16 there is a reference back to 1.5—not to Luke 3.16.

[41] Cf. Marguerat 1999.

of the narrated (hi)story, but not on that of the *discourse*, the form of the narrative.[42]

For the specification of the relationship between the Gospel of Luke and Acts it is also necessary to examine the proems of the two works. It is debated here whether Luke 1.1-4 already has the entire work in view or whether it is to be related only to the first part, thus to the Gospel of Luke. In support of the thesis that it is an introduction to both works, thus that there is already a looking ahead to Acts at the beginning of the Gospel of Luke,[43] one can put forward—alongside the fact that an introduction [230] to the entire work corresponds to the conventions of such proems[44]—the fact that according to Luke 1.2 the reported events were transmitted by those who were "eyewitnesses from the beginning" as well as servants of the word.

> The understanding of the formulation οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου is of decisive importance for the interpretation of the proem of Luke in the framework of the entire work. It is clear grammatically that the concern is with one group since the article would have had to be repeated otherwise.[45] This group is characterized in a twofold way: from the beginning they have become eyewitnesses and servants of the word. The participle γενόμενοι thus relates both to αὐτόπται and to ὑπηρέται. Accordingly, Luke indicates here that the eyewitnesses of the history of Jesus simultaneously possessed the function of witnesses for the proclamation of what happened and what was heard (λόγος is to be understood in this sense here). With this there is also a looking forward to their witness function that is then reported in Acts.[46]

In the proem then it is already expressed that the apostles were both eyewitnesses and proclaimers of the events surrounding Jesus. It is true that this only partially applies to the content of Acts, since with "eyewitnesses" only the apostles could be meant and not Barnabas, the Hellenists, and Paul, who play a decisive role in Acts. Nevertheless, the characterization

[42] Cf. Parsons/Pervo 1993, 45–83.

[43] So, e.g., Cadbury 1922a; Fitzmyer 1981, 9, 289; Korn 1993, 6–32; Marshall 1993, 172–74.

[44] Cf., e.g., the reference to Josephus, *C. Ap.*, and Dioskourides in Bovon 1989, 32–33; 2002, 18.

[45] Cf. Cadbury 1922, 498; Bovon 1989, 37; 2002, 21; Alexander 1993b, 119. The closest analogy is Acts 26.16: προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι.

[46] Contrast Klein 1969, 248–49, who wishes to relate γενόμενοι only to ὑπηρέται on account of the word position. In addition he also relates τοῦ λόγου only to ὑπηρέται and sees a development from "eyewitnesses" to "sermon-witnesses" expressed in Luke 1.2. If, however, with λόγος one understands not only the proclaimed word but the events surrounding Jesus as a whole, then it causes no difficulty to relate the expression γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου to αὐτόπται *and* ὑπηρέται.

of the αὐτόπται as ὑπηρέται already points ahead to their function as witnesses of the Christ kerygma, which begins in the Gospel and finds its continuation in Acts.[47]

On the other hand it is clear that the mentioning of the others who had already written a διήγησις before Luke about the things that Luke undertakes once more to write out καθεξῆς,[48] as well as the remark [231] that Theophilus was already instructed in these things can only refer to the (hi)story of Jesus' activity and fate. Therefore, with the πεπληροφορημένα ἐν ἡμῖν πράγματα the events reported in the Gospel are meant and not also those of the following period.[49] Thus, whereas the proem of Acts clearly refers back to the Gospel of Luke, the proem of the Gospel of Luke is mainly related to the Gospel itself and only looks ahead to a limited extent to its continuation.[50]

The comparison of the second description, which is modified several times in relation to the Gospel of Luke, of the time of the Risen One with his disciples and of his ascension in Acts 1.3-11 shows that this phase possesses its own function here, which differs from Luke 24: if the aforementioned events were the conclusion of the history of the earthly one there, then they are here the start of the period of the reception of the Spirit described in what follows and in the subsequent witness bearing.[51] Thus, the prologue of Acts has a recognizably independent function over against the πρῶτος λόγος. With this Luke does not simply signal the transition from the first to the second book but follows the—not always adhered to—historiographic convention of highlighting the independence of the individual books of a multivolume work.[52] Thus the proems not only connect the two books of the Lukan work with each other but also differentiate them from each other at the same time and assign to each of the two works its own theme.

[47] In Luke 1.2 the concern is with those who were the αὐτόπται *and* ὑπηρέται of the salvation events. That there were additional ὑπηρέτα beyond the circle of the αὐτόπται is not thereby excluded. The command of the Risen One in Acts 1.8 is also spoken only to the apostles but points thematically beyond their circle and takes into view the entirety of what happens between Pentecost and the parousia.

[48] With this there is hardly—as Klein 1969, 254–55, supposes—a looking ahead to the following period that is reported in Acts. Rather, reference is made, through a conventional term (cf. Cadbury 1922, 505) for the description of one's own work, to the careful ordering of the narrated events. Cf. Völkel 1973/1974.

[49] Thus also Klein 1969, 249.

[50] Cf. Marshall 1978, 42; Wiefel 1988, 39; Haenchen 1977, 143 n. 3; 1971, 136 n. 3; Alexander 1993b, 206; 1996, 76–77.

[51] Cf. Parsons 1987, 189–99. On the meaning of the ascension narratives for Lukan theology cf. also Zwiep 1997, 145–93.

[52] Cf. Wikenhauser 1921, 140–42. Analogies are, e.g., Polybius, *Hist.* 2.1.1-2; Philo, *Prob.* 1; Diodorus Siculus, *Bib. Hist.* 2.1; 3.1. On the latter cf. Kunz 1935.

To summarize, the following can be maintained: the Lukan writings are parts of a connected, coordinated work, and in the writing of the first part, Luke undoubtedly had Acts already in view.[53] This is shown especially by the overall perspective of the work, which can be provisionally described as a (hi)story of the Christian mission in continuity with the (hi)story of Israel. In terms of genre, however, only Acts is to be assigned to historiography in the narrow sense. It is thereby the first and within the early Christian Scriptures simultaneously the only presentation in which Christianity understands itself as a historical movement with its own origin and its own people [232] who act in history, and in which it formulates an independent view of the meaning and goal of history.

This means that at the end of the first century, Christianity enters the sphere of ancient history writing and places its own view over against the Greek, Roman, and Jewish presentations of history. That the author of the Acts is the "first Christian historian" is therefore a widely accepted view in New Testament and ancient history research.[54] The fact that more than 200 years should have passed until the next presentation of history by the hand of a Christian, namely the church history of Eusebius, also underscores the distinctiveness of the Lukan work—and especially Acts—within the early Christian literature. On this basis I will now inquire into the nature of the history presentation that is found here.

2. History picture and historical reference
Methodology-of-history reflections

In a 1947 Heidelberg University lecture, Martin Dibelius drew attention to the fact that in the writing of Acts Luke was not merely dealing with the collection and framing of traditions, but he ordered his material into connections, gave the reported events a direction of meaning, and in this way set forth a picture of the course of the first decades of Christianity. It is only because Luke "did more than collect traditional material," namely by linking together the investigated events "into a meaningful connection," that he is to be given the title of historian.[55] With this a direction of thought

[53] Contrast Schürmann 1969, 4, according to whom Acts is not yet in view in the writing of the proem. However, he then nevertheless relates the expression ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου to its function described there (9).

[54] Cf. the title of the article in Dibelius 1968, 108–19; 1956, 123–37, namely "The First Christian Historian." It was taken up in the English translation of Marguerat 2003. See Marguerat 2002.

[55] Cf. Dibelius 1968, 110; 1956, 125. Dibelius contrasts this with the activity of Luke in the Gospel, where he—as with Matthew and Mark—is said to have only gathered traditional material. This description would undoubtedly have to be modified in view of the present state of research on the Gospels. On this point cf. chap. 3 above.

was inaugurated within the primarily German-language Acts research that was advanced in the following period through the important commentaries of Ernst Haenchen and Hans Conzelmann as well as the studies of Eckhard Plümacher[56] and was concerned to work out the intention of the author of Acts. [233]

This perspective can be traced back to the theory-of-history insight that presentations of history are creative, "poetic" conceptions that place present and past into relationship with each other. In this sense it has often been emphasized in recent discussion in the science of history that history first emerges through the interpretive relation to the past from the perspective of the respective present.[57] The *past* is therefore to be distinguished from *history*: as time it lies behind the respective viewer, who can retrospectively confirm it but cannot take part in it himself. Rather, the engagement with the past serves the better understanding of our own respective *present* as a historical phenomenon.

Following Hans Robert Jauss, Hans-Jürgen Goertz, and Paul Ricoeur, this insight can also be described in such a way that it is the historian who defines the beginning and end of his presentation and thereby sets it off from the preceding and following period; he creates the imagination of a complete course of the reported events by setting these in relation to one another and filling out gaps in the source material; finally, through the form of the narrative he creates the impression of an objective picture of the past.[58] With regard to the Lukan work, one can therefore maintain as a first important aspect that through the ordering together of his material into a presentation of history from a specific perspective on Christianity—namely Gentile Christianity that emerged through the mission of Paul—Luke has done justice, to a high degree, to the historian's task of giving meaning to the events.

The poetic dimension of presentations of history, which is based on historical imagination, calls attention to the fact that no sharp boundaries are to be drawn between historical narrative and literary narrative, between history writing and literature, but both participate in a common sphere. As with the literary work of art, the historical presentation is also directed to the setting forth of a fable (or plot), which configures the events within a narrative context and attributes meaning to them through the act of interpretation.[59] Therefore, the relationship between historiography and

[56] Haenchen 1977; 1971; Conzelmann 1972; 1987a; Plümacher 1972; 1974; 2004.

[57] Cf. the chapters in part I above.

[58] Jauss 1982; Goertz 1995, 103; Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 253–311; 1984–1988, III, 157–92.

[59] Ricoeur 1987, 239: "On the basis of . . . connections between history and narrative the historian also forms fables (plots), which are either confirmed or excluded by

literature was [234] also not first grappled with in modern times. Rather, the problem of their distinction was already named by Aristotle and then reflected upon later by Lucian. If Aristotle set what actually happened and what could have happened over against each other and assigned only the first to the sphere of the historian,[60] then Lucian dealt more thoroughly with the question of the emergence of works of history.

On this Lucian first laid down the principle that the historian is obligated to the truth and thus must impartially report the things as they actually occurred.[61] He must subject the events (πράγματα) to a careful examination; in a ὑπόμνημα he should then give them a still unattractive, undeveloped form (σῶμα ἀκαλλὲς καὶ ἀδιάρθρωτον); finally, he should give to this an arrangement (τάξις) as well as a well-shaped form that is pleasing to the ear and well proportioned in diction (λέξις). According to Lucian, the forming of the historical material into a presentation of history is therefore comparable to the work of artists, who also did not themselves *create* gold, silver, ivory, or another material but *formed* them.[62]

The joining of historical material and interpretive presentation is thus a constitutive characteristic for every presentation of history. The differences between historical and literary narratives lie, however, in the "documentary" aim of the former, which is oriented to the securing of the traces from the past. This distinguishes it from novelistic presentations, which on the basis of their genre already show themselves to be works that are not obligated to a critical processing of the source material. The task of historiographic works, by contrast, can be described as "representation" (*Repräsentanz*), insofar as the historical narrative stands for the past in the present on the basis of the historical material.[63]

The second important aspect that emerges from these fundamental considerations is therefore that the insight into the character of Acts as a work that constructs a picture of history does not yet answer the question of its historical reference but rather it can first be tackled in a meaningful way on this basis. Dibelius had also already pointed out the difference between the intention of Acts and the question of its historical value and called attention to the fact that [235] the configuring activity of Luke does not represent a contradiction to his quality and reliability as a historian.[64] In what follows both aspects are to be investigated.

---

the documents but which are never [234] contained in them." The meaning that Droysen attributes to interpretation for historical work is dealt with at length in chaps. 1–3 above.

[60] Aristotle, *Poet.* 9.1451a. Cf. also chap. 3, §1 above.

[61] Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 39–42. He names Thucydides as a model.

[62] Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 47–51.

[63] Cf. Ricoeur 1988–1991, III, 253–93; 1984–1988, III, 157–79. Cf. also chap. 6 above, where this was carried out in relation to the Gospels.

[64] Cf. Dibelius 1968, 28, 95, 118–19; 1956, 24–25, 107–8, 135–37.

3. Acts as a presentation of the first epoch of Christianity

The proem of the Gospel of Luke and the prologue of Acts (1.1-14)[65] already show the author's intention to write a history of Christianity. He divides this into the phases of the history of Jesus and those from the reception of the Spirit until the parousia of Jesus as Son of Man. He describes the content of the first book as ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν of Jesus until the day when he was taken up into heaven; the content of the second part, however, is formulated through the last word of the Risen One, who confers the task of bearing witness up to the end of the earth (Acts 1.8). The time of bearing witness thus reaches both geographically and temporally beyond what is reported in Acts, which comes to expression through the phrase ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς as well as the looking ahead to the coming again of Jesus in 1.11.[66]

The content of the overall work is the presentation of the salvation for Gentiles and Israel that has come in Jesus.[67] In Luke 2.30 Jesus is already designated as σωτήριον, which God has prepared for all people; the same term [236] then occurs again in Luke 3.6 in the announcement of Jesus by John as well as in Acts 28.28, thus at the end of the entire work. In the last-named passage it is conspicuous that now only the Gentiles are named as the addressees of the σωτήριον and are placed over against the Jews. Directly before Paul had spoken the hardening word from Isaiah 6.9-10, which stands over against the insight that "this salvation" is sent—namely now exclusively—to the Gentiles and they—in contrast to the Jews—will also hear, thus will also receive it. With this the directedness of the Christ proclamation has arrived at a decisive turning point: if the mission beforehand was *first* an Israel mission[68] and reached only upon this way also to

[65] For the demarcation of the prologue after 1.14, cf. Barrett 1994/1998, I, 61–63. On the various demarcation suggestions, cf. Walton 1999, who himself decides on chaps. 1–2 as the introduction to Acts.

[66] The expression is often related to Rome (so for instance Haenchen 1977, 150 n. 6; 1971, 143 n. 9; Conzelmann 1972, 27; 1987a, 7; Fitzmyer 1998, 206–7; also Barrett 1994/1998, I, 80, somewhat modified). As evidence reference is made as a rule to *Pss. Sol.* 8.15: ἤγαγεν τὸν ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς (Pompey is meant). Van Unnik 1973 calls this assumption into question: what is meant is *actually* the end of the earth. He appeals especially to the meaning of the expression in the LXX (Deut 28.49; Ψ 134.7; Isa 8.9; 45.22; 48.20; 49.6; 62.11; Jer 6.22; 10.13, and fairly often). It is decisive that the task of the witnesses does not end with the reaching of Rome, but rather a—for the conception of Acts, of course, undoubtedly decisive—stage is completed, namely the transition from the mission to Jews and Gentiles to the *exclusively* Gentile mission. Acts thus ends with a significant turning point in the history of Christianity but not with the reaching of the "end of the earth."

[67] Cf. chap. 11 below.

[68] Cf. the πρῶτος in 3.26; 13.46. It corresponds to this that Paul during his missionary

the Gentiles, then this is now changed to the effect that Israel has shown itself to be hardened by God and the mission will thus from now on be only a Gentile mission. The turning to the Gentiles, which is threatened to the Jews by (Barnabas and) Paul in 13.46 and 18.6 thereby proves to be unavoidable at the end of Acts. The question whether Luke also reckons with an eschatological deliverance for Israel is—this may at least be indicated—disputed, but is, in my view, to be answered positively despite the failure of the Israel mission portrayed in Acts.

Thus, the content of the epoch reported in Acts is the spread—which was intended by God all along—of the salvation that has come in Jesus to Israel and the Gentiles up to the point at which Paul recognizes the Scripture-foretold hardening of Israel, which is therefore no longer an addressee of the Christ proclamation from now on. In this way Luke conceptualizes a first phase of the spread of the Christ proclamation whose central theme is the emergence of the Gentile church as continuation of the history of Israel.

For Luke's picture of history it is also characteristic that the God of Israel is the Lord of history. The important events are constantly traced back to the activity of God, who can act thereby through a messenger, through his Spirit, and in Acts then also through the exalted Christ. It is God who brings about the birth of Jesus; his way through suffering and death on to his exaltation is prefigured in the writings of Israel.[69] In the same way the decisive turning point of the post-Easter period is portrayed as God's intervention into the course of history: he—or the exalted Christ—pours out the Spirit upon the apostles (Luke 24.29; Acts 2.33); the conversion of Saul is brought about through a heavenly intervention (9.3-6, 10-16); the placing of clean and unclean [237] food on the same level—and with this the presupposition for the acceptance of Gentiles into the people of God—is inaugurated through a vision of Peter (10.11-16); the Holy Spirit chooses for the mission Barnabas and Saul (13.2), a pair whose mission work is designated as the opening of a door of faith for the Gentiles, which God brought about (14.27); God directs the journey of Paul, Silas, and Timothy through Asia Minor to Troas and from there further to Macedonia (16.6-10); and at the end of Acts the refusal of the Jews in relation to the Christ message proves to be an event foretold by the Holy Spirit.

Luke's presentation of history also includes the picture of Paul set forth by him. If here the insight has already prevailed for quite some time in scholarship that Luke has a salvation-historical interest in the person of Paul and his picture already differs for this reason from the self-presentation

---

activity, beginning from Cyprus (13.5) up until Ephesus (19.8), constantly goes first to the synagogues.

[69] Luke 9.22; 18.31; 24.26, 46.

in Paul's own letters,[70] then more recently it has also been emphasized that this does not necessarily speak against a knowledge of the contents of the Pauline proclamation or of his letters.[71] Rather, it is decisive that in a later situation and from a certain perspective Luke looks at the mission of Paul and integrates it into his picture of history. For Luke the aforementioned turn from the Israel mission to the Gentile mission is connected with the person of Paul for which reason Paul also appears much more strongly as a *missionary to Israel* than is the case in his letters.[72] Beyond this the presentation of Paul in Acts serves to characterize Paul as the one who suffers for the name of Jesus in a paradigmatic way, who with this becomes simultaneously an example for the communities in the post-Pauline period.[73]

Luke sets forth in this way the picture of a God-directed first phase of Christian history, which begins in Jerusalem and ends with the separation of Israel and church in Rome. By arranging the reported events from this perspective he assigns the Christian church a historical place within the history of Israel. Therefore, the apostolic decree regulates not only the table fellowship of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians but is simultaneously an expression of the Lukan conception [238] of the people of God.[74] It follows the explanation of Peter and James that from time immemorial[75] God had chosen a people from the Gentiles,[76] and formulates the standard for the fulfillment of this promise, which is now beginning. According to the Lukan conception, the people of God therefore consists of the chosen—thus Christ-believing—Israel that has been expanded by Gentiles. This is first changed by the fact that the Jews, on account of their refusal in relation to the Christ message, are excluded—at least temporarily—from the people of God, so that this consists predominantly of former Gentiles at the time of Luke.

The presentation of Acts conveys at the same time the impression that it traces the decisive development for the first decades of Christianity. Luke

[70] Cf. Burchard 1970; Roloff 1979.

[71] Cf., e.g., Porter 1999, 98–125, 187–206; Walton 2000; Plümacher 2004, 135–69.

[72] It is true that in 9.15 the task of Paul is *also* described as bearing the name of Jesus before the Gentiles (cf. 22.15: μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους), and in 13.47 he is designated as φως ἐθνῶν with the quotation from Isaiah 49.6, but it is clear from the presentation that this means an inclusion of the Gentiles in the people of God, which therefore must first be made familiar with the Christ message.

[73] Cf. already Roloff 1979, 529–31, as well as Rosenblatt 1995; Skinner 2003. This specification is also already named in 9.16.

[74] Cf. Jervell 1995.

[75] The expression ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων (15.7) and πρῶτον (15.14) do not refer to the Cornelius episode but, as the Amos quotation in 15.16-17 attests, to an ancient plan of God that is now fulfilled.

[76] The formulation ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαός in 15.14 shows that a part of the Gentiles through election has become the people of God (λαός) and with this come in addition to Israel.

has not only set forth a picture of an epoch but also that of a *complete course* of the pertinent events. That he only reports *de facto* an excerpt of the events of this period, however, is sometimes shown by his presentation itself. Thus, for example, communities in Damascus, Lydda, Joppa, Galilee, Troas, and Rome are presupposed, although Luke has reported nothing of a previous mission. Sometimes people in the circle of the Christian communities come into view—such as, for example, Ananias from Damascus or the Jewish Christian Apollos who comes from Alexandria—without it being discernible how they came into contact with the Christian proclamation. In other early Christian writings, such as, for example, Revelation, Colossians, 1 Peter, or the letters of Ignatius, early Christian communities are mentioned, concerning which Acts reports nothing. This shows that Luke only mediates an excerpt of the events of the first decades of Christianity, whilst claiming through the manner of the presentation to grasp the first epoch of Christian history as a whole.

4. Concerning the historicity of the Acts of the Apostles

It has already become clear that the question of the *historical value* of the Lukan presentation must be distinguished from the question of its *intention*. The controversy that has been argued out in scholarship about the historical value of Acts, in which the emphasis—often expressed by ancient historians—on the historicity of the reported events, [239] sometimes paired with the accusation of an unfounded skepticism among New Testament scholars in relation to Acts as a historical source,[77] on the one hand, and the working out of the intention of the Lukan presentation, on the other hand, stand over against each other, appears unnecessary in light of this. No one disputes that Luke—as every other writer of history—has selected events and arranged them from a certain perspective. Likewise it is uncontroversial that he has made use of information about actual events, general knowledge about the places of the events, and knowledge about the political and military governance of the Roman provinces.[78] If there is agreement about this, then the question of its historical value arises on multiple levels: How precise is Luke's knowledge of circumstances and the course of narrated events? How well is he informed about the local color of the respective areas? And finally: How are his intentions and his manner of presentation to be described? In order to characterize Acts as a work of history, one must carefully distinguish between these levels.

[77] Cf., e.g., Nippel 2003, 357–58.
[78] On this cf., e.g., Wikenhauser 1921 as well as Hemer 1989.

In order to make this concrete, I will take a look, by way of example, at the so-called first missionary journey (Acts 13–14), which in recent time has increasingly become the focus of attention again. In his commentary, Hans Conzelmann had designated this as a "model journey" with which Luke is said to have illustrated the problem that was subsequently dealt with at the apostolic council.[79] In a more recent study, Dean Philip Bechard has investigated the journey in this sense as a literary composition and placed it in the broader horizon of the Lukan conception of the geographical spread of Christianity.[80] With this an important characteristic of this section is named, namely its careful composition by the author. Beyond this Cilliers Breytenbach has investigated the local traditions and implicit knowledge about places that is reworked here and shown that Luke reworked information about the places and regions of the journey and with this gave it a certain "setting."[81]

In the first place, it is clearly recognizable that the journey is framed by the sending of the missionaries on the part of the Antioch church (13.1-3) and by their return to Antioch, including a report about what was experienced (14.26-28).[82] The journey itself can be placed under the theme [240] "from the Israel mission to the Gentile mission," which will determine Acts from now on. It already occurs in the first episode in which the Jewish magician and false prophet Bar Jesus wishes to prevent the pagan proconsul Sergius Paulus from converting to the faith and as a result is struck blind by Paul. The great speech of Paul before Jews and Godfearers in the synagogue of Antioch (13.16-41) stands then at the center of the journey.[83] On this occasion the hearers divide into Jews and Godfearers who become believers and Jews who oppose the proclamation, which causes Paul to pronounce the warning that from now on they will turn to the Gentiles (13.43-46). Subsequently, joyful Gentiles who have come to believe and hostile Jews who drive out the Apostles are set over against each other. The same thing is repeated immediately afterwards in Iconium, then later in Thessalonica, Corinth, and Ephesus, and thus becomes a characteristic of Paul's mission, which illustrates the successive detachment of the Christian community from the synagogue: in Antioch and Iconium another large number of Jews and Greeks come to believe; in Thessalonica there are now only a few Jews but a great crowd of Godfearing Greeks; in Corinth and Ephesus there remains only talk of opposition and reviling from the Jews,

[79] Cf. Conzelmann 1972, 80; 1987a, 98.
[80] Bechard 2000, 93–140.
[81] Breytenbach 1996.
[82] Cf. Bechard 2000, 99–123, as well as Pilhofer 2002, 113–22, 116.
[83] On this cf. Pichler 1997, *passim*; Jeska 2001, 221–53.

which leads to the fact that the Christian proclamation now takes place outside of the synagogue.

Finally, in Lystra, the third and last station about which an individual episode is reported, Paul produces, with the healing of a lame man, amazement among the crowd, which is now represented as exclusively pagan. It regards Barnabas and Paul as the gods Zeus and Hermes walking upon the earth, and the priest of Zeus wants to present an offering to them. This leads to the second, considerably shorter speech of the apostle, which is, apart from the Areopagus speech, the only mission speech before Gentiles. It sets the power of the God of Israel as creator over against the vain idols of the Gentiles. The Jews intervene again, but this time it is not the local Jews but Jews coming from Antioch and Iconium.[84] Finally, as the result of the journey it is held that God has opened up a door to faith for the Gentiles, which simultaneously establishes a link to the apostolic council that follows (14.27; cf. 15.12). With this journey Luke thus presents the structure of the Pauline mission, which is then maintained to the end of Acts and leads to the conclusion that God has hardened the Jews and sent salvation to the Gentiles. [241]

The Lukan configuration of the journey can thus be clearly recognized: the mission speech of Paul is, as the other speeches of Acts also are, a composition of the author, with which he characterizes and interprets people and situations. The echoes of Pauline theology show that Luke wishes to portray him as a speaker before Jews—as later then in an analogous way before Gentiles.[85] The episodes on Cyprus and in Lystra are formed according to the model of comparable miracle narratives.[86] At the same time, however, they are marked by local color. An ἀνθύπατος Sergius Paulus on Cyprus can be confirmed by inscriptional findings, not admittedly for the time presupposed by Luke, but shortly before, namely in the reign of Caligula.[87] In the episode in Lycaonian Lystra, the Phrygian legend of Philemon and Baucis[88] and local tradition about the worship of Zeus as a vegetation God, which can be documented for Phrygia and Pisidia, stand in the background. This, of course, proves nothing more than that Luke furnishes the episodes with a "realistic effect"; a "documentary interest"[89] in actual events cannot be deduced from it.

[84] This happens once again later in Beroea, where Jews coming from Thessalonica stir up the crowds there (17.13).

[85] The Areopagus speech, Acts 17.22-31, can be understood in this sense as a "model speech" of the Lukan Paul before Gentiles.

[86] Cf., e.g., the healing of the lame man in 3.1-10.

[87] Cf. Breytenbach 1996, 38–39, as well as the inscription on p. 181. In the translation provided, however, "Claudius" must—according to the reconstruction—be changed to "Gaius."

[88] Cf. Ovid, *Meta*. 8.620–724.

[89] For both expressions, cf. Marguerat 2003, 23–25.

For the historicity of the reports, the historical plausibility of a Cyprus mission going forth from Antioch can, by contrast, be invoked.[90] Luke had already reported previously (11.19) about a mission of those driven from Jerusalem on Cyprus; moreover, according to 11.20 some of those undertaking mission in Antioch originated from there, even Barnabas himself according to Acts 4.36-37.[91] Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra are also mentioned in 2 Timothy 3.11 as places in which Paul was persecuted; thus they are also present in another tradition, which is presumably not dependent on that of Acts. The priority of Barnabas, who is often named before Paul, also speaks for reworked traditions as does the designation of both with the apostle title, which is otherwise reserved for the circle of the twelve in Luke (Acts 14.4, 14).

The concrete pieces of information, however, are meager and, in part, inexact. The routes covered by the missionaries are—in contrast to what we find in the later journeys[92]—only [242] portrayed in summary fashion and without mentioning details;[93] the cities of Antioch and Iconium, which actually belong to Phrygia,[94] are ascribed to Pisidia; Luke knows nothing to report concerning personal traditions—in contrast to later in Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Ephesus—apart from Sergius Paulus who became a believer, but he remains isolated on Cyprus.

Thus, Luke evidently knows of a common mission activity of Barnabas and Paul and possesses some general pieces of information; however, he scarcely possesses concrete ideas about the geography of the respective regions[95] or detailed knowledge of the communities founded then. From this he created a composition that displays the spread of Christianity *in nuce*. Whether the common mission activity of Paul and Barnabas was limited to a journey, or whether Luke designed this in order to fill the time between the activity in Syria and Cilicia (which is mentioned by Paul in Gal 1.21) and the apostolic council[96] can remain open here.[97]

[90] Cf. Breytenbach 1996, 85–86.

[91] On the person of Barnabas cf. Öhler 2003; on Acts 4.36-37 in particular, see 87–187.

[92] Cf., e.g., 17.1; 20.13-16; 21.1-3, 7-8; 27.2-8.

[93] Cf., e.g., the description of the quite long journey route from Paphos on Cyrprus to Pisidian Antioch in 13.13-14. Perga is the only intermediate stop mentioned; for the return route, the harbor city Attalia is mentioned in addition (14.25).

[94] Cf. Foakes-Jackson/Lake 1933a, 148 and 160.

[95] Cf. Bechard 2000, 353: "It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Luke's knowledge of the more developed and urbanized coastal regions differed substantially, both in scope and character, from his image of the interior."

[96] Conzelmann 1972, 80; 1987a, 98, advocates the latter. That Paul and Barnabas did missionary work in the regions mentioned is not thereby disputed, even if Conzelmann is sometimes understood in this way.

[97] Here I will not go into the question (which has been increasingly discussed again of late) of the relationship between the first missionary journey and the Letter to the

Another finding appears in the so-called second missionary journey (Acts 16–19). The journey in Acts 16.6-10 is already presented in a striking manner as guidance through the Holy Spirit, who leads Paul, Silas, and Timothy through Asia Minor to Troas, from which they then, prompted by a ὅραμα of Paul, come to Macedonia.[98] The meaning of [243] the crossing over to Macedonia is thus stressed in a special way.[99] After this the knowledge of the local and political relations of the Aegean sphere are considerably more detailed than before: in Acts 16.12 Philippi is characterized further as ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτης μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. This expression is only comprehensible if precise knowledge of the historical circumstances is possessed, for it is based on the fact that the Romans had divided the province of Macedonia in 167 BCE into four parts, which were numbered from east to west.[100] Philippi belonged to the first part with the capital Amphipolis.[101]

The local knowledge also includes the naming of Amphipolis and Apollonia on the comparably short journey to Thessalonica, the office designations στρατηγοί and ῥαβδοῦχοι in Philippi, the πολιτάρχαι in Thessalonica, the Ἀσιάρχαι and the γραμματεύς in Ephesus, as well as the sketch of the respective religious situations. With the ἀνθύπατος Gallio of Achaia, a provincial authority is even identified by name whose chronological placement can easily be brought into agreement with the Lukan report with the help of a famous inscription.

The local color is also more detailed in this section. Notes about people in the communities established by Paul are also found—Lydia from Philippi, Jason from Thessalonica, Titius Justus from Corinth, Tyrannus from Ephesus—who in the case of Aquila and Priscilla, and perhaps also the synagogue leader Crispus and Sosthenes, can be verified on the basis

---

Galatians. It may be noted simply that it can only be discussed on the basis of a careful analysis of the intentions of the Lukan and Pauline statements.

[98] The route described in 16.6-8 is full of peculiarities that can hardly be clarified through considerations on the topography and road conditions of the interior of Asia Minor: where do Paul and his companions actually want to go? If—which is to be suspected—with Ἀσία the land and not the province is meant—why do they go to the border of Bithynia if they want to go to Mysia? When they finally come to Mysia—why do they go straight to Troas without doing mission work along the way? Cf. also Koch 1999a, 101–2. The judgment of Jervell 1998, 416–17, probably strikes the right point here: "The missionaries appear to wander around aimlessly but it is only meant to show that the Spirit guides the mission step by step." For Luke the important thing is that the [343] missionaries are led by the Holy Spirit on a direct way to Macedonia, without knowing the goal themselves. He evidently had only very vague ideas concerning the regions that had to be crossed in the process.

[99] Cf. Pilhofer 1995, 153–58.

[100] Cf. Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 45.29 . . . *deinde in quatuor regiones dividi Macedoniam.*

[101] Cf. Thornton 1991, 300–303; Pilhofer 1995, 159–64.

of Paul's letters.[102] It is probably no accident that some of the pieces of Acts composed in the "we-style" appear in this section, which is characterized by precise knowledge of places and people.

This section of Paul's mission is, admittedly, also subject to Lukan configuration. The position of Christianity between Judaism and paganism is profiled through the accusations by pagans in Philippi and Ephesus and by Jews in Thessalonica and Corinth. With the speech before philosophers on the Areopagus—which from a compositional perspective represents a counterpart to the speeches before Jews and Godfearers in Antioch at the center of the first missionary journey—Christianity reaches [244] the center of the ancient intellectual world.[103] When communities are established, Jewish Christians or Godfearers are often the first converts, whereas in his letters Paul mostly has in view communities made up primarily of Gentile Christians. Finally, on several occasions the presentation points beyond the time of Paul into the situation of the church that stands before the eyes of Luke himself.[104]

If we evaluate these findings, then it can be said that the presentation of Luke moves within the framework of what was expected from an ancient historian. He possesses knowledge about the areas concerning which he reports; sometimes chronological inaccuracies slip in;[105] and entirely in the sense of Lucian he has shaped his presentation and in this way drawn a picture of the development of Christianity in the first decades. Christianity appears as a movement that goes back to the activity of Jesus, was spread by the apostles and the "Hellenists," and is based in its concrete form on the mission of Paul, as a movement that stands in continuity with the history of Israel to which the Jews—at least at present—no longer belong.

It has been shown further that one cannot adjudicate the historical value of Acts in general but only in detail. Luke possesses variously detailed information and local knowledge about the different stages of the narrated history, which possibly provides a clue to his own background,[106] perhaps even to his participation in the events.

[102] Cf. Rom 16.3-5; 1 Cor 16.19 (Aquila and Prisca); 1 Cor 1.14 (Crispus); 1 Cor 1.1 (Sosthenes). With regard to the last two, it admittedly remains uncertain whether we are dealing with the same people as in Acts 18.

[103] For the Areopagus speech cf. chap. 3, §2.2, above. For the compositional placement of the speeches in chaps. 13 and 17, cf. n. 58 in chap. 3.

[104] This becomes clear, e.g., in chaps. 17 and 19. The accusations against Paul no longer affect Paul himself at all but his adherents in the cities in question (Thessalonica or Ephesus), whereas Paul himself is already on his way again.

[105] Examples are the famous census of Quirinius, the mixed-up order of Theudas and Judas the Galilean (Acts 5.36-37; cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 17.271; *B.J.* 2.118; *A.J.* 20.97–99), the second visit of Paul in Jerusalem (Acts 11.27-30), the Italian Cohort in Caesarea (Acts 10.1), and the temporal ordering of the governor Sergius Paulus' period of office.

[106] Cf. Pilhofer 2002, 106–12.

An important characteristic of the presentation of history in Acts consists in the fact that Luke views the course of history as directed by the God of Israel, who has himself brought about the emergence of the Gentile Christian church. The reception of Gentiles into the people of God was inaugurated by God; he directed the journey of Paul and his companions to Macedonia; finally, Paul's coming to Rome is also [245] presented as a necessity enacted by God;[107] and the rejection of the Christ message by the Jews proves in the end to be a hardening action of God, since it is grounded with a word of the Holy Spirit.

Finally, the miraculous events that appear many times in the book of Acts belong in this context. Prisoners are liberated by an angel of the Lord or by suddenly collapsing prison walls; human beings are healed, even by shadows or by the miracle worker's sweat cloths and handkerchiefs; and missionaries are transported to other places by the Spirit of God. These events are also demonstrations of the power of God, who becomes visible in this way. This manner of presentation does not make Acts a novel; rather, it shows that in the portrayal of dramatic episodes to illustrate divine activity Luke saw a proven means of historical presentation and no contradiction to his claim to be a historian who is be taken seriously.[108] The Lukan presentation of history is ultimately shown to be theological historiography developed from an Israelite-Jewish perspective.

5. Luke and the discovery of Christian salvation history
A summary

Luke is the first Christian author who grasped the movement going forth from Jesus as a historical one. In the second part of his work, he takes up for this a number of methods of Hellenistic historiography and thereby shows his implied readers that he is talking about events that did not take place "in a corner" (Acts 26.26) but claim a place within the Roman Empire.

The picture set forth by Luke presents the Christian church as the result of the constitution of the people of God that was set into motion by the Spirit outpouring of the exalted Jesus and substantially realized through the mission of Paul. In God's plan of salvation the reception of the Gentiles into the people of God, which was newly constituted through the coming of Jesus, was foreseen all along,[109] whereas the Jews are excluded from this at present through their refusal in relation to the salvation that has come in Christ. This development, which is geographically marked

[107] Acts 19.21: δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν; 23.11; 27.24 as well as Plümacher 2004, 135–69.

[108] Cf. Alexander 1998.

[109] Cf. Luke 2.30-32; Acts 15.7, 14.

through the corner points of Jerusalem [246] and Rome, is presented by Luke in Acts. At the same time, it points beyond itself to the history of the church that has now become Gentile Christian, which will find its end in the parousia of the exalted Jesus announced in Acts 1.11.

The newly constituted people of God is rooted in the history of Israel. The previously mentioned sending out of the seventy-two disciples in Luke 10, which looks forward to the subsequent Gentile mission that goes forth from Israel,[110] already points to this; the historical summaries in the speeches of Stephen and Paul also point to this, as do the vision of Peter and the regulation of the apostolic decree, which present the reception of the Gentiles as an expansion of the already existing people of God. The Christian church derives its identity—and with this its legitimation—from the continuity to Israel. To give a historical place to the church, which had become Gentile Christian through the non-acceptance of the Christ message by the Jews, seems therefore to have been the intention that guided Luke in the writing of his work.[111]

In the view of Luke, the history of Christianity is thus a series of events directed by Israel's God. Since this conviction forms the foundation of his presentation of history and he simultaneously shows himself to be an author conversant with the conventions of Hellenistic historiography, the work of Luke—in this comparable in a certain way to 2 Maccabees and Josephus—represents a combination of Jewish and Greek historiography. What is new, however, is that he makes the emergence and early development of Christianity the object of his viewing of history. The author of the Lukan Doppelwerk is therefore at the same time the discoverer of Christian salvation history.

[110] The number seventy-two follows Genesis 10 LXX and is therefore to be preferred to seventy. Cf. Tannehill 1986/1990, I, 233; Bechard 2000, 226–28.

[111] Cf. Plümacher 1978, 518–20.

Salvation for the Gentiles and Israel

On the Relationship between Christology and People of God in Luke

In his 1983 literature review on Acts, Eckhard Plümacher observed that "not so much the future hope that had become doubtful but above all an uncertainty concerning the continuity with the past . . . represents the occasion of the Lukan work."[1] With this formulation Plümacher points to a turn in Luke scholarship that was emerging ever more clearly in this period and was to have extremely far-reaching consequences for the evaluation of the Lukan Doppelwerk as a whole. According to this view, Luke was not concerned in the first place with a problem of time but with how the church separated from Israel was to be understood historically. For this he is said to activate the history of Israel as an interpretative horizon for the self-understanding of a community that is threatened with the loss of its roots by the separation from the synagogue. The previously dominant thesis of the coming to terms with the problem of the delay of the parousia[2] is therefore replaced by the concepts of "continuity," legitimacy, and identity, with which the problem that stands at the center of the Lukan work is to be described[3]: it is not the outstanding parousia but the coming into question of the belonging of the Christian church to the people of God that Luke wishes to address with the second part of his work and for which he develops an answer.

A second development in Luke research that is complementary to this involves the relation of the church to Israel and to Judaism and—in connection with this—the Lukan conception of the people of God. This question is treated in numerous contributions that are devoted to the role of Israel in the Lukan work and [248] see the point of his theology-of-history

[1] Plümacher 1983, 45–46.

[2] Cf. especially Grässer 1977 [1956]; 2001 [1979], 292–320. For the confrontation of his approach with more recent developments in Acts research cf. Grässer 2001 [1979], 1–47; on the problem of the parousia and Israel in particular cf. 30–43.

[3] Plümacher 1983, 46.

conception in the specification of the relation between Israel and church.[4] With this it is not only the role that Luke attaches to writings and institutions of Israel that has been moved anew into the field of vision,[5] rather the relation of Luke to Israel and Judaism—prompted not least by a new sensibility of Christian theology in relation to Judaism—has been subjected to a new evaluation.[6] Against this background, in what follows I will inquire into which conception of the people of God Luke develops in Acts. We begin by looking at two influential positions in scholarship.

The view advocated by Ernst Haenchen and Hans Conzelmann is that the (future) orientation of the Christ message to Gentiles exclusively, which is stated at the end of Acts, is a consequence of the rejection of the witness by the Jews. For this they appeal to the fact that the mission portrayed in Acts is directed for the most part to Jews, whereas the transition to the Gentiles is suggested in 13.46; 18.6; and definitively put into effect in 28.26-28. Luke processes in this way the transfer of salvation from the Jews, who are excluded from the people of God by their self-refusal, to the Christians, who now take the place of Israel.[7] According to this view, the problem of a continuity of salvation history thus emerged through the fact that the church, separated from its Jewish roots, could no longer hope for a conversion of Israel and in this situation had to solve the problem of the law-free Gentile mission. Luke does this through a historical conception that has the Gentile Christian church take the place of Israel and has unbelieving Judaism be rejected at the same time.

An opposing position, developed by Jacob Jervell in numerous contributions up to his great Acts commentary,[8] firmly contests this view. The incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God is grounded, thus [249] Jervell, precisely on the *acceptance* of the message of salvation by the Jews so that the conversions of numerous Jews, which are mentioned in Acts 2.41, 47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.7; and elsewhere, first present the presupposition for the restitution of the people of God.[9] Jervell points further to the fact that Paul

[4] For an up-to-date overview of scholarship, reference may be made to part 8 of my literature review, which appears in the *Theologische Rundschau* from 2007 on. Overviews of the recent discussion can be also be found in Rese 1999 and in Deutschmann 2001, 13–31.

[5] Cf., e.g., Rusam 2003; Ganser-Kerperin 2000; Jeska 2001.

[6] As examples, one would have to mention the investigations of Deutschmann 2001 and Wasserberg 1998.

[7] Cf., e.g., Conzelmann 1972, 159 (cf. 1987a, 227): "In contrast to Paul (Rom 9–11) Luke does not look beyond the present hardening to a future conversion of Israel. Rather, the time of the Gentile Christian church has now broken in; this has entered into the inheritance of Israel . . . This third explanation of the turning from the Jews and the turning toward the Gentiles . . . is final." Cf. further Haenchen 1977, 109–14; 1971, 98–103; 1968.

[8] Jervell 1998.

[9] Cf. already Jervell 1972; 1998, 92–93.

also continues to turn to Jews after the announcements in 13.46 and 18.6, for which reason the pertinent statements on the turning to the Gentiles are not to be understood in an absolute sense but related to the respective situation in Antioch or Corinth.[10] The problem of continuity is thus not solved by Luke by means of the replacement of Israel by the Gentile Christian church but by presenting the church as the people of God enlarged by the so-called "Godfearers,"[11] in which the apostolic decree is kept and which is to be designated—in contrast to the unfaithful Judaism—as faithful to the law.[12] There is then no "new people of God," and the church also does not take the place of Israel. Rather, the history of the church according to Luke is precisely *part* of the history of Israel and not a new stage of salvation history detached from this.[13]

Despite this different solution to the problem of continuity, Jervell is in agreement with Conzelmann and Haenchen that the non-Christ-believing Jews are excluded from salvation history at the end of Acts. In Jervell the theory of the "divided people of God" takes the place of a hardening pertaining to all Israel: the people of God is newly constituted by the fact that the believing Gentiles are received, whereas the unbelieving Jews are excluded. Jervell also does not reckon with a hope for unrepentant Israel; the word in Acts 28.26-28 is final.[14]

This view of the future of Israel, however, has recently been repeatedly called into question. It has been pointed out that Luke [250] does not exclude a hope for Israel in principle[15] and the hardening of unbelieving Israel by God could itself be reversed again.[16] Moreover, the conclusion of Acts permits one to see signs of hope for Israel in the Roman Jews' division over the acceptance of the sermon of Paul and in the sermon of Paul that is open to all (28.30-31), which also takes place after the word of hardening.[17] When Michael Wolter therefore observes that "the question of Israel's future . . . undoubtedly [belongs] to the topics that are discussed in Luke research at present with the smallest prospect of reaching a consensus,"[18]

[10] Cf. Jervell 1998, 363–64 (on 13.46) and 459–60 (on 18.6).

[11] Jervell 1988.

[12] Jervell 1995; 1983.

[13] Jervell 1991, 18: ". . . the history of the church is the history of Israel and never the history of the nations, completely independently of the fact that many Gentiles have been in the church . . . There is only one people of God, a second never comes."

[14] Jervell 1998, 628: "But now the judgment on the entire unrepentant Judaism is final . . . a future conversion of Israel, such as in Rom 11, is excluded." Cf. Jervell 1991, 22. Similarly Räisänen 2001 [1991].

[15] Cf., e.g., Haacker 1985; Marguerat 1994; 2003, 307–40; Tannehill 1985; 1988; Brawley 1987.

[16] Karrer 2000; Deutschmann 2001, 200–213, 257–60.

[17] So Marguerat 2003, 330–31.

[18] Wolter 1997b, 406.

then the reason for this is to be seen in the differentiated view that Luke sets forth concerning the people of God formed from Israel and the Gentiles in the field of tension between Israel's past and future.

In what follows I will investigate the demonstrated problem of continuity against this background, specifically with regard to the connection between Christology and the conception of the people of God in Luke.[19] Both the question of the position of the Gentiles in the people of God and the question of a hope for the non-Christ-believing Israel can be brought, so the thesis, to a solution against this background. In which direction this is to be sought is indicated by the title of the chapter.

1. Jesus as son of David in the Lukan work

We begin by looking at how Luke describes the salvation that has come in Jesus. Initial indications for this are already found in the childhood narratives of the Gospel of Luke.[20] Starting from here we will pursue two lines of Lukan Christology, which can be characterized as "Davidic" and "prophetic" and which are taken up and [251] developed further by Acts. In Gabriel's birth announcement to Mary in Luke 1.30-35, two characteristic features of the son, to whom Mary will give birth, are named: he will be called μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου and described as the one to whom God will give the throne of his father David and who will rule forever over the house of Jacob. The text stands in the tradition of 2 Βας 7.9-16 (= 2 Sam), where David's descendent is promised an everlasting throne and designated as son by God.[21] Beyond this the designation υἱὸς ὑψίστου in 1.32 reveals influences of royal messianism, as it has found expression for instance in Ψ 2.7 but also in Ψ 88.27-38; 131.11-12. Here the divine sonship is thus made concrete through the Davidic sonship and related to the earthly rule of Jesus over Israel.[22] With this a connection is therefore made with the hope for God's mercy with his people, corresponding to the promises to the fathers (1.54-55).

[19] Moule 1966 remains fundamental for grasping the Lukan Christology. For the more recent discussion cf. Tuckett 1999.

[20] That there are close relationships between the first chapters of the Gospel of Luke and the remaining parts of the Lukan work has been seen for quite some time in the research. On this cf. especially the contribution of Minear 1966 as well as Tannehill 1985; 1986/1990, I, 15–44; Korn 1993, 33–55.

[21] Cf. Fitzmyer 1981, 358; M. Strauss 1995, 88–91. That this text played a role in the formation of end-time expectations within Judaism is attested by its diverse reception in Judaism and early Christianity. *Pss. Sol.* 17 is thereby of special interest for the Lukan use because here the χριστός in v. 21 is designated as υἱὸς Δαυίδ. For the whole matter cf. now Pietsch 2003.

[22] Cf. Hahn 1995 [1965]; 1969.

The explanation that follows in 1.35 then places the Davidic sonship in a special light through the circumstances of the birth of Jesus.[23] The effect of the Holy Spirit and the δύναμις ὑψίστου makes clear that the designation of the expected Davidide as "Son of God" has its foundation in his divine origin. What is begotten in this way (τὸ γεννώμενον) is therefore called holy, because through this generation he is given a special nature.[24] With the "Son of God" designation, which is taken up once again in 1.35 and now interprets, in turn, verses 32-33, a statement about the divine is thus formulated that differs from the Jewish uses that apply this designation to specially chosen men. The divine sonship of Jesus is thus grounded in his origin and with this goes beyond his function as Davidic ruler over [252] Israel.[25] The association in Luke, which is also found elsewhere, between Son of God and Anointed One[26] shows his special interest in connecting the divine origin of Jesus with his role as the ruler upon the throne of David expected by Israel. The view of Jesus as the one with whom the Davidic promises are fulfilled is therefore a way of interpreting the χριστός designation that is central for the Lukan Christology.[27] These promises point, however, simultaneously beyond the earthly work of Jesus, which is already indicated by the special circumstances of his birth and is worked out through his further way.

The right understanding of what is said about him or the χριστός in the law of Moses and in the Prophets and Psalms includes, according to 24.44-47, his suffering and his resurrection (cf. 9.22) as well as the proclamation of repentance for the forgiveness of sins to the Gentiles and Israel.[28] In Acts the line that interprets the Davidic sonship through the connection with the resurrection picks up here.[29] First, in the Pentecost sermon in Acts 2.22-36, Peter comes to speak of the connection of Davidic sonship with resurrection and installation as exalted κύριος: knowing about the divine promise

[23] Here we can let rest the tradition-historical question of the relation of this verse to 1.32-33 and to the respectively reworked traditions (Davidic sonship, virgin birth). It is sufficient to establish that Luke wanted the tradition taken up in 1.32-34 to be understood in the light of 1.35.

[24] Cf. Hahn 1995 [1965], 305–6; 1969, 296–97, and already Dibelius 1953, 16–35, who points to the "Hellenistic Jewish idea of the begetting of great men?" which "[is] traced back to *the agency of the creative 'Holy Spirit' while excluding the husband*" (30, emphasis in original) and which has found expression in Paul in Gal 4.29; 1 Cor 15.45; and in Philo, *Cher.* 40–52.

[25] Cf. Kremer 1991, 142–43; M. Strauss 1995, 93–94; Hahn 1995 [1965], 318.

[26] Cf. Luke 4.41; Acts 9.20, 22.

[27] M. Strauss 1995 has worked out this aspect clearly in his investigation.

[28] εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (Luke 24.47) looks ahead to the Gentile mission, which is preceded, however, as the continuation ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ shows, by the Israel mission.

[29] On this point cf. also Hahn 2002, I, 564–66.

concerning his descendent upon his throne—here recourse is made again to 2 Samuel 7—David, looking ahead (προϊδών), spoke about the resurrection of the χριστός.[30] God provided the confirmation of this prophetic foretelling through the resurrection and the exaltation—which was likewise prophesied by David.[31] In the Pentecost sermon Luke thus connects the tradition about the Davidide Jesus with that of his resurrection and exaltation to κύριος, which he substantiates through the reception of Ψ 109.1.[32] It is therefore no accident that the use of [253] ὁ κύριος in Acts differs from the characteristic use in the Gospel of Luke.[33] In the Gospel, Jesus is addressed as a rule with the vocative κύριε, which represents here a polite form of address.[34] Apart from that κύριος is only used in indirect speech to designate Jesus.[35] In Acts, ὁ κύριος then becomes a designation for the Exalted One, who is installed in his position of power and now operates from there,[36] in whose name one is baptized,[37] in whom one believes,[38] and upon whom one can call in prayer.[39] As the difference between Luke 22.69 and Mark 14.62 also shows,[40] Luke thus shapes the tradition of the Son of Man who is exalted to God to that of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς, who as the Exalted One continues to act in history. Special attention lies here on the Spirit outpouring of the Exalted One, which was presented in the Joel quotation and to which Peter points back in 2.33.

A further recourse to the realization that is bound to the resurrection of the salvation tied to Jesus is found in Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch. In Acts 13.32-33 the promise to the fathers is designated as fulfilled by the resurrection of Jesus and grounded with the quotation from Ψ 2.7, which

[30] This is grounded through the quotation from Ψ 15.8-11 in Acts 2.26-28, from which v. 10 is taken up separately once again in 2.31. It is presupposed that David is both psalm writer and prophet (cf. 2.30: προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων) and therefore speaks prophetically in the Psalms.

[31] Cf. the quotation of Ψ 109.1 in Acts 2.34.

[32] On this connection cf. Mainville 1999.

[33] Moule 1966, 160–61, had already noted this. Cf. also Dunn 1997.

[34] Cf., e.g., Luke 5.8, 12; 7.6; 9.54, 61; 10.17; 13.23; 17.37; 22.33.

[35] So e.g., Luke 7.13, 19; 10.1; 12.42; 13.15; 17.5-6; 18.6; 19.8; 22.61.

[36] Acts 2.34, 36; 4.33; 5.31; 9.5, 10-17; 10.36; 15.26; 18.9; 20.24; 21.13; 22.8, 10, 19; 23.11; 26.15; 28.31.

[37] Acts 8.16; 16.15; 18.8; 19.5.

[38] Acts 5.14; 9.31, 35; 11.21-24; 13.12; 14.23; 16.15, 31; 18.8; 20.21.

[39] Cf. Acts 4.29; 7.59-60—the uses in Luke 24.3, 34 present a hinge between the Gospel and Acts. There the expression ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is encountered for the first time in the discovery of the empty tomb, whereas until then only ὁ θεὸς (τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) is found in apposition (so e.g., 1.32, 68; 4.8, 12); in the second passage the confession is formulated: ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.

[40] In Luke the Son of Man sits ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν at the right hand of God, which points ahead to his new function as the Exalted One. In Mark, by contrast, only sitting at the right hand of the power and coming again for judgment are mentioned.

speaks of the divine generation of the son. In an analogous way as already in 2.27-34, reference is made again afterwards in 13.34-37 to the Davidic sonship of Jesus, which reaches its goal with his resurrection.[41] In both speeches recourse is made for this to Ψ 15.10, which testifies to the difference between David and Jesus with respect to the διαφθορά: in contrast to David, whose grave, known to the hearers, is explicitly referred to in the speech of Peter (2.29), Jesus was not abandoned to decay. The decisive difference, prophesied by David himself, between him and his descendant thus consists [254] in the resurrection, which in this way is presented by Luke simultaneously as the hope of Israel fulfilled in Jesus.[42]

A difference between the christological traditions reworked in the two speeches consists in the fact that the exaltation in 2.34, as also in Luke 20.42-43, is grounded with the help of Ψ 109.1 and aims at the installation to the κύριος, whereas in 13.33 Paul connects the sonship of Jesus with the resurrection with the help of Ψ 2.7.

> The christological structure developed here shows a number of contacts with Rom 1.2-4: in common is the reference to the earlier issued promises (Rom 1.2/ Acts 13.32), the linking of the resurrection of Jesus and the installation to Son of God (Rom 1.4/Acts 13.33) and the reference to the Davidic sonship of Jesus (Rom 1.3/Acts 13.34). To this is added the reference to the prophets in the Holy Scriptures (Rom 1.2), which has a correspondence in the Scripture quotations cited in Luke as well as the analogy of εὐαγγέλιον (Rom 1.1) and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Acts 13.32). In light of the echo of the Pauline teaching on justification that follows in verses 38-39, which has already often been underlined, these analogies are quite noteworthy.
>
> In his concise treatment of the tradition-historical background of Acts 13.33-37 Eduard Schweizer pointed out that Paul corrects the piece of tradition quoted by him in 1.3b-4 by already speaking of the Son of God in verse 3a.[43] If one pays attention to the fact that for Luke also Jesus already becomes Son of God through the miraculous birth, then a correspondence between Luke and Paul can also be seen in the use of this designation.[44]

The Lukan description of the way of Jesus thus begins with the announcement of his divine generation and is thematically concentrated on his Davidic sonship and the promises to Israel connected with this. At the same time, however, it becomes clear that the fulfillment of these promises is tied to the resurrection.[45] There already appears at the end of

[41] Cf. Tannehill 1986/1990, II, 38, 170.

[42] Cf. Acts 26.6-8; 28.20.

[43] Schweizer 1966, 186.

[44] Kremer 1991, 144, also points to the analogy between the birth announcement and Rom 1.3-4.

[45] A culmination of this christological perspective can be seen in the announcement

the Gospel of Luke the indication of the Risen One that the suffering of the χριστός was necessary in order that he enter into his δόξα. In Acts this is taken up by now connecting his installation to the κύριος or his divine sonship with the resurrection. It is first with this that the promise from Luke 1.32 reaches its goal. [255]

Connected with this christological conception is a universally oriented reformulation of the Messiah expectation tied to Israel. This is likewise heard at the end of the Gospel of Luke when the commission of the Risen One to preach to all Gentiles is issued in 24.47. In the Pentecost scene, which is located in Jerusalem and as whose addressees Luke evidently envisages the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles,[46] a connection is made to this opening up of the message of salvation. The eschatologically interpreted[47] Joel quotation in 2.17-21 speaks of the pouring out of the Spirit ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα and ends with the promise καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται. In addition to those present, in 2.39 those who are εἰς μακράν are called recipients of the promise and are summoned by God. It is completely evident that this does not mean Jews in distant lands or later generations but non-Jews, since the expression looks precisely beyond the universal Jewry envisaged as present and thereby picks up on the Joel quotation once again.[48]

The speech in Antioch continues this insofar as it is the first speech that Paul gives in Acts and with this marks the beginning of his public activity

---

in Luke 2.11: Jesus as σωτήρ is described further as χριστὸς κύριος ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ. This direct combination of χριστός and κύριος, which is not otherwise documented in early Christianity, shows that the Lukan birth story already looks beyond the Davidic sonship to the exalted κύριος Ἰησους.

[46] This is supported by the formulation in 2.5 (Ἰουδαῖοι, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν) and the forms of address in 2.14 (ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἰερουσαλὴμ πάντες), 22 (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται), and 29 (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), as well as by the exhortation ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ in v. 36. As is well known, the list of peoples introduced in 2.9-11 contains the difficulty that Ἰουδαία is surprisingly named between Μεσοποταμία and Καππαδοκία and that in v. 11 Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι are listed among those listening between Ῥωμαῖοι and Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες. Scholars often attempt to remove this difficulty in a literary-critical manner. We can let this rest here, since it is sufficiently clear from the context that the important thing for Luke is to have the message of salvation directed first to the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles.

[47] The most prominent changes in relation to the LXX are the replacement of μετὰ ταῦτα with ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in 2.17 and the addition of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν at the end of 2.18. For the comparison of the Lukan text with the LXX and Hebrew texts cf. Steyn 1995; Barrett 1994/1998, I, 136–39; Rusam 2003, 290–99.

[48] Thus also, e.g., Barrett 1994/1998, I, 155–56; Rusam 2003, 328, who refers to 22.21 (πορεύου εἰς ἔθνη μακράν) as well (cf. also Eph 2.17: εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς). Contrast Roloff 1981, 63, who wants to see only Diaspora Jews spoken about.

in Acts. The context is characteristically altered vis-à-vis the Petrine Pentecost sermon. The speech is the first that is given outside of Palestine; moreover, it presents an interpretation of the work for which Barnabas and Paul were chosen by the Holy Spirit according to 13.2. That the concern here is with the proclamation [256] among the Gentiles emerges from 14.27 where their common journey is interpreted as God's work with which he has opened a door of faith for the Gentiles. Within Paul's speech itself the incorporation of the Gentiles that is now occurring is carried out according to 13.26 by taking place before Israelites and Godfearers,[49] which makes clear the universality of the orientation of the Christ message: it is rooted in the history of Israel but it simultaneously goes beyond this and is directed to everyone who believes.[50] Within this speech a linking that is extremely important for the Lukan connection between Christology and the people of God occurs in such a way that the forgiveness of sins for all believers is presented as a direct consequence of the resurrection of Jesus: the solemn new start with which Paul begins the third part of his speech in 13.38[51] presents a direct consequence from the previously described event of the resurrection of Jesus by God.[52]

It is no accident that the last major Paul speech in Acts 26.6-8 highlights the resurrection of the dead as the central content of the promises to Israel[53] and ends in verses 22-23 with a summary that looks back via Acts 13.47; 17.3; Luke 24.44-47 to Luke 2.32.[54] As the Risen One says in Luke 24.44-47, Paul states in Acts 26.6-8, 22-23 that the suffering and resurrection of the [257] χριστός was according to the Scripture; as in Luke 2.32

[49] Independent of the much-discussed historical question, it is clear that the Godfearers as non-Jews who are present in the synagogue play an important role for Luke in the transition of the mission to the Gentiles. It may not, however, be overlooked that the concern is actually with *Gentiles*, which should not be obscured through terms such as "semi-Jew" or "Jewish Gentiles" (so Jervell 1988, 11–12). Rather, with the literary figure of the Godfearers Luke makes clear how he envisages Gentiles who belong to the people of God (not Israel!). On this cf. Koch 2004.

[50] Cf. 13.39: πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται.

[51] γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί . . .

[52] The first part (13.16-25) presents a retrospect of the history of Israel, the second (13.26-37) a retrospect of the execution and resurrection of Jesus. To this is joined as a deduction (οὖν) the statement about the possibility of the forgiveness of sin that is not tied to the law. With this it becomes even clearer than in the speech of Peter that the incorporation of all believers is part of the history of God with Israel.

[53] Therefore, nothing other than the hope of the resurrection is also intended with the mention of the ἐλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ in 28.20, for which reason Paul, as he lets the Jews of Rome know, bears his chains.

[54] These recourses are mostly noted in the commentaries. Cf., e.g., Jervell 1998, 598, as well as the indication by Wolter 2004a. Attention should also be given to the analogy to 1 Cor 15.20, where there is talk, as here, of Christ as the first (Paul: ἀπαρχή, Luke: πρῶτος) from the dead. Reference is made to this by, e.g., Johnson 1992, 438; Fitzmyer 1998, 761.

there is talk of light for λαός and ἔθνη.[55] In this way it becomes clear once more at the end of Acts that within the Lukan Christology the παράκλησις τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and the λύτρωσις Ἰερουσαλήμ, for which the righteous and devout of Israel wait,[56] are not to be separated from the resurrection hope and with this from the attachment to the χριστός Ἰησοῦς as the πρῶτος τῶν νεκρῶν. This is connected with an opening up of the people of God to the Gentiles, as the resurrection of Jesus and the universally oriented outpouring of the Spirit equally show.

Thus, the structure of Lukan Christology set up in Luke 1.32-35 aims from the beginning at an incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God. The sitting of χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς on the throne of David, a notion that is directed, according to its tradition-historical origin, to the earthly rule over Israel, is already transformed in Luke through its link with the divine generation of the Son of God and is then linked in the speeches of Peter and Paul with the resurrection. With this reformulation of the messianic expectation, Luke connects at the same time an expansion of the people of God to the Gentiles: the Spirit sent by the Risen and Exalted One is poured out over all flesh; the incorporation of the Gentiles inaugurated by the Holy Spirit begins with the journey of Paul and Barnabas described in chapters 13 and 14.[57] If Luke has Paul speak firmly in front of Jews and Gentiles and simultaneously relativize the function of the law,[58] then the close connection between Christology and the reception of the Gentiles into the people of God [258] becomes clear.[59] The new definition of the people of God is thus a direct consequence of Lukan Christology and is already anchored in the designation of Jesus as the one begotten by God. It is part

[55] When it is said here that Christ proclaims the light to Israel and to the Gentiles, then through this both the proclamation of Jesus himself and that of his witnesses are summarized. With this it becomes clear once again that the salvation that has come in Jesus was directed to an expansion beyond Israel from the beginning.

[56] Cf. Luke 2.25, 38.

[57] It does not, of course, come completely without preparation: the "Ethiopian Eunuch" already shows himself to be an interested Gentile (8.26-40; cf. Lindemann 2004), Cornelius is baptized by Peter against his initial opposition (chaps. 10 and 11—in which Peter is now led to the knowledge already expressed by him in chap. 2), in Antioch the Hellenists driven out of Jerusalem proclaim the gospel καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνιστάς (9.29). In these beginnings, however, we are not yet dealing with the Gentile mission but with *praeparationes evangelicae missionis ad gentes*, which is, in turn, then programmatically initiated in chapter 13 and takes shapes in the course of history through the journey of Barnabas and Paul. On its formation as an independent narrative unity within Acts, which is framed by 13.1-3 and 14.26, cf. Bechard 2000, 99–123.

[58] This is rightly emphasized by Jeska 2001, 238–39.

[59] It is no accident that the latter is connected with the point within Acts at which "the rise of Paul to *the* proclaimer of the gospel, as the one whom he was already announced to be in chapter 9, is concretely prepared." So Öhler 2003, 253, who therefore rightly designates 13.1-3 as a "fundamental turning point" in Acts.

of the universally oriented salvation plan of God, which is grounded in the writings of Israel, takes concrete form in the announcement of the Son of God and Davidide, and is realized in history since his birth. The temporal πρῶτον of Israel is—as also with Paul in Romans 1.16—preserved, since the proclamation of Jesus is first directed to Israel, the Pentecost sermon of Peter then has the Judaism dispersed among all Gentiles in view, and finally the gospel is also proclaimed to the Gentiles themselves.[60] The Gentile mission is thus anchored in the coming of the Son of God Jesus and after his resurrection and exaltation to the κύριος is put into operation by God himself in the conversion of Cornelius through Peter, in which the Spirit comes for the first time to the Gentiles. The programmatic mission of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles (Acts 13–14) is also inaugurated by the Holy Spirit (13.2). We turn now to the new direction within salvation history that takes place here.

2. The prophetic dimension of the Lukan Christology

Alongside the line of Lukan Christology that is characterized by the connection between Davidic sonship and resurrection another line can be discerned. This is characterized by prophetic features and comes to terms with the rejection of Jesus and the Christ message through Israel. In doing so, another aspect that is constitutive for the Lukan conception of the people of God is simultaneously worked out.

The first passage to be discussed in this connection is the words of Simeon in Luke 2.30-35.[61] The σωτήριον prepared by God is referred to here as prepared κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, which is described further through φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ. A closer examination of this passage shows that going beyond 1.32-33 [259] the Gentiles also come into view for the first time here as addressees of salvation. Concerning this, one should first deal with the terms λαοί and ἔθνη in verses 31-32. It is conspicuous here that the Scripture passage to which Luke alludes with the expression πάντες οἱ λαοί (Isa 52.10) speaks of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. The use of λαοί by Luke is explained by the fact that with this term *all* peoples are meant, thus including Israel, whereas ἔθνη refers to the Gentiles here as also elsewhere in the Lukan work.[62] It also speaks for this interpretation that in the *parallelismus* in verse 32 the ἔθνη and

[60] Cf. Acts 3.16; 13.46; where the πρῶτον is explicitly mentioned.

[61] For the significance of this text for the overall conception of the Lukan work cf. Koet 1992, 1547–69; Radl 1999.

[62] Thus also Wilson 1973, 36; Fitzmyer 1981, 248; Radl 1999, 303. Contrast Stegemann 1991, 89, who wants to relate λαοί to the tribes of Israel.

the λαὸς Ἰσραήλ are set over against each other and the λαοί mentioned in verse 31 are differentiated in this way.

It remains necessary, however, to pay attention to the fact that in Luke 2.32 Israel is designated as λαός σου and Luke uses the term λαοί, which is oriented to Israel, for the designation of the totality of the peoples. The underlying idea thus starts, as the allusion to Isa 49.6 also suggests,[63] from the priority of Israel. The quite remarkable conclusion from this for Luke's use of language runs as follows: it is only because the ἔθνη come together with Israel into view as addressees of salvation that they can be reckoned to the λαοί and can thus be regarded as belonging to the people of God.[64] As the opposition of ἀποκάλυψις and δόξα in 2.32 also shows,[65] this belonging is oriented to the sharing in the salvation of Israel, for the Gentiles first need the revelation, in order to recognize the God of Israel and convert to him, whereas the σωτήριον for Israel will bring divine glory. Thus, with the incorporation of the Gentiles the orientation of the coming of Jesus [260] to Israel is not called into question. It is, however, modified in an important point in the course of the Lukan presentation.

Another pointer to the preparation of salvation also for the Gentiles follows from the fact that the term σωτήριον, which is used for the first time within the Lukan work, only appears in two other very prominent places.[66] First, in 3.4b-6 Luke expands the Isaiah quotation for the introduction of John the Baptist: if this ends in Mark and Matthew after Isaiah 40.3 and thus contains only the exhortation to prepare the way of the κύριος, then in Luke it additionally comprises verses 4-5a and ends with the statement ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. In this way the universal orientation of the σωτήριον that has come in Jesus is taken up again in its direct announcement through John.

[63] ἰδοὺ τέτεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

[64] With this a specific characteristic of Luke's use of language simultaneously becomes clear: λαός is only used for the Gentiles when they are viewed as part of the people of God. Independently of this the Gentiles are never called λαοί, not even in the Lukan understanding of Ψ 2.1 in Acts 4.25 (ἱνατί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά . . .), as is evident from 4.27 where a distinction is made between the ἔθνη and the λαοὶ Ἰσραήλ. The formulation in 15.14 (ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ) lies precisely upon this line: the Gentiles can only be designated as λαός here because they were chosen by God and with this are now part of the people of God.

[65] Grammatically, an opposition between φῶς and δόξα would also be possible (thus Schürmann 1969, 126 with n. 209). It is more likely, however, that τὸ σωτήριον is taken up with φῶς and is now specified further with regard to Gentiles and Israel. Cf. also Stegemann 1991, 90; Koet 1992, 1551–52 n. 12.

[66] This has already been noted often. Cf., e.g., Tannehill 1985, 71; Koet 1992, 1554 and elsewhere.

The third use occurs at the end of Acts. After the hardening word from Isaiah 6.9-10, Paul says in 28.28 that τὸ σωτήριον has been sent to the ἔθνη, who—in contrast to Israel—will also hear (αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται).[67] For our line of questioning, this passage is significant because the aorist ἀπεστάλη indicates that it is not, for example, now, at the end of Acts that the preparation of salvation for the Gentiles takes place and consequently the turning to the Gentiles became unavoidable. Rather, the concern here is with a fixed part of God's plan of salvation, which was announced in Scripture and has been being put into effect since Jesus' birth.[68] What is new is solely that the protagonists acting in history—in this case Paul—have first come to understand *the way in which* the new constitution of the people of God is taking place: namely through the hardening of Israel and the simultaneous turning of salvation to the Gentiles.[69]

From this it also follows that the conclusion of Acts forms an *inclusio* with the prophecy of Simeon and the statement found there concerning [261] the salvation prepared for Israel and the Gentiles is modified by the fact that it will only find a reception with the latter. At the end of Acts it thus becomes clear: the salvation that has come in Jesus was prepared equally for the Gentiles and Israel, but Israel is not in position to also receive it at present on account of its hardening. In light of this, the question first arises of whether the Lukan model of the people of God—as Haenchen viewed it—only reckons now with Gentiles, and secondly the question arises of a hope of salvation for Israel. For this we again take the words of Simeon as our starting point.

In Luke 2.34 the "public" prophecy of Simeon in the temple finds a "private" continuation, which is directed to the parents of Jesus and in which the ambivalence of the relationship between Jesus and Israel is thematized. Now the effect, which Jesus will bring forth in Israel, is foretold: he will become πτῶσις καὶ ἀνάστασις πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ and a σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον.

[67] Here the καί only emphasizes the verb and not the pronoun. Cf. Blass/Debrunner 2001, §442.8, with n. 24. The examples provided there show that the emphatic καί always stands in front with personal pronouns; the listing of Acts 28.28 is therefore incorrect. Cf. Plümacher 2004, 143–44.

[68] Thus, e.g., also Jervell 1998, 628–29.

[69] The fundamental nature of this statement already emerges from the fact that it stands at the end of the Lukan work and is grounded with a word of the Holy Spirit. This speaks against the assumption that the situation that has already shown itself in Antioch and Corinth is repeated here, which is said to allow one to conclude that Luke also reckons with an orientation of the Christ message to the Jews beyond this (so, e.g., Brawley 1987, 74–78; Witherington 1998, 805–6; Jeska 2001, 246, 270). Against this cf. rightly Marguerat 2003, 332 with n. 1.

Decisive for the interpretation of this passage is whether πτῶσις καὶ ἀνάστασις πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ is to be related to different groups and thereby to a division within the people or whether falling and rising again present successive phases within the history of Israel.[70] The second option is supported first by the fact that the πολλοί is only mentioned once, which points to the fact that both events relate to the same group. Semantically, the opposition of πτῶσις and ἀνάστασις points in the same direction, for the ἀνάστασις presupposes the preceding fall, whereas it is not otherwise used as a term for the description of the event of salvation.

Finally, the biblical background can also be advanced in support of this view: if, as Bart Koet has made probable,[71] Isaiah 51.17-23 (and not Isa 8.14, as is mostly assumed) is the Scripture passage that lies behind Luke 2.35,[72] then falling and rising again would belong equally to the history of Israel.[73] If we presuppose this interpretation, then it is here formulated that Israel will first turn from Jesus but then [262] convert to him. With this Luke suggests a salvation–historical–eschatological perspective for Israel.[74]

With the prophetic prediction of the stumbling and rising again of Israel, the history of Israel is thus considered in the light of the prepared σωτήριον. Wherein the irritation consists, which the salvation that has come in Jesus has called forth in Israel,[75] first becomes recognizable in the inaugural speech of John the Baptist in 3.7-9: John indicates to the crowd of people coming out to him that the childship of Abraham is no guarantee that one will escape the coming wrath of God, since God himself can elect stones to be children of Abraham. Instead, fruits of repentance are required, which is interpreted in a social-ethical manner in 3.10-14.

[70] The first solution is advocated by e.g., Schürmann 1969, 128; Bovon 1989, 147; 2002, 104; the latter by Marshall 1978, 172; Koet 1992, 1559–60; Wasserberg 1998, 144–46.

[71] Cf. Koet 1992, 1559–64.

[72] This is supported not least by the fact that in the immediate context there are additional allusions to texts from the immediate context of the Isaiah text: 2.30, 32, alludes to Isa 49.6 with σωτήριον and φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν (cf. also 42.6; 51.5); 2.31 alludes to Isa 52.10 with κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν.

[73] In Isa 51.17 and 22 the expression ποτήριον τῆς πτώσεως is used for the fall of Israel; in 51.17 there also occurs the exhortation Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου ἀνάστηθι, Ιερουσαλημ. This text thus lies closer than Isa 8.14 both terminologically and with respect to the idea of falling and rising.

[74] Thus, e.g., Wolter 1997b, 411. Contrast Wasserberg 1998, 146, who wishes to situate the falling and rising within the Lukan work and relates it to the Jews who convert to Jesus. This, however, is improbable in light of the πολλοί, which presumably refers to Israel as a complete entity.

[75] The following observations come into contact at a number of points with those of Wolter 1995, 553–58.

This aspect is then repeatedly taken up again within the Gospel of Luke: in 6.20-21, 24-26, the blessings on the poor, hungry, and weeping and the woes on the rich, sated, and laughing are set over against one another; the exhortations to love of enemies and renunciation of retaliation are intensified, unlike in Q and Matt, to the topic of lending money even without hope of receiving back what has been lent; the narratives of the rich grain farmer, the unjust judge, the Pharisee and the toll collector, and the Zacchaeus episode point in a similar way to the importance of dealing rightly with possessions; the parables of the merciful Samaritan, the great feast, and the lost son are examples, each in its own way, of the mercy that is required in relation to the needy, even if they do not seem worthy of this mercy.

To this social-ethical dimension, which emerges especially in the Gospel of Luke, comes the expansion, which is then worked out in Acts, of the rule of God to the Gentiles, which passes by Israel. One must first consider here the second text within the Gospel of Luke that thematizes the rejection of Jesus in Israel and the turning to the Gentiles, namely the inaugural sermon in Nazareth in Luke 4.16-30. Here too the sending of Jesus is first described with the help of a Scripture quotation from Isaiah 61.1-2 (vv. 18-21), which consists in a fulfillment of the prophecies about the salvation promised to the poor, imprisoned, blind, and shattered.[76] Jesus then [263] looks ahead to the rejection of his person as a prophet who is not accepted in his hometown and confronts this spurning with the reference to the sending of Elijah and Elisha to non-Israelites. The word about his rejection and the reference to the demand for a sign, which is unmotivated in the course of the narrative to this point, indicate that we are dealing here with a fundamental statement that applies to the constellation between Jesus and Israel and not one that is restricted to Nazareth. Because of this, the answer of Jesus to the rejection prophesied by him also obtains fundamental importance: in his πατρίς (here: Israel) a prophet (here: Jesus) is not acknowledged, for which reason he—as the following examples show—is sent from God to non-Israelites.

In this way the speech is intensified to the statement that salvation will also then take place if Israel refuses it. This statement possesses considerable weight for the Lukan conception of the people of God: it states that the promises of Scripture (cf. v. 21) now fulfilled in Jesus also remain in force if Israel has no share in them. Here there is already an intimation of the way in which the new constitution of the people of God tied to Jesus will take place: the rejection of Israel—which turns out to be hardening in Acts

[76] Albertz 1983, 190, has shown that Luke omits from this text "precisely the parts of the text that related it to Israel and Zion . . . with these deletions and omissions [263] he wants to open up the Old Testament promise . . . beyond the old people of God."

28, thus an action of God—involves a temporal priority of the Gentiles in the reception into the people of God formed from Gentiles and Israel.[77]

The specification of the relationship between Israel and the peoples, which is disclosed in this way, means the following: Luke starts from the fundamental priority of Israel as first addressee of the salvation prepared in Jesus. When he emphasizes this so clearly within the childhood narratives, then he indicates that this orientation possesses fundamental significance for his conception of the people of God. The Gentiles are only part of the people of God due to the fact that they become λαός—which Israel has always been. However, he brings in a second aspect at the same time: the salvation prepared in Jesus will—at least at first—pass by Israel when it takes place, for Israel has closed itself to his claim. This stumbling of Israel, which is prophetically foretold in Luke 2.34, has been fulfilled at the end of Acts in the hardening ascertained by Paul, for which reason the phase of the general Gentile mission can now begin. There arises then the paradoxical situation that on the one hand the standards of the people of God that were obtained in relation to Israel are in force for the Gentiles, but on the other hand Israel itself is not part of the people of God at present. That it is therefore excluded from salvation does not follow from the Lukan conception but it is true that salvation for Israel takes place in another manner than for the Gentiles. [264]

3. Christology and people of God in Luke

With regard to the purpose of the writing of Acts, from which the reflections of this chapter started, the question of the continuity of the church to the history of Israel plays a central role. With respect to the question of how exactly this continuity is to be described, the possibilities of the replacement of Israel through the church and the expansion of the people of God through the addition of God-fearing Gentiles have been discussed in scholarship. Both models, however, do not offer an adequate description of the specification of the relation between people of God and history of Israel that is developed by Luke.

The observations on Lukan Christology have shown that the conception of the people of God developed by Luke must be viewed in close connection with the Christology of his work. The line oriented on the Davidic sonship of the Son of God points to the close connection between the sending of the χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς to Israel and the fulfillment of the promises connected with this through the resurrection as well as the incorporation of the Gentiles into the people of God. The prophetic line makes clear that Israel will take offense at the sending of Jesus because it was hardened by God

[77] Cf. Siker 1992, 83–84.

and the insight into the plan of salvation remains hidden to it. A common characteristic of both lines is that they are developed closely on the basis of the Scriptures of Israel and remain within the historical horizon marked out by these texts. The speeches of Stephen, Peter, and Paul integrate the Jesus event—including his being killed and his resurrection—in the history of God with Israel; until the end Paul points to the fact that the resurrection hope is a central component of the salvation expectations of *Israel*, which does not, however, recognize the universalism bound up with this. The history of the people of God, which is constituted anew through the coming of Jesus, thus proves to be a continuation of the history of God with Israel.

The positions mentioned at the beginning must be modified in light of this. The view represented by Haenchen and Conzelmann has its strengths in the fact that it underscores the separation of Israel and church, which is assigned here to the second line, as an important characteristic of the course of history narrated by Luke. This is prophetically foretold in the *Canticum Simeonis* with the looking ahead to the falling and rising again of Israel; it is made concrete by Jesus at the beginning of his activity to the effect that it is related to the salvation that with the rejection of the sending of Jesus by Israel can also, passing by Israel, turn to the Gentiles. This line is then taken up again in the answer of Paul and Barnabas or Silas to the speeches that blaspheme against their preaching in Pisidian Antioch or in Corinth; it finds its conclusion in the word of the [265] Holy Spirit about the hardening of Israel that Paul speaks at the end of Acts. Nevertheless, one must pay attention (and here lies the weakness of this position) to the fact that the separation of church and Israel in Luke—as also in Paul in Romans 9–11—is part of the divine plan of salvation with Israel. The first statement regarding this, that of Simeon, is already formulated by a person, who is waiting for the παράκλησις τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and who sees this in the σωτήριον, which will simultaneously bring πτῶσις and ἀνάστασις. That the σωτήριον means the fulfillment of the hopes of Israel is emphasized again and again in the Lukan work until the very end. It would be odd to assume that Luke would present the constitution of the people of God in this way if he would grant no place for Israel in it. It is more plausible to assume that Luke views Israel's hardening as a phase of salvation history, which serves the inclusion of the Gentiles but which does not abrogate the final fulfillment of the hopes of Israel.

This finding is extremely significant for the Lukan conception of the people of God. It shows that the rejection of the Christ message on the part of the Jews—even if this only gradually becomes clear to the protagonists acting in history[78]—is part of the divine plan of salvation. The continuity

[78] Already the reception of the Gentiles into the people of God must first be made

thus consists not in the fact that salvation *passes over* from Israel to the church but that the Gentiles are *brought into* the history of God with Israel.[79]

However, the concept set forth by Jervell of a continuity of the church to Israel through the conversion of Jews and the subsequent reception of God-fearing Gentiles into the people of God also cannot convince. It already speaks against this that Paul sees the decisive difference between Jews and Gentiles in the fact that only the latter will hear. Therefore, the fact that Luke starts from a church formed in a Gentile Christian manner in his time and not from a Jewish αἵρεσις that has been expanded by a few Godfearers tolerates no doubt. The continuity of Israel and the church is not therefore conceptualized as a *personal* one, which would be established by Jews converted to Christ, but is anchored in God's plan of salvation, which guarantees this despite the irritating fact that the [266] people of God is a Gentile Christian entity at present.[80] Against the model of Jervell one must therefore object that Luke differentiates very well between the people of God and Israel, namely in the way that the people of God is constituted in a new way in light of the σωτήριον prepared in Jesus. This happens in such a way that the Gentiles are first admitted, whereas Israel is hardened. Thus, the rejection of Israel has an absolutely fundamental character for Luke. It does not mean a division in the people of God but the historical realization of the divine plan to harden Israel and to turn salvation initially to the Gentiles.

According to the Lukan conception of the people of God, the Gentiles are admitted into this without replacing Israel and thereby ousting it from the people of God. Such "disinheriting theories," as have been found time

---

clear—just as the turning *exclusively* to the Gentiles that follows—to the persons acting in history (in this case Peter in Acts 10 and 11), at first against their initial will, as part of God's plan of salvation. The repeated turning of Paul to the Jews, in spite of their rejection, lies on the same level: here too God's plan of salvation is made clear through the historical course, namely the hardening of Israel alongside the simultaneous reception of the Gentiles into the people of God.

[79] Stegemann 1991, 84, therefore rightly points out that in Luke "the hermeneutical horizon of a theology [can] be studied that still knows that the salvation of the Gentiles remains tied to that of Israel."

[80] This would also not be changed by the reference to the fact that a number of Jews are still found among the people converted to Christ and the Christ proclamation also continues to be directed to Jews and Gentiles equally. The reference to the πάντες in Acts 28.30, which is sometimes appealed to for this, already does not lead further because it immediately follows the hardening statement as well as the statement that salvation is sent from now on to the Gentiles. The concern for Luke is thus to explain historically the circumstance of the rejection of the Christ message by the majority of the Jews alongside its simultaneous acceptance by many Gentiles. For an interpretation of his picture of history, one must therefore start from this constellation, which characterizes his view of the course of history, and not from exceptions that are always possible but are not judged to be historically decisive by Luke.

and again since the second century, cannot rightly appeal to the Lukan view. According to Luke the incorporation of the Gentiles into the people of God was always foreseen in the divine plan; it was realized through the appearance of his Son and Anointed One; its implementation in history is tied to the activity of Paul. Therefore the statement can be made by Peter and James at the apostolic council that God had already decided ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων or πρῶτον to have the ἔθνη hear the gospel and to select from them a λαός.[81] This has begun with their activity, as the report of Paul and Barnabas (which follows in Acts 15.12, thus between the speeches of Peter and James) about the activity of God among the Gentiles demonstrates. That this represents an independent electing action of God through which the Christ-believing Gentiles become the λαός and with this part of his people is shown not least by the fact that Luke has the admission of the Gentiles into the people of God be regulated through the decree in Acts 15.20, 29.

Finally, with this the question of whether there is a salvation hope for Israel in Luke can also be answered. For this one must start from the observation that from the beginning the salvation prepared in Jesus is directed not only *also* [267] but, in fact, *first* to Israel. This statement is revoked at no point in the Lukan work—not even in the hardening word of Paul at the end of Acts. This word is not, of course, directed only to the Jews at Rome and may not be played down in its fundamental character for the Lukan view of history. It does not state, however, that the unbelieving Jews are excluded from the history of salvation from now on. Rather, the πρῶτον of Israel lives on *materially* insofar as the picture of the people of God set forth by Luke is oriented on the promises of Israel and expects from the Gentiles that they turn from their idols and turn to the God of Israel and also accept the minimal requirements for the non-Israelites living in Israel.[82] The priority of Israel is, however, "democratized" through the incorporation of the Gentiles bound up with the coming of Jesus; moreover, through the factual rejection of the Christ message on the part of Israel, it is reversed *temporally*: it is now the Gentiles who *first* join the people of God that is being newly constituted, whereas Israel is hardened at present and will only join up with it when God removes this hardening.

In conclusion reference may be made to the fact that the viewing of the connection between Christology and people of God in Luke converges at a number of points with the view developed by Paul. The analogies between Acts 13.32-37 and Romans 1.2-4 were already noted above. To this can be added the fact that the question of the common existence of Jews and

[81] Acts 15.7, 14.
[82] Acts 17.29; 15.20, 29.

Gentiles within a community on the basis of the decree from Acts 15 certainly possesses affinities with Paul's exhortation to consideration for Jewish food commandments on the part of Gentile Christians in Romans 14. Finally, the view of salvation history that Luke advocates is also thoroughly akin to that of Paul in Romans 9–11: both start from a present hardening of Israel, which has the consequence that the Christ proclamation currently finds reception primarily among Gentiles, but does not call into question the election of Israel and the final fulfillment of the promises. Precisely when Luke, who writes several decades after Paul and already has another historical situation before him, starts, in contrast to Paul, from a predominantly Gentile Christian church, it is noteworthy that he conceptualizes the history of the church as a part of the history of God with his people and preserves the eschatological hope for Israel. The continuity of salvation history therefore consists for Luke in the fact that the history of the Gentile Christian church as part of the history of the people of God is closely connected with the history of Israel.

Part III

ON THE WAY TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

This page intentionally left blank

12 [271–295]

Jesus and the Canon

The Early Jesus Tradition in the Context of the Emergence of the New Testament Canon

In the previous chapters of this book various paths were considered upon which early Christianity emerged as an independent ancient religious community. It became clear that central components for this development are represented by the presentation of the activity of Jesus in the Gospels, the position that Paul developed of the Christ message directed equally—if also in a particular way for each—to Jews and Gentiles, and the conception of Luke, which builds on this, of the people of God formed from Jews and Gentiles as part of the history of Israel.

The chapters of part III turn to the development that builds upon this foundation. For this purpose one must first consider the fact that early Christianity produced considerably more writings than the ones that appear in the New Testament. These are collected in part in the corpus of the so-called "Apostolic Fathers" and in part in the so-called "Apocrypha."[1] In these corpora we are dealing, of course, with later collections that are also not clearly fixed in their scope.[2] In the twentieth century, with the discovery of Nag Hammadi, yet another corpus was added to this, which again possesses a shared intersection with that of the "Apocrypha."[3]

The emergence of the New Testament canon is thus a process in which from an extensive number of writings the early church created a [272]

[1] For appropriate editions or translations see Fischer 1993; Wengst 1984; Körtner/Leutzsch 1998; Schneemelcher 1990; 1997; 1991/1992; Markschies/Schröter 2012.

[2] The first compilation of the Apostolic Fathers was undertaken in 1672 by Jean-Baptiste Cotelier. A little later (1703) Johann Albrecht Fabricius compiled the Corpus Apocryphus Novi Testamenti. That both corpora are not clearly demarcated from each other is shown by the fact that the Apostolic Fathers are also found in the first two editions of the apocrypha collection of Edgar Hennecke. On this cf. also Markschies 1998.

[3] For a German translation see Schenke/Bethge/Kaiser 2001/2003. A few of the Nag Hammadi writings were incorporated after their discovery into the edition of the New Testament Apocrypha overseen by Wilhelm Schneemelcher and will also continue to be found there in the new version. See Markschies/Schröter 2012.

collection that it regarded as its binding foundation. The concern here—so much can already be said from the start—was not with an arbitrary determination by bishops or councils that accepted certain writings for dogmatic reasons whilst rejecting others. Such a position would distort in an inadmissible manner the processes that led to the formation of the New Testament canon. It already speaks against this that the New Testament was never officially agreed upon and declared to be binding by a synod of the ancient church. Rather, the emergence of the New Testament in the form in which it ultimately gained general recognition was a long process in which the church ensured continuity with its beginnings and the mutual correspondence of its confession and its accepted writings. With this, demarcations from positions and writings that did not gain acceptance in the church were formulated at the same time. The emergence of the New Testament canon can only be adequately understood in this context of the emergence of the Christian confession and of Christian communities that made use of writings that brought this confession to expression. It is with this process that we will be concerned in what follows.

First, I will view the early Jesus tradition in the context of the emergence of a collection of writings regarded as binding by the church. Here I will connect recent discussion of the canonical and extracanonical Jesus traditions with research on the emergence of the New Testament canon. In the broader horizon the concern is with the question of the relation between the witness concerning Jesus Christ found in the New Testament and the activity of the earthly Jesus. It will be necessary to return to this point at the end of this chapter. We begin with a consideration of the present state of discussion.[4]

1. The concept of a "canon" and the diversity of early Christian writings

The investigation of the New Testament canon has shown that it developed over quite a long time period, that its emergence proceeded differently in the individual regions of the Roman Empire, and that it did not represent a document of the unity of Christianity but gathered together the writings in which the early church found the contents of the Christian faith to be expressed.[5] It is clear also that the term "canon" [273] (κανών, *regula*) can only contribute in a limited way to illuminating the process in question, since it was first applied to the accepted writings in the fourth century,

[4] On this cf. Schröter 2007, 343–54 (chap. 15 in this volume) as well as Schröter 2006b.

[5] Von Lips 2004 provides a recent overview of the emergence and reception of the New Testament canon.

whereas it previously referred to the norms of Christian faith and life.[6] It could, for example, characterize repentance (μετάνοια) as the foundation of the Christian way of life,[7] serve as a summarizing designation for the fundamentals of the faith set down in the New Testament writings,[8] or refer to service in the community,[9] the correct celebration of the Eucharist,[10] or the right Easter date.[11] The essential contents of the Christian confession could also be summarized with this term,[12] although a fixed confession text and the connection between confession and baptism probably cannot yet be presupposed for the first and second centuries.[13] Later, council resolutions were also called "canons," because binding regulations for the form of the Christian faith were recorded in these. This understanding of the expression as a summary of the fundamentals of the Christian faith also comes to expression in further specifications such as "canon of faith" (κανὼν τῆς πίστεως, *regula fidei*), "canon of the truth" (κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, *regula veritatis*), or "canon of the church" (κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας or ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανών).[14] [274]

With the terms "apocryphal/apocrypha" (ἀπόκρυφομ/ἀπόκρυφοι) the situation is different since these terms already occur in the second century in titles or to designate the content of writings.[15] Thus, this designated

[6] Cf. Ohme 1998 as well as Ohme 2002.

[7] Cf. *1 Clem.* 7.2. There, with the reference to the "glorious and honorable rule of our tradition" (εὐκλεὴς καὶ σεμνὸς τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανών) the subsequent comments on the μετάνοια are introduced.

[8] Thus, e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.15.1. In this usage the term is often used in the context of warding off "heretical" teaching, such as that of Marcion or Valentinus, thus, e.g., by Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.5.

[9] *1 Clem.* 41.1 speaks of the "canon of service" (τῆς λειτουργίας κανών) of the community members.

[10] Clement of Alexandria appeals to the κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας (*Strom.* 1.96.1) in order to ward off the practice of celebrating the Eucharist with water.

[11] In Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6.22.1) we find the note that Hippolytus prepared a canon of a sixteen-year cycle for the reckoning of the Easter date (κανὼν ἐκκαιδεκαετηρίδος περὶ τοῦ πάσχα).

[12] Thus, e.g., in Tertullian, *Praescr.* 13; *Virg.* 1.

[13] Cf. Ritter 1984, 405–6; von Campenhausen 1972a, 226–27. Contrast Kinzig 1999.

[14] Thus, e.g., Eusebius reports that Dionysius of Corinth fought the heresy of Marcion in a letter to the Nicomedians and appealed thereby to the "canon of the truth" (*Hist. eccl.* 4.23.4). At a latter point it says that the early bishops of Asia did not go their own way in the matter of the Easter date but held to the "canon of the faith" (*Hist. eccl.* 5.24.6). In *Hist. eccl.* 6.13.3 Eusebius mentions among the writings of Clement of Alexandria an "ecclesiastical canon" (κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός). Irenaeus consistently uses the expression "canon of the truth"; in [274] Tertullian it can also be called canon/rule of faith, God, church discipline, or also of Scripture. Cf. von Campenhausen 1968, 333–34; 1972b, 288–89.

[15] Thus, e.g., in the title of the *Apocryphon of John* as well as at the beginning of the *Gospel of Thomas* where the words of Jesus are designated as "hidden" (λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι).

special, hidden revelations that are only accessible to a few chosen ones. For ancient church authors such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen, the expression "apocryphal" possesses, by contrast, a negative meaning and is equated with "rejected" or "falsified" (νόθος, *falsa*). From this develops then the opposition between "canonical" and "apocryphal" writings.[16]

Against the background of this understanding of "canon," "non-canonized books" (ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία) were set over against the "canonical (books) of the New and Old covenant" (τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) at the council of Laodicea (ca. 363). A little later Athanasius similarly distinguished the "canonized writings that have been handed down and certified as divine" (τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία) from the "so-called Apocrypha" (οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀπόκρυφοι) in his thirty-ninth Easter Letter of 367.[17]

From these findings it follows that the distinction between accepted and rejected writings must be viewed in the context of the developments in which early Christianity ensured its own identity. Here, there is a dialectical relation between the developing norms of the Christian faith and the compilation of authoritative writings insofar as these norms are founded on the witness of writings regarded as binding and viewed as corresponding with them in substance, while at the same time the norms confirm and promote, in turn, the authority of these writings. The early church is thus founded not merely on a collection of binding writings but rather this collection emerged in close connection with the apostolic tradition, which was viewed as foundational.[18] [275]

A second consequence can be developed from the starting point of Ernst Käsemann's much-quoted dictum that the New Testament canon does not ground the unity of the church.[19] At that time Käsemann had grounded this judgment with the multiplicity of the theological positions found in the New Testament and their partial incompatibility and had distinguished on this basis between letter and Spirit—concretely, between canon and gospel. He thus resolved the problem of the variety and partially contradictory

[16] By contrast, in present-day usage—e.g. in Schneemelcher 1990; 1997—the writings that did not gain access into the canon but are nevertheless important witnesses for the history of early Christianity are designated as "Apocrypha" in a neutral sense.

[17] The texts can be found in Zahn 1890, II/1, 202 or 210–12.

[18] Von Campenhausen already emphasized this in a fitting manner. Cf. von Campenhausen 1968, 379–80 (cf. 1972b, 329): "The Bible is never regarded as the sole source of the Christian faith . . . The church always lives . . . simultaneously and first from the tradition . . . Scripture never displaces and replaces the . . . proclamation of the church, which holds fast to the original 'standard of truth.' This 'standard' . . . is not a norm that stands over Holy Scripture but rather it shares with it the same origin in the initial proclamation of the apostles and therefore corresponds with it in substance."

[19] Käsemann 1964a, 221. Cf. 1982, 103.

nature of the canon by introducing a normative criterion of content with whose help he distinguished between the merely external (letter-)canon of the twenty-seven writings and the inner (Spirit-)canon, which is inaccessible to the historian and can only be grasped in faith.[20]

While Käsemann's emphasis on the variety of the New Testament canon can be affirmed without reservation, the problem of his suggestion—which can be assigned, like those of Marcion and Luther, to the model of a "canon within the canon"[21]—resides in the fact that he wants to ground the New Testament canon on a provisional, changeable theological standard. With this, however, its function as the foundation and expression of the binding convictions of early Christianity is effectively undermined. That is to say, if the New Testament canon is measured against a norm that serves to differentiate between more and less "important" writings, then the principle that underlies its emergence is blended out. This principle did not consist at all in defining a theological norm with which writings could be judged but in preserving the connection of the Christian faith to its origins through the collection of the apostolic faith witness and its demarcation from later "falsifications."

> This is shown, for example, by a passage in which Irenaeus summarizes the content of the Christian proclamation and the Christian faith at the end of the second century: "That is to say, although the church . . . is scattered over the whole world, it has received from the apostles and their students its faith in one God, the Father, the almighty, who created the heaven and the earth, the sea and everything that is in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who for our salvation became flesh; and in the Holy Spirit, who proclaimed through the prophets God's arrangements of salvation (οἰκονομίαι) . . . The church . . . received this proclamation (κήρυγμα) and this [276] faith (πίστις) and . . . it preserves it carefully . . . it unanimously proclaims, teaches and hands this down.[22]

In such formulations the fundamental parts of the Christian faith were summarized, which were viewed as standing in continuity with the apostolic proclamation and thus provided the criterion for the acceptance or rejection of binding writings. The emergence of a binding collection of writings is therefore based on the principle that writings that were in use in the communities and did not contradict the apostolic faith witness could be approved.

In what follows, another path than that that of Käsemann is therefore to be embarked upon to approach the meaning of the canon. If we restrict ourselves here to the Jesus tradition, then this is not only for reasons of

[20] Käsemann 1964a, 221–23. Cf. 1982, 103–7.
[21] Cf. Wolter 2003, 48–49.
[22] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.10.1. Cf. Richardson 1970, 360.

clarity but above all because it has become clear through more recent discussion of the so-called "Apocrypha" that the gospels that became canonical[23] only represent a comparably small excerpt from the early Jesus tradition. Recently, the demand has often been made in the framework of the quest for the historical Jesus, above all in North American research, that the ancient church distinction between "orthodox," canonical tradition and "heretical," apocryphal tradition be abandoned. This is to be affirmed without reservation from a historical perspective, for the possibility that historically valuable information is contained in writings condemned as heretical cannot, of course, be excluded.[24] However, it would be a distortion of the findings to conclude from this that the early Jesus traditions are equal in value in a historical perspective and were first divided for dogmatic reasons in the second century into those that were accepted and those that were rejected. This will have to be shown in greater detail.

> It may be noted in advance, however, that the dating of the apocryphal writings, especially the *Gospel of Thomas*, in the first century,[25] which is sometimes asserted without more detailed justification, is not followed here. Independent of the question of the [277] older traditions reworked in the *Gospel of Thomas*, a date of emergence for the writing itself in the second century seems likely.[26] This also applies *mutatis mutandis* to the other apocryphal gospels. The value of the extracanonical Jesus tradition therefore does not lie in changing a Jesus picture drawn from the writings of the first century. Rather, they bring before our eyes constellations and controversies of the second and third centuries in which different ways of referring to Jesus were demarcated from one another.

When in what follows inquiry is first made into the genesis of the distinction between binding and "apocryphal" Jesus tradition, then the aim is to illuminate how the early Christians dealt with a variety of Jesus traditions and how they developed criteria for their acceptance or rejection.

One aspect that should be taken into account but is usually neglected emerges from the textual history of the New Testament writings. Recently, an extremely significant development has taken place within New

[23] In speaking of gospels that have *become* canonical and apocryphal I am taking up a fitting formulation of Lührmann 2000; 2004.

[24] It represents, of course, a procedure that rests on precisely the same level as the rejected preferential treatment of the gospels that have become canonical when in a reversed conclusion the Apocrypha are now given uncritical priority for the historical Jesus question as occasionally happens in a sensational manner. By contrast, Klauck 2002; 2003a, has recently presented a balanced introduction to the apocryphal gospels.

[25] Recently, e.g., by Pagels 2003. The German translation appeared with the title "The Secret of the Fifth Gospel: Why the Bible Only Tells Half of the Truth." See Pagels 2004.

[26] On this cf. my introduction to the *Gospel of Thomas* in Schröter 2001a, 151–63, and in Schröter/Bethge 2012.

Testament textual criticism. If for a long time the reconstruction of the one original reading was accepted without question as the task of textual criticism,[27] then this premise has been strongly called into question recently.[28] The findings of the New Testament manuscripts from the first century lead rather to the assumption that the transmission process was characterized from the beginning by various versions (and translations) of the New Testament writings, which existed with equal validity alongside one another. The text printed in the "Novum Testamentum Graece" or in the "Greek New Testament" is attested by no single manuscript but represents an additional, modern variant of the New Testament that probably never existed before in this form. This finding leads to a substantially different image of the "New Testament" than what stands behind the view that the one "original" text of the New Testament[29] is the goal of the investigation of the textual history and with this the foundation for interpretation. The search for a text form that comes as close as possible to the origin of the writings themselves could [278] prove instead to be inappropriate and therefore in need of revision in light of the textual history of New Testament manuscripts from the first centuries. I will need to return to this at a later point.[30]

2. The authority of the Lord as "canonical impulse"

The authority of the teaching of Jesus represents an important impulse for the emergence of the New Testament canon—perhaps even "the starting point of the 'canonical' development' " altogether.[31] However, this teaching was understood from the beginning as tradition that was to be interpreted in relation to different situations, and that was correspondingly extendable and variable in its wording. The earliest indications of this are found in Paul, who sometimes explicitly refers to the authority of the Lord.[32] These appeals are characterized by the fact that Paul integrates cited sayings of

[27] Thus, e.g., the position of the widely circulated textbook by Aland/Aland 1989a, 284: "Only one reading can be the original, however many variants there may be for a passage." This textbook has also been translated into English. See Aland/Aland 1989b, 280.

[28] Two of the most important contributions concerning this are Parker 1997 and Epp 1999.

[29] The 1881–1882 edition of the New Testament edited in Cambridge by Westcott and Hort bore the title *The New Testament in its Original Greek*.

[30] Cf. §4 below.

[31] Thus von Campenhausen 1968, 169 (cf. 1972b, 143): "This complex (sc.: the Jesus tradition and the gospel literature) forms the starting point of the 'canonical' development and will form the first center of gravity of the later 'New Testament.' "

[32] For what follows cf. also Schröter 2007, 81–104, esp. 86–98 (chap. 5 in this volume, esp. §2).

the Lord into his argumentation in both language and content and adjusts them to the particular situation.[33]

> Thus there is neither a quotation in 1 Corinthians 7.10-11 nor in 9.14; rather, Paul himself formulates the instruction, which he authorizes through the reference to the Lord. It is also characteristic of the two passages that Paul weaves the sayings of the Lord into his comments on divorce or on the apostolic right to support in such a way that they form one among several arguments. In 1 Corinthians 7.8-12 he gives the unmarried and widows as well as the "rest" instructions on his own authority and explicitly distinguishes this teaching from the directives of the Lord. In 7.25 he contrasts the "command of the Lord" (ἐπιταγὴ κυρίου) with his own opinion (γνώμη) and with this introduces the following teaching about the virgins. At the end of the entire exposition, he grounds the contention that his view also possesses a claim to authority with the reference to the fact that he also possesses the Holy Spirit.
>
> In 1 Corinthians 9 he grounds his right to support from the Corinthian community with a directive of the Lord (ὁ κύριος διέταξεν), but he sees his own decision not to make use of this as a behavior that is suitable to his service to the gospel.
>
> In 1 Thessalonians 4.15 Paul expresses that his instruction about the living and the dead at the parousia of the Lord takes place "in a word of the Lord" (ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου). Here too it is completely evident that he is not thinking of a quotation of the earthly Jesus; rather Paul places his own teaching under the authority of the Lord. [279]
>
> Paul introduces the institution of the Lord's Supper cited in 1 Corinthians 11.23-25 with the comment that he received it from the Lord and handed it on to the Corinthians. It is evident that he does not make recourse here to words of the earthly Jesus but to an early Christian tradition and thus places it in a context of tradition. This already follows from the fact that the quoted tradition is introduced with terms that are characteristic for the handing on of tradition, namely "receive" (παραλαμβάνειν) and "hand on" (παραδιδόναι), which show that Paul is citing an early Christian tradition of the Last Supper here.[34] This is also shown, however, by the fact that shortly before this Paul can put forward another interpretation of the early Christian meal (1 Cor 10.16).

When Paul consistently refers in the aforementioned passages to the Lord (κύριος), but never speaks of a "word of Jesus," then this shows that he understands "words of the Lord" to be a teaching legitimated through the Risen and Exalted One, which is to be made concrete by his apostles and prophets in different situations. The intention does not consist then in the word-for-word transmission of sayings of the earthly Jesus but in connecting to a tradition grounded through the authority of the Lord as the basis of early Christian teaching. If it is a matter here of sayings that have

[33] Cf. Schröter 2007, 86–93 (chap. 5, §2.1, in this volume).
[34] Cf. also 1 Cor 15.3.

their point of departure with the earthly Jesus—which is true sometimes but certainly not in all cases—then this is only of interest to Paul insofar as the earthly one is simultaneously the one who has been raised and exalted by God.

This is underlined by the fact that beyond the aforementioned explicit references to the Lord there are found a number of analogies to traditions in other early Christian writings, including the Synoptic Gospels, which are not, however, characterized as words of the Lord by Paul or in other writings.

> The saying about the thief in the night in 1 Thessalonians 5.2 also occurs in 2 Peter 3.10 and has analogies in Revelation 3.3 and 16.15. In Luke 12.39/Matt 24.43 and in the *Gospel of Thomas* 21.5-7 the metaphor of the thief is changed to a word-picture of Jesus. In all cases the context is the exhortation to watchfulness in view of the unknown point of time of the coming of Jesus for judgment.
>
> The exhortation to keep peace in 1 Thessalonians 5.13 (cf. Rom 12.18) is put forward as a command of Jesus in Mark 9.50 (cf. Matt 5.9).
>
> Analogies to the exhortation in 1 Thess 5.15/Rom 12.17 not to repay evil with evil, as well as to the closely related admonition in Rom 12.14 to bless persecutors and not to curse them are found in the Sermon on the Plain and the Sermon on the Mount (Luke 6.28/Matt 5.44) as well as in 1 Peter 3.9. We are dealing with a topos of early Christian paraenesis that was received in both the Synoptic Gospels and in the epistolary literature.
>
> The saying about good behavior toward enemies in Romans 12.20, which is a quotation from Proverbs 25.21 in Paul, occurs in the Synoptic tradition as a command of Jesus to love one's enemies (Luke 6.27, 35/Matt 5.44). [280]
>
> The topos in Romans 14.14 that nothing is unclean from itself can be compared with the Jesus word in Mark 7.15/Matt 15.11: "Nothing that comes into a human being from outside can make him unclean."
>
> The saying about the faith that moves mountains in 1 Corinthians 13.2 has analogies in Mark 11.22-23/Matt 17.20 (cf. also Luke 17.6 as well as the *Gospel of Thomas* 48 and 106).

The presented findings show that a sphere of tradition already existed prior to the emergence of the Gospels that was made up of sayings of Jesus, early Christian teaching authorized by the Lord, topoi from Jewish-Hellenistic ethics, and words from Scripture. In this sphere, with which early Christianity created a tradition of its own and which can be historically associated with the phenomenon designated as the "teaching of the apostles" in Acts 2.42, the distinction between "authentic" sayings of Jesus and other traditions played no role. It was decisive rather that the early Christian teaching as a whole was viewed as authorized by the Lord.

3. The authorization of the Jesus tradition in the second century

The emergence of written narratives about the activity and fate of Jesus in the last decades of the first century represented a new phenomenon. With the explicit attribution of the entire tradition to Jesus and its sketching into his earthly activity, a "historizing" of the early Christian tradition was undertaken. The concern behind this can be described as a "recollection phenomenon": a few decades after the activity of Jesus the recollection of his earthly activity was to be retained by committing it to writing, and at the same time the early Christian tradition was to be secured in its enduring validity through its attribution to Jesus. The specific combination of a historical-biographical interest in Jesus—which is perceptible, for example, in the presentation of his relation to John the Baptist, his activity in Galilee and Jerusalem, the people in his environment, the contents of his proclamation, and the passion events—with the orientation to his enduring significance as God's exclusive representative can be explained against this background. As with Paul it also applies here that the authority of the earthly Jesus is grounded in his identity as the Risen and Exalted One.[35] It is different, [281] of course, that now the recollection of his earthly activity forms the literary framework within which the early Christian teaching—previously authorized in various contexts and in different ways—was transmitted.[36] Two aspects of this development are to be given special consideration in what follows.

(1) The emergence of Jesus narratives resulted in a semantic expansion of the term "gospel," which could now also be applied to sayings of the Lord and later even to the literary designation for the Jesus narratives themselves. Within the early Jesus narratives this process is recognizable in the Gospel of Mark, in which the term "gospel" is related for the first time to the presentation of the (hi)story of Jesus.[37] With this the narrative of the

[35] This becomes especially clear in the Gospel of John where there are already pointers ahead to the post-Easter period within the presentation of the earthly activity (cf. John 2.22; 12.16; 7.39; 20.9). Jesus' words and the Scriptures can first be understood when he is glorified; he will first send the Paraclete when he has returned to the Father (John 14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7, 13). On the basis of this post-Easter perspective [281] Jesus can even say that his going away is good for the disciples because otherwise the Paraclete would not come (16.7).

[36] This teaching could be advanced without ascription to an authority (thus, e.g., in Paul and in 1 Peter), operate under the authority of the brother of the Lord James, or be valid as "teaching of the apostles" (the *Didache*).

[37] This is already clear in the expression "beginning of the Gospel" (ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) in Mark 1.1—independently of whether one relates it to the Gospel of Mark as a whole or to the appearance of the Baptist portrayed in what follows.

activity and fate of Jesus is now declared to be part of the Christian proclamation. It is true that Matthew and Luke do not follow this practice and that the term "gospel" is also not used in the Gospel of John. In the following period, however, reference was often made to "the gospel," which was occasionally also quoted from. With this the existence of written Jesus narratives is thus presupposed, which is shown not least by the fact that words of the Lord could now be cited as "Scripture." For the most part, however, we are not dealing with word-for-word references but with free renderings that are integrated into new contexts. The writing down of the Jesus tradition thus contributed to its authorization as a binding tradition of early Christianity, whereby this authority precisely does not refer to *a specific form* of this tradition.

Thus, for example, the *Didache* introduces the Lord's Prayer with the exhortation that one should pray "as the Lord commanded in his gospel."[38] In *Didache* 11.3 the instructions for dealing with apostles and prophets are traced back to a directive of the gospel (δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). In 15.3-4 reference is made, in the exhortation to peace with one another and to prayer, almsgiving and "all deeds," to the fact that the addressees "have it thus in the gospel" (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ). [282]

The findings in *2 Clement* are also informative. In *2 Clement* 8.5 a saying of the Lord is introduced with "the Lord says in the gospel." The first part of the quoted saying is not attested in the Gospels, whereas the second part corresponds word for word with Luke 16.10.[39] In *2 Clement* 2.4 a saying of the Lord is introduced, after an Old Testament citation (Isa 54.1), with "another Scripture says." There follows a quotation that has a word-for-word parallel in Mark 2.17 as well as analogies in Matthew 9.13; Luke 5.32. In other passages in *2 Clement* sayings of the Lord are introduced with "Jesus says" (4.5) or "the Lord says" (5.2; 6.1; 9.11; 13.2; 15.4; cf. 3.2), and in one passage even with "God says" (13.4). Some of these sayings have quite exact correspondences in the synoptic Gospels, whereas others are only related in content.[40] In 13.2 an Old Testament quotation (Isa 52.5b) is introduced with "It says namely the Lord." Finally, in 12.2 a saying appears that has analogies in the *Gospel of Thomas* 22 and in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (found in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.92.2–93.1), whereas it is not attested in the gospels that became canonical.[41]

[38] *Did.* 8.2: μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ οὕτως προσεύχεσθε.

[39] "If you have not kept what is small who will give you what is great? I say to you: the one who is faithful in the smallest thing is also faithful in what is great."

[40] Thus, e.g., the expression that occurs in 4.5 has thematic connections to Luke 12.4-5/Matt 10.28; Acts 4.19 (cf. 5.29), whereas the one in 15.4 is related to Acts 20.35.

[41] "When namely the Lord himself was asked by someone when his reign would

As shown by this, the author could appeal to sayings of the Lord as "Scripture" just as he does to Old Testament passages. An analogous phenomenon is found in 1 Timothy.[42] Here a proverbial saying is quoted as "Scripture" in 5.18, which occurs as a saying of Jesus in the Q tradition (Matt 10.10/Luke 10.7).[43] Another occurrence, also without attribution to Jesus, is found in *Didache* 13.2.[44] It is interesting in this passage that the saying in 1 Timothy is quoted, together with the Scripture reference from Deuteronomy 25.4, which is also drawn upon by Paul in 1 Corinthians 9.9, as γραφή, and the free formulation in Paul of the directive of the Lord in 1 Corinthians 9.14[45] is replaced by a quotation from the Synoptic tradition.[46] [283]

As these findings show, the word "gospel" is always used in the singular until about the middle of the second century. A specific writing was not necessarily in mind, although knowledge of a certain Jesus narrative—as, for example, with the *Didache*, which appears to know the Gospel of Matthew—is sometimes to be reckoned with.[47] The word "gospel," however, is still primarily qualified in terms of content and designates the Christian proclamation—to which the teaching of Jesus itself now also belongs. As the quotations in *2 Clement* show, Jesus traditions were still largely cited freely, even where the knowledge of a written gospel can be assumed. The concern here is with a phenomenon for which the designation "secondary orality" has established itself in recent research. This brings to expression the fact that the Jesus tradition committed to writing has had an effect on the further process of transmission—not, however, in such a way that it is cited as an authoritative form of the tradition but through the imprint of its language, which then influenced later receptions.

---

come, he said: 'when the two shall become one and the outside as the inside and the male with the female, neither male nor female.' "

[42] Should the Pastoral Letters have first arisen after Marcion's canon (thus recently von Lips 2004, 51–53, in a modification of the thesis of von Campenhausen) then the date of composition for 1 Timothy would not be far away from that of *2 Clement*.

[43] ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

[44] 1 Timothy, where the saying is related to the elders, corresponds in wording with the Lukan version, whereas the *Didache* corresponds with the Matthean version.

[45] "Thus the Lord also commanded those who proclaim the gospel to live from the gospel."

[46] Cf. also Roloff 1988, 305–6 with n. 409.

[47] Whether a written "gospel" that contained the explicitly cited words of the Lord was used by the author of *2 Clement* cannot be clearly established. This view is advocated by, e.g., Koester 1990, 17–18, 353; Lührmann 2000, 132–37; Lindemann 1992a, 194. Contrast von Lips 2004, 37. For a more in-depth discussion of the relationship between the *Didache* and Matthew, see now also Schröter 2008, 249–55, which takes a skeptical position toward the view that the *Didache* knows Matthew.

This can also be perceived in the traditions in *1 Clement* 13.1-2 and 46.7-8, which are introduced as "sayings of the Lord" (λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ).[48] In the first case a series of seven exhortations to mercy and forgiveness are at hand, which have analogies in sayings from the Sermon on the Mount or the Sermon on the Plain, but without these representing a concrete literary model. In 46.8 the saying about the millstone is put forth, which has analogies in Matthew 26.24b and 18.6 (Mark 9.42), whereby again no direct literary relation can be established.

In addition, sayings from the written Jesus narratives stand alongside sayings that are not found there but are the result of subsequent developments of the Jesus tradition—for example, in *2 Clement* 12, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, or in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. An analogous phenomenon can be seen within the textual tradition of the Gospels. This is a clear indication that the borders between "canonical" and "apocryphal" Jesus traditions were fluid for a long time.

Thus, for example, Codex Bezae (D, early fifth century) introduces a saying, after the plucking of the ears of grain on the Sabbath in Luke 6.1-4, that neither occurs in other manuscripts of Luke nor in the parallels in Mark and Matthew: "On the same day he (Jesus) saw someone working on the Sabbath and said to him: 'human, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed, [284] but if you do not know, then you are cursed and a transgressor of the law.' " The saying that is found here in other manuscripts and also in Mark and Matthew, namely "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath" (Luke 6.5), first occurs in D, by contrast, after the subsequent episode about a healing on the Sabbath (between Luke 6.10 and 11).[49] We can no longer establish when the apothegm transmitted in Codex Bezae entered the Jesus tradition. It is clear, however, that the scribe of Codex Bezae viewed it as a materially appropriate component of the Sabbath controversies transmitted in Luke 6. It is also clear how little a distinction between "canonical" and "apocryphal" would bring us further here. If one follows Codex Bezae, one of the oldest biblical codices, then the apothegm undoubtedly belongs to the "canonical" Jesus tradition!

The story of Jesus and the woman caught in adultery comes from the older—probably Latin—Jesus tradition and was later inserted at different points—mostly, however, after John 7.52—in the Gospel of John. The translation carried out on the basis of the old Latin tradition for the (bilingual) Codex Bezae could represent the oldest Greek version. A presumably independent variant of the episode is found in Didymus the Blind (fourth century).[50] Here too a "gray zone" between "canonical" and "apocryphal"

[48] Cf. Koester 1990, 66–71.

[49] A detailed discussion of the passage can be found in Parker 1997, 31–48.

[50] Cf. Lührmann 2004, 191–215, as well as the appendix on the tradition history

Jesus tradition is revealed upon closer examination. Whether this episode is reckoned as part of the binding Jesus tradition depends on which textual tradition is followed. As in the previous example it is evident here that the search for the oldest form of the text would not help one further, for the text that was ultimately accepted by the church contains the episode, which is not found in a number of old manuscripts.[51]

In the tradition of the Lord's Prayer there is found in numerous manuscripts a doxology that is still lacking in the early codices Sinaiticus (א, fourth century), Vaticanus (B, fourth century), Bezae (D, early fifth century), and Dublinensis (Z, early sixth century). Here, the form that is still common today is the most frequent: "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen." Other variants are found alongside this, in which either one [285] element (kingdom, power, glory) is lacking or the words "of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" are added after "glory." The prayer, found in liturgical usage since the early period, thus existed in different versions that then also found expression in the textual tradition. It would not be methodologically or historically sensible to want to reconstruct an "original form" of the prayer and then to trace this back even further, possibly even to Jesus himself.[52] Rather, it is shown precisely in this example that the idea of an "original form" of the tradition breaks down and the task of textual and tradition criticism presents itself differently.[53]

Finally, a further characteristic feature consists in the fact that sayings of the Lord were transmitted in smaller, dialogue-like scenes, which evidently emerged secondarily to the already existing gospels. Examples of this are found in *2* Clement 5.2-4, in the *Gospel of Thomas* 13; 21; 22; 60, and in the *Dialogue of the Savior.*[54]

It is thus characteristic for the period of time in question that even after the composition of the first written narratives neither a fixing of the scope nor the wording of the Jesus tradition can be observed. What could be advanced as sayings of the Lord or as belonging to the gospel was not yet

---

(221–28). Lührmann brings this into connection with the observation of Eusebius about a narrative transmitted in Papias about a woman who was accused of many sins. According to Eusebius the episode comes from the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, from which Didymus could therefore have taken it.

[51] Other significant examples to which this also applies would be the end of the Gospel of Mark as well as the addressee of Ephesians.

[52] This is not to say—this may be emphatically noted—that the prayer could not have its origin with Jesus. Rather, a number of good reasons can be advanced in favor of this. Here, however, the concern is with the tradition process, which is shown to be a free one that is not oriented to the preservation of the *one* original form.

[53] Cf. the corresponding chapter in Parker 1997, 49–74.

[54] Cf. Koester 1990, 353.

defined, for which reason the Jesus tradition was still expandable in principle. This explains the various traditions that arose in the second century, which sometimes represent variants to synoptic traditions but often also expand the scope of the Jesus tradition.

A few examples of the reception of the Jesus tradition in writings of the second century may be mentioned. On its two identifiable fragments the Egerton Papyrus 2[55] transmits episodes that in part show a nearness to the written Jesus narratives but vary these and go beyond them. As shown above all by the subsequently discovered addition in Papyrus Köln 255, it is probable that we are dealing with a combination of Jesus traditions from the Synoptic and Johannine [286] spheres of tradition.[56] One does not need to think of a form of literary mediation here.

The *Gospel of Peter*[57]—of which a part, discovered in 1886/1887, is extant in Greek, to which two more fragments could subsequently be assigned, though without expanding the existing text[58]—contains in the preserved material a version of the passion and Easter narrative. Some characteristics indicate that we are dealing with a version that belongs to a later stage of tradition history than the accounts transmitted in the Synoptics and John. These especially include the one-sided attribution of the guilt for Jesus' death to the Jews as well as the embroidering of the resurrection scenery through the stone that comes to roll by itself, the motif of the cross that follows Jesus and speaks, and a voice from heaven.

The *Gospel of Thomas*[59]—from which Greek fragments are extant from the beginning of the third century as well as an almost complete Coptic copy from the fourth century[60]—presents a collection of Jesus sayings and parables that are presented as "hidden sayings of the living Jesus." Among them appear sayings that belong to the oldest stock of the Jesus tradition and have parallels in the Synoptic Gospels, but also ones of a more recent date that already reflect a later historical situation.

[55] Cf. Klauck 2002, 36–40; 2003a, 23–26; Lührmann 2000, 142–53, as well as www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/Egerton/Egerton_home.html.

[56] Cf. Lührmann 2004, 125–43.

[57] Cf. Klauck 2002, 110–18; 2003a, 82–88; Lührmann 2000, 72–95; Plisch 2002, 17–25; as well as http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/gospelpeter.html.

[58] For the discussion of these fragments and further aspects of the tradition of the *Gospel of Peter* cf. Lührmann 2004, 55–104.

[59] Cf. Klauck 2002, 142–62; 2003a, 107–22; Plisch 2002, 93–122, as well as http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomasevangelium.

[60] On the Greek fragments cf. Lührmann 2000, 106–31; 2004, 144–81.

The *Gospel of Mary*[61]—from which a longer piece is preserved in Coptic on a codex belonging to the Berlin papyrus collection, the so-called *Berolinensis Gnosticus* (BG 8502), as well as two Greek fragments from the third century[62]—contains, on the preserved pages (pp. 1–6 and 11–14 of the original eighteen pages are lacking), a dialogue of the "Savior" with his disciples before his departure and after this a dialogue of Mary with the disciples. Within this [287] Mary tells of special revelations that were given to her in a vision, which evidently also included a heavenly journey. At the end there is a dispute about the authority of Mary, which is called into question by Peter and Andrew but defended by Levi. The *Gospel of Mary* presupposes here the narratives of the appearances of the Risen One in the Gospel of Matthew, and presumably also those in the Gospel of John, and sets forth upon this foundation a post-Easter dialogue situation.[63]

Thus, the writings that were emerging in the second century presuppose the already existing Jesus narratives, but do not feel bound to them in linguistic form or in the interpretation of the content. Rather, it is characteristic that they choose different literary genres for the reworking of the Jesus tradition—for instance the revelatory dialogue or the sayings collection—and also set different accents in terms of content. The Jesus tradition is connected here, for example, with philosophical topoi, and an appeal to secret revelations is also found more frequently. Not infrequently this is accompanied by detaching these traditions from their Jewish context.[64]

The fact that some of the writings explicitly lay claim to the title "Gospel"[65] shows that the word was also used as a designation for literary works and the newly emerging writings placed themselves in competition with the already existing ones. This title had presumably already been given previously to the Jesus narratives that later became canonical. This is suggested by the uncommon form "Gospel according to . . ." which expresses the fact that the concern is with the one gospel, which is transmitted in various narratives. This title form was then imitated, for example, by the *Gospel*

[61] Cf. Klauck 2002, 207–18; 2003a, 160–69; Plisch 2002, 137–42; as well as http://www.thenazareneway.com/the_gospel_of_mary_magdalene.htm.

[62] On this cf. Lührmann 2000, 62–71; 2004, 105–24.

[63] Cf. Hartenstein 2000, 157–58.

[64] In passing it may noted that the upgrading of some apocryphal writings in parts of the present-day Jesus research is problematic because it lays claim to later, often anti-Jewish-oriented traditions for Jesus himself and in this way arrives at a Jesus picture that has little plausibility historically. By contrast, the Jesus presentations of Sanders 1993 and Freyne 2004, e.g., are clearly oriented differently.

[65] The title is attested as a *subscriptio* in the *Gospel of Thomas* and in the *Gospel of Mary* in the form "Gospel according to . . ." Eusebius mentions a "Gospel with the name of Peter" in connection with a letter of Bishop Serapion to the community of Rhossus (*Hist. eccl.* 6.12.3–6).

of Peter and the *Gospel of Thomas.* The earliest external evidence for the literary designation of these writings is found in Justin, who can name them both "memoirs of the apostles" (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων) and "gospels" (εὐαγγέλια), thus using the word in the plural.[66] Here, around the [288] middle of the second century, the word gained a second meaning alongside that of characterizing the content of the Christian proclamation, namely the literary designation of writings that contained the Jesus traditions.

As a conclusion it can thus be stated that from its earliest attestation the Jesus tradition was not directed to the preservation of original sayings of Jesus and the fixation of their wording. Rather, the teaching of Jesus was encountered from the beginning in a variety of receptions that were linguistically variable and expandable in their scope. Thus, the Jesus tradition was from its earliest testimony a free and living tradition;[67] consequently, the idea of a firmly defined, authoritative form must be abandoned.[68]

(2) A second tendency, which in some way stands in opposition to these findings, appears in the endeavor to authorize the Jesus tradition by binding it to the apostolic proclamation.[69] This can be observed first in the prologue of the Gospel of Luke. In the tradition of introductions to literary works, Luke introduces his presentation here as one that is superior to that of his predecessors in completeness, exactness, and composition.[70]

The Papias note concerning Mark and Matthew is comparable to the concern of the Lukan prologue.[71] Papias also stresses the reliability of Mark's account (ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν) and criticizes its lack of [289] order

[66] Justin, *Apol.* 66.3. The former is also found in 67.3 and quite a few times in *Dial.*

[67] With this I take up formulations from Parker 1997, 200, 93, who characterizes the Gospels in the following manner: "The terminology which I adopt here is to characterize the text of the Gospels as a free, or perhaps as a living, text." ". . . the concept of a Gospel that is fixed in shape, authoritative, and final as a piece of literature has to be abandoned." Epp 1999, 278, with n. 106, characterizes the canon with these formulations. We will need to return to this line of thought.

[68] Cf. von Campenhausen 1968, 141–42: "But the 'commands of the Lord' in no way need to include only sayings of Jesus. They encompass the whole of the Christian moral tradition, which did not at all sharply separate its sayings and instructions according to origin"; 143–44: "The authority that stands behind them always remains—as with Paul—the authority of the Lord himself, not the authority of a particular literary work viewed as 'canonical' in which his words would be preserved and found." Cf. von Campenhausen 1972b, 119 and 121.

[69] Luke stresses that he "followed everything from the beginning" (παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν), that this took place carefully (ἀκριβῶς) and that it was then written down in an appropriate order (καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι).

[70] καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. With this there is a looking ahead beyond the Gospel of Luke to the Acts of the Apostles.

[71] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15–16.

(οὐ μέντοι τάξει). By ascribing the two gospels to Mark and Matthew, a connection to the apostolic tradition is additionally secured: Mark is said to have been the "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτής) of Peter; Matthew is naturally understood to be the disciple of Jesus with the same name. The observation concerning the superiority of the oral over the written tradition, which was also transmitted by Papias, can also be assigned to this.[72] If the note about the fourfold writing down of the originally orally preached gospel through Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John in Eusebius[73] goes back to Papias,[74] then this would be a further indication of the tendency, which is perceptible in Papias at the beginning of the second century, to authorize the written gospels through their connection to the apostolic proclamation. The ascription of the written Jesus narratives to apostles or students of apostles is presumably to be explained precisely against this background. Thus, Papias takes note of the written Jesus tradition known to him but feels himself in no way bound to their scope or form—which could also be indicated by the title of his lost writing, "Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord" (Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις)—but legitimates them by tying them back to the oral apostolic witness.

If in Luke and Papias the binding of the Jesus tradition to its apostolic origin still had precedence over the warding off of false teaching—although here too the latter is not fully lacking[75]—then, under the impulse of the controversies emerging in the second century, the question of the demarcation of "orthodox" from "heretical" interpretation of the early faith witnesses came ever more clearly into the foreground. These controversies, the most important of which were those with Marcion, the Gnostic groups, and the Montanists, cannot be dealt with in detail here. It is sufficient to point out that the criteria for the evaluation of accepted and rejected writings were refined through these disputes.

A leading role was played by the already mentioned criterion that a writing must be in agreement with the apostolic witness, thus it must guard the connection to the beginnings of the Christian tradition. Thus, the apostolic authorship [290] of a writing could—as for instance with the Gospels of Mark and Luke—certainly be a mediated one, as Hebrews also shows,

[72] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.4: "I was namely of the view that what comes from books would not help me as much as what has been handed down by the living and remaining voice."

[73] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.5–7.

[74] So Hill 1998.

[75] In Acts 20.29-30 Luke mentions within the farewell discourse of Paul "tearing wolves" that will threaten the flock from outside as well as men from the community, who speak distorted things in order to pull the disciples to their side. Papias speaks of people who teach "foreign commands" (ἀλλότριαι ἐντολαί) and not the truth (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.3).

whose acceptance was considered by Origen because he found Pauline ideas expressed in it.[76] Conversely, although it likewise appealed to apostolic origin, the *Gospel of Peter* was designated as forged and therefore rejected, as was the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Gospel of Matthias* from which Clement of Alexandria transmits three (or four) quotations.

Attention must be given to the fact that the distinction between accepted, disputed, and rejected writings in the ancient church never led to the establishment of the binding writings through a formal resolution.[77] Rather, the question of the acceptance or rejection of a writing always first arose when it was already in use in a community. The criterion of apostolicity in the sense of the correspondence with the early Christian tradition thereby led to the emergence of the four-gospel collection, whose beginnings probably lie roughly in the middle of the second century and which is probably also attested a little later by codices.[78] Irenaeus already presupposes this four-form in his talk of the "fourfold gospel" (τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον) around 180 and defends it against both a reduction and an expansion.[79] The distinction between the four gospels of the church and the "many" of the heresies is also found in Origen.[80]

These statements of ancient church theologians should not, of course, convey the impression that the fourfold gospel was generally recognized in the Christian communities at the end of the second century. Rather, with this the outcome of the historical development, which first came to a relative conclusion in the second half of the fourth century, would be projected in an inadmissible way upon the second and third centuries. The polemical statements of Irenaeus and Origen already point, however, in the opposite direction, as does the letter of Serapion [291] concerning the *Gospel of Peter*.[81] Here, the free handling of the—oral and written—Jesus tradition, which was already spoken of, would also have to be mentioned again. Finally, we must reckon with the fact that the stock of writings that was available in a given location and thereby accessible and read aloud in

[76] According to Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.11–14.

[77] A fixing of the binding writings by an official teaching office first took place at the Council of Trent—again in a situation of theological controversy. To this extent Wrede's dictum that the canon was established through the "authority of the bishops and theologians" of the second to fourth centuries goes astray. See Wrede 1975, 85; 1973, 71. On this cf. also chap. 14 below.

[78] Cf. Skeat 1997 as well as Stanton 1997, 322–23; 2004, 63–91. But cf. also Head 2005.

[79] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.11.7–9. Here Irenaeus evidently uses an older document that had connected the four gospels with the vision of the four creatures in human form in Ezek 1 and with the reception of them in Rev 4. Cf. Skeat 1992.

[80] Origen, *Hom. In Luc.* 1.1. Cf. also chap. 14 below.

[81] Cf. n. 65 above.

the service differed from community to community. The binding Jesus tradition was therefore also not secured by a general acceptance of the four gospels, let alone by a normative scope and wording of these writings but by the κανὼν τῆς πίστεως or the *regula fidei*, which one found expressed in the fourfold gospel.

4. Observations on the textual tradition of the Gospels

Finally, the presented findings can be supplemented by a few observations on the textual tradition of the New Testament Gospels and on the process of their canonization. Here one must call to mind once again the already noted observation regarding the flexibility of the tradition, which did not, for example, bring the process that is to be presupposed for the phase of oral tradition to a standstill but rather continued it and thereby strengthened it insofar as now various written versions of the same gospel came alongside the oral transmission. This applies not only to the aforementioned expansions that the Gospels experienced through the incorporation of additional sayings or episodes but also to the wording of the already existing text.

In the textual tradition of the Gospels,[82] a truly astonishingly free handling of these texts presents itself, which was expressed in the variability of the wording. The text form could even be altered in accordance with the understanding of the respective content. Bart D. Ehrmann has investigated this phenomenon with reference to the christological controversies of early Christianity and worked out various tendencies toward an "orthodox" text alteration (anti-adoptionist, anti-separationist, anti-docetic, and anti-patripassianis). His conclusion runs as follows: "It is not only thinkable that scribes would make such changes, it is manifest that they did. Scribes altered their sacred texts to make them 'say' what they were already known to 'mean.' "[83] [292]

Thus, for example, Luke 2.33, where the father and mother of Jesus are spoken of,[84] is altered in some manuscripts to "Joseph and his mother" in order to avoid a statement about an earthly father that could be in competition with the divine sonship of Jesus. A similar alteration is found in Luke 2.48, where Mary's exclamation "See, your father and I have been anxiously searching for you" was altered to "we have . . . searched." In the baptismal narrative of Luke 3.22 the scriptural word "you are my son,

[82] This also applies to the other writings of the New Testament. Here, however, we will henceforth limit ourselves to the Gospels.

[83] Ehrmann 1993, 276. Cf. also the summary of his observations in Ehrmann 2003, 215–27.

[84] καὶ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες.

today I have begotten you" is found in some ancient manuscripts.[85] This too was changed to the mixed citation found in Mark and Matthew, namely "This is my beloved son with whom I am well pleased," in order to correct an adoptionist sounding statement. In Luke 22.43-44 a passage that portrayed Jesus' struggle with suffering on the Mount of Olives ("his sweat was like drops of blood falling on the earth") was presumably added subsequently (it is lacking in some ancient manuscripts) in order to ward off docetic tendencies.

It can be further observed that texts such as the Lord's Prayer, the words of institution at the Lord's Supper, or the words of Jesus concerning divorce were transmitted in different variants, which cannot be understood according to the model of an original version and secondary versions derived from it. Rather, the different versions are an expression of different ways of understanding that found expression in the particular text forms and could have existed as equally valid alongside one another.

Kurt Aland still advocated the view that the edition prepared by the *Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung* in Münster and by the United Bible Society could be viewed as reaching the goal of constructing the original Greek text of the New Testament.[86] The analogy to the search for the one "historical Jesus" behind the variety of the reception of his activity and fate is obvious.[87] For most of the period of its existence, however, the church existed without a fixed form of the New Testament text[88]—and naturally also without a "historical Jesus." The effort to find the *one* text or the *one* Jesus behind the variety of traditions is therefore shown ever more clearly to be an attempt, which is not adequate to the evidence of the tradition, to find a unified starting point [293] of the tradition, which never existed. Early Christianity was not oriented to the preservation of the one origin but preserved the relation to its own beginnings in the form of a free, living tradition.

Consequences with regard to the New Testament canon also follow from these findings. As explained at the outset, the idea of a canon at the beginning of Christianity was directed to the central contents of the faith and was then also applied on this foundation to writings that were compatible with these contents. The conception of the "New Testament" as a book in which these writings are gathered in an authoritative edition that can be reproduced as often as one wishes in identical form emerged, by

[85] Cf. Acts 13.33.

[86] Aland 1981, 274–75.

[87] Parker 1997, 208: "The quest for a single original text of the Gospels is driven by the same forces that have sought a single original saying of Jesus behind the different texts of different Gospels. Both quests are dubious."

[88] Parker 1997, 188: ". . . while early Christianity may have come to make lists of authoritative books, there were no authoritative copies of them."

contrast, with the discovery of the printing press. In the first centuries of Christianity there was no codex in which, for example, the Gospels were found together with the Letters of Paul or the Catholic Letters. Even the four codices transmitted from the fourth and fifth centuries, which contain the entire stock of the biblical writings, were not produced as *one* book but in multiple volumes. Thus, a "New Testament" in today's sense did not exist in ancient Christianity. Rather, there existed various manuscripts, which contained individual or sometimes also multiple writings and which were known and accessible to a different degree from community to community.[89] The Jesus of early Christianity was thus the Jesus remembered in a living tradition, who obtained sharper contours in the disputes of the second century over against other ways of relating to him.

5. Summary

We started with the question of the relationship between the Jesus tradition and the emergence of the New Testament canon. The examination of the early reception history of this tradition has led in the process to the following conclusions:

Early Christianity and the early church understood the Jesus tradition from the beginning as a free and living tradition. They could therefore be combined with early Christian teaching, ethical instruction [294] from Hellenistic Judaism, and quotations from Scripture and be transmitted as the "teaching of the apostles." This also did not change when with the emergence of the Gospels the process of the authorization of this teaching began through its ascription to the earthly Jesus and its connection to historical-biographical recollections. As is shown by the reception of the Jesus tradition in the second century, here too neither the scope nor the wording of the traditions that were traced back to Jesus or to "the gospel" were fixed. The manuscripts that we possess from the first centuries of Christianity confirm this finding, for they continued the process of tradition in the manner that has been described and increased it through the written versions of the individual gospels that now emerged.

From this the conclusion can be drawn that there was no fundamental difference between oral and written tradition in the first centuries of Christianity. Rather, in both spheres the analogous process of a free, living tradition can be observed, which adapted its concrete form to the respective

[89] Parker 1997, 196, 204: "That a Greek New Testament contains what it does is so natural to us that we need to be particularly careful to remember how much more a theoretical than a real entity the Greek New Testament was, until the invention of printing . . . There is a sense in which there is no such thing as either the New Testament or the Gospels. What is available to us is a number of reconstructions . . . some of these reconstructions are manuscripts . . . others are printed texts like Nestle-Aland."

understanding of the content. It is not by chance that the demarcation of "orthodox" from "heretical" Jesus traditions was therefore also grounded with the continuity of the tradition and thus placed in connection with the rule of faith. It is also no coincidence that this first changed in the modern period when, with the conception of the New Testament made possible by the printing press, a new approach arose that gave rise to the idea of the one, fixed scope and wording behind the free, living tradition.

This finding also has consequences with respect to the quest for the "historical Jesus." This question is also a typically modern one in that it seeks the *one* Jesus who is to be found through historical research behind the manifold tradition, which is clearly reduced thereby. It should not be disputed here that such a manner of dealing with the Jesus tradition has its validity. However, one would have to ask whether it would need to be transformed in view of the way in which the Jesus tradition emerged and was transmitted in the first centuries. Here, one would need to start from the insight that the "historical Jesus" represents a product of historical-critical interaction with the texts, which are first reduced to *one* text form, from which *one* person is then constructed. It is not the fundamental validity of such an undertaking that stands in question but the claim that such pictures of Jesus come closer to the person of Jesus than the early texts themselves. Historical Jesus-pictures do not lead back *behind* the texts but as abstractions from the manifoldness of the tradition they constantly move *in front* of them. They are therefore [295] to be viewed as hypotheses, answerable to historical criticism, that mediate between the person of Jesus and the respective present.

With regard to the relation between Jesus and the New Testament canon, it follows from these observations that the tradition brought into connection with the activity of Jesus was interpreted from the beginning in the light of early Christian faith convictions. Long before the scope of the recognized writings was fixed, the correspondence with the rule of faith as the "canon" of early Christianity, which secured the continuity to the apostolic witness of the beginning period, was decisive. The rejection of other gospels, which subsequently became apocryphal, took place because they contradicted this "canon" and advocated, for example, a docetic or a Gnostic interpretation of the activity of Jesus. It is therefore decisive with regard to the relation between Jesus and the canon that the early Christian reception of the teaching of Jesus moved within a spectrum of interpretation that called for a differentiation between accepted and rejected interpretations. That the rule of faith did not thereby lead to a standardization of the accepted Jesus tradition but instead enabled a broad spectrum of interpretations is shown not least by the fact that four gospels, which are quite different in their theological characteristic features, found acceptance within the Christian canon.

This page intentionally left blank

13 [297–329]

The Acts of the Apostles and the Emergence of the New Testament Canon

Observations on the Canonization of Acts and Its Meaning as a Canonical Writing

In the previous chapter we investigated reception paths of the Jesus tradition in early Christianity. It became clear that at the beginnings of Christianity a sphere of tradition existed that included sayings of Jesus, catechetical-paraenetic traditions, and Scripture words. This material was handed on as "teaching of the apostles" and combined in the Gospels with biographical Jesus traditions into narratives about the activity and fate of Jesus. The question of authentic Jesus tradition arose at the moment when competing traditions emerged. They led as a result to the differentiation of the fourfold gospel, which was recognized as binding, from other "apocryphal" or "falsified" gospels.

In this chapter we turn to another facet of the emergence of the New Testament canon. If an important part of the New Testament already came into view with the four-gospels collection, then a consideration of the Acts of the Apostles will penetrate further into its history of emergence. In the process, we look first at the two most important collections, which stand at the beginning of the emergence of the New Testament—the four gospels and the Letters of Paul—and secondly at Acts and the Catholic Letters, which are closely connected with Acts in terms of the history of the canon. At the beginning of the exposition we place an important quotation from Adolf von Harnack:

> Acts is in a certain way the key to the understanding of the idea of the ecclesial New Testament and has made it into the organism that stands before us. In coming to stand at the head of the "Apostolus" it first made possible the two-fold division and justified the connection of the Letters of Paul with the Gospels. One could also speak of a three-fold division, in which Acts (together with the Catholic Letters and the Apocalypse of John) formed the middle piece.[1] [298]

[1] Von Harnack 1914, 46; cf. 1925, 44. Cf. 1909, 382–84 n. 2; 1958, 48–50 n. 2.

With these sentences Adolf von Harnack summarized his thesis on the emergence of the New Testament and the role of Acts in this process. He developed this view not least in the well-known controversy with Theodor Zahn, which was especially concerned with the question of whether the New Testament is to be traced back to a process of the self-establishment of authoritative Scriptures or alternatively to be judged as a conscious creation of the church at the end of the second century.[2] As is well known, Harnack—whose position was later taken up and intensified once again by Hans von Campenhausen[3]—vehemently supported the latter option and grounded it among other arguments with the fact that the church was forced to establish a canon of Scripture by Marcion and the Gnostic schools of the second century. The canon therefore came about "not through collection . . . but primarily through exclusion."[4] Harnack viewed the reception of Acts as a decisive step within this establishment, since it was made to serve multiple purposes simultaneously:

- Legitimated through the authorship of an author already recognized as a canonical writer, it narrates the deeds and proclamation of *all* apostles, even if only through the mouth of Peter.
- It provides a presentation of the early history of the church, including the transition, which rests on a resolution of the early church, from the mission to the Jews to the mission to the Gentiles.
- Together with the Letters (especially) of Peter and John it fills out the gaps of the apostolic writings alongside the Letters of Paul.
- Through the linking of Paul with the circle of the twelve it made it possible to interpret his letters "according to the *communis opinio* of the church" and "it removed from them what was questionable and inadequate."[5]

For Harnack, Acts is therefore the writing that combines the various parts of the New Testament canon—Gospels, Letters of Paul, Catholic Letters—with one another and brings to expression the intention that becomes recognizable behind this compilation. Harnack specified this as a "logic of self-preservation," which led to the demonstration of the agreement of the apostolic with the proclamation of Christ against its contestation by Marcion and the Gnostics, and in addition to the fusion with the Old Testament and in this way to the securing of the exclusive authority of interpretation[6] [299].

[2] Cf. von Harnack 1889 as well as the response of Zahn 1889a.

[3] Von Campenhausen 1968, 237 and elsewhere; cf. 1972b, 203 and elsewhere.

[4] Von Harnack 1909, 372–99, 375; cf. 1958, 38–67, 42.

[5] Von Harnack 1914, 44–45 (45); cf. 1925, 42–43 (43); 1909, 381–82 (382); cf. 1958, 47–48 (48).

[6] Von Harnack 1909, 380–81; cf. 1958, 46–47.

For Harnack it was simultaneously beyond question, of course, that the gap between claim and reality was nowhere as great as with such a claim by Acts. It was only taken "into the canon *faute de mieux*" (for want of anything better)[7]—namely for want of a book that would *actually* portray the activity of the circle of the Twelve. Its ecclesial reception is therefore accompanied by "colossal exaggerations" that built it up into a report about the "deeds of all apostles"[8] and made Luke into a "companion and coworker of *the apostles*, but especially of Paul."[9] The apostle part of the New Testament is thus legitimated through characteristics that Acts does not at all possess, which are instead inscribed into it artificially. Acts, in reality old and reliable, is thus a recent writing "with respect to the canon."[10]

The pointed position of Harnack will serve as a starting point for the following reflections on the role of Acts in the process of emergence of the New Testament canon.[11] It is indeed the case that the question of why Acts was reckoned among the binding writings of the church since the end of the second century requires another answer than in the case of the Gospels and the Letters of Paul. Harnack's position indicates a problem in this connection that is still virulent at present, namely the relation between historical-critical observation and specification of the canonical meaning of a writing. With Harnack these aspects diverge greatly from each other with respect to Acts. Thus, the canonization of Acts would have to be traced back less to its *content* than to the church-political constellations at the end of the second century.

Historical-critical research has developed this line further after Harnack, even if the accents are often thereby set differently. It has taught us to critically examine Acts with regard to the relationship between presentation of history and underlying events of early Christian history and not to naively identify it with the reality of the early period, to regard the Lukan image of Paul as a reworking of his activity that is not oriented to the theology developed in his letters. It has taught us to interpret Acts as [300] the second part of the Lukan Doppelwerk and to discuss its thematic characteristics within this context.

In this way the historical-critical reading of Acts has brought to light indispensible insights for its interpretation, behind which one cannot fall

[7] Von Harnack 1909, 383 n. 2; cf. 1958, 48–49 n. 2.

[8] Thus in Canon Muratori, line 34: *acta omnium apostolorum.*

[9] Thus Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.1: *non solum prosecutor sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli.*

[10] Von Harnack 1909, 384; cf. 1958, 50.

[11] This question was already dealt with in 1975 by David W. Kuck in his (unpublished) STM thesis (Kuck 1975). I wish to thank Dr. Kuck as well as the Yale Divinity School Library for supplying the work. Cf. further Gregory 2003, who investigates the witnesses for Luke and Acts prior to Irenaeus.

back again. The question of its canonical meaning has played a comparably small role. Whether, however, Harnack's thesis of an ecclesial interest that cannot be reconciled with the content of Acts and even partly stands in contradiction to it represents a satisfying answer to the question of the relationship between the historical and canonical meaning(s) of this writing will have to be tested on the basis of the relevant sources. The acceptance of Acts among the binding writings points at any rate—Harnack emphasized this with complete justification—beyond the *collection* of such writings to the formation of the characteristic features of a New Testament *canon*.[12] In this respect this process represents an important part of the history of the New Testament canon.

In the first—more extensive—section, I will turn to the reception of Acts in the ancient church. In the second—shorter—section, I will then confront this with the fact that Acts discloses its identity as a continuation of the Gospel of Luke. Finally in the third—even shorter—section, I will inquire into the implications of a canonical reading of Acts.

1. Acts in the process of the emergence of the New Testament

1.1 Beginnings of the reception—The external witnesses of the second century

The first references to Acts can be observed in the middle of the second century at the earliest. Attempts to demonstrate knowledge of it in the late writings of the New Testament or in the Apostolic Fathers have been discussed by Ernst Haenchen, David Kuck, Gerhard Schneider, Charles Kingsley Barrett, and recently once again by Andrew Gregory and have been rightly judged as not able to be proven.[13] The echoes in these writings of formulations that are also found in Acts can [301] be traced back throughout to independent receptions of early Christian tradition, whereas indications for a use of Acts are lacking.[14]

[12] The collections of Gospels and Letters of Paul are to be distinguished terminologically and materially from the establishment of a corpus of canonical writings, as this is found in the fourth century.

[13] Haenchen 1977, 17–22; 1971, 3–8; Kuck 1975; Schneider 1980, 170–71; Barrett 1994/1998, I, 34–38; Gregory 2003, 299–351.

[14] Two examples may be named: (1) In 2 Tim 3.11 there is talk of the διωγμοί and παθήματα that Paul suffered ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις. This corresponds to the presentation of the events on the first missionary journey, where Paul and Barnabas were exposed to persecution in these same cities. The absence of any more concrete allusions makes it, however, impossible to prove a knowledge of Acts. The author of 2 Timothy evidently reaches back to Paul traditions independently of Acts. (2) In Ign. *Smyrn.* 3.3 it reads μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπειν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί. This presents an analogy to Acts 10.41: οἵτινες

Thus, Justin and the *Epistle to the Apostles* come into view as the earliest sources for an external witness. With the first, however, a use of Acts cannot be established beyond doubt.[15] The passage advanced as decisive evidence, *1 Apol.* 50,[16] in which incarnation, passion, ascension, and subsequent bestowal of the Spirit are narrated, goes, in the description of the taking up of Jesus as a process that can be seen by the disciples,[17] beyond the report of Luke.[18] Beyond this, the formulation δύναμιν ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες could echo Acts 1.8 (λήμψεσθε δύναμιν). However, an independent reception—analogous to the secondary ending of Mark (Mark 16.19)—of the tradition of ascension and bestowal of the Spirit in connection with Luke 24.49, 51[19] could also be present. At any rate, the quite varied early Christian witnesses about the exaltation or ascension of Christ call for restraint in postulating a literary mediation via Acts when the indications for this are not clear.

If, by contrast, one evaluates the passage as evidence for knowledge of Acts on the part of Justin, then it would be more suitable for confirming the *small importance* that it possessed for Justin.[20] What is most conspicuous in this connection is undoubtedly [302] his complete silence about Paul and the concentration on the Jesus tradition. Both point to the fact that Justin—unlike Acts—grounds Christianity on the writings of Israel and the authority of Jesus but not additionally on that of Paul or another of the apostles.[21] Thus, independent of the question of whether the aforementioned passage betrays Justin's knowledge of Acts and whether his (uncontested) familiarity with the Gospel of Luke could additionally suggest such knowledge,[22] it remains necessary to hold that for him neither Acts nor the Letters of Paul possessed a comparable meaning as the Gospels for the fixing of the Christian tradition.

συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (cf. also Acts 1.4; Luke 24.30, 42-43; John 21.12-13) . The passage, however, more likely points to a common tradition about the eating of the Risen One with his disciples than to a use of Acts. This is reinforced by the observation of Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 2) that Ignatius used an *evangelium quod appelatur secundum Hebraeos* in 3.2. Cf. Barrett 1994/1998, I, 36.

[15] Such a use is questioned by W. Strange 1992, 180–81, and Gregory 2003, 317–21. Cf. also the reserved judgment of Barrett 1994/1998, I, 44. Contrast, however, Haenchen 1977, 22–23; 1971, 8–9; Schneider 1980, 172.

[16] Cf. Haenchen 1977, 23; 1971, 8. The other passages have less weight for the question of a literary knowledge of Acts.

[17] εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες.

[18] Cf. Zahn 1889b, 508–9.

[19] καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν . . . καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

[20] Cf. Barrett 1994/1998, I, 44.

[21] Cf. Lindemann 1979, 353–67.

[22] Thus Overbeck 1872, 314–16; Zahn 1889b, I/2, 579–80.

A somewhat different finding presents itself with regard to the *Epistle to the Apostles.* This writing composed in the second century, probably before Irenaeus,[23] contains a report in chapter 31 (p. 42) about the blinding of Paul, his audition, and his subsequent activity as herald among the Gentiles. Contacts with the corresponding reports of Acts are unmistakable here. Especially conspicuous are the double naming of Saul-Paul, the mention of his temporary blindness, and his designation as "salvation of the Gentiles." By contrast, other elements, such as his being a Jew, the former activity of persecution, and his confession before kings could also have originated from a freely circulating "Paul legend" whose existence is attested, for example, by Galatians 1.23; 2 Timothy 3.11, and *1 Clement* 5. The portrayal of Paul's route from Cilicia to Damascus in chapter 33 (p. 44) stands, by contrast, in contradiction to the presentation in Acts 9.1-2.

In terms of content it is significant that in the *Epistle to the Apostles* a connection between the circle of apostles and the person of Paul is established without making additional recourse to the theology of Paul or his letters. This represents in the first place an interesting analogy to Acts. It is, however, not to be overlooked that the *Epistle to the Apostles*—in contrast to Irenaeus afterwards—does not orient itself to the Paul presentation of Acts apart from the conversion. In the *Epistle to the Apostles* Paul supplements the circle of the eleven apostles; he is taught by them and in this way assigned to the apostles' advocacy of the right teaching against Cerinthus and Simon.

Unlike in Justin, we thus find in the *Epistle to the Apostles* an explicit linking of the apostles with Paul, for which alongside the Gospels recourse is evidently made to Acts.[24] The role of Paul, however, does not possess independent weight. Rather, the decisive authority is the circle of the eleven disciples who are the [303] recipients of revelation and within this revelation are also informed about the conversion of Paul.

Thus, the absence of recourse to Acts in the Apostolic Fathers and in the witness of Justin and the *Epistle to the Apostles* shows that up to the middle of the second century there was no appeal made to Acts for the securing of the foundations of the Christian faith. This signifies a striking difference in comparison with the Gospels and Letters of Paul, for their reception history begins much earlier.[25] Two significant tendencies, however, can already be discerned: Justin ties the Jesus witness to the writings of the apostles or students of the apostles, which already comes to expression in

[23] Cf. C. Schmidt 1919, 361–402. After careful consideration of the evidence, the decision is made ". . . for the second half of the second century, more precisely for 160–170."

[24] Contrast Gregory 2003, 321–26, who questions such an appeal.

[25] Cf. §1.3 below.

his designation of the Gospels as ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων.[26] This possibly anti-Gnostic-oriented designation[27] already points to the effort to secure the Jesus tradition through the authorization of the written gospels, as this then increasingly comes into effect in the formation of the canon.[28] The second tendency is the placement of Paul into the overall apostolic witness. This theme, which appears for the first time in the *Epistle to the Apostles*, will also become important for the history of the canon.

The findings in Irenaeus and Tertullian are completely different from what was found in the writings mentioned thus far.[29] The decisive passages about Acts in Irenaeus are found in the third book of *Adversus haereses.* After he had presented and refuted the Gnostic teaching in the first two books, Irenaeus now produces evidence for the correctness of the teaching that there is only one God, creator of heaven and earth, and one Christ, God's son (3.1.2). The truth of this teaching is guaranteed by its apostolic origin as well as its pure preservation in the church. With this argument Irenaeus objects to the degradation of the apostolic authority as well as the claim of the imperfection of their teaching (3.1.1). He then furnishes the material proof with the aid of the witness of Scripture (6.1-4), that of Paul (6.5–7.2), and that of the Lord himself (8.1-2). This is followed by the apostolic witness of the Gospels about God and Jesus Christ, which culminates in the symbolic interpretation of the τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον (3.9.1–3.11.8). Following this, Irenaeus then turns to the witness of the remaining apostles and [304] their view of God.[30] This passage forms the transition from the four gospels to Acts and thereby the earliest evidence for the sequence of New Testament writings that also appears in Tertullian, Canon Muratori, and later canon lists.[31]

[26] Justin, *1 Apol.* 66.3; 67.3 as well as thirteen times in *Dial.*

[27] Cf. Abramowski 1983; 1991.

[28] Cf. Schneemelcher 1980, 32.

[29] Witnesses for knowledge of Acts are also found in the letter of the martyrs of Lugdunum and Vienna (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.1) and possibly in the narrative about the stoning of James in Hegesippus (*Hist. eccl.* 2.23), in which the scene of the execution of Stephen is evoked.

[30] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.11.9: *Examinata igitur sententia eorum qui nobis tradiderunt evangelium ex ipsis principiis ipsorum, veniamus et ad reliquos apostolos et perquiramus sententiam eorum de Deo.*

[31] In the lists of the fourth century the Catholic Letters were then often added to Acts (cf. n. 76 above). The sequence Gospels—Acts—Letters of Paul—Catholic Letters occurs, by contrast, in Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina Dogmatica* 1.12.5 as well as in Amphilochius of Iconium, whose lists were accepted at the Trullan Synod in 692. Cf. Zahn 1890, 212–19 (the texts are also there). Cf. also the canon of the Synod of Hippo Regius that was read at the Third Synod of Carthage (Zahn 1890, 246–53).

Thus, the first explicit and detailed recourse to Acts takes place in the context of the warding off of the teaching of Marcion and Valentinus.[32] The presentation of the content, especially of the speeches of Acts, in *Adversus haereses* 3.12 has the goal of presenting the teaching of the one God and his son Jesus Christ, as this was advocated by Peter, the Jerusalem community, Philip, Paul, Stephen, and at the apostolic council, as unified, as being in accord with the witness of Scripture, and thus as refuting the teaching of Valentinus and Marcion.

A second goal of the presentation of Irenaeus is focused on an integration of Paul into the apostolic tradition. If conversion as well as the preaching of Paul before Gentiles[33] was already presented in the account of Acts (3.12.9), then in 3.13 he turns again to Paul separately. This takes place first in opposition against the claim that the truth has been exclusively given to Paul in a revelation[34] and secondly against the rejection of Paul. The agreement of Paul with Peter and the other apostles (3.13.1-2), which contradicts the isolation of Paul, follows through the indication that Paul himself [305] confirms in his letter to the Galatians that Peter and he received the commission to the mission from one and the same God.[35] That Paul acknowledges other apostles alongside himself is also attested through further statements in his letters[36] and through the consensus that he strove for at the apostolic council (3.13.3). In this context Irenaeus highlights the fact that the point in time for the apostolic council that one can determine from Acts agrees with the information given by Paul.[37]

[32] Cf. the explicit recourse of Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.12.5.

[33] Irenaeus revealingly comes to speak only about the Areopagus speech and the speech of Paul in Lystra, thus about passages in which Paul explicitly turns to Gentiles. With regard to the speech in Athens he even mentions explicitly that no Jew was present (*non adsistentibus Iudaeis*).

[34] In the background stands the passage of Eph 3.3, which was evidently drawn upon by Irenaeus' opponents for justification. The way that Irenaeus proceeds in order to invalidate this interpretation of the passage is interesting: in 12.9 he draws on it in connection with Acts 9.19-20 and Phil 2.8 and relates the revealed mystery to Jesus' status as Son of God and to his death on the cross. In 13.1, where he cites it once again as an argument of his opponents, he refutes them with passages from Galatians, Romans, and 1 Corinthians, which show that Paul himself speaks of a number of people who proclaim the truth. Both times then it is on the basis of the witness of Paul himself that the "correct" interpretation is presented.

[35] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.13.1: *Eos autem qui dicunt solum Paulum veritatem cognovisse . . . ipse Paulus convincat eos dicens unum et ipsum Deum operatum Petro in apostolatum circumcisionis, et sibi in gentes. Ipsius ergo Dei Petrus erat apostolus cuius et Paulus.*

[36] Irenaeus cites Rom 10.15 (Isa 72.7) as well as 1 Cor 15.11, where Paul himself indicates that the gospel is preached by many unanimously.

[37] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.13.3: *Si quis igitur diligenter ex actibus apostolorum scrutetur tempus de quo scriptum est ascendisse Hierosolymam propter praedictam quaestionem, inveniet eos qui praedicti sunt a Paulo annos concurrentes.*

By contrast, the rejection of Paul is repudiated with the argument that the report of Luke is already shown to be truthful through the Gospel. It follows from this that the report about the election of Paul to be the apostle for the Gentiles may not be called into question. The one who continues to do this separates himself from the fellowship of the apostles.[38]

Between these two parts related to Paul stands the passage in which Irenaeus thematizes the reliability of the report of Acts (3.14). This is first demonstrated by the fact that Acts was composed by a companion of Paul. Irenaeus substantiates this through an appeal to the "we-passages" of Acts, which are confirmed, in turn, by Paul himself, who mentions Luke in two passages in his letters.[39] Secondly, Irenaeus argues that Luke is already legitimated through the Gospel, since a number of items are found in this that are only handed down through it. Thus, if one questions the reliability of Acts, then one simultaneously rejects the gospel—with which Irenaeus does not mean the Gospel of Luke but the gospel as the authoritative report about the activity of Jesus altogether.[40]

Irenaeus' recourse to Acts thus shows the following characteristics:

- Against Marcion and the Gnostics it is demonstrated that the witness of the persons concerning whom Acts reports is in accord with that of the Gospels. [306]
- Against Marcion it is held that Paul may not be isolated from the overall witness of the apostles but must be interpreted within this.
- The trustworthiness of the report of Acts is demonstrated through the fact that the author was a companion of Paul and was the same person as the author of the Gospel of Luke.

If we look back at this point to the statements of Harnack cited at the outset, then they must be corrected with regard to Irenaeus at an important juncture: Irenaeus does not use Acts to remove "what was questionable and inadequate" from the letters of Paul. It speaks against this first that Irenaeus already appeals to Paul and interprets his witness in dispute with his opponents (3.6.5–3.7.2) before the passage in which he passes from the witness of the Gospels to that of the remaining apostles. This also follows, however, from the fact that the agreement of Paul with the other apostles is

[38] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.15.1: *Qui igitur non recipiunt eum qui sit electus a domino ut fiducialiter portet nomen eius in quas praediximus gentes, electionem domini contemnunt et seipsos segregant ab apostolorum conventu.*

[39] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.1-2. Irenaeus cites 2 Tim 4.10-11 as well as Col 4.14 (which he naturally regards as authentic letters of Paul), as far as the Latin translation indicates, almost word-for-word. By contrast, he does not refer to the Λουκᾶς from the list of greetings in Philemon.

[40] This emerges clearly from the formulation *Plurima enim et magis necessaria evangelii per hunc* [sc.: *Lucam*] *cognovimus . . .* (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.3).

derived from *his own letters*, which thus refute the opponents.[41] This follows thirdly from the fact that both the report of Luke about the apostolic council and the "we-passages" are confirmed by Paul and not vice versa![42] Thus, for Irenaeus it is not a matter of "domesticating" Paul with the help of Acts. For this he could scarcely have begun the demonstration of its reliability with an appeal to Galatians. Rather, for him the authority of Paul stands indisputably certain and leads—exactly the other way around—to the derivation from this also of the authority of Acts as the work of a companion of Paul.[43]

As a conclusion to this point, reference should be made to the mention of Acts by Tertullian. Tertullian comes to speak of Acts often and in different contexts.[44] The appeals to the apostles as moral examples and authorities[45] show that he did not see the appeal to this writing as requiring special legitimation. They show simultaneously that he drew on this writing as a historical witness about the early period of the church to a much greater extent than Irenaeus.

Two passages are of particular significance for the question pursued here. In *Prescription against Heretics* 22 Tertullian confronts the claim that certain parts of the teaching of Jesus remained hidden from the apostles or that they did not pass on everything.[46] In his rejoinder Tertullian also refers to Acts alongside passages from the Gospels. This attests [307] the coming down of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, which according to Jesus' own words (Tertullian refers here to John 16.12-13) will lead the disciples into all truth. From this follows the necessity of accepting this writing in order to recognize the Holy Spirit.[47]

The second passage is found within the treatment of the Pauline letters in *Adversus Marcionem* 5. In 5.2-4 Tertullian deals with Galatians and produces evidence that Paul proclaimed no other God than the one who was known all along from the law. Paul also stresses himself that there is only one gospel. At the same time Paul is said to confirm Acts in which this letter is summarized both through the report of Paul's conversion and

[41] Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.13.1: . . . *ipse Paulus convincat eos* . . .

[42] Cf. the argumentation in *Haer.* 3.13.3, which starts from Galatians and then refers to the witness of Acts as being in accord with it.

[43] Cf. Noormann 1994, 51 with n. 72.

[44] Cf. Kuck 1975, 46–59.

[45] Cf., e.g., Tertullian, *Or.* 24; *Scorp.* 15; *Jejun.* 8; *Bapt.* 12–13; *Prax.* 17; *Pud.* 21; *Res.* 39.

[46] Tertullian, *Praescr.* 22: *Solent dicere non omnia apostolos scisse, eadem agitati dementia … omnia quidem apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse.*

[47] Tertullian, *Praescr.* 22: *Et utique implevit repromissum, probantibus actis apostolorum descensum spiritus sancti. Quam scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec spiritum sanctum possunt agnoscere discentibus missum.*

through the report on the apostolic council.[48] It is thus evident why Marcion rejects Acts: it teaches in agreement with Paul that there is no God except the creator, and no Christ except the Christ of the creator, for the promise of the Holy Spirit is only presented in the witness of Acts.[49]

Thus, for Tertullian the testimony of the Holy Spirit through Acts plays a central role. He appeals to this as evidence for the trustworthiness of the apostles, expressly mentions this once again in the context of the apostolic council (beyond the text of Acts),[50] and finally presents this testimony as the unique feature of Acts.[51] Its significance is thus secured first through the witness found in it about the one God and his Christ, which is in agreement with both the Gospels and with Paul; beyond this [308] it is supplemented through the witness about the Holy Spirit. As with Irenaeus Acts additionally plays a role in the controversy over Paul. In this context Tertullian takes a stand against its rejection, for which he reproaches Marcion and his adherents.[52] A comparable tendency appears here insofar as also in Tertullian it is Paul who confirms Acts, whereas the controversy over the right interpretation of Paul is carried out on the basis of his letters. The witness of Acts has a supporting function here, but it must first be secured for its part.

Notably, Tertullian—unlike Irenaeus—appeals, however, in the aforementioned passages neither to the common authorship of Acts and the Gospel of Luke nor to the connection of Luke/Paul, which was known to him at any rate. The former could be attributed to the fact that in his dispute with Marcion he traced back the Gospel of Luke to the mediation of the teaching of the original apostles to Paul. It thus originates in a sense "from a third hand."[53] In this respect this argument would not have

[48] Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.2.7: *Exinde decurrens ordinem conversionis suae de persecutore in apostolum scripturam Apostolicorum confirmat, apud quam ipsa etiam epistulae istius materia recognoscitur, intercessisse quosdam qui dicerent circumcidi oportere et observandam esse Moysi legem . . .* (there follows a mention of the agreement at the apostolic council).

[49] Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.2.7: *Quodsi et ex hoc congruunt Paulo Apostolorum Acta, cur ea respuatis iam apparet, ut deum scilicet non alium praedicantia quam creatorem, nec Christum alterius quam creatoris, quando nec promissio spiritus sancti aliunde probetur exhibita quam de instrumento Actorum.*

[50] Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.2.7: *. . . tunc apostolos de ista quaestione consultos ex auctoritate spiritus renuntiasse . . .* The resolution mentioned afterwards reports the advice of Peter from Acts 15.10 (τί πειράζετε τὸν θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; Tertullian: *non esse imponenda onera hominibus quae patres ipsi non potuissent sustinere*), whereby Tertullian's description represents a generalizing insofar as it presents this advice as a common resolution grounded on the authority of the Spirit.

[51] Cf. n. 49.

[52] Cf. also Tertullian, *Praescr.* 22.11; 23.3.

[53] Cf. Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.4: *Porro Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolicus . . . quanto*

been well suited to support the authority of Acts. That Tertullian does not more strongly invoke the relation of Luke/Paul (e.g., by deriving the historical trustworthiness of Acts from it) is less weighty in comparison with this, since he regards this in any case as given and views Acts from this perspective as an unquestionable report about Paul.[54] It could, however, be connected with the fact that he does not interpret Acts as strongly as Irenaeus does with a view to the agreement of the apostolic witness with the Gospels and Paul but views it altogether as a historical report about the life and activity of the apostle.

If we initially summarize these findings, then we can see that around the middle of the second century an influence of Acts can be most clearly discerned in the *Epistle to the Apostles*, whereas it is less clear in Justin. There is, however—unlike in the case of the Gospels and the Letters of Paul—no explicit mention of the second writing of Luke nor can an influence of the theology-of-history conception of Acts be established. Rather, Acts comes into the focal point of interest in a situation in which the concern is with the securing of the apostolic witness. In this respect one can affirm the judgment of Barrett: [309] "The fact is that the church of the next two or three generations after its composition did not know what to do with Acts."[55] Barrett brings this fact together with the unique evidence of the text of Acts within the New Testament textual tradition, whose variability could be connected with the comparably small authority of Acts as binding Scripture. When, however, the witness of the Gospels was confronted with the appeal to additional, oral tradition and Paul was simultaneously claimed for a position that contradicted both the biblical material as well as the witness of the original apostles, then there arose for the emerging church the necessity of reacting to this challenge. This is the constellation in which one appealed to Acts in the manner described above by interpreting it as a connecting link between the Gospels and Paul and drew on it as a historical report about the activity of the apostles.

1.2 Acts in the circle of writings that were becoming canonical—Manuscripts and canon lists from the end of the second century

We turn now to a few witnesses of the manuscript tradition and to the early canon lists. In terms of time, the period from the end of the second century

---

posterioris apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio. We thus find here an analogous authorization of the Gospel of Luke (not of Acts!) through Paul as in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1: Καὶ Λουκᾶς δέ, ὁ ἀκολουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βίβλῳ κατέθετο, as well as in Canon Muratori (cf. n. 63) and in Origen (cf. n. 66).

[54] Cf., e.g., Tertullian, *Praescr.* 23.

[55] Cf. Barrett 1994/1998, II, lxix–lxx.

is thereby taken into view. Thus, the earliest witnesses in this connection are roughly parallel in time to Irenaeus and Tertullian. In terms of subject matter, I will inquire into the function of Acts within the developing canon.

The earliest manuscripts in which Acts is transmitted together with other writings and which could thus give information about its assignment to a group of writings are P^{45}, P^{53}, and the great codices ℵ, A, B, and D. On the Chester Beatty Papyrus, P^{45} (third century), parts of Acts are found following fragments from all four gospels. Acts was thus transmitted here together with the Gospels. This is contrary to the findings elsewhere insofar as it represents, as a rule, its own part of the New Testament together with the Catholic Letters. P^{45}, however, is not completely preserved so that it cannot be ruled out that it also contained the Catholic Letters.[56] [310] P^{53} consists of two parts with the text of Matthew 26.29-40 and Acts 9.33–10.1.[57] Due to its fragmentary character, however, no secure insights are possible regarding an assignment of Acts to other writings.[58]

Thus for the second and third century no secure conclusions can be drawn from the manuscript tradition for the placement of Acts within the accepted writings. P^{45} could admittedly be a witness for its placement together with the four-gospel collection. This would correspond to the witness in Irenaeus and Tertullian for whom, as shown above, the witness of Acts confirms that of the four-gospel collection.[59] Due to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus, however, it is not possible to make a secure statement about the complete scope of the original.

If we look at the canon lists, in which Acts is preserved without exception from the time of the oldest known list, then Canon Muratori is to be dealt with first.[60] In this Acts is placed after the Gospels and before the

[56] This possibility is mentioned by Trobisch 1996, 52–53. According to his calculation the papyrus had a total size of 60 double pages from Gospels, Acts, and Catholic Letters, which as compared to other manuscripts (P^{45}: 52 double pages; P^{74}: 66 double pages) should by no means be regarded as improbable. Against this background the critical query put to the original version of this contribution by Lührmann 2004, 51 with n. 214 ("With 55 double sided large-paged papyrus . . . it [sc.: P^{45}, J. S.] almost strikes against the limits of the possible.": ". . . in my view J. Schröter underestimates this material problem") must be discussed again.

[57] Cf. H. Sanders 1937.

[58] Moreover, it is not completely certain whether the fragments come from the same manuscript. Cf. Aland 1976, 283.

[59] Cf. also von Campenhausen 1968, 234–36; 1972b, 201–2.

[60] Facsimile edition by Tregelles 1867. Printed in Lietzmann 1921, who also offers an attempt at reconstruction. On the interpretation cf. von Campenhausen 1968, 282–303; 1972b, 243–62; Thornton 1990, 53–72 (I thank Dr. Thornton for placing at my disposal these pages that were not printed in the published edition of his dissertation). I will not deal here with the question of the dating of the Muratorian Fragment, which has come under discussion since Sundberg 1968; 1973; as well as Hahneman 1992. The attempt to date it late has not established itself, for which reason I continue to start from the

Letters of Paul. This confirms its treatment, found in Irenaeus and Tertullian, as the continuation of the witness of the Gospels by that of the apostles.[61] As the relevant statements in Irenaeus and Tertullian attest, this sequence served to bring out the unified apostolic witness as the connecting link between that of the Gospels on the one hand and Paul [311] on the other hand. This can also accordingly be assumed for the designation *acta omnium apostolorum* in Canon Muratori. It is less clear, by contrast, whether this formulation—as in Irenaeus—is directed against an isolated appeal to Paul. The remarks in Canon Muratori are clearly oriented to the eyewitness character of the author.[62] If the author of the fragment had already mentioned in relation to Mark that he was only partially present for the reported events, then it is expressly noted in relation to Luke that he had no more seen the Lord in the flesh than Paul had, at whose instigation he wrote his gospel,[63] thus he was not an eyewitness of what was reported.[64] It

---

traditional placement around 180–200. For fundamental criticism of the late dating cf. Verheyden 2003. Cf. further Ferguson 1982; 1993; Stanton 2004, 68–71.

[61] Alongside the Irenaeus text discussed above cf. Tertullian, *Pud.* 7–11 (examples from the Gospels); 12 (the common agreement of the apostles at the apostolic council); 13–18 (the witness of the letters of Paul); there follows the reference to the Johannine writings as well as to Hebrews (which Tertullian attributes here to Barnabas); similarly *Res.* 39–54. Cf. also Zahn 1888, 195–96.

[62] This especially emerges from the observations on the Gospel of John (lines 29–34). Cf. also von Campenhausen 1968, 295 (cf. 1972b, 254): "The Canon Muratori [is] not interested in the first place in the apostolic 'principle' but it simply inquires after such writings that are old and reliable." as well as Burkhardt 1974.

[63] *Lucas . . . cum eo [recte: eum] Paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum secundum adsumsisset numeni [recte: nomine] suo ex opinione concribset [recte: conscripsit] . . .* (lines 3–6). It is decisive here how the expression *nomine suo ex opinione* is interpreted. Zahn 1890, 29, emends *ex opinione* to *ex ordine*, behind which the καθεξῆς from Luke 1.2 is said to have stood (cf. also the translation back into Greek on p. 140). If, by contrast, one reads *ex opinione*, then the expression either means "according to [the general] belief" (so Metzger 1987, 305–6) or it refers back to Paul (so, e.g., the translation in Schneemelcher 1990, 28 (cf. 1991/1992, I, 43): "according to 'his' [sc.: Paul's, J. S.] belief") or it is oriented to the ἔδοξε κἀμοί from Luke 1.3 and to be translated with "according to his judgment." This solution is advocated by, e.g., Thornton 1990, 67–68. The first interpretation is conceivable in terms of subject matter but linguistically difficult (cf. Zahn 1890, 29). With a reference to Paul the problem arises that the continuation (especially the *prout assequi potuit* in line 6, which could be oriented to the παρηκολουθηκότι from Luke 1.3) does not appear to fit this properly. Through this it is namely stressed that Luke wrote his gospel on the basis of his own investigations. The last named interpretation is therefore the most likely. With the *nomine suo* there exists again the possibilities of a reference to Paul or to Luke himself. Here too the latter is more likely (thus also Zahn 1890, 28–29). First, one would expect *nomine eius* in the case of a reference to Paul; secondly, it is likely that Luke's own authorship is stressed precisely on account of his previously established relationship to Paul. The above formulation therefore refers to the note that Luke was enlisted by Paul as one knowledgeable in Scripture, thus that he was first made familiar with the Christian tradition through him.

corresponds to this that with respect to the "deeds of all the apostles" Luke can very well be introduced as an eyewitness due to his relationship to Paul.

In this sense the assigning of Luke to Paul is taken up in lines 35–39 where the concern is with Acts. The formulation [312] *conprindit [recte: comprendit] quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur* (lines 36–37) emphasizes the eyewitness character of Luke for the events reported in Acts. It can presumably—as the mentioning of his enlistment by Paul in lines 4–5 already can—be brought into connection with the "we-reports."[65] The reference to the absence of a report about the martyrdom of Peter and the journey of Paul to Spain strengthen this interpretation. They evidently presuppose that Luke did not report these events because he did not personally experience them. Here we thus have before us an analogous tendency as in Irenaeus' formulation that Luke was *non solum prosecutor sed et cooperarius apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli* (*Haer.* 3.14.1): The relationship of Luke *to Paul* is extended to *all apostles* and evaluated as a witness for the trustworthiness of his report about them.

Thus, the Muratorianum is of interest for our line of questioning first because it confirms the association of Luke/Paul, which is also found in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen.[66] This, however, is—also in agreement with the authors named above—not derived from Acts. Rather, it is clear that the name Luke was already attached to the Gospel and was transferred from there to Acts.[67] This finding is supported by the fact that in light of the observations on the four-gospel collection (cf. §3 below) it can be regarded as completely improbable that the Gospel of Luke circulated anonymously

[64] The discussion about whether the *post ascensum Christi* (line 3) refers to *conscripsit*, thus to the composition of the Gospel or alternatively to *cum . . . adsumsisset*, thus to the enlistment by Paul is not of great significance for the interpretation. The expression is presumably best explained as a reference to the ascension, which is only reported in Luke.

[65] Cf. Zahn 1890, 54–56.

[66] Cf. Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.4; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1 (n. 53) as well as Origen in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.6: καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιηκότα.

[67] Cf. Thornton 1991, 78: "It is altogether conspicuous that the name of Luke is much more closely attached to the Gospel than to Acts. An attribution the other way around is never recognizable." Similarly Jervell 1998: "It is completely unthinkable that the authors of the oldest witnesses came on their own initiative through inferences [sc.: from Acts, J. S.] upon Luke of all people as the author. There were many travel companions and co-workers of Paul and many who . . . appear to be much more suitable than Luke who is not very prominent." The frequently advocated thesis—in recent time cf., e.g., Pesch 1986, 25–27; Wehnert 1989, 54–66—that the ascription of Acts to Luke took place via the "we-passages" and then was transferred also to the Gospel can only with difficulty be reconciled with this finding. It is more probable that Acts was recognized as a work of the same author who had also composed the εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν and that this one was then identified with the help of the "we-passages" with the companion of Paul from 2 Tim 4.10-11 and Col 4.14.

for a quite a long time and was first ascribed to the Paul-companion Luke in the course of the acceptance of Acts. Rather, the ascription of the third Gospel to Luke is an old [313] tradition that arose at the latest in connection with the superscriptions of the Gospels.[68] To what this is to be traced remains mysterious to a certain extent. It is conspicuous at any rate that the subsequent invention of a tradition about the Gospel-writer Luke first produced the problem of legitimating this gospel, since one could not appeal for this to an eyewitness—unlike with Matthew and John and also unlike with Mark, which was at least supported by the authority of Peter.[69]

The identification of this Luke as a *companion of Paul*, which comes up in the second century and has since then been made time and again up to the present, evidently did not first take place by way of Acts. It speaks for this that both the presumably pre-Irenaean tradition in *Adversus haereses* 3.1.1 and Canon Muratori, Tertullian, and Origen make this connection *without* appealing to Acts for this. This finding could be supported by the fact that possibly also for Marcion "the tradition-historical connection with Paul" could have been decisive for the choice of the Gospel of Luke.[70] If Marcion preferred precisely this gospel, even without mentioning the name of Luke and without appealing to Acts, then this could be an indication that the tradition about the proximity of this writing to the Pauline circle of tradition already dated back a long time and was not first established by way of Acts. This is significant for the canonization of the Lukan writings insofar as a possibility opens up here of already securing the agreement of Paul with the Jerusalem original apostles by way of the Gospel of Luke: if its content was authorized through Paul then it was already impossible from there to break Paul out of the apostolic overall witness.[71]

Secondly, the Muratorianum makes clear that as a presentation of the deeds of *all* the apostles Acts has a significance that goes beyond the presentation of Paul. With this the same tendency is shown here as in the statements about the Letters of Paul. With regard to his community letters (and similarly to his private writings), it is observed that while they are directed to individual communities, they possess a significance for the entire church (lines 54–63) due to their being seven in number, in the same way as the missives of Revelation. This generalizing interpretation is also found in relation to Acts. It shows a second line of reception—alongside the one oriented to the interpretation of Paul. This can be pursued further on the basis of the codices and canon lists from the fourth century on.

[68] On the age of the superscriptions to the Gospels cf. von Harnack 1914, 47; 1925, 45; Zahn 1888, 150–92; Hengel 1984, 11–12.

[69] This is rightly pointed out by Thornton 1991, 69–81.

[70] So von Harnack 1996 [1921/1924], 42; cf. 1990, 29.

[71] Tertullian argues in precisely this sense against Marcion. Cf. *Marc.* 4.2.5.

In the codices ℵ, A, and B, Acts is arranged together with the Catholic Letters. Thus, it does not stand here between the Gospels and [314] the Letters of Paul.[72] The sequence of the corpora can alternate thereby. If in codex ℵ the *Corpus Paulinum*[73] first follows after the Gospels and only then the part with Acts and the Catholic Letters, then in A and B the Letters of Paul come after Acts + Catholic Letters. This order (Gospels—Acts + Catholic Letters—Letters of Paul) is the most widespread. Over against Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Canon Muratori it shows an expanded (or altered[74]) stage of the canon formation: Acts + Catholic Letters now present *together* the apostolic witness before Paul, which that of Paul then follows.

Acts does not have a comparably fixed place within a group of writings vis-à-vis the Gospels or the Letters of Paul. This explains its variable placement in the different canons. However, the fact that when Acts is integrated into a corpus it represents with the Catholic Letters one of the writing complexes of the New Testament canon, whereas it was evidently not placed together with either the four-gospel collection or the Letters of Paul—let alone with the Gospel of Luke—is supported by the following observations:

- In quite a number of manuscripts only Acts and Catholic Letters are transmitted,[75] whereas the compilation Gospels + Acts or Acts + Letters of Paul are not found (with the aforementioned exception of P^{45} and P^{53} as well as D, which do not, however, call this finding into question with regard to the emergence of the New Testament canon). For this reason Acts and the Catholic Letters could also be united together into one group of writings by the editors of the *Novum Testamentum Graece*. This corresponds to the findings in a number of canon lists from the fourth century.[76] [315]

[72] In D this is not to be claimed with the same certainty. The text of the codex breaks off after Acts 22.29, thus it contains only Gospels and Acts. One can, however, hypothesize that here too Gospels and Acts + Catholic Letters formed a corpus, especially since a piece of 3 John is preserved and many pages were torn out of the codex. Cf. Parker 1992.

[73] It goes without saying that the Deutero-Pauline Letters are also always included here. A special role, however, is played by Hebrews, whose Pauline authorship was already disputed in the ancient church. This problem can still be recognized in its different ordering within the *Corpus Paulinum*. However, when it appeared in canon lists, it was always listed in the context of the *Corpus Paulinum* and never regarded as a Catholic Letter. Cf. Hatch 1936.

[74] In Canon Muratori the writings are listed in the sequence Gospels—Acts—Letters of Paul—Catholic Letters (Jude + Johannine letters)—Wisdom of Solomon—Revelation + Apocalypse of Peter.

[75] Cf. Aland/Aland 1989a, 92; 1989b, 83. The complete number of the manuscripts for Acts + Catholic Letters is listed there as 662. Herein are contained 407 complete manuscripts and 46 fragments that only transmit this writing group.

[76] Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 4.36; Canon 60 of the Synod of Laodicea; Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39. For texts and discussion see Zahn 1890.

- Even when the Gospels are arranged in such a way that the Gospel of Luke stands at the end,[77] this evidently does not take place in order to let Luke and Acts follow each other. In the Canon Mommsenianus (Cheltenham Canon), the Letters of Paul follow the Gospels, then Acts, Revelation, and Catholic Letters. In the canon list inserted in Codex Claromontanus the Letters of Paul likewise follow the Gospels, before the Catholic Letters, Barnabas, Revelation, and Acts.[78] Only the Gospels are found in the Curetonian Syriac and in Theophilus so that one cannot derive a compilation of Luke and Acts from this.
- The compilation Acts + Catholic Letters is finally to be explained by the fact that in both cases it is a matter of writings that first enter into the history of the collection of binding corpora subsequent to the Gospels and Letters of Paul, whereas they circulated for quite a long time as individual writings. The ordering, which is also still to be found later, of Acts after the Catholic Letters, even after Revelation, shows this, as does the sequence that ultimately established itself (admittedly occasionally already found earlier), namely Gospels—Acts—Letters of Paul—Catholic Letters—Revelation.[79]

Let me summarize the presented findings again. The Muratorian list confirms that the authority of Paul, which was already claimed for the Gospel of Luke, played an important role in the legitimizing of Acts as a canonical writing. In addition, it makes clear the tendency to regard Acts as the ecclesiastically accepted presentation concerning the activity of the apostles. Its reception history continues in the canon lists and in the ordering of the New Testament writings in the codices in such a way that Acts, once it was accepted as an authoritative writing, usually took over the function of an introduction to the Catholic Letters. Together with these it represented the apostle part of the canon, whereas the letter collection of Paul had always stood for itself and had no need of legitimation from Acts. By contrast, the Catholic Letters, from which for a long time only 1 Peter and 1 John enjoyed uncontested acceptance, could be shown to belong to the canon through a book in which there was talk of James, Peter, and John. This corresponds to the [316] intention, which was discernible since Irenaeus, of

[77] These orderings (namely John—Matt—Mark—Luke; Matt—Mark—John—Luke; or Matt—John—Mark—Luke) are very rare. According to Zahn 1890, 271–384, the first one mentioned is only attested for Egypt and is caused by the prioritizing of John. The second is found in Curetian Syriac, in Canon Mommsenianus and in the commentary on the Gospels by Theophilus. The last named sequence occurs in the Codex Claromontanus.

[78] Metzger 1987 has evidently overlooked this. While he does produce the lists mentioned (310–12), he writes a few pages earlier: "How far the orders in (c) and (d) may have been influenced by a desire to bring the two books by Luke side by side we are not able to say" (279). It is also problematic in Metzger that he does not give greater consideration to the placement of Acts with the Catholic Letters (cf. 295–96).

[79] Thus, after Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Canon Muratori, e.g., Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.1-7.

expanding the witness of Paul through that of the original apostles, a function that was now also taken over by the Catholic Letters.[80] In the course of this, it was probably not least the fact that they were seven in number that played a role in the arrangement together that ultimately took place of the Catholic Letters in their own corpus of writings in the canon.[81]

In the next section I will briefly look at the collections of binding early Christian writings in order to round out the results that have been obtained.

1.3 Acts and the emergence of the New Testament canon

There is no doubt that the four-gospel collection and the collection of the Letters of Paul emerged earlier and independently of the reception of Acts into the circle of binding writings. With regard to the former, various indications, which have been increasingly emphasized once again in recent research, speak for the fact that their beginnings reach back into the first half of the second century.[82] These indications are:

- The superscriptions to the Gospels of the form εὐαγγέλιον κατά + name were already interpreted by Zahn and Harnack as "the gospel in the version of . . ."[83] Alongside the linguistic findings[84] the designation of these writings with the singular τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which is virtually universal before Irenaeus,[85] speaks for this. This points first to the notion of the *unity* of the witness of the Gospels in *multiple forms.*
- That this unified witness refers to the four-gospel collection is first suggested by the codices P^{45} and P^{75} in which in one case there are fragments of all four gospels (+ Acts) and in the other fragments from Luke and John.[86] To this comes now, according to the observations of T.C. Skeat, a codex made up of P^{64}, P^{67}, and P^{4}, which could document the compilation of the four gospels in a codex already for the late second century.[87] By contrast, not a single manuscript [317] is known in which an

[80] Cf. Lührmann 1981, 72.

[81] It may be noted only in passing that it is clearly shown in this how the understanding of the canon was changed with Luther over against this intention: he separated Hebrews from the Corpus Paulinum, James and Jude from that of the Catholic Letters, and for reasons of content he arranged them together with Revelation at the end.

[82] Cf. Stanton 2004, 63–91; Heckel 1999, 266–355.

[83] Zahn 1888, 164–67; von Harnack 1914, 47–48; 1925, 45–46.

[84] There are no analogies that would permit the form κατά + author name to be understood as a common book title. Cf. Hengel 1984, 9–10 with n. 8.

[85] Justin, *Dial.* 66.3 adds to the mentioning of the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων by way of explanation: ἅτινα καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. Hengel 1984, 14 n. 24, refers in addition to a fragment of Apollinaris of Hierapolis (*Chronicon Paschale*, 13–14).

[86] Skeat 1994, mentions the possibility that P^{75} was also a four-gospel codex originally, consisting of two volumes sewn together. The papyrus would then be a further witness for the early common tradition of the four-gospel collection.

[87] Cf. Skeat 1997. Head 2005 has expressed skepticism toward this assumption.

apocryphal gospel was ever transmitted together with one of the four-gospel collection. No more so does a gospel other than the four gospels, differentiated through the additions κατὰ Μαθθαῖον, Μᾶρκον, Λουκᾶν and Ἰωάννην, ever appear in a canon list. In the case of a late emergence of the four-gospel canon around the end of the second century, such a unified tradition situation would scarcely be expected, as the much less clear differentiations in the letters and apocalypses clearly show.

- When Irenaeus symbolically interprets the four-form of the one gospel by referring to the four world regions, the four main winds, and the four cherubim,[88] then he probably takes up here an already older tradition, which allows one to evaluate the compilation of the four gospels as prior to Irenaeus.[89] The consciousness of the unity of the witness of the four gospels is also found in Clement and Origen when they regard these four as the binding ones and either subordinate the other gospels to them or reject them completely.[90]
- Martin Hengel has put forth important arguments for the view that the form εὐαγγέλιον κατά + name represents the older form over against the short form without εὐαγγέλιον. This is especially supported by the manuscript evidence of P^{66} (ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ), P^{75} (ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ), and $P^{4+64+67}$ (ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ).[91] These Papyri from the late second or early third century suggest the hypothesis that the subsequently found short form without ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ is secondary. This uniform designation is a further indication of the great age of the four-gospel collection.

In passing it may be noted that the thesis, which is popular in some places at present, of a Jesus tradition that circulated freely, at least until Justin, and does not yet show any traces of a literary stabilization, presumably looks somewhat different in the light of these results. It is certainly accurate that the Jesus tradition transmitted outside of the four-gospel collection cannot be traced back in toto to a literary dependence upon that collection. However, the situation of the sources shows first that as a rule the extracanonical writings in their present form already presuppose the commitment of the Jesus tradition to writing[92] and secondly that the designations εὐαγγέλιον κατά Θωμᾶν, κατ' Αἰγυπτίους κτλ. evidently represent analogies to the ones in the writings contained in the four-gospel collection. By contrast, the notion that the four-gospel collection was created at the end of the second century for ecclesiopolitical reasons [318] and excluded other strands

[88] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.11.8.

[89] Cf. Skeat 1992; contrast von Campenhausen 1968, 232; 1972b, 198–99.

[90] Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.93.1: Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητόν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους. Origen, *Hom. Luc.* 1.2: *Ecclesia quatuor habet evangelia, haeresis plurima . . . Sed in his omnibus nihil aliud probamus nisi quod ecclesia, id est quatuor tantum evangelia recipienda.*

[91] Cf. Hengel 1984, 9–12.

[92] Cf., e.g., the observations on Egerton Papyrus 2, *Gospel of Peter,* and *Epistle to the Apostles* in Heckel 1999, 273–329. This finding is not invalidated by the fact that additional traditions that were not transmitted via the four-gospel collection are found in the extracanonical writings.

of tradition as "heretical"[93] neither does justice to the observations on the age of this collection nor to those on the relationship of the apocryphal Jesus tradition to the tradition preserved in this collection.

Although it continues the Jesus story and directly goes on from one of the Gospels, Acts never formed a part of the four-gospel collection. Instead, the fact that the Gospel of Luke could be integrated into the gospels collection independently of Acts and the fact that even after the canonization of Acts—despite the recognition of the identity of its author with that of the Gospel of Luke—the idea of a "Lukan Doppelwerk" was nowhere to be found in the ancient church points to the independent status of the two writings, a point to which we will have to return in section 2.

With regard to the Pauline letter collection, reference may be made at this point solely to the testimony from 2 Peter 3.15 and the Letters of Ignatius as well as the comments of Andreas Lindemann.[94] It is to be maintained that the letters of Paul were undoubtedly collected since the early second century. Alongside the Gospels they thereby represent a second corpus of binding writings whose beginnings reach back into the period before Marcion. Despite their orientation to Paul and despite the Luke/Paul-tradition, which is attested since Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Canon Muratori and is possibly even older, Acts was never connected with the Pauline letter collection. This can be traced back to different paths of tradition that are also reflected in the respective receptions of Paul: the Deutero-Pauline Letters and Ignatius are oriented to the theology developed in the letters of Paul or to his apostolic authority; Marcion represents an extreme Paulinism and thereby rejects Acts; Acts, by contrast, is oriented to the missionary-speaker Paul and not to the letter writer.[95]

With regard to Acts, it follows that it entered into the circle of canonical writings at a time when the collection of binding writings had already led to the formation of two corpora. One of these (namely the gospels collection) was also already firmly demarcated with respect to its scope. This explains first why it was never assigned to one of these two collections, although on the basis of its authorship or content it undoubtedly [319] possesses stronger connections to both of these than to the Catholic Letters. That the conception of a Lukan Doppelwerk is never demonstrable in the ancient church, although the composition of Acts by Luke was explicitly recognized,[96] shows in addition that from the beginning of its acceptance

[93] Cf. Koester 1991, 369.

[94] Lindemann 2003.

[95] In the recent period these different rhetorical situations have come more strongly into view and call for a reconsideration of the opposition "Paul of the letters vs. Lukan Paul." Cf. Porter 1999, 98–125, 187–206. Cf. also Walton 2000.

[96] Its contestation was repudiated as was the rejection of Acts as a binding writing.

Acts was regarded as an independent writing alongside the Gospel of Luke, which belonged to the gospels collection, and was also interpreted accordingly with regard to its canonical function.

If Marcion had already demarcated a canon of binding writings through the combination of a gospel writing with the Letters of Paul, then Acts provided the church with the possibility of relating the already existing collections to one another and thus grounding their canon on the witness of Jesus and the apostles, with which the witness of Paul was then also in agreement. This understanding of Acts is recognizable in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and in Canon Muratori. Its significance with regard to the emergence of the New Testament canon, however, goes even beyond this insofar as it additionally serves to integrate the witness of the remaining apostles (apart from Paul). With this it plays a role, as Harnack established with complete justification, that is absolutely constitutive for the notion of a New Testament consisting of the witness of the Gospels, Paul, and the remaining apostles.

In the next section, we turn with this result to Acts as the second part of the Lukan Doppelwerk in order to illuminate in this way from a broader perspective the question, mentioned at the outset, of the relation between canonical meaning and historical-critical reading.

2. Acts and the Lukan Doppelwerk

One of the most important developments within Lukan scholarship in the twentieth century can be seen in the emphasis on the fact that with Luke and Acts we are dealing with a unified work in two parts. This state of affairs is documented not least by the fact that the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* 1998 stood under the title "The Unity of Luke-Acts" after the two writings were previously treated separately (1968 and 1977).[97] In recent studies on the two works, [320] this turn within Lukan scholarship has come clearly to the fore,[98] and Barrett has developed this view of unity into the thesis that the Lukan work can be designated as "the first New Testament" because all that is necessary for the church is already provided here: teaching and activity of Jesus as well as its continuation through the apostles.[99]

Cf. Pseudo-Tertullian, *Haer.* 6.1; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.29.5; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* (PG 60.13).

[97] Cf. the reference in Verheyden 1999, 3–56, 3.

[98] By way of example, reference may be made to Squires 1993; M. Strauss 1995; Pokorný 1998; Wasserberg 1998.

[99] Barrett 1996, 102–3; 1992, 1451–66.

It is not a matter of calling into question the significance of this realization, which has led to important insights for the interpretation of both writings. If the Jesus story of the Gospel of Luke is already narrated with a view to Acts, then Luke has his conception in view from the beginning and the prologue can be related to the overall work with good reasons.[100] Material and terminological connections, such as the echoes of the passion of Jesus in the martyrdom of Stephen but also the analogous shaping of the working of miracles by Jesus and the apostles, can be interpreted beyond this as an intentional literary device of the author, who adjusts his two writings to each other.[101]

The question of the unity of the Lukan work is, however, by no means adequately answered with this.[102] For this, one should begin with the observation that the two parts of the Lukan work are completely independent. This is already shown by the aforementioned observation that in the ancient church Acts was always received as an independent writing, although the identity of the author with the author of the Gospel of Luke was not only uncontested but even served to legitimate it.[103] If the concern here is simply with a—for the historical-critical research ultimately insignificant—reception phenomenon,[104] then this would also have consequences for a present-day understanding of Acts as a canonical [321] writing. That is to say one could then indeed ask why the Lukan Doppelwerk is not also treated as such in the ordering of the canonical writings. If, however, Acts were to be regarded, despite its connection to the Gospel of Luke, as an *independent* work, then this would also cause the ancient church reception to appear in a different light.

First, one must mention the oft-noted finding that the Gospel of Luke and Acts belong to different genres.[105] If the Gospel should be evaluated as

[100] Cf. Korn 1993, 19–32, as well as chap. 10 above.

[101] On this cf. also the connections between the two writings noted by Barrett 1992, 1453–61.

[102] On this cf. especially Parsons/Pervo 1993, who differentiate the various forms in which such unity can be realized. They object here with complete justification against unreflective talk about the unity of the Lukan writings.

[103] Stanton 2004, 80, draws attention to this fact: "We are so accustomed to treating Luke and Acts as one single writing in two parts that it is easy to overlook the fact that in the second century Luke's Gospel and Acts circulated separately. Even in later centuries they were not brought together."

[104] In this sense cf. e.g., Verheyden 1999, 6 n. 13: "There is no undisputable manuscript or other external evidence that Lk and Acts were ever transmitted as one body of literature . . . However, it is far more common to regard the question of the canonization of Luke's work as a different one from that of its compositional or theological unity . . . canonical disunity may be no more than a regrettable accident."

[105] Cf. Parsons/Pervo 1993, 20–44.

a biographical narrative, then Acts belongs in the sphere of Hellenistic historiography. This fact restricts the thesis—represented especially by Robert Tannehill in the more recent period—of a *narrative* unity of the Lukan writings[106] insofar as such a unity is realized at the level of the *story* but not at the level of the *discourse.* The unity is thus not one that lies on the surface of the text but one that must be established in the process of reading.[107] In the two works, Luke makes use of different literary methods in order to structure a communication with his readers.[108] This can be elucidated with reference to the following characteristic features:

- In Acts the stylistic device of repetition plays an elevated role. Thus, after the report of the event by the narrator, the conversion of Paul is narrated two more times by Paul himself and thereby set before the eyes of the reader in its significance. In the same way, immediately following its presentation by the narrator, the encounter between Peter and Cornelius is reported once again by Peter himself with only minor deviations. Finally, the Jesus story is narrated again and again in the speeches of Peter and Paul (with variations). Such a use of repetition is not found in the Gospel of Luke.
- The speeches of the protagonists play a prominent role for the presentation of history in Acts. In these speeches the events are interpreted with a view to their deeper meaning and are moved forward at the same time. The speeches of Stephen in 7.2-53, Peter in 10.34-43, and Paul in 20.18-35 have an especially elevated position insofar as they are given at important turning points in Acts' presentation of history. This method of presentation, which is to be assigned to Hellenistic historiography, also finds no direct parallel in the Gospel of Luke. Rather, the speeches of Jesus are formally and functionally different from those of Acts. Within these speeches, parables are often encountered, a form that is not used in Acts.
- In the "we-passages" the author of Acts presents himself as a direct participant in the reported events. No matter how the riddle of these texts is resolved, it is clear that a method of presentation is chosen here—namely that of author participation—that has no analogy in the Gospel of Luke. Even if this state of affairs is to be traced back to the fact that the Gospel [322] already identified itself through the prologue as a later narrative that is not based on the testimony of an eyewitness, this does not alter the fact that the introduction of the first-person plural in the context of the Paul report is to be explained as a pragmatic method of the author of Acts whose use reveals a certain intention.

To these differences in the choice of respective narrative methods of design are added further characteristic features that differentiate the two parts of the Lukan work from each other. Thus, it is conspicuous that apart from the prologue there never appears an *explicit* reference back to the πρῶτος

[106] Tannehill 1986/1990.

[107] Cf. Parsons/Pervo 1993, 82–83, as well as Marguerat 1999, 57–81, and chap. 10, §1 above.

[108] Cf. Parsons/Pervo 1993, 45–81.

λόγος or an allusion to a word or event that occurs there. On the contrary, the appeals to the Jesus story are characterized by the general topoi of baptism of John, authoritative, Spirit-filled activity of Jesus, death on the cross, and resurrection, to which the topos of bearing witness is then added. They do not, however, presuppose knowledge of the Jesus story *narrated in the Gospel of Luke.*

This observation is strengthened by three passages.[109] In Acts 11.16 Peter cites the Jesus saying Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. This saying is not found in the Gospel of Luke but in Acts 1.5. In 20.35 Paul cites the saying μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν. An ascription of this saying to Jesus, however, is found neither in the Gospel of Luke nor elsewhere in the surviving texts. In 13.25 John is quoted by Paul with the words Τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ· ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμὲ οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι. In the omission of the ἰσχυρότερος from the synoptic versions and the use of ἄξιος instead of ἱκανός, the formulation of this saying has stronger points of contact with the Johannine version than with the one from Luke 3.16. Thus, with these examples it also becomes clear that Acts is not designed as a continuation of the Gospel of Luke in the sense that it would direct the implied reader to what is already narrated there and build on this in such a way that knowledge of it would be presupposed. This can be demonstrated precisely on the basis of the clearest example of a thematic connection, namely the double narrative of disciple commissioning and ascension at the end of the Gospel of Luke and at the beginning of Acts.

To be precise, the much-discussed phenomenon of this modified reproduction of the conclusion of the Lukan Jesus narrative in Acts 1.4-11 exactly confirms the presented finding. It is clear first that the deviations are explained from the respective narrative functions.[110] If the instructions of the Risen One and the ascension are the end of the narrative in Luke, then in Acts they present the beginning of a new work. [323] If this particular function in each case is already clear in the choice of different places (Bethany or the Mount of Olives) and times (cf. the time span of forty days in Acts 1.3 with Luke 24.13), then it emerges with particular clarity from Acts 1.5-8:

- The Spirit baptism as the presupposition of the bearing of witness takes the place of the baptism of John.
- The expectation of the restitution of the βασιλεία τῷ Ἰσραήλ (v. 6) is filled with new content through the commission to bear witness for Jesus (ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες, v. 8).
- The Spirit working through the apostles thus takes the place of Jesus.

[109] Cf. for this Barrett 1992, 1461–62; Parsons/Pervo 1993, 60.
[110] Cf. Parsons 1987, 189–99.

This thematic new filling of the events after the resurrection is finally supported by the fact that at the end of the Gospel of Luke there is no forward reference to a second work. This distinguishes the Lukan writings from other works designed in multiple books that are often drawn upon for comparison with the prologue.[111] Thus, the double report also serves to profile the two works as respectively independent: it concludes the first work, without pointing to a continuation; it provides the second with an introduction of its own.

By way of summary, it can thus be held that the unity of the Lukan work is in the first place a *thematic* one. The two books are designed from a unified perspective on the Jesus story, its rooting in the history of Israel, and its continuation through his witnesses. This unity, however, cannot simply be transferred to the *literary character* of the two works. Rather, there are clear indications that they were designed as independent books, which present a particular segment of the early Christian history and therefore can also be read on their own. The only explicit reference, the mention of the πρῶτος λόγος in Acts 1.1, does not disqualify this observation. This reference simply informs the reader of the fact that such a book exists about the ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν of Jesus, without making an understanding of Acts dependent on its *concrete content.*

That Acts, as presented above, first entered into the circle of binding writings at a comparably late date has its cause in the controversies breaking forth at this time over the legitimacy and sole binding force of the apostolic witness about Jesus as well as the interpretation of Pauline theology. Moreover, the fact that the Gospel of Luke had already become a fixed part of the four-gospel collection at an early date also undoubtedly furthered the separate treatment of Acts. This [324] observation, however, does not in any way alter the finding that the literary characteristics of the Lukan Doppelwerk itself also provide indications of the independent character of the two parts. This opens up the possibility of reading Acts not only as a continuation of the Gospel of Luke—which it is undoubtedly also—but beyond this as a historical presentation[112] of the early period of the church.

Thus, in this respect the ancient church reception of Acts does not stand in contradiction to a reading of the Lukan Doppelwerk that is oriented to the literary findings. Rather, we encounter two distinct but not contradictory ways of reading, which both have a basis in Acts: As part of

[111] Cf. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1, 2; Philo, *Mos.* 1, 2. Parsons/Pervo 1993, 61–64, rightly draw attention to the fact that in these cases the first book is concluded with an announcement of the continuation.

[112] Here "historical" is naturally to be understood in the first place within the framework of the ancient understanding of history and not as a statement about the historical value of Acts. On this cf. the corresponding remarks in chaps. 3 and 10 of this volume.

the Lukan Doppelwerk, Acts has a number of characteristic features that connect it with the Gospel of Luke and in this way allows one to speak of a "Lukan theology," which refers to both parts of the work. Read as a presentation of the early period of the church and of the Pauline mission, it sets forth, by contrast, a picture of the development of the church in the first centuries, the connection of Paul and the circle of the twelve, and the phase of the Pauline mission. It goes without saying that from today's perspective this picture must be critically analyzed with regard to a history of early Christianity and brought into connection with other sources that are not taken into account in Acts. With regard to a *canonical* reading it can, by contrast, be held that Acts presents itself not only as the second part of the Gospel of Luke but *also* as a conceptually and literarily independent presentation of the history of early Christianity insofar as it describes the unfolding of the Christ witness through his witnesses. That with this linking of the Jesus story with the activity of the apostles and Paul it lent itself to the emergence of the New Testament canon precisely as an "integration-writing" is obvious. This leads to the third aspect to be discussed here, namely the meaning of Acts as a canonical writing.

3. Implications of a canonical reading of Acts

If Acts can be evaluated on the basis of its literary characteristics as an independent writing, then there arises in conclusion the question of the relationship between a *historical* and a *canonical* reading. As became clear at the outset, Harnack strictly demarcated the two from each other and regarded the ancient church reception as standing in sharp contradiction to the characteristics of Acts [325] itself. This view was part of his history-of-dogma perspective according to which the canon came about as one of the characteristic features of the emerging early catholic church in the later second century through the removal of certain writings from the oldest tradition by the church. In the process, it was first Acts that made it possible to join the Letters of Paul and the Catholic Letters to the canon, whose sole core was formed by the Gospels. By contrast, the historical-critical research after Harnack has mostly seen the decisive difference not between the historical value of Acts and its later canonization but between the events of the early Christian history and their presentation in Acts. In the preceding remarks, a number of indications have been gathered that modify both viewpoints and thus could allow the aforementioned discrepancies to appear less serious:

- Gospels and Letters of Paul represent two preliminary stages of the New Testament canon that emerged at roughly the same time, though evidently independently from one another. At the moment when both were *equally* accepted as authoritative,

the question arose concerning their mutual relationship. Acts helped in finding an answer to this question in the dispute with Marcion and the Gnostics. This finds convincing expression in Harnack's thesis on the linking of Gospels and Letters of Paul through Acts.

- Neither Irenaeus nor Tertullian nor Canon Muratori appeal to Acts in order to establish the Letters of Paul as "non-questionable" church writings. Rather, the authority of Paul stands beyond question and is used for its part to strengthen the witness of Acts. At this point Harnack's judgment would need to be modified accordingly.
- The appeal to the *prosecutor et cooperarius apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli* can base itself on the Luke/Paul tradition, which for its part is older than the attribution of Acts to Luke. The extension of this tradition to *all* the apostles in Irenaeus—which has analogies in both Canon Muratori and in the compilation Acts + Catholic Letters—can thus be understood as a combination of the Luke/Paul tradition with the content of Acts and does not stand in contradiction to this.
- Acts provides literary indications for reading it as a historical presentation of the early period of the church. Tertullian in particular received it in this way. This can indeed be seen as a reading implied by Acts.
- Recent research on the Paul image of Acts has presented the Paul reception that took place here as a specific perspective that is oriented to Paul as representative of a certain epoch of the spread of Christianity. As a result of this, certain shifts in accent occur in relation to the Pauline letters, which do not, however, necessarily have to be understood as irreconcilable contradictions. The alternative "Luke or Paul" thus appears in a different light.[113] [326]

With regard to a canonical reading of Acts, the following aspects result from this: Harnack rightly emphasized the connections of Acts to the three main corpora of the New Testament canon—Gospels, Letters of Paul, Catholic Letters. The canonical meaning of Acts can be captured well from this perspective. In the first place, it consists in presenting the apostles as the legitimate preservers of the Jesus tradition (a function that was then strengthened through its compilation with the Catholic Letters) and to show the Paul image of Acts to be in agreement with that of the letters. This orientation to the legitimacy of the apostolic proclamation is indeed constitutive for an understanding of the New Testament canon, since this is based not least on a demarcation of legitimate witness from heretical witness.

In the light of more recent Acts research, however, the opposition made by Harnack between a historical and a canonical reading appears just as exaggerated as the antithesis between the historical and the Lukan image of Paul, which was developed in a certain situation in the history of research. Without prejudice to the insights of historical criticism, a canonical reading does not necessarily lead to such oppositions. In support of this I mention three indications:

[113] On this cf. also chaps. 3 and 10 above.

- The legitimacy of the apostolic witness about Jesus is not an interest that is secondarily imputed to Acts without having any basis in the writing itself. Rather, the exclusive binding of the Jesus witness to the circle of the Twelve can be regarded precisely as a characteristic feature of Acts' conception of history.
- Measured by the content of Acts the title *acta omnium apostolorum* is undoubtedly an exaggeration. It also flattens out the finding that Acts makes a clear distinction between the circle of the Twelve as the apostles and Paul as the "thirteenth witness." Nevertheless, it grasps something correct in this, namely that Acts does, in fact, claim to depict the activity of the circle of the Twelve, the Hellenists, and Barnabas, and Paul in its essential facets. That *de facto* this only happens by way of example does not change the fact that the concept of Acts can indeed be seen in providing a *complete* course of these events.
- The agreement of Paul with the Jerusalem apostles in the Paul reception of Acts undoubtedly has a good basis. When Irenaeus and Tertullian see its specific characteristic in the depiction of Paul as being in agreement with the overall apostolic witness, then the intention of Acts is captured very well.

There are thus good reasons for moving the ancient church reception of Acts closer together with its own intention than Harnack did. The intentions that Harnack attributed to the church of the end of the second century can thus already be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the purpose of the composition of Acts itself. According to this, Acts as a "consensus document" of the first century would have been received about 100 years after its emergence under different but analogous conditions [327] in order to bind interpretations that were diverging from one another to the unified witness of the apostles and of Paul.[114]

Finally, the question remains of how this finding can be mediated with a historical-critical reading of Acts. The concern here cannot at all be with wanting to flatten out distinctions and deny differences, which such a reading brings to light with regard to the relationship between history presentation and underlying events. It is, however, also clear that only the embedding of this reading form into a more comprehensive, hermeneutically grounded text theory leads from historical *explanation* to *understanding.* It is not a contradiction to read Acts as a *canonical* writing with the eyes of the exegete trained in historical criticism. Such a reading is oriented to the meaning that Acts attaches to the reported events. This meaning is not exhausted in the question of their historical facticity, which does not, however, become unimportant thereby. For a reading informed by historical criticism, however, Acts also presents the challenge to view the early Christian witness in relation to its coherence. From the perspective of effective history, such a coherence would need to be reflected on in light of the writings gathered in the canon.

[114] Cf. Barrett 1987.

A critical consideration of the early Christian history will in this way undoubtedly not attain to the image of its unity.[115] On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the *meaning* of the past is not contained in the sources themselves but is brought forth through their *interpretation*.[116] The theology-of-history conception of Acts as well as its subsequent canonization can therefore be grasped as hermeneutical challenges to obtain a meaning from the history of early Christianity, which lies, in spite of its not-to-be-contested *diversity*, in its *coherence*. In light of the finding that the differences between the New Testament writings on the one hand and the Gnostic documents as well as Marcion on the other hand are much more severe than the differences *within* the writings received into the canon, such a view also appears from the modern critical perspective as a reconstruction that is answerable to the sources. This is certainly not the *only possible form of reading* Acts. It can, however, be grounded well from the perspective of the literary findings; it is supported hermeneutically through its effective history; finally, it can help to mediate the historical text-meaning and the present significance of Acts with each other.

[115] Cf. chap. 15 below.
[116] Cf. Droysen 1977, 425–35.

4. Appendix [328]

Canon Muratori

1	quibis tamen interfuit et ita posuit	at which he nevertheless was present and thus set it down.
2	tertio euangelii librum secundo lucan	The third book of the Gospel according to Luke.
3	lucas ist medicus post asecensum xpi	This physician Luke after the ascension of Christ,
4	cum eo paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum	since Paul as one knowledgeable in Scripture had enlisted him,
5	secundum adsumsisset numeni suo	under his name
6	ex opinione concribset dnm tamen nec ipse	composed it according to his judgment. But the Lord he also had not
7	uidit in carne et ide prout asequi potuit	seen in the flesh, and thus he begins as it was attainable to him . . .
34	. . . acta aute omniu apostolorum	. . . But the acts of all the apostles
35	sub uno libro scribta sunt	are written down in one book.
36	Lucas obtime theofile conprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula	Luke united together for most excellent Theophilus what in his presence in particular
37	gerebantur sicuti et semote passione petri	happened as he makes clear through the omission of the passion of Peter
38	euidenter declarat sed et profectione	as well as that
39	pauli ab urbe ad spania proficiscentis . . .	of the journey of Paul, who traveled from Rome to Spain . . .

Ordering of the New Testament writings

Sinaiticus	Alexandrinus	Vaticanus	Bezae Cantabrigiensis
Gospels	Gospels	Gospels	Gospels
Letters of Paul	Acts + Cath. Letters	Acts + Cath. Letters	Acts (until 20.28)
Acts + Cath. Letters	Letters of Paul	Letters of Paul	Fragment from 3 John
Revelation	Revelation		
Barnabas	*1–2 Clement*		
Shepherd of Hermas			

Lists with Luke at the end of the four-gospel collection [329]

Cheltenham Canon	Lists in Codex Claromontanus	Curetonian Syriac/Theophilus
Matthew	Matthew	Matthew
Mark	John	Mark
John	Mark	John
Luke	Luke	Luke
Letters of Paul	Letters of Paul	
	1–2 Peter	(no additional writings)
Acts	James	
Revelation	1–3 John	
Letters of John	Jude	
Letters of Peter	Barnabas	
	Acts	
	Shepherd of Hermas	
	Acts of Paul	
	Apocalypse of Peter	

"The Church Has Four Gospels, the Heresy Many"

The Emergence of the New Testament in the Context of Early Christian History and Literature

At an earlier point it was already pointed out that the New Testament is only one part of the literary production of early Christianity, alongside which stand the writings collected in the "Apostolic Fathers" and the "Apocrypha."[1] This gives rise to the question of how it came to the selection of precisely these writings to be included in the canon. Recently there has again been increased discussion of this in connection with the emergence of the New Testament canon. Two tendencies can be discerned.

First, the discovery of texts that were previously unknown or known only by name has once again emphatically promoted awareness of the diversity of early Christianity. Here, reference must be especially made, of course, to the sensational discovery of the thirteen codices from Nag Hammadi in 1945, and additionally to the so-called "Unknown Berlin Gospel," which was already purchased by the Berlin Egyptian Museum in 1967 but which then fell into oblivion and was first published in 1999, or to the so-called Codex Tchacos, which contains four writings, including the *Gospel of Judas*, which was made accessible to the public in 2006. In continuation of the model of Walter Bauer,[2] the conclusion was drawn from this that one should abandon the notion of a unity of early Christianity and conceptualize its history in the form of episodes that are only loosely connected with one another.[3] It will be necessary to return to this problem in the next chapter.

The other tendency is reflected in recent works on the history of the New Testament canon. If earlier conceptions were especially oriented around great theologian figures such as Marcion, Irenaeus, and Origen, then [332] greater attention is now also given to the concrete conditions in the individual communities.[4]

[1] Cf. chap. 12 above.

[2] On this cf. chap. 15 below.

[3] So King 2003, 235–36.

[4] Thus Markschies 2001, e.g., draws attention to library inventories of ancient Christian libraries, which would have to be taken into account in a history of the canon.

Against this background, I will investigate the relationship of the apocrypha to the literature that has been referred to as "canonical" since the fourth century. In the process it will become clear that the apocryphal literature is an important source for the knowledge of early Christianity.[5] It places before one's eyes the diversity in which the Christian faith has expressed itself from an early period. Moreover, it shows the New Testament to be a collection with which Christianity created a corpus of binding writings for itself.

1. The undetermined nature of the beginning

We approach the topic through a fictive, though not completely fabricated, situation. Bishop Serapion from Antioch in Syria visits the Christian community in neighboring Rhossus about 200 CE. He asks the community leader there about the writings that are read from in the worship service of the community. This person cannot immediately answer the question but assures him that he will promptly make exact inquiries. He instructs a coworker who has possession of the books found in the community to record them on a list, which he then delivers to the bishop. On this, Serapion finds a codex with the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, a copy of Acts, and a codex with the Letters of Paul (including Hebrews); moreover, he finds copies of one letter of John and Peter respectively, one of the so-called "Shepherd of Hermas," and one of the Letter of Barnabas. In addition, the following are listed as likewise belonging to the community library: the Gospels of the Egyptians, of Peter, and of Thomas, the apocalypses of Peter and John, as well as an additional letter of Peter and a copy of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The leader of the community explains that with these one is not certain whether they are generally accepted writings, for which reason they are only used for the private consultation of community members who are able to read.

After Serapion had gone through and approved of the list, he asked to be permitted to borrow a copy of the *Gospel of Peter*, which was previously unknown to him. Having returned home, he read this [333] writing and composed thereafter a letter to the community of Rhossus, in which he exhorted them to no longer release this writing for reading, since it is a forgery and those who propagate it in the community constitute a heretical group. Finally, in order to avert the danger of this heresy, Serapion promises in addition to visit the community again soon.

[5] Klauck 2002; 2003a presents an introduction to the current state of research on the apocryphal gospels.

This—not completely invented[6]—story mediates a glimpse into the situation around the turn from the second to the third century. At this time the church did not possess a firmly outlined corpus of accepted "canonical" writings, let alone in the scope that we know today as the New Testament composed of twenty-seven writings. At this time the "New Testament" contained considerably more writings, whereby the available material in concrete use could differ from community to community. For instance, in the aforementioned example, a number of the writings later reckoned to the New Testament—2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude, the Revelation of John—are not included in what is read by the community at Rhossus, whereas the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Letter of Barnabas* are.

The story shows further that what was read in a community did not depend on a previously established "canon" but on what it possessed and judged to be suitable for the readings at the worship service. Therefore, one could further describe the depicted episode and imagine that Serapion visited another community on his visitation tour and received a list there that deviated from that of Rhossus. This list could have contained, for example, the *Gospel of Hebrews*, the letter of James, and two additional letters of John, whereas the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the Revelation of John could have been absent.

Finally, the story shows thirdly that early lists of accepted writings[7] did not emerge in the first instance as authoritative decisions but as lists of books in which one found the Christian confession to be expressed. In the early period of Christianity the concepts of "canon" and "canonical" were therefore also not yet applied to the writings whose validity was accepted. Rather, [334] the central contents of the Christian faith were designated with these terms.[8] The concern then was with binding norms that were based on the recognized writings but not with these writings themselves. Even the thirty-ninth Easter Festal Letter of the Bishop Athanasius from 367, which is important for the emergence of a firmly demarcated collection of writings, was not written to announce the canon of writings but the coming Easter date. It is only at this time—around the middle of the fourth

[6] Cf. the letter of Bishop Serapion to the community of Rhossus in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.3-6.

[7] The oldest example of such a list that we possess is the list for the reading of recommended books that probably originated in Rome around 200 CE, which is called "Canon Muratori" after the person who discovered and edited it. This was already spoken of in the last chapter. Cf. further Schneemelcher 1990, 1–61, esp. 7–40; 1991/1992, I, 19–84, esp. 28–60.

[8] Cf. Ohme 2002, as well §1 in chap. 12 of this volume.

century—that the term "canonical" then also established itself as the designation for the authoritative collection of writings.[9]

It corresponds to this finding that the early church never expressed itself on the scope of the accepted writings in a formal resolution. This resulted rather from the questions of Christology, the doctrine of the trinity, and the faith confession, which were considered much more important and were maintained in council resolutions. By contrast, the standard for the evaluation of writings was whether they enjoyed general acceptance and did not stand in opposition to Christian teaching. The definition of a corpus of binding writings was, by contrast, not an urgent problem of the early church.[10] It is therefore very probable that Christian communities still existed in the third and fourth century in which there were readings from the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, or the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, whereas James, 2 Peter, Hebrews, or the Revelation of John were not known to them at all or known only by name. How then did it come to a distinction between canonical and apocryphal writings?

2. Criteria for distinguishing between accepted and rejected writings

In his expositions of New Testament writings, the ancient church theologian Origen (ca. 185–ca. 253) also expressed his views several times on the scope of the writings recognized by the church. In the process he emphasizes among other things that he only knows four Gospels that are uncontested in the church, namely the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. By contrast, the heresy also refers to many other gospels, such as a "Gospel according to the Egyptians," a "Gospel of the Twelve Apostles," [335] one of Basilides, a "Gospel according to Thomas," and one according to Matthias. Origen explains further that Paul did not write letters to all his communities, and that Peter left an accepted letter, whereas a second was disputed in its authenticity, as was a second and third letter of John. While the Letter to the Hebrews stems from Paul according to its content, it was not, as the manner of expression shows, written by Paul himself. To the stock of acknowledged writings, Origen reckons further the letter of Barnabas, whereas his initially positive judgment on the Revelation of John and the *Shepherd of Hermas* later became doubtful.

In the statements of Origen, which are from about the same time as the letter of Serapion, three evaluations of writings—also found in a very similar form in the Canon Muratori—can be distinguished: there are generally

[9] The opposition "canonical," binding books and heretical "apocrypha" is found for the first time in the letter of Athanasius.

[10] Cf. Lührmann 2004, 1–54, 5.

accepted writings—e.g., the four gospels—alongside ones that are disputed—such as 2 Peter—and ones rejected as heretical, such as mainly the aforementioned gospels that did not become canonical. Writings are also mentioned, about whose acceptance Origen himself is not certain and about which his opinion changes (as with the Revelation of John and the *Shepherd of Hermas*). What are the criteria, according to which writings are assigned to these various groups?

An initial criterion is that of the acceptance of a writing in the church. The terminology "accepted—disputed—rejected" already points to this. That may at first appear odd since this standard is oriented less on content than on the de facto establishment of a writing. It is, however, to be taken into account that the early church reacted to already existing situations, such as the one sketched above in the community of Rhossus, and did not first introduce the use of certain writings by a resolution. Therefore, what had to be justified primarily was why a writing should *not* be read or should be read *only with reservation.*

The reason for rejecting a writing could lie in the fact that one judged it to be a forgery. Thus Serapion, for example, prohibited the use of the *Gospel of Peter* because it belonged to forged apostle writings. Likewise the *Gospel of Thomas* was always viewed as a forged writing in the ancient church tradition.[11] This [336] gives rise to another criterion, namely that of the authenticity of a writing.[12] The requirement of authenticity was, however, not intensified to the necessity of apostolic origin. As the Gospels of Mark and Luke or the Letter to the Hebrews show, writings also found acceptance that were not traced back to apostles or whose origin was uncertain. Instead, the criterion of authenticity was understood in such a way that the writing that stood in question had to be in harmony with the apostolic witness. Thus the Gospel of Mark was authorized by the authority of Peter, and the Gospel of Luke and the Letter to the Hebrews through that of Paul, whereas Serapion grounded his rejection of the *Gospel of Peter* not only with the accusation of forgery but also with its use by heretics designated as "docetists."

Thus, in statements on the writings found to be in use, the ancient church considered their authenticity as well as their agreement with the

[11] Cf., e.g.—alongside the aforementioned statement of Origen—Didymus the Blind (fourth century): "Therefore our teaching prohibits the reading of the apocrypha because many have been forged. And whoever wrote it gave it the title *Gospel of Thomas* or *Gospel of Peter* as he wished" (EcclT 1.8.3-5). I have taken the quotation, including the German translation, from Lührmann 2004, 43.

[12] According to the current state of research, the Pastoral Epistles, for example, would fall victim to this criterion. However, one must follow other lines of thinking in this connection. Cf. §4 below as well as chap. 16.

teaching of Jesus and the apostles as the criterion for acceptance. A certain circularity is unmistakable here, since this witness itself is attested, in turn, in writings. The emergence of the canon therefore cannot be made comprehensible apart from the interplay with the Christian confession, which is itself founded on writings and is, for its part, drawn upon again for the selection of these writings.[13]

3. On the emergence of the New Testament canon[14]

We begin again with the statements of an ancient church theologian from the end of the second century. In the third book of his work *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus of Lyon refers in a detailed manner to the witness of the Old and New Testaments.

First, Irenaeus often quotes from the letters of Paul, which evidently were available to him already collected. The collection of the letters of Paul was probably the oldest Christian collection of writings, whose beginnings already lie at the end of the first century. The existence of such [337] collections is attested long before Irenaeus, for example, through *1 Clement*, 2 Peter, Polycarp of Smyrna, and Ignatius of Antioch. Moreover, with P^{46} (ca. 200) we possess a manuscript from the time of Irenaeus that contains almost all the letters of Paul (including Hebrews, but without Philemon and the Pastorals).

In addition Irenaeus refers not only to the four gospels, but he understands them as *the one fourfold gospel* (τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον). Irenaeus grounds the fourfold nature with the divine order, which is also shown in the four world regions, the four directions of heaven, and the four cherubim of the divine throne room. The collection of the four gospels also developed rather early. This is supported by the fact that the collection of the Gospels in codices is attested for the late second century[15] and the witnesses of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenaeus, and the Canon Muratori are in agreement in referring to an already existing tradition of four gospels accepted in the church. It speaks also for this view that gospels that emerged later, such as the *Gospel of Peter* or the *Gospel of Thomas*, never stood on an equal basis alongside those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and

[13] Therefore, the dispute provoked by the Reformation on whether Scripture or tradition is to be given priority inevitably leads to a dilemma: if one takes the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura* seriously, then the question immediately arises of who should then take responsibility for the selection of the writings upon which the Christian faith is to be grounded. Conversely, the Christian tradition, in turn, is already based on the witness of writings that always remain its critical standard. Thus, Scripture and tradition may precisely not be played off against each other.

[14] On this cf. also the exposition of von Lips 2004.

[15] Cf. Skeat 1994; 1997. But cf. also Head 2005.

John.[16] It is true that they can—as, for example, the *Gospel of the Hebrews* or the *Gospel of the Egyptians* in Clement—occasionally be cited, but they are distanced thereby from the fourfold gospel. The fact, which is by no means to be taken for granted, that the church possesses not *one* but *four* gospels[17] is thereby grounded in such a way that the gospel is understood as the *one* message in various forms: the Gospel according to Matthew or according to Mark, for instance. The superscriptions of the Gospels (which emerged afterwards) are therefore formulated in precisely this way.

Finally, Irenaeus comes to speak of Acts, which testifies that Paul and the remaining apostles found themselves in agreement with one another.[18] His comments in this connection show that Acts, which actually represents the continuation of the Gospel of Luke, was understood within the canon as an introduction to the letters of the other apostles alongside Paul (thus the so-called "Catholic Epistles") [338] and therefore was often transmitted with these. From these apostle letters Irenaeus cites one letter of Peter and two letters of John. He also knows the Revelation of John as a writing that is accepted as valid as well as *1 Clement* and the *Shepherd of Hermas.*

The statements of Irenaeus thus show that collections of individual writings—the Letters of Paul, the four gospels, and the subsequently added collection of Acts and the Catholic Letters—predate the canon. In addition, it is important that in the determination of accepted writings the demarcation from "heretical" understandings played an important role (cf. already the title of the work of Irenaeus). Irenaeus directed himself first against Marcion, who made his own collection of authoritative writings—consisting of the Gospel of Luke and ten letters of Paul—and with this created the idea, perhaps even the name of the "New Testament." The other front consisted of those who—as, for example, the Valentinians—claimed to know more gospels than exist "in truth." Thus, Irenaeus defended the stock of accepted writings both against its reduction and against its expansion.

Thus, the New Testament canon rests on internal impulses (the establishment of important writings of the early period) as well as on exterior impulses (their demarcation from "heretical" understandings). The interplay between the two moments then led in the fourth century to the formation of the collection that we now know as the "New Testament."

[16] The question of the historical value of the apocryphal gospels for the reconstruction of the proclamation of Jesus, which has been intensively discussed in recent scholarship, must be distinguished from this. Writings that were judged to be heretical can also, of course, contain authentic Jesus traditions. This question, however, is not under discussion here.

[17] In this respect the Origen quotation in the title of this chapter reveals a difficulty, since it would undoubtedly have been more convincing if the church would possess only *one* gospel in opposition to the "many" of the "heresy."

[18] On this cf. in detail chap. 13 above.

4. The canon of the New Testament and its meaning for the present

In his much quoted dictum, Ernst Käsemann stated more than fifty years ago that the New Testament canon does not ground the unity of the church but the multiplicity of the confessions.[19] Obviously Käsemann has connected here two things that are not to be reconciled—the New Testament writings and the Christian confessions. It is correct, however, that the writings accepted by the church reflect a variety that is to be retained and made fruitful again and again. [339]

Within the canon a distinction can be made between a core part and unsharp edges. The four gospels and the letters of Paul belonged from the early period to the stable core of the accepted writings, whereas the evidence is considerably less clear otherwise. Considered from the perspective of the history of the canon, the Revelation of John and the Letter to the Hebrews, for example, belong to approximately the same category as the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Apocalypse of Peter.*

It would, however, be premature to conclude from this that the canon is in principle open, let alone to call for the abandonment of the "canonical principle." Two arguments speak against this. First, as we have seen, a resolution from a church authority does not stand behind the emergence of the canon; rather the development of Christianity as an independent religion is reflected in the canon. The New Testament is therefore a historical document that makes it possible for Christianity to preserve the continuity to its beginnings.

The other argument is pragmatic in nature and is related to the canon's effective history. The discussions surrounding the writings accepted as valid in the church led to the emergence of a document that is constitutive for the self-understanding of the Christian church and therefore cannot be abandoned. It is true that there can be no doubt that viewed theologically a lesser status is not due to *1 Clement*, for instance, than to 1 Timothy. The only difference—which is, of course, decisive from a history-of-the-canon perspective—consists in the fact that the latter belongs to the canon, whereas the former does not. Therefore, the canon does not possess its own dignity for reasons of priority in terms of theological substance or history but exclusively from an effective history–hermeneutical perspective.[20] The history and literature of the Christianity of the first century provides

[19] Käsemann 1964a, 221; cf. 1982, 103.
[20] Cf. Wolter 2003.

the context for the writings that have become canonical,[21] but consideration of this should not lead to calling the canon itself into question.

Finally, a third observation says that the emergence of a collection of writings that were granted canonical status was accompanied by the rejection of other writings as "heretical." This did not involve all non-canonical writings but only the ones that were regarded as incompatible with their own confession, because it called into question, for example, Jesus' suffering and death or appealed to special secret revelations. Thus, in the formation of the Christian canon of writings [340] important decisions were simultaneously made with respect to the shape of the Christian faith and views that could not be reconciled with this.

Accordingly, the Christian apocrypha are valuable witnesses for the historical development of Christianity since the second century. They show that the activity and fate of Jesus could be interpreted in manifold ways. With this they expand the spectrum of the acculturations of the Christian faith in the intellectual and cultural world of antiquity. At the same time they make Christianity's "process of becoming a religion" comprehensible, for this took place not least through an inner process of differentiation. Finally, the gospels that were not received into the canon and therefore became apocryphal make clear that in the process of finding its identity Christianity made demarcations that did not tie the variety of early Christian literature to a unity but did reduce it so that contourlessness and arbitrariness might be avoided by the orientation to the standard of the Christian faith.

[21] Reference has already been made to the—historically very appropriate—manner of speaking of writings that *came to be* canonical and apocryphal, which was coined by Lührmann 2000; 2004. Cf. chap. 12 n. 23.

This page intentionally left blank

Part IV

WHAT IS “THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT”?

This page intentionally left blank

15 [343–354]

Particularity and Inclusivity in Early Christianity

In the chapters of the preceding part, the question of the emergence of the New Testament was illuminated from various sides. It thereby became clear that the corpus of writings accepted in the church developed in parallel and in close relation to the confession to which early Christianity knew itself to be obligated. The Jesus tradition retained in the four-gospel collection was therefore demarcated from competing interpretations. Acts obtained an additional meaning as a writing that simultaneously helped to relate the Gospels and the Letters of Paul to each other and to authorize additional apostle letters—the so-called "Catholic Letters"—as binding. However, the church never established the New Testament through a resolution. Rather, it arose to a certain extent through the taken-for-granted validity of the four-gospel collection and the Letters of Paul, to which other writings that were in part contested for some time were then added, as well as through the exclusion of writings that were regarded as forged or heretical.

In the following two chapters I will develop the question of a theology of the New Testament against this background. If it became clear in the preceding chapters that the obligation to a confession and a corresponding corpus of writings proved to be necessary in light of the diverging directions in early Christianity, then we turn now to the question of the unity of early Christian theology with reference to the New Testament itself. Since, as we shall see, a variety of positions is also found here, the question arises of how one might conceptualize a theology of the New Testament, which should view these writings under unifying, systematizing viewpoints. The first contribution deals with this problem.

In light of the diversity of positions that are already found within the New Testament, the question of whether it makes sense at all to speak of *a* "theology of the New Testament" was put forward. It is more reasonable, so a view often expressed since William Wrede, to take leave of such a project in favor of a "history of early Christian religion." [344] In relation to this position, the emergence of the discipline "theology of the

New Testament" itself will be taken into view. The demand for a "biblical theology," from which then quickly arose the demand for a respectively independent Old Testament and New Testament theology, was, as we shall see, originally meant to emancipate the historical-exegetical theology from dogmatics. With this, however, biblical theology has carried, from the time the concept was first presented, a severe birth defect around with it. The extent to which it nevertheless appears promising to hold fast to the idea of a theology of the New Testament is to be shown in this context. The second contribution will deal with these problems.

1. Lost innocence

The historical-critical research has dissolved the idea of a unity of the New Testament. It has instead shown that the writings gathered here bring faith in Jesus to expression in manifold ways. In the ecumenical lecture series of the University of Göttingen, Ernst Käsemann summarized this finding in the sentence—which was already mentioned at an earlier point[1]—the New Testament canon does not ground the unity of the church but the multiplicity of the confessions.[2] That this is still relevant is shown by the review of more recent discussion by Heikki Räisänen, who comes to the conclusion that in this too "the diversity, indeed contradictory character of the early Christian theologies (also within the New Testament)" is stressed.[3] Thus, for a historically grounded view, no doubt can be tolerated concerning the fact that different developments of the faith in Jesus are found in the New Testament. The innocence of an orientation on the ancient church's image of history—according to which at the beginning stood the unified doctrine mediated by the apostles that was then preserved in the church in the fending off of heretical distortions—is irretrievably lost. In its place comes the variety of early Christian faith, which is already to be discerned in the New Testament itself. The question forcefully arises of whether, in the face of this *differentiatedness*, which has emerged with increasing clarity in the past two centuries, [345] one can speak meaningfully at all of a *unity* of the New Testament without thereby flattening out the characteristic features of the individual standpoints.[4]

The New Testament, however, also does not simply present the sum of the faith convictions of the early Christians. Instead it mediates insights

[1] Cf. chaps. 12 and 14 above.

[2] Käsemann 1964a, 221. Cf. 1982, 103.

[3] Räisänen 2000b, 66; cf. 2000a, 147: "The diversity of early Christian theologies (even within the New Testament) is stressed, and even direct contradictions are acknowledged."

[4] Cf. Theissen 1994, 72: "The picture of early Christianity has increasingly differentiated itself. The problem today is not its diversity. The problem is its unity."

into processes of the formation of such convictions, gathers diverse statements on concrete questions about the way of life of the first communities, and documents controversies with divergent understandings. A description of the beginnings of Christian faith must therefore take into account the fact that in the statements that were put into writing and later canonized we have only an excerpt of what was believed in early Christianity.[5] As a result the further question also arises of whether it is at all sensible to view the part of the spectrum of early Christian thinking that is handed on to us in the New Testament in isolation from positions that were not received into the canon. In order to pursue these questions we will first take a look at three stations that have made this a subject for discussion, each in its own way.

The Tübingen church and dogma historian Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860) was the first to submit a thoroughgoing historical consideration of the beginnings of Christianity. Starting from an analysis of the Corinthian Letters of Paul, he came to the view that in early Christianity Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian parties, which appealed to the authorities of Peter and Paul respectively, stood over against each other. The conflict between these two parties is also said to be reflected in additional letters of Paul in which he had to defend his apostolic status against "Judaizing false teachers." In later writings, to which Baur reckons Acts, James, and 1–2 Peter, he observes by contrast the tendency to establish a balance between the two fronts.

With regard to our topic, two things are significant in this. Through the observation of the opposing nature of the positions in the question of the Gentile mission, Baur discovered that not unity but competing directions of thought stood at the beginning of Christianity. Subsequently, his historical analyses led him to the judgment—which also remains valid today—that the Pastoral Letters reflect a different historical situation than the one presupposed in the authentic Letters of Paul and therefore cannot have originated with Paul himself. Finally, he uncovered contradictions [346] between the Paul of the letters and the image of Paul in Acts and regarded the latter as an attempt to level out the differences between Peter and Paul. Unity did not stand at the beginning but is a compromise between two opposing directions of thought.

These exegetical-historical conclusions were obtained on the basis of the conviction that historical individual-appearances can only be

[5] This aspect is especially taken into account by Berger 1995. Berger stresses that in a description of theological positions of early Christianity the rejected standpoints in each case must also be considered, since their advocates were also Christians according to their self-understanding.

understood by discovering their inner connection. As isolated individual-phenomena, by contrast, they remain mute. In early Christianity, Baur saw such a connection in the opposition between Pauline and Petrine parties, whose views were then conciliated with each other. Even if this view was subsequently clearly differentiated with regard to the positions represented in early Christianity, the lasting significance of Baur lies in the thoroughgoing application of the principles of historical research to the beginnings of Christianity. He thereby laid the methodological foundations for all subsequent conceptions of a history of early Christianity.[6]

About one hundred years after Baur, Walter Bauer (1877–1960) questioned, in his book *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*,[7] the "ecclesial standpoint" according to which there stood at the beginning the proclamation of the "pure" teaching of Jesus to his apostles, which later had to be defended against falsifications and heresies. As a countermove Bauer wished to provide evidence that the exact opposite was the case: views later rejected as heresies stood at the beginning of the development and were first suppressed later through an enforcement of "orthodoxy" going forth from Rome. Historical research leads here to a problematization of the relationship between orthodoxy and heresy. A criticism of the ancient church's image of history, which underlies Bauer's investigation, admittedly already appears in Baur, though not in the intensification to the temporal priority of heresy over orthodoxy.

For the most part, the individual conclusions of Bauer's investigation have been surpassed by scholarship.[8] The reversal of the image, which he wished to show to be incorrect, is no more accurate than his thesis of an enforced orthodoxy going forth from Rome since the second century. [347] That the unity of Christianity is to be traced back to strategic-pragmatic causes[9] is a truncated viewpoint. Nevertheless, for the beginnings of Christianity Bauer's approach has heuristic value: the variety of the connections made to Jesus, within and beyond the writings subsequently received into the canon, indicates that from the beginning there existed different, in part contradictory and not infrequently competing, views of the meaning of Jesus and the consequences that follow from his activity.[10] What was to be

[6] By contrast it is inappropriate, as unfortunately often occurs, to dismiss Baur's contribution with the observation that he forced Hegel's philosophy of history onto the history of early Christianity. The article on the Corinthian Letters, in which he submitted his view for the first time, was written before Baur became familiar with Hegel's writings. Cf. Hodgson 1966, 22.

[7] Bauer 1964; 1971.

[8] Cf. Robinson 1988; McCue 1979; Norris 1976; Roberts 1979.

[9] Cf. Bauer 1964, 231–35; 1971, 229–33.

[10] Helmut Koester has especially picked up the thread of Bauer in this way and set forth his view of the beginnings of early Christian faith according to a geographically

regarded as "orthodox" in such variety remained, however, contested—even in a later period when fundamental contents of Christian faith were formulated in the form of binding doctrines. The various early Christian standpoints do not lead then, as Bauer thought, to a separation between canonical and non-canonical writings but lie across them: various, sometimes opposing standpoints are also found among the subsequently canonized writings themselves, even if the controversies here are different than in the second century.

A third spotlight leads to the immediate present. In a more recent investigation, Gerd Theissen describes the early Christian religion from a semiotic perspective as a symbol system.[11] He is concerned neither with the tracing of the historical processes of the formation of faith convictions nor with a systematic apprehension of all the important theological statements of the New Testament—thus neither with history of theology nor with theology of the New Testament. Instead he sets forth a science-of-religion-oriented model that founds the variety of early Christian faith on common "basic motifs" that simultaneously represent the "inner canon in the canon." With this variable, dialogue-friendly attempt to describe early Christian faith as religion and to apprehend its forms of expression from this standpoint, we have an important conception for placing variety and unity in relation to each other that inspires further discussion.

Particularity and inclusivity are specified in respectively particular ways in the three approaches mentioned: Baur understands the unity as the result of a process of mediating between divergent directions; Bauer attributes its establishment to external causes such as organization structures and offices as well as the missionary failure of early Christianity in the eastern part of the Roman Empire; and Theissen describes it as [348] a framework of fundamental convictions underlying the various positions that simultaneously establishes identity and enables difference. It is common to all three approaches that they understand the question of diversity and unity in early Christianity as a historical one. The view of the canon, however, has changed: canonized and rejected positions cannot be divided into "orthodox" and "heretical"; accordingly, in a historical analysis the opponents of Paul cannot be designated, as still happens in Baur, as "false teachers"; orthodoxy and heresy cannot be used, as Bauer does, as descriptive categories for the beginnings of Christianity. Thus, a historical survey makes difficult the specification of clear contours and clear demarcations. Instead, it places before one's eyes a picture of variegated new impulses that supplement, correct, or contradict one another.

---

structured model that is already found in Bauer. Cf. Koester 1980; 1982. Cf. also the revised English edition: Koester 1995/2000.

[11] Theissen 2000; 1999.

Thus, we can formulate an initial conclusion: the apprehension of the forms of early Christian faith not only dissolves the unity of the New Testament, but beyond this it also makes clear that one must distinguish between early Christian religion and New Testament. In contrast to a theology of the New Testament, a description of the former may not orient itself on the canon.[12] The question of particularity and inclusivity belongs in the sphere of the history of early Christian religion. In the next section we are therefore going to sketch a few fields of discussion in early Christianity that pertain to this relationship. The relationship to Judaism, and the topics of Christology, and ecclesiology will be illuminated. Following this, we will then return to the question of the canon.

2. Processes of branching out

Early Christianity emerges within Judaism and develops its independence in becoming detached from it. An initial dispute therefore concerns the question: "How Jewish should Christianity be?" Various views are found concerning this.

A peculiar ambivalence runs through the position of Paul:[13] on the one hand there is no doubt for him that the Christ message is directed not only to Israel but also to the Gentiles. To the latter in particular he knows himself to be called. The acceptance of the gospel means a new creation: previous social, sexual, [349] and religious differences are nullified, for which reason he vehemently opposes the view that Gentiles, in addition to converting to Christ, must be integrated into the Jewish people. He traces back the common basis of Jews and Gentiles not to Moses, the lawgiver of the Jewish people, but to Abraham as the father of all peoples. The function of the law is adjusted to this; circumcision is spiritualized as "circumcision of the heart."

On the other hand, Paul develops his picture of the Christian community in constant dispute with the central categories of Judaism such as covenant, law, circumcision, or the notion of the holy remnant. The writings of Israel are an important basis for his argumentation here. With them he can expound the belonging of the uncircumcised to the childship of Abraham, as well as God's free decision over election and hardening. By contrast, he shows himself to be sparing in the use of notions from Hellenistic ethics and philosophy. He thus sets forth a model that is not oriented on the

[12] The specification of the relation between the two is not always fully clear in the research. Räisänen pleads here for a clear distinction and develops "principles for a science-of-religion oriented history of theology of early Christianity" (Räisänen 2000b, 74; cf. 2000a, 151). Cf. also chap. 16 below.

[13] Cf. Barclay 1996, 381–95, who therefore refers to Paul as an "anomalous Jew."

integration of the Gentiles into the Jewish people but on the community's own distinguishing marks such as baptism, possession of the Spirit, and confession of Jesus as the exalted Lord. He does this, however, within the linguistic and conceptual world of Judaism, which leads to reformulations, relativizations, and rejections of Jewish identity markers. It is decisive for him that the universalism based in Judaism itself contradicts the upholding of demarcating features. Christian identity must therefore be conceptualized beyond these.

Acts develops another solution. It emerges a few decades after Paul at a time in which the church had already become predominantly Gentile Christian and the relation to Israel had thereby become unclear. In this situation Acts activates the idea of the one people of God from Jews and Gentiles in order to deal with the problem of the identity of Christianity. It is no longer the legitimacy of the Gentile mission but the identity of the church in which the Jewish element only remains marginal that is up for discussion. The factual separation of Christianity and Judaism is overcome by having the church be conceptualized on the basis of the purity specifications for Gentiles living in Israel.[14] Here the leading idea is not the nullification of separating features but the expansion of the idea of the people of God through the inclusion of Gentiles.

The question of what is Jewish in Christianity represents a central problem of early Christianity's search for identity. This is not only attested by a multitude of writings, in which this is found in different nuances, but it also becomes clear through the views that were rejected. The [350] position of Peter and Barnabas, which is judged to be hypocritical by Paul in Gal 2.13, confronts us only in the negation as does that of the opponents fought against by Paul in this letter. We can discern that the latter placed value upon circumcision, adherence to times, and food commands and also required this from Gentiles who converted to Christ.[15] This model did not establish itself. Nevertheless, historical research must grant it the same status as the model that became determinative for the shape of Christianity.

A second field of discussion concerns the meaning of the earthly Jesus. The clearest discrepancy here lies between the Gospels on the one hand and Paul on the other hand. For the Gospels, the relation to the activity of Jesus is constitutive. Here the Christology is set forth in close attachment to the person of the earthly Jesus and therefore developed narratively: the resurrected Son of Man who is coming again for judgment is identical with the Jesus who was active in the villages of Galilee. Recollections of the location and time of his origin, family, and first disciples and of

[14] Cf. Wehnert 1997.
[15] Gal 3.3; 4.10; 5.2-3; 6.12-13.

his teaching and deeds of power are therefore kept alive. The history of Jesus simultaneously points beyond itself and becomes transparent for the subsequent situation: the experience of persecutions is already predicted by Jesus, the commission to proclaim the gospel to all peoples is given by Jesus himself, his coming again at the end of time is promised by him. In the Gospel of John the divine nature of Jesus is emphasized so strongly that the earthly and the exalted Jesus are almost not able to be distinguished: in the farewell discourses Jesus already speaks as the Exalted One, although his passion is yet to follow. Later writings that did not gain access into the canon developed this further: the teaching of Jesus is unfolded in dialogues that Jesus conducts as the Risen One with his female and male disciples. Here the appearances of the Risen One in Matthew, Luke, and John form the framework in which the entire teaching of Jesus is placed.[16]

For Paul a relation to the earthly Jesus has only marginal importance. He only rarely cites sayings of the Lord, and even then they are only important because they come from the one who is now venerated as exalted Lord. At the center for him stands instead the confession of the Christ who died for us and the Lord who has been exalted to God.[17] Becoming a Christian is envisaged as participation in the dying and (future) resurrection or as being clothed with Christ.[18] The Gospels' notion of following after, which is oriented on the model of the disciples called by Jesus, is replaced in Paul by the incorporation [351] into the body of Christ. The event of Christ's death and resurrection is given the character of a model: it shapes the existence of the apostle, then also that of his communities.[19] This approach then also determines the Deutero-Pauline letters, despite a number of modifications.

Hebrews views it differently once again: the Christology is developed here from the notion of preexistence: Jesus is an "imprint" of the nature of God (Heb 1.3). At the same time, however, he became like human beings; he was exposed, as they are, to temptations, suffering, and death. This double nature forms the foundation for him being able to conquer death and liberate human beings. Hebrews makes use of cultic ideas here: Jesus, appointed as high priest, has brought himself as the offering, invalidated the old cultic order and thus made possible a new covenant between God and human beings. Preexistence, sharing in the suffering of human beings and expiation of the sins through the high priest Christ are bound together into an impressive, independent conception.

Let us now examine a third area. With respect to the social structure of Christian communities we find different models in the beginning period.

[16] Cf. Hartenstein 2000.
[17] Cf., e.g., Rom 10.9; 1 Cor 12.3; Phil 2.11.
[18] Rom 6.3-5; 2 Cor 5.14-15; Gal 3.27; Rom 13.14.
[19] 2 Cor 4.7-12; 1 Thess 1.6; 1 Cor 11.1; Phil 3.17; 2 Cor 1.5-6.

The foundation of the Pauline conception is the image of a body and the different members. Differences in the community have only functional and not hierarchical meaning. Structures oriented on offices are only discernible as beginnings and even then the leading functions are understood as charisms, as gifts that were given by God to the individuals in order that they can become fruitful in the community (1 Cor 12.28-30). Fundamental is the criterion of usefulness for the building up of the community. Therefore, he urges both the community in Corinth and the one in Rome to have consideration for those for whom the eating of meat sacrificed to idols is a temptation (*Anfechtung*), for whom the adherence to Jewish notions of purity continues to be important.[20]

That the ecclesiological model of Paul was open for interpretations that he himself did not wish to draw out is attested, for example, by his argumentation in 1 Corinthians 11. The equal positioning of woman and man in the Lord does not mean for Paul a nullification of the gender-specific differences. Women and men should be equally *positioned* but are not *equal*. Corinthian women evidently had other ideas here: they drew the consequence that the creation-contingent differences between man and woman could already be invalidated in the present.[21] Two divergent positions in early Christianity again come into view within a letter of Paul. [352]

The Pastoral Letters change the approach of Paul. He himself appears as fictive author of the letters and thereby gives instructions as an authority for the form of the communities in the Pauline sphere of activity. The changed situation is again reflected in the image of the church that is put forward.[22] Divergent currents alongside the simultaneous necessity of the church establishing itself in pagan society led to an emphasis on offices. A similar tendency is then found in the stress on the office of bishop in the writing of the Antiochian bishop Ignatius to the various communities in Asia Minor at the beginning of the second century. But the changed situation also becomes clear in the fact that one is exhorted to a "tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and respectability" (1 Tim 2.2). As in 1 Peter, the Christians are also directed here to a life that gives the Gentiles no occasion to blaspheme them and with this the name of God.[23] It is clearly recognizable that the Christian community is understood as a place in which one has to prove oneself in various trials. 1 Peter uses here the metaphor of being a stranger and an alien in order to describe the status of the Christians within society.[24]

[20] 1 Cor 8–10; Rom 14.
[21] Cf. Gielen 1999.
[22] Cf. Reiser 1993.
[23] 1 Pet 4.14-16; Titus 2.2-5.
[24] 1 Pet 1.1; 1.17; 2.11.

We encounter a completely different model in the sphere that develops an understanding of Christian community oriented to following Jesus. Jesus' call to follow, including the social consequences bound up with it (separation from family, entrance into a community of itinerant missionaries) continues to have an effect here. This is attested by the sayings source, Mark, Matthew, the *Didache*, and the *Gospel of Thomas*, each in its own way. One can see that the activity of Jesus led to the formation of discipleship circles who knew themselves to be sent to all Israel with their message of the inbreaking rule of God. In the mission discourse, the ethos of these groups is reflected in the sayings about uncompromising discipleship and the enmity within the family that Jesus calls forth. When they later came to form their own communities alongside the synagogues, itinerant apostles and prophets continued to exist alongside them. The close relation to these circles clearly shapes the ecclesiology of the Gospel of Matthew:[25] here, not only the mission discourse is preserved, but the concentration of the activity of Jesus on Israel is emphasized, and the ethos is clearly shaped in a Jewish manner. [353]

3. Particularity, inclusivity, and canon

The consideration of three important spheres of early Christian theology has shown that we invariably encounter a variety of standpoints and nuances that can only be systematized through far-reaching abstractions. Moreover, this variety cannot be restricted to the canon, but encompasses more positions and writings than are gathered in it. In light of this finding, William Wrede, about one hundred years ago, regarded it as consistent to take leave of the discipline "theology of the New Testament" in favor of a "history of early Christian religion."[26] The book of Gerd Theissen understands itself in this tradition but without fundamentally contesting the possibility of a theology of the New Testament.[27] How do the two act with regard to the determination of the relation between particularity and inclusivity?

First, it is necessary to consider that the canon of the New Testament also contains an abundance of theological positions. It is therefore open for various possibilities of identification. This has been shown by the examples. Moreover, the borders of the canon are less sharp than its center. Writings such as Hebrews or Revelation are lacking in a number of ancient church canon lists, whereas others such as the *Apocalypse of Peter* or the *Ascension of Isaiah* occasionally turn up in such lists. By contrast, the

[25] Cf. Roloff 1993, 144–68.
[26] Wrede 1975; 1973.
[27] Theissen 2000, 17–20; 1999, 1–2.

Gospels and the Letters of Paul already belonged to the canon early and without dispute. However, the positions that were rejected or not canonized for other reasons also contribute important aspects to a comprehensive understanding of the beginnings of early Christianity.

On the other hand, it is not to be overlooked that a canon limits what is regarded as binding in a community. The obligation to be circumcised is not a view sanctioned by the canon. The rejection of the writings of Israel and the concomitant separation of the God of the Old Testament from the father of Jesus Christ is also a position that was not accepted by the Christian church. The appeal to revelations mediated by the resurrected Jesus whose meaning is only accessible to the initiated was not accepted by the church either. Instead, only writings that assume a unity of the Risen One with the pre-Easter Jesus were received into the canon. Thus, the establishment of a binding corpus of writings means the *limitation* of diversity not its *removal*. It fixes the normativity of the beginning to which henceforth every position should know itself to be obligated. [354] This simultaneously creates the possibility of developing criteria for distinguishing between binding and rejected positions.

Ernst Käsemann must be affirmed in the fact that different forms of Christian faith can appeal to the New Testament with equal right. However, the criterion of the difference between self-righteousness and acknowledgement of God that he formulated is scarcely a materially appropriate standard derived from the New Testament for distinguishing between the spirits.[28] Instead the unifying bond is represented by the faith in the God of Israel as the creator of the world and human beings, in the fact that Jesus Christ represents this God with full validity, and in the fact that he is active in the world through his Spirit. These convictions are found early in various forms. A description of the beginnings of Christianity can therefore make clear that Christian faith is open for various forms without becoming contourless in the process.

Thus, the diversity of early Christianity does not lead to the unity of the church, but it does lead to the perception of the Christian faith as an interpretation of reality with a center that can be clearly named. Thus, historical research fulfills not least an ethical task by making clear that the beginnings of Christian faith are resistant to premature exclusions and claims to exclusive representation of its truth.

[28] Käsemann 1964a, 221–23; 1982, 103–7.

This page intentionally left blank

16 [355–377]

The Meaning of the Canon for a Theology of the New Testament

Conceptual Reflections in Light of Current Discussion

The last chapter of this book deals with the question of how a theology of the New Testament would have to be conceived under the presuppositions of the historical-critical science of the Bible.[1] Here the concern will be less with individual aspects—such as the relationship between the history of early Christian religion and theology of the New Testament,[2] the placement of the activity of Jesus in a theology of the New Testament,[3] or the discussion concerning a whole-Bible theology[4]—and more with the methodological basic problem of a theology of the New Testament. This can be formulated in such a way that what must be clarified is how the texts gathered in the New Testament are to be interpreted as constituent parts of a *corpus of canonical writings.* As we shall see, there exists at this point a fundamental problem that has accompanied the discussion about a "theology of the New Testament" from its beginnings. The reason for this is to be sought in the fact that the discipline has developed in precisely the opposite direction, namely toward the negation of the canon as a fundamental institution for the theology of the New Testament. The deficiency resulting from this can be observed up to the newest approaches. I will first elucidate this in somewhat greater detail. [356]

1. Historical criticism and New Testament theology

The explosive nature of current discussion concerning a theology of the New Testament resides in the fact that historical criticism first brought forth the idea that the New Testament has a theology of its own, but then again strongly called this idea into question: if the idea of a theology of the

[1] Cf. for the discussion von Bendemann 2003.
[2] Cf. esp. Räisänen 2000b; 2000a.
[3] Cf. Weiser 1996; Tuckett 2006.
[4] Cf. Merk 1995; Janowski 1998; 2007; 2005.

New Testament first developed in a double process of differentiation—the demarcation of the biblical from the dogmatic[5] as well as the distinction between Old Testament and New Testament theology[6]—then the historical-critical research, going further, worked out the diversity of early Christian theologies, which is not limited to the writings gathered in the New Testament. From this perspective the "New Testament" appeared to be an imposition from a later time that reflects the dogmatic interests of the early church, which play no role for a historical analysis of these writings.

This led to the judgment that the historical-critical interpretation of the New Testament texts and the idea of a theology common to these are ultimately incompatible with each other. This consequence was first drawn by William Wrede, who only continued to speak of the "so-called New Testament theology," because he saw in this the inconsistency of a standpoint that had not yet freed itself completely from the doctrine of inspiration and still always "has an eye to dogmatics when doing biblical-theological work."[7] As alternatives to a theology of the New Testament, proposals were therefore made involving either its replacement by a history of early Christian religion—and with this the dismissal of the New Testament canon as a decisive entity for historical-critical interpretation—or alternatively a return to the doctrine of inspiration as [357] the authority that justified the special status of the New Testament writings.[8]

In what follows, by contrast, the view is advanced that historical-critical interpretation of the New Testament texts and a theology of the New Testament do *not* exclude each other—and neither should they be dissolved into each other—but stand in a tension-filled dynamic in relation to each other, which is substantial and indispensible for the contribution of New Testament science to the overall theological discourse. Here the question of the New Testament canon plays a fundamental role, which is, however, mostly given too little weight. That is to say, what is insufficiently taken

[5] Thus, as is well known, in the Altdorf inaugural lecture of Gabler in 1787 under the title *Oratio de justo discrimine theologiae biblicae et dogmaticae regundisque recte utriusque finibus* (On the proper distinction between biblical and dogmatic theology and the proper determination of the goal of each). Otto Merk has provided a German translation of this work in Strecker 1975, 32–44. Cf. also Merk 1980.

[6] This consequence was not yet clearly drawn by Gabler himself, but it was then drawn by his Altdorf colleague Georg Lorenz Bauer, who first wrote a theology of the Old Testament (1796), and then a "Biblical Theology of the New Testament." See Bauer 1796; 1838; 1800–1802.

[7] Cf. Wrede 1975, 82; 1973, 69. Here Wrede especially has in view the "method of doctrinal-concepts," which was heavily criticized by him for forcing the New Testament writings into a corset that was not obtained from the writings themselves. Cf. Wrede 1975, 91–108; 1973, 73–84.

[8] The former by Wrede and Räisänen, the latter by Stuhlmacher and Wilckens. I will return to this point.

into account in the discussion concerning a theology of the New Testament is the fact that the *historical analysis* of the individual early Christian texts cannot alone explain their *canonical status*. Rather, this status first emerged from those developments that led to the collection of precisely these writings.

Thus, for the conception of a theology of the New Testament, one must take into account the—actually self-evident—fact that the New Testament texts did not yet possess their status as texts that were binding for the Christian church at the time of their emergence, but first obtained this in a lengthy process.[9] The reason for conferring this special status on them was that they were regarded together as an adequate expression of the faith of the early church. It follows from this—as has already been shown with the example of the Jesus tradition and Acts[10]—that the "canonical" meaning that the relevant texts obtained in their placement together with other writings cannot be identical with the historical function that they possessed at the time of their emergence. Thus, one must distinguish between the historical status and the canonical status of the New Testament texts, even though there is certainly a connection between the two.[11] [358]

Through this the broader problem of the contribution of New Testament science to theology as a whole comes into view. This question concerning the presuppositions of the historical-critical interpretation of biblical texts, which has recently been the topic of increased discussion again, is an indication that, given the high degree of specialization in the historical and exegetical, the relevance of these insights for theology's claim to validity has been pushed into the background. This, however, means no less than that the reference to the historical-critical analysis of the texts gathered in the New Testament cannot alone justify the place of New Testament science within theology. Rather, the development to the New Testament canon shows that New Testament science first reaches its goal when it can make

[9] That this scarcely comes into view any longer could have its basis in the differentiation of the individual theological disciplines. This has resulted in the emergence of the canon falling into the area of Patristics, whereas in New Testament science it is encountered at best in introductions to the New Testament. In terms of the subject matter, collaboration between New Testament science and Patristics would be called for, which could prove extremely fruitful with regard to a theology of the New Testament.

[10] Cf. chaps. 12 and 13 above.

[11] Thus, to name one example, the gospels that made it into the New Testament definitely had the intention of reporting the events that were decisive for faith in Jesus, just as Acts wanted to present the decisive developments that led to the emergence of the Christian church. When they were placed together with [358] other writings this function changed: the Gospels are no longer the decisive witness for the history of Jesus as individual writings but as the four-gospel collection; Acts establishes the connection between the Jesus witness and that of Paul and the remaining apostles.

clear why precisely these texts that it investigates became the foundation of the Christian church.

This is not to question the fact that the specifics of the individual theological conceptions of early Christianity, which have been worked out by historical-critical research, are indispensible for the picture of the emergence of Christianity as an ancient religious community. On this point, Wrede's criticism of the doctrinal-concept method (*Lehrbegriff-Methode*) is to be affirmed without reservation. Furthermore, knowledge about early Christianity in the area of tension between Judaism and the pagan, Hellenistic-Roman world has been able to specify its location within the religious and social world of Greco-Roman antiquity. New discoveries of texts, such as those of Qumran and Nag Hammadi, have enriched our knowledge about ancient Judaism and brought to light original witnesses of the so-called "Gnosis," which was previously known almost exclusively from reports of church fathers.[12] The careful analysis of the material on the Jewish Diaspora[13] has clearly advanced our view of the relationship between Judaism and early Christianity in these regions and placed the understanding of Pauline theology or the situation presupposed in the Revelation of John, for example, upon a new foundation.[14] The excavations in Galilee are of fundamental importance for the placement of Jesus in his Jewish environment and thus for both historical Jesus research and the evaluation of [359] the New Testament gospels.[15] That New Testament science today has outstanding knowledge at its disposal on the early Jesus tradition, the language-world and thought-world of Paul, or the historical and literary features of Acts is not to be questioned.

It is, however, just as clear that with this the questions of what binds the theological conceptions of the New Testament with one another, and why precisely these texts obtained canonical status whereas others did not, do not yet come into view at all. If one does not wish to content oneself with a reference to the factual existence of the New Testament in this connection—and thereby to leave the question unanswered—then a consideration of the emergence and significance of the New Testament canon as a constitutive presupposition of a theology of the New Testament becomes unavoidable. This will be pursued in what follows with the aid of some preliminary reflections on a "theology of the New Testament."

[12] Overviews in VanderKam/Flint 2002, as well as Bethge 2003; 2010.

[13] Cf., e.g., Schürer 1973–1987, III-1, 1–86; Kant 1987; Horst 1991; Delling 1987.

[14] The extent to which the investigation of ancient Judaism has affected Paul research, for instance, is made clear in more recent discussion around the so-called "New Perspective on Paul." Reference has already been made to this in chapter 7 above.

[15] Cf. Reed 2000; Chancey 2005; Freyne 2004; Schröter 2010 [2006], 79–105. Cf. also chap. 6 above.

2. Canon and theology of the New Testament

That the emergence of the New Testament canon is of fundamental importance for a theology of the New Testament is already obvious because with the language of the "New Testament" the corpus of early Christian writings that is binding for the church is already presupposed.[16] In the discipline "theology of the New Testament," however, a viewpoint that William Wrede formulated in his previously mentioned contribution from 1897 continues to be influential.[17] Wrede was concerned—in continuation of the path embarked upon by Gabler—with the "strictly historical character of New Testament theology."[18] By this he meant a dismissal of the doctrine of inspiration and its replacement with a view of the New Testament writings as "historical documents"; standoffishness of New Testament science in relation to every dogma and every systematic theology (83; cf. 69); as well as the "pure, disinterested, interest in knowledge" (sic!) of the New Testament scholar, who only wants to know "what really was" (84; cf. 70). [360]

For Wrede it follows from the surrender of the doctrine of inspiration that the "dogmatic concept of the canon" must also be given up: "the one who regards the concept of the canon as settled submits to the authority of the bishops and theologians of those centuries [sc.: in which the canon emerged, thus of the second to the fourth century]. The one who does not acknowledge this authority in other things—and no Protestant theologian acknowledges it—acts consistently when he also calls it into question here."[19]

Wrede's dictum leaves nothing to be desired in clarity: the canon is judged as an arbitrary establishment of ancient church authorities legitimated by the dogma of inspiration, which is unacceptable for theologians working in a historical-critical manner and which stands in the way of an unbiased engagement with the "historical documents" of early Christianity.[20] The roots of this judgment lie in Johann Salomo Semler's renowned

[16] Here the canon concept is used with a specific meaning, namely one related to the writings that are binding for the church. It was already shown in chapter 12 above that this does not grasp the meaning spectrum of the concept in its entirety and that it was first applied in the fourth century to the writings in question.

[17] Cf. n. 7 above.

[18] Wrede 1975, 82; cf. 1973, 69.

[19] Wrede 1975, 85; cf. 1973, 71.

[20] Wrede's restriction of the historical-critical approach to "Protestant theologians" presents itself differently from today's perspective: the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* from 1943, the dogmatic constitution *Dei verbum* of the Second Vatican Council of 1965, as well as the document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* from 1993 have acknowledged the opening up of Catholic exegesis for historical-critical research from the side of the church—even if a noted Catholic exegete has spoken of a "compromise character" in relation to the latter document (Klauck 2003b,

distinction between "Holy Scripture" and "Word of God" as well as the concomitant criticism of the doctrine of inspiration.[21] Wrede's own position can be described as a historical intensification of this criticism: the interpretation of the New Testament texts is understood as a purely historical undertaking that has its purpose in itself and is aimed at drawing out the emergence and development of the early Christian religion from the early Christian texts.

An unavoidable consequence of this approach is that the New Testament canon is replaced through a selection of writings that appear, in the perspective of the interpreter, to be especially important documents for the formation of early Christian theology. At the same time, writings whose demonstrable influence upon the early Christian theology was small are judged to be unimportant. Precisely this is also [361] what we find in Wrede.[22] This, however, does not take into account—apart from other problems that are soon to be discussed—the fact that by virtue of their belonging to the canon, writings whose demonstrable reception in the ancient church was small are also part of the "cultural memory" of Christianity and can be rediscovered in later situations and gain new significance.[23] To want to exclude them from the history of early Christian theology would therefore be extremely questionable and would run exactly counter to the canon's principle of gathering such writings that were read in the churches as an expression of Christian faith.

Thus, in Wrede writings that he considers decisive for the emergence of the early Christian religion take the place of the canon. What is problematic with this is that the historical developments that led to the formation of the essential features of the Christian church—which naturally also includes the New Testament canon—are excluded from consideration and replaced in a historicist manner by a construction that is characterized by

394–420, 420). If nothing else the relationship between historical-critical Bible science and the meaning of the canon would therefore be an extremely worthwhile topic for the ecumenical discourse.

[21] Cf. Semler 1967, 60–61. The distinction was directed primarily against the Old Protestant Orthodox doctrine of inspiration and upheld against it the right to unreserved examination of the historical emergence of the biblical books. On this cf. also Kaiser 1984.

[22] Wrede wishes, e.g., to exclude 1 Peter, Luke, Acts, Mark, Matthew, *1 Clement*, James, and the *Didache* from consideration because they exhibit no "significant conception for the overall-development" (Wrede 1975, 110; cf. 1973, 85–86). By contrast, the situation is said to be fundamentally different with Jesus, Paul, John, and Ignatius. Between the two stand writings such as Revelation, Hebrews, and *Barnabas*, which each show individual, if also very important Christian views (1975, 111–12; cf. 1973, 86–87). This judgment of Wrede is oriented to the conception of history-shaping personalities and is open to question at many points from today's viewpoint.

[23] An example would be James, which in recent discussion is being rediscovered as an independent conception of early Christian wisdom paraenesis.

the "great personalities" of the beginning period—Jesus, Paul, John, and Ignatius. With this, however, Wrede's judgment that with the dogma of inspiration the canon has to be simultaneously dismissed as a dogmatic construct of the early church is shown to be an ultimately unhistorical position, because it prematurely discards the developments that led to the New Testament.

Nevertheless, the aftereffects of Wrede's approach can also be detected in more recent conceptions of a "theology of the New Testament." Presentations that differ in detail such as those of Joachim Gnilka, Georg Strecker, and Klaus Berger[24] are in agreement that a restriction to the writings determined by the canon—insofar as it is made at all[25]—either follows for practical reasons[26] [362] or—as with Gnilka[27]—is justified with the fact that here the "decisive witnesses of the apostolic time and their faith were consolidated."[28] One seeks in vain, by contrast, for an in-depth justification for the distinction between canonical and non-canonical writings. Thus, it appears to be more consistent when Berger understands his conception—as Bultmann already did—as an implementation of Wrede's program to disregard the canon as a dogmatic imposition from a later time and to concentrate instead on a presentation of the theological views in the early Christian writings. The title of Berger's book—*Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums* (History of Early Christian Theology)—is therefore to be understood as a resolute taking up of Wrede's call for a dissolution of the theology of the New Testament through a "*Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums*" (history of early Christian religion). When "theology of the New Testament" nevertheless turns up again in Berger's subtitle, then this is meant to express the following conviction: a theology of the New Testament can only be conceptualized adequately as a history of early Christian theology.

[24] Gnilka 1994; Strecker 1996; 2000; Berger 1995.

[25] Berger does not orient himself on the definition of the canon but also considers the Apostolic Fathers and the *Gospel of Thomas.* He thus stands in the tradition of Wrede's demand, to which Bultmann also already knew himself to be obligated, though in a different manner. With Strecker and Gnilka, by contrast, the non-canonical writings receive no consideration.

[26] Strecker 1996, 3; 2000, 3. As an additional reason, the effective history of the New Testament as the foundation of the Christian church is then mentioned.

[27] Gnilka 1994, 12.

[28] The conception of Stuhlmacher 1992/1999, however, represents an exception here. In the last part of his theology (vol. 2, 287–349) he deals extensively with the emergence of the canon and its importance for a theology of the New Testament. The hermeneutical premises of Stuhlmacher's conception, which also affect individual judgments on the emergence and importance of the canon, would, however, have to be discussed specifically, which will not take place here.

Thus, what is common—alongside the diversity in implementation—to the conceptions that have been mentioned here only by way of example is that only very marginal attention is given to the question of what actually distinguishes a "theology of the New Testament" from a description of the individual theological conceptions of early Christianity—thus from a *history* of theology.[29] [363]

This situation illustrates the finding formulated at the outset, namely that the idea of a "theology of the New Testament" already carries in itself at the beginning the tendency to self-dissolution. Through the working out of the diversity of early Christian theologies,[30] historical-critical research has destroyed the idea of a theological unity of the writings gathered in the New Testament. The presentation of *theologies in early Christianity* has taken its place, whereas the question of how one is to get from these *theologies* to a *theology* of the New Testament only plays a subordinate role.[31] Before we return to this, we must deal briefly with one way of resolving this dilemma that is not viable.

When Peter Stuhlmacher and Ulrich Wilckens want to solve the indicated problem through a fundamental calling into question of the historical-critical method, bound up with the call for a return to the doctrine of inspiration,[32] then this is indeed consistent insofar as with this—as is shown by Wrede's remark—the exact point is named at which the question

[29] The question of the unity of a theology of the New Testament is only taken into view by Gnilka 1994 at the end of the book (454–64) in a few sketched out comments. Here he advances—following the pass through the theological conceptions of the New Testament authors—the view that it cannot be a matter of systematizing the diversity of the conceptions. The "uniting bond," is, however, to be sought in the guideline of the kerygma of the death and resurrection (462–63). Strecker's conception is similar in nature. In the sentences from a 1992 lecture by Strecker, which are cited by Horn in the preface, he says among other things that "the term 'theology of the New Testament' refers more precisely to the complexity of theologies in the New Testament" (Strecker 1996, VI; cf. 2000, VI). By contrast, Berger is concerned less with the presentation of the individual conceptions in their respective contexts and more with tracing the individual elements of tradition that were formed in the process of the emergence of early Christian theology and thus could point to—by Berger mostly envisaged as [363] personally mediated—interconnections between the various conceptions. Berger therefore thinks of a history of theology according to the model of a tree that splits up into many branches (Berger 1995, 5; cf. already Berger 1987, 186–202). At the end of his history of theology he briefly deals with the emergence of the Christian canon (716–18).

[30] Cf. chap. 15 above.

[31] Luz 1998, 328, therefore observes with complete justification that "New Testament theologies have increasingly become a history of the theologies of early Christianity." The problem is also clearly named by Hahn 1994, 161: "One can, however, only speak of a theology in the strict and actual sense when the concern is with an overall context in which it is expressed in a thought-through manner what Christian faith is and means."

[32] Stuhlmacher 1992/1999, II, 327–31; Wilckens 2002, 16–18.

of the possibility of a theology of the New Testament in the age of historical-critical Bible science arises. The idea that the authors of the biblical writings were inspired by the Spirit of God is, however, a statement of faith, which already presupposes the Trinitarian confession and applies it retrospectively to these writings. Therefore, the recommended orientation to the doctrine of inspiration could not be more unsuitable for solving the problem that stands in question. Stuhlmacher and Wilckens thus commit the same methodological error as Wrede by—now the other way around—directly connecting doctrine of inspiration and canon with each other. It is not taken into account that for its part the doctrine of inspiration serves to trace back the faith witnesses laid down in the biblical writings to God himself [364] and thereby to legitimate their truth claim.[33] The idea of the inspiration of the canonical writings therefore belongs in the larger context within which the early church declared certain writings to be binding witnesses of the Christian faith. The idea of inspiration can neither ground their canonical status nor can its rejection take this status from them.[34]

The concern to work out the characteristic features of the individual early Christian conceptions in their respective particularities and to appreciate them as independent interpretations of the events around Jesus of Nazareth is undoubtedly legitimate and indispensible for the presentation of the history of early Christian theology. At the same time the differences or contradictions between these conceptions may in no way be exaggerated theologically through an alleged "center of Scripture."[35] The decisive question, however, is whether or to what extent one would be able to reach beyond such a historical-descriptive approach, which could really only be the presupposition of a theology of the New Testament, to a theology of the New Testament itself. In addition, one must answer the previously mentioned question of what unites the writings of the New Testament with one another and distinguishes them from other writings that are not found in the New Testament.

We are thus dealing with a decidedly historical problem: the emergence of the New Testament canon is—in contrast to what Wrede thought—not

[33] Therefore one also cannot ground the inspiration of the canonical writings with the claim they make for themselves (so Stuhlmacher 1992/1999, II, 328) let alone claim that the inspiration is "a characteristic of the canon" (so Stuhlmacher 1997, 278; this sentence is lacking in the parallel passage in the second volume of his theology). Rather, inspiration is a theological judgment of the ancient church concerning the significance of the biblical writings and as such to be placed in the history of theology of the early church.

[34] Cf. Metzger 1987, 256: "In short, the Scriptures, according to the early Fathers, are indeed inspired, but that is not the reason they are authoritative. They are authoritative, and hence canonical, because they are the extant literary deposit of the direct and indirect apostolic witness on which the later witness of the church depends."

[35] This model is found in Stuhlmacher 1992/1999, II, 304–21.

an arbitrary establishment of ancient church bishops and theologians that through historical criticism has become antiquated in the meantime and therefore unimportant.[36] Rather, the formation of the New Testament belongs to those developments of the early church in which fundamental characteristics of Christian faith manifested themselves. [365]

With the appeal to specific writings or groups of writings, Christianity created—to speak with Jan Assmann—a "founding tradition" by securing the connection to its beginnings. This is why the question of the apostolic origin of the writings played an important role in the ancient church discussion.[37] This criterion should not be judged with the standards of today's historical criticism, but must be viewed in precisely this context of the securing of tradition. With the tracing back to apostles or students of apostles the connection to the beginning period of Christianity was to be retained and defended against later expansions and falsifications.

A specific feature of the New Testament canon consists in the fact that alongside the (hi)story of Jesus, the letters of Paul and the remaining apostles, and the Acts of the Apostles as the "founding (hi)story" of Christianity, it also declares the writings of Israel to be the foundation of those who believe in Christ. This can already be seen in the fact that the writings of Israel play a fundamental role for the interpretation of the Christ event and thereby prepare for the juxtaposition of the Old Testament and New Testament parts of the Christian canon.[38] With this, however, the *history of Israel* also became a part of the *history of Christianity.* This means simultaneously that in Christianity the writings and history of Israel are viewed from the perspective of the Christ event—thus in an *interpretatio christiana.*[39]

The differentiation between Old Testament and New Testament theology, which established itself following Gabler's aforementioned lecture, created the presupposition for the insight that in their appeal to the writings of Israel the authors of the New Testament stand within a Jewish process of interpretation that is impressively attested by the writings of ancient Judaism. There is therefore no historically demonstrable "salvation-historical continuity" between the two parts of the Christian Bible. Rather, the activity and fate of Jesus of Nazareth led to a new interpretation of the writings of Israel that let them become the "Old Testament."[40] In its beginnings

[36] This has been sufficiently highlighted, for example, in the studies of von Campenhausen, Metzger, and von Lips. On this point cf. also chap. 14 above.

[37] Cf. Baum 1997.

[38] Cf. Hengel 1994; Schneemelcher 1980.

[39] Cf. Hahn 2002, II, 111–42.

[40] Cf. M. Müller 1997. For the fundamental methodological issues as well as Paul's handling of Scripture, cf. also Schröter 1998d.

early Christianity can therefore be understood as a movement within Second Temple Judaism whose convictions concerning the meaning of Jesus led, as a consequence, to the separation from Judaism.

Thus, the formation of the New Testament canon was bound up from the beginning with the emergence of the Christian Bible as a whole. [366] For the authors of the New Testament, the Christ event can only be understood appropriately within this horizon of interpretation—just as the reverse is also true, namely that the meaning of the writings of Israel is first disclosed in the light of the Christ event. Therefore, for the Christian church the "Old Testament" was from the beginning a constituent part of the binding collection of writings, which was then defended in the dispute with Marcion and led to a fundamental setting of the course of action within the history of Christianity in the second century. In a theology of the New Testament this close relationship of the New Testament texts to the writings of Israel must be weighted in accordance with this.[41]

From this tradition-establishing function of the canon follows its meaning for the self-understanding of the Christian community.[42] With the canon a standard is created, to which from now on all theological conceptions know themselves to be obligated. The canon thus grounds a certain view of reality and history, which it simultaneously protects against competing claims—which is shown in the disputes of ancient theologians such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, or Origen with "heretical" views. The establishment of the canon is accordingly an expression of a more comprehensive process within which emerging Christianity committed itself to certain convictions that from then on formed the framework for its interpretation of reality and history.

In the New Testament section of the canon this can be seen in the fact that the writings that were included guaranteed the apostolic witness; with this they secured the continuity to the beginnings of the tradition in Jesus and the apostles and corresponded to the confession that was being formed in parallel. Hence the emergence of the binding, "canonical" collection of writings is closely linked with the processes of the development of the Trinitarian confession and the rejection of heretical understandings by the ancient church. In a theology of the New Testament this "anti-heretical effect" of the canon must be adequately taken into account.

Thus, central developments in the early church are reflected in the emergence of the New Testament canon as part of the Christian Bible. This can be demonstrated without difficulty on the New Testament part

[41] At this point it can only be indicated that according to the view advocated here this should not take place in the way that it does in the presentations of Peter Stuhlmacher and Hans Hübner.

[42] Cf. Assmann 1992, 125–29.

of the canon. The decisive tradition was secured through the tradition of Jesus in the fourfold form of the Gospels as well as through the letters of Paul and the remaining apostles. Beyond this, the [367] controversies with Marcion,[43] the Gnostic movements, and Montanism[44] show that this identity had to be fought for against a devaluation of the writings of Israel, against an abandonment of the relation to the earthly person of Jesus, and against a prophecy that was setting itself up as absolute. Accordingly, the canon does not ground, to quote Ernst Käsemann's dictum once again, the unity of the church (nor the diversity of the confessions, however).[45] But it does obligate the Christian faith to its beginnings and gives it contours through its agreement with the confession and through its profiling in conflicts with "heretics."

If one views the function of the New Testament canon as well as the biblical canon as a whole in this way, then certain ways of dealing with it are ruled out from the beginning: first a judgment such as that of Adolf von Harnack is ruled out, who thinks that the Protestant church should take leave of the Old Testament as a canonical document.[46] In the same way, the occasional demand for the elevation of apocryphal texts to the status of canonical writings, such as, for example, the *Gospel of Thomas*, is ruled out. Neither suggestion does justice to the canon's historical role of illustrating and legitimating the profile of the Christian faith through a certain corpus of writings and firmly establishing it through ecclesial use. Moreover, they contradict the fact that the canon is an entity that is relevant in terms of its effective history, whose scope may precisely not be truncated or expanded according to the prevailing theological conviction.

It also, however, rules out two other approaches: to judge the canon with Wrede as a dogma of the ancient church that has to be replaced by a historically reconstructed history of early Christian religion is shown to be just as unsatisfactory as to exaggerate with Stuhlmacher and Wilckens the unity of the writings gathered in it through a dogmatic standard, which transforms the historical findings into a theological judgment of truth.

Finally, there are no grounds for flattening out the diversity, differences, or contradictions—which are [368] found often enough, as is well known, in the canonical writings. Nor should judgments of weight be made

[43] For the discussion of the pointed theses of Harnack and von Campenhausen with regard to the role of Marcion for the formation of the canon cf. Ritter 1987.

[44] Cf. Paulsen 1997, 310–43.

[45] Käsemann 1964a; 1982.

[46] Von Harnack 1996 [1921/1924], 217–23; 1990, 133–38. As is well known, Harnack judged it to be a "consequence of a religious and ecclesial paralysis" that the Protestantism of the nineteenth century could not make up its mind to deprive the Old Testament of the status of a "canonical document."

between individual writings, between more or less "significant" ones. Both ways—the search for a "center of Scripture" or a "canon within the canon"—could not be more unsuited to do justice to the "canonical principle" according to which the New Testament writings *mutually and in this placement together* are an expression of Christian faith. A "canonical interpretation" of the New Testament writings, which is appropriate because it corresponds to the emergence of the New Testament canon, has to take its orientation, by contrast, from the criteria that played a leading role in its formation. In order to pursue this further we will consider two recent approaches in the following section.

3. On the way to a theology of the New Testament

In an interesting article Gerhard Sellin recently confronted the "dilemma of a present-day theology of the New Testament" with the concept of a "theology of the New Testament as a presentation of the symbolic world that is discernible in the New Testament writings."[47] According to Sellin, "a purely thematic systematization would lead to a false reduction," an argument that was already rightly advanced against the doctrinal-concept method. One must take into account the concrete linguistic form in which the New Testament authors expressed their content. This is fundamentally characterized by symbols, by which Sellin means signs "that transport meaning in the midst of an interpretive community and possess a surplus value in relation to the everyday meaning," thus they refer to another (in religious language: sacred) sphere, which they simultaneously represent. The New Testament texts are said to be permeated by such a symbolic use of language, as can be shown with the expression "cross," which stands for the history of Jesus and at the same time points beyond this.[48]

Ferdinand Hahn has devoted himself to the problem of a theology of the New Testament in the age of historical criticism in another manner and impressively presented his solution in a great work. The conception—it is unnecessary to stress its impressive unity and the stupendous erudition of its author—is divided into two steps, namely "Diversity of the New Testament" and "Unity of the New Testament." In this way the puzzling problem of [369] the historical differentiation alongside the simultaneous theological solidarity of the New Testament writings is to be solved.

In correspondence to this division, the canon question comes into view from two perspectives. Hahn deals first with the relationship of the New Testament writings to the apocryphal writings and to the Apostolic Fathers

[47] Sellin 2004.
[48] Sellin 2004, 117–18.

in the first part, in the short paragraph 42: "Canonical and non-canonical writings."[49] With regard to the canon, Hahn judges that it is "undoubtedly a decision of the church," which builds, however, on the prior "preservation and transmission of the Jesus tradition," on the composition of letters and gospels, and on the initial collection of early Christian writings, and stands "in connection with the life of the church." To this extent it presents a consequence, "which thoroughly corresponds to the intention of the writings that were thereby united" (736). The Apostolic Fathers are to be considered, together with the late writings of the New Testament, as "writings of the transitional period." By contrast, the apocryphal literature is "to be left aside in the context of a New Testament theology, since it cannot belong to the foundation of faith on account of its overall tendency" (741).

In the second part, subtitled "Thematic Presentation," Hahn comments on the canon question at two points within paragraph 1: "Definition of the task." First he deals with the relationship between a theology of the New Testament and a history of early Christian religion. The two are categorically distinct from each other, since in a theology of the New Testament—as also in a history of early Christian theology—"the question of truth cannot be bracketed out." From this follows "as a matter of principle an orientation to the canon of the New Testament" (2). A little later the relationship between history of theology and theology is specified: a theology of the New Testament presupposes the history of theology and presents its necessary continuation by inquiring into the common structures of the faith witnesses of the New Testament (23). Alongside the aspects already mentioned, it is thereby decisive for the orientation to the canon that the writings taken up into the New Testament "all intend to hold fast to 'apostolic tradition' " and other documents "measured by the early Christian faith witness accepted as normative" are not to be viewed as equal in rank to the canonical ones (25). [370]

The programmatic remarks on the symbolic world of the early Christian texts in Sellin and the specification of the canon as a collection of normative faith witnesses of the church in Hahn are important impulses with regard to the conception of a theology of the New Testament. They make clear that—alongside the processes of differentiation within early Christianity—converging aspects and unifying tendencies can be discerned. This includes first—as Sellin points out—symbols that indicate a common understanding of reality possessed by those who believed in

[49] Hahn 2002, 1, 734–42 (§42). Since the concern in the first part, as shown by the subtitle, is with a "history of early Christian theology," it would be more appropriate to speak with Lührmann 2000; 2004 of writings that *became* New Testament writings or apocryphal ones. As is well known, it is even the case that the compilation of the "Apostolic Fathers" first originates from the seventeenth century, as Hahn also explicitly indicates.

Jesus Christ. This includes in addition—as Hahn points out—those developments through which the early Church obligated itself in the selection of binding writings to the early Christian faith witness, as it was held fast to in the apostolic tradition.

However, in both Sellin and Hahn a presentation of these very developments that led to the emergence of the New Testament is lacking. The reference in Hahn to the "connection with the life of the church" and the holding fast to the apostolic tradition are undoubtedly accurate. But they do not work out the characteristic features that are decisive for the differentiation of various groups of writings and for the formation of a "canonical" collection of writings as an expression of tradition and confession. Here, however, a substantial step is skipped in Hahn's conception in the transition from a history of early Christian theology to a systematic presentation of the contents of the New Testament writings, namely a consideration of the processes through which *canonical* writings came into being from the relevant theological conceptions of early Christianity, writings upon which Christian theology and church have been based ever since. The criteria that aid his development of the "unity of the New Testament" in the second volume are therefore not obtained from the emergence of the New Testament either—thus they are not obtained from the *historical formation of this unity.* Rather, Hahn proceeds from a history of early Christian theology to the systematic presentation without specifically considering the developments through which *canonical writings of the Christian church* came into being *from historical documents of early Christianity.*

For this one would need to consider the aforementioned internal and external impulses that worked together in the development of the New Testament canon: the securing of continuity to the beginnings and with this the founding of a tradition of their own, recourse to the history and writings of Israel, connection between "canon" and confession, as well as demarcation from "heretical" interpretations. This can be illustrated [371] with reference to the Lukan Doppelwerk:[50] Luke composed his work as two parts of a presentation in which the development from Jesus via the early witnesses up to Paul is described. In the process of canonization, the Gospel of Luke then became part of the four-gospels collection, whereas Acts was taken up into the canon independently from it and together with the "Catholic Letters" and thereby obtained a function that reaches beyond the continuation of the Gospel of Luke, as a history of the first decades of the church. It now presents—beyond its original intention—the foundational narrative for early Christianity on the connection between Jesus, the apostles, and Paul, and in this way relates the various writings—gospels,

[50] Cf. chap. 13 above.

letters of apostles, and letters of Paul—to one another. Finally, both works were vouched for by the authority of Paul, since Luke was regarded as his companion in the early church. This makes clear by way of example that the canon is the result of a complex process within which those writings emerged as binding that agreed with the confession, were vouched for by apostolic authority, and were read in the early communities.[51]

With this the fundamental importance of the canon for a theology of the New Testament becomes clear: a theology of the New Testament must work out the contents that are characteristic for the writings gathered in the New Testament—namely in this arrangement! Both the aspects inherent in these writings themselves and the aspects that are guiding in their compilation as "canonical writings" must be taken into account. Attention must also be given to the extent to which the criteria of agreement with the confession and apostolicity were regarded as fulfilled for the respective writings from the perspective of the ancient church. Finally, one must take account of the fact that the New Testament canon unifies a variety of early Christian faith witnesses in itself because it came about not through a formal fixation but through the exclusion of those writings that did not satisfy the aforementioned criteria. Since the canon came about in this way, a New Testament theology has to make visible the common contours within which these writings move, without thereby wanting to systematize their respective particularities more strongly than they themselves allow. Differences and contradictions between the New Testament writings explain themselves against the background of the history of the canon in such a way that they do not call into question the core of [372] the Christian faith that comes to expression in the confession. Therefore they can also continue to stand alongside one another in a theology of the New Testament.

Finally, the concern is thus with the apprehension of the historical character of Christianity as a religion with a broad, but not contourless, maneuvering space for interpretation. In order to pace off this space—not least from an effective-history perspective—an orientation to the criteria that resulted from the demarcation of a binding corpus of writings and led to the formation of the biblical canon is historically and theologically necessary.[52] Here the tracing out of those history-of-theology developments through which different directions emerged within early Christianity in the second and third century—and beyond—serves the purpose of working

[51] Cf. Metzger 1987, 251–54.

[52] Against the background of the understanding of the canon presented above, the formulation of Assmann 1992, 129, can also be expressed with regard to New Testament science: "The task of the historical sciences can no longer be seen in tearing down the boundaries of the canon, in 'undermining' (Gadamer), but in reflecting and in making them known in their respective normative and formative structures." Cf. Assmann 2011, 110.

out the aspects that proved to be defining and indispensible and therefore possess a leading function in a theology of the New Testament.

This leads to the last aspect to be mentioned here. As has already become clear, the calling into question of the canon is attributable to a development in which historical-critical Bible science was caught up in the wake of historicism. The canon was thereby inappropriately judged as an arbitrary dogmatic imposition, with whose dismissal the idea of a theology of the New Testament simultaneously becomes invalid. If the presuppositions of this position are seen to be inadequate, then it becomes simultaneously clear that the epistemological and hermeneutical aspects of the appropriation of the past, which were presented in the first chapters of this book, are important also and precisely in relation to the conception of a theology of the New Testament. New Testament science *as a theological discipline* has to make the early Christian texts comprehensible as parts of the process that led in the first three centuries to the formation of the Christian church. A theology of the New Testament has the task of placing the witnesses gathered in the New Testament in relationship to one another with regard to the common understanding of the act of God in Jesus Christ that comes to expression in them and of interpreting them as documents that have contributed to the formation of Christian identity. [373]

In this way the New Testament canon comes into view as a document through which the emerging church created a corpus of writings with whose help it preserved the continuity to its beginnings and protected and defended its foundational tradition, which was also held fast to in the confession. Accordingly, its function for a theology of the New Testament is not reduced to a "collecting pool" of those conceptions that would then have to be presented separately and which one would have to go beyond if necessary. Rather, the historical and theological meaning of the canon is first brought to expression when the canon is acknowledged as a history-of-theology document and the writings found in it are interpreted on this basis *in their canonical context.*

4. Historical Jesus and New Testament theology

What has been carried out thus far can be illustrated by way of example with the quest for the historical Jesus. This is suitable for concretization because it stands at the beginning of historical-critical Bible science, has accompanied it since then, and has in recent years—starting from the Anglophone sphere—experienced a new upswing, as is well known.[53] With regard to a theology of the New Testament, the question arises of whether

[53] Cf. for instance Telford 1994; Meier 1999.

or to what extent the "historical Jesus" belongs in such a venture. As is well known, this problem has been intensively discussed since the famous sentences with which Rudolf Bultmann begins his theology.[54] In the background stands the question of whether the Christian faith is to be founded directly on the activity of Jesus or on the witness that proclaims him as the representative of God and the one who has been raised from the dead and exalted by God.[55]

Here it should first be kept in mind that a distinction must be made between the historically reconstructed Jesus and the earthly Jesus to which the New Testament authors refer. Behind the texts of the New Testament there does not stand, of course, the kind of picture that is constructed with today's methods of historical criticism. Rather, the New Testament authors [374] rework, each in their own way, the information available to them about the activity and fate of Jesus into pictures that are shaped by the belief that God's salvation has become manifest in his coming. This neither means that it would therefore be impossible to draw a historical-critical picture of Jesus,[56] nor that the earthly Jesus would thus be unimportant for a theology of the New Testament. At this point Bultmann undoubtedly expressed an overly sharp disjunction between the proclamation of Jesus and the early Christian "kerygma," which has often been modified and relativized in subsequent conceptions.[57] It became clear that Bultmann gave too little weight to the importance of the earthly activity of Jesus for the formation of early Christian theology. Nevertheless, his insight remains correct that within a theology of the New Testament, Jesus is important only from the perspective of the faith witnesses and not independently from them. This means on the other hand that a historical-critical conception of the activity and fate of Jesus cannot form the foundation of a New Testament theology, but only the reference to the earthly Jesus in the faith witnesses of early Christianity can do so.

The New Testament texts are based on the conviction that the coming of Jesus was a revelation of God. His person and his activity are therefore interpreted with the aid of such categories that move him into

[54] Bultmann 1984 [1948–1953], 1–2 (cf. 2007, 3): "The proclamation of Jesus belongs to the presuppositions of the theology of the New Testament and is not a part of this itself. For the theology of the New Testament consists in the unpacking of the ideas in which the Christian faith secures its object, its foundation and its consequences. But Christian faith did not exist until there was a Christian kerygma."

[55] Cf. Hahn 1994.

[56] On this cf. the recent Jesus presentations of, e.g., Dunn 2003b, Ebner 2003, or Freyne 2004. I have presented my own conception in Schröter 2010 [2006].

[57] Cf. Conzelmann 1987b, as well as the conceptions of Goppelt 1975/1976; 1981; Lohse 1998; and Hahn 2002.

immediate proximity to God and describe his sending into the world as an event through which God offers his salvation to human beings. This could be unpacked in different ways. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is the Son of Man who authoritatively worked upon the earth and to whose coming again for judgment one looks ahead. Paul sets forth his Christology from the point of view of the exalted Son of God who rules as Kyrios and who already opens up in the present, through participation in his death, the possibility of passing through the last judgment. His earthly activity is only of secondary interest. In Hebrews the earthly Jesus appears as the one who became like human beings in everything, in 1 Peter as the one who suffered in an exemplary manner. Neither text is concerned with references to actual events from the life of Jesus, but rather with characteristic features of his earthly existence, namely his lowliness and his suffering. John describes Jesus as the Logos sent by God, who opens up the way to the Father and in whom one must believe in order to cross from the sphere of sin into that of light and truth. [375]

This spectrum of references to the earthly Jesus in the New Testament, which can only be indicated here, shows that the earthly—not the "historical"!—Jesus has entered into the early Christian theologies in different ways. As a common characteristic feature one can see that while references to the earthly activity and fate of Jesus do not always stand in the foreground, the humanity of Jesus is constantly presupposed. Thus, not the *historical* but only the diversely taken up *earthly* Jesus is the object of a theology of the New Testament.

With regard to the formation of the canon, it is important that the confession of the true humanity of Jesus was a criterion for whether writings were accepted as binding or rejected. Here, controversies with various kinds of docetic Christologies, which are already intimated in 1 and 2 John and will later come to a head, stand in the background. As is well known, one of the most serious problems of the ancient church theology was located at this point, which settled, after long disputes, on the formula that full divinity and full humanity is equally to be ascribed to Jesus. If then adherence to the complete humanity of Jesus was an important feature of the formation of the ancient church confession, then it is immediately evident that only such writings were accepted as binding in which this confession found expression. Thus, the already mentioned connection between canon and confession provides a criterion for a theology of the New Testament: God's act of salvation in Jesus Christ is tied to Jesus having become truly and completely human. For this reason a writing such as the Gospel of John, in which divinity and humanity are related to each other in a tension-filled way, could find a place in the New Testament, whereas the *Gospel of Peter* or the *Apocalypse of Peter* from Nag Hammadi do not agree

with this confession and therefore also could not claim a place among the accepted writings.[58]

5. Conclusion

At the conclusion of these remarks I will formulate the consequences of the reflections presented here in six theses.

(1) With regard to the foundation of a theology of the New Testament, a lack of clarity can be observed at present in the specification of the relationship between a theology of the New Testament and a history of early Christian theology or religion. [376] This can be traced back to the fact that the tension inherent in a theology of the New Testament between the diversity of early Christian *theologies* and the unity of a *theology* of the New Testament tends to be overcome as a rule by the dissolution of one of the two poles in favor of the other one. By contrast, it appears to bring us further to understand this tension as a necessary, dynamic, and productive tension whose source lies in the relationship between the historical emergence and subsequent canonization of the New Testament writings.

(2) The New Testament canon obtains new relevance as a witness for the process of the emergence of the Christian faith. In this process, fundamental decisions about the shape of Christianity were made, which found expression both in the Christian confession and in the form of the New Testament canon. The canon thus serves the preservation and defense of the fundamental Christian tradition. Therefore, a theology of the New Testament cannot be replaced by a history of early Christian religion, for it is a fundamental task of New Testament science to interpret the writings that have become canonical as witnesses that continue to be a valid standard for Christianity.

(3) The canonical status of the New Testament writings cannot be secured by appealing to their inspiration. In this case we are dealing rather with a circular argument, in which the special place of these writings, which they first obtained in the context of the emergence of the canon, is already presupposed. Against this it is essential for a theology of the New Testament to consider the developments through which *canonical writings of the Christian church* came into being *from historical documents of early Christianity.*

(4) A theology of the New Testament thus moves between the two poles of the emergence of the New Testament writings and their subsequent status as binding, canonical witnesses. It therefore has to take into account the criteria that led to the distinction between accepted, disputed,

[58] Cf. chaps. 4 and 14 above.

and rejected writings. The texts of the early Christian authors ought to be presented in such a way that they can be recognized as statements within a shared horizon of faith. The action of the God of Israel in Jesus Christ is thus to be presented in such a way that a coherence under the prevailing conditions of understanding is established. Such a coherence, which does not already emerge through a historical analysis of the individual writings but only through their interpretation together as writings of a corpus testifying to the Christian faith, simultaneously distinguishes a theology of the New Testament from a history of early Christian religion. Therefore, a [377] canonical interpretation of the New Testament texts necessarily goes beyond its historical analysis and thus becomes an "artistic achievement" of understanding in the sense of Schleiermacher.[59]

(5) Applied to the question of the historical Jesus within a theology of the New Testament this means that a historical reconstruction of the activity and fate of Jesus cannot be the foundation of a theology of the New Testament but only the reference to the earthly Jesus in the New Testament writings. These references take place in different ways, but they agree that the humanity of Jesus stands beyond question and is also defended in controversial situations. This has its analogy in the christological controversies of the ancient church, in which the true humanity of Jesus was adhered to against its contestation. Here a standard for the demarcation of accepted writings from rejected writings is simultaneously obtained, which must be made fruitful for a theology of the New Testament.

(6) In this way a theology of the New Testament works out the contribution of New Testament science to Christian theology. Schleiermacher already recognized that the "purely philological and historical yield that the canon promises . . . [is] not rich enough to attract a person to such an occupation."[60] Only when New Testament science remains obligated to the question of how a Christianity founded on the New Testament writings can take shape is its place in the spectrum of the theological subjects materially grounded. With this it simultaneously makes its contribution to Christian theology as the critical working out of the faith and life of Christians.

[59] Cf. Schleiermacher (cited according to Scholz 1935), §132: "The perfect understanding of a speech or writing is an artistic achievement, and requires a doctrine of art or a technique, which we designate with the expression hermeneutics." Cf. Schleiermacher 2011, 53.

[60] Schleiermacher (cited according to Scholz 1935), §147. Cf. Schleiermacher 2011, 57.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

Abramowski, Luise. 1983. " 'Die Erinnerungen der Apostel' bei Justin." Pages 341–53 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1991. "The 'Memoirs of the Apostles' in Justin." Pages 323–35 in *The Gospel and the Gospels.* Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. Translated by J. Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Aland, Kurt. 1976. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri 1.* PTS 18. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1981. "Der neue 'Standard-Text' in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln." Pages 257–75 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger.* Edited by E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. 1989a. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik.* 2 ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

———. 1989b. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism.* Translated by E. F. Rhodes. 2 ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Albertz, Rainer. 1983. "Die 'Antrittspredigt Jesu' im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund." *ZNW* 74: 182–206.

Alexander, Loveday C. A. 1993a. "Acts and Ancient Intellectual Biography." Pages 31–63 in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by B. Winter and A. D. Clark. Grand Rapids: Carlisle.

———. 1993b. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1.* SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. "The Preface to Acts and the Historians." Pages 73–103 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts.* Edited by B. Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1998. "Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts." *NTS* 44: 380–99.

———. 2000. "What If Luke Never Met Theophilos?" *BibInt* 8: 161–70.

Allison, Dale C. 1982. "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels." *NTS* 28: 1–32.

———. 1997. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.
Ankersmit, Franklin R. 1983. *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. Den Haag: Nijhoff.
———. 1994. *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 1997. "Die drei Sinnbildungen der Geschichtsschreibung." Pages 98–117 in *Historische Sinnbildung. Problemstellungen, Zeitkonzepte, Wahrnehmungshorizonte, Darstellungsstrategie*. Edited by K. Müller and J. Rüsen. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
Argyle, Aubrey William. 1973–1974. "The Greek of Luke and Acts." *NTS* 20: 441–45.
Arnold, Clinton E. 1996. "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: Stoicheia as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3,9." *NovT* 38: 55–76.
Assmann, Aleida. 1980. *Die Legitimität der Fiktion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der literarischen Kommunikation*. München: Fink.
———. 1991. "Zur Metaphorik der Erinnerung." Pages 13–35 in *Mnemosyne. Formen und Funktionen der kulturellen Erinnerung*. Edited by A. Assmann and D. Harth. Frankfurt: Fischer.
Assmann, Jan. 1988. "Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität." Pages 9–19 in *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Edited by J. Assmann and T. Hölscher. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
———. 1992. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck.
———. 2001. *Moses der Ägypter. Entzifferung einer Gedächtnisspur*. 3 ed. München: Hanser.
———. 2003. *Die mosaische Unterscheidung oder der Preis des Monotheismus*. München: Hanser.
———. 2010. *The Price of Monotheism*. Translated by Robert Savage. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
———. 2011. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Translated by D. H. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Atkinson, Kenneth. 1997. "On Further Defining the First-Century CE Synagogue: Fact or Fiction? A Rejoinder to H. C. Kee." *NTS* 43: 491–502.
Attridge, Harold W. 1984a. "Historiography." Pages 157–84 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M. E. Stone. CRINT II/2. Assen: Van Gorcum.
———. 1984b. "Josephus and His Works." Pages 185–232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M. E. Stone. CRINT II/2. Assen: Van Gorcum.
Aune, David E. 1987. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
Auwers, Jean-Marie, ed. 2003. *The Biblical Canons (Fiftieth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense)*. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Bachmann, Michael. 1993. "Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus." *TZ* 49: 1–33.
———. 1999. *Antijudaismus im Galaterbrief? Exegetische Studien zu einem polemischen Schreiben und zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus*. NTOA 40. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
———, ed. 2005. *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive. Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*. WUNT 182. Tübingen: Mohr.

Baldauf, Christa. 2000. "Sprachliche Evidenz metaphorischer Konzeptualisierung. Probleme und Perspektiven der kognitivistischen Metapherntheorie im Anschluss an George Lakoff und Mark Johnson." Pages 117–32 in *Bildersprache verstehen. Zur Hermeneutik der Metapher und anderer bildlicher Sprachformen*. Edited by R. Zimmermann. Übergänge 38. München: Fink.

Bammel, Ernst. 1959–1960. "Gottes Διαθήκη (Gal. III. 15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken." *NTS* 6: 313–19.

Barclay, John. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Barrett, C. K. 1973. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: Black.

———. 1987. "Acts and Christian Consensus." Pages 19–33 in *Context: Festschrift for P. J. Borgen*. Edited by P. W. Bøckmann and R. E. Kristiansen. Relieff 24. Trondheim: Tapir.

———. 1992. "The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts? Some Reflections." Pages 1451–66 in *The Four Gospels: Essays in Honor of F. Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1994/1998. *The Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

———. 1996. "The First New Testament." *NovT* 38: 94–104.

Barth, Ulrich. 1991. *Die Christologie Emanuel Hirschs. Eine systematische und problemgeschichtliche Darstellung ihrer geschichtsmethodologischen, erkenntniskritischen und subjektivitätstheoretischen Grundlagen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Batey, Richard. 1984. "Jesus and the Theatre." *NTS* 30: 563–74.

Bauer, Georg Lorenz. 1796. *Theologie des alten Testaments oder Abriß der religiösen Begriffe der alten Hebräer*. Leipzig: Weygand.

———. 1800–1802. *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Bengandschen Buchhandlung.

———. 1838. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. London: Charles Fox.

Bauer, Walter. 1964 [1934]. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Edited by G. Strecker. 2 ed. BHT 10. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1971. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Translated by a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Edited by R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1988. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Edited by K. Aland and B. Aland. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Baum, Armin D. 1997. "Literarische Echtheit als Kanonkriterium in der Alten Kirche." *ZNW* 88: 97–110.

Baumgartner, Hans Michael, and Jörn Rüsen. 1982. "Erträge der Diskussion." Pages 691–701 in *Erzählforschung. Ein Symposium*. Edited by E. Lämmert. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. 1864. *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*. Edited by F. F. Baur. Leipzig: Fues.

Bechard, Dean P. 2000. *Paul Outside the Walls: A Study of Luke's Socio-Geographical Universalism in Acts 14:8-20*. AnBib 143. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Becker, Jürgen. 1989. *Paulus, Apostel der Völker*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1996. *Jesus von Nazaret.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1998. *Der Brief an die Galater.* 18 ed. NTD 8/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Belle, Gilbert van, ed. 2007. *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.* BETL 200. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Belleville, Linda L. 1986. " 'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3.21–4.11." *JSNT* 26: 53–78.
Bendemann, Reinhard von. 2003. " 'Theologie des Neuen Testaments' oder 'Religionsgeschichte des Frühchristentums'?" *VF* 48: 3–28.
Berger, Klaus. 1987. *Einführung in die Formgeschichte.* Tübingen: Francke.
———. 1995. *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums. Theologie des Neuen Testament.* 2 ed. Tübingen: Francke.
Bernhardt, Reinhold, and Ulrike Link-Wieczorek, eds. 1999. *Metapher und Wirklichkeit. Die Logik der Bildhaftigkeit im Reden von Gott, Mensch und Natur. Festschrift für Dietrich Ritschl.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Bethge, Hans-Gebhard. 2003. "Nag Hammadi." Pages 20–25 in *RGG*[4] 6.
———. 2010. "Nag Hammadi." Pages 692–94 in *RPP* 8.
Betz, Hans Dieter. 1975. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *NTS* 21: 353–79.
———. 1979. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.
———. 1988. *Der Galaterbrief. Ein Kommentar zum Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Gemeinden in Galatien.* Translated by Sibylle Ann. München: Kaiser.
———. 1992. "Galatians, Epistle to the." Pages 872–75 in *ABD* 2.
Beyer, Hermann W. 1935. "ἕτερος." Pages 699–702 in *TWNT* 2.
———. 1964. "ἕτερος." Pages 702–4 in *TDNT* 2.
Beyer, Klaus. 1968. *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Band I: Satzlehre Teil 1.* 2 ed. SUNT 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Bichler, Reinhold, and Robert Rollinger. 2000. *Herodot.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Bieringer, Reimund, ed. 1996. *The Corinthian Correspondence.* BETL 25. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Bietenhard, Hans. 1977. "Die syrische Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Trajan." Pages 220–61 in *ANRW* II/8.
Black, Max. 1977. "More about Metaphor." *Dialectica* 31: 431–57.
Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Translated and revised by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 2001. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch.* Revised by F. Rehkopf. 18 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Blinzler, Josef. 1961. "Lexikalisches zu dem Terminus τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου bei Paulus." *AnBib* 17–18: 429–43.
Bockisch, Gabriele. 1984. "Herodot—Geschichten und Geschichtsschreiber." *Klio* 66: 488–501.
Bonneau, Normand. 1997. "The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3:10-14." *NovT* 39: 60–80.
Bösen, Willibald. 1998. *Galiläa—Lebensraum und Wirkungsfeld Jesu.* 2 ed. Freiburg: Herder.

Böttrich, Christfried. 2002. "Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien (Gal 2,11-21)." *BTZ* 19: 224–39.

Bousset, Wilhelm. 1965 [1913]. *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen bis Irenäus.* 5 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1970. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus.* Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon.

Bovon, François. 1989. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Lk 1,1–9,50.* EKKNT III/1. Zürich: Benziger.

———. 2002. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

Bradshaw, Paul F. 1992. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Brawley, Robert L. 1987. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. SBLMS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. 1985. "Das Markusevangelium als episodische Erzählung. Mit Überlegungen zum Aufbau des zweiten Evangeliums." Pages 137–69 in *Der Erzähler des Evangeliums. Methodische Neuansätze in der Markusforschung.* Edited by F. Hahn. SBS 118/119. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 1989. *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie.* WMANT 60. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 1992. "Vormarkinische Logientradition. Parallelen in der urchristlichen Briefliteratur." Pages 725–49 in *The Four Gospels: Essays in Honor of F. Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1993. "Das Markusevangelium als traditionsgebundene Erzählung? Anfragen an die Markusforschung der achtziger Jahre." Pages 77–110 in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by C. Focant. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1996. *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien. Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23 und den Adressaten des Galaterbriefes.* AGJU 38. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1999. "Mark and Galilee: Text World and Historical World." Pages 75–85 in *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures*. Edited by E. M. Meyers. DJS 1. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

———. 2000. "Gnädigstimmen und opferkultische Sühne im Urchristentum und seiner Umwelt." Pages 217–43 in *Opfer. Theologische und kulturelle Kontexte.* Edited by B. Janowski and M. Welker. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Breytenbach, Cilliers, and Jens Schröter, eds. 2004. *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung. Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher.* AGJU 57. Leiden: Brill.

Büchsel, Hermann M. F. 1933. "ἄλλος κτλ." Pages 264–67 in *TWNT* 1.

———. 1964. "ἄλλος κτλ." Pages 264–67 in *TDNT* 1.

Bultmann, Rudolf. 1955. "The Problem of Hermeneutics." Pages 267–68 in *Essays Philosophical and Theological*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. London: SCM Press.

———. 1962. *Jesus and the Word*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

———. 1963. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. New York: Harper & Row.

———. 1966. "Is Presupposition less Exegesis Possible?" Pages 289–96 in *Existence*

and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann. Selected, translated, and introduced by S. M. Ogden. New York: World.
———. 1967. "Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus." Pages 445–69 in *Exegetica. Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1983 [1926]. *Jesus*. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1984 [1948–1953]. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by O. Merk. 9 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1993 [1933]. "Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments." Pages 245–67 in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Vol. 1. 9 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1995 [1921]. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. 10 ed. FRLANT 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 2002. *Neues Testament und christliche Existenz*. Edited by A. Lindemann. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 2007. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Vols. 1–2. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.
Burchard, Christoph. 1970. *Der dreizehnte Zeuge. Traditions—und kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Lukas' Darstellung der Frühzeit des Paulus*. FRLANT 103. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 1996. "Nicht aus Werken des Gesetzes gerecht, sondern aus Glauben an Jesus Christus—seit wann?" Pages 405–15 in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel. Bd. 3: Frühes Christentum*. Edited by H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1997. "Glaubensgerechtigkeit als Weisung der Tora bei Paulus." Pages 341–62 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums. Festschrift für Otfried Hofius*. Edited by C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein, and H. Lichtenberger. BZNW 86. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Burkhardt, Helmut. 1974. "Motive und Maßstäbe der Kanonbildung nach dem Canon Muratori." *TZ* 30: 207–11.
Burton, Ernest de Witt. 1964 [1921]. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Bussmann, Claus, and Walter Radl, eds. 1991. *Der Treue Gottes trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas. Festschrift für Gerhard Schneider*. Freiburg: Herder.
Cadbury, Henry J. 1919. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke. I: The Diction of Luke and Acts*. HTS 6. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School.
———. 1922a. "Appendix C: Commentary on the Preface of Luke." Pages 489–510 in *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume II: Prolegomena II: Criticism*. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. London: Macmillan.
———. 1922b. "The Identity of the Editor of Luke and Acts. I. The Tradition." Pages 209–64 in *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume II: Prolegomena II: Criticism*. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. London: Macmillan.
———. 1925. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. I." *JBL* 44: 214–27.
———. 1926. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. II. Recent Arguments for Medical Language." *JBL* 45: 190–209.
———. 1927. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: Macmillan.
———. 1933. "Note XXXII: The Speeches in Acts." Pages 402–27 in *The Beginnings*

of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume V: Additional Notes to the Commentary. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. London: Macmillan.

———. 1966. "Four Features of Lucan Style." Pages 87–102 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert.* Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

Campenhausen, Hans von. 1968. *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. BHT 39. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1972a. "Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum." *ZNW* 63: 210–53.

———. 1972b. *The Formation of the Christian Bible.* Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Cancik, Hubert. 1970. *Mythische und historische Wahrheit. Interpretation zu Texten der hethitischen, biblischen und griechischen Historiographie.* SBS 48. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Cancik, Hubert, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer, eds. 1996. *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel. Bd. 3: Frühes Christentum.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Casey, Robert P., Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake. 1937. *Quantulacumque: Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake.* London: Christophers.

Cassirer, Ernst. 1983 [1956]. "Sprache und Mythos." Pages 71–158 in *Wesen und Wirkung des Symbolbegriffs.* 7 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Chancey, Mark A. 2002. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee.* SNTSMS 118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2005. *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus.* SNTSMS 134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Charlesworth, James H. 1989. *Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries.* ABRL. New York: Doubleday.

———, ed. 1992. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

Chilton, Bruce, and Craig A. Evans, eds. 1994. *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* NTTS 19. Leiden: Brill.

———, eds. 1998. *Authenticating the Words of Jesus.* NTTS 28,1. Leiden: Brill

———, eds. 1999. *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus.* NTTS 28,2. Leiden: Brill.

Clark, Albert C. 1933. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Classen, Carl Joachim. 1991. "Paulus und die antike Rhetorik." *ZNW* 82: 1–33.

Claussen, Carsten. 2002. *Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagogue. Das hellenistisch-jüdische Umfeld der frühchristlichen Gemeinden.* SUNT 27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Collins, John J. 1992. "The Son of Man in First Century Judaism." *NTS* 38: 448–66.

Conrat, Max. 1904. "Das Erbrecht im Galaterbrief (3,15–4,7)." *ZNW* 5: 204–27.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1972. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 2 ed. HNT 7. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1987a. *Acts of the Apostles.* Translated by J. Limburg, A. T. Kraabel, and D. H. Juel. Edited by E. J. Epp and C. R. Matthews. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1987b. *Grundriß der Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Conzelmann, Hans, and Andreas Lindemann. 2004. *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament.* 14 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

Corbo, Virgilio. 1992. “Capernaum.” Pages 866–69 in *ABD* 1.
Cranfield, C. E. B. 1998/2001 [1954/1979]. *The Epistle to the Romans.* 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Cranford, Michael. 1994. “The Possibility of Perfect Obedience: Paul and an Implied Premise in Galatians 3:10 and 5:3.” *NovT* 36: 242–58.
Crossan, John Dominic. 1991. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
———. 1997. “Our Own Faces in Deep Wells: A Future for Historical Jesus Research.” Religion and Postmodernism: An International Colloquium at Villanova University, September 25–27 (Manuscript).
Crossan, John Dominic, and Jonathan L. Reed. 2001. *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Texts.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
———. 2004. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus’ Apostle Opposed Rome’s Empire with God’s Kingdom.* New York: HarperSanFrancisco.
Cullmann, Oscar. 1954. “Πέτρος, Κηφᾶς.” Pages 99–112 in *TWNT* 6.
———. 1968. “Πέτρος, Κηφᾶς.” Pages 100–112 in *TDNT* 6.
———. 1975 [1957]. *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1986. *The Christology of the New Testament.* London: SCM Press.
Dahl, Nils Alstrup (revised by D. H. Juel). 1992. “Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus.” Pages 382–403 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
Danker, Frederick W. 2000. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature.* 3 ed. Revised and edited by F. W. Danker, based on Walter Bauer’s *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur,* 6 ed. Edited by K. Aland and B. Aland. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Danneberg, Lutz, Andreas Graeser, and Klaus Petrus, eds. 1995. *Metapher und Innovation. Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft.* Berliner Reihe philosophischer Studien 16. Bern: Haupt.
Danto, Arthur. 1965. *Analytical Philosophy of History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deissman, Adolf. 1903. “ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Eine lexikalische Studie.” *ZNW* 4: 193–212.
Delling, Gerhard. 1964. “στοιχέω κτλ.” Pages 666–87 in *TWNT* 7.
———. 1971. “στοιχέω κτλ.” Pages 666–87 in *TDNT* 7.
———. 1987. *Die Bewältigung der Diasporasituation durch das hellenistische Judentum.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Denis, Albert-Marie. 1970. *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca.* PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill.
Deutschmann, Anton. 2001. *Synagoge und Gemeindebildung. Christliche Gemeinde und Israel am Beispiel von Apg 13,42-52.* BU 30. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
Dibelius, Martin. 1926. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1929. “Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien.” *ThR* NF 1: 185–216.
———. 1953. “Jungfrausohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukasevangelium.” Pages 1–78 in *Botschaft und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze I.* Edited by G. Bornkamm. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1956. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles.* Translated by M. Ling. Edited by H. Greeven. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

———. 1966 [1913]. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Edited by Günther Bornkamm. 5 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1968. *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte.* Edited by H. Greeven. 5 ed. FRLANT 60. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1971. *From Tradition to Gospel.* Translated by B. L. Woolf. London: James Clarke.

Dietzfelbinger, Christian. 1997. "Sühnetod im Johannesevangelium?" Pages 65–76 in *Evangelium—Schriftauslegung—Kirche. Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher.* Edited by J. Ådna. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Dinkler, Erich. 1967 [1953/1955]. "Der Brief an die Galater. Zum Kommentar von Heinrich Schlier." Pages 270–82 in *Signum Crucis. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur christlichen Archäologie.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Donaldson, Terence L. 1986. "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Gal 3.13-14." *NTS* 32: 94–112.

Dormeyer, Detlev. 1987. "Die Kompositionsmetapher 'Evangelium Jesu Christi, des Sohnes Gottes' Mk 1,1. Ihre theologische und literarische Aufgabe in der Jesus-Biographie des Markus." *NTS* 33: 452–68.

———. 1999. *Das Markusevangelium als Idealbiographie von Jesus Christus, dem Nazarener.* SBB 43. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Droysen, Johann Gustav. 1897. *Outline of the Principles of History (Grundriss der Historik).* Translated by E. B. Andrews. 3 ed. Boston: Ginn.

———. 1977. *Historik. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe von Peter Leyh*. Stuttgart: Frommann.

du Toit, David S.. 2002. "Erneut auf der Suche nach Jesus. Eine kritische Bestandsaufnahme der Jesusforschung am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts." Pages 91–134 in *Jesus im 21. Jahrhundert. Bultmanns Jesusbuch und die heutige Jesusforschung.* Edited by U. H. J. Körtner. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Dunn, James D. G. 1988. *Romans 9–16.* WBC 38. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books.

———. 1990. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law. Studies in Mark and Galatians.* Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

———. 1993. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* BNTC. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

———. 1994. "Jesus Tradition in Paul." Pages 155–78 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. NTTS 19. Leiden: Brill.

———, ed. 1996. *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1997. "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in Acts." Pages 363–78 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums. Festschrift für Otfried Hofius*. Edited by C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein, and H. Lichtenberger. BZNW 86. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 1999a. "Can the Third Quest Hope to Succeed?" Pages 31–48 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus.* NTTS 28,2. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1999b. "Who Did Paul Think He Was? A Study of Jewish-Christian Identity." *NTS* 45: 174–93.

———. 2003a. "Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition." *NTS* 49: 139–75.
———. 2003b. *Jesus Remembered*. CM 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
———. 2005a. "The Dialogue Progresses." Pages 389–401 in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive. Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*. Edited by M. Bachmann. WUNT 182. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 2005b. *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*. WUNT 185. Tübingen: Mohr.
Ebner, Martin. 2003. *Jesus von Nazaret in seiner Zeit. Sozialgeschichtliche Zugänge*. SBS 196. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
Eco, Umberto. 1991. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
———. 1992a. *Die Grenzen der Interpretation*. Translated by G. Memmert. München: Hanser.
———. 1992b. "Interpretation and History." Pages 23–43 in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Edited by S. Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1994. *Lector in fabula. Die Mitarbeit der Interpretation in erzählenden Texten*. Translated by H.-G. Held. 2 ed. München: Hanser.
———. 1996. "Interpretation und Geschichte." Pages 29–51 in *Zwischen Autor und Text. Interpretation und Überinterpretation*. Edited by U. Eco. München: Hanser.
Eddy, Paul Rhodes. 1996. "Jesus as Diogenes? Reflections on the Cynic Jesus Thesis." *JBL* 115: 449–69.
Eger, Otto. 1917/1918. "Rechtswörter und Rechtsbilder in den paulinischen Briefen." *ZNW* 18: 84–108.
Egermann, Franz. 1972. "Thukydides über die Art seiner Reden und über seine Darstellung der Kriegsereignisse." *Historia* 21: 575–602.
Ehrman, Bart D. 1993. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2003. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Elliot, James K. 1969. "The Use of ἕτερος in the New Testament." *ZNW* 60: 140–41.
Ellis, E. Earle. 2002. "The Synoptic Gospels and History." Pages 49–57 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. NTTS 28,2. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill.
Epp, Eldon J. 1999. "The Multivalence of the Term 'Original Text' in Textual Criticism." *HTR* 92: 245–81.
Evang, Martin. 1988. *Rudolf Bultmann in seiner Frühzeit*. Tübingen: Mohr.
Evans, Craig A. 1995. *Jesus and His Contemporaries. Comparative Studies*. AGJU 25. Leiden: Brill.
Ferguson, Everett. 1982. "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance." *StPatr* 18: 677–83.
———. 1993. Review of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. *JTS* 44: 696.
Fischer, J. A., ed. 1993. *Die Apostolische Väter*. SUC 1. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*. AB 28. New York: Doubleday.

———. 1989. “The Authorship of Luke-Acts Reconsidered.” Pages 1–26 in *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist.

———. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday.

Foakes-Jackson, Frederick J., and Kirsopp Lake, eds. 1922. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume II: Prolegomena II: Criticism*. London: Macmillan.

———, eds. 1933a. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume IV: English Translation and Commentary*. London. Macmillan.

———, eds. 1933b. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume V: Additional Notes to the Commentary*. London: Macmillan.

Foerster, Gideon. 1992. “The Ancient Synagogues of the Galilee.” Pages 289–319 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*. Edited by L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Franzmann, Majella. 1996. *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Frey, Jörg. 2002. “Der historische Jesus und der Christus der Evangelien.” Pages 273–336 in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung*. Edited by J. Schröter and R. Brucker. BZNW 114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2006. “Das Judentum des Paulus.” Pages 5–43 in *Paulus. Leben—Umwelt—Werk—Briefe*. Edited by O. Wischmeyer. Tübingen: Francke.

Freyne, Sean. 1980. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier.

———. 1988. *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1994. “The Geography, Politics, and Economics of Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus.” Pages 75–121 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. NTTS 19. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2000. *Galilee and Gospel: Collected Essays*. WUNT 125. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2004. *Jesus, a Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus Story*. London: T&T Clark.

Fried, Johannes. 1996. “Wissenschaft und Phantasie. Das Beispiel der Geschichte.” *HZ* 263: 291–316.

———. 2004. *Der Schleier der Erinnerung. Gründzüge einer historischen Memorik*. München: Beck.

Fuller, Reginald H. 1965. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. London: Scribner.

Gall, Lothar. 1997. “Das Argument der Geschichte. Überlegungen zum gegenwärtigen Standort der Geschichtswissenschaft.” *HZ* 264: 1–20.

Ganser-Kerperin, Heiner. 2000. *Das Zeugnis des Tempels. Studien zur Bedeutung des Tempelmotivs im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. NTA NF 36. Münster: Aschendorff.

Gathercole, Simon. 2005. “The Petrine and Pauline Sola Fide in Galatians 2.” Pages 309–27 in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive. Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*. Edited by M. Bachmann. WUNT 182. Tübingen: Mohr.

Gemünden, Petra von. 1993. *Vegetationsmetaphorik im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Eine Bildfelduntersuchung*. NTOA 18. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.

Gielen, Marlis. 1999. “Beten und Prophezeien mit unverhülltem Kopf? Die Kontroverse zwischen Paulus und der korinthischen Gemeinde um die Wahrung der Geschlechtsrollensymbolik in 1 Kor 11,2-16.” *ZNW* 90: 220–49.

Gnilka, Joachim. 1994. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* HTKNTSup 5. Freiburg: Herder.

Goertz, Hanz-Jürgen. 1995. *Umgang mit Geschichte. Eine Einführung in die Geschichtstheorie.* Reinbek: Rowohlt.

———. 2001. *Unsichere Geschichte. Zur Theorie historischer Referentialität.* Stuttgart: Reclam.

———. 2004. “Abschied von ‘historischer Wirklichkeit.’ Das Realismusproblem in der Geschichtswissenschaft.” Pages 1–18 in *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit. Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive.* Edited by J. Schröter. TBT 127. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gomme, Arnold W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Book I.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Goppelt, Leonhard. 1975/1976. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Edited by J. Roloff. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1981. *Theology of the New Testament.* Translated by J. E. Alsup. Edited by J. Roloff. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Grässer, Erich. 1969. “Das eine Evangelium. Hermeneutische Erwägungen zu Gal 1,6-10.” *ZTK* 66: 306–44.

———. 1977 [1956]. *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte.* BZNW 22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2001 [1979]. *Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte.* WUNT 137. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2002. *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, Kapitel 1,1–7,16.* ÖTK 8/1. Gütersloh: Gutersloher.

Gregory, Andrew. 2003. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus.* WUNT II/169. Tübingen: Mohr.

Haacker, Klaus. 1985. “Das Bekenntnis des Paulus zur Hoffnung Israels nach der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.” *NTS* 31: 437–51.

———. 1991. “ἕτερος.” Pages 64–66 in *EDNT* 2.

———. 1992. “ἕτερος.” Pages 165–67 in *EWNT* 2.

———. 1999. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* THKNT 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Habermas, Jürgen. “Dankesrede anlässlich der Verleihung des Friedenspreises des deutschen Buchhandels am 14. Oktober in der Frankfurter Paulskirche.” *Süddeutsche Zeitung,* October 15, 2001, 17.

Haenchen, Ernst. 1968. “Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte.” Pages 338–74 in *Die Bibel und wir. Gesammelte Aufsätze II.* Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Translated by R. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1977. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 7 ed. KEK 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hahn, Ferdinand. 1969. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity.* Translated by H. Knight and G. Ogg. New York: World.

———. 1985a. *Der Erzähler des Evangeliums. Methodische Neuansätze in der Markusforschung.* SBS 118/119. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 1985b. “Jesu Wort vom bergeversetzenden Glauben.” *ZNW* 76: 149–69.
———. 1994. “Vielfalt und Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Zum Problem einer neutestamentlichen Theologie.” *BZ* NF 38: 161–73.
———. 1995 [1965]. *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. 5 ed. FRLANT 83. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 2002. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr.
Hahneman, Geoffrey M. 1992. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Harnack, Adolf von. 1889. *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200. Theodor Zahn's Geschichte des neutestamentliche Kanons (Erste Band, Erste Hälfte)*. Freiburg: Mohr.
———. 1907. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament II: Sprüche und Reden Jesu. Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
———. 1908. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate.
———. 1909. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. I: Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas*. Vol. 1. 4 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1914. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament VI: Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
———. 1925. *New Testament Studies VI: The Origin of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate.
———. 1958. *History of Dogma*. Translated by N. Buchanan. Vol. 2. New York: Russell & Russell.
———. 1986. *What Is Christianity?* Translated by T. B. Saunders. Fortress Texts in Modern Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress.
———. 1990. *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*. Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth.
———. 1996 [1921/1924]. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche. Neue Studien zu Marcion*. 2 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
———. 1999. *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Edited and commented on by T. Rendtorff. Gütersloh: Gütersloher.
Hartenstein, Judith. 2000. *Die zweite Lehre. Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*. TU 146. Berlin: Akademie.
Hartlich, Christian, and Walter Sachs. 1952. *Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffs in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Mohr.
Harvey, Anthony E. 1982. “ ‘The Workman Is Worthy of His Hire’: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church.” *NovT* 24: 209–21.
Hatch, W. H. P. 1936. “The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament.” *HTR* 29: 133–51.
Havelaar, Henriette. 2003. “Die Apokalypse des Petrus (NHC VII,3).” Pages 591–600 in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*. Vol. 2. Edited by H.-M. Schenke, H.-G. Bethge, and U. U. Kaiser. GCS NF 12. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Haverkamp, Anselm, ed. 1996. *Theorie der Metapher*. 2 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Hays, Richard B. 1983. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.

Head, Peter. 2005. "Is P^4, P^{64}, and P^{67} the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat." *NTS* 51: 450–57.

Heckel, Theo K. 1999. *Vom Markusevangelium zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*. WUNT 120. Tübingen: Mohr.

Heil, Christoph. 2002. "Einleitung." Pages 11–28 in *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch*. Edited by P. Hoffman and C. Heil. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 2005. "Theophilos (Lk 1,3; Apg 1,1)." Pages 7–28 in *"Licht zur Erleuchtung der Heiden und Herrlichkeit für dein Volk Israel": Studien zum lukanischen Doppelwerk. Festschrift für J. Zmijewski*. Edited by C. G. Müller. BBB 151. Hamburg: Philo.

Heiligenthal, Roman. 1984. "Soziologische Implikationen der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre im Galaterbrief am Beispiel der 'Werke des Gesetzes.' Beobachtungen zur identitätsfindung einer frühchristlichen Gemeinde." *Kairós* 26: 38–53.

Hemer, Colin J. 1989. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic Historiography*. WUNT 49. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hengel, Martin. 1972. "Christologie und neutestamentliche Chronologie. Zu einer Aporie in der Geschichte des Urchristentums." Pages 43–67 in *Neues Testament und Geschichte. Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament. Festschrift für Oscar Cullmann*. Edited by H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

———. 1979. *Zur urchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag.

———. 1980. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

———. 1982. "Erwägungen zum Sprachgebrauch von Χριστός bei Paulus und in der vorpaulinischen Überlieferung." Pages 135–59 in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*. Edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK.

———. 1983. " 'Christos' in Paul." Pages 65–77, 179–88 in *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1984. Die *Evangelienüberschriften*. SHAW.PH 3. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

———. 1994. "Die Septuaginta als 'christliche Schriftsammlung,' ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons." Pages 182–284 in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer. WUNT 72. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1995. *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

———. 1996 [1966]. "Die Synogogeninschrift von Stobi." Pages 91–130 in *Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I*. WUNT 90. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. 2001. *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie. Vier Studien*. WUNT 138. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Henrich, Dieter, and Wolfgang Iser. 1983. *Funktionen des Fiktiven*. Poetik und Hermeneutik 10. München: Fink.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 1774. *Auch eine Philosophie der Geschichte zur Bildung der Menschheit: Beytrag zu vielen Beyträgen des Jahrhunderts*. [Riga]: [Hartknoch].

———. 1880. "Vom Erlöser der Menschen. Nach unsern drei ersten Evangelien."

Pages 137–252 in *Herders sämmtliche Werke.* Vol. 19. Edited by B. Suphan. Berlin: Weidmann.

———. 1968. "Yet Another Philosophy of History of the Education of Humanity." Translated by E. Herzfield. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

———. 1993. *Against Pure Reason: Writings on Religion, Language, and History.* Translated, edited, and with an introduction by M. Bunge. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

Hertfelder, Thomas. 1998. "Neue Ansichten vom Historismus." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 118: 361–73.

Hezser, Catherine. 1996. "Die Verwendung der hellenistischen Gattung Chrie im frühen Christentum und Judentum." *JSJ* 27: 371–439.

Hill, Charles E. 1998. "What Papias said about John (and Luke). A 'New' Papian Fragment." *JTS* 49: 582–629.

Hodgson, Peter C. 1966. *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur.* New York: Harper & Row.

Hoffman, Paul. 1995. "Tradition und Situation. Zur 'Verbindlichkeit' des Gebots der Feindesliebe in der synoptischen Überlieferung und in der gegenwärtigen Friedensdiskussion." Pages 3–61 in *Tradition und Situation. Studien zur Jesusüberlieferung in der Logienquelle und den synoptischen Evangelien.* NTA NF 28. Münster: Aschendorff.

Hoffman, Paul, and Christoph Heil. 2002. *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Hofius, Otfried. 2006. "Werke des Gesetzes. Untersuchungen zu der paulinischen Rede von den ἔργα νόμου." Pages 271–310 in *Paulus und Johannes.* Edited by D. Sänger and U. Mell. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2008. *Exegetische Studien.* WUNT 223. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hollander, Harm W. 2000. "The Words of Jesus: From Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q." *NovT* 42: 340–57.

Holmén, Tom. 1998. "Doubts about Double Dissimilarity: Restructuring the Main Criterion of Jesus-of-History Research." Pages 47–80 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus.* Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. NTTS 28,1. Leiden: Brill.

Holtz, Traugott. 1991. "Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition." Pages 380–93 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition.* Edited by H. Wansbrough. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Horst, Pieter W. van der. 1989. "The Altar of the 'Unknown God' in Athens (Acts 17:23) and the Cult of 'Unknown Gods' in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." Pages 1426–56 in *ANRW* II.18.2.

———. 1991. *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millennium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 BCE–700 CE).* Kampen: Kok Pharos.

Hübner, Hans. 1973. "Gal. 3,10 und die Herkunft des Paulus." *KD* 19: 215–31.

———. 1982. *Das Gesetz bei Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie.* 3 ed. FRLANT 119. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1986. *Law in Paul's Thought.* Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Hultgren, Stephen. 2002. *Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative.* BZNW 113. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Humbolt, Wilhelm von. 1969. “Ueber die Aufgabe des Geschichtsschreibers.” Pages 585–605 in *Werke in fünf Bänden. Volume 1: Schriften zur Anthropologie und Geschichte.* 2 ed. Edited by A. Flitner and K. Giel. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgeselleschaft.

Janowski, Bernd. 1997. “Er trug unsere Sünden—Stellvertretung nach Jes 52,13–53,12.” Pages 67–96 in *Stellvertretung. Alttestamentliche Studien zu einem theologischen Grundbegriff.* SBS 165. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 1998. “Biblische Theologie.” Pages 1544–49 in *RGG*[4] 1.

———. 2005. “Kanonhermeneutik. Eine problemgeschichtliche Skizze.” *BTZ* 22: 161–80.

———. 2007. “Biblical Theology.” Pages 83–86 in *RPP* 2.

Janowski, Bernd, and Michael Welker, eds. 2000. *Opfer. Theologische und kulturelle Kontexte.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Järvinen, Arto. 1999. “The Son of Man and His Followers: A Q Portrait of Jesus.” Pages 180–222 in *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Edited by D. M. Rhoads and K. Syreeni. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Jauss, Hans Robert. 1974. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation.* 4 ed. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

———. 1982. “Der Gebrauch der Fiktion in Formen der Anschauung und Darstellung der Geschichte.” Pages 415–51 in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung.* Edited by R. Koselleck, H. Lutz, and J. Rüsen. Beiträge zur Historik 4. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Jervell, Jacob. 1972. “The Divided People of God: The Restoration of Israel and Salvation for the Gentiles.” Pages 41–77 in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.

———. 1983. “The Acts of the Apostles and the History of Early Christianity.” *ST* 37: 17–32.

———. 1988. “The Church of Jews and Godfearers.” Pages 11–20 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives.* Edited by J. B. Tyson. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.

———. 1991. “Gottes Treue Zum untreuen Volk.” Pages 15–27 in *Der Treue Gottes trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas. Festschrift für Gerhard Schneider.* Edited by C. Bussmann and W. Radl. Freiburg: Herder.

———. 1995. “Das Aposteldekret in der lukanischen Theologie.” Pages 227–43 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts. Essays in Honor of L. Hartman.* Edited by T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

———. 1998. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* KEK 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jeska, Joachim. 2001. *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht der Lukas. Apg 7,2b and 13,17-25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels.* FRLANT 195. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles.* SP 5. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

———. 1996. *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Jonge, Marinus de. 1986. “The Earliest Use of Christos. Some Suggestions.” *NTS* 32: 321–43.

———. 1996. *Christologie im Kontext.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Jüngel, Eberhard. 1974. "Metaphorische Wahrheit. Erwägungen zur theologischen Relevanz der Metapher als Beitrag zur Hermeneutik einer narrativen Theologie." Pages 71–122 in *Metapher. Zur Hermeneutik religiöser Sprache.* Edited by E. Jüngel and P. Ricoeur. EvT Sonderheft 3. München: Kaiser.

———. 1989. "Metaphorical Truth: Reflections on Theological Metaphor as a Contribution to a Hermeneutics of Narrative Theology." Pages 16–71 in *Theological Essays I.* Edited and translated by J. B. Webster. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Kahl, Brigitte. 1998. "Der Brief an die Gemeinden in Galatien. Von Unbehagen der Geschlechter und anderen Problemen des Andersseins." Pages 603–11 in *Kompendium feministische Bibelauslegung.* Edited by L. Schottroff and M.-T. Wacker. Gütersloh: Gütersloher.

Kähler, Martin. 1956. *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus.* Edited by E. Wolf. 2 ed. TB 2. München: Kaiser.

———. 1988. *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ.* Translated, edited, and with an introduction by C. E. Braaten. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kaiser, Otto. 1984. "Johann Salomo Semler als Bahnbrecher der modernen Bibelwissenschaft." Pages 79–94 in *Von der Gegenwartsbedeutung des Alten Testaments. Gesammelte Studien zur Hermeneutik und zur Redaktionsgeschichte.* Edited by V. Fritz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kant, Laurence H. 1987. "Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin." Pages 671–713 in *ANRW* II.20/1.

Karrer, Martin. 1998. *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament.* GNT 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2000. " 'Und ich werde sie heilen.' Das Verstockungsmotiv aus Jes 6,9 in Apg 28,26f." Pages 255–71 in *Kirche und Volk Gottes. Festschrift für J. Roloff.* Edited by M. Karrer, W. Kraus, and O. Merk. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 2002. "Jesus der Retter (Sôtêr). Zur Aufnahme eines hellenistischen Prädikats im Neuen Testament." *ZNW* 93: 153–76.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1933. *Leib und Leib Christi. Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit.* BHT 9. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1964a. "Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Echtheit der Kirche?" Pages 214–23 in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen.* Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1964b. *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen.* Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1980a [1973]. *An die Römer.* 4 ed. HNT 8a. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1980b [1973]. *Commentary on Romans.* Translated by G. W. Bromiley. London: SCM Press.

———. 1982. "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church." Pages 95–107 in *Essays on New Testament Themes.* Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kaser, Max. 1955. *Das Römische Privatrecht. Erster Abschnitt: Das altrömische, das vorklassische und klassische Recht.* München: Beck (= *Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft,* Dritter Teil, Dritter Band, Erster Abschnitt).

Keck, Leander. 1986. "Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology." *NTS* 32: 362–77.

Keck, Leander E., and J. Louis Martyn, eds. 1966. *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Kee, Howard C. 1990. "The Transformation of the Synagogue after 70 C.E.: Its Import for Early Christianity." *NTS* 36: 1–24.

———. 1992. "Early Christianity in the Galilee: Reassessing the Evidence from the Gospels." Pages 3–22 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* Edited by L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

———. 1999. "Defining the First-Century C.E. Synagogue: Problems and Progress." Pages 7–26 in *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress.* Edited by H. C. Kee and L. H. Cohick. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.

Kee, Howard C., and Lynn H. Cohick, eds. 1999. *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress.* Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.

Kelber, Werner H. 1995. "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space." Pages 139–67 in *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature.* Edited by J. Dewey. Semeia 65. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1997. *The Oral and the Written Gospel. The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q.* 2 ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 1999. "The Quest for the Historical Jesus: From the Perspectives of Medieval, Modern, and Post-Enlightenment Readings, and in View of Ancient, Oral Aesthetics." Pages 75–115 in *The Jesus Controversy: Perspectives in Conflict.* Edited by J. D. Crossan, L. T. Johnson, and W. H. Kelber. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.

———. 2002. "Der historische Jesus. Bedenken zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion aus der Perspektive mittelalterlicher, moderner und postmoderner Hermeneutik." Pages 15–66 in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung.* Edited by J. Schröter and R. Brucker. BZNW 114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kennedy, George. 1984. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kim, Seyoon. 2002. "The Jesus Tradition in 1 Thess 4.13–5.11." *NTS* 48: 225–42.

King, Karen L. 2003. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap.

Kingsbury, Jack D. 1986. *Matthew as Story.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kinzig, Wolfram. 1994. "Καινὴ διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries." *JTS* 45: 519–44.

———. 1999. "'. . . *natum et passum* etc.' Zur Geschichte der Tauffragen in der lateinischen Kirche bis zu Luther." Pages 75–183 in *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis.* Edited by W. Kinzig, C. Markschies, and M. Vinzent. AKG 74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kitzberger, Ingrid. 1986. *Bau der Gemeinde. Das paulinische Wortfeld* οἰκοδομή/(ἐπ) οἰκοδομεῖν. FzB 53. Würzburg: Echter.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. 1996. *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.* SBS 167. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 2002. *Apokryphe Evangelien. Eine Einführung.* Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 2003a. *Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction.* Translated by B. McNeil. London: T&T Clark.

———. 2003b. *Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum. Neutestamentliche Studien.* WUNT 152. Tübingen: Mohr.

Klein, Günter. 1969. “Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm.” Pages 237–61 in *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* BEvT 50. München: Kaiser.

Kloppenborg, John S. 1990. “City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q).” Pages 145–60 in *How Gospels Begin.* Edited by D. E. Smith. Semeia 52. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 2003. “On Dispensing with Q? Goodacre on the Relation of Luke and Matthew.” *NTS* 49: 210–36.

Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. 2000. “Dating Theodotus (CIJ II 1404).” *JJS* 51: 243–80.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. 1999a. “Barnabas, Paulus, und die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes.” Pages 85–106 in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte. Festschrift für Jürgen Becker.* Edited by U. Mell and U. B. Müller. BZNW 100. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1999b. “Kollektenbericht, ‘Wir’-Bericht und Itinerar. Neue (?) Überlegungen zu einer alten Problem.” *NTS* 45: 367–90.

———. 2004. “Proselyten und Gottesfürchtige als Hörer der Reden von der Apostelgeschichte.” Pages 83–107 in *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung. Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher.* Edited by C. Breytenbach and J. Schröter. AGJU 57. Leiden: Brill.

Kocka, Jürgen. 1986. “Max Webers Bedeutung für die Geschichtswissenschaft.” Pages 13–27 in *Max Weber, der Historiker.* Edited by J. Kocka. Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 73. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Koester, Helmut. 1957. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern.* TU 65. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1980. *Einführung in das Neue Testament.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1982. *Introduction to the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1990. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development.* London: SCM Press.

———. 1991. “Writings and the Spirit: Authority and Politics in Ancient Christianity.” *HTR* 84: 353–72.

———. 1995/2000. *Introduction to the New Testament.* 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Koester, Helmut, and James M. Robinson. 1971. *Entwicklungslinien durch die Welt des frühen Christentums.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Koet, Bart J. 1992. “Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29-32, 34c-35) und Israels Geschick.” Pages 1547–69 in *The Four Gospels: Essays in Honor of F. Neirynck.* Edited by F. van Segbroeck. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Köpf, Ulrich. 1992. “Ferdinand Christian Baur als Begründer einer konsequent historischen Theologie.” *ZTK* 89: 440–61.

Korn, Manfred. 1993. *Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit. Studien zur bleibenden Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk.* WUNT II/51. Tübingen: Mohr.

Körtner, Ulrich H. J., ed. 2002. *Jesus im 21. Jahrhundert. Bultmanns Jesusbuch und die heutige Jesusforschung.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Körtner, Ulrich H. J., and M. Leutzsch, eds. 1998. *Papiasfragmente, Hirt des Hermas.* SUC III. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 1971. “Wozu noch Historie?” *HZ* 212: 1–18.

———. 1979. *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

———. 1992. “Geschichte, Historie V. Die Herausbildung des modernen Geschichtsbegriffs.” Pages 647–717 in vol. 2 of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Edited by O. Brunner, W. Conze, and R. Kosselleck. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Koselleck, Reinhart, Heinrich Lutz, and Jörn Rüsen, eds. 1982. *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung.* Beiträge zur Historik 4. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Kramer, Werner. 1963. *Christos Kyrios Gottesohn. Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden*. ATANT 44. Zürich: Zwingli.

———. 1966. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by B. Hardy. London: SCM Press.

Kratz, Reinhard G. 2000. *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kremer, Jacob. 1991. “ ‘Dieser ist der Sohn Gottes’ (Acts 9,20). Bibeltheologische Erwägungen zur Bedeutung von ‘Sohn Gottes’ im lukanischen Doppelwerk.” Pages 137–58 in *Der Treue Gottes trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas. Festschrift für Gerhard Schneider.* Edited by C. Bussmann and W. Radl. Freiburg: Herder.

Krug, Johannes. 2001. *Die Kraft des Schwachen. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Apostolatstheologie.* TANZ 37. Tübingen: Francke.

Kuck, David W. 1975. “The Use and Canonization of Acts in the Early Church.” STM thesis, Yale University.

Kunz, Margrit. 1935. *Zur Beurteilung der Prooemien in Diodors historischer Bibliothek*. Zürich: Gebrüder Leeman.

Kurz, William S. 1993. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative.* Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

Labahn, Antje, and Michael Labahn. 2000. “Jesus als Sohn Gottes bei Paulus. Eine soteriologische Grundkonstante der paulinischen Christologie.” Pages 97–120 in *Paulinische Christologie. Festschrift für H. Hübner.* Edited by U. Schnelle, T. Söding, and M. Labahn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lachmann, Karl. 1835. “De ordine narrationum in evangeliis synopticis.” *TSK* 8: 570–90.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2000. *Leben in Metaphern. Konstruktion und Gebrauch von Sprachbildern*. 2 ed. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. 1989. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lambrecht, Jan. 1996. “Paul’s Reasoning in Galatians 2:11-21.” Pages 53–74 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lämmert, Eberhard, ed. 1982. *Erzählforschung. Ein Symposium.* Stuttgart: Metzler.

Landmesser, Christof., Hans-Joachim Eckstein, and Hermann Lichtenberger, eds. 1997. *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums. Festschrift für Otfried Hofius.* BZNW 86. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lang, Friedrich Gustav. 1978. “ ‘Über Sidon mitten ins Gebiet der Dekapolis.’ Geographie und Theologie in Markus 7,31.” *ZDPV* 94: 145–60.

Lategan, Bernard C. 1985. “Some Unresolved Methodological Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics.” Pages 3–26 in *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in*

Biblical Texts. Edited by B. C. Lategan and W. S. Vorster. SemeiaSt. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1988. "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1.1-12 and 2.19-20 in the Development of Paul's Argument." *NTS* 34: 411–30.

Lategan, Bernard C., and Willem S. Vorster. 1985. *Text and Reality. Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts.* SemeiaSt. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Lendle, Otto. 1992. *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von Hekataios bis Zosimus.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Levine, Lee I., ed. 1992. *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

———. 1993. "Synagogues." Pages 1421–24 in *NEAEHL* 4.

———. 1996. "The Nature and Origin of the Palestinian Synagogue Reconsidered." *JBL* 115: 425–48.

———. 1999. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

———. 2000. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. 1996. "Das Tora—Verständnis im Judentum zur Zeit des Paulus. Eine Skizze." Pages 7–23 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr.

Liddell, Henry, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. 1968 [reprint 1992]. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9 ed. A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by H. J. Jones. With a supplement. Oxford: Clarendon.

Liebenberg, Jacobus. 2001. *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lietzmann, Hans. 1921. *Das Muratorische Fragment und die monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien.* KlT 1. Bonn: A. Marcus & E. Weber.

———. 1933. "Notizen." *ZNW* 32: 93–95.

———. 1971. *An die Galater.* Edited by P. Vielhauer. 4 ed. HNT 10. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lightfoot, Joseph B. 1887. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* London: Macmillan.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1983. *Jesus, Son of Man.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lindemann, Andreas. 1975. "Jesus in der Theologie des Neuen Testaments." Pages 27–57 in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie. Festschrift für H. Conzelmann.* Edited by G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1979. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion.* BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1992a. *Die Clemensbriefe.* HNT 17. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1992b. "Die Funktion der Herrenworte in der ethischen Argumentation des Paulus im ersten Korintherbrief." Pages 677–88 in *The Four Gospels: Essays in Honor of F. Neirynck.* Edited by F. van Segbroeck. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1999a. "Die Kirche als Leib. Beobachtungen zur 'demokratischen' Ekklesiologie bei Paulus." Pages 133–57 in *Paulus, Apostel und Lehrer der Kirche. Studien zu Paulus und zum frühen Paulusverständnis.* Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1999b. “Einheit und Vielfalt im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Beobachtungen zu Reden, Wundererzählungen und Mahlberichten.” Pages 225–53 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts.* Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
———. 2000. *Der Erste Korintherbrief.* HNT 9/1. Tübingen: Mohr.
———, ed. 2001. *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus.* BETL 158. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
———. 2002. “Zur Einführung. Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus als historisches und theologisches Problem.” Pages 1–21 in *Jesus im 21. Jahrhundert. Bultmanns Jesusbuch und die heutige Jesusforschung.* Edited by U. H. J. Körtner. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
———. 2003. “Die Sammlung der Paulusbriefe im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert.” Pages 321–51 in *The Biblical Canons (Fiftieth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense).* Edited by J.-M. Auwers. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
———. 2004. “Der ‘äthiopische Eunuch’ und die Anfänge der Mission unter den Völkern nach Apg 8–11.” Pages 109–33 in *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung. Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher.* Edited by C. Breytenbach and J. Schröter. AGJU 57. Leiden: Brill.
———. 2006. “Paulus—Pharisäer und Apostel.” Pages 311–51 in *Paulus und Johannes. Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur.* Edited by D. Sänger and U. Mell. WUNT 198. Tübingen: Mohr.
Lips, Hermann von. 1991. “Paulus und die Tradition. Zitierung von Schriftworten, Herrenworten und urchristlichen Traditionen.” *VF* 36: 27–49.
———. 2004. *Der neutestamentliche Kanon. Seine Geschichte und Bedeutung.* Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
Loffreda, Stanislao. 1994. *Kapernaum*. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.
———. 1997. “Capernaum.” Pages 416–19 in *OEANE* 1.
Loffreda, Stanislao, and Vasillios Tzaferis. 1993. “Capernaum.” Pages 291–96 in *NEAEHL* 1.
Lohmeyer, Ernst. 1927. Review of R. Bultmann, *Jesus. TLZ* 52: 433–39.
———. 1936. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. FRLANT 34. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Löhr, Winrich. 2005. “Norm und Kontext—Kanonslisten in der Spätantike.” *BTZ* 22: 202–29.
Lohse, Eduard. 1998. *Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie.* 5 ed. ThW 5,1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Longenecker, Bruce W. 1996. “Defining the Faithful Character of the Covenant Community: Galatians 2:15-21 and Beyond.” Pages 75–97 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr.
Longenecker, Richard N. 1990. *Galatians.* WBC 41. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books.
Löning, Karl. 1997. *Das Geschichtswerk des Lukas. Band I: Israels Hoffnung und Gottes Geheimnisse.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Lorenz, Chris. 1997. *Konstruktion der Vergangenheit. Eine Einführung in die Geschichtstheorie.* Köln: Böhlau.
Lüdemann, Gerd. 1991. “Emanuel Hirsch als Erforscher des frühen Christentums.” Pages 15–36 in *Christentumsgeschichte und Wahrheitsbewußtsein. Studien zur Theologie Emanuel Hirschs.* Edited by J. Ringleben. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lührmann, Dieter. 1980. "Tage, Monate, Jahre (Gal 4,10)." Pages 428–45 in *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments. Festschrift für C. Westermann*. Edited by R. Albertz, H.-P. Muller, H. W. Wolff, and W. Zimmerli. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1981. "Gal 2,9 und die katholischen Briefe. Bemerkungen zum Kanon und zur regula fidei." *ZNW* 72: 65–87.

———. 1987. *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT 3. Tübingen: Mohr.

———, ed. 2000. *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache*. In cooperation with E. Schlarb. MThSt 59. Marburg: Elwert.

———. 2004. *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien. Studien zu neuen Texten und zu neuen Fragen*. NovTSup 112. Leiden: Brill.

Lull, David John. 1986. " 'The Law Was Our Pedagogue': A Study in Galatians 3:19-25." *JBL* 105: 481–98.

Luschnat, Otto. 1970. "Thukydides der Historiker." Pages 1162–83 in *PWSup* 12.

Lux, Rüdiger. 1998. "Erinnerungskultur und Zensur im alten Israel." *BTZ* 15: 190–205.

Luz, Ulrich. 1993. *Die Jesusgeschichte des Matthäus*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. "Christologie im Neuen Testament." Pages 714–18 in *EKL* 1.

———. 1998. "Kann die Bibel heute noch der Grundlage für die Kirche sein? Über die Aufgabe der Exegese in einer religiös-pluralistischen Gesellschaft." *NTS* 44: 317–39.

———. 2002. "Warum zog Jesus nach Jerusalem?" Pages 409–27 in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung*. Edited by J. Schröter and R. Brucker. BZNW 114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Maier, Johann. 1995. *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer, Band II: Die Texte der Höhle 4*. München: E. Reinhardt.

Mainville, Odette. 1999. "Le Messianisme de Jesus. Le Rapport Annonce/Accomplissement entre Lc 1,35 et Ac 2,33." Pages 313–27 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. 1982. "Galilee and Jerusalem: History and Literature in Marcan Interpretation." *CBQ* 44: 242–55.

Marguerat, Daniel. 1994. "Juden und Christen im lukanischen Doppelwerk." *EvT* 54: 241–64.

———. 1999. "Luc-Actes: Une Unité à Construire." Pages 57–81 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 2002. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles."* Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham. SNTSMS 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2003. *La Première Histoire du Christianisme. Les Actes des Apôtres*. 2 ed. LD 180. Paris: Cerf.

Markschies, Christoph. 1998. " 'Neutestamentliche Apokryphen.' Bemerkungen zu Geschichte und Zukunft einer von Edgar Hennecke 1904 begründeten Quellensammlung." *Apocrypha* 9: 97–132.

———. 2000. "Geschichte/Geschichtsauffassung VI. Kirchengeschichte." Pages 789–91 in *RGG*^{4} 3.

———. 2001. “Neue Forschungen zur Kanonisierung des Neuen Testaments.” *Apocrypha* 12: 237–62.
———. 2009. “History/Concepts of History VI. Church History.” Pages 177–78 in *RPP* 6.
Markschies, Christoph, and Jens Schröter, eds. 2012. *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung. I. Band: Evangelien und Verwandtes.* Vol. I/1. Tübingen: Mohr.
Marshall, I. Howard. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster.
———. 1993. “Acts and the ‘Former Treatise.’ ” Pages 163–82 in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by B. Winter and A. D. Clark. Grand Rapids: Carlisle.
Martin, Dale B. 1990. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
Martyn, J. Louis. 1997a. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 33A. New York: Doubleday.
———. 1997b. “Romans as One of the Earliest Interpretations of Galatians.” Pages 37–45 in *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul.* Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Marxsen, Willi. 1959 [1956] *Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums.* 2d ed. FRLANT 67. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 1969. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel.* Translated by J. Boyce. Nashville: Abingdon.
Massa, Dieter. 2000. *Verstehensbedingungen von Gleichnissen. Prozesse und Voraussetzungen der Rezeption aus kognitiver Sicht.* TANZ 31. Tübingen: Francke.
Mayser, Edwin. 1934. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit.* Vol. II/2. Berlin: Teubner.
———. 1935. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit.* Vol. I/3. 2 ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
McCue, James F. 1979. “Walter Bauer and the Valentinians.” *VC* 33: 118–30.
McKay, Heather A. 1998. “Ancient Synagogues: The Continuing Dialectic between Two Major Views.” *CR:BS* 6: 103–42.
McRay, John. 1992. “Gerasenes.” Pages 991–92 in *ABD* 2.
Mehlhausen, Joachim. 1984. “Geschichte/Geschichtsschreibung/Geschichtsphilosophie VII/2. 19–20. Jahrhundert.” Pages 643–58 in *TRE* 12.
Meier, John P. 1991. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Vol. I: The Roots of the Problem and the Person.* ABRL. New York: Doubleday.
———. 1999. “The Present State of the ‘Third Quest’ for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain.” *Bib* 80: 459–87.
Meister, Klaus. 1990. *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Mell, Ulrich, and Ulrich B. Müller, eds. 1999. *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte. Festschrift für Jürgen Becker.* BZNW 100. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Merenlahti, Petri, and Raimo Hakola. 1999. “Reconceiving Narrative Criticism.” Pages 13–48 in *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative*

Criticism. Edited by D. M. Rhoads and K. Syreeni. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Merk, Otto. 1980. "Biblische Theologie II. Neues Testament." Pages 455–77 in *TRE* 6.

———. 1995. "Gesamtbiblische Theologie." Pages 225–36 in *Eine Bibel—zwei Testamente.* Edited by C. Dohmen and T. Söding. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Merklein, Helmut. 1984. *Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip. Untersuchung zur Ethik Jesu.* 3 ed. FzB 34. Würzburg: Echter.

———. 1987. "Entstehung und Gehalt des paulinischen Leib-Christi-Gedankens." Pages 319–44 in *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus I.* WUNT 43. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1989. *Jesu Botschaft von der Gottesherrschaft. Eine Skizze.* 3 ed. SBS 111. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1987. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1993. *Der Kanon des Neuen Testaments. Entstehung, Entwicklung, Bedeutung.* Translated by H.-M. Röttgers. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Meurer, Hermann-Joseph. 1997. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern: Paul Ricoeurs Hermeneutik der Gleichniserzählung Jesu im Horizont des Symbols "Gottesherrschaft/Reich Gottes."* BBB 111. Bodenheim: Philo.

Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. 1997. "Sepphoris." Pages 527–36 in *OEANE* 4.

Meyers, E. M. 1992. "Roman Sepphoris in Light of New Archaeological Evidence and Recent Research." Pages 321–38 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* Edited by L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Minear, Paul S. 1966. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." Pages 111–30 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert.* Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

Molthagen, J. 2003. "Beobachtungen zu Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsverständnis im antiken Griechenland und Israel." Pages 77–93 in *Lebendige Sozialgeschichte. Gedenkschrift für Peter Borowsky.* Edited by R. Hering and R. Nicolaysen. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Mommsen, Wolfgang J. 1972. *Die Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Historismus.* 2 ed. Düsseldorf: Droste.

———. 1984. "Die Sprache des Historikers." *HZ* 238: 57–81.

Moule, C. F. D. 1966. "The Christology of Acts." Pages 159–85 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert.* Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

Moulton, James H., and Milligan George. 1997 [1930]. *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

Mount, Christopher. 2002. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul.* NovTSup 104. Leiden: Brill.

Moxter, Michael. 2002. "Erzählung und Ereignis. Über den Spielraum historischer Repräsentation." Pages 67–88 in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung.* Edited by J. Schröter and R. Brucker. BZNW 114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Müller, Christoph G. 1995. *Gottes Pflanzung—Gottes Bau—Gottes Tempel. Die metaphorische Dimension paulinischer Gemeindetheologie in 1 Kor 3,5-17.* Fuldaer Studien 5. Frankfurt: J. Knecht.

Müller, Klaus, and Jörn Rüsen. 1997. *Historische Sinnbildung. Problemstellungen, Zeitkonzepte, Wahrnehmungshorizonte, Darstellungsstrategien.* Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Müller, Morgens. 1984. *Der Ausdruck "Menschensohn" in den Evangelien. Voraussetzungen und Bedeutung.* Leiden: Brill.
———. 1997. "Neutestamentliche Theologie als Biblische Theologie. Einige grundsätzliche Überlegungen." *NTS* 43: 475–90.
Müller, Peter. 1995. *"Wer ist dieser?" Jesus im Markusevangelium. Markus als Erzähler, Verkündiger und Lehrer.* BThSt 27. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
Müller, Ulrich B. 1997. "Zur Eigentümlichkeit des Johannesevangeliums. Das Problem des Todes Jesu." *ZNW* 88: 24–55.
Murrmann-Kahl, Michael. 1992. *Die entzauberte Heilsgeschichte. Der Historismus erobert die Theologie 1880–1920.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher.
———. 2001. "'. . . wir sind der Herr Überall und Nirgends' (F. Th. Vischer). Historismusdebatten im letzten Jahrzehnt." *TLZ* 126: 233–56.
Mussner, Franz. 1988. *Der Galaterbrief.* 5 ed. HTKNT 9. Freiburg: Herder.
Neirynck, Frans. 1986. "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus." Pages 265–321 in *L'Apôtre Paul. Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministére.* Edited by A. Vanhoye. BETL 73. Leuven: Leuven University Press (= Neirynck 1991, 511–68).
———. 1991. *Evangelica II.* BETL 99. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
———. 1996. "The Sayings of Jesus in 1 Corinthians." Pages 141–76 in *The Corinthian Correspondence.* Edited by R. Bieringer. BETL 25. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. 1994. "'Judentum' und 'Christentum' bei Paulus und Ignatius von Antiochien." *ZNW* 85: 218–33.
Nippel, Wilfried. 2003. "Der Apostel Paulus—ein Jude als römischer Bürger." Pages 357–74 in *Sinn (in) der Antike. Orientierungssysteme, Leitbilder und Wertkonzepte im Altertum.* Edited by K.-J. Hölkeskamp, J. Rüsen, E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, and H. Grütter. Mainz: von Zabern.
Noormann, Rolf. 1994. *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret. Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk des Irenäus von Lyon.* WUNT II/66. Tübingen: Mohr.
Norris, Frederick W. 1976. "Ignatius, Polycarp and I Clement: Walter Bauer Reconsidered." *VC* 30: 23–44.
Oepke, Albrecht. 1984 [1957/1964]. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater.* 5 ed. THKNT 9. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
Öhler, Markus. 2003. *Barnabas. Die historische Person und ihre Rezeption in der Apostelgeschichte.* WUNT 156. Tübingen: Mohr.
Ohme, Heinz. 1998. *Kanon ekklesiastikos. Die Bedeutung des altkirchlichen Kanonbegriffs.* AKG 67. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 2002. "Kanon." Pages 422–24 in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur.* 3 ed. Edited by S. Döpp and W. Geerlings. Freiburg: Herder.
Oster, Richard E. 1993. "Supposed Anachronism in Luke-Acts' Use of ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ: A Rejoinder to H. C. Kee." *NTS* 39: 178–208.
Ostmeyer, Karl-Heinrich. 2002. "Satan und Passa in 1. Korinther 5." *ZNT* 9: 38–45.
Overbeck, Franz. 1872. "Ueber das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zur Apostelgeschichte." *ZWT* 15: 305–49.
Overman, J. Andrew. 1993. "Recent Advances in the Archaeology of the Galilee in the Roman Period." *CR:BS* 1: 35–57.
Pagels, Elaine. 2003. *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas.* New York: Random House.

———. 2004. *Das Geheimnis des fünften Evangeliums. Warum die Bibel nur die halbe Wahrheit sagt.* Translated by K. Neff. München: Beck.

Palmer, Darryl W. 1993. "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph." Pages 1–29 in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by B. Winter and A. D. Clark. Grand Rapids: Carlisle.

Pape, Wilhelm. 1954. *Griechisch-Deutches Handwörterbuch.* Vol. 1. Reprint of the 3rd edition. Revised by M. Sengebusch. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.

Parker, David C. 1992. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1997. *The Living Text of the Gospels.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parsons, Mikeal C. 1987. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. JSNTSup 21. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. 1993. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

Paulsen, Henning. 1997. *Zur Literatur und Geschichte des frühen Christentums. Gesammelte Aufsätze.* Edited by U. E. Eisen. WUNT 99. Tübingen: Mohr.

Perrin, Norman. 1966. "The Wredestrasse Becomes the Hauptstrasse: Reflections on the Reprinting of the Dodd Festschrift." *JR* 46: 296–300.

———. 1974. *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Pesch, Rudolf. 1976. *Das Markusevangelium. Erster Teil: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Mk 1,1-8,26.* HTKNT II/1. Freiburg: Herder.

———. 1986. *Die Apostelgeschichte. Apg 1–12*. EKKNT V/1. Zürich: Benziger.

Petersen, Norman R. 1978. *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1980. "The Composition of Mark 4:1–8:26." *HTR* 73: 185–217.

Pichler, Josef. 1997. *Paulusrezeption in der Apostelgeschichte. Untersuchungen zur Rede im pisidischen Antiochien.* IThS 30. Innsbruck: Tyrolia.

Pietsch, Michael. 2003. *"Dieser ist der Sproß Davids . . ." Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte der Nathanverheißung im alttestamentlichen, zwischentestamentlichen und neutestamentlichen Schrifttum.* WMANT 100. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Pilhofer, Peter. 1995. *Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas.* Vol. 1. WUNT 87. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2002. *Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt. Greifswalder Aufsätze 1996–2001.* WUNT 145. Tübingen: Mohr.

Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. 2002. *Verborgene Worte Jesu—verworfene Evangelien. Apokryphe Schriften des frühen Christentums.* 2 ed. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft.

Plümacher, Eckhard. 1972. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte.* SUNT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1974. "Lukas als griechischer Historiker." Pages 235–64 in *PWSup* 14.

———. 1978. "Apostelgeschichte." Pages 483–528 in *TRE* 3.

———. 1983. "Acta-Forschung 1974–1982." *ThR* 48: 1–56.

———. 2000. "Geschichtsschreibung IV. Biblisch, 2. Neues Testament." Page 808 in *RGG*^{4} 3.

———. 2004. *Geschichte und Geschichten. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte und zu den Johannesakten*. Edited by J. Schröter and R. Brucker. WUNT 170. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 2009. "Historiography IV. The Bible, 2. New Testament." Page 165 in *RPP* 6.
Pokorný, Petr. 1985. *Die Entstehung der Christologie. Voraussetzungen einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Stuttgart: Calwer.
———. 1998. *Theologie der lukanischen Schriften*. FRLANT 174. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Porter, Stanley E. 1995. "Literary Approaches to the New Testament: From Formalism to Deconstruction and Back." Pages 77–128 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by S. E. Porter and D. Tombs. JSNTSup 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
———. 1996. "Thucydides 1.22.1 and Speeches in Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?" Pages 173–93 in *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. SBG 6. New York: Peter Lang.
———. 1999. *The Paul of Acts: Essays in Literary Criticism, Rhetoric, and Theology*. WUNT 115. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 2000. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research. Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. JSNTSup 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
Powell, Mark Allen. 1990. *What is Narrative Criticism? A New Approach to the Bible*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4. Volume V: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon.
Radl, Walter. 1999. "Die Beziehungen der Vorgeschichte zur Apostelgeschichte. Dargestellt an Lk 2,22-39." Pages 297–312 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Räisänen, Heikki. 1983. *Paul and the Law*. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1985. "Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism." *NTS* 31: 543–53.
———. 2000a. *Beyond New Testament Theology: A Story and a Programme*. 2 ed. London: SCM Press.
———. 2000b. *Neutestamentliche Theologie? Eine religionswissenschaftliche Alternative*. SBS 186. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
———. 2001 [1991]. "The Redemption of Israel: A Salvation-Historical Problem in Luke-Acts." Pages 61–81 in *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation: Collected Essays 1991–2000*. Leiden: Brill.
Ramsay, William M. 1899. *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
Reed, Jonathan L. 2000. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.
Reimarus, Hermann S. 1984. "Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger." Pages 11–21 in *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus. Texte aus drei Jahrhunderten*. Edited by M. Baumotte. Gütersloh: Güterloher.
Reinmuth, Eckart. 2002. *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments. Eine Einführung in die Lektüre des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 2003. *Neutestamentliche Historik. Probleme und Perspektiven*. ThLZ.F 8. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
Reiser, Marius. 1993. "Bürgerliches Christentum in den Pastoralbriefen?" *Bib* 74: 27–44.

Rese, M. 1999. "The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts." Pages 185–201 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Rhoads, David M. 1982. "Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark." *JAAR* 50: 411–34.

———. 1999. "Narrative Criticism: Practices and Prospects." Pages 264–85 in *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Edited by D. M. Rhoads and K. Syreeni. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Rhoads, David M., and Kari Syreeni, eds. 1999. *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Richardson, Cyril C., ed. 1970. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York: Macmillan.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1984–1988. *Time and Narrative*. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1987. "Erzählung, Metapher und Interpretationstheorie." *ZTK* 84: 232–53.

———. 1988–1991. *Zeit und Erzählung*. 3 vols. Übergänge 18/I–III. München: Fink.

———. 2004a. *Gedächtnis, Geschichte, Vergessen*. Translated by H.-D. Gondek. Übergänge 50. München: Fink.

———. 2004b. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Riesner, Rainer. 1995. "Synagogues in Jerusalem." Pages 179–211 in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Volume IV: Palestinian Setting*. Edited by R. Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ritter, Aldof M. 1984. "Glaubensbekenntnis(se) V. Alte Kirche." Pages 399–412 in *TRE* 13.

———. 1987. "Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Selbstdurchsetzung oder autoritative Entscheidung?" Pages 93–99 in *Kanon und Zensur*. Edited by A. Assmann and J. Assmann. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation 2. München: Fink.

Robbins, Vernon K. 1978. "By Land and by Sea: The We-Passages of Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages." Pages 215–42 in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edited by C. H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Roberts, Colin H. 1979. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, James M. 2001. "The Critical Edition of Q." Pages 27–52 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by A. Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Robinson, James M., and Helmut Koester. 1971. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg. 2000. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Leuven: Peeters.

Robinson, Thomas A. 1988. *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. SBEC 11. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen.

Rohde, Joachim. 1989. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. THKNT 9. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Röhser, Günter. 1987. *Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde bei Paulus*. *Antike Sündenvorstellungen und antike Hamartia*. WUNT II/25. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2002. *Stellvertretung im Neuen Testament*. SBS 195. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Rollmann, Hans, and Werner Zager. 2001. "Unveröffentlichte Briefe William Wredes zur Problematisierung des messianischen Selbstverständnisses Jesu." *ZNTG* 8: 274–322.

Roloff, Jürgen. 1970. *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus. Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1979. "Die Paulus-Darstellung des Lukas. Ihre geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen und ihr theologisches Ziel." *EvT* 39: 510–31.

———. 1981. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1988. *Der erste Brief an Timotheus.* EKKNT XV. Zürich: Benziger.

———. 1993. *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament.* GNT 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Rosenblatt, Marie-Eloise. 1995. *Paul the Accused: His Portrait in the Acts of the Apostles.* Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

Rösler, Wolfgang. 1980. "Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike." *Poetica* 12: 283–319.

Rosner, Brian. 1993. "Acts and Biblical History." Pages 65–82 in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by B. Winter and A. D. Clark. Grand Rapids: Carlisle.

Rowland, Christopher. 2000. "Geschichte/Geschichtsauffassung V. Neues Testament." Pages 783–89 in *RGG*[4] 3.

———. 2009. "History/Concepts of History V. New Testament." Pages 174–77 in *RPP* 6.

Rusam, Dietrich. 1992. "Neue Belege zu den στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Gal 4,3.9; Kol 2,8.20)." *ZNW* 83: 119–25.

———. 2003. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas.* BZNW 112. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Rüsen, Jörn. 1976. *Für eine erneuerte Historik. Studien zur Theorie der Geschichtswissenschaft.* Stuttgart: Frommann.

———. 1982a. "Die vier Typen des historischen Erzählens." Pages 514–605 in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung.* Edited by R. Kosselleck, H. Lutz, and J. Rüsen. Beiträge zur Historik 4. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

———. 1982b. "Geschichtsschreibung als Theorieproblem der Geschichtswissenschaft. Skizze zum historischen Hintergrund der gegenwärtigen Diskussion." Pages 14–35 in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung.* Edited by R. Koselleck, H. Lutz, and J. Rüsen. Beiträge zur Historik 4. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

———. 1983–1989. *Grundzüge einer Historik I–III.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2003. *Kann Gestern besser werden? Essays zum Bedenken der Geschichte.* Kulturwissenschaftliche Interventionen 2. Berlin: Kadmos.

Sanders, Ed Parish. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1983. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1991. *Jesus and Judaism.* 3 ed. London: SCM Press.

———. 1993. *The Historical Figure of Jesus.* London: Allen Lane.

Sanders, Henry A. 1937. "A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts." Pages 151–61 in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake.* Edited by R. P. Casey, S. Lake, and A. K. Lake. London: Christophers.

Sänger, Dieter. 2002. " 'Vergeblich bemüht' (Gal 4,11)? Zur paulinischen Argumentationsstrategie im Galaterbrief." *NTS* 48: 377–99.

Sänger, Dieter, and Ulrich Mell, eds. 2006. *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur.* WUNT 198. Tübingen: Mohr.

Sauer, Jürgen. 1985. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den synoptischen und paulinischen Aussagen über Feindesliebe und Wiedervergeltungsverzicht." *ZNW* 76: 1–28.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. 1991 [1934]. "Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen." Pages 63–89 in *Geschichtsbild und Geschichtsdenken im Altertum*. Edited by J. M. Alonso-Núñez. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schenke, Hans-Martin, Hans-Gebhard Bethge, and Ursula Ulrike Kaiser, eds. 2001/2003. *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*. 2 vols. GCS NF 8/12. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich D. E. 1864. *Das Leben Jesu*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

———. 1975. *The Life of Jesus.* Translated by S. M. Gilmour. Edited by J. C. Verheyden. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

———. 2011. *Brief Outline of Theology as a Field of Study: Translation of the 1811 and 1830 Editions.* Translated by T. N. Tice. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

Schlier, Heinrich. 1965. *Der Brief an die Galater.* 13 ed. KEK VII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schlund, Christine. 2005. *"Kein Knochen soll gebrochen werden." Studien zu Bedeutung und Funktion des Pesachfests in Texten des frühen Judentum und im Johannesevangelium.* WMANT 107. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Schmeller, Thomas. 1994. "Jesus im Umland Galiläas. Zu den markinischen Berichten vom Aufenthalt Jesu in den Gebieten von Tyros, Caesarea Philippi und der Dekapolis." *BZ* NF 38: 44–66.

Schmidt, Carl. 1919. *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung. Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts.* TU 43. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. 1919. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung.* Berlin: Trowitzsch.

Schmithals, Walter. 1980. "Kritik der Formkritik." *ZTK* 77: 149–85.

———. 1983. "Johannes Weiss als Wegbereiter der Formgeschichte." *ZTK* 80: 389–410.

———. 1997. "Vom Ursprung der synoptischen Tradition." *ZTK* 94: 288–316.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. 1980. "Bibel III. Die Entstehung des Kanons des Neuen Testaments und der christlichen Bibel." Pages 22–48 in *TRE* 6.

———, ed. 1990. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I: Evangelien*. 6 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

———, ed. 1991/1992. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Clarke.

———, ed. 1997. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen II: Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes.* 6 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schneider, Gerhard. 1980. *Die Apostelgeschichte. I. Teil*. HTKNT V/1. Freiburg: Herder.

Schnelle, Udo. 1998. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings.* Translated by E. M. Boring. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

———. 2000. “Heilsgegenwart. Christologische Hoheitstitel bei Paulus.” Pages 178–93 in *Paulinische Christologie. Festschrift für H. Hübner.* Edited by U. Schnelle, T. Söding, and M. Labahn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2002. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* 4 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2003. *Paulus. Leben und Denken.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2005. *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology.* Translated by E. M. Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Schnelle, Udo, Thomas Söding, and Michael Labahn, eds. 2000. *Paulinische Christologie. Festschrift für H. Hübner.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Scholder, Klaus. 1961. “Ferdinand Christian Baur als Historiker.” *EvT* 21: 435–58.

———. 1966. *Ursprünge und Probleme der Bibelkritik im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der historisch-kritischen Theologie.* München: Kaiser.

———. 1990. *The Birth of Modern Critical Theology.* Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM Press.

Scholz, Heinrich, ed. 1935. *Schleiermachers Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums.* QGP 10. Leipzig: Deichert.

Schönebaum, Herbert. 1955. “Karl Lamprecht. Zur 100. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages (25. II. 1856).” *AKuG* 37: 268–305.

Schrage, Wolfgang. 1991–2001. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* 4 vols. EKKNT VII/1–4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Schreiber, Stefan. 2000. *Gesalbter und König. Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenerwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften.* BZNW 105. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2006. “Das Weihegeschenk Gottes. Eine Deutung des Todes Jesu in Röm 3,25.” *ZNW* 97: 88–110.

Schreiner, Thomas R. 1991. “ ‘Works of the Law’ in Paul.” *NovT* 33: 217–44.

Schröter, Jens. 1996. “Der Apostolat des Paulus als Zugang zu seiner Theologie. Eine Auslegung von 2 Kor 4,7-12.” Pages 679–92 in *The Corinthian Correspondence.* Edited by R. Bieringer. BETL 25. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1997. *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas.* WMANT 76. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 1998a. “Gerechtigkeit und Barmherzigkeit. Das Gottesbild der Psalmen Salomos in seinem Verhältnis zu Qumran und Paulus.” *NTS* 44: 557–77.

———. 1998b. “Markus, Q und der historische Jesus. Methodische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Rezeption der Verkündigung Jesu.” *ZNW* 89: 173–200.

———. 1998c. Review of M. Franzmann, *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 93: 666–74.

———. 1998d. “Schriftauslegung und Hermeneutik in 2 Korinther 3. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Schriftbenutzung des Paulus.” *NovT* 40: 231–75.

———. 2001a. “Das Evangelium nach Thomas (NHC II, 2).” Pages 151–82 in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch.* Vol. 1. Edited by H.-M. Schenke, H.-G. Bethge, and U. U. Kaiser. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2001b. *Jesus und die Anfänge der Christologie. Methodologische und exegetische Studien zu den Ursprüngen des christlichen Glaubens.* BThSt 47. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 2003a. “Die Bedeutung der Q-Überlieferung für die Interpretation der frühen Jesustradition.” *ZNW* 94: 38–67.

———. 2003b. “Gewaltverzicht und Reich Gottes. Der Verzicht auf Gewalt als Zeichenhandlung angesichts des Reiches Gottes in der ältesten Jesusüberlieferung.” *BTZ* 20: 157–79.

———, ed. 2004a. *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit. Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive*. TBT 127. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2004b. “Walter Schmithals und die synoptische Tradition. Darstellung und Kritik einer originellen Lösung des synoptischen Problems.” Pages 777–803 in *Paulus, die Evangelien und das Urchristentum. Beiträge von und zu Walter Schmithals zu seinem 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by C. Breytenbach. AGJU. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2006a. *Das Abendmahl. Frühchristliche Deutungen und Impulse für die Gegenwart*. SBS 210. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 2006b. “Jesus im frühen Christentum. Zur neueren Diskussion über kanonisch und apokryph gewordene Jesusüberlieferungen.” *VF* 51: 25–41.

———. 2007. *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament. Studien zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte und zur Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. WUNT 204. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2008. “Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases.” Pages 233–55 in *Matthew, James and the Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Edited by H. van de Sandt and J. Zangenberg. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

———. 2010 [2006]. *Jesus von Nazaret. Jude aus Galiläa—Retter der Welt*. 3 ed. BG 15. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanhalt.

Schröter, Jens, and Hans-Gebhard Bethge. 2012. “Das Evangelium nach Thomas (Thomasevangelium [NHC II,2 p. 32, 10–51, 28]) Oxyrhynchus-Papyri I 1, IV 654 und IV 655 (P.Oxy. I 1, IV 654 und IV 655).” Pages 483–522 in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Vol. I/1. 7 ed. Edited by C. Markschies and J. Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schröter, Jens, and Ralph Brucker, eds. 2002. *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung*. BZNW 114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schuppe, E. 1942. “Paidagogos.” Pages 2375–85 in *PW* 36.

Schürer, Emil. 1973–1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC–AD 135)*. A New English Version Revised and Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black. I–III.2 vols. Edinburgh: Clark.

Schürmann, Heinz. 1969. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HTKNT III/1. Freiburg: Herder.

———. 1994. *Jesus. Gestalt und Geheimnis. Gesammelte Beiträge*. Edited by K. Scholtissek. Paderborn: Bonifatius.

Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 1991. “The Rhetoricity of Historical Knowledge: Pauline Discourse and Its Contextualizations.” Pages 443–69 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Edited by L. Bormann, K. Del Tredici, and A. Standhartinger. Leiden: Brill.

Schwankl, Otto. 1995. *Licht und Finsternis. Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften*. HBS 5. Freiburg: Herder.

Schweitzer, Albert. 1984 [1906/1913]. *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.* 9 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2000. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: First Complete Edition*. Translated by W. Montgomery, J. R. Coates, S. Cupitt, and J. Bowden. London: SCM Press.

Schweizer, Eduard. 1966. "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background." Pages 186–93 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert.* Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

———. 1970. *The Good News According to Mark*. Translated by D. H. Madvig. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

———. 1978. *Das Evangelium nach Markus.* 5 ed. NTD 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1981. *Das Evangelium nach Markus.* NTD 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

———. 1988. "Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3 and Col 2:8, 18, 20." *JBL* 107: 455–68.

———. 1989. "Altes und Neues zu den 'Elementen der Welt' in Kol 2,20; Gal 4,3.9." Pages 111–18 in *Wissenschaft und Kirche. Festschrift für E. Lohse.* Edited by K. Aland and S. Meurer. TAzB 4. Bielefeld: Luther.

Segbroeck, Franz van, ed. 1992. *The Four Gospels: Essays in Honor of F. Neirynck*. 3 vols. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Selb, Walter. 1974. "Διαθήκη im Neuen Testament. Randbemerkungen eines Juristen zu einem Theologenstreit." *JJS* 25: 183–96.

Sellin, Gerhard. 1999. "Hagar und Sara. Religionsgeschichtliche Hintergründe der Schriftallegorese Gal 4,21-31." Pages 59–84 in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte.* Edited by U. Mell and U. B. Müller. BZNW 100. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2004. "Zwischen Deskription und Reduktion. Aporien und Möglichkeiten einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments." *EVT* 64: 172–86.

Sellin, Volker. 1995. *Einführung in die Geschichtswissenschaft.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Semler, Johann S. 1967. *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*. Edited by H. Scheible. TKTG 5. Gütersloh: Gütersloher.

Shauf, Scott. 2005. *Theology as History, History as Theology: Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19.* BZNW 133. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Sieffert, Friedrich A. 1889. *Der Brief an die Galater.* 9 ed. KEK VII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Siker, Jeffrey S. 1992. " 'First to the Gentiles.' A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30." *JBL* 111: 73–90.

Skeat, Theodore C. 1992. "Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon." *NovT* 34: 194–99.

———. 1994. "The Origin of the Christian Codex." *ZPE* 102: 263–68.

———. 1997. "The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?" *NTS* 43: 1–34.

Skinner, Matthew L. 2003. *Locating Paul: Places of Custody as Narrative Settings in Acts 21–28*. SBLAB 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Smit, Joop. 1989. "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech." *NTS* 35: 1–26.

Soards, Marion L. 1994. *The Speeches in Acts.* Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

Spicq, Ceslaus. 1978. *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire.* 2 vols. OBO 22. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires.

Squires, John T. 1993. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts.* SNTSMS 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanley, Christopher D. 1990. "'Under a Curse': A Fresh Reading of Gal 3.10-14." *NTS* 36: 481–511.

Stanton, Graham N. 1997. "The Fourfold Gospel." *NTS* 43: 317–46.

———. 2004. *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stegemann, Wolfgang. 1991. "'Licht der Völker' bei Lukas." Pages 81–97 in *Der Treue Gottes trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas. Festschrift für Gerhard Schneider.* Edited by C. Bussmann and W. Radl. Freiburg: Herder.

Stendahl, Krister. 1963. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *HTR* 56: 199–215.

Sterling, Gregory E. 1992. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography.* NovTSup 64. Leiden: Brill.

Steyn, Gert J. 1995. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum.* CBET 12. Kampen: Kok Pharos.

Stone, Michael E., ed. 1984. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II/2. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Strack, Herman L., and Paul Billerbeck. 1994 [1926]. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Vol. 3. 9 ed. München: Beck.

Strange, J. F. 1992a. "Sepphoris." Pages 1090–93 in *ABD* 5.

———. 1992b. "Six Campaigns at Sepphoris: The University of Florida Excavations 1983–1989." Pages 339–55 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* Edited by L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

———. 1999. "Ancient Texts, Archaeology as Text, and the Problem of the First-Century Synagogue." Pages 27–45 in *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress.* Edited by H. C. Kee and L. H. Cohick. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press.

Strange, William A. 1992. *The Problem of the Text of Acts.* SNTSMS 71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Straub, Esther. 2002. "Der Irdische als der Auferstandener. Kritische Theologie bei Johannes ohne ein Wort vom Kreuz." Pages 239–64 in *Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament.* Edited by A. Dettwiler and J. Zumstein. WUNT 151. Tübingen: Mohr.

Strauss, David F. 1835/1836. *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet.* 2 vols. Tübingen: Osiander.

———. 1837. *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet.* 2 vols. 2 ed. Tübingen: Osiander.

———. 1892. *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined.* 2 ed. Translated from the fourth German edition by G. Elliot. London: Sonnenschein.

Strauss, Mark L. 1995. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Strecker, Christian. 1999. *Die liminale Theologie des Paulus. Zugänge zur paulinischen Theologie aus kulturanthropologischer Perspektive.* FRLANT 185. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Strecker, Georg, ed. 1975. *Das Problem der Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* WdF 367. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1996. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Edited and completed by F. W. Horn. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2000. *Theology of the New Testament.* Edited and completed by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn. Translated by E. M. Boring. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. 1992/1999. *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1997. "Der Kanon und seine Auslegung." Pages 263–90 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums. Festschrift für Otfried Hofius.* Edited by C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein, and H. Lichtenberger. BZNW 86. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Sundberg, A. C. 1968. "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon." *SE* 4: 452–61.

———. 1973. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List." *HTR* 66: 1–41.

Süssmann, Johannes. 2000. *Geschichtsschreibung oder Roman? Zur Konstitutionslogik von Geschichtserzählungen zwischen Schiller und Ranke (1780–1824).* FHA 41. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Talbert, Charles H. 1969. "Tradition and Redaction in Romans XII,9-21." *NTS* 16: 83–94.

———. 1974. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts.* SBLMS 20. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1985. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *JBL* 104: 69–85.

———. 1986/1990. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1988. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." Pages 83–101 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives.* Edited by J. B. Tyson. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.

Taylor, Joan E. 1993. *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Telford, William R. 1994. "Major Trends and Interpretative Issues in the Study of Jesus." Pages 33–74 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. NTTS 19. Leiden: Brill.

Theissen, Gerd. 1989. "Gewaltverzicht und Feindesliebe (Mt 5,38-48 / Lk 6,27-38) und deren sozialgeschichtlicher Hintergrund." Pages 160–97 in *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums.* 3 ed. WUNT 19. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1992. "Nonviolence and Love of Our Enemies (Matthew 5:38-48; Luke 6:27-38)." Pages 115–56 in *Social Reality and the Early Christians.* Translated by M. Kohl. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

———. 1994. "Die Einheit der Kirche. Kohärenz und Differenz im Urchristentum." *ZfM* 20: 70–86.

———. 1996. "Judentum und Christentum bei Paulus. Sozialgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu einem beginnenden Schisma." Pages 331–56 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1999. *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion.* Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM Press.

———. 2000. *Die Religion der ersten Christen. Eine Theorie des Urchristentums.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher.

———. 2004. "Widersprüche in der urchristlichen Religion. Aporien als Leitfaden einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments." *EVT* 64: 187–200.

Theissen, Gerd, and Annette Merz. 1998. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Translated by J. Bowden. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

———. 2001. *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehr—und Arbeitsbuch*. 3 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Theissen, Gerd, and Dagmar Winter. 1997. *Die Kriterienfrage in der Jesusforschung. Vom Differenzkriterium zum Plausibilitätskriterium*. NTOA 34. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.

———. 2002. *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*. Translated by E. M. Boring. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.

Theobald, Michael. 1988. "Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Zur polaren Struktur der Christologie im Markusevangelium." Pages 37–97 in *SNTSU* 13.

———. 2002 *Herrenworte im Johannesevangelium*. HBS 34. Freiburg: Herder.

Thornton, Claus-Jürgen. 1990. "Der Zeuge Lukas. Studien zum Werk eines Paulusbegleiters." Ph.D. diss., Tübingen.

———. 1991. *Der Zeuge des Zeugen. Lukas als Historiker der Paulusreisen*. WUNT 56. Tübingen: Mohr.

Tregelles, Samuel P. 1867. *Canon Muratorianus: The Earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Treu, Kurt. 1984. "Roman und Geschichtsschreibung." *Klio* 66: 456–59.

Trobisch, David. 1996. *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testament. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. NTOA 31. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.

Tuckett, Christopher M. 1979. *The Griesbach Hypothesis in the 19th Century.* JSNTSup 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

———. 1983. "1 Corinthians and Q." *JBL* 102: 607–19.

———. 1984. "Paul and the Synoptic Mission Discourse?" *ETL* 60: 376–81.

———. 1989. "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache." Pages 197–230 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity—La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif.* Edited by J.-M. Sevrin. BETL 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1990. "Synoptic Tradition in 1 Thessalonians?" Pages 160–82 in *The Thessalonian Correspondence.* Edited by R. F. Collins. BETL 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 1999. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." Pages 133–64 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts.* Edited by J. Verheyden. BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 2006. "Does the 'Historical Jesus' belong within a 'New Testament Theology.' " Pages 231–47 in *The Nature of New Testament Theology: Essays in Honour of Robert Morgan*. Edited by C. Rowland and C. Tuckett. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, Mark. 1992. "Design for a Theory of Meaning." Pages 91–107 in *The Nature and Ontogenesis of Meaning.* Edited by W. Overton and D. Palermo. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tyson, Joseph B, ed. 1988. *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.

Unnik, Willem C. Van. 1973. "Der Ausdruck ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς (Apostelgeschichte I 8) und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund." Pages 386–401 in *Sparsa Collecta I.* NovTSup 29. Leiden: Brill.

VanderKam, James C., and Peter Flint. 2002. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Verheyden, Joseph, ed. 1999. *The Unity of Luke-Acts.* BETL 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 2003. "The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute." Pages 487–556 in *The Biblical Canons (Fiftieth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense).* Edited by J.-M. Auwers. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Vielhauer, Philipp. 1965. "Zum Paulinismus der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 9–27 in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* München: Kaiser.

———. 1975. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1979. "Gesetzesdienst und Stoicheiadienst im Galaterbrief." Pages 183–95 in *Oikodome. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* Edited by G. Klein. München: Kaiser.

Vogtle, Anton. 1994. *Die "Gretchenfrage" des Menschensohnproblems. Bilanz und Perspektive.* QD 152. Freiburg: Herder.

Völkel, Martin. 1973/1974. "Exegetische Erwägungen zum Verständnis des Begriffs καθεξῆς im Lukanischen Prolog." *NTS*: 289–99.

Vos, Johan S. 1992. "Die hermeneutische Antinomie bei Paulus (Galater 3.11-12; Röm 10.5-10)." *NTS* 38: 254–70.

Vouga, François. 1988. "Zur rhetorischen Gattung des Galaterbriefes." *ZNW* 79: 291–92.

———. 1998. *An die Galater.* HNT 10. Tübingen: Mohr.

Walbank, Frank W. 1960. "History and Tragedy." *Historia* 9: 216–34.

Walser, Martin. 1998. *Ein springender Brunnen.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Walter, Matthias. 2001. *Gemeinde als Leib Christi. Untersuchungen zum Corpus Paulinum und zu den "Apostolischen Vätern."* NTOA 49. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.

Walter, Nikolaus. 1989. "Paul and the Early Christian Jesus-Tradition." Pages 51–80 in *Paul and Jesus: Collected Essays.* Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. JSNTSup 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Walton, Steve. 2000. *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians.* SNTSMS 108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wasserberg, Günter. 1998. *Aus Israels Mitte—Heil für die Welt. Eine narrative-exegetische Studie zur Theologie des Lukas.* BZNW 92. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Weber, Max. 1988. "Die 'Objektivität' sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis." Pages 146–214 in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre.* 7 ed. Edited by J. Winckelmann. Tübingen: Mohr.

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. 1996. "Zur Frage der Gattung der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 303–22 in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel. Bd. 3: Frühes Christentum.* Edited by H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2002. "The 'We'-Passages in Acts: On the Horns of a Dilemma." *ZNW* 93: 78–98.

Wehnert, Jürgen. 1989. *Die Wir-Passagen der Apostelgeschichte. Ein lukanisches Stilmittel aus jüdischer Tradition.* GTA 40. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1997. *Die Reinheit des "christlichen Gottesvolkes" aus Juden und Heiden. Studien zum historischen und theologischen Hintergrund des sogenannten Aposteldekrets.* FRLANT 173. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wehr, Lothar. 1996. *Petrus und Paulus—Kontrahenten und Partner. Die beiden*

Apostel im Spiegel des Neuen Testaments, der Apostolischen Väter und früher Zeugnisse ihrer Verehrung. NTA NF 30. Münster: Aschendorff.

Weidemann, Hans-Ulrich. 2004. *Der Tod Jesu im Johannesevangelium. Die erste Abschiedsrede als Schlüsseltext für den Passions—und Osterbericht.* BZNW 122. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Weinrich, Harald. 1976 [1963]. "Semantik der kühnen Metapher." Pages 295–316 in *Sprache in Texten.* Stuttgart: Klett.

Weiser, Alfons. 1996. "Jesus und die neutestamentliche Theologie." *ZNW* 87: 146–64.

Weiss, Bernhard. 1882/1883. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament.* Translated by D. Eaton and J. E. Duguid. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

———. 1903 [1868]. *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* 7 ed. Berlin: Hertz.

Weiss, Konradt. 1990. "ἄλλος." Pages 63–64 in *EDNT* 1.

———. 1992. "ἄλλος." Pages 152–53 in *EWNT* 1.

Weiss, Ze'ev. 1993. "Sepphoris." Pages 1324–28 in *NEAEHL* 4.

Weisse, Christian Hermann. 1838. *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet.* 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

———. 1856. *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium.* Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Wengst, K., ed. 1984. *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Clemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet.* SUC 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Wenham, David. 1995. *Paul—Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

White, Hayden. 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. 1988. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. 1921. *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert.* NTA 8. Münster: Aschendorff.

Wilckens, Ulrich. 1974. "Was heißt bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht'?" Pages 77–109 in *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit. Paulusstudien.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 1987–1989. *Der Brief an die Römer.* 3 vols. 2 ed. EKKNT VI/1–3. Zürich: Benziger.

———. 2002. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Vol. I/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Willi-Plein, Ina. 2000. "Opfer und Ritus im kultischen Lebenszusammenhang." Pages 150–77 in *Opfer. Theologische und kulturelle Kontexte.* Edited by B. Janowski and M. Welker. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Wilson, Stephen G. 1973. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts.* SNTSMS 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Windisch, Hans. 1924. *Der zweite Korintherbrief.* 9 ed. KEK VI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Winter, Bruce, and Andrew D. Clark, eds. 1993. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: Ancient Literary Setting.* Grand Rapids: Carlisle.

Witherington, Ben III, ed. 1996. *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wolff, Christian. 1996. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther.* THKNT 7. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Wolter, Michael. 1995. " 'Reich Gottes' bei Lukas." *NTS* 41: 541–563.

———. 1997a. "Ethos und Identität in paulinischen Gemeinden." *NTS* 43: 430–44.

———. 1997b. "Israels Zukunft und die Parusieverzögerung bei Lukas." Pages 405–26 in *Eschatologie und Schöpfung. Festschrift für Erich Gräßer.* Edited by M. Evang, H. Merklein, and M. Wolter. BZNW. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2001. " 'Dumm und skandalös.' Die paulinische Kreuzestheologie und das Wirklichkeitsverständnis des christlichen Glaubens." Pages 44–63 in *Das Kreuz Jesu. Gewalt—Opfer—Sühne.* Edited by R. Weth. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 2003. "Die Vielfalt der Schrift und die Einheit des Kanons." Pages 45–68 in *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons.* Edited by J. Barton and M. Wolter. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2004a. "Das lukanische Doppelwerk als Epochengeschichte." Pages 185–207 in *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung. Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher.* Edited by C. Breytenbach and J. Schröter. AGJU 57. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2004b. "Eine neue paulinische Perspektive." *ZNT* 14: 2–9.

Wrede, William. 1969 [1901]. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums.* 4 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1971. *The Messianic Secret.* Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge: Clarke.

———. 1973. "The Task and Methods of 'New Testament Theology.' " Pages 68–116 in *The Nature of New Testament Theology.* Edited, translated, and with an introduction by R. Morgan. SBT 25. London: SCM Press.

———. 1975. "Über Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie." Pages 81–154 in *Das Problem der Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Edited by G. Strecker. WdF 367. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Young, Norman H. 1987. "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *NovT* 29: 150–76.

Zahn, Theodor. 1888. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erster Band, Erste Hälfte).* Erlangen: Deichert.

———. 1889a. *Einige Bemerkungen zu Adolf Harnack's Prüfung der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erster Band, Erste Hälfte).* Erlangen: Deichert.

———. 1889b. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erster Band, Zweite Hälfte).* Erlangen: Deichert.

———. 1890. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band. Erste Hälfte.* Erlangen: Deichert.

———. 1904. *Grundriß der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons.* 2 ed. Leipzig: Deichert.

———. 1922 [1905]. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater.* 3 ed. KNT 9. Leipzig: Deichert.

Zeller, Dieter. 1977. *Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern*. FzB 17. Würzburg: Echter.

———. 1985. *Der Brief an die Römer*. RNT. Regensburg: F. Pustet.

Zenger, Erich et. al. 1995. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 2 ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Zimmermann, Johannes. 1998. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. WUNT II/104. Tübingen: Mohr.

Zimmermann, Mirjam, and Ruben Zimmermann. 1996. "Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation? Die Jesuslogien in 1 Kor 7,10f. und 9,14: Traditionsgeschichtliche Verankerung und paulinische Interpretation." *ZNW* 87: 83–100.

Zimmermann, Ruben. 2000. "Metapherntheorie und biblische Bildersprache. Ein methodologischer Versuch." *TZ* 56: 108–33.

———. 2001. *Geschlechtermetaphorik und Gottesverhältnis. Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie eines Bildfeldes in Urchristentum und antiker Umwelt*. WUNT II/122. Tübingen: Mohr.

Zwiep, Arie W. 1997. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. NovTSup. Leiden: Brill.

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Ancient Sources

1. Old Testament (Septuagint)

Genesis
- 6.15 193n35
- 10 226n110
- 12.3 168
- 13.15 172n59
- 15.6 168
- 15.13 170n53
- 15.18 172n59
- 17.8 172n59
- 22.18 172n59
- 24.7 172n59

Exodus
- 12.15 196n48
- 12.21 196n44
- 12.27 196n44
- 12.40 170n53
- 23.20 119n74–75
- 25.17 193

Leviticus
- 16 193n35, 194
- 18.5 166

Deuteronomy
- 16.2, 5-6 196n44
- 25.4 80, 260
- 27.26 165
- 28.49 216n66
- 28.58 165n38
- 30.10 165n38
- 32.35 86
- 33.2 173n64

2 Βασ (2 Samuel)
- 7.9-16 230

3 Βασ (1 Kings)
- 19.19-21 121n80

1 Esdras
- 1.6 196n44

Esther
- 8.17 147n54

2 Maccabees
- 2.21 148n54
- 7.23 44n61
- 7.37-38 194n39
- 8.1 148n54
- 11.1 176n88
- 13.2 176n88
- 14.2 176n88
- 14.38 148n54

4 Maccabees
- 4.26 148n54
- 6.28-29 194n39
- 12.13 178n97
- 17.22 194n39

Psalms
- 2.1 238n64
- 2.7 230, 232–33
- 15.8-11 232n30
- 10 232n30
- 88.27-38 230
- 109.1 232n31, 233
- 131.11-12 230
- 134.7 216n66
- 142.2 149n60

Proverbs
- 3.4 86n54
- 3.7 86n54
- 25.21 86, 87, 88, 257

Wisdom of Solomon
- 7.17 178n97
- 9.9 44n61
- 19.18 178n97

Sirach
7.34 86n54
Psalms of Solomon
8.15 216n66
17 230n21
17.21 230n21
Amos
9.1 193n35
Habakkuk
2.4 166, 166n43
Malachi
3.1 119n75
Isaiah
6.9-10 216, 239
8.9 216n66
8.14 240, 240n73
40.3 119n74–75, 238
40.4-5 238
42.6 240n72
45.22 216n66
48.20 216n66
49.6 216n66, 218n72, 238, 240n72
51.5 240n72
51.17 240n73
51.17-23 240
51.22 240n73
52.5 259
52.10 237, 240n72
53 195n41
54.1 259
61.1-2 241
62.11 216n66
72.7 280
Jeremiah
6.22 216n66
10.13 216n66
Ezekiel
43.14, 17, 20 193n35
Daniel
3.38-40 194n39

2. New Testament

Matthew
3.5 120n76
4.13 120n76
5.1-2 91n76
5.9 82, 257
5.11 87n57
5.32 78
5.39-42 87
5.44 82, 86, 86n55, 87, 87n57, 257
7.2 87n62
7.28 91, 91n77
8.5 91, 91n77
8.5-13 128n112
8.28 126
9.13 259
10.10 79, 81, 260
10.23 141
10.28 259n40
11.21 125
13.54-58 123
15.11 82, 257
15.21 127n107
16.14 141
17.20 82, 257
18.6 261
19.9 78
21.30 141n35
24.43 82, 257
26.24 261
26.29-40 285
Mark
1.1 41, 106n33, 258
1.2 119n74
1.2-3 42
1.5 119n75
1.9 119, 119n75, 120
1.14 41, 119
1.16 120
1.16-20 121n80
1.21 120
1.21-34 121
1.23 121
1.25 41n45
1.29 121
1.32-34 121
1.33 122n83
1.39 120
2.1 120, 121
2.1-12 122
2.1–3.6 85n50, 122n87
2.2 122n83
2.5-12 41n45
2.7 41n46
2.13 120
2.14 121n80
2.17 259
3.1 121
3.7 120
3.20 121, 121n81
3.22-27 41n45
4.1 120
4.1-34 85n50

4.35–6.6 122n87
5.1 126, 128
5.2 126n103
5.6-10 41n45
5.20 126n103
6.1 120
6.1-6 123
6.55 126
7.15 82, 257
7.17 121, 121n81
7.24 126
7.24-30 128
7.24–8.9 125n99
7.31 126, 127n108
7.37 42
8.27 124n95, 126
8.38 42
9.33 121
9.42 261
9.42-47 85
9.50 82, 87, 257
10.9 78
10.11-12 78
10.12 78, 78n32
11.22-23 82, 257
13.24-27 42
13.34-36 82
14.62 42, 232
14.64 41n46
16.6 61
16.19 277
Luke
1.1 208n27
1.1-4 211
1.2 211, 211n46, 212n47
1.3 286n63
1.30-35 230
1.32 230, 232n39, 234
1.32-33 231n23, 237
1.32-34 231n23
1.32-35 236
1.35 231n23
1.54-55 230
1.68 232n39
2.1-2 210n38
2.11 187n13, 234n45
2.25 236n56
2.30 216, 240n72
2.30-32 225n109
2.30-35 237
2.31 240n72
2.31-32 237
2.32 235, 238, 240n72
2.33 268
2.34 239, 242
2.35 240
2.38 236n56
2.48 268
3.1 210n38
3.3 120n76
3.4-6 238
3.6 216
3.7-9 240
3.10-14 240
3.16 210n40, 297
3.18 141n32
3.22 268
4.8 232n39
4.12 232n39
4.16 120n76
4.16-30 241
4.18-21 241
4.22-29 123
4.41 231n26
5.8 232n34
5.12 232n34
5.32 259
6 261
6.1-4 261
6.5 261
6.20 91n76
6.20-21 241
6.22 86n56-57
6.24-26 241
6.27 86–87, 257
6.27-28 87
6.27–36 87
6.28 82, 86, 257
6.29-30 87
6.33 86
6.35 86
6.38 87n62
7.1 91
7.1-10 128n112
7.6 232n34
7.13 232n35
7.18-35 120
7.19 232n35
9.22 217n69, 231
9.54 232n34
9.61 232n34
10 226
10.1 232n35
10.4 210n40

10.7 79, 81, 260
10.8 81
10.13 125
10.17 232n34
12.4-5 259n40
12.39 82, 257
12.42 232n35
13.1-9 210n38
13.15 232n35
13.23 232n34
14.19-20 141n35
14.20 141n32
16.7 141n35
16.10 259
16.16 79n27
16.17 79n27
16.18 78, 79n27, 141n32
17.5-6 232n35
17.6 82, 257
17.37 232n34
18.6 232n35
18.31 217n69
19.8 232n35
19.12 210n38
19.14 210n38
20.42-43 233
22.33 232n34
22.35 210n40
22.35-36 80n34
22.43-44 269
22.61 232n35
22.69 232
24 212
24.3 232n39
24.13 297
24.26 65, 217n69
24.29 217
24.30 277n14
24.34 232n39
24.42-43 277n14
24.44-47 231, 235
24.46 217n69
24.47 231n28
24.49 277
24.51 277

John
1.1 187n16
2.22 258n35
3 64
3.13 64, 65n47
3.14-16 64
3.22 120n77
4.42 187n13
6.62 65n47
7.33 65n47
7.39 65n47, 258n35
7.41-42 65n48
7.52 261
8.14 65n47
8.21 65n47
8.28 65n45
8.54 65n47
9.13-34 65n48
10.17-18 65
12.16 65n47, 258n35
12.23 65n47
12.32 65n46
12.32-33 65n45
12.33 65n46–47
13.3 65n47
13.31-32 65n47
13.33 65n74
13.36 65n47
14.4-5 65n47
14.16 258n35
14.26 258n35
14.28 65n47
15.26 258n35
16.5 65n47
16.7 258n35
16.10 65n47
16.12-13 282
16.13 258n35
16.14 65n47
17.1 65N47
17.5 65n47
20.9 258n35
20.17 65n47
21.12-13 277n14

Acts
1.1 298
1.1-14 216
1.3 297
1.3-11 212
1.4-11 297
1.5 210n40, 297
1.5-8 297
1.6 297
1.8 212n47, 216, 277, 297
1.11 226
2 236n57
2.5 234n46
2.9-11 234n46
2.11 234n46

2.14 234n46
2.17 234n47
2.17-21 234
2.18 234n47
2.22 234n46
2.22-36 231
2.27-34 233
2.29 234n46
2.30 232n30
2.31 232n30
2.33 217, 232
2.34 232n31, 232n36, 233
2.36 232n36, 234n46
2.39 234
2.41 228
2.42 257
2.47 228
3.1-10 43n53, 221n86
3.16 237n60
3.26 216n68
4.4 228
4.19 259n40
4.25 238n64
4.27 238n64
4.29 232n39
4.33 232n36
4.36-37 222, 222n91
5.14 228, 232n38
5.15 43n53
5.17-21 43n53
5.29 259n40
5.31 187n13, 232n36
5.36-37 224n105
6.7 228
7.53 173n64
7.59-60 232n39
8.16 232n37
8.26-40 236n57
9 236n59
9.1-2 278
9.3-6 217
9.5 232n36
9.10-16 217
9.10-17 232n36
9.15 218n72
9.16 218n73
9.19-20 280n34
9.20 231n26
9.22 231, 231n26
9.29 236n57
9.31 232n38
9.33–10.1 285
9.35 232n38
10 236n57, 244n78
10.1 224n105
10.11-16 217
10.34-43 296
10.36 232n36
10.41 276
11 236n57, 244n78
11.16 210n40, 297
11.19 222
11.20 222
11.21-24 232n38
12.6-10 43n53
13 236, 236n57
13–14 220, 237
13.1-3 220, 236n57, 236n59
13.2 217, 237
13.5 217n68
13.12 232n38
13.13-14 222n93
13.16-25 235n52
13.16-41 44n58, 220
13.23 187n13
13.25 297
13.26 235
13.26-37 235n52
13.32 233
13.32-33 232
13.32-37 245
13.33 233
13.33-37 233
13.34 233
13.34-37 233
13.38 235
13.38-39 233
13.39 235n50
13.43-46 220
13.46 216n68, 217, 228–29, 237n60
13.47 218n72, 235
14 236
14.4 222
14.14 222
14.15-17 44n58, 45
14.23 232n38
14.25 222n93
14.26 236n57
14.26-28 220
14.27 217
15 246
15.7 218n75, 225n109, 245n81
15.10 283
15.12 221, 245

15.14 4, 218n75-76, 225n109, 238n64, 245n81
15.16-17 218n75
15.20 245n82
15.26 232n36
15.29 245, 245n82
16–19 44n58, 223
16.6-8 223n98
16.6-10 217, 223
16.10-17 207n16
16.12 223
16.15 232n37–38
16.31 232n38
17.1 222n92
17.3 235
17.13 221n84
17.14 44n57
17.22-31 42–46, 221n85
17.24 44n61
17.29 245
17.30 44, 44n62
17.31 44
18 224n102
18.6 217, 228–29, 229n10
18.8 232n37-38
18.9 232n36
19.5 232n37
19.8 217n68
19.11-12 43n53
19.21 225n107
20.5-15 207n16
20.7-12 43n53
20.13-16 222n92
20.18-35 296
20.21 232n38
20.24 232n36
20.28 303
20.29-30 266n75
20.35 259n40, 297
21.1-3 222n92
21.1-18 207n16
21.7-8 222n92
21.13 232n36
22.8 232n36
22.10 232n36
22.15 218n72
22.19 232n36
22.21 234n48
22.29 289n72
23.11 225n107, 232n36
26.6-8 235
26.15 232n36
26.16 211n45
26.22-23 235
26.26 225
27.1–28.16 207n16
27.2-8 222n92
27.24 225n107
28.20 235n53
28.26-28 228, 229
28.28 216, 239, 239n67
28.30 244n80
28.30-31 229
28.31 232n36

Romans

1.1 233
1.2 233
1.2-4 233, 245
1.3 112n53, 192n30, 233
1.3-4 133, 191, 192n31, 233n44
1.4 233
1.16 237
1.17 133, 166n43
1.18-32 45
1.19-21 45
1.26 195
2.1-2 195
2.6 195
2.12-16 195
2.14-15 182n107
3 197
3.1-8 135n11
3.5 195
3.10 195
3.19-20 195
3.20 166
3.24 196
3.25 187, 191, 193–96, 197
3.25-26 194n36
3.28 166
4 19n57
4.15 169n50
4.24-25 191
5 19n57
5.9 196n47
5.13 169n50
6.3-5 199, 324n18
6.3-7 158n15
6.4 198
6.5 198
6.6 198
6.8 198
6.18 197
6.22 197

7.14-25 163, 182n105
7.23 182n108
8.1-11 182n105
8.3 187, 191, 192n32
8.17 198
8.21 197
8.29 198
9.1-5 135n11
9.5 112n53, 192n30
9.6 163n34
9–11 228n7, 243, 246
10.9 61, 191, 192n31–32, 324n17
10.12 192n32
10.15 280n36
11.11-32 135n11
11.26 112n53, 192n30
12 91, 94, 200
12.4-8 200–201
12.9 85
12.9-13 85, 85n52
12.9-21 85
12.10 85n52
12.14 82, 84–86, 257
12.14-21 84-88
12.15 85n52, 86
12.16 85n52, 86, 86n54
12.17 85, 86n54, 87, 257
12.17-21 85
12.18 82, 87, 257
12.19 85, 86
12.20 85n52, 87, 257
12.21 85, 86n54, 87
13.14 199, 324n18
14 152, 246, 325n20
14.9 192n32
14.14 82, 257
16.3-5 224n102

1 Corinthians

1.1 224n102
1.2 192n32
1.9 198
1.13 201n58
1.14 224n102
1.17 62
1.18 63
1.18-25 62, 63
1.18–2.16 192
1.20 193
1.22 193
1.24 63, 187
1.26 63
1.27 193
1.30 187
2.1-5 63
2.2 63
2.4-5 63
2.6-7 193
2.6-16 63
3.5–4.13 63
4.6 63
4.12 88
4.15 175n79
4.18-19 63
4.19 63
5 196, 197, 202n60
5.1 202n60
5.7 196–97
5.8 196n48
6.15 201n58
6.20 197, 198
7 83
7.8-12 256
7.10-11 78, 81, 256
7.12 79
7.14 89
7.16 80
7.18 80
7.23 197, 198
7.25 79
8–10 325n20
8.6 192n31
9 80, 83, 256
9.4 81
9.9 80, 260
9.14 78, 81, 256
9.17-18 79
10.16 198
10.17 198
10.21 198
10.30 198
11 325
11.1 324n19
11.23 112n53
11.23-25 81, 256
12 200
12.3 192n31, 324n17
12.8-10 141, 141n33
12.12-27 200–202
12.12-13 201n58
12.13 135n11, 201n58
12.13-26 201n58
12.17 201n58
12.26 198
12.27 201n58

12.28-30 325
13.2 82, 257
15.1-2 147
15.3 191, 256n34
15.3-5 61
15.11 280n36
15.20 235n54
15.39-41 141, 141n33
15.45 231n24
16.19 224n102
16.22 192n32
2 Corinthians
1.5-6 324n19
3.17 197
4.4 187n14
4.7-12 324n19
4.8-12 199
4.16–5.10 199
5.14-15 198, 324n18
5.15 199n51
5.17 199, 199n51
8.21 86n54
11.4 141, 141n33, 144, 144n51
11.8 80n33
12.9 82n41
Galatians
1–4 191
1.10–2.21 146–50
1.4 191
1.6 136, 141n31, 149n57
1.6-7 135, 137-46, 148, 151, 160, 160n18, 181n104
1.7 135, 136, 140n28
1.11 147
1.12 147, 148
1.13 158
1.13-14 163n32
1.13-16 149n59
1.16 147, 147n53, 192n32
1.19 144
1.21 222
1.23 278
2.2 148, 160
2.7 137n18, 149, 160, 181
2.7-9 148
2.9 148n56, 160, 181
2.11 148n56
2.11-14 113, 135
2.11-21 134, 139
2.12 133
2.13 136, 168, 323
2.14 136, 147, 163n32
2.15 135, 149n58, 151, 162, 167, 168
2.15-16 147, 149, 149n59, 167
2.15-17 150, 158, 168
2.15-21 158, 164
2.16 135n12, 136, 136n15, 150, 152, 158–60, 162n31, 165–68, 179–81, 183
2.16-17 135n13
2.17 162, 162n30, 163n35, 166n44
2.18-21 158, 163
2.19 158-159, 164, 198
2.20 198
3 19n57, 137, 172n60, 173n65
3.1–4.10 150
3.1–5.12 158, 164
3.3 323n15
3.6 167, 176
3.6-29 137n20
3.6–4.7 168
3.7 162
3.8 150n62, 165n37, 166n33, 167
3.10 150n62, 165, 165n37, 166n33
3.10-14 138n21, 147, 150–51, 164–69, 240
3.11 150n62, 165n11
3.11-12 166, 166n42
3.12 150n62, 165n11
3.13 150n62, 165n37, 166n33
3.13-14 150, 166–68
3.14 166
3.15 166, 170, 171, 179
3.15-18 170, 171
3.15-22 170–74
3.15-29 164, 169–70
3.15–4.11 164
3.16 172
3.17 170, 171
3.18 172
3.19 169n50, 170, 177
3.19-20 172
3.20 170n51, 173n65, 178
3.21 172n61
3.23 174, 176, 183
3.23-25 170, 174–76
3.25 174, 176
3.25-26 167n45
3.26-28 199
3.27 199, 324n18
3.28 135n11, 173, 173n65, 199
4 178
4.1 176
4.1-2 175n84
4.1-7 164, 176–80
4.1-11 164, 170, 176–80

4.3 138n21, 177, 177n92,
4.4 176, 187, 191, 192n31–32
4.4-5 179, 197
4.5-6 167n45
4.8 138, 138n21, 151, 179
4.8-11 176
4.9 177, 177n92
4.10 179, 323n15
4.11 170
4.17 162n27
4.21-31 183
4.28 167n45
4.29 231n24
4.31 167, 167n45
5.1 169, 197
5.1-2 167n45
5.1-12 158n13
5.2-3 323n15
5.13 158, 158n13, 163, 164, 169, 169n50, 197
5.13–6.10 158
5.14 183
5.18 175, 175n85
5.19-21 183
5.22-23 183
5.23 182n106
6.2 180, 183
6.12-13 323n15
6.13 158n14
6.14 180
6.15 163, 199
Ephesians
2.6 199n51
2.17 234n48
3.3 280n34
5.2 187
5.23 187n13
Philippians
1.23 198
2.6-11 65
2.6 187
2.8 280n34
2.11 192n31–32, 324n17
3.7-14 163
3.10 198, 199
3.10-14 199
3.17 324n19
3.20 187n13
4.15 80n33
Colossians
1.15 187n14
2.12 199n51
4.14 207, 281n39, 287n67
1 Thessalonians
1.6 324n19
1.9-10 46, 192n31–32
1.10 191, 196n47
3.1 44n57
4.15 81n39, 256
4.15-17 81, 82n41
5.2 257
5.2-3 82
5.9-10 196n47
5.10 198
5.13 82, 87, 257
5.15 257
1 Timothy
2.2 325
5.18 80, 260
2 Timothy
1.10 187n13
3.11 222, 276n14, 278
4.10-11 281n39, 287n67
4.11 207
Titus
1.4 187n13
2.2-5 325n23
2.13 187n13
3.6 187n13
Philemon
24 207
Hebrews
1.3 324
2.2 173n64
1 Peter
1.1 325n24
1.17 325n24
2.11 325n24
3.9 88, 257
4.14-16 325n23
2 Peter
1.1 187n13
1.11 187n13
2.1 197
3.2 187n13
3.10 82, 257
3.15 293
3.18 187n13
1 John
4.9 187
4.14 187n13
2 John
10 79
Revelation
3.3 82, 257

5.9-10 197
14.3-4 197
16.15 82, 257

3. Jewish Literature outside of the Septuagint

Apocalypse of Moses
1 173n64
Apocalypse of Sedrach
7.7 86n54

Derekh Erez
7 86n54

1 Enoch
81.5 149n60

Josephus
Antiquitates Judaicae
1.56 174n69
10.186 174n69
15.136 173n64
17.271 224n105
18.28 125n98
18.212 174n69
18.37 124n93
2.204 170n53
2.318 170n53
3.183 177n91
9.125-26 174n69
20.97-99 232n36
20.183 174n69
Contra Apionem
1 298n111
2 298n111
De Bello Judaico
1.17 209n27
2.118 224n105
2.168 125n98
2.252 124n95
2.463 148n54
2.466-80 128n113
2.454 147n54
3.516-21 126n104
5.382 170n53
Jubilees
1.27–2.1 173n64
49.3 196
Vita
37 124n94
346 124n95
429 174n69

Philo
De aeternitate mundo
109 177n91
De cherubim
40-52 231n24
127 177n91
De confusione linguarum
170-73 178n99
174 178n100
De congressu eruditionis gratia
94 175n75
De gigantibus
6 178n100
16 178n100
De migratione Abrahami
116 174n68
De mutatione nominum
217 174n68
De posteritate Caini
97 175n75
De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini
15 174n68
51 174n68, 174n71
De somniis
1.107 176n88
1.137-41 178n100
1.141-43 173n64
De specialibus legibus
2.233 174n68
2.255 178n98
De virtutibus
178 174n68, 175n83
In Flaccum
15 174n68
Legatio ad Gaium
26 174n70
27 174n68
53 174n68
115 174n68
Legum allegoriarum liber II
89-93 175n75
Quis rerum divinarum heres sit
134 177n91
140 177n91
295 174n68, 175n83
Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat
145 174n68
Quod omnis probus liber sit
1 212n52
Qumran
1QH
4.30-32 149n60

6.36-37 149n60
7.30-31 149n60
1QS
5–7 150n61, 160n20
5.21, 23, 24 150n61, 160n20
10.17-18 87n62
11.12-15 149n60
4Q
174 160n20
258 150n61, 160n20
394-99 150n61, 160
521 173n64

Sibylline Oracles
2.206 177n91
3.80-81 177n91
8.337 177n91

Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs
Testament of Benjamin
4.3 86n54
Testament of Issachar
7.5 86n54
Testament of Joseph
17.7 86n54
18.2 86n54
Testament of Zebulun
7.3-4 86n54

4. Early Christian Literature outside of the New Testament

Apocalypse of Peter
(NHC VII, 3) 66–68
Apollinaris of Hieropolis
Barnabas
21.5 44n61
Chronicon Paschale
13-14 291n85

1 Clement
5 278
7.2 251n7
13 94
13.1-2 261
13.2 85, 89
19.2 44n61
41.1 251n9
46.7-8 261
2 Clement
2.4 259
3.2 259
4.5 259
5.2 259
5.2-4 262
6.1 259
8.5 259
9.11 259
12 261
12.2 259
13.2, 4 259
15.4 259
Clement of Alexandria
Dialogue of the Savior
53, p. 139 90
Stromateis
1.96.1 251n10
3.92.2–93.1 259
3.93.1 292n90
The Second Logos of the Great Seth
p. 53.16–56.19 53n67

Didymus the Blind
Commentary on Ecclesiastes
1.8.3-5 309n11

Eusebius
Epistula Apostolorum
31 278
31, p. 42 278
33, p. 44 278
Historia ecclesiastica
2.23 279n29
3.4.6 207n13
3.24.5-7 266n73
3.25.1-7 290n79
3.39.3 266n75
3.39.4 266n72
3.39.15-16 265n71
4.23.4 251n14
4.29.5 294n96
5.1 279n29
5.8.3 207n13
5.24.6 251n14
6.12.3-6 264n65, 307n6
6.13.3 251n14
6.12.6 66n51
6.22.1 251n11
6.25.11-14 267n76
6.25.6 287n66
Praeparatio Evangelica
9.21.18 170n53
9.22.4-6 147n54

Gregory of Nazianzus
Carmina
1.12.5 279n31

Ignatius of Antioch
To the Magnesians
8.1 148n54
10.3 148n54
To the Philadelphians
6.1 148n54
To the Smyrnaens
2 67n52
3.3 276n14
To the Trallians
10.1 67n52

Irenaeus
Adversus Haereses
1.10.1 253n22
1.24.4 67n53
3.1.1 279, 284n53, 287n66, 288
3.1.2 279
3.3.14 281
3.6.1-4 279
3.6.5–3.7.2 279, 281
3.8.1-2 279
3.9.1–3.11.8 279
3.11.8 292n88
3.11.7-9 267n79
3.11.9 279n30
3.12 280
3.12.5 280n32
3.12.9 280, 280n34
3.13.1 280n34–35, 282n41
3.13.1-2 280
3.13.3 280, 280n37, 282n42
3.14.1 207n13, 275n9, 287
3.14.1-2 281n39
3.14.1-3 206n5
3.14.3 281n40
3.15.1 251n8, 281n38
3.20 67n55
5.2 67n55
5.36 67n55

Jerome
De viris illustribus
2 277n14

John Chrysostom
Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum
60.13 294n96

Justin
Apologia maior
15.9 88
50 277
66.3 265n66, 279n26
67.3 265n66, 279n26
Dialogus cum Tryphone
32.1 64n41
66.3 291n85
90.1 64n41
103.8 206n10
106.3 206n10

Origen
Homiliae in Lucam
1.1 267n80
1.2 292n90

Polycarp
Martyrdom of Polycarp
11.1 138n22
To the Philippians
2.3 85, 89
12.3 88

Tertullian
Adversus Marcionem
4.2.4 283n53, 287n66
4.2.5 251n8, 288n71
5.2-4 282
5.2.7 283n48–50
Adversus Praxean
17 282n45
De baptismo
12-13 282n45
De jejunio adversus psychicos
8 282n45
De praescriptione haereticorum
13 251n12
22 282n46–47
22.11 283n52
23 284n54
23.3 283n52
De pudicitia
7-11 286n61
12 286n61
13-18 286n61
21 282n45
De resurrectione mortuorum
39 282n45

De scorpiace
15 282n45
De virginibus velandis
1 251n12
Orationes
24 282n45

(Pseudo-)Tertullian
Adversus omnes Haereses
6.1 294n96
Gospel of Thomas
13 262
21 262
21.5-7 257
22 259, 262
48 257
60 262
106 257

5. Pagan Ancient Writings

Aristotle
Poetica
9.1451a 36n3, 215n60
9.1451b 13n29

Cicero
De legibus
1.5 37n24
Cleanthes
Hymn to Zeus
4 44n61

Dio Chrysostom
Orationes
12 44n61
Didorus Siculus
Bibliotheca historica
2.1 212n52
3.1 212n52
Diogenes Laertius
Vitae Philosophorum
3.24 177n91
3.92 175n83
7.37 138n22
7.136-37 177n91
(Pseudo-)Diogenes
Epistulae
29 175n82
Duris of Samos
FrGH 76 F 38n34

Empedocles
Fragment 6 177n91
Epictetus
Diatribai
1.11 174n71, 175n76
2.5.23 86n54
3.19 174n72
3.22.17 175n82
Fragment 97 174n72
Euripides
Ion
725-34 175n76

Gaius
Institutiones
1.52 176n87
1.55 176n87

Herodotus
Historiae
8.75 174n67
9.10 176n88

Livy
Ab urbe condita
45.29 223n100
Lucian
De morte peregrine
13 64n41
Quomodo historia conscribenda sit
39-42 215n61
47-51 215n62

Ovid
Metamorphoses
8.620-724 221n88

Plato
Leges
7.808E 175n80
Protagoras
325C 174n71, 175n75
325C-326E 175n83
330A-B 144n48
Symposium
183C 174n72
Timaeus
48B 177n91
56B 177n91
57C 177n91

Pliny the Elder
Historia naturalis
5.74 127n110
Plutarch
Moralia
439E-F 174n73
36E 174n71
37C-E 174n74
439F 174n70
Polybius
Historiarum libri qui supersunt
2.1.1-2 212n52
2.56-63 37n26

Seneca
Ad Lucillum epistulae morales
25.6 174n70
89.13 175n81

Theodotus
Fragment 4 147n54
Thucydides
History of the Peloponnesian War
1.21 37n27
1.22 37
1.22.1 37n29
1.22.1-2 38n32
2.80 176n88
Xenophon
De re publica lacedaemoniorum
3.1 174n70

6. Inscriptions and Papyri

CIJ II
879 129n113
880 129n113
991 129n113

CIL VI
2210 175n77
3898-99 175n77
6327-30 175n77
9741-51 175n77
9753-57 175n77

Papyri
Oxyrhynchus Papyri
6.930 175n78
1224 88
265.28 176n88
Papyrus Egerton 2 263
Papyrus Köln 255 263
Papyrus Rylands 463
109.18 176n88

Index of Modern Authors

Abramowski, L., 279n27
Aland, B., 255n27, 270n89, 289n75
Aland K., 255n27, 269, 270n89, 285n58, 289n75
Albertz, R., 241n76
Alexander, L.C.A., 206n6, 210n35, 211n45, 212n50, 225n108
Allison, D.C., 81n35
Ankersmit, F.R., 34
Argyle, A.W., 206n5
Arnold, E.E., 177n95
Assmann, A., 40
Assmann, J., 1, 35n17, 51, 52n5, 56, 338, 339n42, 344n52
Atkinson, K., 120n78
Attridge, H.W., 40n37
Aune, D.E., 209n34

Bachmann, M., 134n6, 160n19, 161n22–23, 173n65
Baldauf, C., 190n28
Bammel, E., 171n58, 173n63
Barclay, J.M.G., 322n13
Barrett, C.K., 46n67, 141n34, 207n20, 208n26, 216n65–66, 234n47
Barth, U., 12n19–20, 18n49, 18n54, 28n27–28
Batey, R., 123n90
Bauer, G.L., 101n20, 330n6
Bauer, W., 140n27, 305, 320–21
Baum, A.D., 338n37
Baumgartner, H.M., 14n34, 26n20
Baur, F.C., viii, 15–18, 27, 29, 31, 39, 319–21
Bechard, D.P., 220, 222n95, 226n110, 236n57
Becker, J., 157n11, 158n15, 186n8–9
Belleville, L.L., 174n66
Bendemann, R.v., 329n1
Berger, K., 319n5, 335, 336n29
Bernhardt, R., 188n21
Bethge, H.-G., 249n3, 254n26, 332n12
Betz, H.D., 137, 138n24, 157, 163n35, 167n47, 171n58, 173n63, 177n95
Beyer, H.W., 140n27
Beyer, K., 78n23
Bichler, R., 36n18
Bietenhard, H., 126n102, 127n11
Billerbeck, P., 86n54
Black, M., 189
Blass, F., 140n27, 143n44, 239n67
Blinzler, J., 177n93, 177n96
Bockisch, G., 36n18
Bonneau, N., 168n49
Bösen, W., 123n90
Böttrich, C., 136n14
Boussett, W., 104, 185n2, 191n29
Bovon, F., 211n44–45, 240n70
Bradshaw, P.R., 68n58
Brawley, R.L., 208n24, 229n15, 239n69
Breytenbach, C., 75n11, 78n21, 87n63, 122n84, 122n86, 126n105, 155n3, 193n34, 194n39, 220, 221n87, 222n90
Büchsel, H.M.F., 140n27
Bultmann, R., viii, 17, 18n48, 28–29, 84n48, 90, 95n3, 99n15–16, 104–10, 112–13, 115–16, 130, 186n7, 194n37, 335–46
Burchard, C., 136n14, 161n24, 163n35, 165n40, 166n42, 167n48, 218n70
Burkhardt, H., 286n62
Burton, E.d.W., 138n24, 142, 143n43

Cadbury, H J., 206n7–8, 207n14, 208, 209n31, 211n43, 211n45, 212n48
Campenhausen, H.v., 89n71, 251n13–14, 252n18, 255n31, 260n42, 265n68, 274, 285n59–60, 286n62, 292n89, 338n36, 340n43
Cancik, H., 35n16

Cassirer, E., 189
Chancey, M.A., 97n10, 332n15
Charlesworth, J.H., 96n5, 187n11
Clark, A.C., 206n5
Classen, C.J., 158n12
Claussen, C., 120n78
Collins, J.J., 187n11
Conrat, M., 170n51
Conzelmann, H., 42n50, 104n28, 208n23, 209n29, 209n33, 214, 216n66, 220, 222n96, 228–29, 243, 346n57
Coppins, W., vii–viii, xii
Corbo, V., 122n82, 122n85
Cranfield, C.E.B., 85n52, 194n36
Crossan, J.D., 95n2, 106n34, 111, 123n88
Cullmann, O., 148n56, 185n2

Dahl, N.A., 134n7, 187n12
Danker, F.W., 87n58, 140n27
Danneberg, L., 188n21
Danto, A., 22
Debrunner, A., 140n27, 239n67
Deissmann, A., 20n59, 193n33–34, 194n36, 197n493
Delling, G., 177n93, 177n96, 332n13
Delobel, J., 208n24
Denis, A.-M., 178n97
Deutschmann, A., 228n4, 228n6, 229n16
Dibelius, M., 3, 28–29, 43n54, 74, 77, 84n48, 92–93, 116n62, 207n17, 209n28, 209n31, 213, 215, 231n24
Dinkler, E., 148n56
Donaldson, T. L., 151n63, 167n46–47
Dormeyer, D., 40n40, 41n43, 118n71
Droysen, J.G., viii, 2, 10n7, 11–12, 13n28, 16–18, 20, 22–31, 34n10, 35n11, 39, 47, 95n1, 215n59, 302n116
Du Toit, D.S., 42n48
Dunn, J.D.G., 3, 16n42, 42n49, 75, 76n14, 78n20, 83n46, 85n52, 88n64, 88n68, 97n10, 99n14, 113n55, 134n5, 134n9, 135n10, 135n12, 139n26, 148n55, 149n57, 156n6, 157n8, 160n19, 161n22, 161n25, 162n27, 162n31, 165n40, 173n62, 183n111, 232n33, 346n56

Ebner, M., 97n10, 346n56
Eco, U., 27n25
Eddy, P.R., 124n96
Eger, O., 171n55, 171n57
Egermann, F., 38n31
Ehrmann, B.D., 268
Elliot, J.K., 141n31, 141n35
Ellis, E E., 96n5
Epp, E.J., 255n28; 265n67
Evang, M., 105n30
Evans, C.A., 92n83, 96n5

Ferguson, E., 286n60
Fitzmyer, J.A., 207n17, 208n24–25, 211n43, 216n66, 230n21, 235n54, 237n62
Flint, P. 332n12
Foakes-Jackson, F.J., 222n94
Foerster, G., 120n78
Frey, J., xiv, 104n27, 134n5
Freyne, S., 97n11, 109n44, 111n50, 112n50, 116n64, 120n77, 123n91, 124n96–97, 129n113–14, 264n64, 332n15, 346n56
Fried, J. 10n8, 25, 35n12, 52–60, 69
Fuller, R.H., 185n2

Ganser-Kerperin, H., 228n5
Gathercole, S., vii–viii, xii, 160n17
Gemünden, P. v., 186n4
Gielen, M., 325n21
Gnilka, J., 335, 336n29
Goertz, H.-J., 10n7, 11n10, 11n15, 26n19, 26n23, 27n24, 31n35, 35n13, 52n4, 98n12, 130n118, 214
Gomme, A. W., 37n30
Goppelt, L., 346n57
Graeser, A., 188n21
Grässer, E., 136n16, 199n52, 227n2
Gregory, A., 275n11, 276, 277n15, 278n24

Haacker, K., 142, 194n36, 229n15
Habermas, J., 21
Haenchen, E., 42n50, 221n50, 214, 216n66, 228–29, 239, 243, 276, 277n15–16
Hahn, F., 41n42, 82n44, 118n71, 185n2, 188n17–19, 191n29, 230n22, 231n24–25, 231n29, 336n31, 338n39, 341–343, 346n55, 346n57
Hahneman, G. M., 285n60
Hakola, R., 40n39, 40n41, 75n11, 118n70
Harnack, A.v., viii, 17, 17n44–45, 20n59, 104n27, 107n38, 116, 273–276, 281, 288n68, 288n70, 291, 294, 299–301, 340
Hartenstein, J., 264n63, 324n16
Hartlich, C., 101n20
Harvey, A.E., 80n32
Hatch, W.H.P., 289n73
Havelaar, H.W., 66n50
Haverkamp, A., 189n22
Hays, R.B., 162n28, 165n40, 167n47
Head, P.M., 267n78, 291n87, 310n15

Heckel, T.K., 291n82, 292n92
Heil, C., 74n2–3, 206n6
Heiligenthal, R., 157n8
Hemer, C.J., 43n51, 219n78
Hengel, M., 42, 43n51, 104n27, 148n54, 186n7, 191n29, 192n30, 205n2, 206n10, 207n17, 288n68, 291n84–85, 292, 338n38
Henrich, D., 13n27
Herder, J.G., 14n36, 16–17, 75, 89, 101n19
Hertfelder, T., 11n14
Hezser, C., 111n49, 121n79
Hill, C.E., 266n74
Hodgson, P.C., 39n36, 320n6
Hoffmann, P., 74n2, 86n57, 88n65
Hofius, O., 160n19, 161n23
Hollander, H. W., 118n72
Holmén, T., 113n54
Holtz, T., 82n43
Horn, F. W., 208n24, 336n29
Horst, P.W.v.d., 44n60, 330n13
Hübner, H., 165n39, 339n41
Hultgren, S., 91n78, 92n80–81
Humboldt, W.v., 9n4, 13n28, 20, 22–23, 39

Iser, W., 13n27

Janowski, B., 195n41, 329n4
Järvinen, A., 118n73
Jauss, H.R., 14n31, 14n35, 26n20, 214, 214n58
Jervell, J., 43, 44n56, 205n2, 207n15, 207n17, 218n74, 223n98, 228–29, 235n49, 235n54, 239n68, 244, 287n67
Jeska, J., 220n83, 228n5, 236n58, 239n69
Johnson, L.T., 99n15, 107n37, 208n25, 235n54
Johnson, M., 190
Jonge, M.d., 186n7, 187n11
Juel, D.H., 187n12
Jüngel, E., 189–90

Kahl, B., 140, 140n28, 144–45
Kähler, M., 99n15, 107n37
Kaiser, O., 334n21
Kaiser, U.U., 249n3
Kant, L.H., 332n13
Karrer, M., 185n2, 186n7–8, 188n19, 229n16
Käsemann, E., viii, 88n66, 88n68, 194n37, 201n58, 252–53, 312, 318, 327, 340
Kaser, M., 176n87, 176n89
Keck, L.E., 188n19
Kee, H.C., 120n78, 121n78
Kelber, W.H., 74n6, 107n37, 129n116
Kennedy, G.A., 157n11
Kim, S., 81n38
King, K.L., 305n3
Kingsbury, J.D., 118n71
Kinzig, W., 251n13
Kitzberger, I., 186n5
Klauck, H.-J., 44n59, 77n17, 254n24, 263n55, 263n57, 263n59, 264n61, 306n5, 333n20
Klein, G., 211n46, 212n48–49
Kloppenborg, J.S., 74n2, 74n5, 118n73
Kloppenborg Verbin, J.S., 121n78
Koch, D.-A., 155n3, 207n18, 223n98, 235n49
Kocka, J., 12n24
Koester, H., 74n7, 84n49, 88n69–70, 260n47, 261n48, 262n54, 293n93, 320n10, 321n10
Koet, B., 237n61, 238n65–66, 240
Köpf, U., 16n41, 16n43, 27n26, 39n36
Korn, M., 211n43, 230n20, 295n100
Körtner, U. H. J., 249n1
Kosseleck, R., 10n9, 13n26, 13n29, 14n33, 22n2, 22n4, 51n1
Kramer, W., 185n2
Kratz, R.G., 36n20
Kremer, J., 231n25, 233n44
Krug, J., 199n52
Kuck, D. W., 275n11, 276, 282n44
Kunz, M., 212n52
Kurz, W.S., 207n19

Labahn, A., 192n32
Labahn, M., 192n32
Lachmann, K., 75
Lake, K., 222n94
Lakoff, G., 190
Lambrecht, J., 158n16, 162n30
Lämmert, E., 13n27
Lang, F.G., 125n99, 127n108, 127n111
Lategan, B.C., 10n8, 18, 157n12
Lendle, O., 38n31, 38n33–34
Levine, L.I., 120n78
Leyh, P., 11n12
Lichtenberger, H., 156n5
Liddell, H.G., 143n42, 177n90
Liebenberg, J., 29n30, 185n3
Lietzmann, H., 20n59, 148n54, 167n47, 177n95, 285n60
Lightfoot, J.B., 142–44
Lindars, B., 187n11
Lindemann, A., 62n40, 78n20, 79n28, 95n3, 104n28, 108n39–40, 156n7, 200n56, 200n58, 201n58, 210n39, 236n57, 260n47, 277n21, 293, 293n94
Link-Wieczorek, U., 188n21

Lips, H.v., 82n42, 250n5, 260n42, 260n47, 310n14, 338n36
Loffreda, S., 122n82
Löhr, W., 68n56
Lohmeyer, E., 109n43, 110n47, 129
Lohse, E., 346n57
Longenecker, B.W., 162n28
Longenecker, R.N., 138n24, 142n39
Löning, K., 118n71, 206n7, 208n25
Lorenz, C., 10n7, 11n17, 25n14, 98n12
Lüdemann, G., 18n48
Lührmann, D., 77, 119n75, 126n103, 127n108, 179n102, 254n23, 260n47, 261n50, 262n50, 263n55–58, 263n60, 264n62, 285n56, 291n80, 308n10, 309n11, 313n21, 342n49
Lull, D.J., 175n85
Luschnat, O., 38n31
Lux, R., 60n33
Luz, U., 118n71, 186n7, 187n10, 336n31

Maier, J., 161n23
Mainville, O., 232n32
Malbon, E.S., 129n116
Marguerat, D., 43n52, 207n19, 210n41, 213n54, 221n89, 229n15, 229n17, 239n69, 296n107
Markschies, C., 70n59, 249n1–3, 305n4
Marshall, I.H., 210n36, 211n43, 212n50, 240n70
Martin, D.B., 186n5
Martyn, J.L., 137n18, 138n24, 139n26, 162n28, 163n35, 165n40, 167n48, 182n109
Marxsen, W., 129n116
Massa, D., 185n3
Mayser, E., 127n108, 143n42
McCue, J.F., 320n8
McKay, H.A., 126n102
Meier, J.P., 95n2, 99n13, 345n53
Meister, K., 35n16, 37n25, 38n34
Merenlahti, P., 40n39, 40n41, 75n11, 118n70
Merk, O., 329n4, 330n5
Merklein, H., 186n8, 187n9, 201n58
Merz, A., 18n55, 29n31, 96n7, 114n61, 118n69, 123n91, 186n9
Metzger, B.M., 286n63, 290n78, 337n34, 338n36, 344n51
Meurer, H.-J., 185n3
Meyers, C.L., 123n90, 124n92
Meyers, E.M., 123n90, 124n92
Milligan, G., 140n27, 143n44–45, 175n78
Minear, P.S., 230n20
Molthagen, J., 36n21
Mommsen, W.J., 9n2–3, 11n17, 14n33, 26n19
Moulton, J.H., 140n27, 143n44–45, 175n78
Mount, C., 209n34
Moxter, M., 130n118
Müller, C.G., 186n5
Müller, K., 11n10
Müller, M., 187n11, 338n40
Müller, P., 41n42, 118n71
Murrmann-Kahl, M., 11n14, 11n16, 18n54
Mussner, F., 136n16, 138n24, 140n29, 147n53, 158n15, 162n30, 167n48, 171n58, 176n87, 177n95

Neirynck, F., 78n20, 83n45
Niebuhr, K.-W., 156n6
Nippel, W., 219n77
Noormann, R., 282n43
Norris, F. W., 320n8

Oepke, A., 138n24, 172n61, 177n95
Öhler, M., 222n91, 236n59
Ohme, H., 251n6, 307n8
Oster, R.E., 120n78
Ostmeyer, K.-H., 196n45
Overbeck, F., 277n22
Overman, J.A., 123n89

Pagels, E., 254n25
Palmer, D. W., 209n33
Paper, W., 143n41
Parker, D.C., 255n27, 261n49, 262n53, 265n67, 269n87–88, 270n89, 289n72
Parsons, M.C., 211n42, 212n51, 295n102, 295n105, 296n107–8, 297n109–10, 298n111
Paulsen, H., 340n44
Perrin, N., 97n88, 187n11
Pervo, R., 211n42, 295n102, 295n105, 296n107–8, 297n109, 298n111
Pesch, R., 119n75, 207n15, 287n67
Petersen, N.R., 40n39, 75n11
Petrus, K., 188n21
Pichler, J., 220n83
Pietsch, M., 230n21
Pilhofer, P., 280n22, 223n99, 223n101, 224n106
Plisch, U.-K., 263n57, 263n59, 264n61
Plümacher, E., 43n53, 207n19, 209n28, 209n31–33, 210n37, 214, 218n71, 225n107, 226n111, 227, 239n67
Pokorný, P., 133–34, 294n98
Porter, S.E., 40n39, 43n54, 45n65, 46n66, 99n14, 118n70, 207n18, 209n31, 218n71, 293n95
Powell, M.A., 40n39, 118n70

Qimron, E., 160n21, 161n23

Radl, W., 237n61–62
Räisänen, H., 164n36, 229n14, 318, 322n12, 329n2, 330n8
Ramsay, W.M., 136n17, 143–45
Reed, J.L., 97n10, 109n44, 111n50, 112n50, 123n88, 123n90, 124n92, 124n97, 332n15
Reimarus, H.S., 15, 100n17
Reinmuth, E., 10, 18
Reiser, M., 325n22
Rese, M., 208n24, 228n4
Rhoads, D.M., 29n32, 41n42, 118n71
Ricoeur, P., 3, 11n10, 13n30, 14n33, 20n59, 26n21, 34, 39, 52, 57–60, 69, 90, 117, 214, 215n63
Riesner, R., 121n78
Ritter, A.M., 251n13, 340n43
Robbins, V.K., 207n19
Roberts, C.H., 320n8
Robinson, J.M., 74n2, 106n35, 109n45, 111, 114n60
Robinson, T.A., 320n8
Rhode, J., 141n30, 165n39, 166n43, 173n63
Röhser, G., 186n5, 195n42
Rösler, W., 33n4
Rollinger, R., 36n18
Rollmann, H., 104n27
Roloff, J., 43n55, 45n64, 80n31, 129n117, 207n20, 218n70, 218n73, 234n48, 260n46, 326n25
Rosenblatt, M.-E., 218n73
Rowland, C., 40n38
Rusam, D., 177n93–94, 228n5, 234n47–48
Rüsen, J., 10n7, 11n10, 14n32, 14n34, 19n57, 23, 26n20, 33n2, 35n15

Sachs, W., 101n20
Sanders, E.P., 92n83, 134n8, 134n10, 165n40, 264n64
Sanders, H., 285n57
Sänger, D., 145n52
Sauer, J., 87n61, 88n67
Schadewaldt, W., 35n16
Schenke, H.-M., 249n3
Schleiermacher, F. D. E., 27, 92, 185n1, 349, 349n59–60
Schlier, H., 138n24, 140n29, 165n40, 165n48, 171n55, 171n58, 172n61, 177n95
Schlund, C., 64n42, 196n45
Schmeller, T., 125n100–101, 126n103, 127n109, 129n113
Schmidt, C., 278n23
Schmidt, K.L., 28, 105, 110n45, 113n58, 114–15, 130
Schmithals, W., 74n8, 105n30, 112n52
Schneemelcher, W., 249n1, 249n3, 252n16, 279n28, 286n63, 307n7, 338n38
Schneider, G., 207n20, 276, 277n15
Schnelle, U., 18, 76n13, 185n2
Scholder, K., 16n43, 39n36
Scholz, H., 349n59–60
Schönebaum, H., 11n16
Schrage, W., 62n40, 79n26, 201n58
Schreiber, S., 187n11, 194n36, 194n38–39, 195n40
Schreiner, T.R., 160n19
Schröter, J., vii–xiv, 18n48, 19n56, 41n44, 41n47, 60n33, 68n57, 74n8, 79n27, 80n31–32, 80n34, 85n51, 90n72, 92n81, 96n4, 111n48, 118n73, 120n76, 124n96, 145n52, 156n4, 156n6, 160n17, 186n6, 186n8–9, 199n52, 249n1, 249n3, 250n4, 254n26, 255n32, 256n33, 260n47, 285n56, 332n15, 338n40, 346n56
Schuppe, E., 174n66, 174n70
Schürer, E., 124n92, 332n13
Schürmann, H., 87n59, 187n10, 213n53, 238n65, 240n70
Schüssler-Fiorenza, E., 18
Schwankl, O., 186n5
Schweitzer, A., viii, 17, 108–9, 113
Schweizer, E., 126n106, 127n106, 177n93–94, 233
Schwemer, A., M. 104n27, 186n7
Scott, R., 143n42, 177n90
Selb, W., 170n51, 171n54, 171n56–58
Sellin, G., 183n110, 341–43
Semler, J.S., 334n21
Shauf, S., 208n21
Sieffert, F.A., 138n24–25, 142, 149n58
Siker, J.S., 242n77
Skeat, T.C., 207n11, 267n78–79, 291, 292n89, 310n15
Skinner, M.L., 218n73
Smit, J., 157n12
Soards, M.L., 209n30
Spicq, C., 87n58, 174n66
Squires, J.T., 294n98
Stanley, C.D., 165n40
Stanton, G.N., 267n78, 286n60, 291n82, 295n103
Stegemann, E.W., 237n62, 238n65, 244n79
Stendahl, K., 134n7

Sterling, G.E., 209n34
Steyn, G.J., 234n47
Strange, J.F., 120n78, 124n92
Strange, W.A., 277n15
Straub, E., 65n46
Strauss, D.F., viii, 15–17, 27, 95n3, 100–106, 115–16, 130, 185n1
Strauss, M., 230n21, 231n25, 231n27, 294n98
Strecker, C., 199n53, 200n54, 200n57
Strecker, G., 330n5, 335, 336n29
Strugnell, J., 160n21, 161n23
Stuhlmacher, P., 330n8, 335n28, 336–37, 339n41, 340
Süssmann, J., 13n28, 33n4
Sundberg, A.C., 285n60
Syreeni, K., 118n71

Talbert, C.H., 87n61, 88n66, 210n35
Tannehill, R.C., 118n71, 208n25, 226n110, 229n15, 230n20, 233n41, 238n66, 296, 296n106
Taylor, J.E., 122n82
Telford, W.R., 345n53
Theissen, G., 15n40, 18, 29n31, 30n34, 88n65, 95n2, 96n7, 114n61, 118n69, 123n91, 126n103, 130n118, 157n9, 163n34, 186n9, 318n4, 321, 326
Theobald, M., 41n46, 76n15
Thornton, C.-J., 43n51, 206n9, 207n15, 207n17, 223n101, 285n60, 286n63, 287n67, 288n69
Tregelles, S.P., 285n60
Treu, K., 35n14
Trobisch, D., 285n56
Tuckett, C.M., 81n36, 81n38, 82n43, 84n47, 88n69, 101n19, 208n24, 230n19, 329n3
Turner, M., 190n27
Turner, V., 199n53
Tzaferis, V., 122n82

Unnik, W.C.v., 216n66

VanderKam, J.C., 332n12
Verheyden, J., 208n24, 286n60, 294n97, 295n104
Vielhauer, P., 44n63, 177n93
Vögtle, A., 187n11
Völkel, M., 212n48
Vorster, W.S., 10n8
Vos, J.S., 166n41
Vouga, F., 138n24, 144–45, 147n53, 157n11, 167n48

Walbank, F.W., 38n34
Walser, M., 33, 33n1
Walter, M., 200n55
Walter, N., 82n40–41, 83n45
Walton, S., 216n65, 218n71, 293n95
Wasserberg, G., 228n6, 240n70, 240n74, 294n98
Weber, M., 9, 11–12, 17, 20, 110n47
Wedderburn, A.J.M., 207n18, 210n36
Wehnert, J., 207n15, 207n19, 287n67, 323n14
Wehr, L., 148n56
Weidemann, H.–U., 64n42
Weinrich, H., 189
Weiser, A., 329n3
Weiss, K., 140n27
Weiss, Z., 123n90
Weisse, C.H., 15, 73–75, 91–92, 95n3, 101n19, 103, 110, 116, 185n1
Wenham, D., 78n20, 81n35
White, H., 11, 23, 27n24, 33–34, 52n3, 58
Wiefel, W., 212n50
Wikenhauser, A., 205n2, 212n52, 219n78
Wilckens, U., 88n67, 165n39, 194n37, 330n8, 336–37, 340
Willi-Plein, I., 196n43
Wilson, S.G., 237n62
Windisch, H., 142n40
Winter, D., 18, 30n34, 95n2
Witherington, B., 239n69
Wolff, C., 78n22, 82n44, 201n58
Wolter, M., 62n39, 134n5, 202n59, 209n29, 229, 235n54, 240n74–75, 253n21, 312n20
Wrede, W., viii, 15, 103–106, 107n38, 113, 115–16, 131, 267n77, 317, 326, 330, 332–37, 340

Young, N.H., 174n66

Zager, W., 104n27
Zahn, T., 136n17, 138n24, 144–45, 252n17, 274, 277n18, 277n22, 279n31, 286n61, 286n63, 287n65, 288n68, 289n76, 290n77, 291
Zeller, D., 85n53, 87n60
Zimmermann, J., 187n11
Zimmermann, M., 78n21, 78n25
Zimmermann, R., 78n21, 78n25, 186n4, 188n20
Zwiep, A.W., 212n51

Subject Index

Abraham (promise of, sonship of), 136–37, 150–52, 163, 165, 167–74, 176, 181–83, 240, 322; *see also* Law
Acts: character as presentation of history/genre, 3–4, 19, 42–47, 48, 69–70, 205, 207–10, 213, 216–19, 224–26, 299–300; function within the canon, 4, 273–75, 278–80, 284, 288, 290, 293–94, 298–301, 310–11, 343–44; grounding of its authority, 281–84, 290, 294–95, 299–300, 343–44; historicity, 3–4, 42–47, 69–70, 215, 219–25, 301–2; place in the canon, 206, 284–85, 288–90, 303–4; purpose, 227, 323; reception, 276–84, 290, 300–301, 310–11; title, 205–6; *see also* Areopagus speech; Lukan Doppelwerk; Paul
Apocalypse of Peter, 66–68
Apocrypha/apocryphal, 149, 264–65, 291–92; concept, 149, 251–52; historicity, 77, 96n4, 254, 308–11, 313; vs. "canonical," 96n4, 260–62, 271, 292–93, 306–8, 340, 342; *see also* canonicity, criteria
Apostolic council/decree (Acts 15), 4, 148n56, 151, 180–81, 210, 217–18, 220–21, 226, 229, 245–46, 280, 282–83, 286n61
Apostolic Fathers, 4, 76, 249, 276, 278, 305, 335n25, 341–42
apostolicity, 266–67, 309, 338, 344
archaeology, 97–98, 111n50, 120n78, 122–24; *see also* stratigraphy model
Areopagus speech, 42–47, 48, 221, 224, 280
Aristotle, 13n29, 36, 38, 58, 117n67, 200, 215
Athanasius, 252, 289n76, 307, 308n9

Basilides, 67n53, 308
Bengel, J.A., 138
canon critique (calling into question of the canon), 330–31, 333–35, 345
canon formation: exclusion vs. collection of writings, 250, 252, 267, 274, 311, 343–44; impulses for, 253, 255–56, 292–93, 311, 343–44; *see also* Campenhausen; collection of writings; Harnack; Zahn
canon lists, 279, 285–86, 288–90, 303–4, 307–8; *see also* Council of Laodicea; Easter Letter, thirty-ninth
canon of the New Testament: canon vs. collections of writings, 276, 299–300; concept, 250–51, 271, 307–8; effective history, 312; meaning/function, 329–30, 348
"canon within the canon," 253, 321, 341
canonicity, 330–31; criteria, 253, 266–67, 271, 308–10, 326–27, 343–44, 347; division (accepted, disputed, rejected), 267, 309
canons: Claromontanus, 290, 304; Mommsenianus 290; Muratori, 206, 207n13, 275n8, 279, 284n53, 285–90, 293–94, 300, 303, 307n7, 308, 310
Capernaum, 91, 120–23, 126, 128n112
Catholic Letters, 4, 206n3, 270, 273–74, 279n31, 285, 289–91, 293, 299–300, 311, 317, 343
Chladenius, J.M., 22, 55
Christology, 103–6, 112; docetic, 66–68, 268–69, 271, 347; Lukan, 230–42; narrative, 41, 187–88, 323
Cicero, 36–37, 158n12
city-country opposition (Galilee), 123–25
codices, 269–70; Alexandrinus (A), 285, 303; Berolinensis Gnosticus, 264; Bezae (D), 261–62, 285, 303; Dublinensis (Z), 262; Sinaiticus a, 262, 285, 303; Tchacos, 305; Vaticanus (B), 262, 285, 303

collection of writings, 276, 311; *see also* four gospel collection; Pauline letter collection
confession: *see* canonicity, criteria; rule of faith
construction: of history, 10–14, 34, 98–99, 215–16, 301–2; of history and memory research, 49–57; of reality, 114–15, 108–9; *see also* truth, historical
constructivism, 1, 52, 98, 116
Council of Laodicea, 252; 289n76

death of Jesus: in *Apocalypse of Peter*, 66–68; in John, 64–66; in Paul, 62–63, 187, 193–203; for John, *see also* exaltation of Jesus; for Paul, *see also* metaphors, from the cultic sphere; metaphor, redemption; theology of the cross
Decapolis, 125–29
de-historization, 18, 109–10
Didymus the Blind, 261, 309n11
Dilthey, F.W., 27
docetism, 66–68, 268–69, 271, 347; *see also* incarnation of Jesus; Son of Man (expression)
dogmatics and exegesis (relationship between), 14–16, 329–31
Duris of Samos, 38; *see also* historian controversy, ancient

"Easter gulf," 107
Easter Letter, thirty-ninth, 252, 307
ecclesiology: primitive Christian, 149, 152–53, 196–97, 200–3, 324–26; *see also* office
Elert, W., 197n49
Epistle to the Apostles, 277–79, 284, 292n92
ethics, 85–86, 180, 183, 201–3
εὐαγγέλιον: ἕτερος vs. ἄλλος, 137–46, 151
Eucharist, 76, 251
exaltation of Jesus, 62, 64–66, 80, 82, 84, 89, 93, 97, 107, 192, 217, 225–26, 231–34, 236–37, 256–58, 277, 323–24, 346–47; *see also* kyrios tradition
eyewitness testimony, 15, 73, 103, 207, 208n27, 211, 286–88, 296

Fabricius, J.A., 249n2
facticity, 26–27, 38, 46, 69, 301
faith, 194–95; *see also* law vs. faith
fictionality (vs. facticity), 14, 18, 118n69, 25–27, 34, 59, 113–14, 116–18, 130, 214–15
forgetting/distorting of the past, 50–61, 69–70
form criticism, 28–30, 75, 96n5–6, 101n19, 114–15, 117–18, 131, 185n1

four gospel collection, 206–207, 267, 285–86, 287, 289, 290–94, 304, 331–32
"framework" (historical, temporal-historical, narrative, etc.) vs. sayings tradition, 27–30, 97–100; 107–11, 113–17, 121–22, 128–29, 131; *see also* Jesus tradition
Frei, N., 49

Gabler, J.P., 15, 101n20, 330n5–6, 333, 338
Galatians and Romans, relationship between, 167–68
Galilee-Jerusalem disjunction, 129–30
Gentile mission, 45, 125, 128, 135, 137, 147–49, 151, 155, 181–82, 209, 216–18, 220, 226, 228, 231n28, 234–37, 242, 274, 319, 323
Gerasa, 126
Goodacre, M. S., 74n5
gospel: concept, 41, 258–60, 264–65
Gospel of Mark: manner of narration, 122–23; 130–31; Mark–Q relation, 120; source value, 116–31
Gospel of Mary, 264
Gospel of Peter, 67n51, 77n16, 263, 267, 292n92, 306, 309, 310, 347
Gospel of Thomas, 17n46, 74, 76, 77n16, 90–91, 94, 106n35, 110, 111n49, 116, 121, 251n15, 254, 257, 259, 261–63, 264n65, 265, 267, 307, 309, 310, 326, 335n25, 340
gospel superscriptions, 205n2, 206–7, 264–65, 288, 291, 311
Grotius, H., 139

hardening motif, 46, 48, 216–17, 225, 228n7, 229, 239, 241–46, 322
Hebrews, 266, 286n61, 289n73, 291n81, 306, 308–10, 312, 324, 326, 334n22, 347
Hegel, G.W.F., 320n6
Heidegger, M., 27
Heitmüller, W., 105n30, 191n29
Hennecke, E., 249n2
heresy/heretical: *see* orthodoxy vs. heresy
Herodotus, 36–37, 174, 176n8
Hilgenfeld, A., 139
Hirsch, E., 18, 27–28, 31
historian controversy, ancient, 37–39
historical consciousness, 13–14, 21–23, 27, 30, 39, 49–50, 70, 97–98
historical-critical research, xii, 9–10, 14–18, 23–27, 31–32, 270–71, 275–76, 318, 329–34, 336
historical positivism, 11–13, 16–17, 24, 31

historicism of the nineteenth century, 9, 11, 14–17, 20, 345
historicity/historical reference, 100–101, 115–17, 130–32, 215–16, 219–20 (Acts); historicity vs. literariness, 113–17; *see also* fictionality
history: "the history" (collective singular), 9, 22, 51; "history" vs. "past," 9–10, 22–24, 34, 39, 52, 98–99, 130, 214; personal encounter with history, 18, 109; *see also* construction of history; history, views of; myth; neuro-cultural science of history
history, views of, 214; ancient Christian, 35–36, 40–48, 60–70; ancient Greek, 35–39; ancient Jewish-Israelite, 35, 40
history writing, 208–10, 213–14; ancient vs. modern, 35–40; recollection based vs. critical, 50–60
history-of-religions school, 103, 185n1, 186n7
Hort, F.J.A., 255n29
Husserl, E., 58

identity, 1, 21, 47, 49, 59; Christian, 4, 168–69, 180, 183, 198–202, 226–27, 252, 313, 322–24, 344–45; Jewish, 35, 134–35, 147–49, 156–57, 162–63, 168–69, 180, 182–83, 322–23
Ignatius of Antioch, 66, 67n52, 147, 148n55, 163, 219, 277n14, 293, 310, 325, 334n22, 335
ἱλαστήριον, 193–97
imagination, historical, xii, 9, 13–14, 18n55, 19, 34, 52, 90, 118n69, 214
incarnation of Jesus, 65–68, 347, 349
inspiration, doctrine of, 330, 333–37, 348
Irenaeus of Lyons, 4, 67, 206, 207n13, 251n8, 251n14, 252–53, 267, 275n9, 278–87, 289–94, 300–301, 305, 310–11, 339
Israel-church: acceptance, 228–29, 244–45; relationship, 217–18, 224, 225–26, 227; replacement, 228, 242–45; *see also* hardening motif
Israel mission, 136, 149, 151, 153, 209, 216–18, 220, 231, 234, 289n28; *see also* Gentile mission

James, letter of, 258n36, 291n81, 334n22
Jesus: earthly, 107, 256–59, 323–24, 345–47, 349; historical, 28–31, 92–93, 98–99 (concept), 108–9, 131, 269, 271, 345–47, 349; Jesus vs. Christ, 106–8, 112, 115–16, 186–87; "living" vs. earthly, 66–67; travel activity of, 125–29
Jesus tradition: authorization vs. rejection, 258, 265–66; and Christology, 105–6; collection of sayings vs. narrative, 83–88, 90–91, 110–11, 114; commitment to writing, 74, 76, 93, 258–59, 260, 266; narrative vs. sayings tradition, 73–76; 89–94, 106–7, 109, 323–24; oral vs. written, 16, 74–77, 100–3, 105, 118n72, 266–67, 270; sayings tradition, 73–74, 77–88, 91–94, 106–11, 115–16, 131, 255–57; secondary orality, 260; variants vs. original form, 255, 261–62, 268–71; without ascription to Jesus, 82–84; *see also* kyrios tradition; words/sayings of the Lord
Jews–Jewish Christian dispute, 161
Jews–Gentiles/Jewish Christians–Gentile Christians: relationship, 128–29, 134–38, 148–53, 162, 166–69, 176–83, 202, 216–17, 218, 220–21, 224–25, 234–36, 241–42, 322–23
John the Baptist, 91, 108, 119–20, 124, 238, 240, 258
Josephus, 40, 124, 125n98, 126n104, 128n113, 147n54, 170n53, 173n64, 174, 177n91, 200, 209, 209n27, 211n44, 224n105, 226, 298n11
Judaism-Christianity relationship, 156–57, 161, 164, 322–23; *see also* Israel–church, relationship

knowledge, historical, xi, 11–13, 17–18, 25–26, 27–29, 33–35, 98–100
kyrios tradition, 77–83, 104, 112, 192

Lamprecht, K., 11n16
language, putting into, 24–25, 34
language-reality, 188–89
λαός vs. ἔθνη, 218, 235–38, 244–45
law: "of Christ," 180, 183; and Christ event, 162–69, 181–82; curse of, 150–51, 164–69; function/task of, 156–57, 164, 166, 169–76, 181–82; and idol service/enslavement, 137–38, 167–68, 176–80, 181–82, 197; and promise, 166, 170–74, 181–83; vs. faith, 152, 158–59, 168–69, 183; works of, 136, 160–62, 164–66, 180; *see also* Abraham, promise of; Jew–Gentile relationship
Lessing, G., 15n39
life of Jesus research, 15–18, 108–9, 113–14, 130, 185
linguistic turn, 11, 50
literature (poetry) vs. history writing, 13–14, 20, 26, 33, 36–39, 49, 50, 214–15; *see also* narrative
Logos theology, 67, 347

Lucian, 37, 37n26, 39, 64n41, 215, 215n61–62, 224
Lukan Doppelwerk: authorship, 206–8; concept, 206, 208; genre, 208–10, 212, 295–96; relationship between Luke and Acts, 207–13, 293–99
Luke (as author), 224–25, 287–88; and Paul, 3, 207, 233, 245–46, 286–88
Luther, M., 138, 253, 291n81

Marcion, 206, 251n8, 251n14, 253, 260n42, 266, 274, 280–83, 288, 293–94, 300, 302, 305, 311, 339–40
Markowitsch, H.-J., 50
Melito of Sardes, 196
memorics/Memorik, 53, 54, 57
"memory-criticism," 53–57; *see also* Fried, J.
"memory-history," 52
memory research, 49–52; *see also* construction of history; Fried, J.; Ricoeur, P.
Messiah: expression, 187, 191–92, 231 (Christ); faith, 101, 106, 107–8, 115–16, 131, 234, 236–37; *see also* resurrection faith
messianic consciousness of Jesus, 101, 103–4, 106–8
metaphor(s): being dead, 159, 163; body of Christ, 200–3; from the cultic sphere, 187, 193–97, 201; Jesus' titles of majesty, 185, 187–88; participation in Christ, 198–99, 201–2; redemption, 192, 197–98, 221;from the sphere of law, 169–74, 176, 178–81, 192, 195–96; upbringing, 174–76, 181; wisdom-foolishness, 62–64, 192–93
metaphor theory (cognitive approach), 185–86, 188–91, 202–3
missionary journeys of Paul: first, 43–44, 219–22 (historicity), 276; second, 223–24
myth, 16, 35, 54, 100–3, 105, 115–16, 130–31, 189

narrated time (*erzählte Zeit*) and time of narration (*Erzählzeit*), 13, 91, 125,128–29; *see also* fictionality
narrative, historical, 3, 13–14, 18, 19–20, 25–27, 29–31, 33–34, 39–40, 49, 58, 98–100, 117–18, 215; and event, 43, 47–48, 75, 114–19, 122, 129–32, 186; *see also* Christology, narrative; fictionality; Jesus tradition, narrative; literature (poetry)
narrative criticism, 29, 40n39, 75n11, 89, 96n6, 115, 118n70–71
narrative theory, 75–76, 113–14, 117–18
Nazareth, 120–21
neuro-cultural science of history, 54–55; *see also* Fried, J.
"New Perspective on Paul," xi, 3, 134–35, 153, 156, 162n31, 332n14
"New Testament" (concept), 311
Nietzsche, F., 189
Novum Testamentum Graece, 255, 269; *see also* canon; printing press

office, 267n67, 321, 325
Old Testament, 15, 60n33, 82, 101, 131, 241, 259, 260, 274, 318, 327, 330, 338–40, 343
Ong, W., 56
oral history, 56
Origen, 252, 267, 284n53, 287, 287–88, 292, 305, 308–10, 339
orthodoxy vs. heresy, 254, 266, 270–71, 306–8, 312, 318, 320–22; *see also* Apocrypha; docetism; Marcion; Valentinianism

Papias, 92– 93, 103, 207n12, 262n50, 265–66
papyri, 206–7, 263–64, 285, 291–92, 310; Papyrus Egerton, 77n16, 263, 292n92
past-present relationship, 117–18, 125, 214–15
Paul; in Acts vs. Paul's letters, 43–47, 217–18, 221–22, 224–25, 300–1; in *Epistula Apostolorum*, 278–79; historical, 43–47; *see also* Areopagus speech
Pauline letter collection, 293, 310–11; *see also* four gospel collection
Pax, W.E., 197n49
Philo, 174–75, 178
Phylarchos, 37n26, 38n33
Polybius, 37, 37n26, 39, 212n52
printing press, 269–70

Q research, 75–76, 106n35, 109–11, 116

Ranke, L.v., 11, 12n22, 14n35, 18, 39
reality, historical, 42, 52, 55–57, 69–70
recollection, 50–51, 58–60, 130–31, 258; *see also* forgetting; memory
recollection culture: Christian, 51, 60–70
redaction criticism, 75, 87n57, 95n6, 113, 115, 117n65, 19n75, 125, 125n101, 128, 129n17
representation of the past, 3, 18–19, 22, 34, 49–51, 55–60, 69–70, 89–90, 117–18, 131–32, 201–3, 215
resurrection faith (resurrection of Jesus), 2, 44,

46, 60–62, 63–64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 73, 101–2, 105–7, 116, 191–93, 198–99, 201–2, 231–37, 242–43, 263, 297–98, 324, 336n29
Revelation, book of, 219, 257, 288, 289n74, 290, 291n81, 303–4, 307–9, 311, 312, 326, 332, 334n22
rhetoric, ancient, 157–58; *see also* Areopagus speech
righteousness: by faith, 150, 162–64; from the law, 157–64; *see also* law, works of
Rückert, H., 139
rule of faith (*regula fidei*), 251n14, 271

Schiller, F., 13n28
Schwartz, E., 38n34
Sepphoris, 123–25
Septuagint-mimesis, 209; *see also* rhetoric, ancient
Serapion, 66n51, 264n65, 267, 306–9
Sermon on the Mount/Sermon on the Plain, 86–88, 91, 257, 261
sin, cleansing of, 194–97, 201–2
"Sitz im Leben," 28, 105–6, 115, 116n62, 133; *see also* form criticism
Son of David (Jesus as), 192, 230–34, 236–37, 242
Son of God (Jesus as), 17, 104, 119, 147–49, 187, 188n18, 191, 192n32, 231, 233, 236–37, 242, 253, 280n34, 347
Son of Man (expression), 41, 64, 90–91, 186, 232, 347
Source criticism/research, 23–27, 30, 97–98, 108–9
source interpretation, 24–27
stratigraphy model, 111n50, 123n88
σωτήριον, 216, 237–41, 243–44
symbol, 341–42

textual criticism, 126, 254–55, 261–62, 269
theology of the cross, 62–64, 193–95, 201–2
"theology of the New Testament," 343–45, 347–49; biblically oriented vs. historicist, 329–31, 333–38, 340–41, 344–45; vs. history of early Christian religion, 317–22, 326–27, 347–49; and theology as a whole, 331, 349; unity vs. diversity, 317–22, 335–36, 340–43
theory of culture (Fried, J.), 52–57
Thucydides, 37–39, 43, 46, 176n88, 209, 215n61
Tiberias, 123–25
titles of majesty of Jesus: *see* metaphor(s)
Torah: *see* law
Trent, council of, 267n77
Troeltsch, E., 11
truth, historical, 24–27, 30–31, 36–37, 47–48, 51, 69–70, 102, 215, 327, 340
two-source theory, 15, 73–76, 91–93, 102–3, 110–11

Valentinianism, 251n8, 280, 311
Vansina, J., 56

Weiss, J., 105n30
Welzer, H., 50
we-reports, 4, 207, 224, 281–82, 287, 287n67, 296
Wescott, B.F., 225n29
Wette, W.M.L.d., 101n20, 138
"words/sayings of the Lord," 77–84, 255–60, 262–63; *see also* Jesus tradition