INTRODUCTION


As for the now burgeoning literary approach to the NT, see appendix 1 for further bibliography.

For examples of Jewish response to the Holocaust and reinterpretation of the traditional Jewish symbols, see the very different approaches by R. L.

**CHAPTER 1**


CHAPTER 2

In this chapter, I have written out the titles of Jewish primary sources whenever possible. For the Qumran writings this is too complex, so I have used the abbreviations found in the Society of Biblical Literature’s Member’s Handbook, 1994.


An important work that surveys the practice and beliefs of all the sects, including the am-ha-aretz, is E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992).


**CHAPTER 3**


For a general treatment of all the literature, see J. J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora (New York: Crossroad, 1983).
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**CHAPTER 5**


The bald statement that Christianity came to birth with the resurrection experience represents a strong, but also disputed, reading of the evidence, particularly within contemporary scholarship devoted to Christian origins. When I speak of the “birth of Christianity,” I do not, of course, suggest that the scattered, fragmentary, and allusive experiences and convictions reported in these pages as yet constituted a uniform and distinctive “religion.” But I do claim that what eventually developed into that religion found both its point of origin and its self-definition precisely in these experiences and convictions.


Some contemporary historical studies challenge the importance of the resurrection from several directions, all of which share a refusal to take religious experience seriously. The tradition of E. Renan lives on in contemporary explanations of the resurrection as a psychological “event” that takes place in the mind of Peter (at the popular level, see J. Spong, *Resurrection: Myth or Reality?* [San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994]; and at the scholarly level see both G. Luedemann, *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994], and W. Marxsen, *The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth*, trans. M. Kohl [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970]). The tradition of Loisy lives on in studies that attribute belief in the resurrection to the resolution of cognitive dissonance. These place the dissonance in a different sequence than I
do here. Rather than thinking that the dissonance is caused by the disciples’ hopes being shattered by the crucifixion, I locate it in the experience of the resurrection, which shatters their symbolic world. Similar to Loisy are the positions taken by H. Jackson, “The Resurrection Belief of the Earliest Church: A Response to the Failure of Prophecy?” JR 55 (1975): 415–25; and U. Wernick, “Frustrated Beliefs and Early Christianity,” Numen 22 (1975): 96–130.

Pushing the matter even further, the resurrection of Jesus is considered a disease of language according to P. E. Devenish, “The So-Called Resurrection of Jesus and Explicit Christian Faith: Wittgenstein’s Philosophy and Marxsen’s Exegesis as Linguistic Therapy,” JAAR 51 (1983): 171–90. In contrast, P. Lapide, The Resurrection of Jesus: A Jewish Perspective (Minneapolis: Augsburg Books, 1983), despite arguing that since the world continued without change Jesus could not be the Messiah, nevertheless affirms the centrality of the resurrection experience for the first Christians.

More recently, some scholars have insisted that diversity in various “Jesus movements” was even more profound than the NT suggests, to the extent that some post-death followers of Jesus knew nothing of the resurrection and based their lives only on his words and deeds (see B. L. Mack, Who Wrote the New Testament: The Making of the Christian Myth [San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1995], and J. Z. Smith, Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990]). Such radical disintegration of the Christian movement in its earliest stages simply creates a historical problem of a different order.


**CHAPTER 6**

This chapter’s title is borrowed from the book by N. A. Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Books, 1976) wherein one can find his seminal article on *anamnēsis*. That essay, together with another significant piece, “The Crucified Messiah,” is of fundamental importance for understanding the development of the gospel tradition (see the latter study and other of his essays in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*, D. H. Juel, ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991]).


On the Christian practice of preaching, see H. O.


**CHAPTER 9**


CHAPTER 10


(New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951), remains fundamental.


On the role of the secretary in Paul’s letters, see E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*


**CHAPTER 11**


### CHAPTER 12


**CHAPTER 13**


The most thorough attempt to deal with Galatians within the canons of ancient epistolary rhetoric has been made by H. D. Betz, “The Literary Composition and Function of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” *NTS* 21(1974–75): 353–73; see also J. D. Hester, “The Rhetorical Structure of
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On the significance of the Galatian experience for Paul’s argument, see D. J. Lull, *The Spirit in Galatia* (SBLDS 49; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1980).


CHAPTER 14


On various issues related to the study of Romans,

Annot At ed B IB lIogr Aphy


For a commentary in the tradition of classic Lutheran interpretation of Paul, see E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980). Also see the major critical commentaries: J. D. G. Dunn, Romans, 2 vols. (WBC; Waco: Word, 1988); J. A. Fitzmyer, Romans (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1993); and D. Moo, The Epistle to the Romans (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). For nontechnical treatments, see M. Black, Romans, 2nd ed. (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989); B. Byrne, Romans (SP; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996); and L. T. Johnson, Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary (New York: Crossroad, 1997).
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**CHAPTER 16**


**CHAPTER 17**


The crisis in Colossae has been variously interpreted. For a fine collection of essays representing various hypotheses, see W. A. Meeks and F. O. Francis, eds., *Conflict at Colossae*, rev. ed. (SBS, 4; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1975). The essay by F. O. Francis, “Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18,” *Studia Theologica* 16 (1963): 109–34, covers the data well. For various other treatments on the opponents and the nature of the heresy, see C. E. Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism: The Interface between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*, rpr.
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**CHAPTER 18**


**CHAPTER 19**
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CHAPTER 20


On the general background, see the full survey by L. D. Hurst, The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought (SNTSMS 65; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). The Hellenistic aspects of Hebrews are emphasized by L. K. Dey, The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews (SBLDS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1975); R. S. Eccles, “The Purpose of the Hellenistic Patterns in the Epistle to the Hebrews,”


**CHAPTER 21**

Purpose of 1 Peter,” *NTS* 3 (1956–57): 1–11. For a
good cross-section of essays on the epistle, see C. H.
Talbert, ed., *Perspectives on First Peter* (Macon, Ga.:

The possible liturgical background to the letter
is explored by F. L. Cross, *I Peter: A Paschal
Liturgy* (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1954);
A. R. C. Leaney, “I Peter and the Passover: An
Interpretation,” *NTS* 10 (1963–64): 238–51; and T.
C. G. Thornton, “1 Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?” *JTS*

The dependency of 1 Peter on Ephesians is
explored by J. Coutts, “Ephesians 1:3-14 and I
Peter 1:3-12,” *NTS* 3 (1956–57): 115–27; and C.
L. Mitton, “The Relationship Between I Peter and
closer to mine—shared NT parenesis—is found in
P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940);
and A. C. Sundberg, “On Testimonies,” *NovT* 3
(1959): 268–81. For the relation of 1 Peter to
the gospel tradition, see E. Best, “I Peter and the
Gospel Tradition,” *NTS* 16 (1970): 95–113; and
R. H. Gundry, “‘Verba Christi’ in I Peter: Their
Implications Concerning the Authorship of I Peter
and the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition,” *NTS*

Some significant thematic aspects of the letter
are treated in P. J. Achtemeier, “Newborn Babes
and Living Stones: Literal and Figurative in 1 Peter,” in
M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski, eds., *To Touch the
Text* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 207–36; F. H.
Agnew, “I Peter 1:2: An Alternative Translation,”
D. L. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic
Code in I Peter* (SBLMS, 26; Chico, Calif.: Scholars,
1981); E. Best, “I Peter II 4–10: A Reconsideration,”
3:21: A Clue to the Literary Structure of the
Epistle,” *NovT* 16 (1974): 290–305; W. J. Dalton,
*Christ’s Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of I Peter*
Press, 1989); J. H. Elliott, “Backward and Forward
in His Steps” in F. Segovia, ed., *Discipleship in the
184–209; idem, *The Elect and the Holy* (NovTSup,
12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966); B. Gärtner, *The Temple
and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*
(SNTSMS 1; Cambridge; Cambridge University
Press, 1965), 72–88; D. Hill, “On Suffering and
Baptism in 1 Peter,” *NTS* 18 (1976): 181–89; J.
Knox, “Pliny and I Peter: A Note on I Pet 4:4-16
and 3:15,” *JBL* 72 (1973): 187–89; T. W. Martin,
*Metaphor and Composition in I Peter* (SBLDS 131;
Atlanta: Scholars, 1992); T. P. Osborne, “Guide
Lines for Christian Suffering: A Source-Critical and
Theological Study of 1 Peter 2, 21-25,” *Biblica* 64
and Christian Baptism* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard,
1946); W. L. Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition
in I Peter* (WUNT 2.30; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr
[Siebeck], 1989); E. G. Selwyn, “Eschatology in I
Peter,” in D. Daube and W. D. Davies, eds., *The
Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954),
394–401; L. Thurén, *Argument and Theology in I
Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis* (JSNTSup
114; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995); and W.
C. Van Unnik, “The Teaching of Good Works in I

For critical commentary, see P. J. Achtemeier, *I
Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, ed. E. J. Epp
(Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); F.
W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 3rd ed. (Oxford:
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For studies taking into account both Jude and 2 Peter, see M. Desjardins, “The Portrayal of the Dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does It Tell Us More About the ‘Godly’ than the ‘Ungodly’?” *JSNT* 30 (1987): 89–102; J. Knight, *2 Peter and Jude* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995); and D. F.


CHAPTER 23

For studies pertaining to James, the brother of Jesus (the person most frequently associated with the Epistle of James), see R. J. Bauckham, *James* (New York: Routledge, 1999); J. Painter, *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1997); and R. B. Ward, “James of Jerusalem,” *ANRW* II.26.1 (1992): 792–810. For the letter in recent research, see P. H. Davids, “The Epistle of James in Modern...
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**CHAPTER 26**


**EPILOGUE**


Recent critical scholarship has taken up the challenge of several scholars to trace the interpretive consequences of a serious acceptance of the canon. The fullest attempt to push this beyond the programmatic stage has been the work of B. Childs, The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), esp. 3–33; and idem, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993). Also see W. J. Abraham, Canon and Criterion in Christian Theology (London: Oxford University Press, 1998); J. Barton, Holy


Various approaches to doing NT theology are


APPENDIX I


APPENDIX 2


For comprehensive analysis of issues related to the historical Jesus, see B. Chilton and C. A.


