# Earliest Christian History

Edited by
MICHAEL F. BIRD and
JASON MASTON

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
*320*

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe



320

# Earliest Christian History

## History, Literature, and Theology

Essays from the Tyndale Fellowship
in Honor of Martin Hengel

Edited by

Michael F. Bird and
Jason Maston

Mohr Siebeck

Michael F. Bird, born 1974; 2005 PhD from University of Queensland (Australia); Lecturer in Theology and New Testament at Crossway College and Honorary Research Associate at the University of Queensland.

Jason Maston, born 1978; 2010 PhD from Durham University (England); Lecturer in New Testament at Highland Theological College UHI in Dingwall, Scotland.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151877-5
ISBN 978-3-16-151743-3
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.



The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To Frau Hengel

# Preface

Along the way of producing this volume in memory of Prof. Martin Hengel, several individuals have been particularly helpful. We are grateful to those who presented their papers at the New Testament study group of the Tyndale Fellowship in July 2010. It was a lively time of debate and discussion. The suggestion to include some translations of Hengel's own works was first raised when Dr. Wayne Coppins offered his translation of "Paul and the Torah." This expanded into the seven pieces included here. We would like to thank Dr. Coppins for his suggestion and particularly Prof. Jörg Frey and Prof. Roland Deines for advice regarding which of Hengel's works to include. The translators also deserve special notice since they were given far less time than normal to complete their translations. We also give special thanks to the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck led by Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and especially Matthias Spitzner for their patience and guidance in the editing process. Also, we thank Mr. Theunis Pretorius for compiling the author index.

The details of the conference from which many of these essays come is explained elsewhere. One of the significant aspects of the conference was the personal stories told about Prof. Hengel by former students, colleagues and other personal friends. Many stories were told not just about Hengel's work ethic and his encyclopaedic knowledge of the ancient world, Church history and Christian theology, but also of the hospitality shown in his home. Here it was not just the great scholar who was mentioned, but also his wife. In order to honour the support and hospitality of Frau Hengel, we have chosen to dedicate this volume to her.

Michael F. Bird
Jason Maston

# Foreword

In New Testament studies Tübingen is a name to be conjured with. The Tübingen School associated with F. C. Baur in the 19th century made an enormous impact: Stephen Neill and Tom Wright in their history of *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* say of Baur that he was "a heroic figure, a representative of German scholarship at its best, in its tireless industry, in the range of its operations, and in its fearless eagerness to advance to the knowledge of the truth without regard for what the consequences may be in relation to convictions and traditions dearly held and cherished."[1] Neill and Wright go on, however, to speak very critically of Baur's ideas, using words such as "aberration" and "absurdity." Baur's Hegelian analysis of the history of early Christianity and of the New Testament as a conflict between the Jewish Christianity of Peter and others and the Hellenistic Christianity of Paul was very influential, very damaging to traditionally orthodox Christian faith, but deeply flawed, as has been almost universally recognized since. Some of the most effective responses to Baur and his ideas came from Cambridge, notably from the great scholar J. B. Lightfoot, whose defence of more traditional readings of the New Testament was anything but defensive: his work on the New Testament remains a monument of scholarship and of continuing value.

Tübingen in the second half of the twentieth century was again a notable and influential centre for New Testament studies, with a galaxy of great scholars, including (among others) Peter Stuhlmacher, Otried Hofius, and Martin Hengel. These scholars represented once again German scholarship at its best, industrious, wide-ranging and fearless in wishing to advance the truth. But, whereas Baur represented a radical criticism tending to undermine orthodox Christian faith, the new Tübingen school represented a critical scholarship more akin to that of Lightfoot, upholding orthodoxy in face of the sceptical criticism of Rudolf Bultmann and his school which has dominated so much German New Testament scholarship for much of the past hundred years.

This volume of essays represents a response from Cambridge to the 20th century Tübingen school, in particular to the work of Professor Martin Hengel, who died in 2009. It is an appreciative response, not uncritical, but overwhelmingly positive and thankful for the contribution

[1] Stephen Neill and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (Oxford: OUP, 1988), 21.

made by Professor Hengel to New Testament studies. Hengel died just days before the New Testament group of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical and Theological Research had its annual meeting in Cambridge in 2009, and it was decided then and there that the next meeting should be a response to Hengel's work, with a view to producing a volume of essays. The Tyndale Fellowship is an international fellowship of scholars, committed to the defence and promotion of Christian orthodoxy through rigorous scholarly work. Among its founding fathers was Professor F. F. Bruce, whose strengths as a classical scholar committed to honest and demanding biblical research resembled those of Professor Hengel.

The conference took place in Cambridge from July 7th – 9th 2010, and it brought together scholars from different countries and continents, including a good number of people who worked closely with Professor Hengel in Tübingen, such as Professor Seyoon Kim originally from Korea and now based in the USA, Professor Don Hagner from the USA, and several scholars from Germany itself, including Professor Rainer Riesner, who was closely associated with him, and his doctoral student Professor Roland Deines. It was especially good to have their personal insights into Professor Hengel's work, life and personality.

The papers presented at the conference all engaged in different ways with the work of Professor Hengel, in a way that was appreciative, without being uncritical. The conference was not backward-looking, but an attempt to build on some of the legacy represented by Hengel's work and to reflect on some of the themes that he engaged with. Hengel contributed with great learning in all sorts of key areas to do with Christian origins: his books on the Zealots, then on Judaism and Hellenism were major scholarly works on New Testament background, and then his books on the New Testament itself – on the crucifixion, the atonement, Acts and early Christianity, John's gospel, Mark's gospel, and gospel origins more generally – were often admirably brief, but packed with information and perceptive insight. At the conference the different papers engaged in various ways with many of the topics that Hengel discussed so admirably.

New Testament studies is the poorer for the loss of Martin Hengel. But it is clear from the conference that his contribution will not be forgotten. Where New Testament studies will go in the present century (and where Tübingen will go!) remains to be seen. The radical scepticism of the Bultmann era continues to be influential, not least in the popular non-theological world of people like Dan Brown, Philip Pullman and others. There will be a continuing need for scholars like Hengel who see it as important to contend for Christian orthodoxy through careful scholarship, who give themselves to research but also to teaching others, who are keen not to promote themselves but the Christian gospel. What was clear at the

conference was the affection in which Martin Hengel was held by those who worked closely with him: He was a man for whom the crucified Christ was not just a topic for research, but someone to be followed and proclaimed.

We are thankful to all those who made the conference possible, notably Dr Mike Bird who organized the programme but who was sadly not able to be with us, also to Ros Clarke and Ruth Norris, who helped on the practical side. We are thankful to Mike Bird and Jason Maston for editing the volume, and for all who have contributed papers, whether at the conference itself or subsequently. We hope and are confident that the volume will be a worthy celebration of a great Christian scholar.

David Wenham
Retiring chair of the New Testament Group
of the Tyndale Fellowship

# Table of Contents

## *IV. Judaism and Early Christianity*



## *V. Translations of Martin Hengel's Essays*

# Introduction

MICHAEL F. BIRD and JASON MASTON

Prof. Martin Hengel (1926–2009) was a historian of the early church and ancient Judaism. His influence extended through his many publications, research students, and conference participation. He was, as he remains in his legacy, a monumental figure in modern New Testament scholarship in both his native Germany and in the wider world. It is fair to say that Hengel shaped the face of modern New Testament studies with valuable contributions to the place of Judaism in the Hellenistic world, the development of early christology, biography of the Apostle Paul, the origins of Christian atonement theology, tradition-history in the Synoptic Gospels, and studies in the Gospel of John. Hengel was a brilliant skeptic. He was skeptical of the *Religionsgeschichte Schule* of Wilhelm Bousset and his followers. He was equally skeptical of the "Marburg circle" associated with Rudolf Bultmann that effectively sought to make New Testament theology palatable for Heidegerrian existentialists by de-historicizing texts from their context. Hengel's response to these dominating intellectual trends in Germany was not a knee-jerk reaction. Rather, through his near exhaustive knowledge of ancient sources and with his great linguistic competencies in the ancient languages, he presented some of the most devastating criticisms leveled against the reigning paradigms in academia. What is more, Hengel remained a committed churchman his whole life and saw no dichotomy between academic study of the Bible and his deep seated faith. The opening essays written by Jörg Frey on Hengel as a teacher and by Roland Deines on Hengel as a historical theologian show exactly why Hengel was such an attractive figure to so many.[1]

The news of his death in 2009 came on the eve of the Tyndale Fellowship gathering in Cambridge in July of that year. During that time we were privileged to have Prof. Roland Deines, a former student of Hengel, speaking at the Tyndale Fellowship. He delivered a keynote paper at the meeting not long after returning from Hengel's funeral in Tübingen. It was then suggested that the Tyndale Fellowship should host a conference in honor of Hengel and his scholarly legacy. Members of the Tyndale Fellowship,

[1] See also the appreciative essay by Larry Hurtado, "Martin Hengel's Impact on English-Speaking Scholarship," *ExpT* 120.2 (2008): 70–76.

especially the New Testament group, had long been acquainted with Hengel's many works and had benefitted immensely from them. Hengel had also visited Tyndale House many times in the past and was well acquainted with its vision, operation, and sizable library. His last visit was on the occasion of his 80th birthday where he was honored with a series of lectures and he also gave an inspiring address to the faculty and residents. Given that so many of us had been challenged and taught by Hengel in either print or in person, a conference seemed a naturally good way of honoring a great New Testament teacher. The essays that follow are the proceedings from that conference with a few additional contributions from persons who were unable to attend the meeting. The essays are grouped under three headings: christology, Gospels, and Judaism and early Christianity.

Before these essays, however, are two "biographical" essays written by two of Hengel's students, Jörg Frey and Roland Deines. The first, "Martin Hengel as Theological Teacher," by Frey describes how Hengel mentored and trained the next generation of scholars. Hengel's concern was not merely that his students produced excellent scholarship, but he also took a genuine interest in their development as persons. In the second essay, "Christology in Service of the Church," Deines argues that all of Hengel's academic studies have at their center christology. Hengel's interest in christology, though, was not just an historical question. Rather, his solid academic work must be situated in the ecclesial charge which he saw himself as performing. Together the two essays present Hengel as both a scholar and a churchman, as one who expressed his deep love for Christ and the church through service to his students.

Part two follows naturally from Deines' essay with a focus on christology. This is the area for which Hengel's work has been perhaps the most controversial and yet arguably made the greatest contribution. Hengel's study on the development of early Christian christology was courageous because it dared to challenge a reigning paradigm – dominant especially in Germany – where a stratum of Gentile Christianity imbibed with Hellenistic religious categories infused an earlier and lower Jewish Christology with Hellenistic content so that christology evolved into its highest form relatively late and far from its Palestinian origins. In contrast, Hengel wrote:

> The comparison of the three hymns in the Johannine Prologue, the Letter to the Hebrews and the Letter to the Philippians shows, first of all, that christological thinking between 50 and 100 C.E. *was much more unified in its basic structure* than New Testament research, in part at least, has maintained. Basically, the later developments are already there in a nutshell in the Philippian hymn. This means, however, with regard to the de-

velopment of *all* the early Church's christology, that more happened in the first twenty years than in the entire later centuries-long development of dogma.[2]

Taking up Hengel's Christological groundwork, Roland Deines offers his own contribution to the subject of "Christology between Pre-existence, Incarnation and Messianic Self-understanding." He systematizes the way in which Hengel's emphasis upon Jesus' messianic self-understanding provides the historical root for the presumption of his pre-existence and the grounds for a theology of incarnation. The messianic nature of Jesus' ministry means, in the end, that Jesus ultimately stands in God's place. Deines contends, following Hengel's lead, that what the early church believed about Jesus' pre-existence and incarnation was in fact an extension of the reflections by his earliest followers about their own experience of the historical Jesus. The "otherness and strangeness of Jesus" as it was experienced by these followers prompted the need to address the question of his actual ontological status. Thus, a high christology did not so much "develop" as it was "discovered."

Seyoon Kim engages the topic of Paul's Christology by focusing on what Paul meant by identifying Jesus as "the Son of God." Kim begins with 1 Thess 1:9b–10, seeking to reconstruct the message that Paul delivered to the Thessalonians. Criticizing the atomistic exegesis of some commentators, he suggests that these verses provide a concise summary of the gospel that Paul proclaimed to the Thessalonians. Each aspect of these verses functions, then, as a heading that captures an aspect of Paul's whole theology. Kim explores two aspects of the Son's work of deliverance from God's wrath: his atonement and intercession. He applies these observations to explain the unity between Rom 1:3–4 and 1:16–17. Kim elucidates how Paul saw God's installation of Jesus as his Son an exercise of God's saving kingship and the revelation of God's justifying righteousness. Kim also draws attention to the connections between Paul's identification of Jesus as God's Son and Jesus' own proclamation of the kingdom of God. Throughout these sections Kim brings together a variety of Pauline texts to give a well-rounded picture of the gospel of Jesus as the Son of God that Paul proclaimed. Kim concludes that the identification of Jesus as God's Son captures the whole of the gospel message: sins are forgiven and there has been a transfer of lordship, as well as, importantly, a declaration that God has dwelt with humanity in his Son – "Immanuel."

In part three are several studies on the Gospels. Hengel was in many ways a lone ranger in proposing Matthean usage of Luke. He questioned the notion of isolated and introspective Gospel communities that determined their content out of their *Sitz im Leben* and he also highlighted the

[2] Martin Hengel, "Christological Titles in Early Christianity," in *The Messiah* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 443 (italics original).

role of apostolic witness in the formation of the Jesus tradition.[3] Hengel rejected a "fundamentalist rationalistic" exegesis of the Gospels built on a need to harmonize and he let the historical and textual problems of the Gospels set the agenda for his study.[4] Hengel's work on the origins of the Gospels is reinforced by Richard Bauckham. Bauckham's work on the genesis of the Johannine tradition and the eyewitness testimony underlying the Gospels has constituted a largely independent work that has reached conclusions similar to Hengel's on these matters. Bauckham affirms several of Hengel's contentions regarding the Gospels including: (1) the Gospels did not circulate as anonymous works; (2) the author of the Gospel of Mark is the John Mark of the New Testament; (3) the authenticity of the connection of Mark with Peter; and (4) The Marcan story is indebted to additional eyewitness accounts. Bauckham investigates the identity of Mark and reinforces Hengel's conclusions by way of two linguistic arguments. First, he notes that while the name "Marcus" was common as a Roman praenomen, the praenomen would never be used alone. Someone identified as "Marcus" must be a slave or non-Roman. Such usage was rare and it was even rarer for Jews to be named "Marcus." So, if the author of Mark's Gospel was Jewish, he is very likely to be the same person as the "John Mark" of Acts and the "Mark" of the Pauline and Petrine letters. Second, Bauckham argues that the Aramaic words attributed to Jesus in the Gospel of Mark were deliberate authorial attempts to claim historical authenticity and that Mark used these Aramaic citations as a way of intimating that his Gospel was based on eyewitness reports.

With a biographical feel, Rainer Riesner takes one through Hengel's journey to discover Jesus. Riesner sets Hengel's scholarly pursuit for Jesus in contrast to Rudolf Bultmann's dismissal of Jesus, particularly the question of Jesus' self-understanding, and the trustworthiness of the Gospel traditions. Hengel's contention that Jesus made a messianic self-claim was grounded in his high confidence in the historicity of the Synoptic Gospels. It is this latter issue that Riesner explores as he traces how Hengel viewed the origins and sources of these Gospels. Hengel took seriously the patristic indications about the Petrine link with Mark. In contrast to much contemporary scholarship, Hengel questioned the optimistic claims about Q, and his own solution to the double tradition had Matthew using Luke. Riesner turns in the final section to Hengel's view of the origin of the Lukan special tradition, which Hengel connected with Jerusalem, particularly Peter. The essay is highly appreciative of Hengel's historical work, but Riesner also raises critical questions about Hengel's view of the relationship

[3] See Martin Hengel, *Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 68–70, 106–7.

[4] Hengel, *Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 23–24.

between Matthew and Luke and the origin of Luke's special traditions. Despite differing over these points, Riesner concludes by reminding us of Hengel's great legacy: given his detailed and comprehensive work on the Gospels, Hengel has paved the way for subsequent scholars to say something meaningful about the historical Jesus.

Andreas Köstenberger explores the relationship between John and the Synoptics, particularly Mark and Luke. After a brief survey of previous scholarship on this relationship, he concludes that the recent discussion of the Gospels as eyewitness testimony requires us to rethink the relationship between John and the Synoptics. Thereafter Köstenberger advocates a theory of "transposition." He defines transposition as the reworking of earlier texts to express potential meanings and the extension of their meaning to a new context. Transposition is not simply an updating, for it also draws out underlying meanings and ideas. To flesh out his hypothesis and in an effort to build a cumulative case for it, he explores representative examples of how John transposes Mark in sixteen ways and Luke in four ways. John's transposition occurs with theological themes (such as kingdom of God and eschatology) and historical events (such as the Temple clearing and the Gentile mission). Concerning the relationship between John and the Synoptics, Köstenberger concludes that John shows awareness of them as literary documents, but he is willing to extend beyond them. Rightly understood, John is both dependent on and independent of them.

Armin Baum engages the subject of the ending of the Fourth Gospel, specifically the origins and authorship of its epilogues, in "The Original Epilogue (John 20:30–31), the Secondary Appendix (21:1–23), and the Editorial Epilogues (21:24–25) of John's Gospel." Hengel argued that John 20:30–31 was the original ending of the book, John 21 was an editorial appendix, with John 21:23–25 an epilogue added by the editors. Baum endeavours to reinforce Hengel's position by exploring Jewish and Graeco-Roman literary conventions where writings were amended with epilogues, superscripts, *sphragis*, or colophons either by the author or by later editors. Baum contends that the authorial epilogue of John 20:30–31, which provides a purpose statement for the Gospel, was not included as a prologue in order to make room for the Evangelist's lavish poem at the beginning of the Gospel. Given the literary similarities between John 1–20 and John 21 it is likely that both parts come from the same source, though John 21 may have been written down by memory by one of the Evangelist's disciples. The epilogic nature of John 21 is enhanced when it is remembered that the Evangelist probably would have, as other ancient authors did, omitted the original epilogue of John 20:30–31 if a secondary epilogue was added by the same author. John 20:30–31 was retained by the editors out of respect for the integrity of the Evangelist's work. Furthermore, John 21:24–25 is

not a *sphragis*, subscription, or colophon, but represents an epilogue by the editors who wanted to make a concluding remark about the book's origin and quality.

Part four examines Judaism and early Christianity. Hengel's historical interest in the history of Judaism and Christianity extended quite broadly and he wrote just as broadly on Jewish background and early church history. His work on Acts is arguably his most prominent contribution in this area. Hengel proposed that although Luke was indeed a theologian who shaped and created material, it does not mean that the Lucan narrative is eviscerated of historical data and can be reduced to mere theological interests. Likewise Hengel had his own particular view on the Hellenists in Acts as an ideological link between Jesus in Paul that set the agenda for later study of this sub-group.[5]

Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* was a benchmark study of ancient Judaism within its social context. After noting the reception of this work and some of the criticisms against it, Jason Maston addresses the issue of Ben Sira's opponents. Hengel's argument that Ben Sira opposed Hellenism is set against other claims that he disputed apocalyptic Judaism, particularly the Enochic community. Using a set of test passages that employ the formula "do not say" and imputed speech, Maston assesses these different interpretations and advances an alternative theory that locates Ben Sira's opponents in neither category. Rather, he suggests that Ben Sira presents to his students the erring opinions of the fool. The ideas about wealth, God's sovereignty and divine judgment voiced by Ben Sira's interlocutors in these passages are matched with ideas attributed to the foolish and wicked person in Israel's wisdom traditions. The target of Ben Sira's polemic is not a real person or group, but the major opposition of all wisdom, and Ben Sira has utilised a common rhetorical technique and descriptions of the fool to visualise the fool for his students.

Steve Walton discusses the utility of Martin Hengel's contribution to the identity, distinctiveness, and role of the "Hellenists" in early Christianity in his essay on "How Mighty a Minority were the Hellenists?" Hengel stands in the tradition of German scholarship reaching back to F.C. Baur that posited an internecine conflict between Jewish (i.e. Petrine) and Gentile (i.e. Pauline) wings of the church. Hengel regarded the Hellenists as representative of a "liberal Judaism" that constituted a "bridge" between the Jerusalem and Pauline churches. As such, Hengel believed that (1) the Hellenists and Hebrews were divided mainly linguistically; (2) but also divided culturally and theologically; (3) only the Hellenists were scattered by the pogrom in Acts 8.1; (4) the scattered Hellenists engaged with

[5] Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

groups of the margins of Judaism such as Samaritans and God-fearers; and (5) the Hellenists were influential on communities of Jesus-believers outside of Jerusalem. Walton also notes the relative popularity of Hengel's views and how they have been carried forward by others like James D. G. Dunn. However, Walton makes several pertinent criticism of Hengel's reconstruction of the Hellenists and their place in early Christianity. First, Walton agrees that the "Hellenists" are identified linguistically, yet this does not mean that they knew no Aramaic nor were they thereby somehow liberal in the commitment to the pillars of Judaism. Second, as such Walton believes that it is more likely that the Hebrew and Hellenistic believers were more united in their beliefs and fellowships than ordinarily recognized. Third, there was no purportedly distinctive theology of the Hellenists that was somehow anti-temple and anti-Torah. Stephen's speech in Acts 7 is intra-Jewish critique of the temple that comports with other Jewish critiques at the temple such as those found at Qumran. There is nothing to indicate that Stephen's views were "liberal" in the Jerusalem church. Fourth, once more, there is nothing to prove that it was the Hellenists who were exclusively persecuted in the pogrom initiated in Acts 8.1. As far as we know the persecution was widespread and included Christ-believers of all forms. Fifth, Walton agrees with Hengel that the Hellenists were of vital significance for the origins of the Gentile mission of the early church, though it does not require an anti-Temple or anti-Law position to constitute such openness to outsiders.

Michael Bird's essay "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11–14): The Beginnings of Paulinism," examines how the split between Paul and Peter at Antioch provided the occasion for the manifestation of Paul's radical stance towards the Torah when the freedom of his Gentile converts were concerned. Bird argues, in contrast to Hengel, that there was no early parting of the ways between Jews and Christians in Antioch. Instead, the mixed Christian assemblies were probably enmeshed in Jewish life in the city. Bird also surmises, similar to Hengel, that the problem in Antioch was caused by Peter acceding to pressure from a Jacobean embassy to cease fraternizing with Gentiles due to increased persecution of the Jerusalem church by zealous Judeans. Paul did not agree with this *Realpolitik* of James and much less with Peter's compliance with it. In Galatians, Paul decried the efforts of those who wanted to compel Gentiles to be circumcised in order to avoid persecution. Bird concludes, in line with Hengel's own position, that Gal. 2.11–14 reveals a parting in the ways between Paul and the Jerusalem and Antiochene churches. The incident at Antioch was the first public expression of Paulinism understood as the antithesis between Christ and Torah. The incident at Antioch depicts Paul in his most raw and radical theological state.

Grant Macaskill enters into the subject of the origin of atonement concepts in the early church. He takes as his starting point Hengel's study *The Atonement*, where Hengel asserted that Greek-speaking Jewish Christians began to articulate the significance of Jesus' death in terms of a vicarious and sacrificial that explicably only in light of Hellenistic influences. The root of it can be traced even earlier into conceptions among Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians and even Jesus about Isaiah 53. Macaskill notes that reviewers agreed with Hengel's view of Hellenistic influences but demurred from his argument for influences from Isaiah 53 and origins in the historical Jesus. Macaskill then pursues an avenue that Hengel himself neglected, viz., the significance of participatory elements in the presentation of the atonement across the New Testament. It is the participatory element that, in Macaskill's mind, sets Christian views of Jesus' death as an atonement apart from Greco-Roman accounts of dying heroes. Participation combines together the status of believers as a new creation and their own personal experience of suffering. That is corroborated by a further image in the New Testament, that of the church as a temple. If Jesus' resurrection body is likened to a new temple, then participating in that resurrection becomes a participation in the new temple in all its glory. Macaskill contends that a participatory model of the atonement explains much of the theological and exhortory material we find in the New Testament.

D.A. Hagner tackles the topic of the "Parting of the Ways" with a fresh look at the topic in light of Hengel's implicit treatment of the subject. He proceeds to examine several areas including Jesus, the earliest church, Paul, the later New Testament, the second century, and Jewish Christianity. As a result, Hagner dismisses recent claims that the concept of a partings fails to reckon with Jewish and Christian diversity. He accepts an essentialist definition of Judaism as defined by certain pillars and regards the early Jesus movement as constituting a challenge to the status and shape of those pillars. While a decisive division is difficult to date, within a couple of decades of his death, followers of Jesus said and did things that were unacceptable within common Judaism. Perceptions of hostility and the formation of a distinct Christian identity emerged in the formative decades of the early church. Christianity was only a sect of Judaism in the early years of its expansion and thereafter became a distinct religious movement in its right. The partings was a process that took decades but resulted in hardened lines and escalating hostilities between Jews and Christians. He maintains that although there are enough substantial continuities to argue that Christianity is a species of Judaism, the discontinuities are so extensive and significant that Christianity quickly became separate from, and other than Judaism. Although it is commonly suggested that models of a partings are theologically motivated, according to Hagner, attempts to flat-

ten the distinctive between Jews and Christians in antiquity are themselves motivated (however nobly) by modern inter-religious dialogue and are not historically objective. For Hagner the partings should be construed positively as the fulfillment of Israel's hope and divine commission to be a light to the Gentiles.

Anna Maria Schwemer, a longtime collaborator and co-author with Hengel, examines the subject of "The First Christians in Syria." This is a subject that Hengel and she touched upon in their volume *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien* (English trans. *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*), to which she returns to anew here. Schwemer surveys the Pauline and Lucan materials about Antioch and what light they shed on the beginnings of Christianity there. Following Acts, she believes that the first Christians in Antioch were Jewish Hellenistic Christians fleeing the pogrom in Jerusalem. Syria was a natural location for missionary work since it had a large Jewish population and was part of what was, eschatologically conceived in some Jewish traditions, "greater Israel." The arrival of Christianity in northern and eastern Syria is much harder to determine since sources are scarce and legendary traditions abound. Schwemer rejects Richard Bauckham's thesis that the traditions and legends about Addai/Thaddaeus are based on a historical memory of relatives of Jesus carrying out a mission in eastern Syria because the sources that Bauckham relies on are too late to be historically reliable. What Schwemer thinks more likely, following Sebastian Brock, is that Christianity reached eastern Syria in one of two ways: either by Christian Hellenists in Antioch who spread the message among Hellenists in Edessa, or else Christianity reached eastern Syria by Jewish Aramaic speakers who were able to converse with other Aramaic speakers in a shared dialect.

Finally, in part five of this volume, we are greatly privileged to be able to present first-ever English translations of several important essays by Hengel. These essays cover a wider array of subjects and provide a snap shot of the breadth of Hengel's interests in history and its relevance for the contemporary church.

In the first of these essays, "A Young Theological Discipline in Crisis" (translated by Wayne Coppins) we find Hengel opining the lack of breadth of knowledge among Neutestamentlers. He also points out that his decision to go into New Testament rather than Church History was driven by his despair at the reigning Bultmannian paradigm of the day that was based on bad historical conclusions. Hengel urges scholars and students to attain a historical knowledge for this is the best anti-dote to bad theology driven by bad history. That requires a genuine *ad fontes* approach to accumulating knowledge of the languages and sources that surround study of the little

book called the New Testament. Only then will the relatively young discipline of New Testament studies endure further.

Then in "The Earliest Roots of Gnosticism and Early Christianity" (translated by Thomas Trapp) Hengel attempts to plot the origins of Gnosticism. Debates about Gnosticism have centered on whether Gnosticism has Jewish, Christian, or Pagan origins. Hengel wields his sword strongly in the direction of those who advocated a pre-Christian Gnosticism that provided a source and foil for both John the Evangelist and the Apostle Paul. Instead, Hengel advocated that Gnosticism had three main sources – middle platonic philosophy, Jewish apocalypticism, and Christianity – which provided the roots for Gnosticism that began to spread and flower a generation after 70 CE around the turn of the century.

Shifting to the Dead Sea Scrolls "Qumran and Earliest Christianity" (translated by Lars Kierspel), Hengel identifies key distinctive of the Qumranites and how they differed from Jesus and the early church on several matters. He then proceeds to show the close analogies between Qumran perspectives and Christian views specifically mentioning Luke's account about the early church in Jerusalem, Pauline anthropology, and Johannine dualism. Hengel detects clear instances of similarities and differences on these topics. In the end, Hengel regards the similarities due to the common Jewish Palestinian nature of both groups. Resemblances are most clear in the areas of eschatology, messianology, and anthropology. Yet he notes that several fundamental differences between the Galilean Jesus and the priestly Judean Teacher of Righteousness as well. A literary dependence between Essene and Christian sources is therefore unlikely.

Back into the New Testament, Hengel's notable essay "The Lukan Prologue and Its Eyewitnesses: The Apostles, Peter and the Women" (translated by Nelson Moore) explores the eyewitness testimony that Luke weaves into his two volume work. Important for Hengel is that Luke, despite his clear theological overlay, provides discernible indications that he has utilized eyewitness testimony, both individual memory and collective memory from the early church, in his account of Jesus and the beginnings of the Christian mission.

In "Confession and Confessions" (translated by Daniel Johansson) Hengel addresses an ecclesial audience with his concern for Christian faith to be confessional and centered on the biblical testimony to Jesus Christ. He points to confessional language and formulas in the Hebrew Scriptures, the Greek New Testament, and in early Christianity. According to Hengel our Christian faith is based on this Apostolic testimony. It is not based on religious experiences or new philosophical insights, but on the foundation of Jesus Christ.

In an excerpt from a longer work by Hengel on Paul, Israel, and the Church, the essay "Paul and Torah" (translated by Wayne Coppins) sets forth eight theses about Paul and the Jewish Law. Hengel examines linguistic data about νόμος and *torā*. Attention focuses on the reconfiguration of Paul's pre-Christian beliefs about the Law based on his christophany and developing Christology. Paul was no antinomian, but he held certain provocative contentions like the Law in its own way actually increases sin and it was not God's final purpose for the Jews. Paradoxically Paul sees love as the replacement to the Law and yet Christians in this new age still need the commandments as part of Christian exhortation.

It is hoped that these essays will move forward scholarly discussion of subjects that Prof. Hengel found so arresting and also honor the contribution he made to those subjects. This volume is the best way that the Tyndale Fellowship could find to honor the work and memory of Prof. Hengel.

# Part I: Biography