

# Faith in Early Christianity

## An Encyclopedic and Bibliographical Outline<sup>1</sup>

BENJAMIN SCHLIESSER

In the context of emergent Christianity, no Jewish, Greek-Hellenistic or Latin text uses πίστις or πιστεύειν as intensively as the New Testament. One can justifiably talk of an explosive increase in talk of faith in early Christianity.<sup>2</sup> Faith terminology has gained center stage in the religious language of the early Christian movement and developed into its central identity marker. Faith not only determines the self-understanding of an individual, but also functions as a social mark of a group. Statistically, the significance of faith for the self-conception of early Christianity manifests itself in the fact that the noun πίστις and the verb πιστεύειν occur over 240 times each in the New Testament; the adjective πιστός is used 67 times.<sup>3</sup> The remarkably concentrated use of faith terminology in emergent Christianity can only be appropriately explained, if the intrinsic connection between faith and Jesus Christ is acknowledged. Faith relates both to the person of Jesus, to his words and deeds, but also to what God has done in Christ, specifically to the resurrection.<sup>4</sup> In and of itself, the word group

---

<sup>1</sup> Some sections of this essay overlap with my forthcoming article “Faith (New Testament)” for the *Brill Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. I thank Brill Academic Publishers for allowing me to reproduce these sections.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., Klaus Haacker, “Glaube II: Altes und Neues Testament,” *TRE* 13:277–304, 297, 292 (“‘Inflation’ des Redens vom Glauben”); Eberhard Jüngel, “Glaube: IV. Systematisch-theologisch,” *RGG* 3:953–74, 953.

<sup>3</sup> A study on faith in Early Christianity cannot restrict itself to a simple word study on the πιστ-stem, not least because the phenomenon of “faith” is oftentimes expressed by semantically related words or is illustrated in a narrative context. Nevertheless, from a heuristic point of view, it is most reasonable to start from an analysis of πίστις κτλ. and extend the discussion to other expressions of faith. After all, “if there is one term or lexicon on which it is not arbitrary to focus in the New Testament, it is the *pistis* lexicon” (Teresa Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015], 13). On the relationship between “word studies” and “thematic studies”, see *op. cit.*, 31–34.

<sup>4</sup> Clearly, the “explosive increase in talk of faith” corresponds with the fact that “Jesus-devotion appeared quickly and very early, more like a volcanic eruption than an incremental process” (Larry W. Hurtado, “Resurrection-Faith and the ‘Historical’ Jesus,” *JSHJ* 11 [2013]: 35–52, 35f.). Cf., already Gerhard Delling, “The Significance of the

πίστ- is not limited to the religious realm, but associated with a plethora of meanings, and displays a wide range of usage in the historical context of early Christianity.

## 1. Semantics

The “elasticity and multivalency”<sup>5</sup> of πίστις/*fides* and cognates has been pointed out not only in standard dictionaries, but also in a number of linguistic and lexicographical studies.<sup>6</sup> The noun πίστις/*fides* can denote both the subjective attitude of “faith,” “trust” or “confidence,” but also that which stimulates faith, i.e., “honesty,” “trustworthiness,” “loyalty” or “faithfulness” (with reference to persons or interpersonal relations) and “assurance,” “pledge,” “guarantee,” “argument,” or “proof” (with reference to things). Correspondingly, the adjective πιστός (*credens/fidelis/fidus*) comprises the aspects of both “believing”/“trusting” and “faithful”/“trustworthy.” The verb πιστεύειν (*credere/(con)fidere*) can mean “to believe,” “to trust,” “to feel confident that,” “to put faith in,” “to rely on.”

The semantic richness of πίστις/*fides* corresponds to its wealth of usage. It determines the “horizon of understanding” of the early Christian conception of faith. In other words, early Christian talk of faith evokes a complex network of impressions, imaginations, and reflections, which are embedded in a particular sociocultural milieu and which give meaning(s) to the concept of “faith” in a specific communicative situation. As with all cen-

---

Resurrection of Jesus for Faith in Jesus Christ,” in *The Significance of the Message of Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ*, ed. Charles F.D. Moule (London: SCM, 1968), 77–104, 87f.; Jean Duplacy, “D’où vient l’importance centrale de la foi dans le nouveau testament?,” in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*, ed. Joseph Coppens, Albert Descamps, and Édouard Massaux (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 2:430–39. On the question of pre-Easter “faith” in Jesus, see below n. 79 and n. 151.

<sup>5</sup> Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), 13.

<sup>6</sup> See, apart from the entries in the pertinent dictionaries and lexica, e.g., J. Eugene Botha, “The Meanings of *pisteuo* in the Greek New Testament. A Semantic-Lexicographical Study,” *Neot* 21 (1987): 225–40; F. Gerald Downing, “Ambiguity, Ancient Semantics, and Faith,” *NTS* 56 (2010): 139–62; Thomas Schumacher, *Zur Entstehung christlicher Sprache: Eine Untersuchung der paulinischen Idiomatik und der Verwendung des Begriffes πίστις*, BBB 168 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 199–209 (πίστις), 274–85 (*fides*). Other lexical-semantic studies have been published in the context of the πίστις Χριστοῦ-debate (see below n. 57). On the contested semantic relationship between *fides* and πίστις, see most recently Morgan (*Roman Faith* [see n. 3], 7), who takes the side of those who minimize differences in semantic range. “There are perhaps a few more shades of commercial legal meaning attested in Latin, and in Greek rhetoric and philosophy *pistis* may mean ‘argument’ as well as ‘proof’ ...”

tral ideas of early Christianity, “faith” too has a Jewish, Hellenistic-Greek and Roman history, which partly overlap, but which have to be studied each in its own right.

In her comprehensive study on the concept of πίστις/fides in the wider Greco-Roman and Hellenistic Jewish worlds, Teresa Morgan describes this “basic principle of cultural historiography” as follows: “New communities forming themselves within an existing culture do not typically take language in common use in the world around them and immediately assign to it radical new meanings. New meaning may, and often do, evolve, but evolution takes time. This is all the more likely to be the case where the new community is a missionary one. One does not communicate effectively with potential converts by using language in a way which they will not understand. In its earliest years, therefore, we should not expect the meaning of Christian *pistis* (or *fides*) language to be wholly *sui generis*. We should expect those who use it to understand it within the range of meanings which are in play in the world around them, and our study of it should be culturally embedded.”<sup>7</sup>

## 2. The Religious and Cultural Milieu of Early Christian Faith-Terminology

### 2.1 Judaism

#### *Septuagint*

As for the Jewish history of the early Christian notion of “faith”, the usage in the Septuagint as well as in Josephus and Philo are of particular importance.<sup>8</sup> In the Septuagint, the word group πίστ- correlates with the Hebrew (and Aramaic) stem נאם with remarkable constancy.<sup>9</sup> The translators of the Septuagint consistently render the *hiphil* of the Hebrew verb נאם with πιστεύειν, and the *niphal* of נאם with πιστός. It is worth noting, however, that πίστις is not the only translation word used for נאם or נאמא, but is superseded by ἀλήθεια. Contrary to widespread Greek-Hellenistic usage, the sense “evidence” or “proof” is not attested in the Septuagint, with the exception of 2 Esd 20:1; 3 Macc 3:10. Mediated by the Septuagint the basic meaning of the stem נאם influenced and perpetuated the linguistic usage of early Christian writers (cf., Gen 15:6 in Rom 4:3; Gal 3:6; Jas

<sup>7</sup> Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), 4.

<sup>8</sup> On the notion of “faith” in the Septuagint, see the contributions by Frank Ueberschaer and Friedrich Reiterer (πιστεύειν, πείθειν, and ἐπιπίζειν) in the present volume; also Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), 176–211.

<sup>9</sup> On an analysis of the basic “texts of faith” in the Old Testament, see Anja Klein’s contribution to the present volume. She observes that towards the end of the inner-biblical reception of texts of faith there is a tendency to individualize faith and to merge it with obedience to the law.

2:23;<sup>10</sup> Isa 28:16 in Rom 9:33; 10:11; 1 Pet 2:6; Hab 2:4 in Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38). “Faith” can be used in the absolute (e.g., Exod 4:31; Isa 7:9; 28:16), but is also directed to persons (e.g., Exod 4:1, 5, 8; 14:31: Moses; 2 Chr 20:20: Yahweh’s prophets) or words (e.g., Gen 42:20) in general, and quite frequently appears with reference to God (e.g., Gen 15:6; Exod 14:31; Deut 9:23), his salvific deeds (e.g., Ps 78[77]:22), his words (e.g., Ps 106:12, 24) or his commandments (e.g., Ps 119[118]:66).

The Septuagint version of Isa 7:9 does not render the Masoretic play on words on the stem  $\text{נִסַּח}$  (“If you do not stand firm in faith, you shall not stand at all”), but introduces a cognitive dimension:  $\text{καὶ ἔὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε, οὐδὲ μὴ συνήτε}$  (“If you do not believe, you will not understand”). Both the Peshitta and the *Vetus Latina* (*si non credideritis non intelligetis*) follow the Septuagint’s strand of tradition (cf., Isa 6:9:  $\text{οὐ μὴ συνήτε}$ ). Several suggestions have been made to explain the considerable variation.<sup>11</sup> At any rate, the reading testifies to the specifically Greek epistemological nuance of  $\text{πίστις}$ , which is not preformed in the Hebrew Bible and which might even have precluded the reception of Isa 7:9 in the New Testament.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> On the multi-faceted reception of Gen 15:6 in Judaism and in the New Testament see Matthias Köckert, “Abrahams Glaube in Röm 4 und im vorpaulinischen Judentum,” in *Der Römerbrief als Vermächtnis an die Kirche*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2012), 15–47; Sascha Flüchter, *Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit: Auf dem Weg zu einer sozialhistorisch orientierten Rezeptionsgeschichte von Gen 15,6 in der neutestamentlichen Literatur*, TANZ 51 (Tübingen: Francke 2010); Benjamin Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4: Paul’s Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*, WUNT 2/224 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 152–220; Manfred Oeming, “Der Glaube Abrahams: Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte von Gen 15,6 zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels” (1998), in: idem, *Verstehen und Glauben: Exegetische Bausteine zu einer Theologie des Alten Testaments*, BBB 142 (Berlin: Philo, 2003), 77–91. See also Anke Dorman’s contribution on Abraham in Jubilees in the present volume.

<sup>11</sup> A scribal error in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator (already Eberhard Nestle, “Miscellen,” *ZAW* 25 [1905]: 201–23, 213–15), the intrusion of a gloss/marginal comment into the text (e.g., Gordon C.I. Wong, “A Cuckoo in the Textual Nest at Isaiah 7:9b?,” *JTS* 47 [1996]: 123f.) or the combination of “a mechanically trivial mistake ... coupled with ... an ancient conjectural emendation” (Glen M. Menzies, “To What Does Faith Lead? The Two-Stranded Textual Tradition of Isaiah 7.9b,” *JSOT* 80 [1998]: 111–28, 127).

<sup>12</sup> In the history of theology, the altered reading became enormously influential, particularly with patristic and scholastic theology (cf., Wilhelm Geerlings, “Jesaja 7,9b bei Augustinus: Die Geschichte eines fruchtbaren Mißverständnisses” [1987], in: idem, *Fußnoten zu Augustinus: Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Georg Röwekamp, IP 55 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 135–48; Peter Gemeinhardt, “Glauben und Verstehen: Jesaja 7,9b LXX in der patristischen Exegese und Theologie,” in “*Let the Wise Listen and Add to Their Learning*” (*Prov 1:5*): *Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of his 75th*

The textual history, interpretation and New Testament reception of Hab 2:4 is convoluted;<sup>13</sup> while the Masoretic text speaks of the faith(fulness) of the righteous one, the Greek implies God's faithfulness.

In texts unique to the Septuagint, Ben Sira's associating "faith" and the law *and* his paralleling faith in the law with trust in the Lord stand out: "The one who 'believes' in the law (ὁ πιστεύων νόμῳ) heeds the commandments, and the one who trusts in the Lord (ὁ πεποιθὼς κυρίῳ) will not suffer a loss" (Sir 32:24; see also 1QpHab II, 14f.).<sup>14</sup> Abraham's faithfulness to the law is exemplary (Sir 44:20; see also Jub. 24:11; 2 Bar. 54:2), and he proved it most plainly when he was tested (Sir 44:20; cf., 1 Macc 2:52; see also 4QPsJub<sup>a</sup>). Trust in God is associated with hope in God's intervention (Sir 2:6; cf., 1 Macc 2:59–61; see also 2 Bar. 48:22). In 4 Macc the mother of the seven sons is said to have disregarded her pains because of "faith in God/faithfulness towards God" (πρὸς θεὸν πίστις) (15:24). Abraham and others, who were faithful in trials and did not violate God's commandment (16:24), serve as a model in the mother's philosophically colored exhortation to her sons: "You too must have the same faith in God and not be grieved. It is unreasonable for people who have religious knowledge not to withstand pain" (16:22–23). In the context of mission, faith is used as a term for the act of conversion to the one God and results in the protection from divine wrath and judgment (Jdt 14:10; Wis 12:2; cf., Jonah 3:5; see also 2 Bar. 42:2; 54:16; 57:2; 4 Ezra 7:24, 33f.).<sup>15</sup> Extra-biblical literature portrays Abraham's faith as his turning from pagan idols to the true God (e.g., Jub. 11:16–17; 12:1–8; Philo). Overall, Abraham embodies the basic motives of faith prevalent in early Jewish thought, which corresponds to the growing significance of the pa-

---

*Birthday*, ed. Constanza Cordoni and Gerhard Langer, StudJud 90 (Berlin: de Gruyter 2016), 457–80.

<sup>13</sup> In recent years, it has been studied in Stephen Hultgren, *Habakkuk 2:4 in Early Judaism, in Hebrews, and in Paul*, CRB 27 (Paris: Gabalda, 2011); Wolfgang Kraus, "Hab 2,3–4 in der hebräischen und griechischen Texttradition mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament," in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum – The Septuagint and Christian Origins*, ed. Thomas S. Cauley and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 277 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 153–73. See further the collection Matthieu Arnold, Gilbert Dahan, and Annie Noblesse-Rocher, eds., „*Le juste vivra de sa foi*“ (*Habacuc 2, 4*), LD 246 (Paris: Cerf, 2012); and E. Ray Clendenen, "Salvation by Faith or by Faithfulness in the Book of Habakkuk?," *BBR* 24 (2014): 505–13.

<sup>14</sup> The textual transmission of the verse is not unproblematic; it is clear however that the Greek ὁ πιστεύων νόμῳ represents the Hebrew נוצר תורה ("keeper of the Tora") (Manuscript B).

<sup>15</sup> Cf., Egon Brandenburger, "Pistis und Soteria: Zum Verstehenshorizont von 'Glaube' im Urchristentum," *ZTK* 85 (1988): 165–98, 181–83. See also Stefan Krauter's contribution to the present volume.

triarch: He is the first who believed in the one God, he is the paradigmatic proselyte, he kept the divine law, and he proved faithful in trial.<sup>16</sup>

In extra-biblical pseudepigraphical literature, faith figures as a theological-ethical identity marker, which demarcates the pious both from “godless” Jews (4 Ezra 7:131; 2 Bar. 42:2; 54:16, 21) and from “pagans” (1 En. 46:8; Sib. Or. 3:69).

### Josephus

Faith terminology plays a prominent role in the writings of the Roman-Jewish historiographer Flavius Josephus.<sup>17</sup> Generally, his usage does not deviate from common Greek usage. Influences of the Old Testament idea of faith are discernible when he talks about giving credence to, or trusting in, God (τῷ θεῷ, e.g., *B.J.* 3.387; *A.J.* 2.117; 3.309) and the prophets (e.g., *A.J.* 9.12); he argues that the 22 books of scripture “are rightly trusted” (*C. Ap.* 1.38). As distinguished from εὐσέβεια, πίστις does not signify the proper relationship between humans and God, but is found in the sense of “faithfulness” or “fidelity” (e.g., *B.J.* 2.135: the Essene’s eminent “fidelity”) or “proof/evidence” (e.g., *A.J.* 15.69, 260; 16.21; 19.16: “evidence of the power of God”). The category of the genitive in the phrase πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ (*A.J.* 17.179, 284) is disputed, as it could refer to the divinity’s faithfulness or to belief with respect to the divinity. With the expression πίστις περὶ θεοῦ, Josephus points to Moses as the lawgiver, who has to, and successfully does, convince (πειθεῖν) the people to follow the decrees of the law (*C. Ap.* 2.163; cf., 2.153, 169). Here, an existential faith-relation with God is not the primary connotation of πίστις, but rather: the most correct belief about God (i.e., πίστις being virtually synonymous with δόξα; cf., e.g., *C. Ap.* 2.179).<sup>18</sup> In keeping with his overall linguistic usage and in

<sup>16</sup> Cf., Beate Ego, “Abraham als Urbild der Toratreue Israels,” in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition*, ed. Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 25–40; eadem, “Abraham’s Faith in the One God – A Motif of the Image of Abraham in Early Jewish Literature,” in *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, DCLY 2008 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 337–54; Nancy Calvert-Koyzis, *Paul, Monotheism and the People of God: The Significance of Abraham Traditions for Early Judaism and Christianity*, JSNT.S 273 (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

<sup>17</sup> Dieter Lührmann, “Pistis im Judentum,” *ZNW* 64 (1973): 19–38, 26–29; Dennis R. Lindsay, *Josephus and Faith: Πίστις and πιστεύειν as Faith Terminology in the Writings of Flavius Josephus and in the New Testament*, AGJU 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1993). See also Dennis Lindsay’s contribution to the present volume.

<sup>18</sup> Adolf Schlatter, *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, BFCT 14/1 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1910), 27: “Durch πίστις bezeichnet er diese δόξα (sc. περὶ θεοῦ) als gewiß.” John M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*, vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 260f.

marked contrast to other lines of tradition (cf., esp. Philo), Josephus does not mention “faith” when referring to Abraham, but rather repeatedly attributes to Abraham “piety” (εὐσεβεία).

### Philo

Wilhelm Bousset has dubbed the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria “the first theologian of faith, the first who develops a detailed psychology of faith.”<sup>19</sup> The abundant references to, and reflections on, faith in the vast *corpus Philonicum* testify to Philo’s attempt to mediate between philosophical and Old Testament traditions.

In particular, Philo highlights the faith of Abraham. He presents the patriarch, who was of high repute even among non-Jews,<sup>20</sup> both as the prototype of Gentiles who turn to the one God and as the perfect embodiment of the virtue of faith (e.g., *Abr.* 262–73; *Virt.* 211–18; *Praem.* 27–49; *Migr.* 43–44; *Her.* 90–101).<sup>21</sup> Philo famously characterizes faith as “the most sure and certain of the virtues” (*Virt.* 216), the “queen of virtues” (*Abr.* 270), the “most perfect of virtues” (*Her.* 91), a “perfect good” (*Migr.* 44). Faith is firm and unswerving, as it distrusts “created being, which in itself is wholly unworthy of trust” (*Her.* 93), and rather trusts in God, the “Existent” (*Abr.* 270; *Praem.* 27; *Her.* 95). The path to faith leads through “learning” (μάθησις, *Leg.* 2,89). Philo’s understanding of faith, however, is

---

note 629: “practically synonymous with the more frequently used δόξα (2.179, 221, 224, 239, 254, 255, 256, 258).”

<sup>19</sup> Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginning of Christianity to Irenaeus* (1926), trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970), 200. Philo’s use of faith terminology and his “theology of faith” have been analyzed in numerous studies, oftentimes in relation to Paul’s and with respect to their appeal to Abraham: Among those are Lindsay, *Josephus and Faith* (see n. 17), 53–73; David M. Hay, “*Pistis* as ‘Ground for Faith’ in Hellenized Judaism and Paul,” *JBL* 108 (1989): 463–68; Halvor Moxnes, *Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul’s Understanding of God in Romans*, NT.S 53 (Leiden: Brill, 1980); Martin Preisker, *Der Glaubensbegriff bei Philon: Hauptsächlich dargestellt an Moses und Abraham* (Breslau: Gärtner, 1936); Adolf Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament* (1st ed. 1885), 4th ed. 1927 = 6th ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1982), 60–80; Émile Bréhier, *Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d’Alexandrie*, EPhM 8 (Paris: Vrin, 1925), 206–25.

<sup>20</sup> Günter Mayer concluded that the Jewish missionary propaganda centring on Abraham resulted in an extraordinarily positive image of the patriarch, which was in turn countered by a derogatory propaganda of both the leading philosophical schools and political propagandists (Günter Mayer, “Aspekte des Abrahambildes in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur,” *EvTh* 32 [1972]: 118–27, 119f.).

<sup>21</sup> Cf., Jérôme Moreau, “Entre Écriture sainte et παιδεία: Le langage exégétique de Philon d’Alexandrie: Étude sur la πίστις d’Abraham dans le *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 90–95,” in *Philon d’Alexandrie: Un penseur à l’intersection des cultures gréco-romaine, orientale, juive et chrétienne*, ed. Sabrina Inowlocki and Baudouin Decharneux (Turnhout: Brepols), 2011, 241–63.

not apprehended to its full extent, if only his use of πίστις and cognates is considered. The concept of εὐσέβεια represents another seminal idea within Philo's sapiential worldview.<sup>22</sup> A likewise important aspect is the "objective" notion of πίστις in Philo, which associates him with Aristotle's application of faith terminology in the realm of rhetoric (cf., Philo, *Plant.* 173). In numerous instances he uses it to mean something like "objective ground for subjective faith,"<sup>23</sup> i.e., "proof/evidence" (e.g., *Opif.* 93) or "pledge", which is synonymous to other epistemological expressions like "demonstration" (ἀπόδειξις), "evidence" (δείγμα) or "(argumentative) proof" (τεκμήριον).<sup>24</sup>

### Rabbinic Literature

The use of אמן, אמונה and אמונה in Rabbinic texts clearly roots in the biblical linguistic world.<sup>25</sup> This insight was shared even by those who – like Rudolf Bultmann – maintained that "in Rabb[inic] writings faith is understood one-sidedly as obedience to the Law."<sup>26</sup> While the element of obedience (to the law) undoubtedly figures strongly in the Rabbinic idea of faith,<sup>27</sup> other features are part of the "encyclopedic knowledge" constituted by the terms אמן etc. In the realm of economics and private law – which is certainly enwrought religiously –, trustworthiness is required for a proper handling of business processes: For instance, one is to abstain from eating fruits bought from a merchant who cannot be regarded as trustworthy in terms of his tithing (נאמן) (m. Demai 4:1; cf., 4:2; 7:1, 3). Transposed to the religious sphere, the notion of trustworthiness implies that a teacher of the Torah distinguishes himself, among other things, by the trustworthiness of the wise men (אמונה חכמים) (m. ʿAbot 6:5). Finally, faith establishes and nourishes the relationship between God and human beings, even amidst trials and tribulations. As numerous other Jewish texts, the Rabbinic writings revere Abraham as an exemplar of faithfulness, as God's command to give away his son did not stop him from clinging on to God (Gen 22). Less

<sup>22</sup> This is stressed by Martina Böhm's contribution to the present volume.

<sup>23</sup> Hay, "Pistis" (see n. 19), 465.

<sup>24</sup> As Beatrice Wyss shows in her contribution to the present volume, a century and a half later, Clement of Alexandria would seek to prove the significance of πίστις as an epistemological foundation by drawing on Aristotle.

<sup>25</sup> On the theme of faith in Rabbinic literature, see apart from dictionary entries Günter Stemberger, "Glaube im rabbinischen Judentum," *TLZ* 139 (2014): 1113–30, and Michael Tilly's contribution to the present volume.

<sup>26</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, "πίστις κτλ.," *TDNT* 6:174–82, 197–228, 199.

<sup>27</sup> Cf., Menachem Kellner, *Must a Jew Believe Anything?*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 32 (on b. Shab 31a, which in turn refers to Hab 2:4): "The *tzadik* ... is defined as one who lives by faith (*emunah*); faith ... finds its expression in the fulfillment of the 613 commandments of the Torah."

frequently, the rabbis point to Abraham's faith in the promise of offspring (Gen 15:6), though Mekhilta Beshallah 4 (98–99; on Exod 14:15) claims that the sea was divided by the merit of Israel's faith and by the merit of Abraham's faith. Just as faith was instrumental in Israel's exodus from Egypt, it will also be the basis for eternal salvation. In Beshallah 7 (114; on Exod 14:31) it is said that Abraham received this world and the world to come by the merit of faith. Overall and notwithstanding the multivalence of the *אֱמוּנָה*-word group in Rabbinic literature, faith is defined "less in terms of specific propositions that are to be accepted or rejected (beliefs) than in terms of trust and reliance."<sup>28</sup>

## 2.2 Greco-Roman World

### *Epistemology and Rhetorical Theory*

In the Greco-Roman world, *πίστις* and *fides* play a most prominent role in all areas of human life and thinking,<sup>29</sup> in rhetorical, philosophical, political, juridical, and socio-cultural contexts, and not least in the religious sphere. The concept of *fides* is at the heart of the Roman state system and emotional economy, it is virtually omnipresent and characterizes almost all sorts of interpersonal and interstate relationships, as well as those to the gods.<sup>30</sup>

In Plato's epistemology *πίστις* denotes a form of inferior knowledge tied and limited to the sensual world (*Tim.* 27d–28a), while the world of

---

<sup>28</sup> Menachem Kellner, "Dogma," in *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought: Original Essays on Critical Concepts, Movements, and Beliefs*, ed. Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes-Flohr, 4th ed. (New York: Scribner, 1988), 141–46, 142. This statement is also quoted in the essay by Michael Tilly (section 2.1), though he also emphasizes that the Rabbis did not exclude the cognitive dimension and the notion of what has later been called *fides quae*. Basic religious convictions establish and motivate proper religious praxis.

<sup>29</sup> On the use of faith-terminology in everyday language, using the example of papyri, see Peter Arzt-Grabner's contribution to the present volume.

<sup>30</sup> Cf., Carl Becker, "Fides," *RAC* 7:801–39, 801; Viktor Pöschl, "Politische Wertbegriffe in Rom," *AuA* 26 (1980): 1–17, 3: "[Fides] ist der wichtigste Schlüssel zum römischen Wertesystem." Gabriele Thome, *Zentrale Wertvorstellungen der Römer: Texte – Bilder – Interpretationen*, *Auxilia* 46 (Bamberg: Buchner, 2000), 2:50–84. See, apart from Thomas Schumacher's and Teresa Morgan's contributions in the present volume, the thorough discussion in Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), on the role of "faith" in relation to oneself (39–45), to family members and lovers (45–51), in friendship (55–60), and in public life (60–74), as well as in military matters (77–85), politics (85–95), interstate relations (95–104), economics (105–8) and in the legal system (108–16). Morgan (op. cit., 472) repeatedly stresses the relational nature of "faith" in the Greco-Roman cultural world: It "is one of those qualities that can only be practised socially: it is inherently relational and characteristically expressed in action towards other human beings (or, occasionally, animals)."

ideas requires ἐπιστήμη. “Belief” and “understanding” correspond to each other like the categories of “Becoming” (γένεσις) and “Being” (οὐσία) (*Tim.* 29c). In his Analogy of the Divided Line (*Resp.* 6.509d–513e) Plato discerns four levels of knowledge: “conjecture” (εἰκασία) and “belief” (πίστις) as pertaining to the sensual, “thought” (διάνοια) and “cognition” (νόησις) as grasping the intelligible.

According to Plato, rhetorical efforts may aim at “belief” in the sense of “persuasion”, but will never reach at a real perception of truth (*Gorg.* 454e). In line with Plato, Aristotle uses the word group πίστ- to refer to a rhetorician’s attempt to persuade his audience, e.g., in court. He discerns three kinds of “persuasions” (πίστεις) that accomplish this task: the moral integrity of the orator, a certain mind-set of the audience, and a compelling line of argumentation (*Rhet.* 1.2.2–4 [1355b–1356a]). Particularly the first aspect pertains to trusting (πιστεύομεν) in the rhetorician.<sup>31</sup>

The use of πίστις in rhetorical theory is closely related to its colloquial understanding, according to which someone considers true a person’s testimony (or refuses to believe). To mention just two examples from a wide period of time: Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.1.8) has Jason of Pherae say: “hear from me, and believe nothing (ἄκουε καὶ μηδὲν πιστεύε μοι) that I say unless upon consideration it appears to you true,” and Plutarch in his treatise “Concerning Talkativeness” (*Garr.* 503D) holds that “chatterers are disbelieved even if they are telling the truth” (ἀπιστοῦνται δ’ οἱ λάλοι, κἄν ἀληθεύωσιν).

In Stoic tradition, faithfulness ranks among the virtues, together with *pietas* and *iustitia* (Seneca, *Ben.* 2.31.1, citing Chrysippus; cf., *SVF* 3 no. 507), and stands for one significant characteristic of the truly wise man. Epictetus goes as far as to argue that “man is born for fidelity (πρὸς πίστιν),” i.e. fidelity to himself; “he who subverts fidelity subverts the peculiar characteristic of men” (*Diatr.* 2.4.1). As faith(fulness) is deemed one of the cardinal virtues, not only in Stoic thinking, it is also a social norm and shapes human coexistence.

### *Sociality and Relationality of Faith*

The philosophers hold true friendship to be a relationship between men who are good, wise, and alike in virtue. Friendship rhetoric is pervaded by references to the notion and necessity of “faith(fulness)”: Already Xenophon juxtaposes φιλία and πίστις (*Anab.* 1.6.3), and Aristotle declares that “there is no stable friendship without faithfulness” (*Eth. eud.* 7.2 [1237b]).

---

<sup>31</sup> James L. Kinneavy (*Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith: An Inquiry* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1987]) argues for the influence of the rhetorical usage of faith-language on the New Testament. Πίστις entails trust in the reliability of the one who speaks (in Christian terms: God) and assent to the message (the kerygma).

Among Roman authors, it is Cicero, who ties together the virtues of love, benevolence, constancy, and loyalty (*fides*) as the main constituents of genuine friendship (*Amic.* 65). Seneca places *fides* (“loyalty”) next to *libertas* (“freedom of speech”) as the essential characteristics of a true friend (*Ben.* 6.30.4).<sup>32</sup> The concept of friendship and the role of *fides* and πίστις therein, is most complex, as friendship terminology is applied in almost all social relations in public life, imperial politics, or business associations.<sup>33</sup>

“Faith” not only establishes and sustains friendship, but is also invaluable in the sphere of familial and domestic relationships, between family members and between masters and slaves, as well as between patrons and clients. The function of πίστις and *fides* in patronage is twofold: The patron expects “trustworthiness” or “dependability” from his clients, and the client places “trust” in his patron, awaiting the fulfilment of his obligation. Seneca raises doubts whether a relationship of client and patron can be characterized by true *fides*; rather, he allocates *fides* merely among friends (*Ben.* 6.34.3–5). In the ideology of Roman imperialism, the idea of patronage networks was transferred to inter-state relationships:<sup>34</sup> The *imperium Romanum* proves its divinely sponsored “trustworthiness” to subject cities and nations, oftentimes labelled “friends” of Rome, which in turn show their “loyalty” to their protecting power. *Deditio in fidem* (Pol. 20.9.10–12) was a distinctive type of capitulation, in which an autonomous state surrendered to Rome, trusting in its loyalty and expecting its protection.

In the juridical and economic realm, πίστις and, less so, *fides* acquire the meaning “guarantee,” “pledge,” “evidence,” as in rhetorical terminology, though the ethical inflection never disappears. Among business partners, an ethic of “dependability” is vital. Cicero notes that just as friendship is kept up by truth (*veritas*), a business association requires *fides* (*Quinct.* 26: *fide ... societas colitur*). In *de officiis* 1.23, Cicero estab-

<sup>32</sup> Niklas Luhmann (*Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie*, 4th. ed. [Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1991], 577) labelled friendship according to ancient ideals “the society’s principle of perfection.” See also Benjamin Schliesser, “Paulus und ‘seine’ Philipper: Geschäftspartner, Wohltäter, Vereinsgründer? Sozialgeschichtliche Perspektiven auf den Philipperbrief,” in *Der Philipperbrief des Paulus in der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*, ed. Jörg Frey and Benjamin Schliesser, with assistance of Veronika Niederhofer, WUNT 353 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 33–119, 54–61.

<sup>33</sup> On the role of πίστις/*fides* among friends (in the broadest sense), see, e.g., David Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Key Themes in Ancient History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, eds., *Valuing Others in Classical Antiquity*, Mnemosyne Supplements 323 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Craig A. Williams, *Reading Roman Friendship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

<sup>34</sup> Cf., e.g., Dieter Nörr, *Die Fides im Römischen Völkerrecht* (Heidelberg: Müller, 1991).

lishes the principle that “good faith” is the basis of justice: *Fundamentum ... est iustitiae fides*. Notably, a prerequisite of trusting others is trusting oneself: In his *Tusculan Disputations* (3.14) Cicero explains that whoever is brave is self-confident (*fidens*), and whoever is self-confident is without fear.

### *Religious Life*

“Faith” is not only “powerfully functional” and “profoundly transformative” in the personal and public sphere, but also occupies an important place in the realm of religiosity.<sup>35</sup> However, in Greco-Roman religious thinking πίστις/*fides* do not figure as the central terminology to capture the essence of divine-human relationships or the assent to religious propositions. One possible exception is the first century biographer and philosopher Plutarch, who was also a priest at the temple of Apollo at Delphi involved in interpreting oracles. Plutarch testifies to a remarkable, multifaceted religious usage of faith language,<sup>36</sup> and he does so independently from early Christianity, of which – in contrast to Judaism – he obviously did not take notice. One aspect of Plutarch’s notion of πίστις concerns a people’s adherence to its inherited faith as sacrosanct prerequisite for meaningful religious and societal life: When faced with sophistic and atheistic inquiries, we are “to believe according to the faith of our forefathers”

---

<sup>35</sup> Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), 174f. See also Christian Strecker, “Fides – Pistis – Glaube: Kontexte und Konturen einer Theologie der ‘Annahme’ bei Paulus, in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion*, ed. Michael Bachmann and Johannes Woyke, WUNT 182 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 223–50; Gérard Freyburger, *Fides: Étude sémantique et religieuse depuis les origines jusqu’à l’époque augustéenne*, Collection d’études anciennes (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986). Morgan concludes her discussion of “faith” in Greco-Roman Religiosity (op. cit., 123–75) with the observation that “many of the foundations of *pistis/fides* are perceived as fragile” and that the fragility (and consequently: desirability) of πίστις and *fides* created opportunities for Christian missionaries (op. cit., 175). See also below section 5.

<sup>36</sup> Plutarch’s notion of πίστις κτλ. has been studied in George van Kooten, “A Non-Fideistic Interpretation of πίστις in Plutarch’s Writings: The Harmony between πίστις and Knowledge,” in *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity*, ed. Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta and Israel Muñoz Gallarte, Ancient Mediterranean and Medieval Texts and Contexts: Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 215–33; Françoise Frazier, “Philosophie et religion dans la pensée de Plutarque: Quelques réflexions autour des emplois du mot πίστις,” *Études platoniciennes* 5 (2008): 41–61; eadem, “Göttlichkeit und Glaube: Persönliche Gottesbeziehung im Spätwerk Plutarchs,” in *Gott und die Götter bei Plutarch: Götterbilder – Gottesbilder – Weltbilder*, ed. Rainer Hirsch-Luipold (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 111–137. See also Rainer Hirsch-Luipold’s highlighting of the two foci of Plutarch’s idea of faith in his contribution to the present volume: religious tradition and individual faith.

(*Amat.* 13, 756B). Conversely, attending to paternal faith goes hand in hand with a firm confidence that trusts in God's favorable affection and assistance. In Plutarch, therefore, faith has become "a key word of religious self-understanding,"<sup>37</sup> though at the same time being at home in the domain of philosophy and coupled with epistemological and cognitive vocabulary.

Plutarch also witnesses to the correlation of the miraculous and faith: Those, who cherish affection for the divine, will have a strong argument for their faith in the wonderful and in the supernatural character of the divine power (Plutarch, *Cor.* 38.3). However, the fact that among the naïve miraculous experiences evoke faith (cf., Lucian, *Philops.* 13, 15, 30) is criticized by the philosopher (cf., Marcus Aurelius 1.6) or ridiculed by the satirist (cf., Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 339; *Icar.* 2).

Several ancient authors refer to a personification or a deification of Πίστις or *Fides*. The 6th century Greek poet Theognis of Megara laments that the "great goddess" Πίστις has returned to Mount Olympus and left the earth in a devastating moral condition (1135–38).<sup>38</sup> Plutarch reports that Numa Pompilius, the legendary second king of Rome, has built a temple to Πίστις and "taught the Romans their most solemn oath by Faith" (*Num.* 16.1), and he documents a hymn praising the goddess *Fides* next to Zeus, divine Roma and the conqueror of Greece, Titus Quinctius Flaminius: "And the Roman faith we revere, which we have solemnly vowed to cherish" (*Flam.* 16.4). In the third century BC, the Romans established a temple of deified *Fides* on the Capitoline, right next to the temple of Jupiter.<sup>39</sup> During the reign of Tiberius, Roman author Valerius Maximus praises the "venerable deity (*numen*) *Fides*" to be the "surest pledge of human salvation" (*Memorabilia* 6,6).

In past decades, the study of the New Testament concept of faith has been dominated by the question of its religio-historical origin.<sup>40</sup> For a long

---

<sup>37</sup> Gerd Schunack, "Glaube in griechischer Religiosität," in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel, BZ NW 97 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 296–326, 322.

<sup>38</sup> In Theognis, both the noun πίστις and its antonym ἀπιστία occur for the first time in Greek literature (cf., 66, 831, 1137, 1244). The juxtaposition of πίστεις and ἀπιστία in Hesiod, *Op.* 372, is part of a corrupt piece of text, whereby πίστεις might be a secondary addition (cf., Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hesiodos Erga* [Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1928], 84f.).

<sup>39</sup> Cf., Christoph Reusser, *Der Fidestempel auf dem Kapitol in Rom und seine Ausstattung: Ein Beitrag zu den Ausgrabungen an der Via del Mare und um das Kapitol 1926–1943*, *Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma: Supplementi* 2 (Rome: L'Erma die Bretschneider, 1993).

<sup>40</sup> For this phase of the discussion, the following studies are representative: Lührmann, "Pistis im Judentum" (see n. 17); Eduard Lohse, "Emuna und Pistis: Jüdisches und ur-

time the judgment of the History of Religions School has been undisputed that while in classical Greek “[t]he words in πίστ- did not become religious terms,”<sup>41</sup> they were used as catchwords in those religions engaged in missionary propaganda, whether Jewish or non-Jewish.<sup>42</sup> This almost canonical proposition has been challenged by Dieter Lührmann’s proposal that “faith” was by no means a common category of the phenomenology of religion in the context of early Christianity. Rather, πίστις and πιστεύειν represent “semantic loan words” (*Bedeutungslehnwörter*), i.e., the Greek words are merely linguistic cases that encapsulate the semantics of the Hebrew אֱמוּנָה as mediated by Philo and the Septuagint, especially Jesus Sirach.<sup>43</sup> Both extremes fail to account for the evidence. Faith terminology is neither commonplace in the religious language at the turn of the eras, nor is it merely part of a Jewish and early Christian in-group language.

### 3. New Testament

#### 3.1 *Corpus Paulinum*

With good reason Rudolf Bultmann wrote that “Paul put the concept of πίστις at the very center of theology.”<sup>44</sup> He frequently uses the word group

---

christliches Verständnis des Glaubens” (1977), in: idem, *Die Vielfalt des Neuen Testaments: Exegetische Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 88–104; Gerhard Barth, “Pistis in hellenistischer Religiosität,” *ZNW* 73 (1982): 110–26; Axel von Dobbeler, *Glaube als Teilhabe: Historische und semantische Grundlagen der paulinischen Theologie und Ekklesiologie des Glaubens*, WUNT 2/22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 281–313; Brandenburger, “Pistis and Soteria” (see n. 15); Hay, “*Pistis*” (see n. 19); Dennis R. Lindsay, “The Roots and Developments of the πίστ-Word Group as Faith Terminology,” *JSNT* 49 (1993): 103–18; Schunack, “Glaube” (see n. 37). Summaries and evaluations of the proposals are found in Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith* (see n. 10), 54–67.

<sup>41</sup> Bultmann, “πίστις κτλ.” (see n. 26), 179.

<sup>42</sup> Cf., Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen: Nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), 234–36.

<sup>43</sup> Lührmann, “Pistis im Judentum” (see n. 17), 24f. Against that, James Barr (*The Semantics of Biblical Language* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961], 203, 218) had already blown the whistle on an “illegitimate totality transfer,” which disregards the principle that the meaning of a biblical word is determined by its respective context – and not by its “Hebrew” or “Greek” origin.

<sup>44</sup> Bultmann, “πίστις κτλ.” (see n. 26), 217. Compared to the significance “faith” in Paul, few monographs on this topic have seen the light of day. See Schumacher, *Entstehung* (see n. 6); von Dobbeler, *Glaube als Teilhabe* (see n. 40), and among older studies Hermann Binder, *Der Glaube bei Paulus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968); Henrik Ljungman, *Pistis: A Study of Its Presuppositions and Its Meaning in Pauline Use* (Lund: Gleerup, 1964); Wilhelm Mundle, *Der Glaubensbegriff des Paulus: Eine Unter-*

πίστ- in all of his seven undisputedly authentic letters, and the remaining letters of the *Corpus Paulinum* fall into line with this pattern. From a statistical perspective, the prevalence of the noun is noteworthy; it occurs 91 times, whereas the verb is found 42 times and the adjective 9 times (Rom: 40/21/0; 1 Cor 7/9/5; 2 Cor 7/2/2; Gal: 22/4/1; Phil 5/1/0; 1 Thess 8/5/1; Phlm 0/2/0; cf., Col 5/0/4; 2 Thess 5/4/1; Eph 8/2/2). As far as the referential context of Paul's faith terminology is concerned, its concentration in Romans and Galatians corresponds to Paul's desire to reinforce his core message that people are justified by faith, not by works of the law. Apart from the connection between faith and justification, other pairs of concepts have stimulated intense exegetical and dogmatic debates: faith and the word,<sup>45</sup> faith and obedience,<sup>46</sup> faith and Christ,<sup>47</sup> faith and baptism,<sup>48</sup> and faith and the Holy Spirit.<sup>49</sup>

---

*suchung zur Dogmengeschichte des ältesten Christentums* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1932); Erwin Wißmann, *Das Verhältnis von ΠΙΣΤΙΣ und Christusfrömmigkeit bei Paulus*, FRLANT 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926); William Henry Paine Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion*, HTS 2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917); see the account of the history of scholarship in Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith* (see n. 10), 7–78. Recent syntheses include Michael Wolter, "Glaube/Christusglaube," in *Paulus Handbuch*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 342–347 (see also his contribution to the present volume); Benjamin Schliesser, *Was ist Glaube? Paulinische Perspektiven*, Theologische Studien N.F. 3 (Zürich: TVZ, 2011).

<sup>45</sup> Cf., Peter Müller, "Der Glaube aus dem Hören: Über das gesprochene und das geschriebene Wort bei Paulus," in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi (on Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday)*, ed. Lukas Bormann, Kelly del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger, NT.S 74 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 405–442; Otfried Hofius, "Wort Gottes und Glaube bei Paulus," in: idem, *Paulusstudien*, WUNT 51 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 148–174; Gerhard Friedrich, "Glaube und Verkündigung bei Paulus," in *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Binder anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein, BThSt 7 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982), 93–113.

<sup>46</sup> Cf., Don B. Garlington, *The Obedience of Faith: A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context*, WUNT 2/38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); idem, *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans*, WUNT 79 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994); Andrie B. du Toit, "Faith and Obedience in Paul" (1991), in: idem, *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit, BZNW 151 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 117–27; Glenn N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1–4*, JSNT.S 39 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990).

<sup>47</sup> See below on πίστις Χριστοῦ.

<sup>48</sup> Cf., Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 147: "Paul binds faith and baptism together as two aspects of entering into Christ. One now belongs to Christ on the basis of faith in him by being baptized into him." Cf., Otfried Hofius, "Glaube und Taufe nach dem Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments" (1994), in: idem, *Neutestamentliche Studien*

Most references to faith in Paul fail to mention the orientation or content of faith. Already in his earliest correspondence he uses the term πίστις several times without further clarification. Apparently, for the addressees there was no uncertainty as to the grounds, essence, and effects of faith, because faith had been a key element in Paul's (and other missionaries') proclamation (cf., Acts 20:21). Coming to faith means attending to (Rom 10:16–17), accepting (1 Cor 1:21; 2:4–5; 15:1–2, 11, 14; cf., Phil 1:27), and assenting to the contents of the proclamation (Rom 10:9: confession), which springs from and participates in the power of the “gospel of Christ” (2 Cor 2:12; 9:13; 10:14; Gal 1:7; 1 Thess 3:2), and the “gospel of God” (Rom 1:1; 15:16; 2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:2, 8–9), respectively. Paul's mission centered upon proclaiming the “word of faith” (Rom 10:8) and calling to the “obedience of faith” (Rom 1:5; cf., 16:26); he even came to be known as the one who is “proclaiming the faith” (Gal 1:23; cf., 3:2, 5). Faith is at first “faith in God” (1 Thess 1:8<sup>50</sup>; cf., Rom 4:3, 17, 24), though for Paul this takes on the meaning that faith is directed to what God has done in Christ. Expressing this christological content of faith, Paul draws on early *pistis*-formulae, which refer to the salvific significance of Christ's death and/or resurrection (e.g., Rom 4:24; 10:9; 1 Cor 15:3–5).<sup>51</sup> In a nutshell: Christians “believe that Jesus died and rose again” (1 Thess 4:14). Such statements of faith even shaped early Christian predicates of God (Rom 8:11; 2 Cor 4:14<sup>52</sup>; Gal 1:1; cf., Col 2:12; 1 Pet 1:21: πιστὸς εἰς θεόν). Elsewhere Paul explicitly speaks of believing in Christ, using a variety of prepositional constructions, both nominal (Gal 3:26; cf., Eph 1:15; Col 1:4: with ἐν; Phlm 5: with πρός; cf., Col 2:5: with εἰς) and verbal

---

WUNT 132 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 253–75. See also Eph 4:5: εἰς κύριον, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα.

<sup>49</sup> Rather than a simple causal nexus, which requires a conjectured sequence of faith and the Holy Spirit, a more open relationship suggests itself. Gordon Fee (*God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994], 853) proposes “that faith itself, as a work of the Spirit, leads to the experienced reception of the Spirit that also comes through that same faith. Although it does not fit our logical schemes well, the Spirit is thus both the cause and the effect of faith.”

<sup>50</sup> Traugott Holtz (“‘Euer Glaube an Gott:’ Zu Form und Inhalt von 1. Thess 1,9f.” [1978], in: idem, *Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Eckard Reinmuth and Christian Wolff, WUNT 57 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991], 270–96) argues that from the outset of his proclamation, Paul's concept of God was “christological”.

<sup>51</sup> The classic study dealing with these formulae is Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, trans. Brian Hardy, SBT 50 (Naperville: Allenson, 1966) (originally published in German in 1963).

<sup>52</sup> Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, “Faith and Resurrection in 2 Cor 4:13–14” (1988), in: idem, *Keys to Second Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 93–104.

(Rom 10:14; Gal 2:16; Phil 1:29: with εἰς; Rom 9:33; 10:11: with ἐπί; cf., 1 Pet 2:6). All these different forms can be understood as abbreviative variations of faith in relation to the Christ event, which does not exclude, but rather entails affective, personal trust directed “to the Lord Jesus” (Phlm 5).<sup>53</sup>

Another expression that correlates faith and Christ is the syntagma πίστις Χριστοῦ, which actually appears in different shapes: πίστις is linked with “Jesus Christ” (Rom 3:22; Gal 3:22), “Jesus” (Rom 3:26), “Christ Jesus” (Gal 2:16; cf., Eph 3:12); “Christ” (Gal 2:16; Phil 3:9), and “son of God” (Gal 2:20). Scholarship continues to debate intensely whether the genitive should be understood as an objective genitive (“faith in Christ”) or as a subjective genitive (“faithfulness of Christ”).<sup>54</sup> According to the first option, it refers to the faith of the Christian in Christ’s salvific work,<sup>55</sup> while the alternative explanation considers it to denote Christ’s faithfulness unto death as the foundation of human salvation (cf., the explicit references to God’s faithfulness: Rom 3:3; 1 Cor 1:9; 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18).<sup>56</sup> Both interpretations are able to present valid exegetical and theological arguments, and the issue cannot be settled by way of lexical or semantic

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf., Schliesser, *Was ist Glaube?* (see n. 44), 102–10, against, e.g., Bultmann, “πίστις κτλ.” (see n. 26), 219.

<sup>54</sup> The literature produced in and on that debate is overwhelming and cannot be documented here comprehensively. For an overview of the main issues, see, e.g., Matthew C. Easter, “The *Pistis Christou* Debate: Main Arguments and Responses in Summary,” *CBR* 9 (2010): 33–47; Debbie Hunn, “Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Twentieth Century Scholarship,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson 2009), 15–31. The almost entirely neglected early history of the subjective interpretation is presented in Benjamin Schliesser, “‘Exegetical Amnesia’ and πίστις Χριστοῦ: The ‘Faith of Christ’ in 19th Century Pauline Scholarship,” *JTS* (2015): 61–89. See also below on Mark 11:22 and Jas 2:1, but also on the patristic evidence.

<sup>55</sup> Cf., e.g., James D.G. Dunn, “Once more, Πίστις Χριστοῦ” (1997), in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, ed. Richard B. Hays, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 249–71; Karl Friedrich Ulrichs, *Christusglaube: Studien zum Syntagma πίστις Χριστοῦ und zum paulinischen Verständnis von Glaube und Rechtfertigung*, WUNT 2/227 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); R. Barry Matlock, “The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philipians 3.9,” *JSNT* 30 (2007): 173–203.

<sup>56</sup> Cf., e.g., Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (see n. 55); Morna D. Hooker, “Πίστις Χριστοῦ” (1989), in: eadem, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 165–86; Douglas A. Campbell, “The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson 2009), 57–71.

considerations.<sup>57</sup> Based on the personification of πίστις in Gal 3:23, 25 a “third view” has been suggested that refuses the alignment to dichotomous grammatical categories (objective/subjective) and understands πίστις not in terms of a personal disposition or attitude (of Christ or a human being), but as an eschatological event of salvation that marks a turn of the times and opens up the salvation-historical possibility of faith.<sup>58</sup> The enigmatic phrase “from faith to faith” (Rom 1:17) can be understood to encapsulate this dynamic from the salvation-historical to the individual perspective.<sup>59</sup>

Two intrinsically related corollaries result from the exclusive orientation of faith to Christ: In Paul, faith ranks as a soteriological and sociological *particula exclusiva*.<sup>60</sup> (1) Paul’s argumentation, particularly in his letters to the Romans and the Galatians, makes clear that all human beings, Jews and Greeks alike, are “under (the power of) sin” (Rom 3:9; 7:14; Gal 3:22), which for him strikingly correlates with being “under (the power of) the law” (Rom 6:14–15; Gal 3:23; 4:5, 21; 5:18). Salvation from this predicament requires a radical change of dominion. The coming of Christ (Gal 3:19), which is equivalent to the coming of faith (Gal 3:23, 25), brings about this change and enables human participation in the realm of Christ

---

<sup>57</sup> See, apart from Downing, “Ambiguity” (see n. 6): Wally V. Cirafesi, “ἔχειν πίστιν in Hellenistic Greek and Its Contribution to the πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate,” *Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics* 1 (2012): 5–37; R. Barry Matlock, “Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective,” *NovT* 42 (2000): 1–23; Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, “Πίστις with a Preposition and Genitive Modifier: Lexical, Semantic, and Syntactic Considerations in the πίστις Χριστοῦ Discussion,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson 2009), 33–53. It should not be ignored that Plutarch, among others, could use πίστις (and ἀπιστία) with an objective genitive (cf., Barth, “Pistis” [see n. 40], 122; Schunack, “Glaube” [see n. 37], 317 note 101; R. Barry Matlock, “Even the Demons Believe:” Paul and πίστις Χριστοῦ, *CBQ* 64 [2002]: 300–18, 304).

<sup>58</sup> This view is inspired *inter alia* by Ernst Lohmeyer and elaborated in Benjamin Schliesser, “‘Christ-Faith’ as an Eschatological Event (Gal. 3.23–26): A ‘Third View’ on Πίστις Χριστοῦ,” *JSNT* 38 (2016): 277–300; Preston M. Sprinkle, “Πίστις Χριστοῦ as an Eschatological Event,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson 2009), 165–84. Another “third” view, interpreting πίστις Χριστοῦ against the backdrop of the Roman idea of *fides*, has been suggested by Thomas Schumacher in the present volume (section 6.3.2).

<sup>59</sup> On different views on Rom 1:16–17, see John W. Taylor, “From Faith to Faith: Romans 1.17 in the Light of Greek Idiom,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 337–48; Charles L. Quarles, “From Faith to Faith: A Fresh Examination of the Prepositional Series in Romans 1:17,” *NT* 45 (2003): 1–21.

<sup>60</sup> Cf., Ben C. Dunson, “Faith in Romans: The Salvation of the Individual or Life in Community?,” *JSNT* 34 (2011): 19–46. See also Jakob Spaeth’s contribution to the present volume.

“through faith” (Gal 3:26) (cf., Paul’s formula “in Christ”).<sup>61</sup> Conflicts with “Judaizers” in Galatia forced Paul to explicate his doctrine of justification in a pointed manner (cf., Gal 2:15–21; Rom 3:21–28), though it is not unlikely that his basic soteriological tenet – “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through Jesus-Christ-faith” (Gal 2:16; cf., Rom 3:28; see also Eph 2:8–10) – traces back to early Antiochene theology. Even Paul’s appeal to Abraham might have grown out of the Galatian Judaizers’ recourse to the obedience of the patriarch (Gal 3; Rom 4). In a keen *relecture* of the Abraham story, Paul demonstrates exegetically the temporal *and* factual priority of Abraham’s faith-righteousness over his circumcision, concluding that Abraham is also the father of uncircumcised believers (Rom 4:11) and that Gentiles, too, inherit the promises fulfilled in Christ (Gal 3:6–9; cf., Rom 11:17–24).<sup>62</sup> Paul’s cutting the link between faith and law by appeal to the Abraham narrative is diametrically opposed to the Early Jewish image of the (Tora-)observant Abraham.<sup>63</sup> In both Romans and Galatians, though with different emphases, Gen 15:6 (cf., Rom 4:3; Gal 3:6) serves as his primary proof text, seconded by Hab 2:4 (cf., Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11).<sup>64</sup> Abraham’s faith in God “who gives life to the

---

<sup>61</sup> Paul’s notions of “faith” and “in Christ” represent key elements of two distinctive soteriological models, a “juridical” and a “participationist”. For Paul – unlike for many of his interpreters – they do not conflict with, but rather complement, each other. On the participatory dimension of faith, see David M. Hay, “Paul’s Understanding of Faith as Participation,” in *Paul and His Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, PaSt 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 45–76; Douglas A. Campbell, “Participation and Faith in Paul,” in *In Christ in Paul: Explorations in Paul’s Theology of Union and Participation*, ed. Michael J. Thate, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, and Constantine R. Campbell, WUNT 2/384 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 37–60.

<sup>62</sup> Paul’s appeal to Abraham (and his faith) has been studied in detail in David S. du Toit, “Christlicher Glaube als endzeitliche Variante des Glaubens Abrahams,” in *Paulus – Werk und Wirkung: Festschrift für Andreas Lindemann zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. idem and Paul-Gerhard Klumbies (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 325–50; Nicholas T. Wright, “Paul and the Patriarch: The Role of Abraham in Romans 4,” *JSNT* 35 (2013): 207–41; Orrey McFarland, “Whose Abraham, Which Promise? Genesis 15.6 in Philo’s *De Virtutibus* and Romans 4,” *JSNT* 35 (2012): 107–29; Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith* (see n. 10); Maria Neubrand, *Abraham – Vater von Juden und Nichtjuden: Eine exegetische Studie zu Röm 4*, FzB 85 (Würzburg: Echter, 1997). A classic is Ferdinand Hahn, “Genesis 15,6 im Neuen Testament” (1971), in: idem, *Bekennnisbildung und Theologie in urchristlicher Zeit*, vol. 2 of *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Juliane Schlegel, WUNT 192 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 169–86.

<sup>63</sup> Cf., Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith* (see n. 10), 152–220.

<sup>64</sup> On Paul’s reception of Hab 2:4, see, e.g., Steve Moyise, “Does Paul Respect the Context of His Quotations?,” in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, ed. Christopher D. Stanley, SBL.ECL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 97–114; Hultgren, *Habakkuk 2:4* (see n. 13), 43–113. Within the πίστις Χριστοῦ-debate, the verse plays a significant role. Cf., Stephen L. Young, “Romans 1.1–5 and Paul’s Christo-

dead” (Rom 4:17), prefigures Christian faith in God “who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead” (Rom 4:24). (2) The unique ecclesiological character of faith is contingent upon its exclusive orientation to Christ, which overrides all differences of status, gender and ethnicity (cf., Gal 3:28). God justifies both Jews and Gentiles through faith (Rom 3:29). Faith functions both as an identity marker that constitutes a common ethos including both believing Jews and Gentiles, and as a boundary marker that indicates the distinctiveness of the early Christian movement. Already in his first letter Paul uses the participle “believers” (1 Thess 1:7; 2:10, 13) to name the Jesus followers, and he maintains this parlance, oftentimes in conjunction with an inclusive “all” (cf., 1 Thess 1:7; Rom 1:16; 3:22; 4:11; 10:4, 11). The centrality of faith for the Christian group identity corresponds to a devaluation of other identity markers such as circumcision, Sabbath and food laws, the first of which representing the most significant *nota Iudaica* since the Maccabean crisis. Conflicts were to be expected and in fact ensued. As a consequence, in Paul’s thinking the patriarch Abraham not only anticipates the faith of the individual believer, but he is also an ecclesiological figure, the type of the eschatological people of God (cf., Gal 3:9). Accordingly, faith is the mode of existence of the people of God, which Paul not only addresses as “believers,” but also as “those of faith” (Gal 3:7, 9; cf., Rom 3:26; 4:16) and as “family of faith” (Gal 6:10; cf., 3:26: “in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith”). The ethos of faith corresponds with an ethic of faith. Faith is not an end in itself, but includes a responsive element and goes hand in hand with obedience (cf., Rom 1:5; 16:26; cf., 10:16), though obviously not towards the law, but towards the “law of Christ” (Gal 6:2) and to Christ (2 Cor 10:5–6). Faith is a fruit of the spirit (Gal 5:22), working through love (Gal 5:6) and being complemented by love and hope (1 Cor 13:13; 1 Thess 1:3).<sup>65</sup> Depending

---

logical Use of Hab. 2.4 in Rom. 1.17: An Underutilized Consideration in the Debate,” *JSNT* 34 (2012): 277–85; Debbie Hunn, “Pistis Christou in Galatians: The Connection to Habakkuk 2:4,” *TynB* 63 (2012): 75–91; Desta Heliso, *Pistis and the Righteous One: A Study of Romans 1:17 against the Background of Scripture and Second Temple Jewish Literature*, WUNT 2/235 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Brian Dodd, “Romans 1:17 – A *Crux Interpretum* for the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate?,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 470–73; Douglas A. Campbell, “Romans 1:17 – A *Crux Interpretum* for the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 265–85. On Paul as an insightful interpreter of Scripture, employing a “hermeneutics of faith,” see Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

<sup>65</sup> On the triad “faith – love – hope,” see Christine Jourdan, *Foi, espérance, amour chez saint Paul: Aux sources de l’identité chrétienne*, LiB 163 (Paris: Cerf, 2010); Mira Stare, “‘Die grösste unter diesen ist die Liebe:’ Überlegungen zur paulinischen Trias von Glaube, Hoffnung und Liebe,” in *Horizonte biblischer Texte: Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Andreas Vonach and Georg Fischer, OBO 196 (Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 223–35; Ulrich Mell, “Die

on the individual “measure” and strength of faith (Rom 12:3),<sup>66</sup> ethical decisions might diverge (Rom 14:1–15:13). Paul deems this acceptable as long as believers “walk according to love” (Rom 14:15); correspondingly, “whatever does not proceed from faith is sin” (Rom 14:23).

### *Pastoral Epistles*

Relative to their length, the Pastoral Epistles use the word family of πίστις more intensively than any other Christian text of the first or second century.<sup>67</sup> As in Paul, the noun dominates (33 times); the verb occurs only once in the clear sense of human “believing”: 1 Tim 1:16 (ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ, “in him,” i.e. Christ; cf., 3:16). Until recently, it has been commonplace to read the Pastoral Epistles in the light of Paul’s authentic letters and to evaluate their understanding of faith by the yardstick of Paul. They are said to erode and degenerate Paul’s superior, dynamic theology of faith. More recently, however, there have been attempts to move closer together Paul and the

---

Entstehungsgeschichte der Trias ‘Glaube Hoffnung Liebe’ (1.Kor 13,13)” (1999), in idem, *Biblische Anschläge: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 30 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009), 181–208; Jan Lambrecht, “The Most Eminent Way: A Study of 1 Corinthians 13,” in: idem, *Pauline Studies: Collected Essays*, BETL 115 (Louvain: Peeters, 1994), 79–107; Thomas Söding, *Die Trias Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe bei Paulus: Eine exegetische Studie*, SBS 150 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992).

<sup>66</sup> The meaning of the phrase μέτρον πίστεως is not clear. On different approaches, see John K. Goodrich, “‘Standard of Faith’ or ‘Measure of a Trusteeship’? A Study in Romans 12:3,” *CBQ* 74 (2012): 753–72 (cf., the response Stanley E. Porter and Hughson T. Ong, “‘Standard of Faith’ or ‘Measure of a Trusteeship’? A Study in Romans 12:3 – A Response,” *JGRChJ* 9 [2013]: 97–103); John C. Poirier, “The Measure of Stewardship: Pistis in Romans 12:3,” *TynB* 59 (2008): 145–52; Lloyd Gaston, “Faith in Romans 12 in the Light of the Common Life of the Roman Church,” in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, ed. Julian V. Hills (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998), 258–64.

<sup>67</sup> In recent years, the assessment of the Pastorals’ idea of faith has undergone major developments. Cf., Michael Theobald, “Glauben statt Grübeln: Zum Anti-Intellektualismus der Pastoralbriefe,” *Early Christianity* 5 (2014): 5–34; Bernhard Mutschler, *Glaube in den Pastoralbriefen: Pistis als Mitte christlicher Existenz*, WUNT 256 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) (cf., the extensive review by Jens Herzer in *Early Christianity* 3 [2012]: 393–403); Wilfried Eisele, “Der gemeinsame Glaube der Auserwählten Gottes: Zum Glaubensbegriff der Pastoralbriefe nach Tit 1,1–4,” in, *Ein Meisterschüler: Titus und sein Brief: Michael Theobald zu seinem 60. Geburtstag*, ed. idem and Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, SBS 214 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2008), 81–114. Among older studies see Georg Kretschmar, “Der paulinische Glaube in den Pastoralbriefen,” in *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Binder anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein, BThSt 7 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982), 115–40; Otto Merk, “Glaube und Tat in den Pastoralbriefen” (1975), in: idem, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Exegese*, ed. Roland Gebauer, Martin Karrer, and Martin Meiser, BZNW 95 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 260–71.

Pastorals *via* their concept of faith.<sup>68</sup> As in Paul, both the orientation of faith to Christ and its salvific significance are presupposed (1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 3:15<sup>69</sup>; the characteristically Pauline preposition εἰς is missing).

Two major shifts can be observed: (1) The Pastorals display a tendency to objectify faith by focusing on its content: Christians have to continue “in faith” (1 Tim 2:15 etc.), i.e., “fight the good fight of the faith” (1 Tim 6:12), hold on to the doctrine of faith “with a pure conscience” (1 Tim 3:9; cf., 1 Tim 1:19; 4:6; 2 Tim 1:13), particularly in the face of false teaching (1 Tim 1:19; 2 Tim 2:18; 3:8; Titus 1:13). Faith has to be “sincere” (1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 1:5) and “sound” (Titus 1:13; cf., 2:2), just as the teaching (1 Tim 1:10; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1) and Christ’s words are “sound” (1 Tim 6:3; cf., 2 Tim 1:13). A certain “style of thinking” accords to such faith, which differs from that of the opponents: anti-intellectualistic and unpretentious.<sup>70</sup>

(2) Faith is placed in an ethical frame of reference in that it appears next to other virtues such as “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη), “sanctity” (ἀγιασμός), “purity” (ἀγνεία), “godliness” (εὐσέβεια), “love” (ἀγάπη), “perseverance” (ὑπομονή), “gentleness” (πραῦπαθία), “peace” (εἰρήνη), and “patience” (μακροθυμία) (1 Tim 2:15; 4:12; 6:11; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:10; Titus 2:2). Faith is the habitus of a Christian that brings forth “good works” (Titus 3:8) and excludes other attitudes such as “love of money” (1 Tim 6:10).

### 3.2 Synoptic Gospels and Acts

#### Mark

In the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, both the noun πίστις (Mark: 5; Matt: 8; Luke: 11; Acts: 15) and the verb πιστεύειν (10[14]/11/9/37) are represented, as is the adjective πιστός (0/5/6/4).<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf., the programmatic subtitle of Mutschler’s monographic treatment: *Pistis als Mitte christlicher Existenz*. See, as a summary, his contribution to the present volume.

<sup>69</sup> The πίστις Χριστοῦ-debate is prolonged into the Pastorals. Cf., David J. Downs, “Faith(fulness) in Christ Jesus in 2 Timothy 3:15,” *JBL* 131 (2012): 143–60.

<sup>70</sup> Cf., Theobald, “Glauben statt Grübeln” (see n. 67).

<sup>71</sup> Recent general treatments on faith in the Synoptics are missing, as most studies focus on one gospel, one passage or one aspect of faith. Older and dated syntheses include Edward D. O’Connor, *Faith in the Synoptic Gospels: A Problem in the Correlation of Scripture and Theology* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961); Pierre Benoit, “La foi dans les évangiles synoptiques,” *LumVie* 22 (1955): 45–64. On the opposition of faith and doubt in the Synoptics, see the essay Gerhard Barth, “Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen Evangelien,” *ZTK* 72 (1975): 269–92. Studies on the idea of faith of the individual gospels are noted at the beginning of the respective main section, and special studies on particular pericopes are documented when the passage is first mentioned.

In the Marcan narrative, faith is a constituent theme, even though the word family πίστις appears only 15 times (plus four occurrences in Mark's secondary ending).<sup>72</sup> The first words spoken by Jesus at the beginning of his ministry, identified as "the good news of God" (1:14), are programmatic: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ)" (1:15).<sup>73</sup> With the dawn of the new era corresponds the call to μετανοεῖν and πιστεῦειν. The two verbs being virtually synonymous, they describe a transformative, existential change that implies an orientation towards the kingdom of God and personally following its representative, Jesus. From a narratological perspective, this call remains existent and effective across the narrated story, whenever Mark has Jesus preach (e.g., 1:38–39, 45; 5:20; cf., 3:14; 6:12; 7:36), teach (e.g., 8:31; 9:31: the suffering of the Son of Man) or even perform deeds and miracles. At the same time, the call transcends the gospel narrative and extends to its addressees (cf., 13:10; 14:9; 16:15). Consequently, the summary statement 1:14–15 reflects the post-Easter missionary setting of Mark's gospel. Apart from 1:14–15, at least three distinct usages of the motive of faith can be discerned in Mark.<sup>74</sup>

The first two Mark shares with Matthew and Luke; both are frequently linked to the healing ministry and the teaching of the historical Jesus.<sup>75</sup> (1) The saying "your faith has healed/saved you" is a characteristic element of the Synoptics' miracle narratives (Mark 5:34//Matt 9:22//Luke 8:48; Mark 10:52<sup>76</sup>//Luke 18:42; Luke 7:50; 17:19). It points to an under-

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf., Christopher D. Marshall, *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*, SNTS.MS 64 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Mary Ann Beavis, "Mark's Teaching on Faith," *BTB* 16 (1986): 139–42; François Vouga, "'Habt Glauben an Gott:' Der Theozentrismus der Verkündigung des Evangeliums und des christlichen Glaubens im Markusevangelium," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 93–109; Thomas Söding, *Glaube bei Markus: Glaube an das Evangelium – Gebetsglaube und Wunderglaube im Kontext der markinischen Basileitheologie und Christologie*, SBB 12, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987); Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Verständnis des Glaubens im Markusevangelium" (1982), in: idem, *Grundsatzfragen, Jesusforschung, Evangelien*, vol. 1 of *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Juliane Schlegel, WUNT 191 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 409–32. Mark's and Paul's understandings of faith have been compared in William Loader, "The Concept of Faith in Paul and Mark," in *Two Authors at the Beginning of Christianity*, vol. 1 of *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays*, ed. Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer, BZNW 198 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 423–64.

<sup>73</sup> Cf., Marshall, *Faith* (see n. 72), 34–56.

<sup>74</sup> Cf., Hahn, "Das Verständnis des Glaubens im Markusevangelium" (see n. 72).

<sup>75</sup> Cf., Dieter Lührmann, *Glaube im frühen Christentum* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976), 30.

<sup>76</sup> Cf., Juan Carlos Ossandón, "Bartimaeus' Faith: Plot and Point of View in Mark 10,46–52," *Bib* 93 (2012): 377–402.

standing of faith marked by situational urgency, directed to the one who is expected to help, and expressed as unconditional trust in God's life-giving power (Mark 5:36//Luke 8:50: "Do not fear, only believe"; cf., Rom 4:17). Thus, even the faith of the paralytic's friends induces Jesus' help (Mark 2:5).<sup>77</sup> In contrast to pagan Greek tradition (and John), faith is not the result of miracles and signs, but rather leads to healing; unbelief, on the other hand, inhibits Jesus' healing activity (6:5–6).<sup>78</sup> Faith is not (yet) individual faith in the person of Jesus (εἰς ἐμὲ in Mark 9:42 is secondary and reflects Matt 18:6). Nevertheless, there is an evident trajectory from faith with respect to the transformative reality of God's kingdom to faith in Jesus as its representative and agent (cf., Jesus' own interpretation of his deeds in Luke 11:20 [Q]).<sup>79</sup> (2) The canonical shape of the "mountain moving"-saying in Mark 11:22–23 with its ponderous and convoluted style suggests a long and complex prehistory.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, while the Marcan

---

<sup>77</sup> Cf., François Vouga, "Maladie et péché, foi et guérison: Jésus, l'ami de Job ou l'ami de ses amis? (Mc 2,1–12 et Jn 9,1–12)," in *Sola fide: Mélanges offerts à Jean Anselmi*, ed. Elian Cuvillier, Actes et Recherches (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004), 35–52.

<sup>78</sup> The intricate relationship between faith and miracles is discussed, *inter alia*, in Bernd Kollmann, "Glaube – Kritik – Deutung: Gängige Deutungsmuster von Wundergeschichten in der Bibelwissenschaft," *BK* 61 (2006): 88–93; Eduard Lohse, "Glaube und Wunder: Ein Beitrag zur theologia crucis in den synoptischen Evangelien" (1979), in: idem, *Die Vielfalt des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 2 of *Exegetische Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 29–44. See also Wendy Cotter, *The Christ of the Miracle Stories: Portrait through Encounter* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), and the collection of essays by Stefan Alkier and Annette Weissenrieder, *Miracles Revisited: New Testament Miracle Stories and Their Concepts of Reality*, SBR 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013) (especially the essays by Stefan Alkier, Michael Rydryck, and Elaine M. Wainwright).

<sup>79</sup> In his influential essay "Jesus and Faith," Gerhard Ebeling hypothesized that the Christian relationship of faith with Jesus can appeal to Jesus' own concept of faith, indeed to Jesus' own faith (Gerhard Ebeling, "Jesus and Faith" [1958], in: idem, *Word and Faith*, trans. James W. Leitsch [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963], 201–46). Responding to methodological critique, Ebeling abandoned the idea of a historical continuity bound to the concept of faith, though he still argued that the connection of Jesus and faith constitutes the basis for the continuity between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith (Gerhard Ebeling, "The Question of the Historical Jesus and the Problem of Christology" [1958], in op. cit., 288–304). See recently Sigurd Grindheim, "Faith in Jesus: The Historical Jesus and the Object of Faith," *Biblica* 97 (2016): 79–100. Maureen Yeung (*Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to "Faith that Can Remove Mountains" and "Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You,"* WUNT 2/147 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002]) argued that Paul's concept of faith is greatly indebted to the historical Jesus and that both share an eschatological understanding of faith.

<sup>80</sup> See, with a focus on the Marcan version, Jan Lambrecht, "Faith, Prayer and Forgiveness in Mark 11,22–25," *ETL* 89 (2013): 107–12. On the saying in general, see Andreas Grandy, *Die Weisheit der Gottesherrschaft: Eine Untersuchung zur jesuanischen Synthese von traditioneller und apokalyptischer Weisheit*, NTOA 96 (Göttingen

version of the logion parallels Matt 21:21 (cf., 1 Cor 13:2), there is another strand of tradition that talks about the uprooting of a sycamine tree (Luke 17:6 [Q]; cf., Matt 17:20, though there Matthew obviously replaced the motive of the tree by the motive of the mountain, in accordance with Matt 21:21). Scholarship disagrees over the traditio-historical priority of the two strands, but is inclined towards the Q-version and generally tends to attribute the centerpiece of the logion – whether sycamene tree or mountain – to the historical Jesus. Oftentimes, the comparison of faith with a mustard seed (Luke 17:6 [Q]; Matt 17:20) is considered Jesuanic as well, with Mark substituting the image by the imperative: “Have faith in God” (11:22).<sup>81</sup> Mark’s concern that miracle-working faith may not be impeded by doubtful objections (11:23; cf., Matt 21:21) mirrors earliest reflections about the required character of faith. Mark also relates faith and prayer in a characteristic manner (11:24; cf., Matt 21:22). (3) In the story of the epileptic boy (9:14–29),<sup>82</sup> it is the disciples’ lack of prayer (9:28–29) that prevented the healing of the boy. The episode reflects on the theme of faith in terms of a paradoxical dynamics, culminating in the father’s exclamation: “I believe; help my unbelief!” (9:24). His emphatic confession of faith does not proceed from a dispositional or actual intimation of truth, but expresses his acceptance of faith as a premise of his plea for his son’s healing; looking at himself, he can only confess disbelief. The father’s outcry responds to a saying of Jesus, whose meaning is disputed as well: “All

---

2012); Ferdinand Hahn, “Jesu Wort vom bergeversetzenden Glauben” (1985), in: idem, *Grundsatzfragen, Jesusforschung, Evangelien*, vol. 1 of *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Juliane Schlegel, WUNT 191 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 305–26; Josef Zmijewski, “Der Glaube und seine Macht,” in *Begegnung mit dem Wort: Festschrift für Heinrich Zimmermann*, ed. idem and Ernst Nellessen, BBB 53 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1980), 81–103; Jean Duplacy, “La foi qui déplace les montagnes (Mt., XVII, 20; XXI, 21 et par.),” in *A la rencontre de Dieu*, ed. André Barucq, BFCTL 8 (Le Puy: Xavier Mappus, 1961), 273–87.

<sup>81</sup> Mostly (and correctly so), the phrase πίστις θεοῦ is interpreted as an objective genitive construction (different from Rom 3:3). Contrast the views in Peter G. Bolt, “The Faith of Jesus Christ in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 210–14 (subjective genitive) and Jacqueline Assaël, “‘Ayez créance de Dieu’ (Marc 11, 22),” *ETR* 84 (2009): 161–75 (authorial genitive).

<sup>82</sup> This pericope has inspired quite a number of exegetical and systematic-theological studies. Among recent essays that deal with the issue of faith, see, F. Scott Spencer, “Faith on Edge: The Difficult Case of the Spirit-Seized Boy in Mark 9:14–29,” *RevExp* 107 (2010): 419–24; Joel Marcus, “‘I Believe – Help My Unbelief:’ Human Faith and Divine Faithfulness in Mark 9.14–19,” in *Paul, Grace and Freedom: Essays in Honor of John K. Riches*, ed. Paul Middleton, Angus Paddison, and Karen Wenell (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009), 39–49; Otfried Hofius, “Die Allmacht des Sohnes Gottes und das Gebet des Glaubens: Erwägungen zu Thema und Aussage der Wundererzählung Mk 9,14–29,” *ZTK* 101 (2004): 117–37.

things are possible for the one who believes.” Grammatically, the dative τῷ πιστεύοντι could imply that Jesus himself believed,<sup>83</sup> or that the believer participates in God’s omnipotence, or that Jesus avails the divine power (cf., 10:27; 14:36) for the sake of the believer (*dativus commodi*).<sup>84</sup> Mark articulates the tension between faith and unbelief also in 4:40–41 (“The Stilling of the Storm”). Here, Jesus asks his disciples, who are lacking insight into Jesus’ identity (4:40): “Have you still no faith?” In other contexts, faith is linked to Jesus’ miraculous power and authority as sign of divine legitimation (11:31; 15:32; cf., 13:32).

### Matthew

In Matthew’s<sup>85</sup> version of the stilling of the storm, Jesus’ question is reformulated in terms of a particularly Matthean choice of language: ““Why are you afraid, you of little faith?” (Matt 8:26). The Greek word ὀλιγόπιστος represents specifically Christian terminology, though the concept is familiar in early Rabbinic narrations of Israel’s conduct at the Reed Sea or in the desert. Matthew’s consistency in his portrayals of the group of the disciples as having “little faith” (6:30//Luke 12:28 [Q]; Matt 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; ὀλιγόπιστος; 17:20: ὀλιγοπιστία)<sup>86</sup> in distinction to the unbe-

---

<sup>83</sup> The question *Utrum in Christo fuerit fides* (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 3,7,3; cf., Peter Lombard, *Sententiae* 3,26,4) has always been part of scholastic *quaestiones*. Note, in the more recent past, the dispute between Gerhard Ebeling and Rudolf Bultmann concerning this issue: Ebeling’s contention that “it is surely impossible, in view of the manner in which Jesus speaks of faith, to except him from faith himself” (Ebeling, “Jesus and Faith” [see n. 79], 234) is criticized by Bultmann as a logical fallacy that infers from Jesus’ own “understanding of existence” (*Existenzverständnis*), as expressed in his ministry and words, the historical Jesus’ own personal attitude (Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, SHAW.PH 3 [Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1960], 20). On the relevant dogmatic issues, see R. Michael Allen, *The Christ’s Faith: A Dogmatic Account*, T&T Clark Studies in Systematic Theology (London: T&T Clark, 2009).

<sup>84</sup> Thus, with good arguments, Hofius, “Die Allmacht des Sohnes Gottes” (see n. 82).

<sup>85</sup> Studies on Matthew’s idea of faith are quite sparse; see only Andreas Dettwiler, “La conception mathéenne de la foi,” *ETR* 73 (1998): 333–47; Hans Klein, “Das Glaubensverständnis im Matthäusevangelium,” in *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Binder anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein, BThSt 7 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982), 29–42. See further Matthias Konradt’s contribution to the present volume, which analyzes the role of faith in Matthew’s healing narratives.

<sup>86</sup> On the (deficient) faith of the disciples see Uta Poplutz, “Verunsicherter Glaube: Der finale Zweifel der Jünger im Matthäusevangelium aus figuranalytischer Sicht,” in *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes / Études sur Matthieu et Jean: Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag / Mélanges offerts à Jean Zumstein pour son 65<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*, ed. eadem and Andreas Dettwiler, ATANT 97 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 29–47.

lieving people (Matt 13:58: ἀπιστία; cf., 21:25, 32; 27:42; but see Matt 17:17//Mark 9:19: γενεὰ ἄπιστος<sup>87</sup>), reveals his deliberate shaping of the idea of faith. Further variations of the Marcan text confirm this.<sup>88</sup>

In sum, Matthew highlights the orientation of faith towards Jesus' miraculous power and reduces the cognitive element (only Matt 16:8–9), which is accentuated in Mark's correlation of faith and Jesus' teaching and preaching: (1) Matthew omitted the programmatic imperative "believe in the good news!" (Mark 1:15), for in his theologizing, faith is never directed to an object (Mark 11:23–24: πιστεύειν ὅτι is rephrased in Matt 21:21–22), but to a person (18:6: with εἰς; 21:25, 32: with dative; 27:42: with ἐπί), it is nowhere commanded with an imperative construction (like Paul, but in contrast to Mark 1:15; 5:36//Luke 8:50; Mark 11:22, 24; Acts 16:31; John 4:21 etc.), and it does not mark the beginning of Christian existence. (2) Matthew moves together faith and miracles even closer than Mark: He identifies unbelief as obstacle to miracles (13:58: "because of ... unbelief") and in a number of miracle narratives expressly mentions the petitioners' faith as the appropriate attitude, leading to healing. Apart from the references to faith that he shares with Mark and/or Luke (8:10; 9:2, 22), only Matthew has the expressions "let it be done for you as you have believed" (8:13), "Do you believe...? ... according to your faith let it be done to you" (9:28–29; cf., Mark 10:52), and "great is your faith! Let it be done for you as you wish" (15:28). Furthermore, Matthew incorporates both Mark's and Q's versions of the "mountain moving"-saying (17:20; 21:21–22); the first citation of this logion takes the place of Jesus' intense conversation with the father of the epileptic boy (Mark 9:23–24), which is why the episode aims at the broken and insufficient faith of the disciples rather than the dialectic faith experience of the father. (3) The special mention of the faith of the centurion (8:10, 13)<sup>89</sup> and the Canaanite woman (15:28),<sup>90</sup> two Gentiles, is programmatic for the universalistic outlook of Matthew's gospel.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> The referent of Jesus' rebuke in the Matthean parallel is disputed: Does it include the disciples or does it refer collectively to the "faithless generation" apart from the disciples, who are otherwise characterized as having "little faith".

<sup>88</sup> Cf., Hans Klein, *Bewährung im Glauben: Studien zum Sondergut des Evangelisten Matthäus*, BThSt 26 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1996); succinctly in idem, "Glaubensverständnis" (see n. 85), 29–33.

<sup>89</sup> Cf., Theodore W. Jennings and Tat-Siong Benny Liew, "Mistaken Identities but Model Faith: Rereading the Centurion, the Chap, and the Christ in Matthew 8:5–13," *JBL* 123 (2004): 467–94.

<sup>90</sup> Glenna S. Jackson, *Have Mercy on Me: The Story of the Canaanite Woman in Matthew 15.21–28*, JSNTSup 228 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Elaine M. Wainwright, "'Your Faith Has Made You Well.' Jesus, Women, and Healing in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*, ed.

*Luke-Acts*

In the Gospel of Luke several occurrences of faith terminology can be attributed to Luke's editorial work and reveal his distinctive theological intentions.<sup>92</sup> They are confirmed by the evidence of Acts and center on three elements, discernible in condensed form in the Lukan version of Jesus' explanation to the parable of the sower (8:11–15). Luke accentuates that faith builds on hearing and receiving the word, brings about salvation, and requires perseverance in the face of testing (in 8:12–13).

(1) The most distinct Lukan usage of faith is in the context of conversion.<sup>93</sup> The expected reaction to the encounter with the message of faith is, apart from believing, "receiving (the word)" (δέχεσθαι, Luke 8:13; 18:17; 18:17]; Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11), "being persuaded" (πίθεισθαι, Acts 19:8; 28:24; cf., 14:2; 19:9), and most prominently "converting" (ἐπιστρέφειν, e.g., Luke 1:16–17; 22:32; Acts 3:19; 9:35; 11:21) and "repenting" (μετανοεῖν, e.g., Luke 13:3; 15:7, 10; Acts 2:38; 3:19). In the sense of "coming to faith", the gospel and most abundantly Acts uses πιστεύειν in the (ingressive) aorist (e.g., Luke 1:20, 45; 8:12; 20:5; Acts 4:4; 8:12, 13; 9:42), but also in the imperfect (Acts 18:8; cf., Luke 24:11; Acts 28:24), and in the pluperfect (Acts 14:23). Even the noun can express the same idea (e.g., Luke 5:20; 7:9; Acts 3:16), as is evident from the formulaic expression "your faith has saved/healed you," which occurs four

---

Ingrid R. Kitzberger, *BIS 43* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 224–44; Gail R. O'Day, "Surprised by Faith: Jesus and the Canaanite Woman" (1989), in *A Feminist Companion to Matthew*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 114–25. On the multifaceted reception of the narrative, see Nancy Klancher, *The Taming of the Canaanite Woman: Constructions of Christian Identity in the Afterlife of Matthew 15:21–28*, SBR 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013).

<sup>91</sup> First, they frame the healing narratives that make reference to faith, and second, they exhibit redactional changes motivated by a certain theological rationale.

<sup>92</sup> Even in syntheses on the synoptic or the New Testament understanding of faith, Luke's portrayal has always been a "stepchild of scholarship" (Wolfgang Schenk, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk," in *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Binder anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein, BThSt 7 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982], 69–92, 70). See, apart from Schenk's study, Johannes M. Nuetzel, "Vom Hören zum Glauben: Der Weg zum Osterglauben in der Sicht des Lukas," in *Praesentia Christi*, ed. Lothar Lies (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1984), 37–49; Schuyler Brown, "The Lukan Use of πίστις/πιστεύω," in: idem, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*, AnBib 36 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 36–48. See also Christfried Böttrich's contribution to the present volume, which regards Luke-Acts as the concept of a grand story of faith and hope, connecting the people of God with the Christian community.

<sup>93</sup> Cf., Christoph W. Stenschke, *Luke's Portrait of Gentiles Prior to Their Coming to Faith*, WUNT 2/108 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

times in Luke (7:50<sup>94</sup>; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42) and always implies a re-orientation of the life of the one who has been healed.

(2) Luke's four-time reiteration of the logion testifies to the innate correlation of faith and salvation (σώζειν) in his theology. In those occurrences unique to Luke, faith materializes as trust in the forgiveness of sins (7:48–50) and as the prerequisite for Jesus' mercy on the unclean (17:13, 19). Physical healing and eschatological salvation are intertwined, which precludes a dissociation of "miracle faith" and "salvific faith" (cf., e.g., Luke 5:20; 7:9; 8:48, 50; 17:19; 18:42; Acts 3:16<sup>95</sup>; 14:9 with Luke 8:12; Acts 15:11; 16:31).<sup>96</sup> Both contexts evidence that the life of the believer follows and focusses on Christ (cf., the prepositional constructions πιστεύειν εἰς; Acts 10:43; 14:23; 19:4; πιστεύειν ἐπί; Acts 9:42; 11:17; 16:31; 22:19; πίστις εἰς; Acts 20:21; 24:24; 26:18).

(3) Luke illustrates the transition from becoming a believer to being a believer programmatically in Luke 8:12–13: The faith of some believers lasts only temporarily and lacks both permanence and perseverance. Luke's attentiveness to a declining or endangered faith is evident in the disciples' plea "Increase our faith!" (17:5, but see Jesus' response: 17:6), in Jesus' word to Peter "I have prayed for you that your own faith may not fail" (22:32), in the encouragement "to continue in the faith" (Acts 14:22; cf., 11:23; 13:43), and in the comment that "the churches were strengthened in the faith" (16:5). Finally, Stephanus (6:5) and Barnabas (11:24) are apostrophized as men "full of faith." Luke refers to dispositional, enduring faith with the genuinely Lukan perfect participle (e.g., 15:5; 16:34; 18:27), the present participle (e.g., 2:44; 5:14), but also the nominal adjective (10:45; 16:1, 15) and the noun (e.g., Luke 8:25; 18:8).<sup>97</sup>

### 3.3 Johannine Writings

Faith is a most crucial idea in the theology of the Gospel of John.<sup>98</sup> Notably, the evangelist exclusively uses the verb πιστεύειν (98 times), and once

<sup>94</sup> John J. Kilgallen, "Faith and Forgiveness: Luke 7,36–50," *RB* 112 (2005): 372–84; idem, "Faith and Forgiveness: Luke 7,36–50," *RB* 108 (2001): 214–27.

<sup>95</sup> Cf., Jan Lambrecht, "The Lame Man's Trust or Peter's Faith? (Acts 3,12–16)," in: idem, *Understanding What One Reads: New Testament Essays*, ed. Veronica Koperski, ANL 46 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 125–31; Stefan Schreiber, "Der Glaube in der Wunderdeutung von Apg 3,16," *SNTU.A* 22 (1997): 25–46.

<sup>96</sup> See also Luke 13:3, 5 and Acts 3:19.

<sup>97</sup> Note that two passages from Luke's special material contain πιστεύειν (Luke 18:8; 22:67), while on the other hand he omits it in 17:23 (contrast Matt 24:23/Mark 13:21; Matt 24:26).

<sup>98</sup> Cf., Johannes Beutler, "Faith and Confession: The Purpose of John" (2002), in: idem, *Neue Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften: New Studies on the Johannine Writings*, BBB 167 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 101–13; Horacio E. Lona,

only the adjective πιστός (20:27). Among the Johannine epistles, 1 John, too, has a preference for the verb (10 times), though the noun occurs once (1 John 5:4), as does the adjective (1 John 1:9; cf., 3 John 5). The prominence of the verb is to be credited to John's understanding of faith as an active, dynamic personal relationship with Jesus. The meaning of the various constructions with πιστεύειν is remarkably coherent: When focussing on the christological content of faith, John uses πιστεύειν in the absolute, with the preposition εἰς, with the dative or with a ὅτι-clause. The difference in expression does not imply a difference in substance. Those who believe him (5:38, 46; 6:30; 8:31, 45, 46; 10:37, 38; cf., 1 John 3:23), his word(s) (John 2:22; 4:50; 5:47), his deeds (10:38), in him (2:11; 3:16; 4:49; 7:38 etc.) or in his name (1:12; 2:23; 3:18) accept that he is the "Holy One of God" (6:69) and the Christ, the Son of God (11:27; 20:31; cf., 1 John 5:1, 5), that he is the "I am" (8:24; 13:19), that God has sent him (11:42; 17:8, 21), that he came from God (16:27, 30), that he is in the Father and the Father in him (14:10–11). Believing in Jesus, i.e., in the one whom God has sent (6:29), becomes identical with believing God, who sent him (5:24). This identity is expressed in the imperative: "Believe in God, believe also in me!" (14:1; cf., 12:44). Other "objects" of faith designated by the dative are the scripture (2:22; cf., 7:38), the scriptures of Moses (5:47), and Moses himself (5:46), as they testify to his mission.

Overall, faith in John is the affirmative acknowledgement of Jesus' identity and mission, the recognition of his self-revelation, which entails an intimate relationship with him. This is distinct from Paul, who centers on the salvation-historical significance of Jesus' death and resurrection. Next to πιστεύειν, John uses other expressions to convey his idea of believing in Jesus: to hear his voice (ἀκούειν, e.g., 5:24–25), to come to him (ἔρχεσθαι, e.g., 5:40), to accept him (λαμβάνειν, e.g., 5:43), or to love him (ἀγαπᾶν, e.g., 8:42; cf., 1 John 5:1). Furthermore, believing is placed next to seeing (ὄρᾶν, 6:30; 20:8; cf., 4:48; 6:36; 20:29; θεωρεῖν, 2:23; 6:40) and knowing (γινώσκειν, 6:69; 8:31–32; 10:38; 17:8; εἰδέναι, 4:42; 16:30).<sup>99</sup>

---

"Glaube und Sprache des Glaubens im Johannesevangelium," *BZ* 28 (1984): 168–84; Andrie B. du Toit, "The Aspect of Faith in the Gospel of John with Special Reference to the Farewell Discourses of Jesus," *Neot* 25 (1991): 327–40; Jean Zumstein, "L'évangile johannique: Une stratégie du croire" (1989), in: idem, *Miettes exégétiques*, MoBi 25 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991), 237–52 = idem, "Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Strategie des Glaubens," *TBei* 28 (1997): 350–63; Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Glaubensverständnis im Johannesevangelium" (1985), in: idem, *Grundsatzfragen, Jesusforschung, Evangelien*, vol. 1 of *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Juliane Schlegel, WUNT 191 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 539–57. See also Nadine Ueberschaer's contribution to the present volume.

<sup>99</sup>Cf., Victor Hasler, "Glauben und Erkennen im Johannesevangelium: Strukturelle und hermeneutische Überlegungen," *EvT* 50 (1990): 279–96.

The relation between “believing” and “knowing” is complicated. Faith can appear as the first step towards knowledge (6:69; 8:31–32), whereas, on the other hand, the reverse order is possible as well (16:30; 17:8; cf., 1 John 4:16). Finally, abiding (μένειν) in Jesus or in his word is the signature of true discipleship (8:31; cf., 6:56; 15:4–7, 9–10); this idea becomes particularly prominent in 1 John (2:6, 10, 24, 27, 28; 3:6, 9, 24; 4:13, 15, 16; cf., 2 John 9; see also 1 John 2:19).

Though in the theology of John responses to the revelation in Jesus appear to have a dichotomous structure and result in either faith or unbelief,<sup>100</sup> he does not describe the people in his narrative according to dualistic categories, but creates “ambiguous and complex” characters.<sup>101</sup> John employs these characters as symbols or metaphors for the intricate relational dynamics stimulated by the people’s encounter with Jesus and the impression of his words and deeds upon them. The multifaceted characters include Nathanael (1:50), the disciples (e.g., 2:11; 6:69; 11:15), people from the crowd (2:23;<sup>102</sup> 7:31; 8:30; cf., 11:48), among them “many” Jews (8:31; 11:45), Nicodemus (3:12, 14–18), the Samaritan woman (4:21), the Samaritans (4:39–42), the royal official (4:50, 53),<sup>103</sup> “many ... of the authorities” (12:42), Martha (11:25–27, 40),<sup>104</sup> the Beloved Disciple (20:8),<sup>105</sup> or Thomas (20:24–29).<sup>106</sup> The portrayal of such characters draws

---

<sup>100</sup> See however Rainer Metzner, “Der Geheilte von Johannes 5: Repräsentant des Unglaubens,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 177–93.

<sup>101</sup> Susan E. Hulen, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 15. See also the compendium Steven A. Hunt, D. François Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann, eds., *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, WUNT 314 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); Klaus Scholtissek, “Mündiger Glaube: Zur Architektur und Pragmatik johanneischer Begegnungsgeschichten: Joh 5 und Joh 9,” in *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur*, ed. Dieter Sänger and Ulrich Mell (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 75–105.

<sup>102</sup> Cf., Debbie Hunn, “The Believers Jesus Doubted: John 2:23–25,” *TJ* 25 (2004): 15–25.

<sup>103</sup> Cf., Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, “Königlicher Glaube: Der βασιλικός in Joh 4,46–54 als Paradigma eines nachösterlichen Jüngers,” *BN* 136 (2008): 85–104. On John 4:44f., see Gilbert van Belle, “The Faith of the Galileans: The Parenthesis in Jn 4,44,” *ETL* 74 (1998): 27–44.

<sup>104</sup> Cf., Johannes Beutler, “Unterwegs von der Trauer zur Hoffnung und zum Glauben: Jesu Gespräch mit Marta in Joh 11,20–27,” in: idem, *Neue Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften: New Studies on the Johannine Writings*, BBB 167 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 153–64; Francis J. Moloney, “The Faith of Martha and Mary: A Narrative Approach to John 11,17–40,” *Bib* 75 (1994): 471–93.

<sup>105</sup> Cf., Udo Borse, “Joh 20,8: österlicher oder vorösterlicher Glaube?” (1989), in: idem, *Studien zur Entstehung und Auslegung des Neuen Testaments*, ed. Regina Börschel, Wolfgang Fischer, and Franz-Josef Helfmeyer, SBAB.NT 21 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996), 211–21; Brendan Byrne, “The Faith of the Beloved Disciple and the

the reader into the gospel narrative and offers both possibilities of identification and existential challenges.

Two closely related interpretative cruxes emerge from John's portrayal of the theme of faith: First, the correlation between faith and signs,<sup>107</sup> and second, the soteriological relevance of faith. (1) In retrospection, the evangelist formulates the *raison d'être* of his book: "These [sc. the signs] are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that as believers you may have life in his name" (20:31).<sup>108</sup> A few verses prior, a variation of the gospel's central message is placed in a narrative setting. Jesus says to Thomas, who requested tangible signs: "be not faithless, but believing" (20:27). The tension between the two conceptions is conspicuous and pervades the entire gospel: On the one hand signs may lead to faith (e.g., 2:11, 23–25; 4:53–54; 7:31; 11:47–48; cf., 6:2, 30; but see, e.g., 12:37), while on the other hand Jesus distances himself from those who believed upon seeing signs (2:23–25), rebukes those who re-

---

Community in John 20" (1985), in *The Johannine Writings*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans, Biblical Seminar 32 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 31–45.

<sup>106</sup> Cf., Benjamin Schliesser, "To Touch or not to Touch: Doubting and Touching in John 20:24–29," *EC* 8 (2017): forthcoming; Dennis Sylva, *Thomas – Love as Strong as Death: Faith and Commitment in the Fourth Gospel*, LNTS 434 (London: Bloomsbury 2013); Christopher M. Tuckett, "Seeing and Believing in John 20," in *Paul, John, and Apocalyptic Eschatology: Studies in Honour of Martinus C. de Boer*, ed. Jan Krans, B.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, and Peter-Ben Smit, NTSup 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 169–85; Jörg Frey, "'Ich habe den Herrn gesehen' (Joh 20,28): Entstehung, Inhalt und Vermittlung des Osterglaubens nach Johannes 20," in *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes / Études sur Matthieu et Jean: Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag / Mélanges offerts à Jean Zumstein pour son 65<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*, ed. Uta Poplutz and Andreas Dettwiler, ATANT 97 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 267–84; Margareta Gruber, "Berührendes Sehen: Zur Legitimation der Zeichenforderung des Thomas (Joh 20,24–31)," *BZ* 51 (2007): 61–83; Michael Theobald, "Der johanneische Osterglaube und die Grenzen seiner narrativen Vermittlung (Joh 20)" (1998), in: idem, *Studien zum Corpus Iohanneum*, WUNT 267 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010), 443–71; Dorothy A. Lee, "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20," *JSNT* 58 (1995): 37–49. See also the study by Glenn W. Most, *Doubting Thomas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

<sup>107</sup> Cf., Craig R. Koester, "Jesus' Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. idem and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 47–74; idem, "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John," *Bib* 70 (1989): 327–48; Marianne Meye Thompson, "Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel," *BBR* 1 (1991): 89–108; Marie-Émile Boismard, "Rapports entre foi et miracles dans l'Évangile de Jean," *ETL* 58 (1982): 357–64.

<sup>108</sup> Cf., Thomas Söding, "Die Schrift als Medium des Glaubens: Zur hermeneutischen Bedeutung von Joh 20,30f.," in *Schrift und Tradition: Festschrift für Josef Ernst zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Knut Backhaus and Franz Georg Untergaßmair (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1996), 343–71.

quest signs (4:48), and blesses those “who have not seen and yet have come to believe” (20:29). Apparently, signs cannot proof, but *may* point to Jesus’ identity, and thus elicit faith. The gospel’s programmatic post-Easter perspective focusses on the situation of the addressees: As personal encounter with Jesus is no longer possible, and as his signs are no longer performed, but rather remembered (cf., 17:20; 19:35; 20:30–31), they can and shall yet believe and receive salvation. In fact, retrospective realization of Jesus’ words and deeds after his glorification involves a deeper, previously inaccessible understanding of their christological-soteriological implication (cf., 2:22; 12:16; 13:7; 14:20).

(2) The soteriological relevance of faith is encapsulated in the speech of John the Baptist: “Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life” (3:36; cf., e.g., 3:16; 6:40, 47). Faith leads to life (and not to righteousness, as in Paul), hence to full participation in salvation. Some passages, however, suggest that John also knows a deficient manifestation of faith, one that does not include a personal relationship with Jesus (2:23–25), that remains ignorant (7:31) or that lacks the courage of public confession (12:42–43). This has been ascribed to an inconsistent concept of faith with different traditio-historical origins (miracle faith vs. “true” christological faith), but should more likely be associated with John’s fluid idea of faith: As the design of John’s characters illustrates, he is aware of the dynamic existentiality of faith that transcends a clear-cut distinction between salvific faith and fatal unbelief.

In the apocalypse of John,<sup>109</sup> the adjective πιστός takes center stage: Faithfulness is both an outstanding characteristic of Jesus, the true witness (Rev 1:5; 3:14; cf., 19:11) and the required attitude of his followers: “Be faithful until death” (2:10; cf., 17:14). The words of the seer are called “trustworthy (πιστοί) and true” (21:5; 22:6). While the verb is missing, the noun twice denotes virtuous steadfastness of the Christians (2:19; 13:10: both with ὑπομονή). The implicit subject of the genitive constructions in 2:13 (πίστις μου) and 14:12 (ἡ πίστις Ἰησοῦ) is debated: Grammatically, both Jesus’ and the Christians’ faith(fulness) could be in view, though the conceptual proximity to Hebrews and James tips the scales toward a subjective genitive reading.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf., Heinz Giesen, “Christlicher Glaube in Anfechtung und Bewährung: Zur zeit- und religionsgeschichtlichen Situation der kleinasiatischen Gemeinden im Spiegel der Johannesoffenbarung,” in *Mächtige Bilder: Zeit- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Johannesoffenbarung*, ed. Bernhard Heininger, SBS 225 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2011), 9–38.

<sup>110</sup> See the extensive discussion and the opposing view in David A. deSilva. “On the Sidelines of the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate: The View from Revelation,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 259–74 (objective genitive).

### 3.4 Hebrews

The theology of Hebrews has aptly been called a “theology of faith,”<sup>111</sup> though compared to other such theologies, like Paul’s or John’s, the emphases are quite different.<sup>112</sup> Most prominently, the author of Hebrews deploys the theme of faith almost exclusively in paraenetic sections.

The ethical focus of “faith” in Hebrews has prompted a discussion on its “christology” and its “Christian” character in general. Some discerned in Hebrews a “dangerous departure” from the concept of faith represented by Jesus, Paul, and John<sup>113</sup> and declared that the understanding of faith in Hebrews is “poor”, “profane” and “unchristological.”<sup>114</sup> In the past decades the discussion has received new momentum. It is said that the *auctor ad Hebraeos* depicts Jesus as “model and enabler of faith,”<sup>115</sup> either in a typological framework in terms of an antitype who has perfected the anticipatory faith of the witnesses<sup>116</sup> or in a narratological framework in terms of a figure that inaugurated and fulfilled the “story” of faith.<sup>117</sup> According

---

<sup>111</sup> Otto Kuss, “Der theologische Grundgedanke des Hebräerbriefs” (1956), in: idem., *Aufsätze zur Exegese des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 1 of *Auslegung und Verkündigung*, (Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 281–328, 311.

<sup>112</sup> As with Paul, studies on the concept of faith in Hebrews continue to flourish. Among monographs and essays attempting an overview, cf., Dennis R. Lindsay, “Pistis and ‘Emanah: The Nature of Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al., LNTS 387 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 158–69; Victor Rhee, *Faith in Hebrews: Analysis within the Context of Christology, Eschatology, and Ethics*, SBL 19 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001); Gerd Schunack, “Exegetische Beobachtungen zum Verständnis des Glaubens im Hebräerbrief: Eine kritische Anfrage,” in *Text und Geschichte: Facetten theologischen Arbeitens aus dem Freundes- und Schülerkreis: Dieter Lührmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Stefan Maser and Egbert Schlarb, MThSt 50 (Marburg: Elwert, 1999), 208–32; Thomas Söding, “Zuversicht und Geduld im Schauen auf Jesus: Zum Glaubensbegriff des Hebräerbriefes,” *ZNW* 82 (1991): 214–41; Dennis Hamm, “Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Jesus Factor,” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 270–91; Gerhard Dautzenberg, “Der Glaube im Hebräerbrief,” *BZ* 17 (1973): 161–77. Erich Gräßer’s monograph *Der Glaube im Hebräerbrief*, MThSt 2 (Marburg: Elwert, 1965) still stands out for its unmatched scope and precision, despite a number of shortcomings. See also my other contribution to this volume.

<sup>113</sup> Werner Georg Kümmel, “Der Glaube im Neuen Testament, seine katholische und reformatorische Deutung” (1937), in idem., *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933–1964*, MThSt 3 (Marburg: Elwert, 1965), 67–80, 74.

<sup>114</sup> Gräßer, *Glaube* (see n. 112), 3.4.64–71.

<sup>115</sup> Hamm, “Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews” (see n. 112), 272.

<sup>116</sup> Christopher A. Richardson, *Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith: Jesus’ Faith as the Climax of Israel’s History in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2/338 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

<sup>117</sup> Matthew C. Easter, *Faith and the Faithfulness of Jesus in Hebrews*, SNTSMS 160 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

to a “maximalist” view the structure of the letters testifies to an implicit christological orientation of faith, i.e., “faith in Christ,” even if this phrase is nowhere attested.<sup>118</sup>

In Hebrews, the noun πίστις occurs 32 times. The Verb πιστεύειν is used only twice (4:3; 11:6), the adjective πιστός five times (2:17; 3:2, 5; 10:23; 11:11; cf., ἀπιστία in 3:12, 19). There are a number of other terms, however, that are in a close semantic vicinity to the word group πίστις and should therefore be considered as part of Hebrews’ faith terminology: To these belong among the nouns “standing firm” (ὑπόστασις, 3:14; 11:1), “confidence” (παρρησία, 3:6; 4:16; 10:19, 35), “assurance” (πληροφορία, 6:11; 10:22), “confession” (ὁμολογία, 3:1; 4:14; 10:23), “patience” (μακροθυμία, 6:12), “endurance” (ὑπομονή, 10:36; 12:1), “obedience” (ὑπακοή, 5:8), and “hope” (ἐλπίς, 3:6; 6:11, 18; 7:19; 10:23); among the verbs “to hold fast” (κατέχειν, 3:6, 14; 10:23; κρατεῖν, 4:14; 6:18), but also “to be patient” (μακροθυμεῖν, 6:15), “to remain” (μένειν, 13:1), and “to obey” (ὑπακούειν, 5:9; 11:8). Semantic opposites are manifold as well: Next to “unbelief” (ἀπιστία, 3:12, 19) they include ideas such as “shrinking back” (ὑποστολή, 10:39), “transgression” (παράβασις, 2:2; 9:15), “disobedience” (ἀπειθεία, 4:6, 11; παρακοή, 2:2), as well as “to fall away” (ἀποστήναι, 3:12; παραπίπτειν, 6:6), “to shrink back” (ὑποστέλλειν, 10:38), “to throw away (confidence)” (ἀποβάλλειν, 10:35).

Most occurrences of πίστις are found in Heb 11.<sup>119</sup> The chapter sets in with a “rhetorical definition” of faith,<sup>120</sup> which responds to the critical situation of the addressees and does not offer an abstract, general and timeless *definitio fidei*. The interpretation of the verse is disputed. Most likely the description combines a “volitional” dimension with a “rational”

<sup>118</sup> See, not quite convincingly, Rhee, *Faith in Hebrews* (see n. 112).

<sup>119</sup> Exegetical treatises on Hebrews 11 as a whole and on (the faith of) single figures abound. See the monographs Pamela M. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, SBL.DS 156 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997); Christian Rose, *Die Wolke der Zeugen: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 10,32–12,3*, WUNT 2/60 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994). Pertinent essays are published in Richard Bauckham et al., eds., *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) (see especially the contribution of Loveday Alexander, Markus Bockmuehl, Nathan MacDonald, and Robert W. Moberly). Cf., Bertold Klappert, “Hoffender Glaube, kommender Christus und die neue Welt Gottes (Hebräer 11,1–12,3),” in *Logos – Logik – Lyrik: Engagierte exegetische Studien zum biblischen Reden Gottes: Festschrift für Klaus Haacker*, ed. Volker A. Lehnert and Ulrich Rüsen-Weinhold, ABG 27 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007), 219–66. On a comparison of Sir 44 and Heb 11, cf., Frank Ueberschaer, “Mit gutem Glauben und vorbildlicher Weisheit: Zwei Ahnentafeln im Vergleich (Sir 44f. und Hebr 11),” *PzB* 20 (2011): 27–50.

<sup>120</sup> Cf., Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes* (see n. 119).

dimension:<sup>121</sup> “Faith is standing firm (ὑπόστασις) with respect to the things hoped for, evidence (ἐλεγχος) of things unseen.”<sup>122</sup> Firmness and steadfastness is required of the addressees, who are described as the wandering people of God (3:7–4:13), being in danger of losing sight of their promised eschatological goal: God’s rest (κατάπαυσις; e.g., 4:1, 3, 10–11), the heavenly things (3:1; 6:4; 8:5; 9:23), the heavenly Jerusalem (12:22; cf., 13:14), the “the promised eternal inheritance” (9:15). As second or third generation Christians, they find themselves in a period of fundamental change, struggling with maintaining their belief in the reality of the divine promises in the face of disillusioning experiences (e.g., 10:32–39; 12:12–13). On their earthly pilgrimage as “strangers and foreigners” (11:13; cf., 13:14), they have to be called for lifting their drooping hands and strengthening their weak knees (12:12). The notion of “invisible things” situates the *auctor ad Hebraeos* in a Platonizing frame of reference, which he shares with Philo, though his work also incorporates both mystical and apocalyptic strands.

The author encourages the disheartened Christians by reference to paradigmatic believers of Israel’s glorious past. Anaphoric “through faith” appears 18 times, emphatically insisting on the exigency of faith. Abraham stands out as supreme (human) example, who was convinced by, and oriented towards, the invisible, hoped-for things, as he “set out, not knowing where he was going” (11:8). He epitomizes those, who “through faith and patience inherit the promises,” which is why Christians are called to be his imitators (6:12). At the same time, his steadfast faith is contingent upon the steadfastness of God’s promises (6:16–18; cf., 11:11; 10:23: “he who has promised is faithful”). However, Abraham remained a stranger even after reaching the promised land (11:9–10), for no one has ever arrived at the final, heavenly destination (11:13, 39–40) – with exception of Christ. He is presented as the climax of the “great cloud of witnesses” (12:1), as

<sup>121</sup> Cf., Schlatter, *Glaube* (see n. 19), 526.

<sup>122</sup> The meaning of ὑπόστασις is particularly controversial. While the rendering “confidence” or “assurance” (cf., NRSV; Luther: “gewisse Zuversicht”) should be dismissed on philological and contextual grounds, it is debated whether the accent is on the active notion of “standing firm/beneath” (ὑπό + στάσις; cf., Heb 3:14) in the face of the trials of faith, or on the (middle-platonic) idea of the transcendent, objective reality, which stands firm and grants firmness (cf., the influential essay Heinrich Dörrie, “Zu Hebr 11,1,” *ZNW* 46 [1955]: 196–202). The term ἐλεγχος signifies the cognitive dimension of faith: By means of logical reasoning an individual is convinced of the reality or substance of a certain subject matter (πράγμα). The rational aspect of Hebrews’ idea of faith is discussed in James W. Thompson, “The Appropriate, the Necessary, and the Impossible: Faith and Reason in Hebrews,” in *The Early Church in its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris, and James W. Thompson, NT.S 90 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 302–17.

he is the only one who has finished the tedious and strenuous walk; he is the “forerunner” (6:20), “pioneer and perfecter of faith” (12:2).<sup>123</sup> Nowhere does Hebrews speak of faith in Christ – the only specified personal object of faith is God (6:1: ἐπὶ θεόν) – but of the trust of the Messiah (2:13: πεποιθώς) and the faithfulness of Jesus, high priest, apostle, son of God (2:17; 3:2, 5–6: πιστός; cf., 5:7, 8: εὐλάβεια, ὑπακοή). First and foremost, an existential connection with Christ comes about not by believing *in* him, nor primarily by believing *like* him, but by “considering” him (3:1: κατανοεῖν), “looking” to him (12:2: ἀφορᾶν), and “reflecting” on him (12:3: ἀναλογίζεσθαι).

Christ’s way of faith is not only something to contemplate on, but is also of singular soteriological significance: He suffered “for everyone” and thus became the “pioneer of ... salvation” (2:9–10; cf., 5:9: “source of eternal salvation”), he is the faithful high priest according to the order of Melchizedek (5:10), who atones for the sins of the people (2:17), he is the “forerunner on our behalf” (6:20). Such predicates make him, who was “without sin” (4:15), both mediator and guarantee of a new and better covenant (7:22; 8:6; 9:15).

### 3.5 Catholic Epistles

#### James

As the *auctor ad Hebraeos*, James is an exponent of Jewish-Christian paraenetical tradition.<sup>124</sup> Since and due to Martin Luther’s critique of James’ writing as an “epistle of straw,” his idea of faith has been regarded

<sup>123</sup> The author of Hebrews has been described as “the only New Testament writer who explicitly explores and expounds upon the faith(fulness) of Christ in any degree of detail” (Todd D. Still, “Christos as Pistos: The Faith(fulness) of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al., LNTS 387 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 40–50, 48). See the recent monographs by Richardson, *Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith* (see n. 116); Easter, *Faith and the Faithfulness of Jesus* (see n. 117).

<sup>124</sup> Cf., Stephan J. Joubert, “*Homo reciprocus* No More: The ‘Missional’ Nature of Faith in James,” in *Sensitivity towards Outsiders: Exploring the Dynamic Relationship between Mission and Ethics in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, ed. Jacobus Kok et al., WUNT 2/364 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 382–400; Manabu Tsuji, *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*, WUNT 2/93 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Markus Lautenschlager, “Der Gegenstand des Glaubens im Jakobusbrief,” *ZTK* 87 (1990): 163–84. On a metaphorical, aesthetic dimension of “works,” see Jaqueline Assaël, “Mettre en œuvre la foi, selon l’Épître de Jacques,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 506–29. Despite the fact that in recent years there is a refreshing tendency to read James “with new eyes,” most studies on his understanding of faith contain a sidelong glance at Paul and at their different approaches to faith, justification/righteousness, and works (see the entries in the following notes).

as lacking christological substance (despite 2:1<sup>125</sup>). In recent decades, the letter has escaped from the shadows of Pauline theology and is now interpreted on its own terms. James regards faith as a basic human attitude, which exceeds a simple monotheistic confession (2:19), but orients the entire existence towards God. James shares with Hebrews and Revelation, but also with 1 Peter, the view that faith will face trials and afflictions and therefore requires endurance (Jas 1:2–3; cf., 1 Pet 1:6–7; 5:9). The bulk of references to faith (14 occurrences) owes itself to the excursus-like argumentation in Jas 2:14–26: All three occurrences of πιστεύειν and eleven (of 14) occurrences of πίστις are found in this passage. In contrast to Paul, but in line with Jewish tradition, James combines the notion of Abraham’s faith (Gen 15:6) with the supreme test of his faithfulness (Gen 22) in order to prove from scripture “that faith was active along with his works, and faith was brought to completion by the works . . . , that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone” (Jas 2:22, 24).<sup>126</sup> Particularly the latter conclusion has prompted readers of James to discern a head-on attack against Paul,<sup>127</sup> a critique of a misconstrued or misunderstood Paulinism,<sup>128</sup> or a critical dialogue with Pauline Christians of the second generation.<sup>129</sup> Others conclude that Paul and James are concerned with a different

---

<sup>125</sup> The style of Jas 2:1 is, as it stands, quite clumsy and has prompted several conjectures. However one reconstructs the text, the category of the genitive πίστις τοῦ κυρίου remains disputed. Cf., Cirafesi, “ἔχειν πίστιν” (see n. 57), 24–28 (objective genitive); Bruce A. Lowe, “James 2:1 in the Πίστις Χριστοῦ Debate: Irrelevant or Indispensable?,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 239–57 (subjective genitive with primary reference to trust in God).

<sup>126</sup> On Abraham and Rahab in James, cf., Pierre Keith, “La foi, les œuvres et l’exemple d’Abraham et Raab dans Jc 2,14–26,” in *Bible et Terre Sainte: Mélanges Marcel Beaudry*, ed. José Enrique Aguilar Chiu, Kieran J. O’Mahony, and Maurice Roger (New York: Lang, 2008), 313–31.

<sup>127</sup> Cf., Martin Hengel, “Der Jakobusbrief als antipaulinische Polemik” (1987), in: idem, *Paulus und Jakobus: Kleine Schriften 3* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 520–48, 524f.

<sup>128</sup> See the classic statement in Martin Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, KEK 15, 12th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 221; cf., from a rhetorical perspective Jean-Noël Aletti, “James 2,14–26: The Arrangement and Its Meaning,” *Bib* 85 (2014): 88–101, 100: “The choice of a *chreia* allowed James to repeat an opinion that had become common in some Christian communities and to criticize it, showing that it was erroneous. By presenting the common opinion as a maxim (γνώμη), he did not need to cite Paul and thereby avoided attributing to him what was only an erroneous recapitulation of his doctrine of justification.”

<sup>129</sup> Cf., Elian Cuvillier, “‘Jacques’ et ‘Paul’ en débat: L’épître de Jacques et la tradition paulinienne (Jc 2:14–26//Ep 2:8–10, 2 Tm 1:9 et Tt 3:5.8b),” *NovT* 53 (2011): 273–91.

“theme”<sup>130</sup> or that only the semantics of their common vocabulary diverges.<sup>131</sup> Again others assume a convergence of common early Jewish Abrahamic tradition and consider James’ argument un-Pauline rather than anti-Pauline.<sup>132</sup> As yet, no one has seized the doctoral mortarboard, promised by Martin Luther to the one who is able to reconcile Paul and James.

### *1 Peter, Jude, 2 Peter*

1 Peter is characterized by Pauline theologoumena, which also pertains to the language and phrasology of faith (e.g., 1 Pet 1:5: διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν; 1:8: πιστεύειν εἰς [Χριστόν]; 2:6), but its fundamental concern is paraenetic; thus it is not the soteriology or christology of faith *per se* that lies at the heart of the author, but its genuineness (1:7), which is to be proved at the parousia. Believers are guarded through faith (1:5<sup>133</sup>) and “will not be put to shame” (2:6 = Isa 28:16), whereas unbelievers stumble. Faith is directed to Christ (1:8), who mediates faith in God (1:21: πιστός εἰς θεόν<sup>134</sup>); God is predicated as the “faithful creator” (4:19), to whom suffering Christians should entrust themselves. In Jude, the “most holy faith” is presented as the foundation, upon which the addressees are to build themselves (Jud 20) and which they have to contend (3); lack of faith is fatal (5). In 2 Peter, “faith” ranks first among a series of important “Christian” concepts, which is concluded by “love” (2 Pet 1:5–7);<sup>135</sup> all such virtues base upon and are embedded in “knowledge” (ἐπίγνωσις) of

---

<sup>130</sup> Cf., Klaus Haacker, “Rettender Glaube und Abrahams Rechtfertigung: Zum Verhältnis zwischen Paulus und Jakobus (und Petrus?),” in *Gottes Wort in der Zeit: Verstehen – verkündigen – verbreiten: Festschrift für Volker Stolle*, ed. Christoph Barnbrock and Werner Klän, *Theologie, Forschung und Wissenschaft* 12 (Münster: Lit, 2005), 209–25. Haacker employs the text-linguistic distinction between theme and rheme.

<sup>131</sup> Cf., Sharyn Dowd, “Faith that Works: James 2:14–26,” *RevExp* 97 (2000): 195–205, 202: “James is using Paul’s vocabulary but not his dictionary.”

<sup>132</sup> Cf., Matthias Konradt, *Christliche Existenz nach dem Jakobusbrief: Eine Studie zu seiner soteriologischen und ethischen Konzeption*, SUNT 22 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 245. See also Cf., Serge Ruzer, “James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse,” in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, ed. Gary A. Anderson, Ruth Clements, and David Satran, *STDJ* 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 79–104. The individuality of James’s idea of faith and its independence from Paul is also stressed in Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr’s contribution to the present volume.

<sup>133</sup> Mostly, διὰ πίστεως is regarded to refer to human faith. But see David G. Horrell, “Whose Faith(fulness) Is It in 1 Peter 1:5?,” *JTS* 48 (1997): 110–15 (God’s faithfulness).

<sup>134</sup> Only here in the New Testament, πιστός is linked with the preposition εἰς.

<sup>135</sup> In 2 Peter, the πιστ-word group is represented only through πίστις (2 Pet 1:1, 5).

God and Christ (1:2f., 8; 2:20), the preeminent religious concept in 2 Peter.<sup>136</sup>

#### 4. Further Developments

Traits of the various notions of faith among the New Testament authors are represented and taken up in non-canonical early Christian literature.<sup>137</sup> Neither the Apostolic Fathers nor the apologetic literature of the 2nd century exhibit significant developments of the New Testament idea of faith. Hebrews' situating faith in paraenesis resonates in 1 Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Didache, whereas the Pauline "soteriological" trajectory is reflected in Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, and Barnabas, but also in Justin or Irenaeus.<sup>138</sup>

Though 1 Clement does echo Pauline parlance, predominantly that of 1 Corinthians, his idea of "faith" is closer to Hebrews:<sup>139</sup> Πίστις features as the first of the Christian virtues (64:1) and denotes both patient endurance and obedience; it is jeopardized by doubting and being double-minded (11:2; 23:3–4; cf., Jas 1:8; 4:8). The prime examples of "faith" are, next to

---

<sup>136</sup> On the notion of faith in Jude and 2 Peter, see Jörg Frey's contribution to the present volume. He concludes that, in distinction from John and Paul, the two late New Testament writings place particular stress on the lifelong obligation inherent in the believers' faith-relation.

<sup>137</sup> Cf., Lührmann, "Glaube" (see n. 75), 79–102; Roland Rößler, *Studien zum Glaubensbegriff im zweiten und beginnenden dritten Jahrhundert* (PhD diss., Universität Hamburg, 1968); William Henry Paine Hatch, *The Idea of Faith in Christian Literature from the Death of Saint Paul to the Close of the Second Century* (Strasbourg: Imprimerie Alsacienne, 1925), 72–140. In the course of the πίστις Χριστοῦ-debate in Pauline scholarship, a number of studies traced the subjective genitive reading in patristic times. Their results contradict each other diametrically. Some argue that Christian tradition during the first three centuries clearly bears witness to interest in the faith of Jesus Christ (e.g., Michael R. Whitemon, "After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Neglected Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers," *JTS* 61 [2010], 82–109; Ian G. Wallis, *The Faith of Christ in Early Christian Traditions*, SNTSMS 84 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995]), others remain very sceptical (e.g., Roy A. Harrisville III, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Witness of the Fathers," *NT* 36 [1994]: 233–41; Mark W. Elliott, "Πίστις Χριστοῦ in the Church Fathers and Beyond," in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Biblical, Exegetical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle [Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009], 277–89).

<sup>138</sup> Cf., Lührmann, "Glaube" (see n. 75), 87f. To be sure, such categories should only be used with great caution and without inherent value judgments.

<sup>139</sup> Differently Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), 512: "1 Clement's treatment of *pistis* builds largely, though not exclusively, on Paul's." See also a mediating position in Wolfgang Grünstäudl's contribution to the present volume.

Paul (5:5f.), Abraham (10:1, 7; 31:2) and Rahab (12:1, 7). Throughout, faith is faith in God (3:4; 12:7; 10:6; 34:4).

The evidence is comparable in the Shepherd of Hermas: The object of faith is God (e.g., Mand. 4,3,3: εἰς τὸν κύριον),<sup>140</sup> faith is monotheistic faith in the creator (Mand. 1,1). A moral-religious category, faith ranks highest among the virtues (Vis. 3,8,3; Sim. 9,15,2) and coordinates all other virtues. Simplicity and perfection of faith is the goal (Mand. 9,6); as in 1 Clement, the most vicious enemy of such faith is “double-mindedness” (διψυχία), an inner divisiveness that results in a deficient religious-ethical living out of faith. Hence the paradigmatic plea: “Believe (in) the Lord, you who are double-minded!” (Vis. 4,2,6). The Didache has, statistically, little to offer on the subject of faith; πίστις occurs a mere three times. The writing testifies to the view that “the whole time of your faith” (16,2), i.e., Christian existence since baptism (cf., 6,2), is worthless, “if in the end you have not been perfected” (16,2). Only endurance in faith leads to salvation (16,5; cf., Matt 24:13), not faith *per se*.

2 Clement, too, mentions faith only in passing: Christians are those who have once come to faith (2,3; cf., 15,3), but now have to prove their commitment through purity, righteousness, and endurance in order to receive eternal life. Doubts, double-mindedness, even unbelief might befall the Christian (11,1; 19,2).<sup>141</sup>

Ignatius of Antioch follows in Paul’s steps, though he bypasses the issue of the law. Faith is mediated through Christ (*Phld.* 8,2: ἡ πίστις ἡ δι’ αὐτοῦ; cf., Acts 3:16) and relates to Christ (*Trall.* 9,2) and the events of salvation, i.e., Christ’s death (with εἰς, *Trall.* 2,1), his blood (with εἰς, *Smyrn.* 6,1) and his bodily resurrection (*Smyrn.* 3,1). The phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and related expressions are as ambiguous as in Paul (*Eph.* 20,1; *Magn.* 1,1; *Rom.* Inscr.). Ignatius presses for the unity of faith (*Eph.* 13,1) and exhorts his addressees to gather “in one faith and one Jesus Christ” (*Eph.* 20,2). In distinction from the errors of the unbelieving rest of humankind, they are to be “steadfast in the faith” (*Eph.* 10,2), and within the community faith is accompanied by “love” as the standard of commu-

---

<sup>140</sup> The phrase πίστις τοῦ κυρίου appears four times in the Shepherd of Hermas (Vis. 4,1,8; Mand. 11,4; Sim. 6,1,2; 6,3,6). It includes two ambiguities: the category of the genitive and the meaning of κύριος (God or Christ). Michael Whinton (“After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ” [see n. 137], 105; cf., Wallis, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* [see n. 137], 188) regards κύριος as a designation of Jesus and opts for a *genitivus auctoris*: “Given the emphasis on obedience to the Lord in each of the passages, a genitive of source is preferred so that reference is being made to ‘faithfulness from the Lord’.” See also the expression πίστις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (Sim. 9,16,5), which is analogous to Gal 2:20.

<sup>141</sup> See Jim Kelhoffer’s contribution to the present volume, in which he adduces the category of reciprocity in a patron-client relationship to clarify the believer’s continuous obligations toward God.

nal life (e.g., *Eph.* 1,1; *Magn.* 1,1f.; *Rom.* Inscr.; *Smyrn.* Inscr.). “The beginning [of life] is faith, the end is love; and if these two exist in unity, it is God.” Everything else follows from it (*Eph.* 14,1; cf., 9,1).<sup>142</sup>

In Polycarp’s letter to the Philippians faith also has a clearly christological orientation.<sup>143</sup> It is directed to God, who raised Christ from the dead (with εἰς, 2,1), but also to Christ (with εἰς, 1,3; cf., 12,2), whose patient endurance serves as an example that is to be imitated and believed (8,2). Faith represents an ethical norm: In the letter’s *Haustafel* (4,1–6,3) the wives are instructed to “walk in the faith (ἐν τῇ ... πίστει) given to them” (4,2), and the widows “must think soberly about the faith of/in the Lord (περὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου πίστιν)” (4,3).

The Epistle of Barnabas stresses the soteriological implication of Christ’s suffering as the content of faith: “Let us believe that the Son of God could not suffer except for our sakes” (7,2; cf., 13,7, referring to Gen 15:6). The meaning of the phrase ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ (4,8) is grammatically ambiguous and could refer to faith in Christ or the faith of Christ, but the following verse clearly envisages human faith (in Christ) when it talks about “the whole time of our life and faith” (4,9; cf., Did. 16,2). Faith relates to, and results from, hearing the word (of faith) (9,3; 11,11; 16,9: λόγος τῆς πίστεως), hence the objective genitive construction “faith in the promise” (6,17: πίστις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας). The author praises the “great faith” of his addressees (1,4), but intends with his letter to perfect their knowledge (γνώσις) along with their faith (1,5). Faith is also associated with “love” and “hope” (1,4; 4,8; 11,8); “fear” (φόβος) and “endurance” (ὕπομονή) are called “helpers of our faith” (2,2). Faith appears as the basic Christian condition or disposition, while knowledge, love, hope, fear and endurance are its expressions and its required concomitants.

The flood of new writings that would become “apocryphal” as a result of the construction of the canon or would be labelled and condemned as “heretical” in the formation of “orthodox” theology developed and diversified the Christian talk of faith. The almost infinite variety of writings and their respective views on faith cannot be assessed here.<sup>144</sup> Rather, at the end of this *tour de force*, a number of aspects will be presented to conclude the previous discussion and to point to some implications.

<sup>142</sup> On the unity of faith and love in Ignatius, see Wolfgang Grünstäudl’s contribution to the present volume.

<sup>143</sup> This is also accentuated in Bernhard Mutschler’s contribution to the present volume. He describes “faith in Christ” as the operative basis of other aspects of Christian life such as love, truth, edification, justice or hope.

<sup>144</sup> An exemplary selection of such writings is analyzed in the present volume by Tobias Nicklas and Veronika Niederhofer (Acts of Paul and Thecla) and Enno Edzard Popkes (Gospel of Thomas).

## 5. Conclusions and Corollaries

1. *Cultural compatibility of faith.* A thorough analysis of the linguistic and social setting of early Christian communities yields findings of great value for our understanding of Christian faith language and at the same time opens up significant venues for future research: First, one-sided religio-historical contextualizations and delineations are inadequate. Christian talk of faith is rooted in the religious sphere of Judaism, in the Greek-Hellenistic world of thought and in the socio-cultural and imperial atmosphere of the Roman Empire. Second, attempts at establishing a basic, “fideistic” Christian meaning of πίστις in distinction to a “pagan” are likewise misguided, as they neglect both the rich context of faith language and its polysemy, and potentially result in disconnecting the Christian texts from their “natural habitat in the ancient world.”<sup>145</sup> Future discussion will, therefore, lay the primary focus neither on the question of influences, dependencies, and genealogies of the early Christian concept of faith, nor in an apologetic manner on its unequivocal singularity and uniqueness. Rather, it acknowledges that Christian authors inhabited the same physical, cultural and intellectual world as their contemporaries – and yet developed a distinctive conception of central identity-establishing tenets, such as faith.<sup>146</sup>

2. *The newness of faith.* The general openness of Christian theology and language to the existing discourses of the ancient world does not preclude its newness and innovativeness. Any cultural movement leaving a lasting impression in the course of history is distinguished by a specific, signal “surplus” which cannot be explained in its entirety from its sociocultural background. From a mere statistical perspective, the newness of faith is mirrored in the “explosive increase in talk of faith” in early Christianity in

---

<sup>145</sup> Van Kooten, “A Non-Fideistic Interpretation of πίστις” (see n. 36), 216.

<sup>146</sup> See the quote by Teresa Morgan above n. 7, who employs the image of “evolution”, and Schliesser, *Was ist Glaube?* (see n. 44), 116–18, adopting the notion of “emergence.” The classic definition of emergence, a concept applicable to the rise of faith, is from the 19th century English philosopher George Henry Lewes (*Problems of Life and Mind: First Series: The Foundation of a Creed*, vol. 2 [Boston: Osgood, 1875]): “Every resultant is either a sum or a difference of the co-operant forces; their sum, when their directions are the same – their difference, when their directions are contrary. Further, every resultant is clearly traceable in its components, because these are homogeneous and commensurable. It is otherwise with emergents, when, instead of adding measurable motion to measurable motion, or things of one kind to other individuals of their kind, there is a co-operation of things of unlike kinds. The emergent is unlike its components insofar as these are incommensurable, and it cannot be reduced to their sum or their difference.”

virtually all layers of its writings.<sup>147</sup> In terms of historical linguistics, the frequent and multiform use of πίστις κτλ., its association with other central Christian terms, motives and images, and its christological focus contributed considerably to the emergence of a Christian idiom, making it a distinctive part of the ancient religious discourse.<sup>148</sup> Materially, the precipitous increase of faith terminology relates to the “volcanic eruption” of Jesus-devotion, which “emerged consequent upon, and in connection with, the astounding conviction that God had raised Jesus from death and exalted him to heavenly glory.”<sup>149</sup> Within his theological frame of reference, Paul expressed the newness of faith most succinctly by his idea of the “coming of faith” (Gal 3:23) at the turning point in salvation-history, which for him is coincidental with the coming of Christ. Finally, whereas in Greco-Roman and Jewish religiosity faith can be *one* feature of religious identity, Christianity propagates it as the exclusive characteristic of human relationship with God and Christ. This exclusivity reflects a novel development and is without parallel in the ancient world.<sup>150</sup> The question why it is precisely *faith* that attained such unparalleled central status, has of yet not been explained conclusively and requires further analysis.<sup>151</sup>

3. *The christology of faith.* At any rate, the omnipresence of faith language roots in its christological concentration. Generally speaking, in the person of Christ and in the event of Christ, faith has its origin, content, and goal. The various early Christian writings accentuate different aspects of that Christ-faith, which in turn correspond to the referential context and the intended message. Drawing on Augustine’s influential distinction of Christ as both *sacramentum* and *exemplum* (*Trin.* 4,3), one can discern two main foci: The first emphasizes the soteriological significance of cross and res-

<sup>147</sup> Jünger, “Glaube” (see n. 2), 953.

<sup>148</sup> See the programmatic title of Thomas Schumacher’s monograph: *Zur Entstehung christlicher Sprache*. Cf., Udo Schnelle, “Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung,” *NTS* 61 (2015): 113–43, 130: “Die Entwicklung einer eigenen Sprachwelt war ein entscheidender Schritt zur Eigenständigkeit der neuen Bewegung der Christen.”

<sup>149</sup> Hurtado, “Resurrection-Faith” (see n. 4), 35f.

<sup>150</sup> Cf., Brandenburger, “Pistis und Soteria” (see n. 15), 169: “Eine *solche* Rede vom Glauben hat im klassischen Griechentum und auch im zeitgenössischen Hellenismus schlechterdings keine Analogien.”

<sup>151</sup> See, however, the remarks in James D.G. Dunn, “In Grateful Dialogue: A Response to My Interlocutors,” in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D.G. Dunn’s Jesus Remembered*, ed. Robert B. Stewart and Gary Habermas (Nashville: B&H), 287–323, 289: “Jesus was a figure whose mission, in its character and its teaching, made a considerable *impact* on his immediate followers. It is this fact that I am confident can be taken as given, which allows me to speak of *faith* as already a factor before Easter. It is this fact that enables me to argue that high esteem for Jesus (faith) should not be set aside or stripped away from the data as post-Easter and ‘nonhistorical’.” See also above n. 4.

urrection and regards faith as accepting and aligning one's existence to what God has done in Christ, with all its ethical and doctrinal implications. The second – which occurs mostly, but not exclusively, in later writings – expresses and stresses these implications as such, pointing to the ethical significance of Christ's path of faith(fulness), to the entailed conformity to the Crucified and to the well-defined and authoritative content of faith. Both aspects, the “soteriology of faith” and the “ethos and dogmatics of faith”, cannot be separated and have not been separated in infant Christianity, regardless of such tendencies in the history of (Protestant) exegesis.<sup>152</sup>

4. *The sociality of faith.* Faith is not only an integral part in the emergence of Christian language, theology and ethos, but also in the formation of Christian identity in distinction from other identities. Whoever believes in Christ enters and belongs to the Christian community irrespective of status, ethnicity, and gender. Faith in Christ is the necessary *and* sufficient mode of becoming and being part of the “body of Christ.” As has been stressed time and again by James Dunn, faith acquired the sociological function as both “identity marker” and “boundary marker.” “If circumcision could no longer serve as a boundary which had to be crossed by one who wanted to enter the people of God's promise, what replaced in the emerging Christian communities? If a group's identity depended on there being a boundary round the group, marking off those inside from those outside, what formed the boundary marking off infant Christianity? *Faith in Christ* is the first obvious answer.”<sup>153</sup> In terms of their social function, there is a marked analogy between the centrality of πίστις κτλ. in the Christian identity discourse and the pivotal role of *fides* in Roman life and thinking, as “keystone of Roman morality”<sup>154</sup> and as desirable characteristics of all relationships of dependence and loyalty.<sup>155</sup>

5. *The holism of faith.* If faith is in the center of communal Christian self-understanding, it should also be in the center of the individual Chris-

---

<sup>152</sup> Emblematic for such an infelicitous separation is the concept of “Early Catholicism” (*Frühkatholizismus*) which was introduced to describe a phase of decline in early Christian history from the apostolic (Pauline) immediacy of faith to its dogmatization, institutionalizing and ethicizing in subsequent generations. See Jim Kelhoffer's and my discussion in the respective contributions in the present volume on 2 Clement and Hebrews.

<sup>153</sup> James D.G. Dunn, “Boundary Markers in Early Christianity”, in *Gruppenreligion im römischen Reich: Sozialformen, Grenzziehungen und Leistungen*, ed. Jörg Rüpke, STAC 43 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 49–68, 61f.

<sup>154</sup> John H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 175f.

<sup>155</sup> Becker, “Fides” (see n. 30), 801.

tian self-understanding.<sup>156</sup> The insight of William Henry Paine Hatch, expressed 100 years ago, still holds true: “[F]aith is from the beginning much more than belief or conviction, for it involves the feelings and the will as well as the intellect.”<sup>157</sup> Which shade of holistic faith comes to the fore is determined both by the context of the actual argument and by the cultural and religious context of author and audience: acceptance of a message, assurance, proof, persuasion, propositional belief, certainty, internal knowledge, trustworthiness, faithfulness, loyalty, trust, faith, and even Πίστις/*Fides* as divine manifestation. The semantic range of Christian faith language is fully compatible with the contemporary linguistic milieu, as all these shades are matched in Jewish and Greco-Roman parlance. But the fact that the language of faith monopolizes the linguistic perception of divine-human relationships and that the language of faith is itself monopolized by its relation to Christ, distinguishes early Christianity from its religious and sociocultural environment.

6. *The attractiveness of faith.* The expansion of Christianity, which finally led to the Christianization of the Roman Empire, is closely linked to the early Christian concept of faith. It is not a coincidence that the term “faith” should develop into a synonym for the Christian movement and later to a label for any religion. This linguistic development is prepared by Paul’s habit of describing followers of Christ as “believers” (cf., 1 Thess 1:7; 2:10, 13 etc.) and also by his phrase “proclaiming the faith” (Gal 1:23). The church fathers continued along this path, calling the Christians “believers” (Justin, *1 Apol.* 53,3) and Christianity “our whole faith” (Melito of Sardis, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4,26,13) or – to demarcate an orthodox from a heretical belief system – simply “the faith” (Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian). Faith as a term lent itself to characterize Christianity, because

---

<sup>156</sup> This aspect was focused – albeit one-sidedly – by Rudolf Bultmann. See, e.g., his *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, 2 vols. (New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1951–1955), 2:324: “‘Faith’ is the acceptance of the *kerygma* not as mere cognizance of it and agreement with it but as that genuine obedience to it which includes a new understanding of one’s self ... [Faith] *determines one’s living in its manifold historical reality* ...” Bultmann’s interpretation recurs in modified form in Michael Wolter’s cognitive construal of faith as a comprehensive concept of reality (*Wirklichkeitsverständnis*) (Michael Wolter, *Paulus: Ein Grundriss seiner Theologie* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2011]).

<sup>157</sup> Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith* (see n. 44), 35. Cf., recently, Campbell, “Participation and Faith in Paul,” 44: “Christian believing is for Paul apparently both comprehensive and ethical, and even emotional; it is an entire mind or mentality.” Starting from the traditional threeness of the capacities of the mind – reason, will, emotion – I have described aspects of faith from a Pauline perspective in Schliesser, *Was ist Glaube?* (see n. 44), 42–68: “faith and reason” (accepting as true, being convinced, knowing, confessing); 69–87: “faith and volition” (deciding, obeying, loving), 88–115: “faith and emotion” (experiencing, trusting, being confident).

faith as a concept of religious identity, both communal and individual, exerted a considerable power of attraction among people in the Roman Empire.

In conclusion, I briefly hint at a few aspects regarding the attractiveness of faith, which are all related to what has been said in this final section:<sup>158</sup>

1. The inherent fragility of faith-relationships and, more concretely, the fragility of religious and interpersonal πίστις/*fides* in the early Roman empire might have played a role in the increasing attraction of the Christian faith-religion.<sup>159</sup> 2. The holistic nature of faith, which not only opened up a new understanding of reality but “create[d] a new reality that equally includes the cognitive, emotional, and pragmatic dimensions of human existence,”<sup>160</sup> made an impression on non-Christians – not only the lived-out faith of martyrs, missionaries and church leaders, but also of the faith of ordinary Christians in their respective context of life.<sup>161</sup> 3. The simplicity of Christ-faith was appealing – not only to the unsophisticated, but for those in particular. The message “Believe on the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved” (Acts 16:13) is easy to comprehend and does not require philosophical expertise or moral grandeur. Faith functions as an “equalizer,” as

---

<sup>158</sup> On the whole array of questions, see the classic studies by Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100–400)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984); Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996). See also Christoph Marksches, *Warum hat das Christentum in der Antike überlebt? Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch zwischen Kirchengeschichte und Systematischer Theologie* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004).

<sup>159</sup> Cf., Morgan, *Roman Faith* (see n. 3), *passim*. Morgan reaffirms older and nowadays largely dismissed views (by, e.g., Arthur D. Nock, *Conversion* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933], 99–121), which stress “how fragile *pistis* and *fides* are; how infinitely manipulable and constantly in danger of being undermined by lies, persuasion, fraud, envy, greed, ambition, faction, conspiracy, treachery, adultery, imperialism, and a host of other everyday attitudes and activities” (Morgan, *Roman Faith* [see n. 3], 6) and how the fragility of πίστις/*fides* might have “led to a growing interest in elective cults, including Christianity” (175). Nonetheless, as a matter of course even Christian religious faith is fragile, “always to some degree provisional and evolving” (370, on Matt 9:22), always in need of being reinforced, as especially the later New Testament writings amply demonstrate.

<sup>160</sup> Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 292. This is said on Paul’s idea of “communion with Christ,” but is equally applicable to faith. James Dunn refers to the oftentimes neglected fact that the vivacity and success of earliest Christianity was closely linked with the reception of the Spirit, which was seen “as a significant, trans-formative and sometimes eye-catching experience on the part of the recipient” (James D.G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, vol. 2 of *Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 283). On the relationship between faith and the Spirit in Paul, see above n. 49.

<sup>161</sup> Cf., Marksches, *Christentum* (see n. 158), 44.

it were,<sup>162</sup> which holds out the prospect of eternal σωτηρία for all who believe and transcends, by means of that prospect, existent social stratification and moral gradation (at least ideally). 4. By virtue of the sociality of faith, lower class and socially disadvantaged believers experienced a revaluation of their social identity, but also became beneficiaries of the social welfare, which was inherent in the Christian movement from its beginning and gained stable, effective structures early on. 5. Amidst the murky cloud of gods and goddesses prominent in popular religion, the exclusive christological focus of faith was appealing particularly to the educated. A belief system that devises a clear “either-or”-structure effects a “reduction of complexity” and at the same time an increase of cogency. It condenses reality “to the most simple and general concepts: the One Cause, the Sole Being, the One,”<sup>163</sup> and, one might add, a single directedness of religious affiliation. 6. That Christianity was able to reach into more educated strata of society and to gain influence in the dominant religious and philosophical discourses can be explained not least by the “theologies of faith” of early Christianity’s most prolific thinkers: Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews, and later Justin, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria. Even educated classes in the cities were attracted and responded to their distinct conceptualizations of faith as a *fides quaerens intellectum*. These presentations of a reasonable faith were appealing even to intellectuals, who would leave their former religious and social worlds to join the Christian movement.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>162</sup> Cf., Wolter, *Paulus* (see n. 156), 84 (“Gleichmacher”).

<sup>163</sup> Walter Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 26 (with reference to Niklas Luhmann).

<sup>164</sup> Schnelle, “Das frühe Christentum” (see n. 148), 142.