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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to advance the question of Paul's relationship to the historical Jesus by going beyond a mere paralleling of texts and by concentrating on the genuinely theological themes that join them. In contrast to the "new hermeneutic", and Eberhard Jüngel in particular, the method of enquiry will emphasize events that speak rather than "speech-events" (Sprachereignisse). The central thesis suggests that Jesus and Paul are related on an essentially theo-logical level. That is, they realized God, both in their perception and experience, as one who offered grace and reconciliation to the outcasts and sinners of their day. It is proposed that Jesus' deliberate table-fellowship with toll collectors and sinners revealed such a theology. It is further suggested that this fresh vision of God emboldened the Hellenists, and eventually the Apostle Paul, to welcome uncircumcised Gentiles as equal members of the people of God. Paul's violent persecution of the Hellenists was short-lived, for on the Damascus road he too experienced the God who justifies the ungodly. And finally it was postulated that the experience of the Spirit among the Gentiles served as evidentiary proof that God was indeed open to outsiders. Egalitarianism and mutual acceptance was to be the norm for the church. Thus the goal of the disser-
tation is to argue that the theological continuity expressed above is not due to mere coincidence, but is traceable to the deeds and words of the historical Jesus.
To my son,

David Andrew Simmons
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Thesis Statement and Methodological Approach.

The goal of my dissertation is to advance the discussion of Paul's relationship to the historical Jesus by going beyond a mere paralleling of texts and by indicating some of the shortcomings of the "new hermeneutic's" approach to the subject. Specifically, it will be suggested that the essential connection between Jesus and Paul is not to be found along the lines of verbal dependence, nor in the realm of dogmatic comparisons (e.g. comparing Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God with Paul's doctrine of justification by faith). Rather, it will be proposed that the continuity existing between Jesus and Paul is of a genuinely theological nature.\(^1\) It will be argued that Jesus and Paul realized (both in their experience and perception) that God was extraordinarily gracious to the outcasts and sinners of their day. The thesis proposes that both Jesus and Paul came to realize that the righteousness of God is most supremely evident when God pours forth his grace, mercy and

---
\(^1\) When enquiring into the meaning of Jesus' table-fellowship with sinners, P. Fiedler speaks of the theologischen implications of Jesus' conduct [cf. Jesus und die Sünder (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1967) 15].
love upon the ungodly. Hence from this perspective, the meaning of the righteousness of God cannot be simply restricted to what God requires nor is it simply some type of divine pronouncement which makes persons righteous. Rather, God's righteousness is that aspect of his person which moves him to take the initiative in grace to accomplish reconciliation and healing for his creatures. So the experiences, deeds and words of both Jesus and Paul are guided by this one central principle: God's relationship to his creatures is determined by the richness of his grace and cannot be restricted by any legal framework in itself.

It will be shown that such a new vision of God ran counter to the expectations of many of Jesus' and Paul's contemporaries. For they were convinced that according to the law God must invariably reward the righteous and punish the ungodly. Yet in this regard, it will be proposed that the behavior and message of Jesus and Paul represented a "qualifying" or "relativizing" of the law when they felt it was misleading or ran counter to the will and way of God as described above. For them, God's gracious initiative is directed toward the essential worth of the individual, yes, even of the ungodly, regardless of religious status or purity. For these reasons a central premise of the dissertation is as follows. It will be postulated that Jesus' solidarity with the outcasts of his day, whether they be toll collectors or sinners, reflects God's grace toward
them, which by extension can be seen in Paul’s belief that God justifies the ungodly.

It will become increasingly apparent that the methodological approach of the paper forms an essential part of the thesis itself. Firstly, a broad foundation for the presentation of the thesis will be established. This will be accomplished by clearly articulating the nature of the problem that exists between Jesus and Paul. Then the presentation will contextualize the issue by reviewing the history of the debate from F. C. Baur in the mid-1800’s to "the new quest of the historical Jesus" as it exists at present. Also a major task of the dissertation will be to present and thoroughly analyze two of the most recent and comprehensive monographs on the subject. One of the works studied will be Josef Blank’s Paulus und Jesus: Eine theologische Grundlegung (1968). However as a prime example of the "new quest" and "new hermeneutic", Eberhard Jüngel’s Paulus und Jesus: eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie (1962) will receive more attention.

Having laid the foundation for the thesis, the discussion will then proceed to unfold how God’s gracious initiative was realized in the life and ministry of Jesus. In contrast to Jüngel, the paper will emphasize events that speak rather than speech-events. That is, the experiences and conduct of Jesus will be viewed as forming the basis and
explanation for his words and not the other way around.

Thirdly, the point will be made that the validity of the causal link between the ministry of Jesus and the early Christian movement allows one to further enquire into the relationship between Jesus and Paul. Therefore the paper will examine how God's gracious initiative was experienced by the early Christians, Paul included. In particular, the experience of the early Christian Hellenists, and how they came to apply the theology of Jesus, will be viewed as a possible link between the historical Jesus and the apostle Paul.

Finally, the last chapter will give a summary of the results and set forth the conclusions.

B. Defining the Problem.

Paul cannot claim the same experience of Jesus as Peter (cf. Acts 10:39,42). Paul was not among the first disciples and by all accounts never saw the earthly Jesus. Nevertheless, he was the first New Testament writer to mention in "pen and ink" the name of Jesus and to designate him as "Lord". When one considers that a large portion of the New Testament is attributed to the apostle Paul, it

---


becomes clear that he is one of the earliest and most extensive witnesses to the Christian faith.  

Yet when compared with the Synoptics, what we are able to gather from his letters concerning the historical Jesus is very meager indeed. From Paul we know that Jesus was born a Jew under the law (Gal 4:4). With respect to lineage, Paul tells us that Jesus was from the royal family of David (Rom 1:3). He also notes that Jesus had a final meal with his disciples the night before he was betrayed (1 Cor 11:23-26).

Apart from these facts, Paul mentions little more concerning the earthly Jesus. He says nothing about the calling of the disciples, Peter’s confession or the transfiguration. The ministry of John the Baptist is passed over in silence. Mary is not mentioned and the likes of Judas Iscariot merit not a word. Paul tells us nothing about the cleansing of the temple, Jesus’ conflict with the authorities, his trial nor even the place and time of his death. In fact, if we only had Paul as a source, we would know nothing about the parables, the Sermon on the Mount or the

---


6V. P. Furnish, "The Jesus-Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann" *BJRL* 47 (1965) 37.
Lord's Prayer. 7 Paul is silent on the miracles of Jesus, his exorcisms and messianic signs. 8 Also, Paul never directly quotes Jesus. Even when it appears that he is alluding to the words of Jesus (cf. I Cor 7:10, 9:14 f.), Paul rarely cites Jesus as his source. 9 He even fails to do so when a connection to the historical Jesus lay close at hand. 10

The discussion to this point has already revealed some considerable difficulties. How could one, whom many consider to be chief among the apostles and first in importance after Jesus, appear so ignorant of the historical

7 Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931) 173. Schweitzer argues that the death and resurrection of Jesus, the mystic union of Paul with the exalted Christ, as well as the profound influence of the Spirit have so altered the world that Paul saw no need to appeal to the historical Jesus (ibid., 173).


9 Schoeps, Paulus, 55-56; Keck, Paul, 39-40. But see R. Bultmann's comment below chap. 2 (n. 47) p. 21.

10 Schweitzer notes the following examples. In Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8-10, Paul seems to be making an allusion to the "love command" (cf. Matt 22:37-40; Luke 10:27) yet there is no reference to the historical Jesus. Also Paul's words concerning plain speech in 2 Cor 1:17-19 appear to be a reference to what Jesus said in Matt 5:37, but again Paul fails to make the connection. And finally, Paul seems to be oblivious to the fact that his exhortation "Bless those who persecute you" (Rom 12:14) parallel Jesus' words in Matt 5:44 and Luke 6:28 (cf. Mysticism, 173).
Jesus? Do the dogmatic formulations of Paul concerning the atonement, justification by faith and the resurrection have any essential connection with the historical Jesus? Or are these doctrines simply the product of the "theological genius" of the Apostle Paul? Indeed, has not Paul replaced the religion of Jesus with a religion about Christ?

Such questions have preoccupied New Testament scholarship for the past century and a half. A review of the literature during this period will help in understanding the varied approaches and results of the enquiry. Such a study will also aid in determining the viability of continued research in the area and in establishing which options offer the most promise for advancing the discussion.

13 Keck, Paul, 2-3.
Chapter II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. A Historical Overview of the Methods and Approaches from F. C. Baur to the New Hermeneutic.

The modern form of the debate was cast by F. C. Baur with the appearance of his "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde".1 His thesis was that the Corinthian church consisted of Gentile believers who tended to identify with Paul and Apollos and of Jewish believers who sided with Peter.2 According to Baur, the latter constitutes the "Christ Party" because they felt that they had a closer relationship with the historical Jesus via Peter.3 In light of this, Paul defended his apostleship and message by emphasizing the importance of the cross of Jesus and by countering the Judaizing tendencies of his opponents.4 Thus Baur claims that Pauline Christianity is in complete antithesis


2 "Die Christuspartei", 62-63.

3 Ibid., 105.

4 Ibid., 131.
to Judaism and Petrine Christianity. Ernst Käsemann concludes that the inherent conflict between the two parties was ultimately resolved. The synthesis of Pauline Christianity and Petrine Christian resulted in what he calls "Early Catholicism".

The apparent discontinuity between the theology of Jesus and that of Paul was expressed in the most extreme terms by Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche believes that the manner in which Jesus taught and lived tended to remove any sense of guilt from our relationship with God. Therefore to preach that one must be saved by faith in Christ is a "dysangel" and Paul was the chief "dysangelist". In no uncertain terms Nietzsche pours forth his disdain for the Apostle Paul when he states,

And alas what did this dysangelist not sacrifice to his hatred! Above all the Saviour himself: he nailed him to his cross. Christ's life, his example, his doctrine and death, the sense and the right of the gospel - not a vestige of all this was left, once this forger, prompted by his hatred, had understood in it only that

\[5\text{Ibid., 134-36. Perhaps it should be noted that Baur also felt that the thought and teaching of Jesus were not of central importance to Paul. He claims that this may explain why Paul took the liberty of transforming the ethical and religious content of Jesus (cf. Vorlesungen, 124).}\]

\[6\text{Ernst Käsemann may well have been the first to coin the term "Early Catholicism" [cf. his New Testament Questions of Today (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 236 (n.1)].}\]
which could serve his purpose.\(^7\)

Yet in contrast to Baur and Nietzsche, Heinrich Paret claims that Paul's theology is firmly established upon the historical person and life of Jesus.\(^8\) He surmises that the differences in Paul's thought and terminology are simply due to the missionary context that Paul found himself in. Paret believes that parallels between Paul's epistles and the Synoptics prove that Paul knew of the earthly Jesus. He suggests that Paul probably gained this knowledge by way of oral and written traditions.\(^9\)

On the other hand, Hans Heinrich Wendt represents Paul as one who differed radically from the historical Jesus. He notes that Jesus spoke in the simple language and images of the common people and talked of a personal religion and morality.\(^10\) In contrast, Paul speaks of "righteous-


\(^8\) "Paulus und Jesus: Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des geschichtlichen Christus", *JDTh* 3 (1858) 9.

\(^9\) Ibid., 40, 55. Similarly A. Hoyle argued that a difference in form does not necessarily mean that Paul's message is false or contradictory to that of Jesus (cf. his "Paul and Jesus", *Exp Tim* 8 (1896-97) 487-92. Cf. also G. Matheson, "The Historical Christ of St. Paul", *Exp* 1 (1881) 353, 369.

\(^10\) H. Wendt, "Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu", *ZThK* 4 (1894) 18, 77-78.
ness" as a "theological ideal" and is often preoccupied with complex theological speculations. His Pharisaic background caused him to reformulate and expand upon the faith to such an extent that Paul lost sight of the pure religion of Jesus.\textsuperscript{11} Wendt concludes that Paul's teachings never have and never will have the positive influence that resulted from the simple gospel of Jesus. In order to receive genuine spiritual illumination, Wendt counsels that one must leave Paul and return to Jesus.

It remained for Adolf Hilgenfeld to respond to the radical challenge of Wendt. Hilgenfeld maintains that when Wendt placed Paul's gospel over against that of Jesus, he has simply reinstated the position of the Judaizers.\textsuperscript{12} Hilgenfeld argues that Paul's doctrine of the cross only unfolded "the kernel" of Jesus' teaching and in no way contradicted, undermined or even diluted what Jesus said.\textsuperscript{13}

In the same vein Adolf von Harnack counters both Baur and Wendt by asserting that Paul was the one who really understood Jesus. Harnack believed that Paul simply continued the work of Jesus by giving it a language that was

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12}A. Hilgenfeld, "Jesus und Paulus", ZWTH 37 (1894) 494.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., 494, 541.
comprehensible to all.\textsuperscript{14}

One of the most radical positions emphasizing the discontinuity between Jesus and Paul was set forth by William Wrede. Wrede argues that it is impossible to understand Paul on the basis of Jesus' preaching.\textsuperscript{15} This is so because Paul believed in a superhuman, pre-existent heavenly being prior to his conversion, or, for that matter, before ever hearing about Jesus.\textsuperscript{16} Upon being converted, Paul's belief in such a heavenly figure became identified with his faith in "Jesus". This means that everything relating to the earthly Jesus is irrelevant to the Apostle Paul.\textsuperscript{17} Paul's Christ did not originate from nor was it determined by the person of Jesus.\textsuperscript{18} In what came to be one of the most significant comments on the subject, Wrede states, "It follows conclusively from all this that Paul is to be re-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}A. Harnack, \textit{What is Christianity?} (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901) 189, 194. Also R. R. Lloyd explains Paul's "silence" on the earthly Jesus by noting that Paul was writing letters not treatises and that Paul was converted through the risen Christ [cf. "The Historic Christ in the Letters of Paul", \textit{Bib Sac} 58 (1901) 279-93]. For a similar presentation see C. Lattey, "Quotations of Christ's Sayings in St. Paul's Epistles", \textit{Scrip.} 4 (1949) 22-24.
\item \textsuperscript{16}W. Wrede, \textit{Paul} (Lexington: American Theological Association Committee on Reprinting, 1962) 87-88, 151.
\item \textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 89.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Ibid., 147, 166.
\end{itemize}
garded as the second founder of Christianity". 19

Although Adolf Jülicher did not completely accept Wrede's "Second Founder" theory, he agrees that the personality and historical circumstances of Paul greatly differ from those of Jesus. Along the lines of Wendt, Jülicher claims that Jesus related to the Old Testament as a frommer Bibel leser who possessed the spiritual insight and originality to give authoritative instructions on the law. On the other hand Paul's approach was more like that of a learned rabbi. As a trained technician, Paul viewed the law as that body of religious knowledge worthy of continued analysis and detailed study. 20

Johannes Weiss agrees with Wrede that Paul attributed "religious veneration" to Jesus, thus making the Proclaimer the Proclaimed. 21 However, Weiss suggests that Paul's doctrine of reconciliation and his christology were actually theological expressions of Jesus' religious attitude. He maintains that Paul had a clear idea of the main features of


20 A. Jülicher, Paulus und Jesus (Tübingen: Mohr, 1907) 57-61.

21 Weiss, Paul and Jesus, 4-5.
Jesus' life and ministry. The reason why Paul did not make direct reference to the historical Jesus was that he assumed his readers already knew a lot about Jesus. Paul himself had learned about Jesus from Stephen and those whom he persecuted. Moreover, Weiss contends that 2 Cor 5:16 indicates that Paul probably saw the earthly Jesus.

22 Weiss sought support for his theories in passages such as I Cor 10:1 and Phil 2:8 (ibid., 18).


24 Ibid., vol.1, 188. This particular verse played a critical role in the development of the Jesus/Paul debate [cf. J. W. Fraser's summary in his "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: 2 Corinthians 5:16 Once More", NTS 17 (1970-71) 297]. Rudolph Bultmann interpreted Paul's words in 2 Cor 5:16 to mean that Paul thoroughly rejected any interest in the historical Jesus. To enquire after the earthly Jesus rather than accept the Christ of the kerygma by faith is to seek Christ κατὰ σάρκα (cf. below nn. 45-48). However, Otto Betz counters Bultmann by maintaining that the words κατὰ σάρκα are to be associated with the verbs οὐδέμεν and ἐγνώκαμεν and not with the substantives οὐδένα and Χριστόν ["Fleischliche und 'geistliche' Christuserkenntnis nach 2. Korinther 5:16", TBei 14 (1983) 170]. That is to say, Paul is repudiating a particular manner of knowing rather than rejecting the value of the historical Jesus [cf. Martin, Reconciliation, 103]. Betz rightly notes that the phrase "from henceforth know we no man" excludes the notion that Paul is only referring to the historical Jesus ("2. Korinther 5:16", 170). Precisely what constituted knowing "according to the flesh" is open to debate, but it may well reflect the manner in which Paul's opponents chose to view Christ and judge the spirituality of all persons (including Paul) [V. P. Furnish, II Corinthians (New York: Doubleday, 1984) 312-13]. Neither Christ nor his followers can be judged according to the fleshly standards of this world, especially with regard to outward appearance [P. E. Hughes, Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Michigan, 1962) 199-200]. So the verse really has nothing to say about Paul's understanding of the historical Jesus, but addresses every fleshly evaluation of persons [U. B. Müller, "Zur Rezeption gesetzeskritischer Jesusüberlieferung in frühen Christentum", NTS 27 (1980-81) 168].
As the debate heated up on the Continent, Gerhard Kittel made a direct response to Wrede. He rejects Wrede's notion that Paul believed in a pre-existent Christ prior to conversion and maintains that Paul took stock of the historical Jesus more than Wrede allowed. The humility, meekness and patience of Christ has surely influenced Paul (Rom. 1:3, Gal. 4:4).

Continuing the theme of discontinuity, one of the most influential articles was produced by Wilhelm Heitmüller. He made the important observation that although Paul occasionally appeals to the words of Jesus, it cannot be proven that Paul knows these as the words of Jesus. Paul confesses that he has no interest in the earthly Jesus. His contact with the risen Lord negates any need to know the historical Jesus (2 Cor 5:16). Paul's Christianity was not derived


26. Ibid., 401-02. For a similar treatment from an American point of view see J. G. Machen, "Jesus and Paul", Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912) 547-78. Against Kittel, cf. M. Brückner, "Zum Thema Jesus und Paulus", ZNW (1906) 113, 116-17. Cf. also below chap. 6 (n. 7) 265.

from the historical Jesus, but from a Christianity heavily influenced by Hellenism. As he states, "Die Entwicklungsreihe lautet -- Urgemeinde -- hellenistisches Christentum -- Paulus." 28

William C. Wilkinson was among those who rejected the "Back to Jesus" movement as described above. He proposes that Paul was the true communicator of Christian faith. He went so far as to state that Paul understood and represented Jesus even better than the evangelists, especially Matthew. 29

Nevertheless, the emphasis on how Hellenism may have influenced the apostle Paul proved to be a rich source of enquiry. William Bousset's Kurios Christos is a prime example of such a study. Bousset claims that Paul's christology was derived from the Hellenistic mystery religions. He hypothesizes that Paul had been profoundly influenced by the idea of a mystical union with the deity as accomplished through the spirit. In the pattern of Wrede, Bousset believes that Paul identified Jesus with the Kurios and faith in Kurios Christos now becomes equivalent to faith in God. 30 So it is the cultic worship of the Kurios in community which

---

28 Ibid., 330. Cf. n. 24 above.
30 Kurios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926) 105, 110-11, 132-34, 149.
forms Paul's christology and not the historical Jesus.  

In contrast to Bousset's monumental work, Adolf Deissmann states that Jesus and Paul are joined by their experience and understanding of God as Father. For both of them, God requires holiness, but in love extends grace to all, even sinners.  

But in contrast to Bousset's view, E. Rohde rejects the notion that Paul's understanding of Jesus as Lord is derived from the Hellenistic religions. He points out that the concept of κύριος in the Hellenistic religions varied greatly from Paul's use of the term. Indeed, the Hellenistic religions venerated an entire pantheon of κύριοι without making any distinction between the "one God" and the "one Lord" Jesus Christ as Paul so frequently does. He also notes that the relationship between God and Christ was not Paul's invention. Such a belief was already a part of the faith of the early church prior to Paul's conversion.  

In agreement with Deissmann and Rohde, Karl Holl counters Bousset by pointing out some essential differences.

---

31 Ibid., 210.

32 Deissmann, *Paul*, 188-89. As indicated in the introduction, the concept of God's grace being offered to notorious sinners will become increasingly important as the discussion continues.

33 E. Rohde, "Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus", *ZNW* 22 (1923) 48-49.

34 Ibid., 54, 56.
that exist between Christianity and the mystery religions. The very fact that Christianity triumphed over the mystery religions indicates that Paul did not create Christian syncretism or sell Christianity out to the mystery religions. Holl asserts that Paul genuinely understood Jesus and did not compromise this understanding by accommodating it to the wisdom of this world. And finally, Bousset's thesis that the κύριος title sprang forth from Hellenism can be rejected on the basis that "Lord" was already in use in the Aramaic speaking church prior to Paul's conversion.

The extraordinary emphasis on Hellenism as seen in Heitmüller and Bousset was also questioned by Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer maintains that the essence of Paul's thought primarily belongs to what he calls "late Judaism" and that this period is chiefly characterized by apocalyptic. He concludes that Paul uses the terminology of Hellenism but not its ideas. Paul did not Hellenize Christianity. On the contrary, Paul is to be seen in the light of "Jewish primitive Christianity" and characterized by "eschatological mysticism". Within this context, Schweitzer

36 Ibid., 19, 27.
37 Ibid., 20.
38 Schweitzer, Interpreters, 176-77.
39 Ibid., 238.
claims that Paul developed "eschatological sacraments".\textsuperscript{40} Indeed, it is the theme of eschatology which joins Jesus and Paul. They share the same eschatological world view, but from a different perspective. Jesus looks forward to the coming of the kingdom of God while Paul looks back upon the eschatological event of Christ. This event has in some degree ushered the kingdom into the present.\textsuperscript{41} However, the death and resurrection of Christ have so determined Paul’s world view that no link remains with the historical Jesus or his sayings (2 Cor 5:16).\textsuperscript{42}

In contrast to Weiss' view that Paul saw and knew the earthly Jesus, Hans Windisch states that Paul knew little about the historical Jesus and that his missionary preaching contains practically nothing of the Synoptic tradition. At any rate, Paul certainly did not see the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{43} He possesses a "Damascus Gospel" which is very different from the "Jerusalem Gospel". There is continuity between the two gospels, but not identity, and this explains the difference that exists between Paul and Jesus.\textsuperscript{44}

The discussion thus far has reviewed the thoughts

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 242-43.
\textsuperscript{41}Schweitzer, Mysticism, 113.
\textsuperscript{42}Schweitzer, Interpreters, 245. Cf. n. 23 above.
\textsuperscript{43}H. Windisch, "Paulus und Jesus", ThStKr 106 (1934-35) 437.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., 437, 466-68.
of the major contributors from the turn of the nineteenth century to the period just prior to World War II. Although the issue of Paul's relationship to Jesus was intensely debated, the results remained inconclusive. However, the insight and thought of Rudolf Bultmann soon gave the debate new direction and impetus.

Bultmann clarified the issue by posing three important questions:

1. Is Paul's thought influenced by the historical (historische) Jesus either directly or indirectly as mediated through the early church?

2. How is the content of Paul's theology related to Jesus' proclamation, irrespective of any causal significance that Jesus may have had on Paul?

3. What significance has the fact of the historical (geschichtliche) Jesus for the theology of Paul?\(^45\)

In regard to the first question, the influence of

\(^45\) R. Bultmann, *Faith and Understanding* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) 220-46. For a brief explanation of what Bultmann means by Historie and Geschichte cf. K. Wegenast, *Das Verständis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuterpaulinen* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener-Vluyn, 1962) 19-20. Kümmel notes that questions one and two are essentially the same, and so there are just two central questions: 1. The problem of continuity, i.e. what is the historical connection between Jesus and Paul; and 2. The problem of identity, i.e. the material similarities and differences between the two ("Jesus und Paulus", 171). However, Bultmann's distinction between questions 1 and 2 is valid. The first question deals with the issue of continuity while the second with material similarities. And, of course, Paul's theology may be compared with that of the historical Jesus without raising the issue of a historical connection of any kind. Yet in the event that a significant degree of continuity was discovered, the question of just how Paul came in contact with the theology of Jesus is an intriguing one.
Heitmüller led Bultmann to conclude that Paul first encountered Christianity in its Hellenized form. This would mean that Paul was not a disciple of the earthly Jesus nor was he dependent on knowledge of Jesus as mediated through the first disciples (Gal 1:1, 11 ff.). The simple gospel as proclaimed by Jesus was irrelevant for Paul. Apart from a few references to the words of Jesus, Paul is ignorant of the sayings of the Lord. Ethical injunctions that seem to parallel the Synoptic tradition are only possibilities and cannot be proved.

In response to question two, Bultmann admits that there are similarities between the content of Paul's theology and the preaching of Jesus. They both share the same mythological world view with its understanding of a transcendent God who is both Creator and Judge. They both believe that the world is fallen and that an apocalyptic intervention of God will end the course of this present

---

46 Furnish, "Debate", 365.


48 Bultmann accepts the following as Pauline references to the words of Jesus: 1 Thess 4:15-17; 1 Cor 7:10, 25, 11:23-25.

49 Bultmann is referring to such passages as Rom 12:14 and its possible parallel with Matt 5:14; Rom 13:9 f. and the words found in Mark 12:13; Rom 16:19 and that of Matt 10:16, and 1 Cor 13:2 and the words of Jesus in Mark 11:23 (Faith and Understanding, 222-23).
world and usher in the kingdom. They share the same view of the law, i.e. the basic content of the law can be summed up in the commandment to love God and neighbor. And finally, Bultmann agrees with Schweitzer that Paul and Jesus basically share the same eschatology.

In regard to his third question, Bultmann claims that the historical (geschichtliche) person of Jesus is of central importance for the theology of Paul. This is true because Paul viewed Jesus as the crucified Messiah who presents the believer with the real possibility of authentic existence. Thus according to Bultmann, it is not the Was or content of Jesus’ message that is important, but the Dass, the fact that Jesus the crucified is proclaimed as God’s messenger and Messiah. In short, the Jesus of the kerygma is important, not the historical (historische) Jesus. So in this sense, it is the geschichtliche Jesus that makes Paul’s proclamation the gospel. Thus Bultmann’s emphasis on the kerygma and its existential significance set the tenor of the debate for the next two decades.

One of the earliest works of this period was that of Joseph Klausner. Klausner agrees with Weiss that Paul knew

50 Bultmann, Existence and Faith, 194.
51 Ibid., 224 and Faith and Understanding, 226-27, 30.
52 Ibid., 196.
53 Bultmann, Faith und Understanding, 236-38.
54 Ibid., 235.
the historical Jesus, but in a manner reminiscent of Wrede he concludes that Paul was the true founder of Christianity. He argues that Paul’s theology was not at all influenced by the earthly Jesus, but derived from his understanding of the Old Testament.55

Martin Buber’s attempt at a resolution of the problem somewhat parallels that of Windisch. It will be recalled that Windisch sought a solution by speaking of two gospels.56 Buber surmises that the differences between Paul and Jesus can be explained by the existence of two faiths. He claims that Jesus’ faith could be described as ʾemūnâ, i.e. a personal trust in God’s role in the history of Israel and his covenant people. By way of contrast, Paul’s (and also John’s) faith emphasizes the acknowledgment of facts or material content. Buber alleges that Jesus’ faith was truly Jewish in nature and could best be described as a Vertrauensverhältnis. On the other hand, Paul’s faith was Hellenistic in nature and could be described as an Anerken- nungsverhältnis.57

One conservative response to Windisch, Bultmann and Buber was that of J. Schniewind. He maintains that the fact

56 See above nn. 43-44.
57 M. Buber, Two Types of Faith (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951) 8, 26-29, 154, 170.
that Paul seldom used the words of Jesus does not mean that he had no interest in the earthly Jesus. Paul was vitally concerned with the earthly Jesus. For him Jesus was a man of "flesh" and one who was crucified as an atonement for our sins. After all, Paul refers to the exalted Lord as "Jesus" and believes the same gospel common to all of the apostles. Since Paul's message is the fulfillment of what the Synoptics say about Jesus, one simply cannot separate the message and life of Jesus from the theology of Paul.

Similarly, L. Goppelt maintains that one cannot separate Paul's dogmatic and ethical formulations from the earliest traditions about the Christ event. Goppelt proposes that Paul developed his theology and ethics in conformity with the early Christian tradition. And as Schniewind asserted, Paul's failure to quote the words of Jesus does not mean he had no interest in the historical Jesus. In fact, he notes that a good portion of Christian literature (apart from the Synoptics) rarely quotes Jesus. Citations in 1 Cor 7 and 9 and 1 Thess 4 prove that Paul had been entrusted with the Jesus tradition from the churches in


Jerusalem and Antioch.  

Also in contrast to Bultmann, Hermann Ridderbos claims that Jesus' self-revelation as Messiah and Son of God was theologically compatible with that of the kerygma of the church and Paul. Yet the connection between Jesus and Paul is to be found primarily in Paul's own experience of the risen Lord and only secondarily in tradition.

On the other hand, the thesis of H. J. Schoeps ran counter to that of Weiss and Klausner and in a way expanded upon that of Schweitzer and Bultmann. Schoeps denies that Paul ever saw the historical Jesus and states that Paul scarcely regards the Palestinian tradition about him.

However, the complexity of his thought and background rules out the possibility of viewing the issue as an "either-or" situation (i.e. Paul being a product of either Hellenistic Christianity or Palestinian Christianity). Schoeps maintains that Hellenism, Jewish-Hellenism of the Diaspora, Palestinian Judaism, rabbinical exegesis and apocalyptic all play a part in molding Paul's thought and writings.

During the last two decades the conservative sector of the debate more or less echoed earlier arguments. For

---

62 Ridderbos, Jesus and Paul, 43, 95, 100-01.
63 Paul, 57.
64 Ibid.
example, despite problems of methodology and the inconclusive results of paralleling texts, many scholars still chose this route in their treatment of Paul and Jesus. Classic examples are those of David M. Stanley and D. L. Dungan. The latter maintains that the Synoptic editors and Paul correspond in their interpretation and application of the sayings of Jesus. Paul remained true to the sayings of the Lord but adapted them to the church's situation. Yet his reworking of the tradition actually set the stage for the editorial process which produced the Synoptics. Paul only alludes to the words of Jesus rather than quoting him because of his literary style and because the sayings of Jesus were so well known to his congregations.

Dale C. Allison gave a concise but thorough treatment of the alleged parallels that exist between Paul and Jesus. He notes that Pauline allusions to the words of Jesus are found in relatively well defined areas of his epistles (cf. Rom 12-14; 1 Thess 4-5; Col 3-4 and 1 Cor 9, 11 and 15). He also notes that these passages seem to parallel specific


66 Dungan, Sayings, 139-41.

67 Ibid., 145.

68 Ibid., 147. Cf. J. W. Fraser, Jesus and Paul: Paul as Interpreter of Jesus from Harnack to Kümmel (Berkshire: Marcham Manor, 1974) 99.
blocks of the Synoptic tradition (Luke 6:27-38; Mark 6:6b-13 par; Mark 9:33-50) including the Passion narratives. He concludes that Paul did not know isolated sayings of the Lord, but entire blocks of tradition which ultimately stem from the teaching of the historical Jesus.

However, Klaus Wegenast holds that Paul did not examine the tradition and then conform his gospel to it, but the other way around. Paul is not a servant of the tradition but makes the tradition serve him. In this sense Paul cannot be strictly viewed as a preserver of the tradition.

F. Neirynck and Nikolaus Walter have produced some of the most recent studies on parallels and reach similar conclusions. As in the case of Brückner, Schmithals and Kümmel, they conclude that parallels do not prove dependence upon the historical Jesus. In contrast to Stuhlmaecher’s thesis, Walter states, "Weitergabe von Tradition ist noch

---


72. Ibid., 120.

nicht in sich die Garantie für eine wirkliche Kontinuität auch in der Sache!"74

Rather than succumb to "parallelomania", Walter seeks another path toward a solution.75 He suggests that Paul may have been influenced by the Hellenists whom he persecuted.76

The above discussion once again reveals the complexity of the issue together with the methodological difficulties that accompany it. With respect to parallels, the problem of establishing the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus still remains. We know where to find the sayings of Paul (his own epistles) but the source of the authentic words of Jesus is more difficult to ascertain. Even when a portion of the Jesus-tradition is judged to be authentic and Paul seems to be alluding to these words, it still cannot be proven that Paul knows he is relying on the ipsissima verba of Jesus. In other words, literary similarity does not necessarily mean genetic dependence. One can only conclude that this approach, although extensively studied, has failed to resolve the methodological difficulties contained therein

74. Walter, "Paulus", 518.

75. This is Samuel Sandmel's term for the lack of restraint in drawing parallels which leads to faulty or at best unsubstantiated conclusions ["Parallelomania", JBL 81 (1962) 1-13].

and thus its results remain inconclusive.  

However, the question of Paul's relationship to the earthly Jesus was soon to be studied on a much deeper and more substantial level. The proponents of the "new quest" of the historical Jesus committed themselves to an analysis of the theological continuity that may exist between Jesus and Paul rather than examining mere verbal parallels. It is to this aspect of the debate that I now turn.

It was observed that Bultmann places a great deal of emphasis upon the role of the kerygma. He maintains that the earthly Jesus is not of central importance for the early Christians and Paul, but Christ preached as Lord, the kerygma, is the foundation of the church and its message. Yet it was Bultmann's extraordinary emphasis upon the kerygma that ultimately led to the "new quest". Many observed that the kerygma is vitally concerned with the existential meaningfulness of a historical person, i.e. Jesus.  

The quest is "new" because it is not concerned with detailed historical memories about Jesus, but with the kerygmatic evaluation of the historical person of Jesus. This is judged to be a valid enterprise because the kerygma does maintain the continuity between the earthly Jesus and the heavenly

---

77 Furnish, "Debate", 374.
79 Ibid., 90.
Lord. Again it is not Jesus' self-consciousness nor biographical data which are important,

...but the understanding of existence which emerged in history from his works and deeds. It is this, not his personality or alleged specifics of his biography, which is his historic person.

Nevertheless, the new quest believes that an implicit kerygma can be found in the words and deeds of the historical Jesus. So the words and deeds of Jesus are analyzed with respect to their intention and meaningfulness. For the new quest, the important thing is to gain a new understanding of the self in the face of existence.

It follows that such an approach will necessarily involve a modern view of history and an existentialist understanding of the self. Yet such an understanding is not to be viewed as in conflict with "objective philological, comparative-religious and social-historical research".

At once it can be seen that the approaches of Bultmann and the new quest contain points of similarity and contrast. The similarity lies in the emphasis on the existential significance of the kerygma for interpreting the

---

80 Ibid., 95.
81 J. M. Robinson, "The Recent Debate on the 'New Quest'", JBRel 30 (1962) 204.
82 Ibid.
83 Robinson, New Quest, 70-71.
84 Ibid., 96 f.
self. The difference can be seen in that the new quest insists that this existential significance is founded upon the words and deeds of Jesus himself. The mere Dass of Bultmann is judged to be insufficient to explain the importance of history for the kerygma and faith. In fact some of Bultmann's best students proved to be worthy exponents of the new quest.

Ernst Käsemann is a case in point. In complete accord with Bultmann, Käsemann notes that,

Mere history is petrified history, whose historical significance cannot be brought to light simply by verifying the facts and handing them on.

Yet in the spirit of the new quest, he notes that the early Christian community refused to isolate the exalted Lord from the earthly Jesus. To put it simply, the eschatological event of God in Christ is bound to Jesus of Nazareth, one who lived in Palestine during the first century. Käsemann maintains that the kerygma must do this because God reveals himself in real life, in καρπός, i.e. the human condition of guilt or grace before the living God. As in the case of


87 Ibid., 25.
the evangelists, one cannot reject the earthly Jesus in favor of the exalted Lord.\textsuperscript{88}

Similarly, W. G. Kümmel accepts the new quest as a viable means of exploring the relationship between Paul and Jesus. As with Schoeps, Kümmel believes that the "Jewish/Hellenistic" dichotomy is an "oversimplification". He claims that Paul drew from both and was also dependent upon the early Christian church. And the tradition that Paul received from the church is ultimately traceable to the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{89} Although he agrees with Schweitzer and Bultmann concerning the role of eschatology in the Jesus/Paul question, he concludes that the source of this eschatological understanding was traceable to the earthly Jesus.\textsuperscript{90}

In contrast to Käsemann and Kümmel, Walter Schmithals judged the new quest as doomed to failure.\textsuperscript{91} In view of early Christian gnosis, Schmithals claims that Paul refused to allow any continuity to exist between the exalted

\textsuperscript{88}Ibid., 34-35.

\textsuperscript{89}Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus", 175.

\textsuperscript{90}Kümmel states, "Die Wirklichkeit und die Verkündigung von dem sich bereits verwirklichenden und in naher Zukunft in Vollendung erwarteten göttlichen Endheil haben ihre Wurzel bei Jesus selbst, und Paulus ist nur der Bote dieser Wirklichkeit in der neuen durch Gott geschaffenen Situation der Gemeinde des Auferstandenen" (Ibid., 181).

\textsuperscript{91}Schmithals, "Paulus", 158.
Lord and the historical Jesus (cf. 2 Cor 5:16). As was the case with the early Christian community, Paul consciously ignores this "fleshly" Jesus. So the problem of the historical Jesus cannot simply focus upon Paul, but must deal with the indifference of the entire Christian community toward the earthly Jesus.

As one of the most recent and comprehensive treatments of Paul and Jesus, Josef Blank's *Paulus und Jesus* is worthy of consideration. In contrast to those who emphasized the influence of Hellenism on Paul, Blank believes that Paul is best explained in the context of Palestinian Judaism. Even though Paul was born in Tarsus, he was a Pharisee and was trained at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem. Although Blank does cite parallels between the Pauline epistles and the Synoptics, he agrees with A. Schlatter that the relationship between Paul and Jesus must

---

92 Ibid., 150-51. Cf. n. 24 above.

93 Ibid., 152-57. Remaining true to Bultmann, Schmithals states, "Das 'Dass', nicht das 'Was' der historischen Existenz der auferstandenen und erhöhten Christus begründet die christliche Predigt" (159).

be sought on the basis of broad theological themes. 95

Nevertheless, the resurrection of Christ and its significance for Paul played a central role in Blank's study. He maintains that Paul's conversion and apostleship was not due to his encounter with the kerygma but to his Damascus road experience. 96 As was the case with Ridderbos, Blank held that Paul's encounter with the risen Christ takes priority over his dependence on early Christian tradition. 97

In evaluating Blank's contribution, let it be said that his consistent emphasis on Paul's encounter with the risen Christ casts doubt upon how much he has really accomplished in relating Paul to the historical Jesus. The only factor which partially protects Blank against this criticism is his emphasis on the role of the Hellenists. Since the stoning of Stephen made a powerful impression upon Paul prior to his conversion and Stephen represents the Hellenists, Blank concludes that Paul first encountered Christian tradition in its Hellenistic Jewish form. 98 He argues that

---

95 Ibid., 65, 70, 129-30. For additional thoughts see his discussion concerning the "Son of God" (250-303) and the parallels he draws between such passages as Phil 4:4-7/Matt 6:25-34; Luke 12:22-31; 1 Cor 8 and 9/Matt 5:38-42; Mark 9:42-48 (130, 199). Cf. also parallels such as Phil 3:8 ff./Matt 13:44-46 and Rom 3:26 f./Matt 20:1-5 in his Paulus: von Jesus zum Christentum (München: Kösel, 1982) 94.


97 Ibid., 125; Kim, Origin, 332-33. See also the discussion concerning Wegenasts' view above, p. 27.

this particular type of tradition tended to clarify and draw practical implications from Jesus' understanding of the law and temple. Their central message was that Jesus the crucified was indeed God's Messiah (Acts 7:51-53). Thus Blank concludes,

_Dann hat man zwei feste Punkte: Gesetzeskritik und Messiasbekenntnis zum gekreuzigten Jesus von Nazareth, auf die Saulus als Pharisäer stiess und deren Wirkung er später auch niemals mehr vergass._

He argues that if Paul persecuted these Hellenistic Jewish Christians and he himself originated from the areas they represented, the Hellenists may well comprise a _wirkungsgeschichtliche Bindeglied_ between the words and work of Jesus and Paul.

---

99 Against this thesis E. P. Sanders has argued convincingly that Jesus never opposed the essence of the law. In the light of the new age to come Jesus only questioned its complete adequacy [Jesus and Judaism (London: SCM, 1985) 61-76, 245-69]. Sanders' keen observation on this point will become increasingly important as the discussion continues.


101 Ibid., 247. Walter notes that Paul's new understanding of the law in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8-10 probably sprang forth from a Christian evaluation of the Torah. It cannot be determined if Paul knows he is working with a saying of Jesus but this much can be determined. Paul has reduced the Jesus-tradition to meet the needs of his paranasis and thus speaks of a new "law of Christ" (Gal 6:2; 1 Cor 9:21). Walter claims that this represents "theological reflection" characteristic of a "hellenistisch-judenchristliche Richtung", i.e. Stephen and his followers (Walter, "Paulus", 513. Cf. also M. Hengel, _Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity_ (London: SCM, 1983) xi, 12-13, 27-32.
Blank's emphasis on the Hellenists may well be the most important point of his entire work. Yet Heikki Räisänen would view it as his weakest. He considers Walter's reservations concerning Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:9 as justified. If the Hellenists did pass on the "love command" to Paul, they domesticated it and probably did not transmit it as a saying of Jesus. There is no comprehensive criticism of the law in Stephen's speech. Although Stephen did say something about the temple, criticism of the temple is absent in Paul. So Paul's persecution of the Hellenists did not arise out of their criticism of the law and temple. Räisänen postulates that Paul persecuted them because they were accepting uncircumcised Gentiles as the people of God. This was not a conscious theological decision to reject the law, but grew out of their spiritualizing tendency to regard some ritual aspects as adiaphora. He concludes that the Hellenists were a bridge, but not between Jesus and Paul. They were a bridge between Jesus' apocalyptic proclamation of a new temple and later Christian writers such as Mark and

---

102 A much more thorough treatment of Räisänen's position will be taken up in chapter five below.


104 Ibid., 276-77, 300.

105 Ibid., 286, 300. Räisänen notes his indebtedness to G. Sellin on this point (cf. Torah, 288).
Hebrews. They may also form a link between Hellenistic Judaism of the Diaspora and the Palestinian Jesus movement. 106

So Blank's treatment of the Jesus/Paul question can be summarized as follows. He chose the more promising route of comparing broad theological themes but undermined his approach by devoting too much time and space to the resurrection. His words about the Hellenists are of interest, yet he represents them as bearers of law-critical sayings of Jesus. And as noted, Räisänen's analysis has done much to undermine this particular approach to the problem. 107

On the other hand, of all the works cited above on the new quest, none has been so impressive and innovative as Eberhard Jüngel's Paulus und Jesus. It is impressive because it is a prime example of one who consistently followed the approach of the new quest in discussing Paul's relationship to Jesus. It is innovative because in addition to his dedication to the new quest, Jüngel masterfully applies the exegetical principles of the new hermeneutic.

106 Ibid., 301. Joseph Fitzmyer also fails to see a link between Jesus and Paul with respect to the law. If there is a link to be found, it would probably be between Paul and Matthew's Jesus ["The Attitudes of Jesus and Paul toward the Law of Moses" (an unpublished paper given at the SNTS Conference, Atlanta, 1986)].

107 Torah, 260, 276.
It is to his work that I now turn.

B. A Presentation of Eberhard Jüngel’s 
Paulus und Jesus Topically Considered.

1. The Nature of His Work, His Thesis and Methodology.

The full title of Eberhard Jüngel’s work is Paulus und Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie. The thesis or purpose of his work can be partially discerned from the title. In accordance with the new quest, Jüngel maintains that the christological basis of Paul’s doctrine of justification presents one with the question of the historical Jesus (p.3). To put it simply, how did "the Proclaimer become the Proclaimed" (der Verkündiger zum Verkündigten)? His goal is not to give a definitive answer to the question of christology but to present a clarification (Präzisierung) of the question (p.279).

Methodologically, Jüngel’s approach can be summed up in a few words. By claiming that the central message of Paul is his doctrine of justification by faith (pp.17-66) and that of Jesus to be his proclamation of the kingdom of God (pp.87-214), Jüngel seeks to explain the relationship

---

108 This work originally served as his doctoral thesis under Ernst Fuchs and was entitled, Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre zur Verkündigung Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie [Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962) title page]. All references in the text will be from this work unless otherwise stated.
between the two through his understanding of Sprachereignis (language-event) (pp.16, 263-84). Paul's doctrine of justification is represented as an eschatological language-event which parallels Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God (pp.266-79). The former is presented as being an explanation and theological formulation of the latter (pp. 267, 280). The two events are essentially the same, both forming integral parts of an overall Sprachgeschichte (p.279).

109 It immediately becomes clear that one cannot understand Jüngel's treatment of Paul and Jesus without knowing what he means by Sprachereignis and Sprachgeschichte. Although the meaning of such terms will become clearer as the discussion proceeds, let it suffice to say that Sprachereignis as a term relates directly to an ontology which views language as defining and even creating existence. Language has the power not only to communicate but to give what is spoken to those who truly hear in faith. For example, with respect to the person of Jesus Christ, Jüngel states, "Die christliche Verkündigung Jesu Christi geschieht da, wo Jesus Christus in Person zur Sprache kommt. Das Ereignis, das Jesus Christus in Person zur Sprache bringt, ist ein Sprachereignis des Glaubens" (p.71). Cf. also John Webster, Eberhard Jüngel: An Introduction to his Theology (Cambridge: The University Press, 1986) 7.

110 In addition to the words of Jesus, Jüngel believes that the behavior (das Verhalten) of Jesus is important (especially as seen in his fellowship with sinners and in the performing of miracles). However, it will be demonstrated that for the most part Jüngel concentrates on the authoritative manner in which Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God.

111 For the idea that the "righteousness of God" or "justification" (δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ) parallels Jesus' preaching of the kingdom, cf. Bultmann, Faith and Understanding, 232.
2. The Significance of the "Historical Jesus" and How this Relates to Jüngel's Understanding of Language and Faith.

Again, as a proponent of the new quest, Jüngel rejects Martin Kähler's thesis that the historical Jesus has nothing to do with the Christ of faith. Jüngel maintains that if this indeed was the case then the Jesus who won the disciples to faith would not be the real Christ (p.73). On the contrary, Jüngel teaches that the very manner in which the historical Jesus presented himself as one who spoke in the name of God implies a christology (p.79). This fact suggests that a definite connection exists between the historical Jesus and the kerygma. A central premise of the new quest is succinctly expressed when Jüngel declares that the kerygma requires the historical Jesus just as much as the historical Jesus requires the kerygma [(n.1) p. 274].

Such an acknowledgement is a prerequisite for proper exegesis. He maintains that if proper exegesis is going to take place, the historian and the theologian must meet somewhere

---


113 Here Jüngel contrasts his position with that of Bultmann by explaining that such a language-event as the preaching of Jesus (gen. obj.) by the early church must itself take place within the confines of history. That is to say, the kerygma by nature echoes the Sprachereignis of Jesus Christ from which it was originally derived.
So for Jüngel, history and theology must be brought together with regard to the Jesus/Paul question. He seeks to accomplish this union by giving a theological interpretation of history. He does so by defining the historical Jesus as *das geschichtliche Phänomen Jesus von Nazareth* (pp. 82-83). The precise meaning of such a statement can only be discovered by understanding Jüngel’s existentialist approach to scripture, his special view of history and his philosophy of language. Jüngel evidences all three of these aspects of his theology when he says,

> Der historische Jesus ist also als zu erforschendes Objekt mit dem geschichtlichen Phänomen Jesus von Nazareth identisch, während er als erforschtes Objekt dem geschichtlichen Phänomen Jesus so zu entsprechen hat, dass durch die historische Forschung Jesus selbst zur Sprache kommt (pp. 83-84, italics mine).

So Jüngel’s understanding of the historical Jesus is essentially bound up with his view of how language, faith and history interrelate with one another. For these reasons

---

114 Jüngel presents a picture of a historian and a theologian tunneling from opposite sides of a mountain. If and when they meet, then proper exegesis has occurred (82).

115 The influence of Gerhard Ebeling upon Jüngel is apparent here. With respect to history, language and faith Ebeling asks, "Hence the proper question regarding the past is not: What happened? What were the facts? How are they to be explained? or something of that kind, but: *What came to expression?* ["The Question of the Historical Jesus and the Problem of Christology", in his *Word and Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963) 295; italics mine]. The theological and philosophical factors which greatly influenced Jüngel will be discussed below in chapter three.
Jüngel will not tolerate a complete separation of the theology of Paul from the life and teachings of Jesus (p.273). Indeed as described above, his entire thesis is founded upon the theory that there is an essential, or better still, an ontological relationship between language, faith and history.

3. The Eschatological Significance of Jesus.

In accordance with Schweitzer and Bultmann, Jüngel believes that eschatology is the key to explaining the relationship between Paul and Jesus (p.13). As he clearly states,

Die δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ als "Thema" der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre erkannten wir als ein die ganze paulinische Theologie bestimmendes eschatologisches Phänomen. Die βασιλεία Θεοῦ als "Thema" der Gleichnisse Jesu erkannten wir als ein die ganze Verkündigung Jesu bestimmendes eschatologisches Phänomen (p.266).

It follows that the eschatological significance of Jesus and his message is of utmost importance for Jüngel. Indeed, not only is Jesus the eschatological person, but Jesus is the personal equivalent of the eschaton (p.60).\textsuperscript{116} It is the eschatological message of Jesus which constitutes him as the unique eschatological person. No one ever preached the kingdom of God like Jesus. Through the Sprachereignis of Jesus, the very essence of the kingdom is brought into the

\textsuperscript{116}Jüngel quotes his Doktorvater in saying that "Jesus selber das Eschaton war." [Cf. Ernst Fuchs, "Christus das Ende der Geschichte", \textit{EvTh} 10 (1948-49) 456].
Das heisst aber: Die Authorität der Verkündigung der Basileia durch Jesus ist die Basileia selbst. Als die die Verkündigung Jesu autorisierende Macht ist die Basileia gegenwärtig (p.193).

Herein lies the hermeneutical function of the parables of Jesus. Through Jesus' proclamation of the parables, the kingdom of God is made present and hence people are able to experience the nearness of God (p.181). The following examples will help clarify Jüngel's thought and hermeneutical approach in this regard.

a) Matthew 20:1-15 "The Laborers in the Vineyard"

Jüngel rejects J. Wellhausen's allegorical interpretation of this parable. He maintains that Wellhausen failed to take into account its implications for the Christian church. Jüngel believes that the function of this parable is to express the love of God toward those who are called and that we should rejoice in the grace of God. In accordance with his thesis, he proposes that this message of God's love and grace is reflected in Paul's doctrine of justification (pp. 164-165). Jüngel argues that the main emphasis of this parable has nothing to do with keeping a working contract. Rather the goodness of God is manifested to the workers as persons, regardless of how much they have labored.

---

The eschatological significance of the parable lies in its ability to bring the kingdom into the present. As Jüngel explains,

An der Geschichte Jesus wird die Nähe der eschatologischen Gottesherrschaft als Ereignis der Güte Gottes offenbar. Die Parabel weist auf die Zukunft der Tat Gottes an Jesus hin, indem sie diese Zukunft zur Sprache bringt als die jetzt im Ereignis der Güte Jesu nahe Gottesherrschaft.

The existential significance of the parable is expressed in the terminology of E. Fuchs. That is, the parable teaches us not to view things with an "evil eye" but "to see with God's eyes" (Ibid.).

b) Luke 15:11-32 "The Prodigal Son"

In contrast to Jeremias, Jüngel does not interpret this parable as a justification of the gospel in the face of its critics (p.161). Rather, the parable is an Ereignis der Liebe in which the Father gains both sons (pp.161-162). The repentance of the younger son is to be interpreted within the context of the father's love. The love of the father "heard" the son prior to his confession, the result being that the younger νεκρός ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν

---

(Luke 15:24). As in the previous interpretation, the experience of love brings the kingdom into the present which in turn creates a new existential situation for the hearer (pp.162-63).

As has become clear from his treatment of the parables, Jüngel does not believe that the parables are primarily to dispel doubt, give new knowledge or gather listeners to Jesus. No, the parables actually give the hearers what they need. For example, in contrast to Bultmann's interpretation of Matt 13:44-46 ("The Hidden Treasure" and "The Pearl of Great Price") Jüngel does not think that "decision" has anything to do with the interpretation. On the contrary, "joy" is the central concern here. As Jüngel puts it, the finder is found because the Mehr Gottes gives eschatologische Freude (p. 144).

In a sense for Jüngel, Jesus "speaks the kingdom on" his hearers because the kingdom is made present by the language-event. The kingdom is evidenced as a power, albeit the power of love (p.193). The experience of this love creates a new existence for those who hear. In turn this new existence creates the real possibility of loving

---


122 Cf. Weder, Gleichnisse, (n.215) 140.

one's neighbor (pp. 193-96). As Jüngel puts it,

Im Vertrauen auf die Macht der Liebe bringt Jesus die Gottesherrschaft als das grosse Ereignis der Liebe zur Sprache, das die Verlorenen in eine neue Geschichte, in die Geschichte der Liebe beruft (pp. 162-63).

This also means that the very Sein Gottes is made present in the parables and that it creates a neues Sein for all who hear. So the new being of the hearer is joined to the being of God by none other than das Sein Jesu selbst (Ibid.).

4. The Conduct and Deeds of Jesus and How They Relate to the Question of Christology.

In the midst of his consistent emphasis on the language-event of Jesus, Jüngel occasionally makes reference to his conduct and deeds. The prime example given by Jüngel is Jesus' table-fellowship with publicans and sinners (Matt 11:19b par. Luke 7:34b). As in the treatment of the parables, Jüngel views this act as an eschatologisches Geschehen which offered the love of God to those who needed it most (p.211).125

124 Jüngel's understanding and treatment of the Son of Man parallels his work on the kingdom of God (pp. 215-63). Jesus' speech about the Son of Man brings the essence of the Son of Man into the present (pp. 250-51). In this way the present becomes eschatologically determined (pp.254-58) [cf. W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus (London: SCM, 1957) 153]. Apart from this point, it is not clear how Jüngel's treatment of the Son of Man contributes to his argument concerning Paul and Jesus (cf. Robinson, "New Hermeneutic", 357).

With reference to purity regulations and sabbath observation, Jüngel again looks to the conduct and deeds of Jesus. He interprets Mark 7:15 and parallels as a \textit{Frontalangriff} against the ancient distinction between the holy and the profane (pp. 209-10).\textsuperscript{126} Similarly Mark 3:4 is understood as a \textit{Kampfwort} directed against a Pharisaical Missbrauch der Werke (pp. 208-09).\textsuperscript{127}

Despite his emphasis on \textit{Sprachereignis}, when it comes to \textit{specifically} addressing the question of Paul's understanding of faith and that of the early church, Jüngel turns to the miracle stories for an explanation. In his section entitled \textit{Der Ort des Glaubens}, Jüngel speculates about how the faith of the early church developed. He proposes that the death of Jesus caused the church to associate their faith with a particular \textit{Ort} and that place was the miracle-working power of Jesus (p.277). As he states,

Hierin scheint sich ein historischer Sachverhalt zu spiegeln, so dass wir nach dem Grund dafür zu fragen haben, dass die Gemeinde gerade im Zusammenhang mit den Heilungsgeschichten Jesus und den Glauben zusammenbrachte (p.276).

Nevertheless, faith in Jesus the miracle worker and healer needed some means of surviving the crushing blow of the


crucifixion (p.281). Jüngel proposes that such a catastrophe was overcome by God identifying Geschichte with the Eschaton through the Sprachereignis of the resurrection. The overall effect of such a divine act is that,"Dieses Ereignis der Identität von Geschichte und Eschaton macht Jesus als den Christus zum Grund des Glaubens" (p.282).

5. The Language-Event of Paul's Doctrine of Justification as Viewed in the Light of Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom and Its Bearing upon the Law.

Jüngel's primary goal in this section is to substantiate his claim that Paul's doctrine sola gratia is thematically parallel to the eschatological language-event of Jesus (p.279). He rejects Wrede's theory that Paul's doctrine of justification is simply die Kampfslehre des Paulus against the Jews (p.18). On the contrary, he maintains that justification by faith lies at the very core of Paul's theology (pp.17-32). He substantiates this claim by indicating that the theological foundation for this doctrine

---

128 Wrede, Paul, 122 ff. R. P. Martin also rejects Wrede's view on this point (cf. Reconciliation, 33).

is δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. As Jüngel states,

Dass ebenso, wie hinter der ὄρη Θεοῦ der νόμος steht (cf. Rm 4:15), so auch hinter der δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in Rm 1:17 und 3:21 das εὐαγγέλιον steht, wie wir bereits gesehen haben, V. 16 einerseits und das auf Rm 1:18-3:20 folgende evangelische ννυλ δέ in Rm 3:21 andererseits, "das der Menschheitsgeschichte unter dem νόμος ein Ende setzt" (p.28-29).

This "righteousness of God" is never used ambiguously by Paul, but is to be consistently understood as a genetivus auctoris, i.e. a righteousness born of God. God is viewed as "the originator" or "the cause" of the righteousness given to man (pp.274-75). Jüngel understands Paul to be in perfect harmony with Jesus in this regard. Both Paul and Jesus speak their eschatological messages extra se making God's righteousness and his kingdom an extra nos experience (pp.274-75). It is for these reasons that Jüngel surmises that Paul's doctrine of justification is a theological explication and extension of the language-event of Jesus

---


131. Just how one interprets δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ will become increasingly important as the discussion continues (cf. chap. 5, pp. 223-26). Perhaps it should be mentioned here that Käsemann also acknowledges that Paul regularly uses words like δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ as an objective genitive describing that righteousness which is acceptable in God's eyes and can be bestowed by him upon his people. Yet in contrast to Jüngel (and Bultmann as well) Käsemann argues that Paul often has the subjective genitive in mind [cf. his treatment of such passages as Rom 1:17, 3:5, 25 f., and 10:3 f. in his Commentary on Romans (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 23-24]. That is, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ often refers to God's righteous nature by which he remains faithful to his covenant. In this sense God's righteousness is revealed in his saving activity [cf. "The Righteousness of God' in Paul", in his New Testament Questions of Today, 169].
This is so because the Christian faith required a theology and Paul took it upon himself to provide one (p.267). The result of Paul's thinking and theologizing is that Paul replaces Jesus' \( \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \varepsilon \iota \alpha \ \Theta \varepsilon \Theta \) with \( \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \omicron \upsilon \eta \ \Theta \varepsilon \Theta \).

All of these points have a direct bearing upon the law as far as Jüngel is concerned. Jüngel teaches that the law had a Geschichte of its own. It came into effect four hundred and thirty years after God's promise to Abraham (Gal 3:17) and met its end (\( \tau \varepsilon \lambda \omicron \omicron \) \( \theta \omicron \omicron \) \( \omicron \) \( \omicron \)) in the eschatological event of Christ (Rom 10:4) (p.55).

The consistency that Jüngel showed in his interpretation of \( \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \omicron \upsilon \eta \ \Theta \varepsilon \Theta \) is also reflected in his use of \( \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \). The "law" that Jüngel speaks of is always to be understood as "the law of Moses". In his opinion, \( \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \) is never to be interpreted in the general sense of "rule", "attitude" or "principle". Even though an apparent contradiction arises when comparing passages such as Rom 3:27 and 8:2 with Rom 7:10 ff. and Gal 3:12, Jüngel states:

Der 'Selbstwiderspruch' wäre leicht beseitigt, wollte man annehmen, Paul redete von zwei verschiedenen Gesetzen. Aber das ist nicht der Fall. Er redet von demselben einen Gesetz. Aber von diesem Gesetz redet er als von einer geschichtlichen Grösse. Das zeigt schon allein die Tatsache, dass für Paulus das Gesetz des Mose oder auch die alttestamentliche Offenbarungsurkunde überhaupt Nomos bedeuten kann (cf. z.B. Rm. 10:5; 2 Kor. 3:7 ff.) (p.55).

Nevertheless, even though the word \( \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \) retains its essential content as the law of Moses, the effect of the law
has been altered by the Christ event. This means that various Pauline phrases such as "the law of faith", "the law in my members", "the law of sin", "the law of the Spirit", "the law of sin and death" and "the law of Christ" (Rom 3:27, 7:23, 25, 8:2; Gal 6:2) all refer to the selfsame law, but must be interpreted in the light of the eschatological event of Christ. For example, in commenting on Rom 8:2 and Gal 3:24, Jüngel states,

An Jesus Christus zeigt sich, was das Gesetz ist; ohne ihn ein Gesetz der Sünde und des Todes und gerade so als παράδειγμα auf ihn bezogen; mit ihm das Gebot der Liebe (p.270).

So for Jüngel the law has both a positive and a negative function, depending upon its relationship to the eschatological event of Christ. The unparteiische Strenge of the law allows it to be both the law of God, or the law of sin, and the law of the Spirit and of Christ, or the law of sin and death (pp. 58-59, 270). Yet when the law comes under the influence of the eschaton, it takes on christological significance for Paul. It has been eschatologically determined by Christ and finds its new place in Christ (Rom 8:2). As Jüngel states, "Er wird dort zum νόμος Χριστοῦ (Gal.6:2)" (p.61). Also, as the law of Christ, the law is in some way able to bring forth the full meaning of the Spirit. Just as it had apart from Christ brought forth the full significance of sin, in Christ it shows the true significance of the Spirit (p. 61).
In conclusion, Jüngel believes that the language-events of both Jesus and Paul had the same effect upon the law: they ended it. As he himself states,

"Die Zeit des den Menschen an seine Vergangenheit kettenden Gesetzes ist zu Ende, weil in Christus das Eschaton da war" (p. 53).

C. Summary of Results.

It is reasonable to assume that some type of "causal connection" exists between the post-Easter Christian community and the life and ministry of its founder. Since Paul was a leading figure in the early church, this historical connection permits one to enquire about Paul's relationship to Jesus. However, Paul's own experience and letters pose more questions than answers in this regard. The tremendous influence that Paul has had upon the Christian faith and church only serves to accentuate the difficulties at hand. Indeed for more than a century, in one form or another, the question of Paul's relationship to the historical Jesus has been a major, if not the major concern of New Testament scholarship. The theories and approaches are many, yet the results remain inconclusive. Because of the nature

---

132 E. P. Sanders comments on the "substantial coherence" and "causal connection" existing between the historical Jesus and the birth of the Christian movement [cf. below chap. 4 (n. 239) 180 and chap. 5 (n. 1) 182].

of the sources, the paralleling of texts has proven to be futile. The exploration of theological themes offers more promise. Those themes which can be traced back to a particular attitude or consistent way of life common to both Jesus and Paul are more promising still. Eberhard Jüngel’s use of *Sprachereignis* and his emphasis on the deeds of Jesus is a good case in point. However, questions remain. What does Jüngel actually mean by *Sprachereignis*? What philosophical and theological influences have guided his understanding and use of such a term? How much has Jüngel, by means of a modern philosophy of language, actually advanced our understanding of how two men of the first century relate to each other? Has his extraordinary emphasis on the kingdom of God as "language-event" caused him to overlook the God of the kingdom? Similarly, has his singular use of δικαιοσύνη θεού as the tertium comparisonis between Jesus and Paul caused him to slight such concepts as "grace", "love", "mercy", "joy", "peace" and "reconciliation"? It is to these questions and others that I now turn.

---

As indicated in the title, the purpose of this chapter is to explain, and render a critical analysis of, Jüngel's work on Paul and Jesus. The method of study will involve placing Jüngel and his work within the proper philosophical and theological context. This means that much will be said about Martin Heidegger and his philosophy of language and how his thought relates to the new hermeneutic. The goal of this section is to further establish a foundation for the development of the thesis by pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of Jüngel's approach.

A. The Philosophical Importance of the Early Heidegger for an Understanding of the New Hermeneutic.

Even though Martin Heidegger's later works (or the "later Heidegger") bear more directly upon the subject of the new hermeneutic, his philosophy of language is clearly reflected in his earlier works (or the "early Heidegger"). For this reason, and for the sake of clarity, it will be necessary to give a brief sketch of the early Heidegger.

Martin Heidegger's philosophy could be described as a philosophical protest against the scientific and technological understanding of existence so characteristic of our day. He is reacting against the practically inherent tendency of Western society to explain human existence within the framework of the so-called "subject/object schema". Therefore he rejects the notion that the true meaning of Being can be discovered through the activity of a subject enquiring into the nature and quality of an object. He believes that this type of objectifying and categorizing of reality actually creates a barrier between Being and humans, which constitutes the aforementioned subject/object schema. Consequently we have fallen away from the true meaning of Being.

Heidegger maintains that it is this kind of separation and alienation which has resulted in the dissolution and pervasive mediocrity of our modern technological society. Heidegger believes that this devolution away from the true

---

1"Being" is capitalized in order to maintain Heidegger's distinction between Being in its most fundamental sense (das Sein) and the being of entities in general (das Seiende), cf. Martin Heidegger, Being and Time (London: SCM, 1962) 26. Henceforth, all references to Heidegger's Being and Time will simply be included in the text.

meaning of Being has its origin in the metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle. Even though both elevated the question of Being to a new level by recognizing its transcendence, they also paved the way for the development of the modern scientific view of reality (pp.21-23). The very concept of Plato's ideal world provided the foundation of the subject/object schema in which reality becomes objectified as a product of human thought. In turn, Aristotle's implicit empiricism opened the door to an endless categorizing and analysis of things which only served to intensify the process of objectification. Heidegger argues that the philosophies of Descartes, Kant and Hegel have done nothing to alter this dilemma. The result is that the fundamental question of Being has been forgotten in our day (p.21).

Herein lies the major task of Heidegger, i.e. to rethink the question of Being. The horizon of this task is determined by repeatedly asking and seeking the answer to the question, "Why is there something as opposed to nothing?". Or in giving a somewhat expanded version, one might ask, "What is it in all that is, which keeps 'what is' from slipping back into 'what is not'?". Simply put, Heidegger is preoccupied with the most basic question of all, i.e. the question of fundamental ontology.

---

3 Thiselton, Horizons, 332.

4 M. Heidegger, An Introduction to Metaphysics (Yale: The University Press, 1959) 1, 2, 12, 22, 29, 32.
Yet if modern thought is inextricably bound by the subject/object schema, how then is one to approach the question of the true meaning of Being? Heidegger proposes that one must transcend the subject/object mentality by taking the "step back or behind" modern metaphysics. This "step back" is accomplished by approaching the question of Being from a phenomenological perspective (p.50).

It should be noted here that the later Heidegger's special interest in the relationship between language and Being is already present at this stage of his thought. This is true because Heidegger maintains that the very nature of the word "phenomenology" provides the way for "the step back". This word uncovers something of the true nature of Being as well as defining the proper approach to the question of Being. Heidegger bases his thoughts on the fact that the Greek noun φαινόμενον is derived from the infinitive φαινεσθαι meaning "to show itself". In turn this word finds its source in the verb φαίνω which means "to bring to the light of day". Finally, the fundamental root of all of these words is φα which communicates the idea of "light" or "that which is bright" (p.51). Also, Heidegger proposes that the "ology" in "phenomenology" can only be properly understood if one considers Aristotle's concept of the λόγος. Heidegger understands Aristotle to teach that λόγος

---

5 Achtemeier, New Hermeneutic, 29.
lets something be seen. That is it allows what is discussed in the discourse to become manifest (p.56). So "phenomenology" allows things to appear as they really are. In the process of letting things come to light phenomenologically, the true meaning of Being is uncovered.\(^6\)

It is evident that Heidegger is not primarily interested in the etymological importance of words in themselves, but rather in their ontological significance. It is this factor which will become of central importance for the later Heidegger, but is present, even if in embryonic form, at this early stage.

The manner in which Heidegger joins his quest for Being with the question of truth is another case in point. For even though Heidegger's philosophy is not primarily concerned with epistemology, the question of the true meaning of Being encompasses the question of truth. For what is truth but the uncovering or bringing to light of that which was previously hidden? Indeed, the Greek words for truth, \(\eta \ \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \iota \alpha\) and \(\tau \omicron \ \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma\), show that truth and Being are essentially related and that the discovery of them both comes about phenomenologically. For these words consist of

\(^6\)An excellent contemporary example of the new hermeneutic at work is that of Richard Palmer. It is noteworthy that Palmer perfectly echoes Heidegger when he explains the root meaning of phenomenology [cf. R. Palmer, Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger and Gadamer (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969) 127-28.]
the alpha privative α plus the verbal stem λαθ which means "to be concealed" (p.57). Thus Heidegger explains that "Being-true" ("truth") means "Being-uncovering" (p.262).

Also it is not difficult to see how such a phenomenological approach to the question of Being can be related to hermeneutics. For φαινόμενον and λόγος let things appear as they are and "uncover" the truth (ἀ-λήθεια) of Being in the process. For these reasons, Heidegger states that the meaning of phenomenology as a method lies in interpretation (pp.61-62). Richard Palmer aptly summarizes the hermeneutical significance of Heidegger's phenomenology by stating that

...phenomenology means letting things become manifest as what they are, without forcing our own categories on them. It means a reversal of direction from the one one is accustomed to: it is not we who point to things; rather, things show themselves to us."

In the course of his quest for Being and his interpretation of reality, Heidegger's phenomenological approach leads him to ask which entity, among all the entities which shine forth Being, would best serve as the focus of the enquiry. He believes that the very asking of the question yields the answer. The only being for which the question of

---

7 Ibid., 128.
Being is an issue is "human-being" (pp.26–27).  

2. The Existential Analysis of Dasein as a Means of Clarifying the Fundamental Question of Being.

The previous section indicated that Heidegger's phenomenology as determined by a thorough-going ontology of language is of central importance for the new hermeneutic. This point will become even more evident as the discussion continues. Yet of equal importance is Heidegger's existentialism as seen in his consistent focus on the significance of human existence for the understanding of Being. Indeed, as will become apparent, the new hermeneutic could be described as an amalgam of the central principles of an existentialist philosophy and that of linguistic ontology. But for now, Heidegger's existentialism will be the subject of study.

Human-being is literally an "out-standing" being in the original sense of the Greek word ἐξετάσις ("to stand out"). Human-being stands out with respect to other beings in a twofold way. Firstly, it stands out in that it is able to distance itself from itself in order to enquire and observe its own being. Secondly, because it is able to do

---

8 It should be noted that Heidegger often hyphenates words in order to distinguish a mode of being from the mere existence of an entity as a object. So "human-being" is the type of Being evident in persons and does not simply refer to people as living things among other things.

9 Thiselton, Horizons, 152.
this, a human stands out with respect to all other entities. These truths constitute the "ontological difference" which allows Being to come to light in human-beings in a special way. For these reasons, Heidegger calls human-being *Dasein* or "Being-present". This means that *Dasein* can never simply be regarded as an entity which can be defined by the scientific "thematizing of nature". *Dasein* transcends all such thematizing. As Heidegger explains,

*Dasein* is an entity which does not just occur among other entities. Rather it is ontologically distinguished by the fact that in its very Being, Being is an issue for it (p.32).

In summary let it be said that the existential analysis of *Dasein* is the predominant focus of study for the early Heidegger. He believes that a phenomenological analysis of *Dasein* will be able to perceive the essence of Being shining through and thus clarify the meaning of *Da-

---


12 A more complete presentation of the early Heidegger is beyond the scope of this paper. However, for more information on some of the basic principles of early Heideggerian philosophy note the following in his *Being and Time*: *Dasein* as Being-in-the-world as "thrown", 82, 172-75, 295-96. *Dasein*’s "ownmost" possibility of Being-toward-death, 67-68, 295. *Dasein* as fallen, 96-97, 212-20. *Dasein*’s possibility of existing authentically in resoluteness and authentic historicality, 270-73, 342-43, 428, 435-38.
sein’s existence.13


1. The Turn.

It was clear from the early Heidegger that Dasein evidenced a special relationship to Being. Yet the later Heidegger is not primarily concerned with the relationship

13 Rudolf Bultmann’s appropriation of Heideggerian philosophy in the development of his existentialist theology forms an essential link between the early Heidegger and the existentialism seen in the new hermeneutic. However, such a study also goes beyond the scope of a critique of Jüngel.

Yet for Bultmann’s own comments on the influence of Heidegger see his Existence and Faith, 339, 341; Faith and Understanding, 55; Essays Philosophical and Theological (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955) 254-55.


For parallels between the thought of the early Heidegger and Bultmann note the following:


Dasein and Soma as "Thrown". Cf. Heidegger, ibid., 174-75; Bultmann, ibid., 227, 232.


Historie as opposed to Geschichte. Cf. Heidegger, ibid., 444; Bultmann, Jesus and the Word (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958) 11.

between Dasein and Being but with what constitutes that relationship. Heidegger concludes that language plays the decisive role here.\(^\text{14}\) This shift in emphasis has been called "the turn" because it is viewed as a reversal of his previous position.\(^\text{15}\) Yet from the preceding analysis of the early Heidegger, it became clear that themes central to the later Heidegger are already present in his Being and Time. So Palmer and Michaelson seem to be correct in interpreting "the turn" as simply the development of concepts that were already present in the early Heidegger.\(^\text{16}\)

The shift from a existentialist analysis of Dasein to an ontological study of language brought with it a shift in method. The approach of the early Heidegger was characterized by an active questioning, while the later Heidegger could be described as an "expectant passivity" which awaits the disclosure of Being in language.\(^\text{17}\) In the later Heideg-

\(^{14}\) Thiselton, Horizons, 329. By way of analogy one might say that what Being and Time was to the early Heidegger On the Way to Language is to the later Heidegger. It should be noted that Bultmann opted not to make this shift in emphasis. Rather he continued to interpret the New Testament in light of the fundamental question of human existence (cf. Achtemeier, Introduction, 41).


\(^{16}\) Palmer, Hermeneutics, 141; Michaelson, "Theology as Ontology", 139.

\(^{17}\) Heidegger, Introduction, 143.
Being is increasingly portrayed as taking the initiative to "dis-close" truth (recall \( \Delta \Upsilon \Theta \varepsilon \Upsilon \alpha \)) in the place (\( Dasein \)) where it can shine forth. Consequently, Heidegger's earlier emphasis upon the existential anguish of Dasein in the face of death is replaced by a calm receptivity which awaits the call of Being in language.

2. Language as a Type of Being.

Already in his Being and Time Heidegger made a sharp distinction between authentic language (\( Rede \)) and unauthentic language (\( Gerede \)) [pp.212-20]. The later Heidegger explores the nature of authentic language in an attempt to arrive at a more primordial basis for the being of language.

Heidegger believes that this is necessary because modern technology persists in superimposing a "Framework" upon the "Showing" of language which in turn obstructs the appearance of Being. He believes that modern thought is cast in "the presses of technical-scientific calculations". The result is that true speaking is "levelled-down" and appears as mere information. Such talk is "formalized language" which obscures "natural language" and forces humans to conform to a "technological-calculative

---

18 Achtemeier, Introduction, 42.
19 Cf. n. 12 above.
universe". \(^{21}\) In order to free modern thought from "the presses of technical-scientific calculations" one must take "the step back", i.e. get behind modern metaphysics. \(^{22}\) As one does so, it will be discovered that language is ontologically intertwined with the being of Being itself. Words are not simply the expression of human thought or linguistic tools which can be manipulated to communicate information. \(^{23}\) Rather, behind every conventional signification stands something that is ontologically more primordial than the signification itself. \(^{24}\) As Heidegger explains,

Saying is in no way the linguistic expression added to the phenomena after they have appeared—rather, all radiant appearance and all fading away is grounded in the showing of Saying. Saying sets all present beings free into their given presence and brings what is absent into their absence. \(^{25}\)

It is the word that brings a given thing into the "is" of existence and holds it there so that it might continue to be. \(^{26}\) Things need words in order to be. \(^{27}\) So language is

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 131-32.


\(^{24}\) Palmer, Hermeneutics, 134.


\(^{26}\) Heidegger, "The Nature", 82.

\(^{27}\) As Heidegger states, "The word makes the thing into a thing — it 'bthings' the thing. We should like to call this rule of the word 'bathing' (die Bedingnis)" ("Words", On the Way to Language, 151; cf. also 141, 148).
not simply a medium of understanding, but a "world" in itself. In this sense the "Saying" of language grants reality and as such is not a being or a thing per se. Rather, language gives Being. In language, it is the being of Being in entities which is disclosing itself in Saying and in this disclosure, Being speaks (p.120). So the essential nature of language and Being are one. Being comes into being through language and so language can be described as "the house of Being". This central point of the later Heidegger can be seen in his often quoted statement, "the being of language -- the language of Being". Or as he frequently notes from Stefan George's poem "The Word", "Where word breaks off, no thing may be." So the very existence of reality is dependent upon language.

3. Language as an Event.

The nature of language as "event" has already become evident in the discussion. Indeed, this aspect in its most rudimentary form was already present in the early Heidegger

31. Ibid., 65, 94.
32. Ibid., 61, 62, 82, 108; cf. "Words," 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, 52, 55. Heidegger’s paraphrase of George is, "No thing is where the word is lacking."
when he spoke of truth as "showing" or "unconcealment" (ἀ-λήθεια). To "say" means to "show" or let something be seen or heard. As Heidegger explains, "The essential being of language is Saying as Showing". Language "speaks" by showing, even when no words are spoken. In fact authentic language is the "soundless voice" of the event of showing. The event of showing is itself brought about by what the later Heidegger calls "Owning" or " Appropriation". The later Heidegger explains that "appropriation" is the "gentle law" which permits beings to be as what is appropriate for them and maintains this being. Therefore " Appropriation" provides for the clearing of Being (in Saying or Showing) and yields the "there is". This is an event of Being through language.

The nature of language as event is further illustrated by Heidegger's theory that language permits (einlassen) Being to be present (anwesend). So language as event "happens", it "befalls", it "holds itself back" and it

33 Cf. above pp. 58, 59, 64. Cf. also Heidegger, "The Way", 115 and his Being and Time, 57, 262.
34 Ibid., 122.
35 Ibid., 123; cf. 126.
36 Ibid., 124.
37 Ibid., 129, 135.
38 Ibid., 127.
"transforms". Yet one of the most important functions of language is that it "gathers". Language gathers because it draws Dasein back to the true meaning of Being. It gathers because it allows the structure and order of Being to come into Dasein's world (p.120). And with the study of language as event, the discussion comes full circle. What is the essential relationship between Being, Dasein and language? What is the significance of this relationship for an interpretation of existence? It is to these issues that I now turn.

4. Language as the Abode of Dasein.

It will be recalled that the early Heidegger concluded that since the question of Being was an issue for Dasein, then Dasein must have a special relationship to Being. The later Heidegger now proposes that language is that which constitutes the special relationship between Being and Dasein. Being makes itself known in "the place" (Dasein) where language comes to expression.

Again as previously noted, the seeds of such thought are already evident in the early Heidegger. For in

41 Heidegger states, "Because the essence of language is found in the act of gathering within the togetherness of being, language as everyday speech comes to its truth only when speaking and hearing are oriented toward logos as collectedness in the sense of being" (Introduction, 173. Cf. also Thiselton, Horizons, 335-57).
42 Cf. above discussion, chap. 3, p. 60-61.
his Being and Time Heidegger states that "Discourse is essentially equiprimordial with state-of-mind and understanding" (p. 203). This means that language is an existentielle of Dasein which is constitutive for the very existence of Dasein (pp. 204, 209). In a sense, language "makes room" for Dasein to exist in a realm of authentic understanding of Being. Language creates "an open space" for things to be disclosed as they really are and hence Being comes to speech as it really is. Language uses Dasein to shine forth Being, and to that extent, creates human-being for what it really is. It becomes clear that the poetic maxim, "Where word breaks off, no thing may be" applies in its most fundamental sense to Dasein itself. If there was no language, there would be no humanity. It is language that constitutes the distinctive humanity of Dasein.44

5. Poets, Poetry and the Interpretation of Dasein as a Hermeneutic of Existence.

Authentic Dasein exists in language and by virtue of language. Language creates the "world" of Dasein.45 This

43 Heidegger, Introduction, 139.
45 Again Heidegger claims that, "Language is not a mere tool, one of the many which man possesses; on the contrary, it is only language that affords the very possibility of standing in the openness of the existent. Only where there is language is there world,..." ["Holderlin and the Essence of Poetry", in his Existence and Being (London: Vision, 1968) 299-300.] Cf. also Palmer, Hermeneutic, 205-08. Hans-Georg Gadamer, Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960) 419.
fact once again exposes the pure folly of viewing language as an object to be used by humans.\textsuperscript{46} On the contrary, the saying of Being in language provides for the "Appropriation" of \textit{Dasein} to exist as a speaking being.\textsuperscript{47} This means that language is always "ahead" of \textit{Dasein} and \textit{Dasein}'s speaking only follows after the Saying of Being.\textsuperscript{48} As Heidegger explains, "Every spoken word is already an answer: a counter-saying..." corresponding to the expression of Being.\textsuperscript{49} Even when we ask questions or make an enquiry into something, language has already granted these thoughts and questions to us. So thinking is really only listening to "the grant" of language.\textsuperscript{50} It becomes apparent that the relationship between Being and \textit{Dasein} is a reciprocal one. The Saying or Showing of Being needs \textit{Dasein} to articulate it in word and \textit{Dasein} needs to hear the Saying of Being in order to exist.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{46}Or in early Heideggerian terminology, language is never to be thought of as simply "present-at-hand".

\textsuperscript{47}Heidegger, "The Way", 128. Heidegger clearly states, "For man is man only because he is granted the promise of language, because he is needful to language, that he may speak it" ("The Nature", 90).

\textsuperscript{48}Heidegger, "The Nature", 75.

\textsuperscript{49}Heidegger, "The Way", 129, 135.

\textsuperscript{50}Heidegger, "The Nature", 71, 75.

\textsuperscript{51}Heidegger, "The Way", 134.
The mystical relationship between Being, language and Dasein becomes evident at this point.\textsuperscript{52} Heidegger readily admits the mysterious nature and origin of language and proposes that of all people, the poets are most open to Being in language (p.205).\textsuperscript{53} This is true because the poets speak a "natural language" as opposed to the formalized technical information-bearing language of modern society.\textsuperscript{54} True thinking of a reflective kind is always poetic and all poetry is a type of true thought.\textsuperscript{55} For these reasons the later Heidegger increasingly turns his attention to the

\textsuperscript{52}The later Heidegger wants to avoid being identified with a "word-mysticism", yet also desires to preserve the full force of primal language. He seeks to accomplish both by stating, "In citing such evidence we must avoid uninhibited word-mysticism. Nevertheless, the ultimate business of philosophy is to preserve the force of the most elemental words in which Dasein expresses itself, and to keep the common understanding from leveling them off to that unintelligibility which functions in return as a source of pseudo-problems" (\textit{Being and Time}, 262).

\textsuperscript{53}In regard to mysticism and poetry, Heidegger states, "The origin of language is in essence mysterious. And this means that language could only have arisen from the overpowering, the strange and the terrible, through man's departure into being. In this departure language was being embodied in the world: poetry. Language is the primordial poetry in which a people speaks being" (\textit{Introduction}, 171; italics mine). Cf. J. B. Cobb, "Is the Later Heidegger Relevant for Theology?" in \textit{The Later Heidegger}, 179. Also, Michalson notes that early in his career Heidegger wanted to write on the mystic Meister Eckhart. He concludes that the idea that Being reveals the "unthought" is indicative of a "mystic mentality" which also "suits the counter-Reformation mentality" ("Theology as Ontology", 154).

\textsuperscript{54}Heidegger, "The Way", 132-33.

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., 136. For more on the relationship between poetry and Being, cf. Heidegger, "Words", 139-56.
interpretation of such poets as Rilke, Trakl, George, Humboldt, Goethe and especially Holderlin. The assumption is that by standing with the poet and allowing his language to effect one in an immediate way, one will also experience the intuitive openness to Being as the poet. Since the very essence of Being is made present in the words of the poet, every word of the poem is to be carefully reflected upon. Even the very punctuation may be latent with hidden meaning revealing the nature of Being.

The hermeneutical implications of such an understanding of Being, language and Dasein are self-evident. Through an interpretation of Dasein, made possible by the clearing of Being in poetic language, one gains insight into the very nature of Being and all of existence. It remains to be seen just how such an interpretation of existence came to be incorporated into theology and serve as a means of understanding the New Testament. It is to this issue that I now turn.

C. Two Major Contributors to the Origin and Development of the New Hermeneutic.

Having outlined the major points of the early and later Heidegger, the discussion can now pick up again where


the second chapter left off. It will be recalled that extensive work with the kerygma ultimately resulted in the new quest of the historical Jesus. Gerhard Ebeling and Ernst Fuchs were two of the earliest to respond to the call for a new quest. 58 In accordance with the theme of the new quest, both theologians claim that the kerygma harks back to the historical Jesus and sheds light on the development of christology. 59 Also both Ebeling and Fuchs accepted Bultmann's thesis that the text makes a claim upon the hearer and thus calls him/her to decision. 60 Yet in contrast to Bultmann, they moved away from a purely existentialist analysis of Dasein and made "the turn" with the later Heidegger. As will be discussed below, the "new" hermeneutic of Ebeling and Fuchs applies the linguistic ontology of the later Heidegger to the New Testament. It is to this subject that I now turn.

1. Gerhard Ebeling.

Just how the philosophy of the later Heidegger came to be the guiding force behind the new hermeneutic deserves a few words of explanation. In terms which Heidegger would

58 C. E. Braaten, "How New is the New Hermeneutic?" ThT 22 (1965-66) 228. The embodiment of Ebeling's position can be found in his "The Question of the Historical Jesus and the Problem of Christology". Fuchs set forth his response in his Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid., 226.
never allow, his "Being" is viewed as analogous to "God" and his understanding of language as disclosing Being is seen as paralleling the doctrine of divine revelation.\(^61\) At the risk of oversimplification, such a transformation of the later Heidegger works itself out in the following way. The Scriptures are understood as functioning in the same way as the poems so carefully reflected upon by the later Heidegger. That is, the biblical interpreter is to stand with the writers of scripture and be open to the primal language that they experienced. In this way the interpreter is grasped deep down and experiences reality on the same level as the original authors.\(^62\)

Gerhard Ebeling is a perfect example of such an approach. For him the word "God" means human existence in the world as word situation. This means that God is never to be viewed as a reality existing apart from the linguisticsality of human-being.\(^63\) The "word of God" reveals truth in that it renders a decision concerning that which is distinctively human. Therefore the primary function of the word of God is that it verifies human-being in the world.\(^64\)

The parallels with the later Heidegger are clearly

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 230.

\(^{62}\) Cobb, "Later Heidegger", 181.


\(^{64}\) Ibid., 44.
evident. Ebeling proposes that knowledge of God is a "linguistic event". This is so because the nature of reality and God is characterized by "wordliness". It is this "wordliness" which constitutes the imago Dei in humans. 65

Since reality and God are determined by "wordliness", it follows that truth also exists by virtue of language. Indeed, it is the gift of language to humans which permits truth to be an issue for them. 66

With regard to anthropology, the influence of the later Heidegger is once again evident. As Ebeling explains, humans are not their own masters but are dependent upon language for their very existence. 67 Moreover, the existence of society as a whole is secured by language. The linguisticality of humanity allows for the mutual dependence of all persons. 68

All of this means that true language is of utmost concern for Ebeling. As with Heidegger, Ebeling believes that our modern understanding of language is cut off from the true nature of language. The classical distinction

65. Ebeling, Word and Faith, 351.
66. Ebeling, God and Word, 22.
67. Ibid., 29.
68. Ibid. For language creating and mediating the "world" see Ebeling's Introduction to a Theological Theory of Language (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 57. Cf. also Ebeling, God and Word, 30.
between *signum* and *res* which emphasizes the significatory function of language simply will not do.\(^{69}\) Such a view with its technical grammatical structure restricts thought and results in an atomizing of speech. Such an atomizing of speech has "poisoned" our language and in turn has fragmented our understanding of reality.\(^{70}\) To speak of God in such terms would be irresponsible and unauthentic. Such talk of God would be involving mere tradition, "a dead relic of the language of the past".\(^{71}\)

As with the early Heidegger, such an unauthentic approach ultimately leads to a crisis; in this case a "crisis of language". This crisis is precipitated by the fact that literary or formalized language will eventually exhaust itself and its usefulness. When this happens, *Dasein* is left speechless. In the midst of this linguistic crisis *true language* is permitted to speak forth in silence for the first time.\(^{72}\) In this way the "worn out and superficial" speech of everyday language has become transcended by true speech.\(^{73}\)

For Ebeling, the hermeneutical significance of such

\(^{69}\) Ibid., 17.
\(^{71}\) Ebeling, *God and Word*, 3.
\(^{72}\) Ebeling, *Introduction*, 74, 76.
\(^{73}\) Ibid., 127.
a view of language cannot be overestimated. Hermeneutics is reduced to a theory of language with the "widest possible horizon". The ontological importance of language means that when hermeneutics is properly understood, it adds nothing to language. The task of hermeneutics is simply to remove "obstacles" or "hindrances" so that language can come to expression. 75 When hermeneutics operates in this way then a "word-event" has taken place. 76

This last point strikes the very core of Ebeling's theology and hermeneutics. As he himself states, "The primary phenomenon in the realm of understanding is not understanding OF language, but understanding THROUGH language". 77 This means that the word mediates understanding and has a hermeneutical function in itself. So the content and object of hermeneutics is the word-event. The word-event illumines of its own accord, opening our understanding to a true perception of reality and being. 78 As in the case of the later Heidegger, authentic human speech is always an answer to the summons of language. In this sense each

74 Ibid., 156.
75 Ibid., 157.
76 Ebeling, Word and Faith, 313.
77 Ibid., 318; italics are his. Cf. Ebeling, Introduction, 126.
78 Ebeling, Word and Faith, 319-20.
person is a receiver not a doer. 79

In relation to "God", "speech" and "act", Ebeling has a tendency to view these as one. For the "word of God" is not a symbolic mode of speech but the way that God deals with humankind. As Ebeling explains, "For with God word and deed are one: his speaking is his way of acting". 80

As far as the Bible is concerned, it is the original word-event as passed down in fixed form. This does not mean that the Bible presents us with the unauthentic language of a past tradition. Rather, the Scriptures present one with endless possibilities of varied expression and limitless experiences as word-event. 81 The Bible is not "mere speech" but as word-event it sets in motion and changes the existence of those who hear it. 82 The word-event of the Bible enters into and disturbs everyday language, thus presenting its hearers with a genuine experience of reality and truth.

The most significant word-event of the Bible is that of Jesus Christ. That is why the quest of the historical Jesus is so necessary. Indeed, it is the word-event which makes such a quest possible. In response to the dilemma of "the factual Jesus of history or the Christ of faith", Ebeling comments,

79Ebeling, God and Word, 30-31.
80Ebeling, The Nature of Faith, 90.
81Ebeling, God and Word, 39.
82Ebeling, Nature of Faith, 182-84.
The only thing that can lead us out of the historical difficulty is the view of history which takes its bearings on the word-event and consequently on the linguisticality of reality. Hence the proper question regarding the past is not: What happened? What were the facts? How are they to be explained? or something of that kind, but: What came to expression?"\(^{83}\)

The question remains as to what exactly came to expression in Jesus. Ebeling's answer is that faith and love came to expression to such a degree that all biographical detail and psychological presentation are rendered superfluous.\(^{84}\) The important thing is that faith and love find their focal points in the historical Jesus.\(^{85}\) So the quest of the historical Jesus has now become the quest of the "linguistic event" that brought faith and love to expression.\(^{86}\) It remained for Ebeling's close friend and colleague, Ernst Fuchs, to continue the promotion and development of the new hermeneutic as outlined above.\(^{87}\)

2. Ernst Fuchs

As the Doktorvater of Eberhard Jüngel, the theology and thought of Ernst Fuchs merit special consideration.

---


\(^{84}\) Ibid.

\(^{85}\) Ibid.

\(^{86}\) Ibid., 304.

\(^{87}\) As with Braaten's treatment, the purpose here is not to point out the distinctions between Ebeling and Fuchs. In the main they are unified in their thought and approach [cf. Braaten, "How New?" (n.19) 227].
With respect to Bultmann and Heidegger, Fuchs considers their influence to be nothing less than the beginning of "a new academic era". Remaining true to an existentialist theology, Fuchs considers the fundamental question of interpretation to be ...wie verstehe ich mich? So, as in the case of Bultmann, the question of human existence is the hermeneutical principle which sets the text in motion. For Fuchs, the text reveals its meaning when it speaks about us.

Yet, as indicated above, Fuchs made "the turn" with the later Heidegger and no longer focuses primarily on the question of human existence. As was the case with Ebeling, the fundamental question of human existence has become radicalized by way of explaining the ontological nature of language. In fact Fuchs argues that Bultmann's analysis of human existence should have taught him that language is the

---


89 Ibid., 7-9.

90 By way of analogy Fuchs says that just as a mouse brings out the "catness" of a cat, the hermeneutical principle of human existence is what sets the text in motion (cf. Fuchs, *Hermeneutik*, 109, 116). Compare also Achtemeier, *Introduction*, 126.
connection between existence and reality. He should have realized that there must be some point of agreement (Einverständnis) which joins human being and the being of Being in a primordial way. And as indicated in the discussion of the later Heidegger and Ebeling, this point of agreement is language.

Fuchs claims that such an understanding of language is logically evident in that Sein is "earlier" than all other beings. Also everything that "is" is a "category" of human conceptualization, which itself is a child of language. This can only mean that as in the case of Being, language is "earlier" than all things. There is no reality apart from language. As Fuchs explains,

Die Sprache gehört so eng zur Wirklichkeit, dass sie die Wirklichkeit sogar allererst freigibt: die Sprache spricht die Wirklichkeit 'aus' (dieser 'aus' ist das 'aus' in der Existenz).

Or as expressed more succinctly, "Die Wirklichkeit ist das Gesprochene der Sprache".

Where an intelligent word is

---

92 Achtemeier, Introduction, 93-95; Gadamer, Wahrheit und Methode, 401; Thiselton, Horizons, 312.
94 Hermeneutik, 131.
95 Ibid. In making a direct reference to Heidegger, Fuchs asks simply, "Was wäre Namenlose?" (Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem, 114).
spoken, Being comes into being and manifests itself for what it is.\textsuperscript{96} Language "permits" Being to be because it "gathers" the aspects of the being of a thing together and allows it to be present.\textsuperscript{97} As was so evident in the later Heidegger, it becomes clear that Being needs language in order to be.\textsuperscript{98} Language sets the boundaries and the possibilities of existence.\textsuperscript{99}

The nature of language as event has once again become evident through the course of the discussion. As indicated, language "permits" and "gathers".\textsuperscript{100} These aspects of language mean that language also "creates" because it "orders". In that it creates order, it also "liberates" and "justifies" the existence of a thing, human thought included. In agreement with Heidegger and Ebeling, Fuchs holds that language is not the product of human thought, but the other way around.\textsuperscript{101} Language "grants" thought. Language is the Ja of Being for things to be. When language is allowed to express itself in this way, then a "language-

\textsuperscript{96} Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem, 129.
\textsuperscript{97} Fuchs, Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus, 405.
\textsuperscript{98} As Fuchs states, "Und die Versammlung des Seins bedarf der Sprache, um zu sein" (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{99} Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem, 282.
\textsuperscript{100} As Fuchs states, "Das Wesen der Sprache heisst Erlaubnis" (ibid., 283).
\textsuperscript{101} Fuchs, Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus, 428.
event" (*Sprachereignis*) has occurred. In fact, *true language* only occurs as event. Fuchs believes that to subordinate language as a function of thought only proves that we are sinners. The "sin" spoken of here is that of domesticating God and language through unauthentic speech.\(^{102}\)

As in the previous discussion, the point has been reached where the special relationship between Being, language and human existence can be addressed more directly. Fuchs teaches that as humans we are "born" of language and exist linguistically between the call of language and the appropriate answer thereto.\(^{103}\) Human conduct or behavior is simply a mirror of the answer to the call of language.\(^{104}\)

In contrast to Bultmann's description of the existential state as *Fraglichkeit* ("uncertainty") characterized by *Sorge* ("care") and *Angst* ("anxiety"), Fuchs maintains that the historicality of human being (*Geschichtlichkeit*) is not *Fraglichkeit* but *Sprachlichkeit* ("linguisticality").\(^{105}\)

The principles so outlined now establish the herme-

\(^{102}\) Ibid.

\(^{103}\) As Fuchs states, "Nicht der Mensch hat die Sprache geboren, sondern der Mensch ist aus der Sprache geboren" (*Hermeneutik*, 63; cf. also 133).

\(^{104}\) Ibid.

\(^{105}\) Fuchs, *Zum hermeneutischen Problem*, 115. Fuchs describes the existential state in purely Heideggerian terms: *In-der-Welt-sein* provides *Raum und Zeit* for each person to "gain" or "lose" himself or herself (cf. 112 and 124).
neutical horizons for Fuchs. The goal of interpretation is to shed light upon the understanding of the self with respect to language. In short, the horizon of hermeneutics consists of the existentialist interpretation of the linguisticity of human existence. The text is not to be viewed as an "object" to be interpreted. Rather, the text itself interprets the present condition of human existence before God. The interpreter experiences reality in a new way through the ontological power of language. This is a "language-event" (*Sprachereignis*).

The inherent "immediacy" of *Sprachereignis* redefines the nature of history for Fuchs. The disclosure of Being in language as event is the primary historical orientation of the new hermeneutic. In contrast to Bultmann, what is

---

106 Fuchs, *Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*, 286. For Fuchs' distinction between "existentialism" and "existentialist" interpretation see his "Was ist existentielle Interpretation?", *Zum hermeneutischen Problem*, 65-69.

107 Fuchs states, "Der Text ist also nicht nur der Diener, der kerygmatische Formulierungen herbringt, sondern noch weit mehr ein Herr, der uns in den Sprachzusammenhang unserer Existenz einweist, in welchem wir 'vor Gott' existieren" (*Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*, 429; cf. also 430).

108 As Palmer explains, "Reading a work then, is not a gaining of conceptual knowledge through observation or reflection; it is an 'experience', a breaking down and breaking open of one's old way of seeing" (*Hermeneutics*, 249). It will have been noticed that Ebeling prefers the term "word-event" (*Wortgeschehen*) to Fuchs' "language-event" (*Sprachereignis*). The two terms refer to essentially the same phenomenon [cf. J. M. Robinson, "Hermeneutic Since Barth", in *The New Hermeneutic*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) 57].
historically significant for the new hermeneutic is the coming to speech of past possibilities in language. So Fuchs is not primarily concerned with Historie or Geschichte, but with Sprachgeschichte ("language-history"). So Sprachgeschichte has nothing to do with "pastness" per se but with the possibility of experiencing "language-events". In short, the ontological nature of language as evident in "language-history" transcends the dimensions of space and time as it addresses the existence of the hearer in the present.

In the light of what has been said concerning Fuchs' theology and thought, the implications for the interpretation of the Bible should be apparent. Fuchs teaches that theological enquiry into the word of God is nothing more than the quest for Being within the horizon of biblical language. The aforementioned Ja of Being is understood to be God's "Yes" which grants a loving relationship in which God belongs to humanity and humanity belongs to

109 Such a view of history is addressed by Palmer when he states, "For Heidegger and Gadamer, language, history, and being are all not only interrelated but interfused, so that the linguisticality of being is at the same time its ontology -- its 'coming into being' -- and the medium of its historicality" (ibid., 177; italics are mine).

110 Again the complexity of such thought is illuminated by Palmer when he says, "The power of language to disclose transcends even time and place, and an ancient text from a people long extinct can render present with the most amazing exactness the interpersonal linguistic world that existed among those people" (ibid., 207).

111 Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem, 115.
God. The expression of God's will in his word is what constitutes the New Testament as a *Sprachphänomen*. As was the case with Ebeling, such an understanding of the Bible directly addresses the question of the historical Jesus and christology. Similarly Fuchs maintains that the problem of the historical Jesus is resolved through the medium of *Sprachereignis*. Just as Heidegger viewed history as the disclosure of Being in the language of the poets, Fuchs understands that God came to speech in the language-event of the historical Jesus. The authority of Jesus lies in his *Sprache*, particularly in the parables. This in turn has christological implications because Jesus' authoritative word is a witness to his freedom and power before God. Also through the language-event of Jesus, Jesus has the ability to grant his hearers the permission to obtain the freedom to belong to God. These factors constitute the language-event of Jesus as the linguistic phenomenon of the New Testament. In fact, it is the *Sprachereignis* of Jesus which makes the New Testament new. Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God was the eschatological event which made the previous revelation of God "old" and the *Sprachphänomen* 

113 Ibid., 277-78.
114 Ibid., 268.
of the New Testament "new".  This is true because Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom was not a mere description of it. On the contrary, the reality of the eschatological event of the kingdom is brought into the present through the language-event of Jesus. The ontological character of Jesus' words actually brings about the reality of which they speak. The parables and beatitudes of Jesus actually grant the hearers the love, peace and joy of God. The language-event of Jesus calls one to experience the reality of the kingdom. It gathers the existence of the hearers and thus creates a "world" in which the promises of God can be experienced as a reality in the present. Even though Jesus' own conduct reveals the will of God in forgiveness, love and decision, and serves as the "framework" for his

116 Ibid., 284.

117 In commenting on the term Sprachereignis as used by Jüngel, J. B. Webster explains, "This term, derived from Fuchs, abbreviates a proposal that the language of the New Testament is not simply an information-bearing sign, but is itself the presence of the realities which it articulates or 'brings to speech' ["Eberhard Jüngel on the Language of Faith", MTh 1 (1985) 256].

118 This extraordinary emphasis on language can be seen when Fuchs claims that, "Der Bereich, in welchem und durch welchen diese Freude ankommt, ist Sprache: Liebe, Friede, Freude ereigen sich für den Menschen sprachlich, und Sprache ereignet sich als Liebe, Friede, und Freude" [Glaube und Erfahrung, 214. Cf. Fuchs, Marburger Hermeneutik (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968) 51].

119 Fuchs, Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus, 346.

120 Ibid., 291, 295-96, 426.
message, the deeds of Jesus only serve as a clarification of the language-event.\textsuperscript{121} All of this means that due to the authentic language of Jesus the individual is "singled out" and the language-event "grasps him deep down". The ontological character of Jesus' parables affects "the world" of the hearer and thus "strikes home" at the very core of his or her being.\textsuperscript{122}

One particular way in which the language-event affects the "world" of the believer is with respect to the law. Fuchs understands Jesus as the greatest preacher of the law. Yet in preaching it Jesus transformed the law through the language-event. The transformation came about through an intensification of the law as seen in the antitheses of Matt 5:21-48.\textsuperscript{123} In this way Jesus mandated that one make a decision for God in the light of the intense requirements of the law. So now through the language-event

\textsuperscript{121} As Fuchs insists, "Es ist nicht so, dass erst die Parabel Jesu Verhalten erklärt, obwohl sich Jesus mit ihr verteidigt, sondern umgekehrt, Jesu Verhalten erklärt den Willen Gottes, mit einer an Jesu Verhalten ablesbaren Parabel" (ibid., 290). Even when Fuchs says that Jesus' conduct serves as the "framework" of his message, he qualifies this statement by stating, "Wenn gesagt werden muss, dass Jesu Wort seine Tat war, so liegt der Ton trotzdem nicht auf der Tat, sondern auf dem Wort. Mein Satz, Jesu Verhalten sei der 'Rahmen' seiner Verkündigung gewesen (ebda.), ist ein hermeneutischer Satz. Was Jesus sagte, ist gerade der 'Kern' seines Verhaltens" (Glauben und Erfahrung, 19).

\textsuperscript{122} Thiselton, Horizons, 344; Fuchs, Hermeneutik, 133-34.

\textsuperscript{123} Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem, 286.
of Jesus, the law has become a "help" or that which gives "permission" (Erlaubnis) for one to be justified.\textsuperscript{124}

No one understood this better than the Apostle Paul. In Fuchs' opinion, Paul views the law simply as a historical stage or phase (heilsgeschichtliche Etappe) extending from the time of Moses to that of Jesus. The language-event of Jesus' cross and resurrection brought the eschaton into the present, thus marking the end of the law as a historical phenomenon.\textsuperscript{125} Through the proclamation of Jesus' cross and resurrection, Paul's own message constitutes a language-event, forming an integral part of an entire Sprachgeschichte. Through the language-event of Jesus and as continued in Paul, the righteous condition for entering the kingdom of God has been fulfilled, thus providing freedom for humanity and creation.\textsuperscript{126} The language-event gives the righteousness of God (δικαίωσιν Θεοῦ) to all who

\textsuperscript{124} As Fuchs states, "Dieses so gepredigte, so verwandelte, weil zu sich selbst gekommene Gesetz des väterlichen Willen Gottes ist das grossartige Sprachereignis in der Verkündigung Jesu. Das Gesetz sagt jetzt: mit Verlaub, siehe, ich stehe auf der Seite der Liebe, ich erlaube Euch ihre Gerechtigkeit" (ibid., 287).

\textsuperscript{125} Fuchs, "Christus", 456. "End" here is understood in a temporal sense and not in the sense of "goal" (cf. also 461).

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
believe. However, since "belief" means obedience to God in love, the law has actually been transformed through the word of the cross. The law now serves the Christian by allowing him or her to do the will of God in love. This entire linguistic phenomenon is what constitutes Paul's doctrine of justification as the center of his theology. Justification is the primary language-event of Pauline theology.

With these last remarks the preparation for the analysis and critique of Eberhard Jüngel's *Paulus und Jesus* has come to an end. For when Fuchs approached the question of the historical Jesus by means of language-event and carried that approach over to address the issue of Pauline christology, he paved the way for his most avid student to continue along these lines. This Jüngel did as was evident

---

127 Fuchs teaches that "Gottes Gerechtigkeit ist im Sinne eines *Gen. auctoris* die Gerechtigkeit, die Gott schafft, Gerechtigkeit 'aus' Gott (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ)" [ibid., 455]. As noted, Jüngel interprets Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the same manner [cf. above chap. 2 (n. 128) 48]. But again see Käsemann's remarks on the varied use of the term in Paul [above chap. 2 (n. 131) 49].


129 Fuchs, *Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*, 266.

130 Fuchs, "Christus", 456.

131 Fuchs claims that the *Sprachlichkeit* of Pauline theology and existence is seen in that the whole work of God is focused upon the name of the Lord Jesus (*Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*, 265).
from the presentation in chapter two. It remains to be seen how successful Jüngel was in accomplishing his goal of relating Paul to the historical Jesus.

D. A Contextual Analysis and Critique of Eberhard Jüngel's *Paulus und Jesus*.

1. An Explanation of Jüngel's *Paulus und Jesus* as a Prime Example of the New Hermeneutic at Work.

The above discussion of the later Heidegger, Gerhard Ebeling and Ernst Fuchs has shed light upon some of the complexities of Jüngel's thought as it appears in his *Paulus und Jesus*. It becomes clear that Jüngel's theology falls within the camp of the new quest. Also as an heir of the linguistic philosophy of the later Heidegger as it became theologized through Ebeling and Fuchs, Jüngel is a major proponent of the new hermeneutic.

These philosophical and theological influences explain why, as in the case of Ebeling and Fuchs, Jüngel sought the solution of the problem of the historical Jesus by way of *Sprachereignis*. As in the case of the later Heidegger, Ebeling, and Fuchs, Jüngel refuses to view language as an information bearing system. Rather, language is an address (Anrede) to our very being which "takes hold" (einholen) of it and draws it out. When this happens, then this is a "language-event" [Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt. Zur Begründung der Theologie des Gekreuzigten im Streit zwischen Theismus und Atheismus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977) 13].
must also be linguistically determined. In fact, as seen in Ebeling, that which is of historical significance for Jüngel is not simply "what happened" or "what were the facts", but rather what has come to expression in language. This explains how Jüngel can give a theological interpretation of history based upon his understanding of language as "ontologically charged". The ontological nature of language bridges the gap between history and dogmatics.

All of these points address the question of what exactly does Jüngel mean by the "historical Jesus". Jüngel's *Paulus und Jesus* has already provided the answer. In the main, the "historical Jesus" is also a *geschichtliche Phänomen* which is essentially linguistic in nature. The "historical Jesus" is simply Jesus coming to speech in the language-event as described earlier; whether it be in the kerygma of the early church, Paul's doctrine of justification or a contemporary study and expression of the Christian faith. Again it is the ontological nature of language which transcends space and time through the language-event, thus "bridging the gap" between these different situations.

If the linguisticality of all existence ensures that there must be a connection between the historical Jesus as so described and the kerygma, then the same must hold true

---

134 See above chap. 3, pp. 77-79.
135 See above chap. 3, pp. 84, 90.
for Jesus and Paul as well. The very fact that the entire New Testament can be described as a *Sprachphänomen* implies that the language-events of Jesus and Paul are of the same nature and constitute integral parts of an entire *Sprachgeschichte*.\(^{136}\) This thesis led Jüngel to isolate and compare what he thought to be the central linguistic phenomena in the messages of Jesus and Paul. The criterion which guided Jüngel in his choice of these phenomena was eschatology. The language-event of Jesus as seen in his proclamation of the kingdom is judged by Jüngel to be the eschatological event of the New Testament.\(^{137}\) The Pauline corollary of this event is his doctrine of justification by faith.

Such a thesis becomes plausible when one once again recognizes the special relationship between language and Being. The eschaton was there in the preaching of Jesus because the essential reality of the kingdom was brought into the present through the language-event of Jesus. The language-event of Jesus actually creates and grants the

---

\(^{136}\) See above, chap. 3, p. 85.

\(^{137}\) In particular, Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom is not simply an eschatological event, but is *the eschaton*. See above chap. 2, pp. 42-43. Jüngel claims that the kingdom of God is God's majestic act whereby he places himself over against the world. The language-event of Jesus brings this "majestic act" into the present by virtue of the "expressibility" (*Sagbarkeit*) of God. This means that Jesus himself is "das Gleichnis Gottes" by which the transcendent God is made immanent in words. This event creates a "world" in which human-being can exist authentically (*Gott als Geheimnis*, 394-95, 485).
realities of which it spoke. In so doing the language-event of Jesus creates a new "world" for the hearer in that it grants a new existential situation to all who believe. It gives a new Sein to all who hear in faith. 138 All of this is possible because the ontological nature of language enabled Jesus to "speak the kingdom onto" (Ansprechen) his hearers. 139

As was the case with Fuchs, Jüngel occasionally mentions the conduct of Jesus within the context of Jesus' parabolic speech. The deeds of Jesus are really "acted parables" which explicate the language-event of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom. Jesus' acts are a commentary on what he said.

Jüngel's treatment of Paul follows the same pattern as described above. His emphasis on the ontology of language led him to insist that γενετιβος Θεου in Paul always be understood as genetivus auctoris. 140 It too is described as something that can be spoken onto the believer extra se and experienced in the present extra nos through the language-event. 141 So as previously indicated, the language-events of Jesus and Paul are basically the same linguistic phenomenon.

138 See above chap. 2, p. 45.
139 Again chap. 2, p. 45.
140 See above chap. 2, nn. 130 and 131.
141 See above chap. 2, p. 49.
The combined effect of these language-events has a direct bearing upon the existence and function of the law. In light of the immutability of the essence of language, Jüngel claims that νόμος constitutes a geschichtliche Grösse always to be understood as the law of Moses. The historicality of this particular type of language came to its end (τέλος) with the eschatological language-event of Jesus. Nevertheless "end" does not mean "nonexistent". The νόμος still remains νόμος, but as in case of Fuchs, it becomes transformed into the "law of Christ", "the law of faith", "the law of the Spirit", etc. through its encounter with the ontological effectiveness of the language-event of Jesus. In this case the law is now on the side of the believer enabling him or her to be obedient to the will of God in love, which is the fulfillment of the law. Conversely, νόμος still functions as "the law of sin", and "the law of sin and death" apart from Jesus and Paul.

Without a doubt the approach of the new hermeneutic, and particularly that of Jüngel as seen in his Paulus und Jesus, presents the theologian with a fascinating philosophy of language and with new avenues for interpreting the Scriptures. Yet questions remain with regard to the value of such an approach and what has really been accomplished in relating Paul to the historical Jesus.

142. Cf. above chap. 2, pp. 48-52.

In that Jüngel is a foremost proponent of the new hermeneutic, the inherent strengths and weaknesses of such an approach are found in his work as well. Hence one of the strong points of Jüngel is his existentialist interpretation of scripture. It has value because the question of human existence with respect to one's finiteness and potential is a common biblical theme. Also such terms as "authentic" and "unauthentic", whether they be viewed with respect to human existence or language, can by analogy parallel the New Testament concepts of being "saved" or "lost". Finally, the emphasis upon "decision" or "resolve" is an essential part of the message of the New Testament, one that needs to be addressed to every generation. In summary, existentialist interpretation has value in that it addresses the question of the meaning of life and seeks to communicate in contemporary terms.

Similarly, Jüngel's understanding of language is not without merit for interpreting the New Testament. It has emphasized that the language of the text contains a power intrinsic to itself.\(^\text{143}\) Also by providing new ways in which faith can come to expression within the context of an increasingly secularized society, Jüngel's promotion of the new hermeneutic has reduced the tendency to view the text as

\(^{143}\text{Cf. above chap. 2, pp. 43-46.}\)
an outmoded form of communication having no immediate relevance. 144

On the other hand, Thiselton raises some questions concerning the existentialism of the new hermeneutic. His main point is that an extraordinary emphasis on the self can shift the focus of enquiry away from God and the things of God. 145 By focusing exclusively on the question of human existence, one does not do justice to many of the purely theological themes of the New Testament. 146 Such an approach can lead to an "abbreviated view" of God and humanity. 147 Also not only does such an excessive individualism shift the focus away from God, but it can inadvertently ignore the significance of the communio sanctorum. 148

The input of the community of believers and especially the tradition of interpretation as understood by that community, is a necessary check upon an unbridled individualism. This especially holds true with regard to a hermeneutic which advocates "doing violence" to the text in order to see

144 Webster, "Eberhard Jüngel", 255.

145 He asks, "All the same, can language about God be reduced to language about man exhaustively and without remainder?" (Thiselton, Horizons, 40).


147 Macquarrie, Existentialist Theology, 15.

148 Heinrich Ott, "What is Systematic Theology?" in The Later Heidegger and Theology, 94. Cf. also Braaten, "How New?", 234.
"something more" than the original authors had in mind.\textsuperscript{149} For the new hermeneutic contends that the goal of hermeneutics has been reached only when the interpreter "sees more" than what is written, thereby ensuring a genuine "retrieve".\textsuperscript{150} Also if the validity of the interpretation rests upon the individual's experience of the language-event, is not the door opened to an infinite variety of interpretations?\textsuperscript{151} It must be maintained that the experience of the individual (whether it be Jesus, or Paul, or anyone else) be viewed in the context of the wider community. Simply put, the meaning of one's words and deeds must be determined within the context in which they occur. Yet Jüngel consistently fails to acknowledge this basic principle of interpretation. No clear distinction is made between explicatio and applicatio.\textsuperscript{152} By emphasizing the immediate ontological impact of the text, the meaning of the original speaker all too often gets lost in the quest for meaningful-


\textsuperscript{150} Achtemeier, \textit{Introduction}, 53, 143.

\textsuperscript{151} J. Verhaar, "Language and Theological Method", \textit{Cont. 7} (1969) 17.

With these remarks a major weakness of Jüngel's approach becomes clear. For lack of a better term, it may be called "wordliness". Jüngel's extraordinary emphasis on language simply effects every aspect of his theology and thought. For all of its complexity of thought and articulation, Jüngel's use of language (and that of the new hermeneutic for the matter) is not founded upon traditional linguistic analysis and simply ignores the conventional use of language. As John E. Zuck notes, the meaning of words cannot be derived apart from the human context in which they were spoken. Language simply ceases to function as

---

153 Robinson, "Hermeneutics Since Barth", 53. D. Nineham laments that the cultural roots of the Jesus of the new quest are more at home in the soil of twentieth-century Germany than in first-century Palestine ["Jesus in the Gospels", Christ for Us Today (London: SCM, 1968) 45-65]. A specific example of this is Jüngel's abbreviation of New Testament eschatology. The end time is brought into the present because belief in an apocalyptic consummation is unacceptable to modern ears and does not relate to contemporary problems [cf. also Bultmann, New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings (London: SCM, 1984) 4-5; Kümmel, Promise, 146; Bornkamm, Jesus, 93-94; Sanders, Jesus, 154; Harvey, Constraints, 67, 84]. It is doubtful if such an abbreviated view of eschatology represents the thoughts and teachings of Jesus, the early church and Paul [Sanders, Jesus, 152 f. Cf. also Stuhlmacher, "Gerechtigkeit Gottes", (n.2) 240-42; Gollwitzer, Paulus und Jesus, 20]. Paul not only looked back upon what God did in Christ, but he also looked forward to what he will do in Christ [Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus", 173; Blank, Paulus und Jesus, (n.92) 102].


language if the meaning of words is divorced from the substance of things communicated by them. The consciousness, attitudes and behavior of the speaker, together with the wider context of the religious, social and cultural milieu must be taken into consideration.

Also just as an over-emphasis on human existence "abbreviated" the message of the New Testament, Jüngel's "wordliness" does so even more. Firstly, Jüngel's ontology of language, as in the case of the later Heidegger, Ebeling and Fuchs, has presented a restricted view of human existence. Humans are represented primarily as speaking and hearing creatures, expectantly awaiting the call of Being in language. Amos Wilder has argued that this view has overemphasized the "conative" aspect of humans to the virtual eclipse of the "cognitive" aspect. Human beings are also "thinking creatures" and should not simply be reduced to "voluntarism".

Indeed as Webster notes, humans are not


158 A. Wilder, "The Word as Address and the Word as Meaning", in The New Hermeneutic (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) 212-13. With respect to the historical Jesus, Wilder states, "But surely his words, deeds, presence, person and message rested upon ideology, if we can use the term in a good sense, upon dogma, eschatological and theocratic" (ibid.).
only speaking creatures, but they are also acting creatures. He maintains that in many instances, actions speak louder than words. The same holds true for Jüngel’s presentation of God’s redemptive act in Jesus Christ. God is practically equivalent to the language-event of Jesus. Even when Jüngel speaks of the conduct and deeds of Jesus reflective of the Father, a careful analysis reveals that deed is always subordinated to word.

Moreover the preference for poetic, metaphorical or parabolic speech further accentuates the narrowing of the New Testament and its message. Such a view does not take into consideration that the content of the Bible can also be communicated through informative statements or assertions. As Wittgenstein indicated, assertions are not necessarily "closed". They too can be "open ended" to some extent. This means that assertions can stimulate creative thinking as well.

Such a restricted view of language simply overlooks the value of "natural speech" and thus ignores the variety


160. G. G. O’Collins counters the accusation of wordliness by claiming that "Actions 'express' reality and 'deeds' 'speak'. What has meaning and is real for us must become present in language" ["Reality as Language: Ernst Fuchs’s Theology of Revelation", ThSt 28 (1967) 86].


of expression found in the New Testament. These general criticisms of Jüngel's approach can now be elucidated by citing specific examples from his *Paulus und Jesus*.

The first example cited focuses upon Jüngel's treatment of the conduct and deeds of the "historical" Jesus. His extraordinary emphasis on *Sprachereignis* has led him to belittle the significance of the acts and deeds of Jesus. Although he occasionally mentions the deeds of Jesus, one must question how much Jüngel has really spoken of what Jesus did, how he did it and what were his reasons for doing it in the first place. Even when he speaks of Jesus' association with publicans and sinners, he fails to analyze a single explicit example of him doing so. Jüngel simply describes this practice of Jesus as an "eschatological event". He then goes on to enmesh this concrete action of Jesus in a "wordliness" so typical of his approach. For example, he claims that table-fellowship exhibits the ability to love one's neighbor. Yet this ability is *angesprochen* by Jesus and a *neues Sein* is *zugesprochen* (p.211). All of this is made possible because "Diese Macht der Liebe hat

---


164 As will be discussed below, E. P. Sanders asserts that the deeds of Jesus often constitute a firmer foundation to work from than the sayings material. He especially focuses on the theological significance of Jesus' table-fellowship with publicans and sinners (*Jesus*, 186-90, 208 f.).
Jesus mit seiner Verkündigung der nahen Gottesherrschaft 'angesagt'" (ibid.). Additionally, when Jüngel fails to clearly examine how Jesus' contemporaries reacted to what he did and why they responded so, his treatment of the historical Jesus is weakened further still. 165 Finally, the significance of Jüngel's emphasis on the actual conduct and deeds of Jesus is again called into question when one reads words like Verhalten Jesu or Jesu Verhalten at least a dozen times on a single page without the author ever explaining what is exactly meant by them (p.277).

The same holds true for his treatment of the miracles of Jesus. Apart from his comments on Mark 3:4, Jüngel does not specifically examine any other miracles. He fails to do so even when he considers the importance of such miracles for the formulation of early Christian faith. 166

Finally, it should be noted that Jüngel devotes four entire sections of his work to the question of the historical Jesus (pp. 5-16, 71-86, 87-214, 215-62). Nevertheless, he fails to mention how Jesus related to other renewal movements of his day (e.g. the Zealots, Pharisees and Qumran). He does not mention why Jesus consistently chose to identify and suffer with the outcasts of his day. He does not explore Jesus' position on the sabbath and purity regu-

165 Again see Sanders, Jesus, 159, 178, 200 f.
166 Ibid., 38, 109, 134 f., 157, 161 f., 219, 266.
lations and how his contemporaries responded to him in this regard. There is not a word about the cleansing of the temple, nor how Jesus' deeds may have influenced the earliest Christian believers.\textsuperscript{167}

For these reasons, it is suggested that Jüngel's emphasis on \textit{Sprachereignis} and \textit{Sprachgeschichte} has obscured and therefore weakened his limited treatment of the conduct and deeds of Jesus.\textsuperscript{168} Overall it must be conceded that Jüngel is not so much interested in the historical significance of what Jesus did and why he did it. On the contrary, he is vitally concerned with the historical importance of what Jesus said and how he said it.

Nothing could be more evident than Jüngel's analysis of the kingdom of God as \textit{Sprachereignis}. Again his linguistic ontology is pressed beyond the limits of acceptability. The kingdom is reduced to the level of a linguistic phenomenon, which leads Blank to ask if the kingdom is itself a parable or some kind of substance contained in a parable.\textsuperscript{169} Also in that Jüngel consistently describes the kingdom as \textit{Macht} he (no doubt unintentionally) "depersonalizes" the

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{167} In contrast to Jüngel, Trautmann gives a detailed analysis of the symbolic meaning of the deeds of Jesus (cf. her \textit{Handlungen}, 119 f., 129-30, 200, 228, 372. Cf. also Dodd, \textit{Founder}, 145; Klausner, \textit{From Jesus to Paul}, 257; Sanders, \textit{Jesus}, 11, 61-105, 294-316).

\textsuperscript{168} Cf. Blank, \textit{Paulus und Jesus}, 100, 106, 128.

\textsuperscript{169} J. Blank, "Rückkehr zum Mythos?", \textit{UnSa} 18 (1963) 171. Cf. also Stuhlmacher, \textit{Gerechtigkeit Gottes} (n.2) 240.
\end{footnotes}
kingdom. Yet as Blank argues, where there is a kingdom there must be a king.\textsuperscript{170} In the New Testament, whenever one experiences the power of the kingdom, that power is not attributed to language, but to the King.\textsuperscript{171} The point is that Jüngel’s emphasis on the language of the kingdom has shifted the focus away from \textit{the God} of the kingdom. Also by joining his thoughts on the kingdom with his enquiry into the development of \textit{christ-ology}, knowledge of "God" is somewhat by-passed.\textsuperscript{172} Thus the fundamental questions of "What is the object of theology?" and "What exactly is being interpreted?" are raised once again. As Macquarrie notes, theology must go beyond an existentialist analysis of \textit{Dasein} and speak about \textit{God} as transcendent.\textsuperscript{173}

Also as previously indicated, Jüngel’s preoccupation with the nature of language has completely colored his treatment of the law. Räisänen challenges Jüngel’s claim that νόμος must always be understood as the "law of Moses". He simply notes that Josephus, Polyaenus, Antonius Diogenes and Philo used νόμος in the sense of "rule", "order" or

\textsuperscript{170} Blank, \textit{Paulus und Jesus}, 103. As Wedderburn points out, "But 'kingdom of God' could be used to refer not just to God's activity, but also to God himself" ("Paul and Jesus: The Problem of Continuity", 196).

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid. Cf. also Harvey, \textit{Constraints}, 134, 164, 170-71.

\textsuperscript{172} Webster, \textit{Eberhard Jüngel: An Introduction}, 134-35.

\textsuperscript{173} Macquarrie, \textit{Existentialist Theology}, 245. Cf. also Cobb, "Later Heidegger", 194.
"attitude". Paul does the same, especially in passages such as Rom 3:27, 7:21-25 and 8:2.174

By not acknowledging the varied use of νόμος in Paul and by teaching that the law of Moses becomes transformed into the "law of Christ", one might ask to what extent has the law really come to an end?175 If according to Jüngel, the law of Moses serves as an ethical guideline for the believer to do the will of God, is not Jüngel in danger of creating a "New Torah"? His section entitled "Der Gericht nach dem Werken" (pp.66-70; esp. 63) does nothing to eliminate this danger.176

On a broader scope, the linguisticality of Jüngel's approach has resulted in an "abridgment" of Paul's theology. His eagerness to establish a linguistic phenomenon analogous to Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom has led him to practically equate the doctrine of justification with the entirety

176 Cf. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes, 68, 231; Räisänen, Paul and the Law, 78; Blank, Paulus und Jesus, 294 and his Paulus: von Jesus zum Christentum, 40, 65, 75, 100.

The purpose of the dissertation is not primarily to clarify Jesus' and Paul's relationship to the law nor to evaluate Jüngel's treatment in this regard. The comments here merely show that the issue cannot be solved on the level of "Sprachereignis" and another approach is called for.
of Pauline theology. Such a narrow focus has caused him to slight equally, if not more, important Pauline concepts such as grace, mercy, love and reconciliation. Indeed in making a direct reference to the kingdom of God, Paul not only mentions "righteousness", but "joy" and "peace" as well.

Moreover, Jüngel's fascination with the power of the spoken word and his understanding of humans as primarily hearing/speaking creatures, has caused him to define δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in too narrow a fashion. His insistence that the righteousness of God in Paul always be understood as genetivus auctoris is evidence of this fact. The forensic nature of such a righteousness and its ability to be "imputed" by means of language-event certainly coincides with Jüngel's understanding of language, but falls short of the varied expression found in Paul's theology. For as in

177 The importance of justification for Paul is not to be denied, but its polemical significance is not to be ignored either. Wrede's Kampfslehre and Schweitzer's Nebenkrater may overstate the case, but they recognize the polemical context in which Paul's doctrine is often found [Cf. Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul (London: SCM, 1971) 71]. And as will be discussed below, just as Jüngel has neglected the historical context of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom, he has equally neglected the historical context of Paul's words on justification.


the case of νόμος, Paul uses δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in a number of ways. 180 In addition to a righteousness that comes from God, Keck notes that Paul uses "the righteousness of God" as referring to God's moral integrity. 181 Paul teaches that "righteousness" characterizes the very nature of God and it is this righteousness which moves God to be faithful to his creatures. 182 It is God's own righteousness which makes justification by faith possible at all (Rom 3:25-26). 183

In the final analysis Jüngel provides no theological foundation for Paul's doctrine of justification apart from Sprachereignis. For Jüngel, whoever experiences God's Ja der Liebe in the language-events of Jesus and Paul is righteous before God. Apart from this, Jüngel's equation of

---

180 Cf. Käsemann, New Testament Questions, 170-72. Käsemann rightly notes that Paul's use of the term preserves a "theological tension" and a "dialectic" which allows him to present God's righteousness as present, yet fully realized in the future, as a gift, yet mandating service, as forensic, yet based upon an ethical life (ibid., 171-72). To raise any single aspect to an absolute destroys the dialectic and Paul's fluidity of expression is lost (ibid., 172).


182 As Käsemann explains, "To be justified means that the creator remains faithful to the creature, as the father remains faithful to the prodigal son, in spite of guilt, error, and ungodliness" (Perspectives, 75). Cf. also J. A. Bollier, "The Righteousness of God", Interp. 8 (1954) 413.

Jesus' preaching of the kingdom with Paul's doctrine of justification appears to be arbitrary and without a proper theological foundation.

E. Summary of Results.

It was discovered that the philosophy of the later Heidegger and the theologies of Gerhard Ebeling and Ernst Fuchs greatly influenced Eberhard Jüngel in his writing of *Paulus und Jesus*. Overall it was concluded that such a word-oriented theology could not adequately relate Paul and Jesus because it did not take into consideration the conventional use of language, slighted the deeds of Jesus and Paul and tended to focus on human existence and the ontology of language rather than upon God. In regard to Jüngel's approach Webster rightly concludes, "Recourse to unanalyzed notions of divine language or the verbality of God's being obscures rather than elucidates." 184

The remainder of the dissertation will develop the thesis as outlined in the introductory chapter. Rather than seeking out verbal parallels or comparing doctrinal concepts such as the kingdom and justification, Jesus and Paul's understanding of God will form the basis of the study. It will be proposed that both Jesus and Paul know and have experienced God as taking the initiative in grace to accomplish reconciliation and healing for his creatures. It will

---

184 Webster, "Eberhard Jüngel", 271.
be suggested that this is most vividly manifest in God's openness to outsiders. God is one who justifies the ungodly. Therefore, the remainder of the discussion will seek to address questions such as:

1. What means did Jesus use to help others "realize" (both in their perception and in their actual experience) a new understanding of God?

2. How did the early Christian community (including the Apostle Paul) experience God's grace and how was this grace actualized in their lives and ministry?

3. How may the theology and experience of Jesus (as outlined in question 1) relate to the theology and experience of Paul (as set forth in question 2)?

It is to these questions and others that I now turn.
Chapter IV

GOD’S GRACE, MERCY AND LOVE FOR THE OUTCASTS AND SINNERS AS EVIDENCED IN THE DEEDS AND WORDS OF JESUS


The purpose of this chapter is to further the discussion of Paul’s relationship to the historical Jesus by focusing on the genuinely "theo-logical" significance of the deeds and words of Jesus.¹ As stated in the introduction, God is the real focus of the study.² This particular approach is designed to avoid two shortcomings of the new hermeneutic as evidenced in Jüngel’s Paulus und Jesus.

Firstly, the "solipsistic" nature of the new hermeneutic (and Jüngel in particular) is avoided by not concentrating

¹Cf. again Fiedler, Sündere, 15. Also J. R. Donahue uses the same terminology in his effort to express the theology of Jesus in Mark’s gospel ["A Neglected Factor", JBL 101/4 (1982) 564].

²See above chap. 1, p. 1. The intent of my thesis as expressed here is somewhat in contrast with Geza Vermes’ point. Vermes contends that Jesus was not primarily concerned with God, but with the relationship of his disciples to himself, each other and the world [Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospel (London: Collins, 1973) 43]. I am proposing that Jesus’ understanding and representation of God serve as major foci for interpreting the Gospels and for explaining the origin and development of the early Christian movement.
exclusively on the importance and meaning of human existence. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, a refusal to "hypostatize" the kingdom and the various ways that God is revealed therein, will aid in preventing the "depersonalization" of the kingdom that was so evident in Jüngel. Indeed as Schmidt points out, the first and foremost significance of the term βασιλεία is that of the "being", "nature" and "state" of the king himself. Along the same lines, Jeremias has noted that Jesus consistently followed the convention of his day by paraphrasing the divine name. Just as the use of malkūtā in Judaism was employed as a paraphrase for God as ruler, Jesus' use of "kingdom of God" served as a reverential circumlocution for 'God' (as ruler). So Koch rightly notes that the precedent for such usage can indeed be found in the Old Testament, particularly in passages such as Isa 40:9, and Hab 3:8-10. The major point here is that the kingdom has revealed the God of the Hebrews, which means

---

3 Wilder, "The Word as Address", 216. Also see the views of Thiselton, Cobb, and Macquarrie as expressed above chap. 3, pp. 97-99.

4 Kim argued that Old Testament Judaism tended to "hypostatize" the attributes of God, which essentially separated these attributes from the person of God (Origin, 241). In his own way, Jüngel has done the same by substituting the language-event of the kingdom for the person of God (see above chap. 3, pp. 104-105).


6 Jeremias, Proclamation, 102.

7 Meyer, Aims, 136.
that the term can never be fully separated from the divine subject. Jeremias aptly sums up the issue when he states,

So when Jesus announces ἡγγαευ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, his meaning is virtually, "'God' is near". This is what people will have heard in the call of Jesus: "God" is coming, he is standing at the door, indeed (ἐφασεν), he is already there.

So the point throughout the dissertation will be that although the kingdom is powerful, it cannot simply be reduced to the power of love, or joy as Jüngel has attempted. Rather as Meyer notes, "the reign of God" signifies "God" and signifies "God" precisely as Jesus knows him. This is what loads the phrase with meaning and calls for it to be unpacked.

The importance of these opening remarks cannot be overemphasized because they delineate the central principles of the dissertation. The point in view here is that

---


9 Jeremias, Proclamation, 102. No doubt Jeremias includes the aorist form of the verb φανερα to emphasize that sense of immediacy so prevalent in the message of Jesus.

10 Aims, 137.

11 As will be developed further below, the "kingdom of God" will be examined in the context of Jesus' conduct. As E. Schillebeeckx maintains, in the life of Jesus "God's rule and orthopraxis" are inseparable [Jesus: An Experiment in Christology (New York: Seabury, 1979) 267]. I.e. praxis evidences the coming of God's rule and God's rule defines praxis (ibid.). For Jesus, his vision of God became the determining factor in his behavior.

12 See above, chap. 1, pp. 1-2.
within the religious and socio-political contexts of his day, Jesus' deeds and words reveal a very distinctive understanding of God. He represented God as full of mercy and unequivocally forfeiting his own "rights" for the good of his creatures. God is a God of love who not only forgives sins, but is eager to take the initiative in grace to accom-

---

Fiedler, Sünder, 276-77. It should be added that this statement does not presuppose the existence of some "monolithic" form of Judaism at the time of Jesus [C. Dietzfelbinger, Die Berufung des Paulus als Ursprung seiner Theologie [(WMANT 58, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1985) 24]. There were at least fourteen different "strains" of Judaism in existence by the dawn of the first century [P. Sigal, The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism: The Foundations of Judaism from Biblical Origins to the Sixth Century A.D. (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980) 382]. The very fact that one had to ask such questions as "What must one do to enter the kingdom of heaven?" is indicative of such pluralism [J. Neusner, First Century Judaism in Crisis: Yohanan ben Zakkai and the Renaissance of the Torah (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 37]. Kraft and Nickelsburg comment that E. P. Sanders' "covenantal nomism" has merit, but it is important to note the diversity of perspectives expressed in the sources [R. A. Kraft and G. E. Nickelsburg, Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986) 21]. As they state, "Judaism during this period was dynamic rather than static, pluralistic rather than homogeneous" (ibid., 20). Nevertheless, the Torah served as the single unifying factor joining together the various aspects of Jewish society (Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, 28; cf. also Kraft and Nickelsburg, Early Judaism, 21). And despite the diversity in interpretation and application (from the accommodating position of the Sadducees to the extreme of Qumran) there did exist common presuppositions concerning God and his law. Such premises included: God is merciful because he chose Israel to be his elect, separated from sin. God is just and will certainly reward the righteous and destroy the wicked [J. Riches, Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism (London: 1980) 68]. However, it will be shown that Jesus' understanding of God tended to call into question certain aspects of these premises.
Although such elements have always been a part of the faith of Israel, the degree to which Jesus pushed these concepts to the forefront was extraordinary for the context in which he lived.

Yet E. P. Sanders is all too correct in rejecting any notion that Jesus was the only Jew of his day who believed God was loving, merciful and forgiving. Such a view would indeed be "incredible" (Jesus, 326).

Even a brief sketch of the religious, social and political contexts at the time of Jesus does much to overcome the historical "rootlessness" of Jüngel's approach [see above chap. 3, pp. 91-93 and G. Theissen's, The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of Earliest Christianity (London: SCM, 1978) 65]. The basic position taken here is that "increasing Hellenization" was perceived by some as threatening the very identity of the people of Israel [cf. Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135) rev. ed., 2 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973) 52; Riches, Transformation, 76]. This situation resulted in the formation of various resistance/renewal movements such as Pharisaism, Essenism, Zealotism and the Jesus movement, all of which were characterized in one way or another by an intensification of the Torah [Theissen, First Followers, 84, 85, 93 and his Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 84; G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1962) 16-17.]. Of particular note here is that the hâsidîm or "pious ones" (who may have given rise to the pǝrûšîm "the separatists" and the early rabbis) increasingly understood God in terms of holiness, separation and ritual purity (Sigal, Emergence, 160-65). The religious elitism inherent in such an understanding of God may not have resulted in the inter-/intra-cultural fragmentation to the extent which Theissen and others envision [First Followers, 93; Sociology, 84. Cf. also A. Oppenheimer, The CAM HĀ-ÂRETZ: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 85-87, 92-94, 101-02, and R. Scroggs, "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement", in Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, part two (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 9; Riches, Transformation, 65-69]. Nevertheless, as will be presented, the egalitarianism of Jesus and his openness to outsiders represented a theology which ran counter to the expectations of his contemporaries (Fiedler, Sünner, 170).
For example, Jesus' attitude and conduct toward the poor, the ill, the socially disenfranchised and especially towards those who were morally bankrupt, represented a God who had unreservedly cast his lot for the welfare of human beings. It is clear that such a radical understanding of God did not have its roots in the religious establishment, nor was it dependent upon the conversion of it. It is equally clear that the theological implications of Jesus' conduct and words tended to elicit two general responses: "die Frommen" were challenged to question their conventional

16 Trautmann, Handlungen, 401. The social elements in this statement should not be construed as detracting from the purely theological principles represented here. As R. Scroggs states, "God is here and does love and accept the outcast. Jesus' word and act are theological through and through, even when they are directed to a distraught society" ("Earliest Christian Communities", 13).

17 Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 13. To investigate the possible "sources" of Jesus' theology would go beyond the scope of this paper. However, Marcus Borg proposes that Jesus possessed a "mystical" knowledge of God which was also characteristic of other "holy men" of his day. He claims that Jesus knew the Father "noetically", that is, in an immediate or intuitive manner (Conflict, 231). He believes that this personal experience of the mysterium tremendum led Jesus to realize that God's love, mercy and grace determined and sustained the existence of all creatures (ibid; 233; cf. Matt 6:26-30; Luke 12:24-28). Or as Fiedler puts it, God grants Lebensraum to all, both the good and the bad (Sünder, 274). This means that the love and forgiveness of God forms the ground for all existence (cf. Matt 18:23-30a; Luke 7:7,41-42a). Indeed Jesus perceived the nature of God to be most evident when God, in his love and mercy, cared for the needs of those inimical to his will and way (Riches, Transformation, 135). Hence God's reign is manifested most poignantly when one shows love towards one's enemies (Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 19, 29 f., cf. Matt 5:43-48 and par.).
understanding of God and the sinners were encouraged to trust that Jesus had accurately interpreted the person of God.18

B. The Primary Area of Concentration: Jesus as a "Friend of Publicans and Sinners".

1. Narrowing the Scope of Enquiry.

The question remains as to what aspect of the life of Jesus best demonstrates the theological principles set forth thus far. The purpose of this section is to answer this question by narrowing the scope of enquiry. The method will be to briefly sketch some basic approaches to the subject, eliminate the least viable and settle upon what is deemed to be the most promising. The goal of what follows is to establish the direction and parameters for the rest of the dissertation.

In considering the options, it has often been argued that Jesus' attitude towards the law was in stark contrast to that of his Jewish contemporaries. That is, the Jews understood the law as a system of works-righteousness, while Jesus interpreted the law as demonstrating God's overriding concern for humankind.19 The basic premise here is aptly expressed by Jüngel. He claims that the Jews consistently erred by seeking to establish their own righteousness

18 Fiedler, Sünders, 276-77.
19 See above chap. 1, p. 2.
through works of the law. In so doing, they refused to
trust God by faith and hence did not receive salvation.20

Jüngel's position evidences a negative appraisal of
Judaism often found in New Testament scholarship. That is, Judaism is viewed as a system of works-righteousness in which one must earn salvation by keeping innumerable rituals and practices.21 Thus Jesus' conflict with his contemporaries is not to be found in some particular doctrine or ideology, but concerns the very nature of the Jewish faith.22 Furthermore, Jesus' lack of concern for purity regulations, and rules governing the proper observance of the Sabbath, is construed as his attempt to dismantle a

20Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus, 51; cf. also 16-18, 208-10.


22A broad sketch of this type of approach is summed up by E. P. Sanders when he states, "The frequent charge against Judaism, it must be recalled, is not that some individual Jews misunderstood, misapplied and abused their religion, but that Judaism necessarily tends towards petty legalism, self-serving and self-deceiving casuistry, and a mixture of arrogance and a lack of confidence in God" [Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion (London: SCM, 1977) 427].
religious system which tended to promote petty legalism and self-righteousness. Jesus' conduct in this regard is often viewed as evidence that he sought to undermine or replace the Torah.

However, E. P. Sanders questions the validity of such an understanding of Judaism. He argues that an analysis of the Jewish material roughly contemporary with Jesus and Paul, does not reveal a religion preoccupied with legalism and externals. On the contrary, Sanders understands the Hebrew faith as being consistently characterized by what he calls "covenantal nomism". That is, the covenant and Israel's election are established by the grace and mercy of God. The very existence of the law presupposes the establishment of the covenant, and is never to be viewed as a means of earning salvation. Fellowship in the covenant is maintained by obedience to the law and by atonement, but this is not to be interpreted as a way of earning grace. Thus Judaism is not a system of legalism which promotes self-righteousness. It is not a religion which teaches that

23 Jesus, 276.
24 Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 422.
25 Ibid., 235-36.
26 Ibid., 419-20.
27 E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 44.
one can be justified by works.  

Sanders concludes that the false view of Judaism as described above, is based upon erroneous theological presuppositions which in turn are supported by an improper use of the Rabbinic literature. He maintains that such analyses present Judaism as a foil over against which the superiority of Christianity is asserted. Such assessments miss what may well be the major area of conflict between Jesus and his contemporaries, and for that matter, between Paul and his peers as well. That is, the central issue is not so much about legalism as it is about who can receive the grace of God and under what conditions can that grace be received.

In response to the issue of purity, it must be granted that Jesus did not accept a Pharisaiic interpretation of

---

28 Ibid., 105.

29 Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 233-34. Sanders traces the view that Judaism is basically a religion of works-righteousness to F. Weber's System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud (1880). He argues that the mistaken view of Judaism contained therein was continued through works like Emil Schürer's Geschichte der jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu-Christi (1886-90), William Bousset's Die Religion der Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (1903), Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament und Rudolph Bultmann's Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen (1949). With regard to these works, Sanders states that, "They proceed from wrong premises, they misconstrue the material, and they are, like those Jews who cast off the yoke, beyond redemption" (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 234).

30 Ibid., 44.

31 Jesus and Judaism, 280.
the "clean" and "unclean" (cf. Matt 15:1-20; Mark 7:1-8, 14-23; Luke 11:37-41). Jesus simply was not overly scrupulous about the meticulous tithing of food, washing of hands and the avoidance of those in a state of ritual impurity. Jesus' noncompliance in this regard is even more striking when one considers that approximately sixty-seven percent of all the rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees is concerned with dietary regulations. And no doubt such a lack of respect for the traditions (as also seen in the likes of Hanina ben Dosa and Honi the Circle Drawer) must have offended those who viewed themselves as the official purveyors of a Pharisaic interpretation is that view of scripture which sought to apply the injunctions of Exod 19:6 to all the people of Israel; particularly in regard to purity regulations, tithing and Sabbath observance [see below pp. 122-24. For an overview of how Jesus and the Pharisees relate with regard to the law and purity regulations see Sigal, Emergence, 405; Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus", in his Essays on New Testament Themes, 39; J. Neusner, "The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism", in Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity; from the First to the Seventh Century, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1973) ix; Riches, Transformation, 140-44; Borg, Conflict, 161. Cf. also nn. 22-23 below.]

Apart from Josephus and the Gospels, the most complete source of data concerning the traditions of the Pharisees is the early rabbinic literature of post-70 AD. Jacob Neusner judges these traditions to be "thematically congruent" with the gospel portrait of the sect ["Purity", 65. Cf. also his Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70: Part III, Conclusions (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 305, 318 and his From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973) xxi]. Oppenheimer is also in agreement here (AM HÄ-ÅRETZ, 14).

Neusner, Rabbinic Traditions, 304. For specific examples of such injunctions see Dem. 2:3, 6:6, 9,12 (Schürer, History, vol. 2, 386-87).
of true religion. But to equate the Pharisaic interpretation of purity with the entirety of the Torah is basically in error. To address the question of purity is not the same as addressing the status of the law. Such a position is based on a false premise, and hence can never arrive at a sound conclusion. Therefore it is suggested that the issue of purity vis-à-vis the law, and the alleged system of work-righteousness as mentioned above, are not the overriding factors which define the relationship of Jesus to his contemporaries.

The same line of argumentation is used with reference to Jesus' attitude towards the Sabbath. As Sigal points out, the Sabbath became more and more important in the later prophetic and intertestamental times. Also an examination of the Mishnah reveals that the Sabbath became increasingly interpreted in a restrictive sense, i.e. the Mishnah meticulously catalogs activities which were permitted and prohibited. Dietzfelbinger proposes that by the time of Jesus

---

35 Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 76, 80-81.
36 Sanders, *Jesus*, 264.
38 The strength of this train of thought rests upon the assumption that Mishnaic law from AD 70-170 essentially reflects the legislation in existence during the initial decades of the first century (cf. Schürer, *History*, vol. 2, 467). The stringency of such regulations by extreme separatist groups can be seen in the "Damascus Rule" which states, "No man shall assist a beast to give birth on the Sabbath day. And if it should fall into a cistern or pit, he shall not lift it out on the Sabbath" [G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1962) 113]. For the
the Jews had misconstrued the meaning of the Sabbath and viewed it as a means of "self-actualization". That is, just as the purity regulations were used as a system of works-righteousness, Sabbath observance was understood as a way of meriting favor with God. Against this background, Jesus is represented as one who deliberately violated the observance of the Sabbath throughout his ministry and hence in some way invalidated or undermined the law of Moses. The fact that Jesus consistently took the initiative to heal cases which were not particularly life threatening is viewed as important here. It means that Jesus purposefully made the Sabbath a "battleground" from which he "programmatically" waged war against the "official understanding" of the

...Continued...

thirty-nine classes of work prohibited on the Sabbath, including certain types of healing, see again Schürer, History, vol. 2, 468-74.

39 C. Dietzfelbinger, "Sabbatheilungen", EvTh 38 (1978) 298. Taking a broader perspective, Borg states that observance of the Sabbath was being used to secure the political integrity of Israel by preserving "a Torah people" (Conflict, 160).


41 Healing was allowed on the Sabbath to save life or to take precautions which would prevent the loss of life (m. Shab. 2:5, 10:1-5, 7:2, 22:6; m. Yom. 8:6-7; cf. Schürer, History, vol. 2, 473-74, esp. n.56; Sigal, Emergence, 410; Dietzfelbinger, "Sabbatheilungen", 381; Harvey, Constraints, (nn. 9, 10) 38.
Sabbath. According to Borg, the Sabbath controversies were at the center of Jesus' earthly ministry and were the precipitating factor in his execution.

However, the same error committed by those who focused on purity is also present in the thought of those who view the Sabbath as central. Often the fine but vital distinction between the Pharisaic interpretation of the law and the essence of the law itself is not made. Sigal consistently avoids this error by emphasizing that Jesus did not abrogate the law, but in the manner of the "proto-rabbis", he provided alternative interpretations of the halakah. These interpretations often contradicted the views of "extreme pietists" (i.e. the Pharisees). Far from undermining the law of Moses, what we have in Jesus is a deliberate and reasoned decision to distinguish between what is a false and superficial observance of God's law on the one hand and...

---

42 Cf. Dietzfelbinger, "Sabbatheilungen", 296-98; Borg, Conflict, 151.

43 Borg notes that Mark 3:6 and John 5:16, 7:19-23 independently state that the initial movement to execute Jesus was due to Sabbath violations (Conflict, 147). He emphasizes the centrality of the Sabbath controversies by stating, "In either case, it indicates that sabbath violation by a teacher and/or the community around him exceeded the limits of tolerance of the first-century Judaism and further demonstrates the central symbolic significance of sabbath fidelity" (ibid.). But it should be noted that despite Borg's emphasis here, he does not believe that Jesus "set aside" the Torah but that he differed from his opponents concerning the interpretation of it (ibid., 138, 161).

44 Sigal, Emergence, 391, 404-13.
hand, and what is true and vital on the other.\textsuperscript{45}

In conclusion, it must be granted that Jesus' attitude towards the law is not at all easy to determine.\textsuperscript{46} Yet two things are clear: the Pharisaic interpretation of the law is not essentially equivalent to the law of Moses, and specific anti-law statements are difficult if not impossible to find in the words of Jesus.\textsuperscript{47} On the contrary, when asked what must one do to inherit eternal life, Jesus pointed to the Decalogue as the foundation for discipleship.\textsuperscript{48} Also far from negating the Torah, the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount can be viewed as "radicalizing" or "intensifying" the principles of the law.\textsuperscript{49} Although explicit opposition to the law of Moses would help in explain-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Sanders, Jesus, 248.
\item \textsuperscript{46} A. E. Harvey notes that even the Jewish courts could not reach a unanimous decision on this point, and this may be one of the reasons why they delivered Jesus over to Pilate for judgment (\textit{Constraints}, 30-36).
\item \textsuperscript{47} The most extraordinary example cited by Sanders is the phrase "Let the dead bury the dead" (Matt 8:22; Luke 9:60). Yet even here an explicit rejection of the Torah is not at hand. It does appear that at least in this case Jesus was willing to question the adequacy of the law. That is, the law is not absolute and exhaustive in defining God’s will in every case (\textit{Jesus}, 255). This subtle yet important distinction between "qualifying" or "relativizing" the law on the one hand and "destroying" or "rejecting" the law on the other, will become increasingly important as the discussion continues.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Meyer, \textit{Aims}, 148.
\end{itemize}
ing the hostility directed towards Jesus, such evidence is not forthcoming.\(^50\) In the main Harvey's conclusion is on target when he states,

> It seems therefore that we can exclude from our investigation of Jesus' attitude to the law the possibility that he \textit{deliberately} flouted it or laid himself open to charges of having transgressed it.\(^51\)

Therefore the position of this dissertation is that issues of purity, the Sabbath and the law do not define the central theme of Jesus' message and ministry. Although these areas could be regarded as "interpretive tools" which Jesus used to move (or jar!) his listeners toward a clearer understanding of God, they are not judged as constituting the \textit{foremost} concern of the historical Jesus. Rather as stated in the initial pages, the most significant acts of Jesus will serve as the "framework" for interpreting his theology.\(^52\) "Most significant" here means those acts which

\(^50\) Sanders, \textit{Jesus}, 246; Räisänen, \textit{Torah}, 257-59, 272.

\(^51\) \textit{Constraints}, 41 (italics mine). I take the "\textit{deliberately}" to carry over to the phrase "laid himself open..." as well. See again Sanders, \textit{Jesus}, 268, 277. Cf. also Fiedler, \textit{Sünders}, 90.

\(^52\) See above chap. 1, p. 3. Cf. also E. Fuchs, "The Quest of the Historical Jesus" in his \textit{Historical Jesus}, (London: SCM, 1964) 21 f. Yet despite Sander's reference to Fuchs on the priority of deed over word (\textit{Jesus}, 5) it should be noted that Fuchs still views the language of Jesus as the all-important factor (see above chap. 3, p. 88). E. Schillebeeckx expresses a more balanced view of the interrelationship of deed and word when he states, "He proclaimed the rule of God, oriented on humanity, a rule, that demanded a corresponding practice exemplified in his own life and one that he articulated by speaking in parables and instructive discourses" (\textit{Jesus}, 269).
were deliberately chosen by Jesus and which consistently tended to elicit a response from his hearers.\(^{53}\) It is suggested here that it is the strategic demonstration of specific acts laden with theological content which sets the discourse in motion and gives meaning to that discourse.\(^{54}\) And therefore of all the acts which could qualify for review, Jesus' association with publicans and sinners, and particularly his table-fellowship with them, is deemed to be the most striking.\(^{55}\) By consciously acting so in the name

\(^{53}\) As Meyer comments, "He willed his public actions to be open and transparent to epitomize his views and values and to signify his purposes" (Aims, 169. Cf. also Trautmann, Handlungen, 62-63).

\(^{54}\) In this regard David Daube sees the following "tripartite" formula: "Revolutionary Action--Protest--Silencing of the Remonstrants". He emphasizes the priority of deed over word by stating, "Nevertheless, in this form, things are set in motion by single datable actions. Which means that the general ideas first become reality in and will always derive their ultimate sanction from deeds done by Jesus and his followers at particular moments of their activity" [The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athlone, 1956) 173].

\(^{55}\) Jesus' healing of lepers and the role of women and children in his ministry also reflect God's care for the outsiders, but the centrality of his fellowship with sinners is emphasized by Fiedler when he states, "Gott will den Tod des Sünders nicht, sondern -- dass er lebe. Dieser Lebenswille Gottes für den Sünder ist die Richtschnur des Verhaltens Jesu für das er um Gefolgschaft wirbt" (Sünder, 274). And as H. Küng states, "For Jesus this fellowship at table with those whom the devout had written off was not merely the expression of liberal tolerance and humanitarian sentiment. It was the expression of his mission and message: peace and reconciliation for all, without exception, even for moral failures" [On Being a Christian (New York: Doubleday, 1976) 273].
of God, Jesus portrayed the unique understanding of God as outlined at the beginning of this chapter.56 So the goal of what follows is to show that in his openness to outsiders, Jesus rejected the belief that God's righteousness mandated the destruction of the wicked.57 On the contrary, through his fellowship with sinners, Jesus represents a God who is infinitely gracious in nature.58 In love for what is his,

---

56See above this chapter, pp. 111-17. With respect to Jesus acting in God's stead, Jeremias states, "The fact that Jesus justifies his own mercy upon sinners, his own preaching of forgiveness in word and action by referring to God's mercy on sinners has one important consequence: in his scandalous conduct, Jesus is claiming to be realizing the love of God; he is claiming to act as God's representative" (Proclamation, 120). Harvey notes that in the context of Jesus' day a Jewish son was expected to be obedient to his father, learn from him, and in time, serve as his personal agent (Constraints, 159-60). Harvey suggests that the early church associated the title "Son of God" with Jesus because he was understood to have shown unquestionable obedience to his heavenly Father, to possess intimate knowledge of him and to have acted as the Father's authoritative agent, carrying out his will on earth (ibid., 168-73).

57Riches, Transformation, 146, 168. Schillebeeckx is particularly insightful here. He claims that within the historico-political context of his day, Jesus' message of salvation for all, even sinners would be incomprehensible apart from his unique understanding of God as θεός. He claims that this is the source of Jesus's theology, and his belief in a benevolent God who refuses to permit evil to have the final word (Jesus, 267-68).

58Küng rightly notes that noun forms such as "grace", "love" and "mercy" are rarely if ever used by Jesus (Christian, 255, 276). But he also states that Jesus often expressed these ideas in verb forms such as "forgive", "release" and "bestow". His conclusion is that Jesus speaks of God's grace, love, forgiveness, and mercy "in the sense of accomplishment" (ibid., 276). He believes that this reveals a central principle of the life and ministry of Jesus, i.e. Jesus understood God as one who actualized his grace in the lives of sinners in an unconditional way. Küng states, "Acceptance is absolute, without inquiry into
God breaks through traditional categories which delineate the righteous and unrighteous and desires the redemption of all. It is to this subject that I now turn.

2. Examination of the Sources.

The primary purpose of this section is to establish that Jesus' association with publicans and sinners belongs to what might be called the *ipsissima facta Jesu*. To that end, it should be noted that the Synoptic tradition is replete with references to his acceptance of publicans and sinners.

...Continued...

the past, without special conditions, so that the person liberated can live again, can accept himself— which is the most difficult thing, not only for the tax collector. This is grace: a new chance in life" (ibid.).

59 Fiedler, *Sünder*, 170; Jeremias, *Proclamation*, 178; Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 19. Again Schillebeeckx notes, "Salvation and a future are vouchsafed to people without a future" (*Jesus*, 269). And again, Küng notes how "action oriented" the theology of Jesus really is. With regard to the concept of divine love, he claims that actions speak louder than words and that practice serves as the criterion (*Christian*, 255).

60 Franz Mussner, *The Miracles of Jesus; An Introduction* (Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1968) 28. In accordance with Sander's work, the position taken here is that the deeds of Jesus are more readily accessible than the sayings material (*Jesus*, 5).
sinners. For example, in his call to discipleship, it appears that at least one of Jesus' followers was a tax collector (Mark 2:13-17; Matt 9:9-13; Luke 5:27-32). Although various interpretations have been forwarded concerning the context and composition of these passages, one thing is clear: Jesus deliberately chose to call and have fellowship with the rejected and outcasts of his day. Additionally, when Jesus commented on his relationship to John the Baptist, he used the condemning invectives of his

61 Calling upon the criteria of "dissimilarity", "coherence" and "multiple attestation", Perrin judges Jesus' acceptance of publicans and sinners to be so secure that he declines to even argue the case (Rediscovering, 46). Cf. also Küng, Christian, (n. 78) 277, 646. But note the remarks of G. Theissen on the limitations of such criteria in his The Shadow of the Galilean: The Quest of the Historical Jesus in Narrative Form (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 127, 141. In the same vein see L. Keck's A Future for the Historical Jesus: The Place of Jesus in Preaching and Theology (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) 33-34.

62 Cf. also Matt 10:3. J. R. Donahue judges Mark's account to be derived from the earliest strata of oral tradition. He also proposes that Mark deliberately chose this incident to be indicative of Jesus' entire ministry ["Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification", CBQ 333 (1971) 57].

63 It is important to stress how deliberate Jesus was in taking this particular course of action. The theory being presented is that in a calculating way, Jesus made an important theological statement by consciously choosing to eat with toll collectors and sinners. As Küng rightly remarks, "Did he not realize what he was doing? Did he not realize how much sharing a meal - then as now - can compromise a person? When we are invited, we consider carefully who is inviting us - and who is to be avoided at all costs. This would have been particularly obvious to the Oriental: fellowship at table meant more than mere politeness and friendliness. It meant peace, trust, reconciliation, fraternity. And this - the devout Jew would add - not only in men's eyes, but also in God's" (Küng, Christian, 273).
opponents to do so (Matt 11:19; Luke 7:34). By not completely rejecting the charge, "Here is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners", it can be inferred that there is some truth to it. That is, he was not an ascetic, and he was indeed a friend of tax collectors and sinners. And finally, in a fashion that even shocks modern ears, Jesus proclaimed that publicans and sinners will enter the kingdom of God before the righteous in Israel (Matt 21:31).

In conclusion, this brief overview reveals the following. It is extremely unlikely that the accounts of Jesus' openness and acceptance of publicans and sinners are derived from contemporary Judaism, or from the earliest

64 In appealing to the criterion of "dissimilarity" Perrin judges these passages to be "indubitably authentic" (Rediscovering, 106). Cf. Küng, Christian, 272, 645 (n. 38).

65 Perhaps it should be added here that the negative attitude expressed toward publicans in Matt 18:17 is to be understood in the light of Matthew's "Gemeindeordnung" and are not indicative of Jesus' attitude towards the sinners of his day (Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 57). Similarly the words in Matt 5:46 f. and Luke 6:32-34 may be viewed as part of Jesus' overall argument that notorious sinners such as these will be accepted by God [Otto Michel, "Τελόνη", TDNT 8 (1972) 103-04].

66 For the obvious "shock value" that such conduct would have had in Jesus' day, cf. Küng, Christian, 272, 274. Cf. also Sanders, Jesus, 208, 271 and Perrin, Rediscovering, 119.
Christian communities. Rather, such conduct on the part of Jesus is judged to be part of the tradition, possessing the highest degree of historical validity.

Nevertheless, the following questions remain. Who were the "publicans"? What group constituted the "sinners"? Why exactly were the Pharisees and others offended by Jesus' acceptance of them? What was the theological significance of Jesus' actions here, especially in regard to his table-fellowship with such persons? It is to these questions that the discussion now turns.

3. The Identification of the "Publicans and Sinners".

The purpose of this section is to determine the identity of the "publicans and sinners" so as to make Jesus' association with them more comprehensible. In contrast to the historical rootlessness of Jüngel's approach, the method employed will involve a brief description of the social, religious and political contexts where applicable.

With respect to the "publicans", their classification as "sinners" is dependent upon how one interprets their

---

68 Jeremias, Proclamation, 121. Cf. also Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 60.
69 See above chap. 3, pp. 102-04.
place in society. In the first instance, was their sin of a political kind? In other words, were they generally viewed as quislings and traitors who betrayed the God of Israel by collaborating with the Romans? Or secondly, did the nature of their occupation by necessity cause them to commit certain religious infractions? I.e., were they classed as sinners because they were ritually unclean? Or

W. O. Walker argues that the problem being addressed here is an unreal one. He claims that the words "tax collector" in the Gospels resulted from a mistranslation of the Aramaic word ʧēlānē, which according to M. Jastrow means "night demons" or "street urchins" ["Jesus and the Tax Collectors", JBL 97 (1978) 237]. Thus the meaning of the term is roughly equivalent to our modern word "playboys" (ibid.).

R. A. Horsley also rejects the notion that Jesus was notorious for having had frequent fellowship with toll collectors and sinners [Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1967) 212, 319]. He claims that the stories of Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10) and "The Publican and the Pharisee" (Luke 18:9-14) are Lucan, both reflecting his emphasis on Jesus' ministry to "sinners" (ibid., 213-217). Also Matt 5:46-47 and 18:17 indicate that the Matthean church did not promote Jesus' supposed fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. Statements such as "toll collectors and harlots will go into the kingdom before you" are simply rhetorical devices directed against a self-righteous establishment (ibid., 213-214). And finally, "sinners" more than likely refers to the fact that at some time or other all Jews would transgress the law and hence need repentance (ibid., 223). Thus, according to Horsley, Jesus did not get into trouble for having fellowship with publicans and sinners. Rather, Jesus believed God had initiated a political revolution which would break the spiral of violence existing between the established institutions and the common people. For these reasons Jesus came into direct conflict with the "imperial and high priestly rule" of his day (ibid., 322-24).

However, the authenticity of the Gospel sources as discussed above, and the frequent mention of tax collectors in the rabbinic literature, render these theses unlikely.
thirdly, was the basis of their sin purely moral in nature? Were they held in contempt by all of the people because they were genuinely immoral and dishonest? The answer to these questions will aid in determining the nature of Jesus' offense and any possible theological significance it may entail.

The first option is based upon the theory that a tax farming system similar to that developed by the Greek city-states was operative in Palestine at the time of Jesus. Under this system the state would avoid the expense of creating and maintaining the labor force needed for the collection of taxes by opening the enterprise to the private sector. The right to collect taxes was offered to the highest bidder, who in turn would guarantee the state's share from his own resources. The person who won the contract was an ἀρχηγός or "chief tax collector" who hired out lesser functionaries for the completion of the task (cf. Luke 19:2; Matt 10:3).

According to this view, the publicans of the Gospels are understood to be part of this tax farming system. The Pharisees judge them to be "sinners" because through the collection of taxes they are indirectly supporting the

---

71 Michel, "Τελώνης", 89. It is known that such a system was adopted by the Romans and was being used throughout Palestine by 56 B.C.

72 Ibid., 90.

73 Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 59.
oppressors of Israel and promoting the demise of the nation. So Jesus' association with them is judged to be treason, and the events that lead to his death are understood to be political in nature.

In response to this first option, it must be granted that a tax farming system was in place during Jesus' ministry. But the really important point here concerns what type of taxes were being collected in Galilee. Michel argues that direct Roman taxes in the form of a poll tax (tributum

---

74 Of course the most radical expression of such an anti-Roman attitude was present among those known as "Sicarii" or "Zealots" (Sigal, Emergence, 380-81). Although Harvey doubts that zealotism even existed at the time of Jesus, Meyer claims that traces of such sentiment can be found in the Synoptic tradition (Mark 12:14-17 par., Mark 15:6-15 par., Matt 5:38-48 par.) (cf. Harvey, Constraints, 46 and Meyer, Aims, 236). Indeed the Jewish revolts from Maccabeus (167-141 BC) to Bar Kochba (AD 132-136) indicate that the "sole rule of God" was a long standing policy in the minds of many Israelites (Josephus, Jewish War, 2:8, 7:10 and Antiquities, 18:1. Cf. also G. Vermes, Jesus and the World of Judaism (London: SCM, 1983) 4; Meyer, Aims, 235.

75 For these reasons Borg describes Jesus' fellowship with tax collectors as "a political act of national significance" which tended to undermine the Pharisaic program for maintaining the national integrity of Israel (Conflict, 86-87; 120-21, 143. Cf. also Riches, Transformation, 105-06; Sanders, Jesus, 178).

76 Horsley appears correct when he argues that the τελῶναι were not the wealthy publicani who worked for the Roman government collecting direct poll taxes. Rather, they were small-scale toll collectors who handled tariffs and customs duties throughout the Roman provinces (Jesus, 212). For these reasons they would not have been regarded as "quislings" because they collected local tariffs under Herod Antipas rather than imperial taxes for the Romans (ibid., 213).
capitis) or direct taxes on produce (tributum agri) were not part of the tax farming system at the time of Jesus. Similarly, Donahue maintains that in Galilee the collection of a direct poll tax by means of a tax farming system had ceased by 44 B.C. He claims that the "publicans" of the Gospels were not collecting direct poll taxes, but various types of custom taxes designed to regulate commerce. In a convincing manner, he argues that the τελώνας of the Gospels are not actually publicani but "toll collectors". The relevance of his findings lies in the fact that such persons were not part of the classical publican system as described earlier. Again, this means that they would not have been viewed as traitors supporting the Roman government. Consequently, Jesus' acceptance of such persons cannot be interpreted in purely political terms, nor can the extreme opposition he experienced be attributed to collaborating with the enemy.

The second view which holds that the toll collectors are sinners because they are "unclean" once again finds its basis in the Pharisaic interpretation of purity as discussed earlier. The toll collectors are judged to be sinners in

---

77 "Τελώνης", 97.
78 "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 44.
79 Ibid., 53. Cf. Horsley's comments above, n. 70.
80 Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 50.
81 See above this chapter, pp. 118-22.
that they did not adhere to a literal interpretation of Exodus 19:6 "...you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation". Unlike the Pharisees, the toll collectors refused to view the Levitical regulations for priest and temple as being applicable to all Israelites. As nonobservant, they were classed as sinners, having no part in the haburah or "the Fellowship" of "the Separatists". Their continual contact with Gentiles and their trading in untithed or even Sabbath Year produce labeled them as sinners that should be avoided by the righteous. So the conclusion of this argument is that the toll collectors were unclean, having the same religious status as prostitutes and thieves. They had made themselves into Gentiles, and thus

82Cf. above n. 32.

83Although the Pharisees were perûsîm, i.e. "the separated ones", in practice they followed the dictum later articulated by Hillel, "Do not separate yourself from the community". Nevertheless, they shunned all those deemed levitically unclean and thus basically constituted an ecclesiola in ecclesia [Borg, Conflict, (n.42) 58, 291; Schürer, History, vol. 2, 396-97; and the following works by Neusner: Purity, 58-59, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 26].

84The literature of the rabbis reveals that if a member of the community became a toll collector he was to be immediately expelled. He could only return by giving up the profession and starting the initiation process all over again [Neusner, "The Fellowship (ḥaberîm) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth", HTR 53 (1960) 136]. It should be noted that in addition to the infractions mentioned above, the toll collectors (as well as the populace at large) were suspected of being lax in regard to the halakot, whether it be the washing of hands, heave offerings or meticulous tithing (Oppenheimer, CAM HĀ-ÅRETZ, 14-17, 80; J. Neusner, Crisis, 30; Purity, 365).
were stripped of all civil rights, being viewed as illegitimate children in the commonwealth of Israel. So once again, the outrage caused by Jesus' association with toll collectors is thought to be his implicit endorsement of those who violated purity regulations.

A major flaw in this argument is that there is considerable evidence that the toll collectors were not regarded as levitically unclean. Jeremias argues that the profession itself was not inherently impure. He claims that only the crook of the staff, by which the toll collector searched for undeclared goods, was deemed impure. Also the fact that the Gospels and the rabbinic literature consistently join toll collectors with the likes of "thieves" and "robbers" is another indication that purity is not the issue here. For these reasons Donahue states,

Our examination of the evaluation of the toll collectors and tax collectors in the Talmud has shown that the toll collectors were not considered to be ritually defiled because of their contact with Gentiles, but

85 Michel, "Τελούνης", 101-03; Perrin, Rediscovering, 92-94. Sanders rightly rejects the notion that the toll collectors were cut off from salvation. He states that all any sinner had to do was to repent and show the sincerity of that repentance by offering sacrifice in the temple ("Jesus and Sinners", 21-23). As I. Abrahams comments, "A penitent publican, like any other repentant sinner... would find a ready welcome in the arms of a Rabbi" [Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (New York: KTAV, 1967) 58]. Cf. also Horsley, Jesus, 213.

86 Jeremias, Proclamation, 111.

87 Abrahams, Pharisaism, 55; Meyer, Aims, 15; Neusner, Crisis, 28.
were scorned because of their dishonesty and that judgment on them remains harsh throughout the Talmud". 88

Donahue's emphasis on genuine moral failure as opposed to purity is deemed to be on target here. That is, the toll collectors were generally held in disrepute by all the people because of their dishonesty and immorality. 89 This is true because the indirect taxes gathered (the portorium) were the object of much fraud. 90 The tax rate on many goods was fixed arbitrarily. Often the only standard of regulation was how much the collector thought he could get away with. 91 Also a person's goods and merchandise could be searched on the spot, with any "undeclared" goods being subject to confiscation. 92 For these reasons tax farmers and toll collectors were viewed with contempt throughout the Roman Empire. The rabbinic literature supports the Gospel

---

88 Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners", 59; italics mine.

89 As Theissen clearly states, "The toll collectors in the ancient world were not state officials but entrepreneurs who leased tolls from the state, paid an agreed sum to the treasury and put the rest in their own pockets. Understandably they were very unpopular" [Shadow, (n. 2) 206; italics mine].

90 Michel, "Τελώνης", 97.

91 Ibid., 99. Donahue notes that John the Baptist exhorts the toll collectors to take only that which is appointed (διακατασχέω) (Luke 3:13). This indicates that the toll collectors were "minor functionaries" who sought to extort as much as they could above what was required ("Tax Collectors and Sinners", 58).

92 Michel, "Τελώνης", 100-01.
tradition in this regard by equating toll collectors with thieves, robbers and extortioners. They are represented as those who invent dues for illegal profit, and it is for these reasons that their occupation is banned as immoral.  

This means that Jesus' association with such persons is not a matter of political activism per se, nor simply a lack of respect for Pharisaic traditions. Jesus identified with persons who were genuinely immoral, and he did so in the name of God. It was this juxtaposition of the seemingly incongruous which outraged the pious of his day.

The identification of the "sinners" entails similar issues and conclusions. The major question is whether the sinners are those who deliberately flout the law of Moses or those who simply "lighten" the Torah for the sake of expediency. In an effort to answer this question, Borg isolates the following possibilities. The "sinners" are: sinners by way of occupation, Gentiles, nonobservers of the Pharisaic

---

93 Abrahams, *Pharisaiism*, 55; Jeremias, *Proclamation*, 109-10. Künz describes such persons as "downright sinners, miserable sinners in the proper sense of the term" (*Christian*, 271). He comments that in one sense they were incapable of repentance because they simply had no way of knowing the number of people they had defrauded or how much money they had stolen (ibid.). But cf. n. 85 above.

94 As Künz notes, "Contrary to all expectations cherished by his contemporaries of the preacher of God's kingdom, Jesus refused to play the part of the pious ascetic, keeping away from feasts and not mixing with certain types of people" (*Christian*, 272). Künz again indicates that Jesus' willingness to suffer severe criticism in this regard demonstrates his deliberate decision to associate with such persons (ibid., 273).
interpretation of the Torah, or those Jews who were fla-
grantly immoral, such as thieves, prostitutes, murderers, etc.  

The first two options appear to be the least likely.  

Borg argues that since the "sinners" are consistently iden-
tified as a distinct group separate from the toll collectors  
seems to indicate that something other than sins of occupa-
tion is in view.  

Secondly, even though the word "sinners" became the technical equivalent of "Gentiles" in Jewish  
thought, it is very doubtful that Jesus was being castigated  
for having fellowship with non-Jews.  

Even though Jeremias  
claims that the salvation of the Gentiles formed a vital  
part of Jesus' message, he has to admit that his earthly  
ministry was restricted to the Jews.  

Although Hengel and  
Meyer believe that Jesus may have been open to a Gentile  
mission, they too arrive at the same conclusion (cf. Matt  
8:5-13, 10:5, 23, 15:21-28).

---

95 Borg, Conflict, 83-84.  
96 Ibid. Of course, one could argue that the word  
"sinners" functions collectively, representing all types of  
occupational sins. In this case, "toll collectors" could be  
understood as designating a specific type of occupational  
sin that Jesus came in contact with.  
97 K. H. Rengstorff, "Ἄμαρτωλός", TDNT 1 (1964)  
324-25.  
98 Jesus' Promise to the Nations, (Naperville:  
99 Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 62; Meyer, Aims,  
168, 234.
The theory that "sinners" refers to all Israelites who failed to abide by the Pharisaic interpretation of purity is part of a long standing tradition in Protestant theology. It is based upon an identifiable social group which appears to have come into being as a result of the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. They were the 'amme hā-āretṣ or "peoples of the land" who had ignored the Deuteronomistic prohibitions and had intermarried with the Moabites and the Ammonites (Neh 13:1-3, 23). For these reasons they had no part in the amanah or "firm agreement" enacted by Nehemiah (Neh 9:38, 10:1-28; 13:1-2). That is, in an effort to distill a "pure Israel" from "the mixture" Nehemiah covenanted with Levites, priests, leaders of Israel and with all those who separated themselves from the 'amme hā-āretṣ to follow the law of Moses as set forth in Nehemiah 10:29-39. Everyone who accepted the terms of the covenant must separate themselves from the Gentiles, Samaritans and Jews who were negligent in regard to the temple, Sabbath, purity and marriage laws (Neh.10:29; Ezra 4:4, 6:19-21, 9:1).

100 The first appearance of the term is in the singular ('am hā-āretṣ) and appears in such passages as Jer 1:18, 34:19; 37:2; Ezek 7:27; 22:29; 2 Kgs 32:30. Although the precise nature of this social group remains unclear, the negative connotations which later became associated with the plural form are not present (Oppenheimer, 'AM HĀ-ĀRETZ, 10). Cf. also Sigal, Emergence, 119.

101 Sigal, Emergence, 118.

102 Ibid., (n.70) 142. Cf. also Oppenheimer, 'AM HĀ-ĀRETZ, 84.
The proposed relevance of this social phenomenon for the study of the New Testament is set forth by Borg. He argues that economic hardship, a heavy tax burden and even the corruption of the religious leaders led the vast majority of Jews to be nonobservant with respect to tithes, the temple tax and keeping the prohibitions of the Sabbath Year. This "lightening" of the Torah and the traditions only tended to exacerbate the problem of their alienation. Also increasing Hellenization led the Pharisees to define the "true Israel" in terms of purity, which in turn tended to accentuate the nonconformity of the am hā-ārets. Oppenheimer summarizes the situation by stating,

The great strictness characterizing matters of ritual purity and impurity, the difficulty of complying with it, the danger of transferring ritual impurity from one person or object to another, all of this led to a situation whereby ritual purity became the guiding principle in the division of Jewish society into classes. This means that all who failed to observe such religious

---

103 For data on the extraordinary tax burden of the Jews see Neusner, Crisis, 29 and Riches, Transformation, 108. Also for many, the Pharisaic purity regulations proved to be impractical for daily living and the observance of the Sabbath Year would have spelled financial disaster (Borg, Conflict, 33). And finally, the fact that some Levites and priests were wealthy land owners who served only a few days a year in the temple caused some to see no need to tithe (Oppenheimer, AM HA-ĀRETZ, 70-71).

104 For the basic differences between the Pharisees and the am hā-ārets see Morton Smith, "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism", NTS 7 (1960) 359.

105 AM HA-ĀRETZ, 17.
scruples were classed as "am hā-ârets" and were to be avoided.  
Regardless of whether the person was a member of the upper-class, a merchant, or even a priest, if that person failed to abide by a rigid understanding of purity, they were classed as "am hā-ârets" and ostracized by the Pharisees. So practically all of the Israelites were viewed as le-Mitzvôt (not concerned with ritual purity) and la-Tôrah (ignorant of the law). They were "untouchables", "fathers of impurity" whose very clothes were capable of transferring uncleanness. For these reasons the people were judged to be "ignoramuses", cut off from the kingdom of God.

106 Ibid., 87, 117. As Sigal points out, "The broad mass of the populace, the "amme hâ-ârets, did not abide by the rigid purity and tithing standards of the pĕrushîm" [Emergence (n.2) 332].

107 Even though the term Gelîli sôtêh or "stupid Galilean" is used as a synonym for "am hā-ârets" in the rabbinic literature, this does not mean that the "am hā-ârets" were restricted to Galilee (cf. Vermes, Jesus and the World of Judaism, 5; Oppenheimer, "AM HA-ARETZ, 19-21, 78-49).

108 Oppenheimer, "AM HA-ARETZ, 12. It is clear that a major assumption of this position is that the negative attitude towards the "amme hâ-ârets" found in the rabbinic literature was also present among the Pharisees (Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 10). Cf. also m. Ab. 2:6; b. Ber. 47:6, b. Pes. 49b (Sigal, Emergence, 458). However, Oppenheimer argues that such attitudes only intensified after the destruction of the second temple ("AM HA-ARETZ, 116, 172-76).

109 Hag 2:7 states that the garments of the "amme hâ-ârets are midras or "unclean". For additional regulations governing how the pious should relate to the "people of the land" see m. Dem. 2:3, 6:6, 9, 12; m. Sheb. 5:9 (Schürer, History, vol. 2, 386-87). Cf. also Neusner, "The Fellowship", 125-28.
Furthermore, it is alleged that this is actually how the common people of Israel were made to feel. As Scroggs summarizes,

To feel that he was violating God's decrees was an inevitable result of the Pharisaic exclusivism and the peasant could only have felt locked out of religion, resentful toward God and more than ever convinced of his own worthlessness.

Therefore according to this view, the offense of Jesus lies in the fact that he offered the grace of God to the majority of Israelites as opposed to the oppressive legalism of the Pharisees. As Jeremias contends, Jesus offended the Pharisees by offering the Gospel to "the poor" (Matt 11:5 par.) and "the little ones" (Mark 9:42; Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14). He presents the essence of this view when he states,

Summing up, then we can now say that Jesus' following consisted predominantly of the disreputable, the 'amme hā-āreṣ, the uneducated, the ignorant, whose religious ignorance and moral behavior stood in the way of their access to salvation, according to the convictions of

---

110 Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 10-11, esp. n. 39; Borg, Conflict, 44; Theissen, First Followers, 85.

111 Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 11 and also n. 36, p. 10.

112 Although Sanders rejects such a view, he encapsulates its essence by stating, "Here, however, we must not only clear out some terminological underbrush, but fell a large tree; for we are up against a clearly cherished view: the Pharisees, who dominated Judaism, excluded everyone but themselves from salvation, and Jesus let the common people in" (Jesus, 189).

113 Proclamation, 110-11.
the time.\footnote{Ibid. 112; cf. also 119. Jeremias' lack of precision in defining the terms used not only confuses the issue, but is contradictory. In his article "Zöllner und Sünder", he proposes that to define ἁμαρτωλοί as "Nicht-Pharisäer" is too broad. In contrast to what he says above, he refuses to define ἁμαρτωλοί as ʾam hā-ārets but rather argues that they are immoral persons who follow a sinful lifestyle ["Zöllner und Sünder", ZNW 30 (1931) 294-95].}

Even though such a view is well entrenched in Protestant theology and may appear to explain the hostility directed towards Jesus, it contains some serious problems. Firstly, the entire argument is based upon the premise that the Pharisees were so influential that they effectively controlled and determined the religion of Israel.\footnote{Sanders, Jesus, 195.} It is believed their importance and religious power transcended the value of the temple, sacrifices, priests and synagogue worship throughout the land. Whom they excluded from the kingdom of God were excluded from the kingdom of God.

This dissertation suggests that in a manner analogous to Josephus, such a position has exaggerated the influence of the Pharisees.\footnote{Ibid., 196-97.} Even though the Pharisees did wield some influence, and could technically be called "the people's party", they did not and could not control the insti-
Josephus' admission that the Pharisees numbered only six thousand agrees with the Synoptic tradition that the sect comprised only a small part of the nation. The fact is that the priests were in control of the religious cult, and there is every indication that they accepted the sacrifices, prayers of repentance and worship of the common people. This means that the am hā-ārets would not have felt cut off from the covenant. As Sanders rightly argues, they may have resented the petty legalism and sense of superiority of some Pharisees, but they would not have judged themselves excluded from Judaism.

Since it appears that in the main the Pharisees were a lay movement that sought to aid all Israel in keeping God's law, they were in a real sense a "people's party". However, since the majority of Israel failed to heed the Pharisaic interpretation of the law, the Pharisees felt the tension of censuring the nonobservant on the one hand, while maintaining popular appeal on the other (Meyer, Aims, 232).

In response to Josephus' portrait of the Pharisees Schürer comments, "In the New Testament and in Josephus they appear quite plainly as a small body within the nation", (History, vol. 2, 396). Also for the possible "political agenda" which motivated Josephus to describe the Pharisees as the "leading party" (Jewish War, 2:162) and as having the support of the masses (Antiquities, 17:42) see Neusner, Politics to Piety, 2 and Sanders, Jesus, 196-67.

Sanders, "Jesus and Sinners", 19.

Jesus, 194, 200. It may well be that the severe estrangement often depicted as existing between the Pharisees and the am hā-ārets is itself in error. After all, the Pharisees were a lay movement dedicated to preserving the relevance of the Torah for the person in the street. That is why they lived in the community. Also, the purpose of many purity regulations was to provide for contact with the am hā-ārets (cf. Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, 26; Oppenheimer, CAM HA-ÂRETZ, 160-63; Sanders, Jesus, 192).
The second major flaw of this position is simply this: the common people of the land are never classed as morally wicked persons, that is, as sinners excluded from the covenant. Sanders points out that even the rabbinic literature does not contain a single reference regarding the common people as "the wicked", i.e. those who flagrantly and willfully rejected the law of God. Impurity is not what constitutes one a "sinner", but simply disqualifies one from being a ḥaber. And despite his inconsistencies, Jeremias is correct when he does reject the notion that 'am hā-āretṣ is synonymous with ἁμαρτωλοί. For he correctly understands that this would mean that all the Jews were "beyond the pale" except the Pharisees. Jeremias also makes the important point that Jesus himself was a 'am hā-āretṣ, and asks why the Pharisees would have been offended by Jesus' association with his own kind. The conclusion appears obvious. The vast majority of Israelites desired to observe the basic requirements of Judaism, and were in no way cut

---

121 Ibid., 11. Sanders states that "not intending to be observant is precisely what makes one 'wicked'; but the wickedness comes not from impurity as such, but from the attitude that the commandments of the Bible need not be heeded" (Jesus, 185).
122 Sanders, "Jesus and Sinners", 20.
123 "Zöllner und Sünder", 294.
124 Ibid.
off from the covenant.\textsuperscript{125} So if any class of people could be viewed as comprising what may be called "normative Judaism" the \textit{am hâ-ârets} is it.\textsuperscript{126}

Therefore, the position of this paper is that just as in the case of the toll collectors, the issue is not a matter of purity, but is thoroughly moral in nature. That is, the term "sinners" does not designate the common people of the land, but persons who were genuinely wicked. Or as Sanders proposes,

\begin{quote}
But the \textit{charge} against him was not that he loved the \textit{amme hâ-âretz}, the common people. If there was a conflict, it was about the status of the \textit{wicked}. It is a mistake to think that the Pharisees were upset because he ministered to the ordinarily pious common people and the economically impoverished.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

The point being made is that Jesus fully accepted the conventional understanding of \textit{\'Am\varphi\tau\omega\lambda\iota\iota}. Yet he took the initiative to actively seek out and identify with those persons whom the \textit{general populace} labeled as "sinners".\textsuperscript{128}

In the name of God, Jesus demonstrated by his deeds that notorious frauds and profligates could experience God's grace even though they had not repented in accordance with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{125} Harvey, \textit{Constraints}, 42; Meyer, \textit{Aims}, (n.109)
\item \textsuperscript{126} Sanders, "Jesus and Sinners", 18.
\item \textsuperscript{127} Jesus, 179.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Rengstorff, "\'Am\varphi\tau\omega\lambda\iota\iota", 330; Vermes, \textit{Jesus the Jew}, 53. Again Schillebeeckx emphasizes that Jesus \textit{actively sought out sinners} for the purpose of restoring communication (Jesus, 212).
\end{itemize}
the standards of contemporary Judaism.  

By not requiring the traditional signs of repentance, Jesus evidenced his matchless confidence in the God who acts mercifully,-lovingly and graciously toward all of his creatures, including sinners.  

Jesus' fellowship with toll collectors and 

---

129 Michel, "Τέλοςης", 104. Sanders is keen to emphasize that the sinners were absolutely unrepentant and remained so indefinitely (Jesus, 25, 45, 206-08, 210, 271; "Jesus and Sinners", 23-26). Of course if this were the case, Jesus would have been so different from his contemporaries that he would not have been taken seriously by the religious leaders, or the masses for that matter (Harvey, Constraints, 50-51). And yet in his Jesus and Judaism Sanders flatly states that "Surely Jesus desired the conversion of sinners" (208). And he consistently emphasizes that even though those called did not repent "as normally understood" (206) they would be included in the kingdom if they "follow Jesus" and "heeded him" (207) or if they "accepted him" (210, 271). Surely "following", "accepting" and "heeding" Jesus is not devoid of all moral content. Fiedler proposes that Jesus is providing a different form of repentance than that which was prescribed by the temple, sacrifices and restitution. That is, when the sinner trusts that God does not desire the death of the wicked, but that God actually desires fellowship with that which is his, and then reciprocates by genuinely desiring fellowship with God, then repentance has taken place in the fullest sense (Sünder, 273). Schillebeeckx speaks of "a joyful commitment to the living God" which is founded on faith and trust (Jesus, 200). With regard to the saving fellowship offered by Jesus, Schillebeeckx believes that such faith entails an attitude of true μετάνοια (ibid., 207). Küng argues that such a relationship leads to a "higher righteousness" which is itself based upon unconditional forgiveness (Christian, 274-75).

130 Fiedler, Sünder, 226-27. By identifying with the outcasts in this way Jesus implied that the reconciling grace of God is not restricted to any particular time (the Day of Atonement), place (the temple) or individual act (offering up a sacrifice) (Sanders, Jesus, 271; Meyer, Aims, 251). Yet again it is in the context of Jesus' apparent challenge to the complete adequacy of the Mosaic covenant that Fiedler sees a deeper understanding of repentance. What is required is a genuine Umkehr, i.e. a complete reorientation to the person of God (Fiedler, Sünder, 228).
sinners is indicative of his belief that God had provided ein Vertrauensvorschuss which effectively destroyed all barriers hindering immediate access to God.\(^{131}\) Therefore his conduct in this regard is theologically motivated through and through. As Fiedler states, "Jesus konnte so handeln, weil für ihn Gott so handelte, und darin unterschied er sich eben durchweg von den Vorstellungen seiner Zeitgenossen".\(^{132}\) No doubt to the shock and dismay of his contemporaries, Jesus graphically challenged the premise that separation from sinners constitutes one of the highest virtues.\(^{133}\) By accepting people as he found them without prerequisites or preconditions, Jesus implied that his adversaries were wrong in their understanding of God.\(^{134}\) He completely undermined the fundamental premise that the only fate awaiting the

---Continued---


\(^{131}\) Ibid., 274. Manson sees such an understanding as being somewhat antithetical to Anselm’s theory of satisfaction. That is, for Jesus "repentance" cannot be reduced to some system of lex talionis (On Paul and John, 58).

\(^{132}\) Ibid., 228, cf. also 273. No doubt the pious believed that Jesus did not take sin seriously enough and that he lacked respect for the holiness of God.

\(^{133}\) Jeremias, Proclamation, 118. Abrahams notes that throughout the Pharisaic tradition, there was a real fear of making the return of the sinner too easy (Pharisaism, 58).

\(^{134}\) Rengstorf, "Ἄμαρτωλός", 330; Perrin, Rediscovering, 103.
sinner is the judgment of God. The poor, the mourners and
the hungry are not blessed because they are good, but be-
cause God is good. And as previously indicated, this
radical understanding of God's gracious acceptance of the
outcasts was most poignantly set forth in Jesus' table-
fellowship with them. It is to this topic that I now turn.

B. The Theological Significance of Jesus' Table-fellowship with Toll Collectors and Sinners.

It has often been proposed that Jewish eschatology
serves as the key to understanding Jesus' table-fellowship
with sinners. As Jüngel states,

Jesus hat diese Geschichte der Liebe eröffnet, indem er
zu denen ging, die der Liebe bedürften: er ass und
trank mit den Zöllner und Sündern (cf. Matt 11:19b par,

Jesus' conduct is interpreted as a "proleptic indication"
that even the wicked would be invited to the eschatological
"messianic banquet" (Mark 14:25; Matt 22:1-14, 26:29; Luke
14:16-24; 22:19). Although such a position is basically

---

135 Fiedler, Sünder, 93; Riches, Transformation, 146. Exodus 23:7 declares that God will in no way justify the
guilty. To believe the contrary would reflect the epitome
of moral corruption (Meyer, Aims, 160).

136 Meyer, Aims, 130.

137 Paulus und Jesus, 211 (italics mine).

138 Schillebeeckx suggests that Jesus' table-
fellowship with sinners is part of his role as "eschatologi-
cal messenger" whereby Jesus invites such persons to partake
in "the great eschatological feast" (Matt 22:1-14; Luke
14:16-21) (Jesus, 211). Cf. also Sanders, Jesus, 208 and
his "Jesus and Sinners", 27-28; Perrin, Rediscovering, 106-
07; Hengel, Charismatic Leader and His Followers (Edinburgh:
correct, theologizing about the eschaton can obscure the most rudimentary aspects of Jesus' understanding of God. That is, Jesus' acting so in God's name is significant whether or not it is eschatological. For this reason the simplest meanings of table-fellowship within the context of Jesus' day may well prove to be the most profound. For the oriental, eating together was a sign of intimacy, friendship, trust and acceptance. As Jeremias states, "It was an offer of peace, trust, brotherhood and forgiveness; in short, sharing a table meant sharing life". This means that table-fellowship signified a close relationship, and that a state of harmony existed between those who ate to-

---Continued---


139 This was certainly true in the case of Jüngel, see above chap. 3, 106-07.

140 Borg, Conflict, 80. The special social and religious significance of table-fellowship is part of a long-standing tradition in Israel's history. It forms a social bond that is not to be betrayed (Ps 41:9), is part of the most cherished ceremonies (Exod 18:12; 24:11, 1 Kgs 3:15) and is hallowed by words of blessing at even the most humble meals (Meyer, Aims, 159).

The important point at this juncture is that as one who spoke and acted in the name of God, Jesus ate with the sinners and outcasts of his day. And as argued throughout, Jesus' fellowship with sinners was a matter of deliberate practice based upon his understanding of God. It meant that God in his unlimited goodness desired to have communion with all of Israel, especially those who needed it.

---

142 R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Sheed and Ward, 1971) 44. Of course refusing to eat together also had its meaning. Since table-fellowship functioned as a moral indicator distinguishing that which was holy from unrighteous, and clean from unclean, the Jews were not to eat with Gentiles; cf. Deut 14:21 (Meyer, Aims, 159).

143 Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 172. The egalitarianism of Jesus with regard to "undesirables" may once again be contrasted with the pious of his day. As Neusner states in reference to the haberim, "For the new member, affiliation with the fellowship represented a step toward individualism, and resulted in the disintegration of customary social relationships" ("The Fellowship", 129).

144 Borg, Conflict, 84. "Deliberate practice" is not meant to imply "religious regimentation". Jesus' table-fellowship was spontaneous, nonascetic and open not only to the impure, but also to the vilest of sinners (Riches, Transformation, 105-06). Again this stands in stark contrast to that of the haberim. As Neusner comments, "The new member of the fellowship could no longer associate with any men freely and carelessly" ("The Fellowship," 136; cf. also his Politics, 73, 83-84).
most (Mark 2:17 par.)\textsuperscript{145} God in his incomprehensible mercy does not desire the death of the wicked, but instead extends grace, love and acceptance to all persons, without preconditions regardless of their moral situation.\textsuperscript{146} As Riches states,

Moreover, we can say that God's giving to men is not conditional on men's efforts, or past performances at all. On the contrary, he extends his mercy to the least of men, to the fallen, the sick, the sinners, and the outcasts, to all who humbly receive it.\textsuperscript{147}

God in his grace is one who is ready to forgive and takes the initiative to provide whatever is needed for repentance in the truest sense of the word, i.e. a loving response to

\textsuperscript{145}In reference to Mark 2:1-3, 6, 13-14 Schillebeeckx states, "This solidarity Jesus had with sinners, his contact with sinful people, aimed at opening up communication with God and with men, is indeed a 'being delivered into the hands of sinners'; solidarity of that kind, mingling with sinners, is for their salvation: Jesus means in that way to open up communication; his being delivered into the hands of sinners (Mark 9:31 with 14:41) is for Mark at the same time the real import of Jesus' death: the 'saving gift' to sinners, so to 'mix with sinners' that in the end he himself goes to the wall" (\textit{Jesus}, 212).

True as this is, it is important to note that Jesus' approach is not exclusive but inclusive. He did not exclude the righteous but challenged them to believe that God desires communion and reconciliation with all of his creatures, including the sinners (Fiedler, Sünner, 153; Meyer, \textit{Aims}, 162).

\textsuperscript{146}As Trautmann clearly expresses, "Die Mahlgemeinschaft Jesu mit Zöllnern bezeichnet die bedingungslose und definitive Annahme des Sünders durch Gott" (\textit{Handlungen}, 386, italics mine). Cf. also Schnackenburg, \textit{Mark}, 43.

\textsuperscript{147}\textit{Transformation}, 154. Hofius simply states that Jesus' table-fellowship graphically communicated God's will to associate with, love and bestow honor on the ungodly (\textit{Tischgemeinschaft}, 19).
God's offer of love. And it is the immediacy of God's grace which envelops the sinners where they are that makes such a response possible. In his righteousness God reclaims what is his by providing the optimal conditions for reconciliation, requiring only "die Antwort der Liebe". Also Jesus' collegiality with the outcasts meant that God's holiness is not that fragile something that needs to be coddled and protected in a thousand different ways. Rather, God in his holiness invades the domain of the fallen and completely transforms the environment in which he is

148 As Fiedler states, "In der 'Dialektik' von Vergebung Gottes und Umkehr des Menschen setzt Jesus den Akzent eindeutig auf Gottes Vergebung" (Sünders, 275). Hofius believes that the theological significance of Jesus' table-fellowship with sinners has also been preserved in the pseudepigraphal work "The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs" (Tischgemeinschaft, 6-7). In "The Testament of Simeon" 6:5-7, 7:1 and "The Testament of Asher" 7:3, God becomes incarnate and eats with sinners and Gentiles as a sign of his salvation for all (ibid., 7-8).

149 As Meyer states, "'Gratuity' and 'present realization' -- the electrifying immediacy of 'free' and 'now'-- are probably the distinctive accents in Jesus' message" (Aims, 132).

150 Fiedler, Sünders, 283. Along the same lines Hengel comments, "In a particular way he turned to those who were outcasts from Jewish society and proclaimed the possibility of a new life for them on the basis of the nearness of God" (Between Jesus and Paul, 61). In this regard Küng describes Jesus' table-fellowship as "inspired behavior" (Christian, 266). Schillebeeckx speaks of Jesus' association with outcasts and sinners as an invitation to enter in faith into a companionship with God (Jesus, 179).
found. For these reasons separation from the wicked does not engender righteousness and holiness, but leads to a theological irresponsibility in the purest sense.

In a similar vein, God in his grace, love and mercy is portrayed by Jesus as one who transcends any factors which could thwart reconciliation. In what must have appeared to some as reckless abandon, Jesus' table-fellowship completely disregarded traditional categories which distinguished the righteous from the unrighteous and the repentant from those that showed no signs of repentance. The distinction between the temenos or realm of the sacred, and the secular was no longer relevant. This means that Jesus' fellowship with the outcasts tended to undermine the distinction between the saint and the sinner in Israel. As Trautmann explains,

---

151 M. D. Hooker argues that the goodness of God is more powerful than the power of defilement. Thus Jesus is able to come in contact with sinners and make them clean ["Interchange in Christ", JTS 22 (1971) (n.2) 351]. Along the same lines Borg describes Jesus' understanding of holiness as "inclusive mercy" (Conflict, 199).

152 Fiedler, Sünden, 170. As Hofius states, "Indem Jesus die Sünder an seinen Tisch holt hebt er grundsätzlich und in göttlicher Vollmacht die Grenze auf, die Menschen zwischen Frommen und Gottlosen, Gerechten und Sündern, Reinen und Unreinen gezogen haben und immer wieder so gern ziehen" (Tischgemeinschaft, 18).

153 Sanders, Jesus, 34, 41.

154 Meyers argues that Jesus' openness to outsiders was Jesus' way of imagining the real and not the "stubbornly illusory" condition of Israel before God (Aims, 160, 171). Cf. also Schnackenburg, Mark, 45.
Er durchbricht die Schranken, die zwischen 'rein' und 'unrein' bestehen, er hebt die Unterscheidung zwischen 'Sünder' und 'Nicht-Sünder' auf und erklärt ganz Israel als Sünder.  

This is true because all exist by the love of God and all are in need of his grace. All must come to see their need before God. Jesus' acceptance of sinners graphically demonstrated that God's love defines both the need of all and the standard for all.

In short, God's love compels him to meet human need irrespective of the conditions and the circumstances which surround that need. And it was just this kind of insight into the character of God which caused Jesus to emphasize that God does not always have to operate within the parameters of Torah and temple. Just as Jesus' acceptance of sinners was direct and immediate, God's total concern for the well-being of humankind directs him to express his grace and love for people apart from, but not necessarily as

155 Handlungen, 399.
156 See above in this chapter (n.17) p. 116.
157 Riches, Transformation, 152, 185.
158 Riches summarizes these points by stating, "Instead he sought a renewal of the tradition by giving it new direction: cutting away attempts to multiply detailed prescriptions of the Law and directing them instead to personal standards as a means of regulating conduct; rejecting the belief in God's punitive justice, and emphasizing instead God's mercy, his will to heal, to forgive, to overcome enmity with love" (ibid., 185).
159 Abernathy, Understanding, 110.
antithetical to the law and temple. In this sense it could be said that Jesus has relativized the importance of the law and the temple. As Küng states,

Jesus relativizes the law and this means the whole religio-political-economic order, the whole social system. Even the law is not the beginning and the end of God's ways. Even the law is not an end in itself, it is not the final court of appeal.

So once again it appears that Jesus' acceptance of the outcasts was based upon his distinctive understanding of God; an understanding that may well have challenged the complete adequacy of the Mosaic dispensation, and to that extent relativized the Torah and temple.

Therefore it is maintained, as it has been throughout, that the theology of Jesus as evidenced in his openness to outsiders does not simply serve as a "framework" for his

---


162 Sanders, Jesus, 250; Borg, Conflict, 236. Schillebeeckx interprets Jesus' radical demand that one love God and all persons, even sinners and enemies, as a key to decipher his assessment of the law. Schillebeeckx concludes that Jesus believed that God's rule is first and foremost concerned with the well-being of humankind (Jesus, 237). He states that, "Jesus is the exegete, not of the law but of God; and in being so, he exposes man and provides a new perspective on salvation" (ibid., 242).
Rather, his fellowship with sinners reflects the essence of his understanding of the Father. It is this understanding which serves as the foundation upon which his words are built; it is the source from which his words flow. Indeed it is the words of Jesus, particularly some parables, which function hermeneutically. They interpret the conduct of Jesus, thus communicating his understanding of God. So from this perspective, a brief analysis of selected portions of the Synoptic tradition is in order.

C. Two Parables Reflective of the Theology of Jesus as Evidenced in His Openness to Outsiders.


Since a detailed analysis of the parables goes beyond the scope of this paper, only the most relevant points may be discussed here. With respect to the authenticity of this particular parable, one may proceed with a degree of caution. For example, it appears that Matt 20:16 is not authentic.

See the analysis of Fuchs above, chap. 3 (n. 121) p. 88.

For a list of the major treatments of this parable see J. D. M. Derrett, Studies in the New Testament, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1977) (n.1) 49 and (n.4) 50.

The parable passes the test of "dissimilarity" as set forth by Käsemann as well as the criterion of "coherence" used by Perrin [Cf. Käsemann, Essays, 35-37; Perrin, Rediscovering, 43. Cf. also Weder, Gleichnisse, (n. 76) 225, 228]. The use of such criteria is qualified but not negated by the legitimate concerns of Hooker, Calvert, and Barbour [cf. M. D. Hooker, "Christology and Methodology", NTS 17 (1970-71) 480-83 and her "Interchange in Christ", JTS 22 (1971) 50-51. See also D. G. A. Calvert, "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of
original, repeating what was said in Matt 19:30.\textsuperscript{166} Also the idea that the first will be last and the last first seems to have been borrowed from Mark 10:31, and Luke 13:30 uses the same phrase with no parable associated with it.\textsuperscript{167} Upon further examination, Linnemann rightly notes that the implicit warning contained in these words is not compatible with the general tone of the parable.\textsuperscript{168} In this regard, Eichholz postulates that the parable has been umadressiert, i.e. made to address the life situation of the disciples rather than that of the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{169}

Having said this, there is considerable scholarly support for locating the parable within the context of

\textit{...Continued...}


\textsuperscript{167}Via, \textit{Parables}, 148.


\textsuperscript{169}Gleichnisse, 106.
Jesus' association with toll collectors and sinners. If this be true, then the parable was originally connected with a reliable Jesus phenomenon, hence lending some support to its authenticity. Additionally, as indicated above, the very nature of the parable seems to meet the criteria of coherence and dissimilarity. Even though Eichholz agrees with Jülicher's description of "The Laborers in the Vineyard" as evangeliunm in nuce, he rightly notes that this gospel is not what one might expect. The element of protest contained in the story evidences how radical its message really is. The basis for "reward", if one can call it that, strikes the listener as a "polar reversal" of the norms of the day. For these reasons Weder views Matt 20:1-15 as one of the most authentic passages found in the


171 Cf. n. 165 above.

172 Gleichnisse, 94.

173 Ibid. Eichholz notes that the protest of the workers who had labored all day is similar to the objections of the older brother in "The Prodigal Son" as discussed below.

Synoptic tradition. 175  

As far as interpretation is concerned, as usual the suggestions are many and varied. In general, however, the following elements are common. The theme of the parable is believed to be drawn from the commercial life of Israel where one's financial reward is proportionate to services rendered. 176 Since the eleventh hour workers receive the same pay as those who worked all day, it is often thought that some workers are treated on a contract basis while others are rewarded on the basis of generosity. 177 The broad theological inferences often drawn from these suppositions are that God is both just in paying what he agreed

175 Weder comments, "Es gibt kaum eine neutestamentliche Parabel, die nach den Kriterien von Diskontinuität...und Konsistenz... so sicher auf den historischen Jesus zurückgeht wie die vorliegende. Deshalb ist ihre Echtheit in neuerer Zeit nicht mehr bestritten worden" [Gleichnisse, (n. 46) 220].


177 Perrin, Rediscovering, 117. But Derrett argues that the nature of the crop being harvested, and the cost of labor under such conditions of urgency mean that proportionately all the workers were rewarded the same (New Testament, 53-54). He claims that generosity and merit have nothing to do with the interpretation of the parable (ibid., 66-67). Yet K. Erlemann is quick to emphasize that the parable does not destroy das Lohndenken of that day. He notes that the first workers got paid exactly what they had agreed upon [Das Bild in den synoptischen Gleichnissen (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988) 102].
upon, but has the freedom to show mercy to whom he wills.\textsuperscript{178} The specific application of these premises is that the works-righteousness of the Pharisees and the scribes is condemned by the love, mercy and grace of God so evident in Jesus' words and deeds.\textsuperscript{179} As Jeremias states,

The parable is clearly addressed to those who resembled the murmurers, those who criticized and opposed the good news, Pharisees for example. Jesus was minded to show them how unjustified, hateful, loveless and unmerciful was their criticism.\textsuperscript{180}

W. R. Farmer is more explicit in his castigation of the Pharisees when he says, "It is to rebuke the attitude of self-righteousness on the part of those who resent God's mercy to repentant sinners".\textsuperscript{181}

Yet as the study has shown, the theological agenda of Jesus involves more than a mere anti-Pharisaic campaign. As Weder contends, the parable is not explicitly directed against the Pharisees but contains elements applicable to


\textsuperscript{179} Fiedler, \textit{Sünden}, 175-76.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Parables}, 27. Yet Sanders is right in his consistent opposition to Jeremias in this regard. If the sinners were repentant in the traditional sense of the word, then the Pharisees would have acclaimed Jesus as a "national hero" ("Jesus and the Sinners", 23).

\textsuperscript{181} "Historical Essay", 115, italics mine. But again Sander's reasoning prevails when he states, "The notion that the conversion of sinners was offensive to the Pharisees is, when thought about concretely, ridiculous" ("Jesus and the Sinners", 23).
all. For these reasons an approach which addresses the essential value of the individual before God and the basis for making such a determination seems more profitable.

Fuchs appears to be on target when he claims that the parable tends to undermine all human categories for valuing or devaluing the self before God. These words of Jesus are the καταστροφή of all worldly interpretations of how God must relate to his creatures. Those who accept the parable must abandon the presupposition that God's relationship to the individual must be governed by the quid pro quo dialectic so common to human experience. More particular, the goodness of God is not determined by our human understanding of goodness, but by God's own personal understanding of what is good and right. And it is this particular kind of goodness and righteousness which causes

---

182 Weder, Gleichnisse, 228.
183 Jesus, 21.
184 E. Lohmeyer, Urchristliche Mystik (Darmstadt: Gentner, 1956) 137.
185 Cf. Manson, Matthew and Luke, 219; Fiedler, Sündер, 183; Riches, Transformation, 153; Perrin, Rediscovering, 118.
186 As James Breech notes, the householder promised the workers who had come at nine, noon, and three o'clock, that he would pay them what he thought was right. So the basis for remuneration is directly related to the householder's own assessment of what is right. That is, the very character of the householder is the determining factor in how the workers are paid [The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 149]. Cf. also Fiedler, Sünder, 274.
God to extend his mercy, grace and love to all persons regardless of their social status or moral condition. So the central message of the parable is expressed by the grumblers who complain that God has made the least equal to them. And indeed he has, for his goodness and love leads him to see all persons the same, i.e. fully worthy of the grace and mercy which brings about reconciliation.

In summary, the words of this parable are judged to be an explication of Jesus' openness to outsiders, particularly clarifying the meaning of his fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. Those who received the parable in this context would be challenged to reevaluate their understanding of God and their understanding of the basis of one's relationship to God. So although the parable may be described as a "kingdom parable" or a "parable of reversal" it is the King or the very character of God which serves as the focal point of the saying. In commenting on Matt 20:1-15 Jeremias states,

The fact that Jesus justifies his own mercy upon sinners, his own preaching of forgiveness in word and action by referring to God's mercy on sinners has one

---

187 Breech, Silence, 149-53. Derrett relates the idea of "equality" with that of the covenants. He claims that Matthew wanted to show that all divine covenants are equally valid, whether they be made at Sinai or in Jesus (New Testament, 72-73).

188 Weder, Gleichnisse, 224.

189 Fiedler, Sünden, 183.

190 Cf. Sanders, Jesus, 150; Crossan, Parables, 66.
important consequence: in his scandalous conduct, Jesus is claiming to be realizing the love of God; he is claiming to act as God's representative.\textsuperscript{191}

In some ways, the theme of God's grace towards the unworthy is even more poignantly set forth in the parable of "The Prodigal Son" as discussed below.


Although the theological affinity between "The Laborers in the Vineyard" and "The Prodigal Son" is generally acknowledged, the authenticity and literary unity of the latter are also in dispute.\textsuperscript{192} For example, Luise Schottroff flatly states that Luke is the author of the parable, and that he is writing under the influence of the Apostle Paul, rather than Jesus.\textsuperscript{193} She claims that Luke has created the parable for the purpose of promoting his own christology, which in turn determines the entire tone of the fifteenth chapter.\textsuperscript{194} The fact that the parable can readily be construed as an affront to Jewish piety is also viewed as

\textsuperscript{191} Jeremias, Proclamation, 120.

\textsuperscript{192} For more on the theological continuity that exists between these parables see Derrett, New Testament, 49; Fiedler, Sünner, 181; Farmer, "Historical Essay", 122; Jeremias, Proclamation, 120. For a synopsis of the various views concerning the integrity of the parable see G. Scholz, Gleichnisaussage und Existenzstruktur: Das Gleichnis der neueren Hermeneutik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der christlichen Existenzstruktur in den Gleichnissen des lukanischen Sonderguts (Frankfurt: Lang, 1983) 252-53.

\textsuperscript{193} "Das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn", ZThK 68 (1971) 51, 52. Cf. also Völkel, "Zöllner und Sünder", 10.

\textsuperscript{194} Schottroff, "Verlorenen Sohn", 51.
evidence that these words did not originate with Jesus. 195

With regard to the literary unity of the parable, Jack T. Sanders points out that the first half (vv. 11-24a) is well able to stand on its own, while the second half (vv. 24b-32) appears to be a Lucan addition. 196 He judges the many semitisms of the first half as indicative of its authenticity, while the Lucan terms in the final verses convey the opposite. 197 His conclusion is that the original form of the parable ended with verse 24, and thus the saying should not be described as zweigipfelig or "two pointed." 198

In response to these remarks the following should be noted. The apparent affront to Jewish piety may actually be viewed as a mark of its authenticity. 199 That is, Luke

195 Ibid.
197 Ibid.
198 Ibid., 433.
199 Scholz summarizes Jeremias' argument in this regard in his Gleichnisaussage und Existenzstruktur, 254-55. Once again Jeremias points to the criteria of coherence and dissimilarity. With regard to the former Jeremias notes that the parable reflects a Palestinian background and is consistent with the preaching of Jesus. Yet he also notes that the parable is unlike early Judaism and Christianity in that it does not point to repentance as a precondition for salvation (ibid., 253). Jeremias judges the parable to be authentic on these grounds. But Scholz comments that these factors do not necessarily point to the historical Jesus (ibid.). Yet in the end Scholz does speak for the literary unity of the parable (ibid., 261).
15:1-32 meets the criteria of "dissimilarity" and "coherence" as described earlier. As has been shown throughout the dissertation, shock and outrage on the part of Jesus' contemporaries may well be one of the surest signs of authenticity. Also, one may acknowledge Luke's tendency to editorialize without rejecting the literary unity of the parable.\textsuperscript{200} The fact that the parable opens with the statement that two sons are involved indicates that the second half has its place.\textsuperscript{201} Jeremias adds that in addition to its basis in 15:11, the latter half is linguistically compatible with 15:12-24. It blends with the pattern of the whole story without allegorizing it or distorting it.\textsuperscript{202} Perrin supports this view when he states, "The second part of the parable is integral to the whole, and the characters in it are every bit as realistically conceived and presented as those in the first part".\textsuperscript{203} For these reasons, despite Schottroff's denial, terms like "double parable", "double-
edged" or "two-pointed" do seem applicable to Luke 15:11-32.

So the position taken here is in agreement with E. P. Sanders' judgment of the parable. When all factors are considered, one is not pressed to doubt the authenticity of "The Prodigal Son".205

Although the present scene of the parable may be more literary than historical, the Ausgangssituation certainly relates to Jesus' association with toll collectors and sinners.206 As Meyer affirms, the parable probably served as a "counter-attack" against those who rejected his identification with the outcasts of his day.207 So just as "The Laborers in the Vineyard" can be viewed in the context of Jesus' table-fellowship with sinners, Luke appears correct


205 Sanders, Jesus, 386 (n. 24).

206 Völkel argues for the literary nature of Luke's setting by noting that the toll collectors and sinners are described as coming to hear Jesus rather than to eat with him as traditionally reported (cf. 15:1) "Zöllner und Sünder", 8.

207 Aims, 138. A. M. Hunter seeks to hold together the literary and the historic aspects of the story by stating, "Yet its artistry should not make us forget that it originated in Jesus' 'warfare' with the Pharisees" (Parables, 61). Yet as expressed previously, to reduce the message of the parable to "antiphariosism" is to miss the point.
in locating "The Prodigal Son" within this setting as well.\textsuperscript{208}

If indeed the parable was spoken in this particular milieu, then it too would serve as an explication of Jesus' identification with the outcasts of his day. By arguing in ways that must have seemed "profane" to the learned, Jesus associated these words with his fellowship with sinners. Thus the parable reflects Jesus' understanding of God as it was demonstrated in his acceptance of sinners. In by-passing the complexities of a formal exposition of the Scriptures, Jesus' hearers are immediately confronted with the following decision. Has he correctly understood the Father or not?\textsuperscript{209}

The answer to this question quite naturally addresses the subject of interpretation. Via rejects any attempts at allegorizing, but must concede that the prodigal more than likely represents the toll collectors and sinners while the elder son is indicative of all who condemn Jesus' table-fellowship with them.\textsuperscript{210} Also the compassion of the father

\textsuperscript{208}Cf. Linnemann, \textit{Parables}, 73; Borg, \textit{Conflict}, 92; Fiedler, \textit{Sünder}, 159.

\textsuperscript{209}Fiedler, \textit{Sünder}, 155. As Via explains, "Yet he wanted his conduct to be understood as explaining the will of God. The father in the parable then, points subsidiarily both to Jesus' historical conduct and to the nature of God" (\textit{Parables}, 173).

\textsuperscript{210}Via, \textit{Parables}, 164. Similarly, E. P. Sanders claims that "The Lost Sheep", "The Lost Coin" and "The Lost Son" all correspond to the toll collectors and sinners (\textit{Jesus}, 179).
for his son coupled with the phrase "he was lost and is found" (Luke 15:24, 32) would have been perceived by Jesus' hearers as a strong allusion to God and his desire to save humankind.\textsuperscript{211}

Having established these points, a good number of analyses of Luke 15:11-32 generally fall into one of two camps. That is, either they concentrate on the dialectic between law and grace, or stress the role of repentance in the parable. For example, Jeremias once again casts the argument in terms of the gospel and legalism. He views the saying as an "apologetic parable" which Jesus used to combat the criticism of the scribes and the Pharisees.\textsuperscript{212} Jeremias sees it as a rebuke of their narrow-minded legalism which supposedly resents God's love for "repentant sinners".\textsuperscript{213} He summarizes his position when he states,

\begin{quote}
It was meant as an appeal to their conscience; Jesus says to them: See the greatness of God's love for his lost children, and contrast it with your own joyless,
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{211} Breech, \textit{Silence}, 185. Cf. also Linnemann, \textit{Parables}, (n.1) 73.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Jeremias states, "The parable was addressed to men who were like the elder brother, men who were offended at the gospel" (\textit{Parables}, 105, cf. also 106).
\item \textsuperscript{213} Jeremias, \textit{Rediscovering}, 104. For a similar line of argument see Manson, \textit{Matthew and Luke}, 290 and Farmer, "Historical Essay", 116. The latter basically represents the legalism of Pharisees as a foil for the grace of the gospel.
\end{itemize}
loveless, unthankful, and self-righteous lives.\textsuperscript{214}

Jeremias is also numbered among those who view the parable as extolling the virtues of repentance. He claims that out of all the parables, "The Prodigal Son" is the clearest expression of repentance.\textsuperscript{215} Similarly, Hunter believes that a major purpose of the parable is to give insight into what he calls "the anatomy of repentance".\textsuperscript{216}

And finally Völkel states that the extraordinary emphasis on repentance here is due to Luke's role in shaping the parable. Luke chose to concentrate on the concept of μετάνοια as opposed to God's provision of a right relationship.\textsuperscript{217}

In response to the view that the major purpose of the parable is to attack the legalism of the Pharisees, little needs to be said here. The thought that the Pharisees were disturbed by the repentance of sinners has been shown to be

\textsuperscript{214}Rediscovering, 104. C. H. Dodd also emphasizes the "ill will" and "self-righteousness" of the scribes and Pharisees (Parables, 93).

\textsuperscript{215}He states that the Greek phrase εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἔλθὼν (Luke 15:17) probably reflects the Aramaic ḫâdâr beh which means that the younger son fully acknowledged his guilt (Luke 15:18) (Proclamation, 152-53).

\textsuperscript{216}Parables, 61.

untenable. No doubt they were disturbed, but not by the fact that the sinners have repented, been forgiven and received the grace of God. As Linnemann explains, their shock and confusion are due to the fact that Jesus' conduct defies classification. His identification with sinners in the name of God "disturbs the order" which invariably condemns sin and mandates separation from it. So in this sense the elder son has rightly interpreted the situation. The father has indeed violated "the rules" that make sense out of life and family relationships. From this perspective the judgment of the elder son is totally in order; it is completely understandable. But Jesus' point is that an extraordinary case is at hand which transcends the ordinary rules and makes way for new understandings of God and the world. Through the speaking of this parable in the context of his fellowship with sinners, Jesus forcefully appealed for a new understanding of God, an understanding to

218 Cf. above 145-49. As discussed previously the theological agenda of Jesus transcends both the influence of and the immediate concerns of Pharisaism. As E. P. Sanders states, "The parables are about God, who seeks and saves sinners, not primarily about elder sons who resent them" (Jesus, 281).

219 Parables, 74.

220 Ibid. Cf. also Fiedler, Sünder, 160.

221 Perrin, Rediscovering, 97.

222 Fiedler, Sünder, 161.

223 Via, Parables, 171-72.
be received by all. Hence the father goes out and expresses his love and concern for both sons. The overall impact of Jesus' conduct and words is inclusive. Thus far from simply chastising his opponents, they are invited to join in the joyous fellowship of the father as well. As Hunter rightly notes in this instance, the implicit rebuke contained in the parable quickly transforms into an appeal, i.e. "the appeal of love for love".

It becomes clear, then, that the emphasis on repentance is equally misplaced. Although the words of the younger son initially appear to support the thesis that repentance is of central importance (cf. 15:17-19, 20), exactly the opposite is true. Jüngel takes a step in the right direction when he asserts that the love of the father "heard" the son prior to his repentance. But again, the

---

224 But for a classic example of an existentialist interpretation which focuses upon the self rather than on God see Scholz, Gleichnisaussage und Existenzstruktur, 267. Scholz claims that the main purpose of the parable is to reveal a false understanding of the self (as seen in the older son) and to present a proper understanding of the self (as seen in the younger son) (ibid.). Scholz's hermeneutic is evident in his trifold repetition of the phrase, "Ich finde meine Identität..." (ibid., 268).

225 Weder, Gleichnisse, 259; Via, Parables, 171; Manson, Matthew and Luke, 289.

226 Parables, 63.

power demonstrated here is not in saying, or hearing, but in doing. As Bailey clearly notes, "The father's acts replace speech". 228 The father's uninhibited love for his son motivates him to run forth and receive him prior to his confession. 229 In this sense the love and acceptance of the father actually prevents the son from repenting and carrying through with his plans for restitution and acts of contri-
tion. 230 As Via so clearly states, The acceptance is not based on any conditions, proba-
tion, or proofs of repentance. In fact repentance finally turns out to be the capacity to forego pride and accept graciousness. 231

In conclusion, Jesus is seen to demonstrate and explain a situation which reveals God and his love in a unique and decisive way. 232 In the light of his table-
fellowship with sinners, this parable once again communicates the unbroken love of God for all of his children, even

---

228 Bailey, Peasant and Poet, 182. It has often been noted that it was considered to be undignified for an aged oriental to run in public (cf. Linnemann, Parables, 77; Bailey, Peasant and Poet, 181; Jeremias, Rediscovering, 102).

229 As Manson comments, "...God loves the sinner while he is still a sinner, before he repents; and that somehow it is this Divine love that makes the sinner's repentance possible. This is the true point of the parable" (Matthew and Luke, 286).

230 Linnemann, Parables, 77. As Breech comments, "His actions pre-empt all of the younger son's expectations and calculations" (Silence, 197).

231 Parables, 171.

232 Fiedler, Sünder, 168.
when they are in a state of sin and waywardness. At the risk of appearing to "cheapen" forgiveness, Jesus rejects the thought that God's grace needs to be "protected" by preconditions and signs of restitution. The only precondition required of the outcasts is die Voraussetzung der Offenheit or "the precondition of openness". His openness to outsiders demonstrated God's offer of grace, mercy and love; now they must only reciprocate in being open to his gracious offer.

D. Summary of Results.

By consistently focusing on the genuinely theological significance of Jesus' deeds and words the following was accomplished. It was suggested that in the light of the religious, social and political contexts, Jesus possessed a distinctive understanding of God. His was a God full of love, mercy and grace toward all his creatures and one who took the initiative to accomplish reconciliation with human-kind, regardless of their moral and religious status in life.

It was proposed that such an understanding of God was most graphically portrayed in Jesus' table-fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. It was found that the toll

---

233 Ibid., 157-59.
234 Ibid., 168.
235 Ibid.
collectors were not ostracized because of impurity, or their supposed support of the Romans, but because they were extortioners and thieves. Similarly, "the sinners" are not the am ha-arets or "people of the land". Rather, they were genuinely immoral persons who had flagrantly broken the law of God. From this perspective, the theological concerns of Jesus went beyond the influence and the particular interests of the Pharisees. Thus it was concluded that the theological agenda of Jesus could not be reduced to "anti-pharisaism".

Therefore the offensiveness of his conduct lies in the fact that in the name of God Jesus joined the seemingly incongruous: the righteous and holy God with immoral sinners. In so doing he implied that God, in his love, mercy and grace, willingly provided ein Vertrauensvorschuss which paved the way for reconciliation. Such a provision effectively by-passed the traditional signs of repentance and restitution as prescribed by the law and the temple. All that was required of the outcast is an openness to the grace of God accompanied by die Antwort der Liebe.

In view of such an understanding of God, holiness and righteousness take on new meanings. God in his holiness invades the domain of sin and reclaims what is his. In his righteousness he provides what is needed to save the lost. Such a theology tended to break down the traditional categories which distinguish the righteous from the unrighteous.
and the clean from the unclean. Jesus' acceptance of the outcast means that God does not always have to operate within the confines of Torah and temple. God can express his grace apart from, but not necessarily antithetical to these institutions. And it is to this extent that the total adequacy of the Mosaic dispensation to meet all occasions and circumstances is called into question. To a degree, the Torah and temple became relativized.

In contrast to Jüngel's approach, the words of Jesus were shown to be an explication of his fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. The parables of "The Laborers in the Vineyard" (Matt 20:1-16) and "The Prodigal Son" (Luke 15:11-32) were judged to function in this very way. They interpret Jesus' conduct as reflecting the understanding of God as described above.

Having said this, the discussion has arrived at a pivotal point. The crucial question at this juncture is whether Jesus' distinctive understanding of God influenced the earliest Christian believers, Paul in particular. The validity of the question is ensured by the fact that the earliest Christians understood themselves as part of a movement that originated with the historical Jesus. As E. P. Sanders proposes,

Further, I think — and this is far more important

---

236 Farmer, Jesus, 48.
than *a priori* suppositions - - that the evidence shows that there was a causal connection: that there is substantial coherence between what Jesus had in mind, how he saw his relationship to his nation and his people's religion, the reason for his death, and the beginning of the Christian movement.²³⁷

Any answer to the question would have to meet the following criteria in order to be considered valid. Firstly, the "causal connection" or "substantial coherence" between the historical Jesus and the early Christian movement should meet the criterion of dissimilarity. As Noack comments, "It must be found in a view and an attitude which would be understood by Jews yet in some way oppose Jewish concepts and beliefs."²³⁸ And secondly, it must give some explanation of how a religious movement originally directed to Jews quickly evolved into one that readily incorporated the Gentiles.²³⁹ It is the position of this dissertation that Jesus' openness to outsiders meets both of these criteria. Just as his understanding of the Father caused him to act and speak in ways that obliterated the distinction between the righteous and unrighteous in Israel, so too the early Christians, and especially Paul, acted and spoke in ways that destroyed the distinction between Jews and Gentiles.

²³⁷ Jesus, 22. As G. Ebeling asserts, "For it is undeniable that a historic connection exists between Jesus and the primitive church" (*Word and Faith*, 301).

²³⁸ "Teste Paulo", 14.

²³⁹ As E. P. Sanders comments, "But the overwhelming impression is that Jesus started a movement which came to see the Gentile mission as a logical extension of this" (*Jesus, 220*). Cf. also Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 55.
As Nils Dahl states,

As Jesus' work destroyed the significance of the distinction between sinners and the righteousness in Israel, so Paul's fidelity to the truth of the gospel had to forbid discrimination within the church between Jews and Gentiles.

Such an understanding of God and his people was most clearly demonstrated in the life, experiences and ministry of the Apostle Paul. The theology of Jesus as evidenced in his fellowship with toll collectors and sinners became realized in Paul's ministry to the Gentiles and articulated in his doctrine that God justifies the ungodly (Rom 4:5). It is to this subject that I now turn.


241 Again Dahl comments, "Jesus speaks rarely, if ever, of justification. But if we think of his beatitudes of the poor, his miraculous help to the disturbed and his solidarity with outcasts, we can be sure that his work was a 'justification of the ungodly'" (Ibid., 115).
CHAPTER V

THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT AND REALIZATION OF THE THEOLOGY OF JESUS IN THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN HELLENISTS AND PAUL

A. Introduction: Examining the Plausibility and the Possible Contours of a "Causal Link" Between the Earthly Jesus and His First Followers.

The purpose of this chapter is to further examine that "substantial coherence" which Sanders proposed existed between the thought of Jesus and the birth of the Christian movement. In particular it will be posited that the early Christian Hellenists played a significant role in what Sanders calls the "causal connection" between the earthly Jesus and his first followers. The theory being proposed is that the theology of Jesus as reflected in his table-fellowship with toll collectors and sinners may well explain why some Christian Hellenists felt free to evangelize the Gentiles without first requiring them to become Jews (i.e.

---

1 See above chap. 4 (n.227) 180. Cf. also Sanders, Jesus, 231. Scroggs argues that from a sociological point of view, the principle of continuity is inherent (cf. his "Earliest Christian Communities", 8). Farmer presupposes continuity and describes such a presupposition as a "common sense assumption" ("Historical Essay", 108).

2 Again see above chap. 4 (n.237) 180. See also Hengel's comments on the "connecting links" in his Between Jesus and Paul, xi.
submit to the law and circumcision). It will be argued that in due course, this *imitatio Dei* not only served as the basis of the new movement, but also profoundly influenced the life and ministry of the Apostle Paul. So as in the case of Blank, the Hellenists will be viewed as a possible *wirkungsgeschichtliche Bindeglied* joining the historical Jesus and the Apostle Paul.

Therefore it will be suggested that just as the opposition to Jesus cannot be traced to any explicit rejection of the law and the temple, the persecution of the Hellenists is not to be attributed to their repudiation of these institutions either. Rather, just as Jesus shocked many of his contemporaries by accepting toll collectors and sinners in the name of God, the Hellenists drew severe criticism and even violent persecution because they offered

---

3 These words reflect a key theme of this chapter. That is, the theological principles set forth in the deeds and words of Jesus were adopted and eventually extended to those beyond the pale of Israel. As Theissen states, "The Jesus movement found doors opened to them in the Hellenistic cities because they could offer prospects of a resolution of the tensions between Jews and Gentiles: theirs was a universal Judaism, which was *open to outsiders*" (*First Followers*, 58; italics mine). The emphasis here also underscores a major premise of the dissertation, i.e., the theology of Jesus, the Hellenists and Paul is characterized by what might be called an "openness to outsiders".

4 Or as Borg states, "Based like the Pharisaic program on an *imitatio Dei*, Jesus' paradigm pointed to a different aspect of God for primary emulation and thus to a different historical course for the people of God" (*Conflict*, 134).

5 See above chap. 2, p. 35.
the Gentiles a full share in the kingdom. By developing and expanding upon this "openness to outsiders" which was so evident in the deeds and words of Jesus, they had called into question the traditional equation, "The Nation of Israel = The People of God". The dissertation will go on to explore the theory that this was the real reason why Paul persecuted the Hellenists. Again it will be argued that Paul did not oppose the Hellenists because they rejected the law and the temple, or even because they believed in a crucified Messiah. Rather, this dissertation will suggest that the Acts account of the Hellenists contains no explicit rejection of the law or temple. Also while belief in a crucified Messiah may have been offensive and even incompre-

---

6 Admittedly a certain reading between the lines is necessary here, but it would seem reasonable to assume that Paul knew something about those whom he persecuted. As G. Lyons states, "That he was once a persecutor of Christians implies a measure of natural acquaintance with the facts of the gospel as a reason for his radical rejection of it (see 2 Cor 5:16)" ["Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding", (SBLDS 73, Atlanta: Scholars, 1985) 160]. Cf. also Blank, Paulus und Jesus, 244-47.

7 This position contrasts with A. Hultgren's point that the Hellenists were persecuted because they confessed Jesus as Messiah and because they were "a heterodox movement within Judaism" that must be brought back into line with "normative Judaism" ["Paul's Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale and Nature", JBL 95 (1976) 97-11, esp. 101-02; cf. also Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, xiii, esp. (n. 73) 178 and Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, 22-26]. However, the fact that belief in a crucified Messiah was a central doctrine of the "Hebrews", yet they escaped the persecution, suggests that this was not sufficient ground for Paul's violent reaction against the Hellenists [cf. E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 267].
hensible to some, it was no crime. For these reasons the cause of Paul's violent reaction against the Hellenists will be sought elsewhere. Specifically, it will be proposed that Paul vehemently rejected the view that God received sinners and that he could not bring himself to accept the inevitable consequences of such a view. He violently opposed any movement which ignored the distinction between Jews and Gentiles and which proclaimed that the Gentiles could become the people of God without first becoming Jews.

From this perspective, Paul's Damascus road experience takes on a special hermeneutical function. That is, it helps to explain how Paul came to accept an understanding of God which he rejected so violently at first. It will be suggested that Paul's experience on the Damascus road, and his eventual joining of those whom he persecuted, is to be interpreted in the light of the theology of Jesus and the Hellenists. Paul experienced the love and acceptance of God in a state of ungodliness; he was granted mercy without asking for it; he received grace while yet a sinner.

From this point on it will be argued that such a realization of God's grace in this particular context had far-reaching consequences for Paul and the church. Paul experienced a theological revolution in the most literal sense. He came to accept that Jesus had correctly interpreted God and that he too must seek to realize the grace of God in the lives of sinners, the ungodly and the outcasts of
his day. And as implied above, the role of the Hellenists and Paul's contact with them tended to dictate the route he was to take in actualizing this calling. He too would serve the God who justifies the ungodly by bringing the gospel to the Gentiles, accepting them as they were without first requiring them to become Jews.

And finally, it will be proposed that such an understanding of God came to be the lens through which Paul interpreted the entirety of Christian experience. For example, with regard to himself, the magnitude of God's grace is accentuated by his own sense of unworthiness and sin (1 Cor 15:8-11; 2 Cor 12:11). With reference to his hermeneutic, Paul was totally committed to the belief that God justifies the ungodly (Rom 4:5, 5:8, 11:32). With respect to the church, God's unconditional acceptance of the outcasts and sinners mandated a spirit of mutual acceptance and egalitarianism. The themes of divine impartiality and equality now become a central feature of Paul's ecclesiology (Rom 2:11, 10:12; Gal 2:11-15, 3:28). And lastly, Paul came

8Again the nature of the sources requires that to some extent the thesis remain hypothetical. As Schoeps notes, the question of what constituted the "common theology" of the earliest Christian community is an extremely complex one. He adds that the nature of the sources prohibit any definitive answer (Paul, 59). Yet just as Vermes argues that the number of similarities existing between Jesus and Manîna rules out the possibility of pure chance, it is suggested here that the similarities existing between Jesus and Paul are also not due to mere coincidence (cf. Vermes, Jesus the Jew, 78).
to view reconciliation as the essence of Christian ministry (2 Cor 5:18-20). Each of these elements will be considered in turn, but for now the experience, conduct and mission of the early Christian Hellenists will be the focus of study.

B. The Impact of the Theology of Jesus upon the Experience, Conduct and Mission of the Early Christian Hellenists.


The sudden appearance of two distinct groups in the Jerusalem congregation may indicate that Luke is working from a source. Also the presence of non-Lucan themes and vocabulary suggests the same. Even though scholars are divided on the exact origin and nature of the source, they generally agree that a "kernel" of truth is contained there-


10 Luke usually emphasizes the growth and harmony of the Christian community. The fact that there is no mention of the size of the congregation, but there is mention of a significant conflict among its members, may reflect a non-Lucan source (cf. Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 4 and Haenchen, Acts, 84). With regard to vocabulary, words like Ἑλληνιστής, Ἑβραῖος, γόνυσμος, παραθεωρέω, and καθημερινός are also not typically Lucan (Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 4).
So Francis Watson's view that Acts gives us virtually no reliable information on how the Gentile mission got started is somewhat overstated. Here one can at least surmise that two distinct groups existed side by side at a very early stage in the church and that there was some type of discord between them.

For a synopsis of the various sources which Luke may have used in the composition of Acts, see Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) xxxviii-xl. Conzelmann conjectures that Luke used three major sources in the composition of Acts, i.e. a Jerusalem source about the apostles, a "Hellenistic" collection about Stephen and "The Seven" and a collection of stories about the conversion of Paul. He proposes that the rest of Acts consists of various reports of Paul's journeys which have been formed into a "travel narrative" (ibid.). Concerning Acts 6:1-6, Walter agrees that the source has been influenced by the Hellenistic Jewish sector of the church which eventually found its center in Antioch ("Apostelgeschichte 6:1 und die Anfänge der Urgemeinde in Jerusalem", *NTS* 29 (1983) 370-93). In developing his theory concerning Lucan sources, J. Jervell draws upon what he terms the "double-facetedness" of Luke. He posits that Luke had two sources at his disposal: one from Jerusalem about Peter and one from Antioch about the Hellenists [The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984, 22). But Räisänen argues that since Luke has little information on how the church was founded in Antioch, an Antiochene source is doubtful (*Torah*, 244-45). In summary, Haenchen no doubt is correct when he states that Luke did not have any complete source to work from and had to "fill in the gaps" in order to make a sensible narrative. Lucan theology determined how the events were arranged (Haenchen, *Acts*, 83).


Räisänen, *Torah*, 245. Conzelmann relates the distinctiveness of the two groups with the issue of persecution. Assuming that only the Hellenists were persecuted, he states, "Apparently there was a twofold organization, and this must have been recognizable even to outsiders; otherwise the persecution could not have been limited to the Hellenists" (*Acts*, 44). But again Watson takes a critical stance in this regard. He states that Luke's tendency to emphasize the centrality of Jerusalem and the apparent
Nevertheless, in order to speculate in an intelligent manner about the theology of the Hellenists and any possible connections they may have had with the historical Jesus, it will be necessary to give a more precise description of them. Only then can one offer legitimate theories concerning issues such as the value of Stephen’s speech, the question of why the Hellenists were persecuted and the nature of the early Christian mission to Gentiles. It is to these subjects that I now turn.

2. The "Hellenists": The First to Receive Gentiles into the Church.

H. Windisch gives a clear and relatively concise treatment of the controversy surrounding the identification of the Hellenists. The major possibilities outlined here are as follows. First, one must determine whether the word *'Ελληνιστής as mentioned in Acts 6:1 and 9:29 refers to Gentiles, or to Jews of the Diaspora who spoke Greek rather than Hebrew.

...Continued...

conflict of Luke's account with Gal 1:22 casts doubt on the reliability of Acts 6:1 ff. (cf. Paul, 26-27). Although G. Lüdemann presupposes that some knowledge of the early Christian community is recoverable from Acts 6, he argues that the account of the neglect of the widows is in toto redaktionell [Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) 81]. He states that this Lucan composition is designed to conceal the fact that the Hellenists and Hebrews are sharply divided over the status of the law and the temple (ibid., 84).

14 Windisch, "'Ελληνιστής", 504-16.
than Aramaic or Hebrew. Secondly, if the term refers to Greek speaking Jews of the Diaspora, is the distinction purely linguistic in nature or are there cultural, philosophical and theological differences as well?

In addressing the first issue, the fact that each of "the Seven" in Acts 6:5 have Greek names leads some to conclude that Gentiles are being spoken of here. Also since the word *Ελληνιστής is contrasted with *Ιουδαίος in Acts 11:20, one might again conclude that the term refers to Gentiles. However this position contains several difficulties. As Moule notes, since there is no evidence that there were Gentile converts in the church at this early date, one would practically have to rewrite the book of Acts if the term means "Gentiles". Furthermore, the fact that "Nicolaus" is specifically described as a "proselyte" indicates that something other than Gentiles is being spoken of here. And if the *Ελληνισταί of Acts 6:1 are actually

\[\text{Ibid., 511. Cf. also Watson, } Paul, 27.\]
\[\text{Watson, } Paul, (n. 28) 186.\]
\[\text{C. F. D. Moule, } "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" Exp Tim 70 (1958/59) 102. Cf. also Wilson, } The Gentiles, 129.\]
\[\text{Wilson, } The Gentiles, 129. Although one could conceivably argue that they are all Gentiles and that Nicolaus had been converted to Judaism. Of course then one would have to explain the presence of uncircumcised Gentiles in the church at a very early stage in its development, why these Greeks only evangelized Jews and why such a controversy arose over the issue of circumcision later on if Gentiles had been accepted much earlier in Jerusalem.\]
Greeks, then why did they initially only preach to Jews when scattered as the result of persecution of Stephen (Acts 11:19)?

In response to these difficulties, it should be noted that the dominant view among scholars (both historically and in the present) is that Ἑλληνιστής refers to Greek speaking Jews of the Diaspora who came to settle in Palestine. In support of this view, Schürer notes that many Jews of the Diaspora returned to Palestine and established their own synagogues there. This historical phenomenon coincides with what is found in Acts 6:9 and 9:29.

Thus it appears that language played an important role in the development of distinct worshiping communities in Jerusalem. With regard to Christian Jews, Hengel

---

19 Ibid., 140-41.

20 Windisch, "Ἑλληνιστής", 511. As Räisänen states, "The Hellenists were Greek speaking Jews who had come to Jerusalem from the Diaspora and had been converted to the new faith" (Torah, 242). Cf. also Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 6-7 and Watson, Paul, 27.


22 Ibid. Moule notes that although early versions fail to distinguish between Ἑλληνιστής and Ἑλληνες, the Peshitta of Acts 9:29 has that Paul disputed with "those Jews who also knew Greek" ["Once More", (n. 4) 101].

23 Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, 19.
However, a practical fellowship in worship and not in external organization, held the Christian community together in its earliest days, the necessity and consistent holding of services in Greek led to the formation of a new 'second' community in Jerusalem.

So the term 'Ελληνιστής in Acts 6:1 does appear to refer to Greek speaking Jews of the Diaspora who settled in Palestine and came to accept the Gospel at a very early phase in the history of the church; perhaps as early as Pentecost.

With regard to the second issue mentioned above, i.e. whether the division between the Hebrews and the Hellenists was due to cultural, philosophical or theological factors, Hengel's view should be qualified. His insistence that 'Ελληνιστής exclusively refers to a linguistic distinction apart from any "syncretistic" connotations and that "Hellenistic syncretism" is a modern discovery which plays no role here, seems a bit overstated. The assumption that the Greek language of the Hellenists is reflective of a more...

---

24 *Between Jesus and Paul*, 14; cf. esp. p. 55.

25 Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 273. Cf. also Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul*, 3. One objection to this view is that Paul spoke Greek but refers to himself as 'Εβραῖος. Moule's response is that 'Ελληνιστής refers to those Jews who could only speak Greek, while 'Εβραῖος refers to one whose mother tongue was Hebrew, but could speak Greek as a second language ("Once More", 100-01).

26 Ibid., 9. Yet Hengel does state that Jesus' message was compatible with "the universalist Greek-speaking world" and with Greek thought, echoing what he calls "Greek gnomic wisdom" or "Cynic thought" [*Acts and the History of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 72].
cosmopolitan experience appears to be sound. That is, they spoke Greek because they had lived among the Gentiles and had to learn how to live among them while still maintaining their Jewish identity. Such an experience would to some degree ensure the incorporation of Hellenistic culture and thought. For example, in citing Philo (Migr. Abr. 87-93), Räisänen notes that in some instances Jews of the Diaspora sought to dispense with certain aspects of the Torah which were deemed to be most offensive to non-Jewish neighbors.

As A. J. M. Wedderburn remarks, Diaspora Jews had continual contact with non-Jews and had to develop "a certain modus vivendi" in order to survive in a Gentile environment ["Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", NTS 34 (1988) 168]. J. Stambaugh and David Balch note that this type of accommodation often involved more than language. Ideas of rank and authority often took on a Greek format and phraseology, even in the running of the synogogue. The rights of women were governed by Greek law rather than Jewish law, and the education of the children was influenced by the Greek gymnasium [The Social World of the First Christians (London: SPCK, 1986) 50-51]. Yet they are careful to add that despite these accommodations to the pagan world, the law, the synogogue and contact with Jerusalem reminded them of their distinctive heritage and identity (ibid.).

Moule, "Once More", 100-01; Windisch, "Ἐλληνιστής", 511.

Torah, 287. N. J. McElney notes that although circumcision was certainly the norm throughout the Diaspora, it was waived at times for political expediency and for medical reasons ["Conversion, Circumcision, and the Law", NTS 20 (1974) 319-41]. Stambaugh and Balch relate how Izates, king of Adiabene was not initially required to be circumcised for political reasons, but later had to submit to the rite (Social World, 47-48). And Räisänen is careful to state that such an "allegorizing" away of circumcision was by no means endorsed by the majority of Diaspora Jews. Even Philo supported the execution of those Jews who would waive the requirement of circumcision [Torah, (nn. 2-3) 287]. In an effort to explain Philo's animosity towards the allegorizers, Räisänen emphasizes the "cognitive dissonance" present in his thought. He comments that such ambivalence
Although this dissertation does not develop Räisänen's approach, i.e. that the "spiritualizing tendencies" of Diaspora Jews gave the Hellenists the liberty to accept uncircumcised Gentiles, Räisänen does appear correct in asserting that the experience of the Hellenists prepared them to receive Gentiles into the church. That is, their language provided a common medium of communication whereby enquiring Gentiles could learn more about the Jesus move-

...Continued...

towards the law and circumcision may have been present among the Hellenists as well, including Paul prior to his conversion (ibid., 288). Yet passages such as Phil 3:3-5, 2 Cor 11:22 and Rom 11:1-2 do not indicate that Paul the Pharisee was consciously discontented with Judaism [Cf. B. Gaventa, Paul's Conversion: A Critical Sifting of the Epistolary Evidence (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1978) 102]. As Wilson puts it, Paul was not a "budding schizophrenic or a dissatisfied legalist" (Gentiles, 170). Cf. also W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Law: Reflections on Pitfalls of Interpretation" in Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett (London: SPCK, 1982) 5 and P. H. Menoud, "Revelation and Tradition: The Influence of Paul's Conversion on his Theology", Interp. 7 (1973) 132.

Yet as will be discussed below, it is important to note that Räisänen does not believe that the Hellenists were bearers of law-critical Jesus tradition. However, he does insist that the "spiritualizing" tendencies of the Hellenists, together with the sense of "eschatological urgency" in Jesus' message, allowed the Hellenists to "allegorize" the requirement of circumcision (Torah, 286-87, 300).
So it would seem reasonable that the first contacts between Gentiles and Christians would take place within the Greek speaking sector of the church. Also it could be argued that the increased exposure of Diaspora Jews to Gentiles and their culture predisposed some Hellenists to be more open to Gentiles and their special concerns. And finally, rather than point to a lack of orthodoxy on the part of Diaspora Jews in an attempt to explain why they came to view Gentiles as the people of God, is not another explanation close at hand? Could it not be that the example

31. As E. M. Smallwood states, "One of the most striking characteristics of the Jew has always been his ability to preserve his national identity even after generations of residence among gentiles and to resist assimilation except in the superficial matter of language assimilation for everyday contacts" [The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian, a Study in Political Relations (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 123].

32. It should be emphasized that at this stage it would be premature to speak of an aggressive evangelization of the Gentiles. More than likely, as was the case with many cults of the day, interested persons would take the initiative in joining the cult after reading the testimonia and observing the worship services (Stambaugh and Balch, Social World, 43). Cf. also Wedderburn, "Jesus and Paul: Similarity and Continuity", 181 (n. 40).

33. Yet as has been argued throughout the paper, and as reiterated below, this was by no means characteristic of a majority of Diaspora Jews. The historical and political context of the day often led to an intensification of Jewish distinctives rather than a relaxation of these norms. As Kraft rightly notes, even though Diaspora Jews may have made accommodations in language and culture for the purpose of living in a pagan society, it was their religion which maintained their distinctive identity as a people (Die Entstehung des Christentums [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981] 226-27). Cf. also Smallwood, Jews, 123.
of the historical Jesus emboldened the Christian Hellenists to take the unprecedented step of welcoming uncircumcised Gentiles? That is, just as Jesus' extraordinary vision of God and his grace tended to break down the distinction between the righteous and unrighteous in Israel, the Hellenists were motivated by that vision to ignore the traditional distinctions which tended to separate Jews and Gentiles. It is suggested here that such a realization of the theology of Jesus, both in their understanding and experience, enabled the Hellenists to take the deliberate step of granting unconditional acceptance to the uncircumcised and to ultimately embark on an active mission to the Gentiles. Exactly when Gentiles began to seek entrance into the church cannot be determined with any certainty. Yet Räisänen speculates that if Hellenistic Jews and Gentiles were present on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-13), then the issue of uncircumcised Gentiles may have arisen as early as this. At any rate, he believes it likely that the Hellenists began admitting Gentiles at a very early stage, perhaps even during Stephen's lifetime. And as will be developed below, he

34 But Räisänen insists that the Hellenists were dependent upon the Hebrews for their understanding of Jesus (Torah, 287). Yet H. Kraft states that it is very likely that Hellenists were among the disciples of the earthly Jesus and that they could have been influenced by him at this time (Die Entstehung, 229, 241).

concedes that such a practice may have had a stake in Stephen's martyrdom. 36

Thus, in conclusion, it is suggested that the radical practice of the Hellenists was not primarily due to a rejection of the law and temple per se. Rather, just as Jesus' extraordinary emphasis upon the availability of God's grace and mercy to the undeserving tended to undermine the central importance of these institutions, the theology of the Hellenists did the same. 37 And just as Jesus' deliberate policy of identifying with sinners in the name of God drew the most severe criticism from his contemporaries, the Hellenists were willing to suffer for their belief that God accepted the Gentiles as they were without first becoming Jews. 38

36 Torah, 286, 300.

37 Cf. G. Theissen, "Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie urchristlicher Missionare", NTS 21 (1975) 192-221. It might be added at this point that in this context it is not possible to make a clear distinction between the law, the temple and Jewish dietary regulations. To promote an acceptance with God which makes the law relative to God's grace and mercy would in essence do the same to all related institutions and practices.

38 It seems plausible that the Hellenists may also have alienated themselves from the "Hebrews" on this score. Despite Luke's tendency to emphasize the theme of harmony and unity in the church (cf. Acts 2:1, 42-47, 4:32-37) there is evidence that all was not well (cf. n. 10 above). The fact that the Hellenists are mentioned in the context of being neglected (παραωρεόμενοι) lends support to this theory (cf. Walter, "Apostelgeschichte 6:1", 374-75; J. D. G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977] 269). If Theissen is correct in saying that the Hellenists contributed more than their fair share to the relief fund, yet it was their widows who were being neglected, then their sense of isolation would have been even more acute (First Followers, 57).
The theory being proposed is that this was a deliberate, theologically based practice originating with the historical Jesus and one that was promulgated by the first spiritual leaders of the Hellenistic community. It is to this subject that I now turn.


A central purpose of this section is to further build the case that the path the Hellenists took in initially receiving and ultimately evangelizing Gentiles was not due to an explicit rejection of the law and the temple. To that end it will be shown that if Stephen's speech has any relevance at all, it lies in what the speech does not say rather than in what it says.

---

39. From the subsequent activity of Stephen and Philip (see n. 69 below) it is clear that the function of "the Seven" was not simply "to organize the dole" as Moule puts it ("Once More", 100-01). Indeed, the coordination of relief efforts for needy widows does not merit the severe persecution brought against them and the community they represented (cf. Conzelmann, Acts, 44). As Dietzfelbinger rightly notes, the Seven minister as apostles performing signs and wonders and Philip is specifically called an evangelist (cf. Acts 21:8) (Berufung, 18; cf. also Räisänen, Torah, 244). It is very possible that Stephen and the Seven comprise a distinct and authoritative body of spiritual leaders who represent a community whose beliefs and experiences differ significantly from their Hebrew peers [F. F. Bruce, New Testament History (New York: Doubleday, 1971) 217-19]. Cf. also W. Simonis, Jesus von Nazareth: seine Botschaft vom Reich Gottes und der Glaube des Urgemeinde: historisch-kritische Erhellung der Ursprünge des Christentums (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985) 146].
than in the content of the speech itself. It will be argued that Luke's account of the speech contains no expressed repudiation of the law or the temple. Also the time-honored theory that the Hellenistic Jews of the Diaspora were generally less orthodox in their observance of the law than the Palestinian Jews is viewed as suspect. It will be argued that in the main there is no convincing evidence that the Hellenists felt free to dispense with the law, the temple and perhaps most importantly, circumcision, because of any inherent laxity on their part. In the place of these theories it will be suggested that the missionary strategy of the Hellenists as seen in Acts 11:19-20 reflects a theology and practice that was present at an earlier stage, if only in embryonic form. In other words, their acceptance of uncircumcised Gentiles as full members of the people of God represents the real reason for the persecution of Stephen and his followers. Furthermore as mentioned above, it will be argued that the theological motivation for such a radical step has its roots in the life and ministry of the historical Jesus. Once these points have been made, the significance of Paul's actions as a persecutor of the church and his call to evangelize the Gentiles can be dealt with in a coherent manner.
4. The Relevance of Stephen’s Speech.

Luke has connected the persecution of the Hellenists with the speech and martyrdom of Stephen. A common interpretation which seeks to unravel the significance of this connection is expressed by Dietzfelbinger. As noted above, Dietzfelbinger rightly supposes that Stephen is no loner, but a representative of the Hellenists in Jerusalem. But he goes on to say that the reason why the Hellenists were singled out for persecution and the Hebrews were left unscathed is because the latter remained true to the law and

---

40 The question of the authenticity of Stephen’s speech is of perennial debate among scholars. For a summary of the various views concerning the trustworthiness of the speech see Haenchen, *Acts*, 286. Haenchen himself posits that the speech is simply "sacred history" containing no particular theme and that Luke has taken over a "history-sermon" and adapted it to his purposes (ibid., 289). In the same vein, Conzelmann notes that the speech never actually addresses the charges that are levelled against Stephen (*Acts*, 57). He concludes that the speech is a Lucan insertion which serves the purpose of making the transition to the Gentile mission (ibid.). In making that transition, E. Richard states that Luke no doubt desires to convey the message that Judaism is not irrelevant to Christianity but serves as a source and inspiration for the new movement [*Acts 6:1-8:4, The Author’s Method of Composition* (Missoula: Scholars, 1978) 358]. On the other hand, even though Räisänen believes that Luke has composed the speech after Old Testament models, he claims that this does not mean the speech is devoid of all historical validity. But again see Räisänen’s comment in nn. 11 and 13 above.

41 *Berufung*, 20.
the temple while the former did not.\textsuperscript{42} It is often argued that the charges brought against Stephen in Acts 6:11, 13 and 14 and his resulting martyrdom demonstrate his repudiation of the law and the temple.\textsuperscript{43} Similarly, Hengel con-

\textsuperscript{42}Although this work will not develop the theory that Stephen and the Hellenists represented a thoroughgoing criticism of the law and the temple, it does endorse the view that only the Hellenists were persecuted at this early stage. As Wilson notes, a comparison of Acts 9:26 and 31 with 11:1-2 indicates that more than just the apostles were present in Jerusalem shortly after the outbreak of persecution (\textit{Gentiles}, 142). Similarly, Haenchen comments that by 9:31 the community is once again back in Jerusalem, but 11:19 f. still shows the victims of the persecution as dispersed throughout the area (Acts, 103). So Kraft no doubt is correct when he remarks that the phrase "except the apostles" actually means that part of the church identified with the leadership of the Twelve as contrasted with those associated with the Seven (Kraft, \textit{Die Entstehung}, 239).

Wilson speculates that this was Luke's way of maintaining the authority of the Jerusalem church as the headquarters of the new movement, an authority needed to give official sanction to the Gentile mission (\textit{Gentiles}, 138). Of course, as indicated earlier, the fact that the Hellenists could be singled out as the objects of persecution only tends to accentuate their distinctiveness with regard to the Hebrews (Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 180). For more along these lines see Bruce, \textit{The Book of Acts} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 162, esp. n. 8; Räisänen, \textit{Paul and the Law} (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983) 251; Hengel, \textit{Acts}, 74 and his \textit{Between Jesus and Paul}, 25; Dunn, \textit{Unity}, 274 and Conzelmann, \textit{Acts}, 61.

\textsuperscript{43}Jervell delineates the major points of this approach. He notes that even though Luke represents the accusations against Stephen as being false, they are nevertheless used as historical sources in constructing the argument (\textit{Unknown Paul}, 13-14). Hengel is also an excellent example of this school of thought. He states that, "We can conclude from this that the charges against Stephen which Luke mentions in Acts 6:11, 13 f. 'he does not cease to blaspheme against this holy place and the law', are not Luke's invention but repeat in abbreviated form the accusation of Pharisaic Jews against this Christian minority: they were persecuted because they dared to criticize the temple and the Torah, i.e. the two pillars on which Judaism rested" (\textit{Between Jesus and Paul}, 55, cf. also his comments on p.
tends that Stephen continued to develop the "eschatologically motivated" message of Jesus which was critical of the law and temple. That is, as Walter also notes, certain law-critical elements of the Jesus tradition were singled out by the Hellenists and used to substantiate their own estimate of the law and the temple.

As for the reasons why the Hellenists were inclined to think and act so, the following points are often made. The Hellenists are viewed as that portion of the Diaspora
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57). Cf. also Kim, Origin, 44.

44 Between Jesus and Paul, 25-26. Hengel admits that the exact nature of Stephen's criticism of the law cannot be determined but conjectures that it probably was along the lines of the antitheses of Matt 5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, and 43 or Mark 2:27 f., 7:15, 18 f. and 10:5 [ibid. (n.137) 151]. Nevertheless, he proposes that it was the pneumatic character of Stephen and the Hellenists which propelled them to stress the law-critical statements of Jesus and his implied criticism of the temple (ibid., 28. Cf. also his remarks in Charismatic Leader, 71). Hengel claims that their forced exile from Jerusalem only served to intensify their criticism of the temple and the ritual law (Acts, 73-75). But Räisänen counters Hengel here by maintaining that the future tense of ἄλλαςσω in Acts 6:14 does not simply refer to an eschatologically motivated interpretation, but to what he calls an "apocalyptic prophecy". Stephen is prophesying that Jesus will change the law of Moses at some time in the future, not that the law has changed (Torah, 263-66). Räisänen also argues that Peter is filled with the Spirit as well and that he too has pneumatic experiences. So the activity of the Spirit cannot be cited as the distinguishing mark of the Hellenists (ibid., 267-69).

45 Cf. Lüdemann, Apostelgeschichte, 91. In this regard Walter appeals to some of the same scriptures as Hengel in support of his view, i.e. the antitheses of Matt 5 and citations from Mark 2 (cf. Berufung, 19). Cf. also Walter, "Apostelgeschichte 6:1", 371, 377.
which exercised "liberalizing" tendencies with respect to the law in an effort to accommodate the pagan environment in which they lived. As Klausner asserts,

Detached Jews, not rooted in the soil and traditions of Palestine, spiritually rent asunder and suspended between Judaism and Hellenism, they were the very best material for a new religion, the first of which tendencies were: a definite depreciation of the ritual requirements in favor of the ethical; a definite exaltation of blind belief in a personality and in miraculous deeds at the expense of the study of the Torah; and along with this, an indifferent attitude toward political life and the political future of the nation, and a covert inclination to put a higher evaluation upon the individual than upon the nation and a stronger evaluation upon humanity than upon Jewish nationality.

This scenario appears plausible at first, but it is fraught with difficulties. A major defect has already been presented in chapter four above. That is, since Jesus was not critical of the law, this cannot serve as a starting point for an understanding of the Hellenists. In fact, as was the case with Jesus, Stephen's speech contains nothing which can be viewed as an explicit rejection of the law.

---


47 From Jesus to Paul, 276.


49 Cf. also Müller, "Rezeption", 183. As Wilson states, "If it was a dispute over the Law which led to Stephen's death, we must assume that the disagreement was greater than a mere squabbling over details. Stephen and the Hellenists must have challenged orthodox Judaism on a sensitive and fundamental point. When we turn to Stephen's speech we are disappointed, for there is no hint of an
On the contrary, Stephen is presented as speaking of the law as the "living oracles of God" and implying that his accusers are the ones who have broken the law (Acts 7:38, 53). The speech consistently presupposes the validity of the law.

For these reasons Räisänen and others suggest that Stephen's attack on the temple and its cult is the real reason behind his martyrdom and the persecution of the Hellenists. And if this be the case, it is futile to look for a connection between Jesus and Paul on this score. The temple issue may connect Jesus with Stephen, and the latter may have influenced the writing of Mark, Hebrews and the Epistle of Barnabas, but criticism of the temple is not to...

...Continued...

unorthodox or radical critique of the Law in it" (The Gentiles, 146). Cf. also Watson, Paul, 26.


Ibid., 186-87. Likewise Räisänen observes, "The conclusion must suffice that the Hellenists are unlikely candidates as transmitters of law-critical Jesus tradition apart from the love command which, in itself, need not imply any criticisms of the law at all" (Torah, 257). Räisänen notes that if anything, the Hellenists may have "domesticated" the love command of Jesus by not saying that one must love one's enemies (ibid.).

be found in the writings of Paul. So as far as Räisänen is concerned, the Hellenists do not form a link between Jesus and Paul.

With reference to the issue of the temple, the limitations of this argument are similar to the ones present in Stephen's alleged criticism of the law. Firstly, the meaning of Jesus' words about the temple in Mark 14:58 are notoriously uncertain, and his cleansing of the temple may actually have been an endorsement of the temple rather than a rejection of it. As Cullmann notes, Jesus' insistence that the temple be properly used was no crime. Also the thought that a new temple would be established in the messianic age is part and parcel with Jewish eschatology. So Jesus' words and deeds in this regard may well be described

---

53 Räisänen, Torah, 276-77. Yet Wedderburn suggests that the issue of the status of the temple and the admission of the Gentiles may be more closely related than Räisänen proposes. Wedderburn argues that Stephen may not have been guilty of speaking against the temple per se but against the restricted use of the temple. He suggests that the Hellenists may have welcomed Gentiles into their worship services and contended that they also had the right to worship in the temple as well ("Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 165-66).

54 Torah, 300.


56 Cf. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 162.
as symbolic, but they were hardly revolutionary. 57 Thus as in the case of the law, specifically focusing on Jesus' supposed rejection of the temple is to build on shaky ground. Also Räisänen himself concedes that Stephen's speech does not contain a vehement criticism of the temple. 58 All that is said is that the presence of God cannot be restricted to any one building; a message proclaimed by the prophets and one that must have been dear to all Jews of the Diaspora (Isa 66:1). 59 So Stephen is not guilty of speaking against the temple per se, but against an overestimation and abuse of the temple. 60 None of these points would merit the extreme measures brought against Stephen and the rest of the Hellenists.

And finally, as noted above, an underlying presuppo-

57 Ibid., 46-47. But R. Bauckham counters E. P. Sanders' position that Jesus' demonstration in the temple was a mere gesture intended to make a point, but not to lead to any concrete action ["Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple", in Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity by Members of the Ehrhardt Seminar of Manchester University (Cambridge: James Clark, 1988) 72, 86-87. Cf. also E. P. Sanders, Jesus, 70]. He interprets Jesus' action in the temple as set forth in Mark 11:15-16 as a clear rejection of the compulsory temple tax, exploitation of the poor and profiteering (ibid., 74-81). This in turn was viewed by the chief priests as a deliberate undermining of their "political-economic power base" which was designed to destabilize the "political-economic status quo" during the Passover season (ibid., 88-89).

58 Torah, 272-73.


sition for both of these arguments is that the Hellenists of the Diaspora were in some ways less orthodox than the Palestinian Jews.\footnote{Cf. nn. 46, 47 above.} This premise is used to explain why they sensed the freedom to neglect the law, the temple and eventually circumcision. Yet again such a view is surely an overstatement. Jervell is particularly insightful here. To claim that the Jews of Diaspora were inclined to be less observant would tend to undermine the very existence of the Diaspora as a phenomenon.\footnote{The Unknown Paul, 21.} After all, the very fact that the Hellenists of Acts 6 and 7 had returned to live in Palestine indicates a desire to maintain their Jewish heritage.\footnote{Also Kraft notes that the religious devotion of Diaspora Jews is evidenced by their willingness to travel to Jerusalem for the feasts of Passover, Tabernacles and Pentecost (Die Entstehung, 242).} Also it must not be forgotten that those who opposed Stephen and Paul were Hellenists as well (Acts 6:9, 9:29).\footnote{Scroggs, "Earliest Christian Communities", 204. Cf. also Wilson, Gentiles, 149.} And finally, as will be dealt with shortly, Paul was a Hellenist, yet he too persecuted the followers of Stephen and in turn was harried by Hellenists, not only in Jerusalem (Acts 9:29), but throughout the Mediterranean world (2 Cor 11:26; Acts 13:50, 14:2, 17:5, 18:12).

The sum of the matter to this point is as follows. The words and deeds of Jesus seem to contain no explicit
rejection of the law and the temple. Thus it appears unlikeli­
ly that Stephen and the Seven were bearers of law-
critical Jesus tradition, nor does it seem that they reject­
ed the temple in principle. All of these points seem to
indicate that the conflict surrounding Stephen and the Helle­
nists and the motivating factors behind their lives and
ministries lies elsewhere. The next section is devoted to
exploring alternative suggestions in this regard.

5. Acts 11:19-20 as Reflective of the Fundamental
Theology and Missionary Strategy of the
Hellenists.

The basic premise of this section is that the activi­
ty of the Hellenists in Acts 11:19-20 represents a further
development of the theology and practice of their fellows as
described above.65 It is suggested that rather than simply
admitting uncircumcised Gentiles into their fellowship, some

65 For a synopsis of opinions concerning the integrity
of the passage see Conzelmann, Acts, 87. Conzelmann himself
concludes that although Luke has extensively reworked the
material, 11:20 appears to be pre-Lucan (ibid.). Räisänen
theorizes that it would have been much easier for Luke to
have simply represented Barnabas as starting the church in
Antioch. Instead we have Barnabas being sent from Jerusalem
to visit an already existing church. So he too concludes
that Luke's words concerning the "anonymous refugees" appear
to be a well established portion of the early Christian
tradition (cf. Torah, 247-49).
Hellenists now actively began to evangelize them. Again it is maintained that such an openness to outsiders is traceable to the historical Jesus.

With regard to the context, Luke correctly joins 11:19 f. with 8:1 by use of the words ὅ...διεσπαρέντες, i.e. those who were scattered were actually members of the Stephenite group in Jerusalem. This is an important link for at least two reasons. First, it indicates that shortly after being driven from Jerusalem the Hellenists were the first to embark on a mission to the Gentiles. And secondly, it evidences a missionary strategy which might have been guided by theological presuppositions which could have been

---

66 It should be noted that the contrast between the phrases "only the Jews" in 11:19 and "to speak with the Greeks also" in 11:20 indicates more than a mere linguistic distinction. In this case, the context demands that Ἑλληνιστὴς be interpreted as "Gentiles" [cf. Haenchen, Acts, 365; Bruce, Acts (n. 16) 223].

67 Haenchen, Acts, 365. Räisänen questions whether the group in Antioch was identical with Stephen and the Seven, but concedes that they were definitely "like minded people" who were fleeing Jerusalem as a result of the persecution (Torah, 248-49).

68 A good number of contemporary scholars agree that it was neither Peter nor the church at Jerusalem which started the mission to the Gentiles. Rather, as has been argued to this point, the Hellenists are to be credited as the first to accept Gentiles as full members of the people of God (Räisänen, Torah, 284; Paul and the Law, 252-53; Theissen, First Followers, 9; Windisch,"Ἑλληνιστὴς", 510; Dunn, Unity, 268; Bruce, Acts, 120; and his New Testament History, 231).
present at an earlier stage. In fact, it is reasonable to assume that since Stephen's speech neither rejects the law nor the temple, the basis of his offense can be deciphered from the activities of the Hellenists in Antioch. The precise nature, meaning and consequences of the mission to the Gentiles in Antioch will now be the focus of the study.

6. The Theological Significance of the Waiving of Circumcision and Paul's Persecution of the Church.

The purpose of this section is twofold. First, it will continue to develop the theme of what may have motivated the Hellenists to drop the requirement of circumcision.

69 Haenchen remarks that the "anticlimactic tone" of 11:19-20 is due to the theologizing tendency of Luke. That is, Luke has purposefully played down the influence and evangelistic activity of those filled with the Spirit and wisdom (Acts 6:3) in order to present the Jerusalem apostolate (and Peter in particular) as the initiators of the Gentile mission (cf. Luke's use of the Cornelius incident in Acts 10:1-11:18) (Acts, 306). Even the presence of Peter and John at the reception of the Spirit by the Samaritans tends to "minimize" the significance of Philip's work (ibid.). Both the ministry to the Samaritans and the ambiguous status of the Ethiopian are used by Luke to pave the way for apostolic approval of the mission to the Gentiles (ibid., 314). Yet Conzelmann notes that the very fact that Peter is represented as visiting the converts of Philip reveals the priority and importance of the Hellenists [Geschichte des Urchristentums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 49]. If Peter would really have been the first to evangelize non-Jews, his name would not have been overshadowed by one of the Hellenists (ibid.). Furthermore, both Haenchen and Conzelmann believe that the story of the Ethiopian has its roots in the Hellenist community and in its original form recorded the conversion of the first Gentile (Haenchen, Acts, 315; Conzelmann, Acts, 67). Cf. also Räisänen, Torah (n. 4) 284. For more on whether the Ethiopian was a Gentile, a proselyte of Judaism or a "God-fearer" see Hengel, Acts, 79; Bruce, Acts, 75.
Second, it will seek to discover what theological themes can be read from Paul's persecution of the church. In order to accomplish these tasks, Haacker rightly states that one must enquire after the "theologische Begründung" of Paul's persecuting activity.

In addressing the issue of why the Hellenists waived the requirement of circumcision, Raisanen's remarks are again worth noting. Even though Raisanen looks to the temple as the real cause for the persecution of Stephen and the Hellenists, as noted earlier he claims that the Hellenists soon began to receive uncircumcised Gentiles as full...
members of the people of God. Once again he maintains that a "spiritualizing tendency", which was largely formed in the Diaspora, enabled the Hellenists to ignore the more "offensive" parts of the Torah. And as previously noted, he believes that Jesus may have prepared the Hellenists to take this step by emphasizing certain aspects of Jewish restoration theology. Nevertheless, Raisanen asserts that the influence of Jesus is to be understood more in the way of analogy than in the sense of direct dependence. This last point leads Raisanen to conclude that in the end "action

72 As Raisanen states, "The experience of the 'Hellenists' among non-Jews probably prepared them for the decision to give up those parts of the law which were most offensive to would-be converts" (Torah, 287). He concludes that the Hellenists came to view the "ritual" aspects of the Torah as adiaphoron (ibid., 300).

Although Raisanen does not promote the idea that circumcision was dropped for the sake of expediency, F. Watson does. Watson argues that since Jews were ridiculed for their religious practices (cf. 1 Macc 1:43-49; Philo, MIG., 86-93) the Gentiles in Antioch were exempt from circumcision, purity regulations, and the observance of the Sabbath and other feast days (Paul, 34). Similarly, Paul exempt the Gentiles from these requirements to ensure the success of his preaching and the furtherance of his mission to them (ibid., 35). Thus Watson concludes, "Paul's theological discussions about the law are therefore attempts to justify this essentially non-theological decision" (ibid., 36, italics mine). However, it is very doubtful if the pressure of "success" and such blatant pragmatism accounts for the actions of the Hellenists and Paul. As Smallwood reiterates, in the main the Jews remained uncompromising in their religion and practices, often creating an exclusiveness which bred unpopularity and in some cases outright anti-Semitism (Jews, 123).

73 Torah, 287. He cites Sanders, Jesus, 323 for support here.

74 Ibid., 287.
preceded theology" and that the dropping of circumcision should be described as "haphazard" involving no decisive theological step.75

Nevertheless, he concedes that the dropping of circumcision was more than likely the reason why Paul persecuted the Hellenists. Räisänen states that,

If Gal 1:15 f. is not mere hindsight, it was immediately clear to Paul that the encounter with Christ entailed for him a commission to proclaim the gospel among the Gentiles. This indicates that before the conversion experience, the Gentile question had constituted a crucial bone of contention between Paul and the Hellenists he had persecuted.76

He goes on to argue that since Gal 5:11 and 6:12 view circumcision as a means of avoiding persecution, a connection between the issue of circumcision and persecution did exist in the mind of Paul.77 So in addition to concluding that the Hellenists did indeed drop the requirement of

---

75 Ibid., 286. But again see his description of this practice as a "missionary strategy" (Paul and the Law, 254-55). The central premises of Räisänen's argument generally follow those set forth by Weiss. The latter proposed that the evangelization of the Gentiles came as a matter of course, involving no decisive theological step, and baptism eventually came to be viewed as a substitute for circumcision (Weiss, Earliest Christianity, 172-73). Wilson also claims that admitting uncircumcised Gentiles was due more to circumstance than to anything else. As the Hellenists moved beyond the boundaries of Palestine, Jews would become more scarce and Gentiles more plentiful (Gentiles, 152).

76 Torah, 282. Hultgren notes that the church at this stage was similar enough to Judaism to cause a representative of Judaism to take action ("Pre-Christian Persecutions", 97).

circumcision, he now surmises that this was more than likely the reason why Paul persecuted them.  

However in the end of the day, Räisänen emphatically maintains that even though circumcision may form a link between the Hellenists and Paul, it does not constitute a "bridge" between Jesus and Paul. The simple fact that Jesus was not concerned with the issue of circumcision as it relates to the incorporation of the Gentiles excludes the possibility of a link here.

In response to Räisänen's position, the alleged unorthodoxy of Diaspora Jews has been dealt with already. Also the historical and political contexts of the day were not at all conducive for such an "allegorizing" of circumcision. As set forth in the previous chapter, increasing Hellenization tended to threaten the national identity of the Jewish people. To counteract such tendencies, there was often an intensification of Jewish distinctives, not a relaxation of these norms. For example, Kraft notes that factors such as Caligula's enmity towards the Jews, certain

---

78 Ibid., esp. p. 285. Cf. also his Paul and the Law, 253. When commenting on Gal 1:12, 16; 2:2, Räisänen states, "Paul thus refers to a connection between his call vision and his work among the Gentiles. Presumably the Christians persecuted by him were already engaged in such a mission, which was an important reason for Paul persecuting them" ["Conversion", 406].

79 Torah, 300-01.

80 Cf. above pp. 202-03; esp. n. 47.
apocalyptic expectations about the coming of the messiah, the nature of the kingdom of God and especially what constituted the people of God, became burning issues among the Jews. All of these factors led to a revival of Jewish nationalism in which, for the vast majority of Jews, obedience to the law and circumcision was the litmus test for true Jewishness. In the main, being a Jew came to mean not being like a Gentile. So within this particular context, the idea that the Hellenists just "drifted" into a neglect of circumcision is hardly credible. Räisänen's description of this action as a "missionary strategy" admits as much. And finally, the fact that the Hellenists continued to accept uncircumcised Gentiles in the face of severe persecution indicates that more than mere practicality was involved here. Thus Dietzfelbinger is correct when he states,

Laut Apg 11:19-21 nahmen vertriebene Stephanusanhänger in Antiochien auch Griechen in die Gemeinde auf, ohne die Beschneidung, also den vorherigen Übertritt zum Judentum, zu verlangen, und dies war offenbar eine theologisch überlegte und verantwortete Entscheidung.

And with regard to this decisive theological step,

81 Die Entstehung, 262-63.
82 Ibid. Cf also Dunn's comments below, n. 181.
83 Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 163.
84 Cf. his Paul and the Law, 255.
85 Berufung, 139.
the words of Scroggs are well worth noting. He claims that reactionary elements and protest can explain the emergence of a sect, but cannot account for the continuance of the movement. He argues that more positive elements are needed to promote its ongoing existence. As discussed above, it is the central thesis of this work that Jesus' radical understanding of God and his grace serves this very purpose. As was the case with Jesus, so is it now with the Hellenists. The character of God is such that he seeks to pour forth his grace and love upon sinners, the ungodly, yes, even upon his enemies. Thus the theological significance of the Hellenists' conduct is rooted and grounded in the belief that God now accepts Gentile "sinners" as his people, and by his grace, transcends all barriers or requirements which could hinder reconciliation. This was a bold vision and a radical step which challenged the traditional equation "The Nation of Israel = The People of God". As Haenchen rightly states, "Renunciation of cir-

86 "Earliest Christian Communities", 16.

87 Both Hengel and Müller note that the Hellenists' reception of the Gentiles is in complete accord with Jesus' turning to "second rate and marginal groups" (Hengel, Acts, 75; Müller, "Rezeption", 166-67). Cf. also Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 175.

88 Bruce says that the Hellenists "dared to experiment" (Acts, 225). But this "experiment" clearly involved more than just giving it a go to see what happens. If the missionary strategy of the Hellenists is described as an experiment at all, it was based on a hypothesis of significant proportions, i.e. a new perception of the nature of God.
cumcision involved not merely 'a different missionary method' but a change of theological presuppositions which went right to the utmost depths'. "The utmost depths" can mean nothing other than the very nature of God, and by extension, the identity of the people of God. Therefore the reason why Paul reacted so violently to the Hellenists was not so much the dropping of circumcision itself, as if the issue was simply a matter of proper religious observance. Rather, Paul correctly interpreted the theological implications of their behavior. He perceived that the Hellenists were advocating an understanding of God which virtually obliterated the distinction between Jews and Gentiles. In so doing, the Hellenists struck at the very core of Israel's raison d'être at a very troubled time in her history. So from Paul's perspective, the problem with the Jesus movement

89 Acts, 366. As a case in point, Haenchen argues that since Barnabas is immediately associated with the Gentile mission, he may well have been among the δασπαρέντες (Acts 11:19 f.). He judges Barnabas as one who knew what he was doing, and one who would only waive circumcision based upon his own Christian insight (Ibid., 371).

90 Gager comments that competing views of the same ideology often lead to intense conflict [Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975) 82-83]. So Paul's opposition to the Hellenists is not a matter of doctrinal superiority or due to some type of religious snobbery as Gaventa proposes. On the contrary, the conflict addressed the essential components of their entire universe.

was not simply a matter of doctrine or interpretation. Rather, the god represented therein was a foreign god; one that ignored the traditional categories of righteousness, holiness, the condemnation of sinners and the affirmation of Israel as the distinct, unadulterated people of God. It was this understanding of God which was leading Jews to apostatize, and it was the apostates who were threatening the integrity of the nation. With the "zeal" of Phineas of old, he was convinced that the destruction of the Hellenists was pleasing to God and would ultimately promote the welfare of his people. Yet in the process of doing this very thing, he experienced the theology he sought to destroy. It is to this subject that I now turn.

92 Haacker argues that the word ζηλος in Gal 1:14 and Phil 3:6 underscores the theological motivation of Paul's persecution. He believes that the historical context of this word is traceable to Judas the Galilean, the Maccabees and perhaps ultimately to the actions of Phineas in Num 25:6-13. He also notes that the justification language of Gen 15:6 is joined with the zealousness of Phineas in Ps 106:30-31. And finally, he stresses that the rabbis consistently interpreted Num 25:13 to mean that the slaughter of the godless served as an atonement for the sins of Israel. His conclusion is that in the spirit of Phineas, Paul was convinced that the slaughter of the Hellenists would serve as a sacrifice, crediting him with righteousness and turning the wrath of God from Israel ("Berufung", 9-10, 14).
C. The Realization of the Theology of Jesus in the Life and Ministry of the Apostle Paul.

1. The Theological Significance of Paul's Calling.

At the very outset it should be stated that some rather fine distinctions must be made in order to avoid "ein beliebter Irrweg" as Bultmann puts it. Although Paul's conversion experience will be the focus of study, the approach taken will not follow the likes of Blank or Kim. It will be recalled that Blank's emphasis on the exalted Christ essentially breaks any connection with the historical Jesus. Kim's treatment does the same, yet adds that in some cognitive way, the entirety of Paul's gospel was communicated to him on the Damascus road. Again this proposal negates any link with the historical Jesus, and in the

---


94 For a review of how Paul's conversion has been treated since the beginning of this century cf. Luck, "Bekehrung", 187 f. For the debate on whether Paul's Damascus road experience should be understood as "conversion" or "calling" cf. Blank, Paulus, 214; Gaventa, "Conversion", 350; Wilson, Gentiles, 154. The position taken here is that Paul's experience was not so much a conversion from unbelief to belief, but a call to serve Jesus as an apostle to the Gentiles [cf. Haacker, "Berufung", 4; U. Wilckens, "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem" ZThK 56 (1959) 274; Wilson, Gentiles, 155; cf. esp. Räisänen, "Conversion", (n. 1) 416].

95 Blank, Paulus und Jesus, 184, 210.

96 Origin, 82, 97-98, 136, 193, 223, 274. Cf. also Dietzfelbinger, Berufung, 64.
interest of defending Paul's authority and independence, effectively isolates him from the early Christian community as well. Also as noted above, any attempts at giving a psychological explanation of Paul's calling are doomed to failure. There is no evidence that Paul was unsettled in his mind or dissatisfied with respect to the law.

Although this is certainly true, Gager warns against completely ignoring the psychological aspects of Paul's conversion. To do so would tend to isolate Paul's conversion experience from his total life context. He argues that Paul's persecution of the Hellenists constituted a "stress experience" accompanied by an "intense bond" with the Hellenists, albeit a negative one. All of this opens the door for a "transvaluation" of values which in turn creates the possibility of "postdecision dissonance" in the one converted. In an effort to alleviate the tension created by this dissonance, the new convert speaks negatively of the old value system. For Paul this would mean denigrating the role of the Jews and the law, while emphasizing the new status of the Gentiles and faith [J. G. Gager, "Some Notes on Paul's Conversion (Its Influence on His Theology)", NTS 27 (1981) 697-702]. Even though Gager's emphasis on the total life context and the bond Paul had with the Hellenists is a step in the right direction, the theological motives for his persecution of the church are ignored and the influence of the historical Jesus is not mentioned. Also his description of Paul's Damascus experience as "justification" (cf. esp. p. 702) is in need of correction. Paul's initial experience was that of grace; the subsequent formulation of that experience took many forms, justification by faith being one of them.

Cf. also Wilson, Gentiles, 154; Bruce, Acts, 183. Despite Gager's emphasis on the psychological factors in Paul's conversion, he is in full agreement here. He rejects any attempt at interpreting Romans 7 as evidence that Paul was struggling with the requirements of the law ("Some Notes", 698). Gager would agree with Dahl in stating that with reference to the standard of the law, Paul was "blameless" (cf. Phil 3:3-11; Gal 2:15-21). And with regard to the transvaluation of values, he would again find support from Dahl when Dahl states, "He rejected everything in which he had once hoped, he accepted a status equivalent to that of pagan sinners, in order to obtain a righteousness which was not his own but a gift from God" (Studies in Paul, 111).
In contrast to these analyses, this study will continue the method of examining *experiences and conduct* in an effort to extract the theological principles reflected therein. As Haacker rightly emphasizes, the unity of "Denkakt und Lebensakt" must be maintained in order to appreciate the overall context of Paul's experience and practice. Luck concurs and states, "Da aber Denkakt und Lebensakt, Religion und Theologie bei Paulus nicht zu trennen sind, gilt das auch für seine Existenz (vgl. 2 Kor. 6:8-10)".

---Continued...---

But G. Theissen argues that Rom 7:7-23 and Phil 3:4-6 represent the tremendous inner conflict that Paul experienced with regard to the law [*Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 234-35]. The Philippian passage represents Paul's conscious evaluation of his pre-Christian struggle with the law, while the Romans passage depicts the *unconscious* struggle that Paul experienced prior to his conversion (ibid., 235). Theissen maintains that, on an unconscious level, Paul sought a resolution of this conflict in two ways: through an over-identification with his own group (Gal 1:14; Phil 3:6) and the venting of his anger upon the Christians because of his own shortcomings (ibid., 238, 241).

99 This particular approach follows the pattern set forth by E. Best in his "The Revelation to Evangelize the Gentiles", *JTS* 35 (1984) 16. And with regard to the theological significance of Paul's experiences and the consequences thereof, Wilson argues that neither Luke nor Paul view the Damascus experience as "anthropocentric" but as "theocentric" (*Gentiles*, 155; italics mine).

100 *Berufung*, 2.

101 "Bekehrung", 193. In reference to Paul's Damascus road experience, Gager expresses the same idea when he posits that one must take into account two major phases in Paul's life; the antecedent and the *subsequent* (*Some Notes*, 698).
For these reasons, it is now suggested that what Paul experienced on the Damascus road was the very thing that he sought so vehemently to destroy as described in the previous section. He experienced what the outcasts and sinners experienced when they sat at table with Jesus. He experienced what the Hellenists were so attracted to and what the Gentiles experienced via the Hellenists. That is to say, in the midst of his violent persecution of the church, and his absolute rejection of the theology which motivated the Hellenists to receive Gentiles, Paul experienced the unmitigated grace of God.\textsuperscript{102} And considering the overall context of the experience, this was no ordinary grace, if one can speak of such a thing. But rather the experience conveyed a God who unconditionally offered his acceptance and one who, in his love, provided the basis for reconciliation irrespective of the moral condition of the recipient.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{102}Luck, "Bekehrung", 196; cf. also 193. With reference to this extraordinary reception of grace and Paul’s articulation of the significance of that experience, Haacker comments, "Der Sprachgebrauch des Paulus hat hier keine wirkliche Vorgeschichte in jüdischer oder christlicher Tradition, sondern ist das Ergebnis eigener Erfahrung und eigenen Nachdenkens" ("Berufung", 12).

\textsuperscript{103}As Dunn states, "To put it another way, it was his own experience of grace which made 'grace' a central and distinctive feature of his gospel — grace as not merely a way of understanding God as generous and forgiving, but grace as the experience of that unmerited and free acceptance embracing him, transforming him, enriching him, commissioning him (e.g. Rom 5:2, 17; 12:6; I Cor 1:4 f., 15:10; 2 Cor 9:14, 12:9; Gal 2:9; Eph 1:7 f., 3:7 f.)" (Unity, 190). Cf. also Edward Schillebeeckx, \textit{Christ: The Experience of Jesus as Lord} (New York: Seabury, 1980) 113.
Such an experience of grace mandated a fundamental change in Paul's perception of God, his understanding of what God required and his assessment of who constituted the people of God. For example, with regard to Paul's perception of God it could be said that this extraordinary reception of grace became the horizon for Paul's understanding of "the righteousness of God".104 "God's righteousness" now means that in the integrity of his character, God remains implicitly faithful to his creatures on the basis of his own goodness and love for them, and not based upon their ability to comply with certain religious observances or even upon one's own moral status at any given point in time.105 This in turn addresses the issue of what God requires of his people. In other words, just as Jesus' fresh vision of God and the manner in which he chose to actualize that vision, tended to transcend and thereby relativize the institutions

104J. R. Donahue comments that his analysis of "the righteousness of God" in Paul has once again impressed him with the "theocentric character of Paul's theology" ["A Neglected Factor in the Theology of Mark", JBL 101/4 (1982) 568].

105As Käsemann states, "To be justified means that the creator remains faithful to the creature, as the father remained faithful to the prodigal son, in spite of guilt, error and ungodliness,..." (Perspectives, 75). Considering the thesis of this dissertation, his mention of the "Prodigal Son" is most interesting. For more on δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as reflecting God's own character see Keck, Paul, 118, 121; Dahl, Studies, 128.
of his day, Paul’s reception and experience of that vision tended to do the same. And finally, the question of just how these experiences and principles were to be realized in life and ministry directly addresses the issue of who constituted the people of God. Such a theological revolution in Paul’s life meant that those early followers of Jesus had indeed correctly interpreted the person of God. And perhaps most importantly, it meant that God had chosen to impart the riches of his grace to the outcasts and sinners of this world. It also meant that God’s gracious provision of "rightness" to the unworthy effectively negated distinctions

---

106 Cf. Müller, "Rezeption", 185. But again, even though Müller sees a parallel between Jesus and Paul, the connecting link is not the influence of the historical Jesus, but the cross and resurrection. However, Paul’s view of the law cannot be solely derived from the cross and resurrection. The analysis of Deut 21:23 by Kim and Dietzfelbinger does nothing to alter this. As Räisänen states, "It is by no means obvious that the idea of a person bearing the curse of others should logically lead to the idea that the law which entailed the curse must be abolished, just as the destiny of the OT scapegoat did not lead to the idea of an abolition of the Torah" (Paul, 205).

107 A. Wire, Pauline Theology as an Understanding of God: The Explicit and the Implicit (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974) 262. It should be noted that in addition to persons who were genuinely immoral, Wire emphasizes that God chose to identify with those who "lack credentials" and are weak with regard to the power structures of this world (ibid.). Accordingly the central theme of Paul’s theology in her view is that God chooses to be a "weak one" who opts out of the "power game" (cf. Moxnes, Conflict, 290).
between the Jews and the Gentiles. And finally, on a personal or individual level, Paul came to understand that if he were to remain true to God as he now perceived him, he too must seek to realize God's grace in the lives of outcasts and sinners. The route he was to take in actualizing this calling was in some respects already determined by those whom he persecuted. From henceforth he too would serve the God who justifies the ungodly by bringing the gospel to the Gentiles, accepting them as they were without first requiring them to become Jews.

108 As has been argued to this point, E. P. Sanders suggests that a parallel exists between Jesus' acceptance of sinners into the kingdom and Paul's inclusion of Gentiles in the church. He also notes that the opposition that Jesus received at the hands of the religious establishment parallels the opposition to the Gentile mission that Paul received from "false brethren" (Gal 2:4) ("Jesus and Sinners", 30). My argument is that the nature of the parallelism is essential and not coincidental.

109 Gaventa, "Conversion", 108.

110 But Watson argues that one should not assume that Paul's conversion experience entails his calling to the Gentiles any more than the assumption that his entire theology is contained therein (Paul, 30). In contrast however, Räisänen asserts that the immediate context of Paul's persecuting activity does shed light on how he came to understand his apostolic calling (Paul and the Law, 253. Cf. also Müller, "Rezeption", 167 f.).

111 Dietzfelbinger notes that Paul consistently joins his Damascus experience with his call to be an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal 1:15, 1 Cor 9:1 f., 15:8-10; Rom 1:14-16) [Berufung, 137-38]. It should be noted that Räisänen also endorses the major points made in this section. That is, he agrees that Paul's Damascus experience forced him to admit that Gentiles were to be accepted without circumcision, and that the covenantal privileges were not restricted to Jews alone ("Conversion", 409).
2. Paul’s Experience and the Justification of the Ungodly.

This section continues the theme that the realization of God’s grace, both in Paul’s perception and personal experience, had a momentous impact upon how he came to interpret the entirety of Christian life. That is to say, that radical understanding of God as initiated by Jesus and further developed by the Hellenists came to be the lens through which Paul viewed himself, interpreted the Scriptures and defined the meaning of Christian community.

When discussing how Paul reflects upon his own calling, it should be noted that he consistently follows a twofold pattern. First, he acknowledges his own unworthiness by emphasizing that he wrongfully persecuted the church of God (Gal 1:13; Phil 3:6). Then, in the light of this particular life context, he accentuates the magnitude of God’s grace by asserting that God called such a one to serve him.

Perhaps the most striking example of this pattern is found in the Corinthian correspondence. In a spirit of extreme self-deprecation, Paul describes himself as the ἕκτρωμα, that is, "the abortion, miscarriage, or stillbirth" (I Cor 15:8). He views himself so because in direct

---

112 G. Fee claims that ἕκτρωμα communicates something "horrible" and "freakish" and does not simply address the temporal aspects of Paul’s calling [The First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 733]. For the thought that Paul may be borrowing one of "die Schimpfwörte"
opposition to what God was doing in the world, he ruthlessly persecuted the church of God (1 Cor 15:9). Nevertheless, in absolute contradistinction to what one might expect, God was gracious to such a one. So the sheer grace of God is expressed by Paul in the most radical terms. As Luck states, Paul's acceptance and calling was completely upheld by the grace of God just as if some premature birth had been miraculously sustained. The point being made is that just as the outcasts and sinners had experienced the love and acceptance of God through their encounter with Jesus, Paul had experienced the same on the Damascus road. And it is argued here that it was this shock of the unexpected, as experienced within the context of his persecution of the Hellenists, which enabled Paul to view God as one who justi-

...Continued...

of his opponents at Corinth see Christian Wolff, Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther; zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8-16 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982) 169.

113 Fee, Corinthians, 734. Kim rightly notes that in this instance Paul understood himself to be "ungodly" because in persecuting the people of God, he was in effect opposing God (Origin, 287). But again he confines the entire experience to what he calls the "Damascus Christo- phany" and makes no attempt at unpacking its meaning with respect to the life and ministry of the earthly Jesus (ibid).

fies the ungodly. 115

Leon Morris fully recognizes the "resounding paradox" expressed here. 116 Simply put, how is it that God can justify the ungodly, and yet still maintain the integrity of his character? 117 In an attempt to soften the starkly

115 Once again, the context of a particular experience tends to define the theological significance of that experience. As Schillebeeckx notes, Paul was not at all concerned with the intensity of his zeal, but became profoundly disturbed at how mistaken he was with respect to the object of his zeal, i.e. the church (Christ, 145). It is suggested here that this extraordinary juxtaposition of two inherently different experiences, that is, the horror of misguided zeal coupled with an overwhelming sense of God’s grace and love, caused Paul to reformulate his view of God and the people of God. Also if Haacker’s exposition of Gen 15:6; Num 25:6-13; and Ps 106:30-31 is on target (cf. n. 93 above), then Paul’s coordination of Gen 15:6 with Rom 4:5 contains noteworthy theological implications. The thought that God is pleased with the slaughter of the godless now becomes a gross misunderstanding of the person of God (Haacker, "Berufung", 15).

116 The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 199.

117 In grappling with this problem, T. W. Manson rightly argues that God must recognize a real distinction between righteousness and sin in order to be both righteous and be the one who justifies. He concludes that only those who have a special faith relationship to God in Jesus are so justified [On Paul and John, 56-58]. Nevertheless, it should be added here that the apparent contradiction of God justifying the ungodly largely disappears when one considers the full range of meanings associated with the words δικαιόω, δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη. As C. H. Dodd remarks, Paul was fully aware that in Hebrew thought, God’s mercy is evidenced in his justification. Thus Paul can say that God justifies the ungodly because for him "the righteousness of God" not only entails δικαιοσύνη but ἐλεημοσύνη as well [The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1935) 57-58]. In a related way, Wedderburn notes that "the righteousness of God" encompasses God’s nature, what this nature directs him to do, and the results of his actions ["Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", (n.42) 181]. And as previously discussed, the primary emphasis in this study will be to interpret God’s righteousness as his faithfulness to redeem his creatures by effecting a right relationship
radical nature of Paul's exegesis, C. E. B. Cranfield notes that the words ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ ἀνθρώπου are an allusion to scriptures such as Exod 23:7; Prov 17:15; 24:24 and Isa 5:23. He claims that since all of these citations relate to human judges who accepted bribes and acquitted the guilty, Paul must be speaking of a totally different kind of justification here. Cranfield believes that the type of justification spoken of in Rom 4:5 is solely based upon Christ's atoning death as set forth in Rom 3:24-26.

In response to these points let it once again be acknowledged that the cross and the atonement do play a central role in Paul's theology. Yet one must carefully discern just how Paul presents his cross theology in Romans. As Michael Theobald argues, Paul's presentation in Rom 3:21-31 is theo-zentrisch orientiert. That is to say, Paul is primarily concerned with what kind of God would provide such an atonement for sinners and rebels. Theobald rightly concludes that Paul's two-fold "proof" of God's righteous-
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with them. So in this sense, for both Jesus and Paul, God is never more righteous than when he justifies the ungodly (see below, esp. n. 122).

118 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: Clark, 1975) (n. 1) 382.
119 Ibid.
ness (cf. the twice repeated ἐνθεσίαν of Rom 3:25-26) is thoroughly based upon his belief that God in his grace is invariably faithful to his creatures. For Paul then, the righteousness of God (gen. subj.) is never more evident than when God demonstrates his covenantal faithfulness (or "Sein in Treue") in an extraordinary show of grace.

Also to simply concentrate on the benefits of the atonement without fully taking into consideration the moral condition of the recipients of God's grace is to ignore the really salient contribution that Paul is making here. Once again, what has already been suggested with regard to Jesus and the Hellenists is equally applicable to Paul. Such a revolutionary vision of God, and the radical way in which God realizes his grace in the world, tended to redefine exactly who constitutes the people of God. Just as Jesus' table-fellowship with toll collectors and sinners tended to break down the distinction between the righteous and unrighteous in Israel, and the application of this theol-

121 Ibid., 136-37, 144.
122 Again Theobald's point is that Paul discusses the righteousness of God in a way which maintains and promotes the premise that God's soteriological acts are theologically determined (ibid., 150-51).
123 Meyer fully realizes this when he claims that the "concrete presupposition" of Rom 4:5 was Jesus' table-fellowship with publicans and sinners (Aims, 160).
124 Theobald notes that the complex structure of Rom 3:21-31 is unified by Paul's theocentric approach to the issue of justification and the inherent universalism contained in his argument ("Das Gottesbild", 134).
ogy by the Hellenists tended to relativize the distinctions that existed between Jews and Gentiles, Paul's understanding of God led him to express these concepts in the strongest of terms. Paul boldly asserts that God manifested his saving love to those who were morally bankrupt (ἀσθενής) and ungodly (ἀσεβὴς) (Rom 5:6-8). He emphatically states that God expressed his loving solidarity with those who were inimical to his very person and will (Rom 5:10). All of this was done without any indication that the ungodly were ready and anxious to reform their ways and hence become worthy of God's love. The twice repeated ἐτύ of Rom 5:6b and 8b (i.e. "still powerless" and "still sinners") clearly emphasizes that the basis for God's gracious and loving acts lies within the divine person and not in the objects of his mercy.

125 As Käsemann states, "The point is that Christ did his saving work at an unexpected and, morally considered, even inappropriate moment. Unworthy, genuinely ungodly people benefited from it" (Romans, 137).

126 Morris, Romans, 222; cf. also Cranfield, Romans, 264.

127 Martin, Reconciliation, 147. Cf. also J. A. Ziesler, Pauline Christianity (London: Oxford University, 1983) 80. In a spirit which reflects the overall thesis of this dissertation, Manson suggests that Rom 5:8 should not be restricted to the death of Christ but is indicative of the theology of Jesus as seen in his table-fellowship with toll collectors and sinners (On Paul and John, 49). He further states that, "This process by which rebels and traitors become loyal subjects of God's kingdom, and strangers become sons of the Father is in the strictest sense 'Reconciliation' which lies at the heart of Paul's gospel" (ibid. 50). The manner in which the theology of Jesus and Paul both communicate the theme of reconciliation will be
Furthermore, the above mentioned points indicate that despite Cranfield's attempts, the central issue surrounding Rom 4:5 is not the cross and the atonement, but the implicit trust of an otherwise ungodly man, Abraham. Cranfield himself admits that since Abraham had no works, in effect he had to believe in a God who justifies the ungodly. 128 Morris agrees and notes that Abraham's pagan background, the fact that he was a "stranger" and his uncircumcised state all meant that he too was in the class of the "ungodly". 129 Yet more importantly, from Paul's perspective, Abraham also fell into that class of people who understood God to be one who would justify the ungodly. 130 Again "to justify" can not be understood in the sense of acquitting sinners as if
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discussed below.

128 Romans, 232.
129 Romans, (n. 22) 198. Cf. also Käsemann, Romans, 112.

130 In commenting on Rom 4:5, A. Kolenkow makes some interesting observations. She notes that the word ἀγάφης is used four times in Gen 18:23 and 25 and that in each instance the word refers to Abraham's intercession for Sodom. She remarks that the rabbis interpreted this to mean that not only did Abraham realize that he was ungodly but that Abraham had compassion for the ungodly. Out of this compassion, Abraham dared to believe that God would justify the ungodly ("The Ascription of Romans 4:5", HTR 60 (1967) 228-29).
they were in fact not sinners. This Paul never allows. Rather, God in his grace is "righteous" (δικαιος) in the covenantal sense, that is, one who mercifully restores a right relationship between himself and the objects of his mercy.

Yet as profound and life-changing as this experience was for the first believers and the Apostle Paul, one might surmise that the continued existence of such an extraordinary understanding of God and his people was in no way assured. It is suggested here that the survivability of the theology of Jesus and the far-reaching consequences of that theology would be enhanced if an analogous experience could be received on an ongoing basis and on a universal scale.

By "analogous" I mean that such an experience would communicate essentially the same theological message as the conduct of the earthly Jesus, and, for the lack of a better word, be as "evident". The theme of the next section proposes

131 Manson acknowledges that -ow verbs have a "factive sense", i.e. such verbs not only communicate but also realize their meaning. However, he claims that δικαιοω should not be understood as meaning "make righteous" (On Paul and John, 54). He bases his argument on the fact that such verbs as δικαιοω are derived from adjectives which denote some moral quality and thus are in a class by themselves. For these reasons he concludes that δικαιοω should be understood as meaning "deem" or "regard" as righteous. In this case the verb would not mean "acquit" in a juridical sense but would be indicative of what Manson calls a "royal amnesty" or "paternal dispensation" (ibid., 55-57).

132 Martin, Reconciliation, 35.

133 Cf. nn. 138, 147 below.
that the activity of the Holy Spirit in the early Christian community functioned in this very way.

D. The Confirmatory Function of the Spirit in the Life of the Early Christian Communities.

The central premise of this section is that just as Jesus' identification with outcasts and sinners communicated God's solidarity and acceptance of such persons, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles is indicative of the same. Again the focus of the enquiry will not be on what the early church said about the Spirit per se. Rather as has been the approach from the start, the theo-logical significance of the activity of the Spirit and how the early church came to interpret the experience of the Spirit will be of utmost concern.

1. The Reception of the Spirit by Cornelius and his Household.

Luke's account of the Cornelius event lends support to the above-mentioned thesis. Even though Luke is at pains to present Peter as the initiator of the Gentile mission, when in fact the Hellenists are to be credited here, he accurately interprets the theological significance of Cornelius' reception of the Spirit (Acts 10:44-48).\(^{134}\) Luke's note that all who heard (not just Cornelius) received the Spirit reveals his understanding of the magnitude of the

\(^{134}\) Cf. E. Best, "Revelation", 11.
occasion (10:44). The twice repeated τὰ ἐθνη (10:45, 11:1) indicates that the incident was not perceived as an isolated experience, but as one that had relevance for the entire Gentile world. The ecstatic utterances mentioned in 10:46 appear to be viewed as evidentiary proof that the Gentiles have received the Spirit just as the Jews. This in turn is interpreted as a sign of God's acceptance of them as his people (11:17-18, 15:8). Räisänen concurs and states that the display of ecstatic gifts by uncircumcised Gentiles served as "empirical evidence" upon which the Hellenists and the Jerusalem church waived the requirement of circumcision. So the central point of the whole story is that this demonstration of God's approval necessitates community acceptance. It will be shown that Paul's interpretation of the Spirit in Galatians follows a similar pattern of argumentation and communicates the same theological principles.

137 Best, "Revelation", 12. Kraft notes that the baptism of Cornelius also indicates his full acceptance into the Christian community (Entstehung, 273).
138 Torah, 286. Cf. also his "Conversion", 413.
2. Paul's Understanding of the Spirit in Galatians.

The purpose of this section is to lend support to the theory that Paul interpreted the Gentile reception of the Spirit as evidence of their acceptance with God, and hence their full incorporation into the family of God. To that end it should be noted that in Galatians many key Pauline concepts such as "grace", "righteousness" and "adoption" are not primarily discussed within the context of the cross and resurrection, but with regard to the experience of the Spirit.\(^{140}\) As Dunn asserts, for Paul πνεῦμα is "an experiential concept" which is essentially equivalent to receiving God's grace.\(^{141}\) He maintains that in Paul's thought, the reception of the Spirit and the experience of grace are actually verifiable correlates of one another which engender an awareness that God is at work in the believer.\(^{142}\) In a similar vein, but with reference to Paul's doctrine of justification, Dahl comments,

Justification and the gift of the Spirit are inseparable from one another. Paul makes no distinction between the forensic and the pneumatic. The gift of the

\(^{140}\) Although the purpose of the letter no doubt relates to the "Judaizing controversy" and its insistence that the Galatians' experience of conversion and the Spirit could only be perfected through circumcision, Paul's use of πνεῦμα is not simply being employed polemically [D. J. Lull, The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of PNEUMA as Divine Power (SBLDS 49, Chico: Scholars, 1980) 39]. Rather as Lull expresses it, the Spirit serves as "a primary datum of experience" for the Galatians (ibid., cf. also p.40).

\(^{141}\) Jesus, 202-03.

\(^{142}\) Ibid.
Spirit is evidentiary proof of God's acceptance. Analysis of selected passages in Galatians will further illustrate the points set forth here.


Betz's description of Gal 3:1-5 as the "probatio" or "proof section" which determines the effectiveness of Paul's argument in 3:1-4:31 complies with the methodology of this dissertation. That is, Betz asserts that Paul is arguing that the ecstatic and miraculous activity of the Spirit among the Galatians was empirically verifiable and that this activity was evidentiary proof that they had been justified.

143 Studies, 133. Wedderburn also maintains that the gift of the Spirit was probably "the experiential truth" upon which the Hellenists and Paul based their belief that God had unconditionally accepted the Gentiles as his people ("Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 171). The defense of this belief in terms of justification and righteousness is naturally understood as coming after the experience of the Spirit itself (ibid).

144 Betz, Galatians, 128. However, J. Smit questions Betz's analysis on this point. He argues that the nature of Paul's argument in Galatians is more suited to genus deliberativum (a political speech given in parliament) rather than genus iudiciale (a judicial plea presented in court) ("The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech", NTS 35 (1989) 6-7]. His point is that the Galatians are not being addressed as a jury to pass judgment on their own situation or the authority of Paul (ibid., 3). Rather, they are being presented with two courses of action, i.e. the path of honor and advantage or the path of shame and disadvantage (ibid., 13). This would mean that Gal 3:1-4:11 would not comprise the probatio as Betz asserts, but the confirmatio (ibid.).
and accepted as the children of God.\textsuperscript{145} Phrases such as "received the Spirit" (3:2), "experienced such things" (3:4) and "he who grants the Spirit and works miracles" (3:5) are reflective of "an enthusiast's or ecstatic experience" which should be viewed as evidence that God is at work among them.\textsuperscript{146} Thus he concludes that the initial reception of the Spirit was "ecstatic" or "enthusiastic" in nature and served as the "primary datum" of the churches in Galatia for determining the presence of God in their midst.\textsuperscript{147}

The theological significance of these experiences is clearly expressed by Williams. He states that,

...the experience of the Spirit and the status of justification are, for the apostle, inconceivable apart from each other. Each implies the other. Those persons upon whom God bestows the Spirit are justified; the persons whom God reckons righteous have the Spirit.

\textsuperscript{145}Lull notes that a major purpose of Galatians is to explain exactly what the experience of the Spirit means. He claims that Paul argues from what the Galatians know, i.e. that the Spirit is active among them, to what they do not know, i.e. that they are already the children of God without submitting to the law of Moses and circumcision ("The Spirit in Galatia", 109). He also remarks, as noted above, that Paul's argument here parallels that of Peter in Acts 10 (ibid., 66; cf. also Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", 171).

\textsuperscript{146}Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 135. It should be noted that Betz understands that the one who works miracles (δύναμεν) refers to God and not Paul or some other charismatic leader in the church (ibid.). Cf. also S. K. Williams, "Justification and the Spirit in Galatians", \textit{JSNT} 29 (1987) 98. Once again this underscores the truly theological significance of Paul's words here.

poured out upon them. 148

Williams also claims, as does Dahl and Betz, that the καθώς of 3:6 indicates that the Galatians' reception of the Spirit was experienced in the same way that Abraham received the righteousness of God. 149 So again, the reception of the Spirit functions as evidence that the Galatians have been justified and that they are presently the children of Abraham and the heirs of God. 150

These last points direct the study to Paul's words in Gal 4:6-7. 151 Paul again seems to be appealing to an inner working of the Spirit in the hearts of the Galatians which is evidenced in the ecstatic cry, Ἄββα, ὁ πατήρ. As Betz points out, the activity of the Spirit in the human heart,

148 "Justification", 97. Williams points out that the association of justification and the Spirit is found throughout Paul's letters, e.g. Rom 8:1-17; 1 Cor 6:11; 2 Cor 3:8-9 [ibid., (n. 15) 100]


150 As Williams states, "Thus Scripture proclaimed that all the Gentiles, begotten as children of Abraham by the Spirit of God would be blessed by being reckoned righteous" ("Justification", 96).

151 Since the focus of this study is on conduct and experience rather than on verbal parallels, the theory that Paul is reflecting upon the words of Jesus in Matt 6:9/Luke 11:2 will not be pursued. For a list of sources concerning Jesus' use of Ἄββα and a synopsis of the discussion see Betz, Galatians, (n. 93) 211, and Martin, Reconciliation, 217-21. For the thought that the experience of the Galatians parallels that of Jesus at baptism, the reader is directed to Dunn, Jesus, 22-23, 26, 38. This writer accepts Betz' judgment that it is not possible to determine if Paul is consciously alluding to the words or the experience of Jesus here (Galatians, 211).
the use of the verb καδαζω and the word ἀββα, all indicate a state of ecstasy and joyous enthusiasm. Such an experience in the Spirit produced what Dunn calls a "filial consciousness" which gave the Galatians the abiding assurance that they were accepted by the Father, and that they were full members in the church. Therefore this so-called "Abba-cry" was a testimony to the reality to their place in the family of God.

In summary, it has been proposed that Paul did not view the supernatural activity of the Spirit as simply an incidental aspect of Christian worship. Rather, the ongoing manifestation of the Spirit was once again a sign of that divine "Solidarität" so evident in the ministry of Jesus and experienced by his followers. In particular, the activity of the Spirit among the Galatians meant that God had accepted them as they were. It meant that in their uncircumcised state, they had received the grace of God,

152"Spirit", 147. Cf. also Dunn, Jesus, 240.
153"Jesus", 240. He states that, "Assurance is the consciousness and confidence of sonship. God does not only want men to be his sons; he wants them to know it" (ibid.).
154Williams, "Justification", 97.
156Lull notes that the use of the present participles in 3:1-5 indicates the continued work of the Spirit among the Galatians. The point being made is that the ongoing presence of the Spirit was a constant testimonial to God’s acceptance of them [ibid., 93 (n. 146)].
been justified and fully incorporated into the church. In short, the presence of the Spirit among the Galatians was the divine sign authenticating their salvation experience.\textsuperscript{157}

So the conclusion of this brief study is as follows. The theological import of the reception of the Spirit by uncircumcised Gentiles is seen to be analogous with and essentially equivalent to Jesus' table-fellowship with outcasts and sinners. Just as Jesus' conduct portrayed a God who took the initiative to identify with the outcasts of his day and bestow an abundance of grace and love upon the unworthy, so too the activity of the Spirit revealed a God who accepted Gentiles as they were and one who desired fellowship with them as his people. It has also been suggested that just as Jesus' understanding of God tended to relativize the distinction between the righteous and unrighteous in Israel, the presence of the Spirit tended to break down the distinctions that existed between the Jews and the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{158} So the activity of the Spirit in the

\textsuperscript{157}Ibid., 103.

\textsuperscript{158}Perhaps it should be mentioned here that just as the theological significance of Jesus' conduct tended to relativize the value of the law and the temple, Paul implies that the work of the Spirit does the same (Gal 3:3, 5). Lull notes that Paul consistently contrasts words associated with the law, e.g. νῆπιος, δουλος, and παιδαγωγός (Gal 3:24-25, 4:1-2) with terms associated with the Spirit, e.g. πνευματικός, τέλειος, ἑλεύθερος, (Gal 3:19-4:7). Lull interprets this to mean that the soteriological relevance of the law has been superseded by possession of the Spirit ("The Spirit in Galatia", 118, 127-28, 131).
church was not only theologically relevant, but sociologically important as well. The next section will focus on the social implications of the Spirit's work among the believers.

E. Mutual Acceptance and Equality in the Church.

The discussion has developed the theory that Jesus, the early Christian Hellenists and Paul believed in and practiced what might be called "a theology of inclusiveness". Jesus' table-fellowship with outcasts and sinners indicated that they were included in the kingdom of God. The Hellenists and Paul persistently maintained that the Gentiles were now to be included as the people of God. Their belief and practice was confirmed by the presence and activity of the Spirit among them. It will now be suggested that this kind of divine impartiality mandated a spirit of egalitarianism and mutual acceptance in the church. 159

159 J. M. Bassler examines the theme of impartiality in Romans with regard to divine favor and judgment. He concludes that impartiality forms the core of Paul's entire argument in this epistle. He also notes that the paranetic section of Rom 14:1-15:6 indicates that divine impartiality mandates equality and mutual acceptance in the community ["Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans", NovT 26 (1984) 43, 55, 57].
1. Gal 3:28 - "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus".

It is generally agreed that Gal 3:28 represents a carefully formulated pre-Pauline tradition of the church. The trifold repetition of οὐκ ἄνω, the similar sounding phrases "Jew nor Greek", "slave nor free", "male nor female", as well as its chiasmic construction, all evidence the "proklamatorischen Charakter" of the passage. Also extra-biblical parallels lend support to the theory that Paul may be drawing upon an early Christian saying here. The parallels with 1 Cor 12:13 and Col 3:11 point in the same direction, and also show that the issue of how Jews and Greeks were to relate to each other was not unique to the

---


162 Dautzenberg notes that the prayers of Rabbi Jehuda and Rabbi Meir contain some interesting parallels to the words of Paul here. Jehuda taught that a good Jew is to praise God for not being made a Gentile, a woman or unlearned. Rabbi Meir replaced the word "unlearned" with the word "slave" (Männlich und Weiblich", 186). Dautzenberg also mentions the Greek parallel in Diogenes Laertius 1:33 where thanks are offered for not being made an animal, a woman or a barbarian (ibid., 187). Paulsen claims that each of these sayings have a tradition of their own and it is not possible to trace the origin of Gal 3:28 to any of them ("Einheit und Freiheit", 85).
Nevertheless, the agreement ends when it comes to determining what the text meant to the Galatians and to discerning its contemporary application. Positions tend to emphasize either the strictly theological aspects of the passage or to concentrate on its sociological implications. Paulsen is a good example of the former. He claims that since Paul's understanding of baptism, the body of Christ and adoption in Galatians are all christologically determined, his entire argument is theologically oriented. Paulsen thus concludes that the apostle is not directly concerned with social change. Rather, he believes that the eschatological expectations of the early church and Paul have been joined to the latter's understanding of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ (although not explicitly mentioned in 3:28). This in turn is understood to reflect the Hebraic belief that at the eschaton there would be a devaluing of values.

---

163 Paulsen, "Einheit und Freiheit", 78-79, esp. (nn. 19-20) 79; Windisch, "Ελληνιστής", 514; Moxnes, Conflict, 90-91; Dautzenberg, "Männlich und Weiblich", 185.

164 For a list of the many articles seeking to decipher Paul's exact meaning here, the reader is directed to Paulsen; "Einheit und Freiheit", (n. 114) 93. With regard to the possible social and ethical implications of the text, Paulsen uses the word "Ratlosigkeit" to describe the bewildering array of interpretations presented (ibid.).

165 Ibid., 76, 88, 95.

166 Ibid., 86.
and a lifting of all differences.\(^{167}\) So for Paulsen, the present removal of the distinctions between Jew and Greek, bond and free and male and female are only to be interpreted soteriologically.\(^{168}\) Since the believer has only experienced the end time to a degree, the Christian is still bound to the conventions of this world as far as social distinctions are concerned.\(^{169}\)

Yet even though Paulsen strongly emphasizes the theological focus of Galatians 3, he too concedes that the apostle’s words do contain weighty sociological implications. He even maintains that such implications were somewhat realized in Paul’s day as is evident by his words on slavery (1 Cor 7) and his directives concerning how women should conduct themselves in worship services (1 Cor 11 and 14).\(^{170}\)

It is here that Dautzenberg offers a healthy corrective to Paulsen’s analysis. He concurs that a central

\(^{167}\) Paulsen maintains that such beliefs had affinities with Gnostic thought as well, as seen in the idea of the "androgyne" or "Ur-mensch" (ibid., 81-83).

\(^{168}\) Ibid., 90.

\(^{169}\) Ibid., 94-95.

\(^{170}\) Ibid., (nn. 72-73) 87, 89. But D. P. Fuller concludes that the negation of distinctions was applied to Jewish cultural and religious practices and not to differences in sex or social status ["Paul and Galatians 3:28", TSFB 9 (1985) 9-10]. He describes patriarchalism and slavery in the early church as a type of "divine accommodation". Fuller claims that due to the social and cultural context of the day, this kind of accommodation was necessary for the survival of the movement (ibid., 12).
message here is that distinctions which were socially problematic in the world are to carry no weight in the church (cf. 1 Cor 7:21 and Phlm 16). And to this extent he agrees that the context is soteriologically determined. Yet he goes on to note that in Judaism, or Christianity for that matter, one's sex or social status never did have relevance with regard to salvation. So the message of Gal 3:28 addresses more than the question of salvation. Also Dautzenberg rightly contends that Paul's words in Gal 3 emphasize realized experience far more than eschatological expectation. He states that the thrice repeated οὐκ ἐνι points to a new experience that has already been realized. And as suggested above, Dautzenberg also identifies this experience with the outpouring of the Spirit upon all the members of the church. His conclusion is that the experience of charismatic gifts played an important role in the community and that such experiences had significant sociological and ethical consequences (cf. 1 Cor 11:2-16 and Philemon).

171 Dautzenberg, "Männlich und Weiblich", 183-84.
172 Ibid., 183, 195.
173 He comments that the outpouring of the Spirit as presented in Joel 3:1 f. and Ezek 39:39 transcended all social groups. Thus with regard to women, their exercise of spiritual gifts would represent a departure from the praxis of the Jewish synagogue (ibid., 197).
174 Ibid., 198-99. As Windisch states, "The sacrament of the reception of the Spirit makes Hellenes and Jews equal, transforming both into members of the body of Christ and bearers of the Spirit" (Ἑλληνιστῆς, 514).
Betz concurs and reiterates that the reception of the Spirit not only brought the assurance that one was a child of God, but that it imparted a liberating experience which transcended religious, social and cultural barriers. Such an experience tended to undermine all factors which foster discrimination and divisiveness in the community. Fully admitting that one can only surmise just how this spirit of egalitarianism was realized in the church, Betz nevertheless insists that Paul's words represent a bold step toward equality and mutual acceptance. To be "justified" means to be part of a unified community. As M. Barth explains, salvation is also a "social act" which creates solidarity between those who were once estranged. For these reasons Peter's refusal to eat at table with Gentiles in Antioch is laden with theological and sociological meaning.

175 "Spirit", 151.
176 Ibid., 152. In commenting on Gal 3:27-28, Moxnes states that both Luke and Paul interpret the reception of the Spirit and baptism as breaking down distinctions and this in turn creates a new community with its own social order. He agrees that the common experience of charismatic gifts engendered a spirit of unity and acceptance in the church (Conflict, 90-91, 213).

177 "The Kerygma of Galatians", Interp. 21 (1967) 138, 141-42. With regard to divine impartiality in Romans cf. Moxnes, Conflict, 288. Although Moxnes relates this theme to the cross and resurrection rather than the historical Jesus, he does speak of "the place" of Paul's theology. He states, "The 'place' where Paul spoke of God was the conflict between Jews and Greeks, high and low, insiders and outsiders. Most of Paul's statements about God in Romans were related to this situation in which he attempted to achieve unity through conflict" (ibid.).
His conduct conveyed a message which ran counter to the theology of inclusiveness as described above. Paul did not allow that message to go unchallenged.

2. The Incident at Antioch: Gal 2:11-14.

Dunn correctly asserts that the really important issues concerning Paul's confrontation with Peter are often overshadowed by the question of whether the events of Galatians 2 took place before or after the so-called "Jerusalem Council" of Acts 15. He is also correct in stating that the central issue here concerns the meaning of table-fellowship within the context of the early church. And finally, his words about increasing Hellenization and the threat it posed to Jewish national and religious interests are helpful for interpreting Gal 2:11-14. Indeed, the point that the controversy at Antioch came at a time when there was widespread pressure to preserve one's Jewish heritage also appears to be on target.

179 Ibid., 11.
180 Dunn argues that by the middle of the first century the Gentile question had become acute due to political and social factors ("Incident", 7-10). As has been discussed throughout the dissertation, increasing Hellenization was a continual threat to Jewish culture and distinctives [cf. above chap. 4 (nn. 13, 15) pp. 114-15]. For example, Philo (Leg. 301-02) and Josephus (Jewish War 2:9) both describe Pilate as a ruthless and violent dictator who was incredibly insensitive to the religion and culture of the Jews. For example, he sought to introduce elements of the imperial cult in Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement and...
For these reasons, Dunn accepts the premise that the situation in Galatians 2 can be explained in the following way. He maintains that the open table-fellowship in Antioch was viewed by some as compromising Jewish distinctives at a very sensitive time in their history. In an effort to counteract this tendency, "the men from James" (reflecting the sentiments of many Jewish believers, cf. Acts 11:2-3, 15:1-5; Gal 2:4-5, 3:2) required that the Gentiles be circumcised and observe Jewish purity regulations. Peter's inconsistency is attributed to this type of political,

appropriated funds from the temple treasury to build public works (Smallwood, Jews, 160-61). He backed off from these measures only when the Jews were willing to expose their necks to the sword in protest (ibid.). Gaius' attempt to desecrate the temple by placing a statue of himself in the Holy of Holies was also ill fated (Philo, Leg. 198-207; Josephus, Jewish War, 184-203). Diaspora Jews faced similar difficulties. Sejanus levelled false charges against Jews in Rome and threatened to annihilate them in Italy, perhaps because they refused to grant him cult status [ibid., (n. 72) 165; 201-02]. Also Josephus, Tacitus and Suetonius all record the expulsion of the Jews from Rome (Tacitus dates it at about A.D. 19). Since their expulsion is linked with the Isis-cult, the reason for such action may have been related to the Jewish religion itself (ibid., 203).

D. Cohn-Sherbok questions Dunn's documentation on this score. He claims that there is no specific evidence that the Jews responded to the above mentioned pressures by accentuating Jewish distinctives, or by forcing others to conform to Jewish law ["Some Reflections on James Dunn's 'The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-18)'", JSNT 18 (1983) 69-70]. However, he does say that the requirements of the law itself were enough to motivate one to strict observance (ibid).
social and religious pressure.  

Nevertheless, when it comes to describing the nature of the table-fellowship at Antioch, Dunn's view merits a closer look. He claims that since the believers in Antioch, Paul included, understood themselves to be a sect of Judaism, they willingly complied with the Jewish purity regulations to a degree. That is, the Gentiles in Antioch were already observing the "Noahic requirements" of Gen 9, but "the men from James" judged this to be insufficient. Dunn believes that the difference in behavior can be explained by the fact that there was a wide range of interpretation among the Jews concerning social relations with Gentiles. Some Jews were more lax than others. So the Gentiles at Antioch were judged to be "sinners" (Gal 2:15) because they were not as scrupulous in their observance of Jewish purity regulations as those who came from James. In Dunn's opinion, the intensification of Jewish norms caused Paul to see (for the first time) that justification

---

182 Dunn, "Incident", 11, 13-16.
183 Watson also doubts Paul's account here (Paul, 33). He claims that Peter would never have denied his Jewish identity. Perhaps there was a relaxed attitude toward the law, but he maintains that Paul has exaggerated Peter's role in the incident. Watson argues that Paul has embellished the account for the purpose of strengthening his case for justification by faith (ibid.).
184 Ibid., 30-32.
185 Ibid., 23.
186 Ibid., 27-28.
by faith was relevant to one's entire life context, and not just related to conversion.  

In response to Dunn's position, Cohn-Sherbok once again criticizes his lack of documentation. He rightly notes that Galatians does not say that the Gentile believers had observed a considerable degree of dietary laws and perhaps had kept the tithing regulations as well. He contends that Galatians contains no such data, nor does it give any specifics about what the men from James required. All we know is that prior to their arrival, Peter ate with the Gentiles and that he was subsequently criticized for doing so. There is absolutely no indication that Paul and Peter are dissenting over the degree of conformity, as if the bone of contention concerns their relative positions on some sliding scale of observance or nonobservance. As Holtz points out, the entire argument is presented as an "Entweder - Oder", not simply as a matter of "more or less". In a direct response to Dunn's position, Holtz states, "Der Gegensatz ἐθνικὸς ζηύ -- Ἰουδαΐζειν ist

---

187 Ibid., 37, 41.
188 "Reflections", 71.
189 Ibid., 71.
kein relativer eines bestimmten Weniger oder Mehr an Einhaltung von Speisegeboten — er bezeichnet einen grundsätzlichen Wandel der Lebensweise". Therefore Holtz unequivocally rejects the notion that there was some kind of half-baked Jewish lifestyle in Antioch which Dunn is pleased to call "Noahic". In contrast to Dunn, Holtz's reconstruction of the events in Antioch lends support to the central thesis of this work. He rightly assumes that there is a dynamic relationship between conduct and theology. In arguing this case, he notes that Paul's use of the word ἐθνικὸς (2:14), his strong reaction to Peter's separation from the Gentiles and the nature of the argument as a whole, indicate that there was unlimited freedom of fellowship in Antioch prior to the coming of the emissaries from Jerusalem. Such freedom of behavior, especially in the context of table-fellowship, is again laden with theological significance. It meant that the Gentiles had been accepted by God as they were, and that from now on, there were to be no barriers separating Jews and Gentiles in the church. The central issue at stake is how the grace of God is to be actualized

192 Ibid., 151.
193 Ibid., (nn. 55, 56) 151.
194 This is the same point made by Haacker when he spoke of the essential unity of Denkakt und Lebensakt [see above (n. 101) 219].
195 Holtz, "Zwischenfall", 348.
in the lives of his people. Therefore Peter's separation from the Gentiles is theologically motivated, but sociologically relevant as well. 196 His behavior indicates that he viewed the Gentiles as those who were to be avoided. It means that they have in some way not met the preconditions for fellowship. 197 Whether Peter fully realized it or not, he once again questioned the basis of their acceptance with God and the legitimacy of their full membership in the people of God. At that moment his conduct did not reflect the "theology of inclusiveness" as mentioned above. Paul realized that such an understanding of God, together with the divisive tendencies contained therein, was completely foreign to the vision of Jesus, the confirmation of the Spirit and the experience of the believers as a whole. Peter's conduct communicated a message which threatened the singularity of the gospel and the unity of the church. 198 In this light, Paul's intense reaction to Peter in Antioch becomes more comprehensible.

F. Summary of Results and Conclusion.

It was suggested that the beliefs and practices of the early Christian Hellenists form a "causal connection" between the historical Jesus and the Apostle Paul. It was

196 'Ibid., 351-52.
197 'Cohn-Sherbok, "Reflections", 72.
198 'Holtz, "Zwischenfall", 355.
concluded that the nature of that connection did not consist of a thoroughgoing critique of the law or the temple. Rather, it was suggested that perhaps due to the unique experiences of the Hellenists as a distinct worshipping community, they were attracted to the theology of Jesus as evidenced in his openness to outsiders. Therefore their decision to waive the requirement of circumcision and to accept the Gentiles as full members of the people of God was not a matter of circumstance, mere practicality or expediency. The Hellenists were emboldened to take the decisive step of accepting uncircumcised Gentiles because of the radical theology of the historical Jesus. Just as Jesus' understanding of God tended to break down the distinctions that existed between the righteous and the unrighteous in Israel, the theology and practice of the Hellenists tended to ignore the distinctions that existed between Jews and Gentiles.

It was noted that such an extraordinary missionary practice came at a very sensitive time in the history of Israel. It struck at the very raison d'être of her existence. It was for these reasons that Paul reacted so violently against the Hellenists. He was convinced that the god of Jesus and the Hellenists was a false god. The Jesus movement was promulgating a god that ignored the distinction between the righteous and the unrighteous, and thus threatened the very existence of Israel as a distinct people.
However, in his endeavor to curtail the spread of the movement, Paul experienced the very theology he sought so vehemently to destroy. On the Damascus road, Paul experienced the love and acceptance of God while yet a sinner. It was argued that from henceforth this extraordinary experience of grace became the lens through which Paul interpreted God, himself and the Scriptures. As a result, he came to realize that Jesus and the Hellenists had correctly interpreted God and that he too must seek to actualize the grace of God in the lives of sinners, the Gentiles in particular. The most radical expression of this theology is found in Paul's words concerning the justification of the ungodly (Rom 4:5; cf also 5:6-8).

Furthermore, it was suggested that the activity of the Spirit among the Gentile converts served both to confirm and promote the theology of Jesus, the Hellenists and Paul. Paul argues that the charismatic gifts of the Spirit and the ecstatic "Abba-cry" of the early believers serve as evidentiary proof that the Gentiles are now part of the people of God (Gal 3:1-5, 4:6).

In summary, the theology of Jesus and his followers could be described as a "theology of inclusiveness". This theme of equality and egalitarianism was confirmed by the indiscriminate activity of the Spirit in the churches. It was suggested that such a theology contained weighty sociological implications as well. Divine impartiality mandated
mutual acceptance and equality in the community. Within this context, Peter's separation from the Gentiles at Antioch evidenced an understanding of God which was diametrically opposed to the experience of Jesus, the Hellenists and Paul. Paul's strong reaction to Peter's conduct becomes more intelligible in this light.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The question of Paul's relationship to the historical Jesus was deemed to be a viable topic of research for the following reasons. Firstly, the message of the New Testament itself presents us with the problem of determining how could one, who was not a disciple of the historical Jesus, have become so influential in the development of the church and its doctrines. Secondly, this question of Paul's relationship to the earthly Jesus has occupied the minds of New Testament scholarship for the last century and a half, and is still a current topic of debate.

With regard to this last point, a review of the literature was made starting with F. C. Baur's "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde" (1831) and continuing to the present form of the debate. Special attention was given to the role that Rudolf Bultmann played in the discussion and to the "new quest" which developed out of his emphasis on the kerygma. Also the works of Gerhard Ebeling, Ernst Fuchs and especially Eberhard Jüngel were studied as representatives of the "new hermeneutic". As might be expected, opinions varied widely. It was discovered that Nietzsche's "The Antichrist" and Wrede's "Second Founder" theory represent those who emphasized the discontinuity that exists
between Jesus and Paul, while the likes of Jüngel, Blank and Allison argue for the essential continuity existing between the two.

Such an overview not only provided the dissertation with a firm foundation, but it also revealed the importance of one's methodological approach. For example as noted by S. Sandmel, F. Neirynck and N. Walter, a mere paralleling of Pauline texts with portions of the Synoptic tradition does little to strengthen the case for continuity. Not only is such an approach weakened by the nature of the sources, i.e. the uncertainty as to what constitutes authentic Jesus traditions, but it is weakened further still by the fact that when it appears Paul is alluding to the words of Jesus, it cannot be proven that Paul knows he is doing so. For these reasons, it was concluded that such an approach had failed to resolve the methodological difficulties and that its results remained inconclusive.

Nevertheless, a methodology which examines broad theological themes rather than verbal parallels was judged to be more promising.¹ As indicated above, Josef Blank and Eberhard Jüngel were studied in this light. However, Blank's

¹As V. P. Furnish states, "But it is at least clear from this survey and the analysis thus far, that in the future scholars must concentrate not on what or how much Paul knew about the historical Jesus, but rather on the way he employed and applied the knowledge he did have, and what place the Jesus of history had in relation to the heart and centre of his preaching" ("Debate", 381).
consistent emphasis on the importance of the *exalted Christ* in the life of Paul tended to weaken his argument that Paul was influenced by the *historical Jesus*. Yet his analysis of the Hellenists as a *wirkungsgeschichtliche Bindeglied* between Jesus and Paul was judged to be helpful. Jüngel on the other hand, sought to join Jesus and Paul by using the concept of a *Sprachereignis* or "language-event". By employing the peculiar linguistic ontology of the "later Heidegger", Jüngel suggested that Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom and Paul's message of justification are essentially the same language phenomenon, both being part of an overall *Sprachgeschichte*. But it was concluded that his extraordinary emphasis on the creative power of speech entailed a "wordliness" which narrowed the focus of study beyond acceptability. For example, the historical context of Jesus and Paul was virtually ignored, along with a more conventional understanding of language. In turn, the messages of Jesus and Paul were reduced to the existential significance of their respective language-events. It was judged that such an approach tended to "depersonalize" Jesus' message of the kingdom, i.e. it emphasized the ontological significance of parabolic speech rather than concentrated on the *God* of the kingdom.² With regard to Paul, his choice of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ as the *tertium comparationis* between Jesus

² *Cf.* again J. B. Webster, "Eberhard Jüngel", 271.
and Paul was viewed as arbitrary. Paul's theology cannot be reduced to his doctrine of justification, and his understanding of righteousness is more varied than Jüngel allowed. And finally, even though Jüngel often spoke of the conduct and behavior of Jesus, he consistently stressed the importance of speech at the expense of deed. A notable exception was his discussion concerning the meaning of Jesus' table-fellowship with publicans and sinners. Although Jüngel failed to develop this theme, it was deemed worthy of further investigation.

From this point on, every attempt was made to clearly articulate the central thesis of the dissertation and to remain consistent with regard to methodology and development. In the main, the thesis built upon Sanders' premise that a "substantial coherence" and a "causal connection" existed between the thought of the historical Jesus and the birth of the early Christian movement. With regard to Paul in particular, it was suggested that the radical theology of Jesus as reflected in his table-fellowship with publicans and sinners parallels Paul's understanding of God as evi-

3. In contrast to Jüngel, H. Küng well expresses the position of this dissertation. He states, "Theory and practice, for Jesus, coincide, in a much more comprehensive sense: his whole behavior corresponds to his proclamation. And while his verbal proclamation substantiates and justifies his conduct, his actual behavior clarifies his proclamation in the light of practice, makes it unassailable: he lives what he says and this gains for him the minds and hearts of his hearers" (Christian, 266).
denced in his ministry to the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{4} That is, in contrast to the expectations of many of their contemporaries, both Jesus and Paul understood God to be one who unconditionally offered grace, mercy and love to the vilest of sinners. In the name of God, they \textit{deliberately} sought the company of the outcasts of their day, proffering reconciliation and willingly suffering persecution at the hands of their own countrymen.\textsuperscript{5} It was argued that this continuity was not due to chance, but was mediated to Paul by the early Christian Hellenists whom he persecuted. It was also suggested that Paul’s experience of grace on the Damascus road and the reception of the Spirit by the Gentiles was theologically analogous with Jesus’ table-fellowship with outcasts and sinners. So in contrast to Jüngel, the methodology employed in this dissertation emphasized events that speak rather than "speech-events". Also the focus of the enquiry concentrated on the \textit{theo-logical} message communicated by specific \textit{deeds and experiences}. And unlike Jüngel, the goal of the dissertation was not to further elucidate Paul’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} As W. R. Farmer states, "If Jesus ate with sinners, and if his parables illuminate the historical circumstances and the theological significance of this fact -- which they certainly do -- then we have a firm phenomenological basis on which to pursue the sociological and theological development between Jesus and Paul" ["The Dynamic of Christianity: The Question of Development between Jesus and Paul", \textit{RelLife} 38 (1969) 574]
\end{itemize}
christology. Rather, its intent was to explore the genuinely theological themes common to Jesus and Paul.  

In fleshing out the various components of the thesis, the following was observed. It was proposed that the extreme opposition that Jesus experienced was not due to an explicit rejection of the law and temple, or to any laxity on his part concerning observance of the Sabbath and purity regulations. The ministry of Jesus cannot be reduced to mere antipharisaism. As mentioned above, Jesus graphically demonstrated a fresh vision of God through his deliberate policy of eating with publicans and sinners. With regard to the latter, it was suggested that the "publicans" of the Gospels were probably not those who collected direct poll taxes for the Roman government. Thus such persons could not have been accused of treason and Jesus would not have been viewed as "collaborating with the enemy". Rather, the publicans were probably "toll collectors" who gathered local customs and tariffs, yet collected all that the market could bear. They were thieves, guilty of graft and extortion. Similarly, it was argued that the "sinners" were more than likely not the ġam hā-ārets or "people of the land" who failed to abide by a Pharisaic interpretation of the Torah. Rather, the "sinners" of the Gospels were genuinely immoral.

As Farmer rightly notes, when studying Paul one must learn to distinguish between his christology and his theology ("Dynamic", 577).
persons, profligates and harlots. Therefore the scandal of Jesus' table-fellowship lie in the fact that in the name of God he offered grace and reconciliation to notorious sinners without requiring the traditional signs of restitution and repentance. In so doing he virtually obliterated the distinction between the righteous and unrighteous in Israel. In this way, his extraordinary understanding of God and his grace tended to relativize the institutions of the law and the temple. All of this occurred at a very sensitive time in Israel's history; a time when she literally struggled to maintain her identity as a distinct people. Yet Jesus' bold vision of God and God's "openness to outsiders" struck at the very core of Israel's raison d'être.

From this point on it was proposed that the early Christian Hellenists, as represented by Stephen and the Seven, continued to promote the theology of Jesus and eventually came to apply it to the Gentiles. Due to a common language, and the cosmopolitan background of the Hellenists, enquiring Gentiles would be more likely to contact Hellenistic Christian Jews rather than their Palestinian counterparts. But once the contact had been made, the Hellenists made a conscious decision to admit uncircumcised Gentiles into their fellowship. The justification for such a radical step was once again Jesus' acceptance of toll collectors and sinners. If Jesus did not bar such persons from the kingdom, on what grounds should the Gentiles be excluded? So just as Jesus'
understanding of God and his grace tended to break down the
distinctions between the righteous and unrighteous in Is­
rael, the theology of the Hellenists led them to ignore some
of the traditional distinctions which separated Jews from
Gentiles. However, such an extraordinary understanding of
God and his grace once again was perceived as a threat to
the very existence of Israel. The reception of uncircum-
cised Gentiles as full members of the fellowship called into
question the traditional equation, "The Nation of Israel =
The People of God". It was proposed that this was the real
reason behind the martyrdom of Stephen and the scattering of
the Hellenists.

It is at this juncture that Paul came to realize, both
in his perception and experience, that the theology of Jesus
as communicated by the Hellenists was indeed a correct
understanding of God. With the zeal of Phineas of old, he
sought to root out the apostates who dared to contaminate
the stock of Israel with the presence of uncircumcised
Gentiles. Yet on the Damascus road, he too experienced an
extraordinary infusion of God's grace. In retrospect, he
realized that in the midst of opposing what God was doing in
the world, God granted mercy and grace to such a one. God
did indeed justify the ungodly (Rom 4:5, 5:6-8). Such an
experience had far-reaching consequences for the apostle and
the church. That is, the vision of God which originated
with Jesus and was promoted by the Hellenists, came to be
the lens through which Paul viewed himself, the people of God and the Scriptures. He came to realize that if he were to serve God, then he too must seek to actualize the grace of God in the lives of outcasts and sinners. Considering the circumstances surrounding his calling, the route he was to take in fulfilling that calling was already determined. From henceforth, in the name of God, he would actively seek to bring in Gentiles as full members of the people of God.

It was further argued that the activity of the Spirit among Gentile believers served to ensure the continued existence of such a radical understanding of God and his people. That is, the experience of the Spirit among the Gentiles was viewed as being analogous with and essentially equivalent to Jesus' reception of outcasts and sinners. Just as Jesus' acceptance of sinners implied God's reception of them, the outpouring of the Spirit was viewed as "evidentiary proof" that the Gentiles had been accepted as the children of God.

In summary it was suggested that the distinctive vision

---

7 C. Wolff suggests that the entire life of Jesus, especially as seen in his humility, poverty and obedient service, became a pattern for Paul ["Niedrigkeit und Verzicht in Wort und Weg Jesu und in der apostolischen Existenz des Paulus", NTS 34 (1988) 183-84]. When comparing the thoughts expressed in passages such as Mark 9:35, Matt 23:11; and Luke 9:48 with 1 Cor 9:19, 23 and 2 Cor 11:7, Wolff concludes, "Der ganze Weg des Christus ist für Paulus von Niedrigkeit und Verzicht gekennzeichnet gewesen" (ibid., 185; cf. also 188, 191).
of God as seen in the table-fellowship of Jesus, the reception of the Gentiles by the Hellenists and Paul, and the activity of the Spirit among Gentile believers evidenced what might be called "a theology of inclusiveness". That is, God's openness to outsiders was to be reflected by a spirit of egalitarianism and mutual acceptance in the church. The liberating effect of God's grace endowed the believer with the potential of transcending all religious, social and cultural barriers. "Salvation" means not only to be reconciled to God, but to be part of one unified community. There is to be solidarity between those who were once estranged. This was especially relevant with regard to the Jewish and Gentile sectors of the church. On this score, it was suggested that Peter's behavior in Antioch reflected a theology, and hence a way of relating to others, which ran counter to that vision of God described above. His separation from the Gentile believers indicated that in some way uncircumcised Gentiles had not met the preconditions for fellowship. This in turn strongly implied that God had not accepted them either. In short, his behavior

---

8Hofius notes that the speaking of the "Beracha" at table does not only constitute a fellowship among the participants, but also a fellowship with God. As he states, "Weil aber Tischgemeinschaft Gemeinschaft vor Gott und mit Gott ist, deshalb ist sie heilig!" (Tischgemeinschaft, 13). Hence not only does table-fellowship represent reconciliation and the strengthening of a new relationship (Gen 31:46, 54; Jer 52:31-34) but refusal to eat at table can mean the opposite (Jer 40:13-16, 41:1 f.) (ibid., 10-11).
was theologically motivated, and entailed weighty sociological implications as well. It was proposed that Paul's strong reaction to Peter at Antioch becomes more intelligible in this light.9

In closing, let it be said that Paul has indeed realized, both in his understanding and experience, the distinctive elements of Jesus' earthly career.10 As was the case with the historical Jesus, Paul came to know and accept God as one who sought reconciliation (καταλλαγή/καταλλάσσω) with outcasts and sinners (2 Cor 5:18-20).11 For Paul, Jesus was the focus of God's Versöhnungstat und Versöhnungswort whereby in love, God refused to count the trespasses and sins of his enemies (ἐχθροί), the ungodly (ἀσεβείς), the morally weak

9. Farmer makes the interesting note that Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch may well parallel Jesus' rebuke of those who opposed his practice of eating with sinners ("Dynamic", 576).

10. R. P. Martin, Reconciliation, 212. As Martin states, "In short, Paul's 'message of reconciliation' offered a network of personal relationships to God and one's neighbors in society that answered the deepest yearnings of contemporary men and women just as Jesus in his day had called and claimed men and women in a Palestinian life-setting to be his followers" (ibid., 222).

(ἀσθενής) and the sinners (ἀμαρτωλοί) (Rom 5:6-10). And for both Jesus and Paul, God is understood as taking the initiative, and as one who "made the first move" to enter into our world and identify with those who were in desperate need of his reconciling grace. And for them both, one's understanding of God is indissolubly bound to one's praxis in life and ministry. By sitting at table with sinners, Jesus demonstrated the good news that God desired reconciliation with them. Through his active mission among the Gentiles, Paul demonstrated that God desired reconciliation with them as well. Thus the community of believers is never more in touch with its historic Founder than when it seeks to actualize what Furnish calls the "kerygmatic imperative" ... "Be reconciled to God" (2 Cor 5:20b). In

---

12 Cf. Hofius, "Versöhnung", 19; and T. W. Manson, On Paul and John, 53. Concerning the manner in which Paul interfaces the concepts of δικαιόω/δικαιοσύνη with καταλλαγή in Rom 5 and 2 Cor 5 see again Martin, Reconciliation, 97, 153.

13 Martin, Reconciliation, 99. As Martin notes, God is always the subject and never the object of the verb καταλάσσω (ibid., 106). For a brief but informative analysis of how the verb καταλάσσω and the noun καταλλαγή communicate the idea of God's divine initiative cf. Manson, On Paul and John, 50-51 and Thrall, "Salvation Proclaimed", 227. Thus V. P. Furnish states, "Paul is stressing God's initiative, and that God's purpose to save is rooted in his love" ["The Ministry of Reconciliation", CurTM 4 (1977) 213].

14 Meyer, Aims, 161, 172.

15 Reconciliation, 216. Furnish rightly understands that this "kerygmatic imperative" must be realized in the life of the community and makes a reference to Gal 3:27-28 (ibid., 217-18).
obedience to this "rule of love", it once again reenacts Jesus' vision of "the rule of God". ^16

^16 Ibid., 217-18.
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