

A STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH
IN THE PAULINE CORPUS AND IN LUKE-ACTS
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE REASONS
FOR DIFFERENCES IN THEIR UNDERSTANDING.

BY

IAIN STEWART MACLEAN

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Divinity,
Rhodes University, in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

CONTENTS.

Summary	1.
Introduction	3.
Chapter One: The People of God	5.
Chapter Two: The Whole Christ	22.
Chapter Three: The Body of Christ	33.
Chapter Four: Luke, Jesus and the Church	50.
Chapter Five: The Restoration of the People of God (Israel)	62.
Chapter Six: The Apostles, the Holy Spirit and the Community	77.
Conclusion:	91.
Bibliography:	95.
Footnotes:	98.

SUMMARY:

This essay consists of six chapters with an introduction and conclusion.

INTRODUCTION:

The introduction sets out the scope of the essay and states the methodology that is followed.

CHAPTER I THE PEOPLE OF GOD

This and the next two chapters deal with the Pauline conception of the Church. This chapter deals in particular with Paul's understanding of the continuity of the Church with Israel. The Old Testament terms and types that Paul uses are examined and their new application to the Church noted. The Church is examined as the "people of God", the "ekklesia" the "saints", the "elect" and the "temple of the Holy Spirit".

CHAPTER II THE WHOLE CHRIST

This chapter deals with the understanding of the Church as being "in Christ", as being "with Christ" in his redemptive acts. Here the close union between Christ and the Christian is examined, especially as it is conveyed by the "local" understanding of "in Christ" and the Christians' participation "with Christ" in baptism. The term fellowship (Koinonia) is also examined. The chapter concludes that Paul regards Christians as being "solid" with Christ.

CHAPTER III THE BODY OF CHRIST:

Here the corporate understanding of the Church as the Body of Christ is examined. After a brief survey of various theories of origin it is suggested that the formula and concept itself was an original Pauline formulation.

The "body of Christ" is closely identified with the actual redemptive acts, but it is exceeding the figures usage to regard the Church under this figure as the literal physical body of Christ. While the term is used metaphorically, it is yet more than a metaphor. It expresses the corporate nature of the Christian Church, in its union with Christ.

CHAPTER IV LUKE, JESUS AND THE COMMUNITY

This chapter looks at Luke's treatment of Jesus' purpose. It seeks to answer the question as to whether Jesus intended to found a community.

The question of eschatology and its relationship to the Lukan concept of the Church is examined. It is shown that Luke did have an interest in eschatology and that this did not prevent him conceiving of Jesus' founding a community.

CHAPTER V THE RESTORATION OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD (ISRAEL)

We see in this chapter that Luke has an unique ecclesiology. For he does conceive of a Church, but one that is essentially Jewish, in fact the restored Israel. Luke only envisages one Israel, from which unbelieving Jews are cut off. This Israel, as part of its restoration, comprehends within itself both the Samaritans (who are viewed by Luke more as Jews than non-Jews) and the Gentiles.

CHAPTER VI THE APOSTLES, THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE COMMUNITY.

The Apostles are regarded by Luke as the regents of the restored Israel, not really as the guarantors of a Jesus tradition or as the first ecclesiastical officials. As such they are instrumental in showing the Church's continuity with Israel and the events of Jesus' Resurrection and Ascension. They are vital for the Lukan conception of the restoration of Israel. When this is done by the inclusion of believing Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles, they disappear from Luke's account. The Holy Spirit is viewed as Jesus' gift to the Church, which guides it into an understanding of its universal nature. The Holy Spirit is seen as essential in Christian initiation. Participation in the Holy Spirit, together with the Church's common origin, give the Church its unity and life.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion sums up the Lukan and the Pauline concepts of the Church, noting both their similarities and the points wherein they differ. Reasons are advanced for these differences.

INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of the introduction is to set out the scope of this essay and to define its limits.

The growth of the ecumenical movement, arising out of the missionary endeavour of the modern Church, has raised acutely the question of the nature of the Church. The search for the "historical Jesus" has now been replaced by a search for the "historical Church". At the same time the unitary view of the Scriptures has been lost and the New Testament regarded largely as a collection of books reflecting quite differing views on the same subject. The growth of form, source and redaction criticism has shown that the New Testament writers have each to be regarded as authors and theologians in their own right.

However, the recognition of diversity within the New Testament has led to extreme positions being adopted, particularly in the area we are to examine. Thus it is maintained by some scholars today that Paul is our witness to a primitive, unstructured and charismatic Christianity. Whereas Luke is regarded as exemplifying an early trend towards the institutionalised Church, in fact a form of "Early Catholicism". This term is often used but there seems to be little clarity as to what it is supposed to describe. Thus it can be taken as meaning "that transition from earliest Christianity to the so-called ancient Church, which is completed with the disappearance of the imminent expectation (i.e. of the Parousia)⁽¹⁾" which in turn is thought to imply "... the organization of the Church according to hierarchical in contrast to charismatic ministry; the development of the monarchical episcopate; an objectification of the proclamation and an emphasis upon a strictly formulated rule of faith; a stress upon "orthodoxy" or "sound doctrine" in opposition to false teaching; moralization of the faith and conception of the gospel as new law; an under-

standing of faith in objective rather than subjective, in static rather than dynamic, terms, as fides quae creditur in contrast to fides qua creditur; a development of the principle of apostolic succession and transmitted authority; ..a. trend towards sacramentalism; .. " ² Luke and other New Testament documents such as the pastoral epistles, 2 Peter, Ephesians and Jude are regarded as reflecting this institutionalising tendency. Paul in contrast is regarded as the exemplar of primitive, pure and charismatic christianity.

Thus Luke and Paul have been chosen as the subjects for this study of the concept of the Church. We are aware of the danger of a comparative approach, of only seeing those features that stand either in sharp contrast or in close similarity to each other. At the outset it will be admitted that there are differences in their understanding of the Church; however these differences are not such that schemes of the probable development of the early Church cannot be constructed from the New Testament documents. This is in no way to prejudge the results of this investigation.

Naturally, in an essay of such brief compass, an examination of sources, historicity and related fields of enquiry must unfortunately be omitted.

In this study it will be assumed that Ephesians is Pauline or at least by one closely associated with him. Also, that Luke-Acts is one work written by one author. The methodology followed will be that of a straightforward examination of the relevant documents, following in both the Pauline Letters and in Luke-Acts a thematic approach. This it is hoped has enabled us to examine their concepts of the Church, without becoming involved in technical questions concerning the origins or composition of the various works.

CHAPTER ONE: THE PEOPLE OF GOD.

Paul, in his letters, is the first Christian writer to present a clear and powerful statement of the nature and function of the new community that originated in, and centred on, the life and work of Jesus Christ. However, two qualifications have to be made to the above statement. First, this new community that Paul describes is seen not only in its relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ, but also in its relationship to God's chosen people, Israel. The new community, the Christian Church is rooted in the Old Testament people of God and, as will be shown later, Paul describes the Christian community both in its continuity and in its discontinuity with the Old Testament people of God.

Secondly, it must not be assumed that Paul presents us with a detailed, dogmatic treatise on the nature of the Church. To expect this would be to misunderstand the nature of the New Testament documents. Paul wrote to communities that already existed. There was, it may be said, the "brute fact" of the community, of the "Church of the Thessalonians in God the father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess.1), or "the Church of God which is in Corinth" (1 Cor.1:1), to which Paul addressed his letters. Paul can take the existence of various Christian communities for granted, for they were all (with the exception of the Roman Church (Rom.1:10) the result of his missionary work. It is to these communities that Paul addressed his letters, letters that were really "occasional tracts" or "tracts for the times" written to deal with the problems that arose in the various communities. Thus, 1 Thessalonians is written to rebuke those who, being excessively concerned with the End, neglect their other duties. The Corinthian correspondence answers various questions that had been asked, as well as rebuking the Corinthians for their immoral behaviour. The letter to the Galatians contains Paul's rebuttal of the Judaizing party in the Church while those to the Ephesians and Colossians show Christ as the exalted Lord, head and Lord over all gnostic powers and principalities.

Thus the existence of the new community is not dealt with in isolation, but forms an integral part of Paul's thought in his dealing with specific issues that arose in the communities to which he addressed his letters.

Paul sees the saving event and lordship of Christ as present realities in the world in the life of the Church. It has God as its Creator, the God who indeed called Abraham, who called Moses and Israel out of Egypt, who brought his people out of exile and who now calls to himself a new people from among all the peoples. This new community Paul sees as God's work in Christ, which now experiences the presence of His Spirit. Thus Paul's concept of the Church cannot be viewed in isolation, "but only indirectly in the context of his conception of salvation taken as a whole."⁽¹⁾ However, "it is in his ecclesiological utterances that the motifs and aims of his thought come to focus. Herein they are actualized and given practical application."⁽¹⁾

To give a complete survey of Pauline thought is clearly impossible within the limits of this thesis. We propose then to examine the Pauline concept of the church by viewing the Church as (1) The people of God and as (2) the body of Christ. Within these two conceptions are comprehended both the continuity of God's people throughout history and the radical discontinuity that, paradoxically, this 'new' people of God entails.

THE PEOPLE OF GOD

Paul conceives the Church to be the new people of God, a people, that, while rooted in the old ethnic people of God, by its adherence to Jesus as the Messiah (Rom.1:3,4&5) and call for faith in Him (Rom.1:17, 3:28, 4:4), raised acutely the question of the nature of the people of God. He uses titles and descriptions for the church that previously had only been used to describe the historical, ethnic people of God, Israel. By transferring these titles and descriptions to the new Christ-centred community, Paul simultaneously invests them with new meaning as well as asserting the continuity between the old and new peoples of God.

THE CHURCH AS ISRAEL/PEOPLE OF GOD.

The Old Testament Scriptures reveal that Israel became the people of God through God's choice and call (Exod 19:5, 23:22, Dt.4:37, 7:6, 14:2). Israel's understanding of herself as God's chosen, particular people, was closely connected with the saving action of God in his redemption of His people from slavery in Egypt. God in fact declares to the people through Moses that "I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great acts of judgment, and I will take you for my people and I will be your God" (Exod 6:6~~6~~, 7).

Inextricably linked with the understanding of Israel as God's People is the concept of the covenant. God not only calls out a people, he also establishes a relationship with them, that he will "make you (Israel) fruitful and multiply you and will confirm my covenant with you --- and I will walk among you and will be your God, and you shall be my people" (Lev.26:9,12).

The basis for God's election is his free love for them (Dt.7:8) or rather his love for their forefathers (Dt.4:37) and his promises which he made with them (Dt. 7:8).

In Leviticus and Deuteronomy the implications of Israel being God's people are fully worked out. With the revelation of God's Law Israel became His nation, his own people, with their own distinctive Law (Dt. 4:7). Because God has chosen them, they are called upon to separate themselves to Him, to obey His commandments (Dt. 7:9). Consequently they are a separated people, a people called to be Holy. Holiness is in fact the concern of the book of Leviticus, particularly of the "Holiness Code" (Lev.19-26). Israel is God's people only so far as they obey Him.

The history of Israel shows how God's people continually failed to keep his commandments. The prophets continually spoke against Israel's failure, warning of God's coming judgement, yet, they claimed that God was still willing to re-establish His covenant which they had transgressed. Jeremiah, for instance, proclaimed that the days were coming when God would make a new covenant, whereby the Law

would be written in the people's hearts and God "will be their God and they will be (His) people" (Jer. 31:33). This was also part of the hope that other prophets set forth (e.g. Ezek. 11:20, 36:28, 37:23; Hos. 2:3; Zech. 8:8, 13:9). This brief survey indicates that the concept of the "people of God" is a central concern of the Old Testament, a concern that the prophets took up, for they looked for a purified people of God for the future.

Paul clearly identified the Church with this ecclesiological people of God, as will become clear from his letters. The very word "people" is used by Paul to refer to the Church. In the LXX λαός (apart from some 40 instances) always translates $\square \psi$ and has become "a specific term for a specific people, namely Israel".⁽²⁾ Paul uses λαός in a similar way to refer to Israel, as can be seen in Romans 11:1,2 ("God has not rejected his people (τὸν λαόν) whom he foreknew."), 15:10 ("Rejoice, O Gentiles, with his people (τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ) and 1 Cor. 10:7 ("The people οἱ λαοί sat down.) and 14:21 (... by the lips of foreigners will I speak to this people) (τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ). However, Paul goes beyond LXX. usage by using λαός figuratively to refer to the Christian community, which consisted of Israelites (οἱ λαοί in LXX usage)⁽³⁾ and Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη οἱ λαοί in LXX usage)⁽³⁾ (Rom.9:25,26 2 Cor.6:16 Titus 2:14). Before Christ there was the people of God and the Gentiles, but now there is a new people (οἱ λαοί), constituted through faith in Jesus Christ and not by adherence to the Law (see especially Gal.3) or by circumcision (Gal.2:12f, 6:12f). Thus it is that the common O.T. description of Israel as "my people" (Hos.2:1,25) is used in Rom. 9:25 of the new community that now includes gentiles. Significantly, Paul only uses the term λαός in Old Testament quotations,⁽⁴⁾ thus stressing the continuity of this new people with the old people of God. In Rom. 15:3-12 Paul states "that Christ became a servant to the circumcised", in order to show God's truthfulness, that the promises of God might be fulfilled (C.F. Gal. 4:4-5). The fulfilment of these promises enables the gentiles to rejoice with God's people (Rom. 15:10). In Christ's sacrificial offering, there has been a cleansing from

sin and the provision "for himself a people (λαόν) of his own" (Titus 2:14).

As the people of God, the Church must also be the new Israel and, although the term "New Israel" does not occur in the New Testament, the understanding that the Church is such is certainly present. Israel is the specific term that Paul uses to refer to the ethnic people of God, particularly in Romans 9+11, where eleven instances out of the seventeen occurrences of Paul's use of the term occur. Paul is dealing with the question of the people of God, who are they and how are they constituted. The manner in which Paul deals with this question not only reveals his attitude towards ethnic Israel, but also provides us with an understanding of the new people of God and its relationship to the old Israel. The contrasts and figures that Paul employs serve to define more closely the nature of the people of God.

In Romans 9+11 Paul is struggling, in the realisation that most of Israel has rejected Christ, with the question of God's faithfulness to his promises. What happens now to God's chosen people Israel, in their refusal to respond to the Gospel ("a hardening came upon part of Israel Rom. 11:25), to obey (Rom. 10:21, 11:2) and ^{in their attempts} to seek righteousness by works instead of by faith (Rom. 9:31)?

Paul attempts to resolve this problem by appealing to God's faithfulness to His promises and to His people, to the fact of Israel's disobedience and to the doctrine of the remnant.

Thus, in Rom. 9 ("For not all who are descended from Israel, belong to Israel") Paul states that membership of God's people does not only consist of physical descent, but also of obedient faith, for the unbelieving Jews are like branches that have been broken off an olive tree (Rom. 11:17f). They have, in terms of the figure of the olive tree (Rom. 11:17f), been excluded from Israel. The believing Gentiles however, are like wild olive branches that have been grafted on to the cultivated olive tree (Israel). That believing Gentiles are now regarded as part of Israel is clear from Rom. 9:25 ("Those who were not my people, I will call my people")

where an Old Testament verse referring to Israel alone (Hos. 2:1), is now applied to

a people that includes gentiles. This inclusion of gentiles into the people of God is the meaning of Ephesians, when it states that Jesus Christ has "broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the Law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two". (Eph. 2:14, ~~f~~5). Previously the gentiles without Christ were referred to as "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise" (Eph.2:12f). However through Christ's death they have been reconciled with the Jews to God (Eph.2:16) and are now "fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household of God" (Eph. 2:19), indeed they are Israel.

Paul can then use the very title Israel to refer explicitly to this new people of God. Such a use is implied in 1 Cor. 10:18 by the words "Israel according to the flesh" which does imply another Israel "according to the Spirit". However Paul does not draw such a contrast here, for he is more concerned to show the similarities, so that the example of "Israel according to the flesh" might serve as a warning to the Corinthian Church. However, his reference in Gal.6:16 to the "Israel of God" does seem to be a clear application of the title, in implied contrast to the Israel according to the flesh (1 Cor.10:18) to the Jewish-Gentile Church.(5)

However, in Rom.9+11, Paul, grief-stricken because his kinsmen have not accepted the gospel, does not seem to completely transfer the term Israel from the ethnic people of God. He does grant that, because of their disobedience, only a remnant will be saved (Rom.9:27), but God has by no means rejected his people (Rom.11:1~~f~~2). A believing remnant has accepted the Gospel (Rom.11:5) and Paul believes that the inclusion of the gentiles will arouse Israel to jealousy (Rom.11:11) and thus to belief. Paul illustrates the relationship between the old and new Israel by the metaphor of the olive tree (Rom.11:17-24). The analogy serves to define the continuity of God's people in history, for Israel's "hardening" (Rom.11:7,25) does not mean the destruction of Israel, but rather the exclusion of the unbelievers (Rom.11:18,25). Into this continuity the gentile believers are grafted, thus

enabling Paul to say that they (the Gentiles) are borne by the root (Rom.11:18) or that the Exodus generation are the "forefathers" of the Corinthian Church (1 Cor.10:1).

As the Church of believing Jews and Gentiles is Israel, so it must also be the children of Abraham. Paul shows that descent from Abraham is not a Jewish privilege alone, for in fact, when Abraham was justified by faith, he was still an uncircumcised Gentile (Rom.4:3, 10-12). Thus he is really the father of all who believe, Jew and Gentile (Rom.4:1, 11,16). The promise that Abraham would be the father of many nations has been fulfilled in the Gentiles receiving the gospel (Rom.4 12-25, Gal.3:7). Similarly, Paul shows in Galatians that membership of the people of God is not by physical descent alone or by observance of the Law (Gal. 4:1-32), but by faith. So Paul can argue that the true "seed" that is, descendant (for the noun is singular), of Abraham, is Christ. Consequently only those who are in Christ, who have been baptized into Christ (Gal.3:27) are Abraham's offspring (Gal.3:29), for they all form "one man in Christ Jesus" (εἷς is masculine). As the true Israel then the Church can truly be the "true circumcision" (Phil.3:3), for in baptism all have been circumcised with the circumcision of Christ (Col.2:11,12). This transference of terminology together with its change of meaning is characteristic of Paul's approach to the new people of God. Thereby he asserts its essential continuity, in the providence of God, with His chosen people.

THE CHURCH AS Ἐκκλησία

The use of Ἐκκλησία⁽⁶⁾ to designate the new community also reveals its continuity with the people of God. Paul's use of this term is understandable in the light of its use in the LXX to refer to the assembly of God's people.

In the LXX. Ἐκκλησία is used about 100 times and is always a translation of קָהָל (7) or its derivatives. The Hebrew term itself is used of being summoned and of the act of summoning, particularly of men gathering for war (Gen.49:6; Num. 22:4) of the assembly of the people, gathered to hear God's Law (Dt. 9:10; 10:4), of the people's leaders gathering for religious purposes (1 Chron. 13:2,4), of a crowd

gathering for sacrifice (2 Chron. 20:5,24; 30:3,4) and of the people in the temple gathering of ("Holy ones" Ps.22:23; 89:6, "of faithful ones" Ps.149).

The term itself is often qualified by the linking of God's name to form (Dt.23:26) and it is this understanding that became important, that of the community as God's people. Thus it can be stated that "it ($\aleph \aleph \aleph$) bears a practically technical sense of the assembly of Yahweh or Israel".) ⁽⁸⁾

Another Hebrew term, $\aleph \aleph$ is also used to refer to the assembly of the people, but although it and $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ became practically equivalent in meaning, $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}$ ⁽⁹⁾ was usually used to render $\aleph \aleph \aleph$. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ translates $\aleph \aleph \aleph$. In the Mishnah both $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ and $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ refer to local assemblies of Jews, but both terms were later displaced by $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ Philo uses $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}$ once, Joseph six times to refer to the meeting place of the Essenes. Why then did the early Christian community describe itself as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and not $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}$ when the terms were equivalent and in fact both translated the current Aramaic $\aleph \aleph \aleph$? Probably the current practice of using the term $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}$ to refer to the Jewish place of worship and the local Jewish community placed limitations on a community that believed the Messiah had come and that salvation was now open to Gentiles. ⁽¹¹⁾

In the LXX, Deuteronomy, the only book in the Pentateuch to use $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, uses it to refer to the people as a whole when it refers to "He whose testicles are crushed or whose male member is cut off shall not enter the assembly ($\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon$) of the Lord." (Dt. 23:3-8). Elsewhere in Deuteronomy $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is used to describe the assembly gathered to hear the Law (Dt. 4:9-13). Interestingly, in Acts 7:38, Stephen refers to the Sinai gathering as "the congregation ($\tau\eta \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$) in the wilderness". Further in Chronicles, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ describes the people assembled at the building of, and consecration of the Temple (1 Chron 13:2; 28:2; 29:1; 2 Chron 6:2), at the king's enthronement (1 Chron.23:3), fasting (2 Chron. 20:3) and sacrificing (2 Chron. 29:23). Nehemiah uses $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ for those gathered to hear the Law or to celebrate feast days (Neh. 18:2; 23:1). The word is used in the Psalms of liturgical assemblies (Pss. 22,23, 26, 26:12, 35:18, 40:10). ⁽¹²⁾

Philo clearly regarded the ἑκκλησίᾳ as the people gathered in the wilderness and receiving God's Law. Josephus saw the Jews as God's own people " .. or people prepared for the worship of God .. looked after by priests .. The type of worship the foreigners call "mystery" and "initiation" and which they cannot be bothered to practice for more than a few days at a time, we Jews observe throughout our lives, faithfully and joyfully" (13)

This very term, closely related to Israel as the people of God is used by Paul in various ways.

He uses it in 1 Cor. 15:9 and Gal. 1:13 (the Church of God) when speaking of his past life when he persecuted the Church of God. As this was at a very early period, the "Church of God" refers probably to the Jerusalem community. (14)

Clearly the term does refer to local communities, for Paul can refer to believers who gather in "house-churches" (those of Prisca and Aquila's Rom.16:5, Nymphas Col.4:15 and Philemon's Phil.2) as τῆς ἑκκλησίας. The term also includes the totality of believers in a given area (of Judea 1 Thes. 2:14; Gal. 1:22; of Galatia, 1 Cor. 16:1; Gal.1:2; of Macedonia, 2 Cor.8:1 and of Asia, 1 Cor.16:14) or of a city (in Thessalonica 1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess 1:1; in Corinth, 1 Cor.1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1; in Cenchreae, Rom.16:1 and in Laodicea, Col.4:16). The community gathered for worship can also be termed ἑκκλησίᾳ (1 Cor.11:18; 14:19, 28,35 ἐν ἑκκλησίᾳ). Paul sometimes uses the plural form (1 Thess. 2:14 "Churches of God"; 2 Thess. 1:4 "in the Churches of God"; Gal. 1:22 "Churches of Christ in Judea" and 1 Cor. 11:16 the churches of God) which implies that he is thinking of the churches as so many local assemblies. (15)

In 1 Cor. 10:32 Paul by the words "Give no offence to Jews or to Greeks or to the Church of God" makes a clear distinction between Jews, Greeks and the Church of God. It is not clear as to whether "Church of God" refers to the local assembly or to a wider body. What is significant however is the division, for it implies that believers are neither Jews or Greeks, but through Jesus Christ they are a new

people, the Church of God ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$: "the one person" of Gal.3:28). Again, in 1 Cor. 12:28 the statement "and God has appointed in the Church first Apostles" .. suggests that "church" here has a wider, universal application. This is possible, as it seems unlikely that one local church would have more than one apostle.⁽¹⁶⁾

However the Didache in its teaching⁽¹⁷⁾ "concerning apostles" seems to imply that more than one could be present at a worship service. So again evidence is inconclusive for a universal meaning. Only in two passages in Colossians⁽¹⁸⁾ and nine in Ephesians⁽¹⁹⁾ is it clear that a wider, universal meaning is being given to the word.

However, while the local meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is strongly attested, it is unlikely that the understanding of a universal church is absent from Paul's thought in Corinthians, for he can appeal to common practice concerning the eucharist (1 Cor. 11:23) and the place and role of women in the local church (1 Cor.11:2,16).

How is the relationship between the universal and local conception of the church to be conceived? It can be denied that there is any difference and that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ always refers to a local assembly.⁽²⁰⁾ However it cannot be denied that there exists at least an understanding of a universal body, that the local churches are united to Christ and consequently to others (Gal. 3:27-28 1 Cor.12:13). Rather, we would say, "... the whole power of Christ is most certainly available to every local congregation: Christ, since he has been raised from the dead by the power of God, has indeed become superior to the limitations imposed by locality and by other characteristics of the world of space-time matter, but this transcendence of earthly limitations does not yet belong to the Church".⁽²¹⁾

That Paul saw the Church as the people of God, as God's $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is evident in the explicit parallel that he draws between the Corinthian church (1 Cor.1:2) and the Church of Israel in the wilderness, 'our fathers' (1 Cor.10:1-4). In this paraenetic context Paul warns that as their fathers had many privileges yet fell, so could the Corinthians, in spite of their privileged status and their baptism and eucharist, still fall under God's judgement. For Paul then the history of Israel is the history of the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, the community that like the old, is called

by God in Jesus Christ. Thus he often refers not just to the "Church", but to the "Church of God" (1 Thess. 2:14; 2 Thess. 1:4; 1 Cor. 1:2; 1 Cor. 11:16) or the Church of Christ (Gal. 1:22; Rom. 16:16). Paul takes this Old Testament term and invests it with new meaning, for "it was a Christian Jew who first drew out the implications of the word and formulated a clear conception of the Church. To St. Paul we are indebted for a doctrine which rightly emphasizes both the continuity of the Old and New Covenants of God with men, and also the universality, oneness, and novelty of that society on earth which is God's $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in Christ."⁽²²⁾ Paul develops his conception of the people of God fully by using other definitive terms and images drawn from the Old Testament.

THE CHURCH AS "THE SAINTS"

As the people of God, the church is composed of saints ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\sigma\iota$) which term is used interchangeably with $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (2 Cor 1:1 c.f., 1 Cor. 6:1-2, 14:33, 16:15, Eph. 1:1, Phil. 1:1, Col. 1:2, 3:12 with 1 Cor. 1:2, Gal. 1:2, 1 Thess. 1:1, 2 Thess. 1:1). In the Old Testament, Israel was holy (Deut. 14:2 Exod. 19:5), an understanding that contributed to the meaning of the word 'Holy' in the New Testament in three ways. ⁽²³⁾ First, the conception of Israel as Holy by separation to God and for his purposes is fundamental in the Old Testament and Judaism. Second, in an eschatological sense "the holy" are those who have been delivered from the rule of darkness and share in the Messianic age (this is a characteristic theme of Paul's writings c.f. e.g. Col. 1:12, 1 Thess. 3:13). Thirdly, there is the ethical sense in which it is implied that the community will keep the commandments of God (1 Thess. 4:3-12).

The Church, aware of that it is the gathering of the Messianic people, regarded itself not only as separated unto God, but also as actually Holy, through the activity of the Holy Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13; 1 Cor. 3:16). The Church then, is composed of the saints because they are the new Israel, living in the new age, awaiting Christ's return. ⁽²⁴⁾

THE CHURCH AS "THE ELECT"

In the Old Testament, Israel was fully aware of its election by the free choice of God. Now, in the New Testament, Paul regards the Church as comprising the elect. He thus can speak of Christians as "the elect" (Rom.8:33; Titus 1:1; Col.3:12; 2 Tim.2:10). The election of the Church is rooted in the will of God, long before its actualization in the founding of a Church (Eph.1:4; 2 Thes.2:13; 2 Tim.1:9;). It is to be noted that Paul is referring to a whole people, not individuals, for God calls a people now, just as He called Israel in the Old Testament period. It is only because Paul thought in terms of collective entities that his agonizing theodicy in Romans 9-11 is possible. There he is not denying corporate election, but the Jewish belief that this election was mediated by natural descent. While God does recognise natural relationship partly (for Isaac is chosen from Abraham's seed and Israel from Isaac's), election rests entirely with God, even before the birth of the people concerned (Rom.9:11).

However, the fundamental difference now, for Paul, is that there is no election for the Gentiles or Jesus outside of God's own "elect one" (Luke 9:35; 23:35;

John 1:34) Jesus Christ. ⁽²⁵⁾ Paul can state that only "in Him" are "the elect" chosen before the foundation of the world (Eph.1:4 ^{cf} ~~also~~ 1 Cor.1:27).

THE CHURCH AS THE "SONS OF GOD"

As Israel, through election and the covenant became the "son of God" (Dt. 14:1; Exod.4:22,27; Hos.11:1), so Paul refers to ^{the} community of the Church as "the sons of God" (Rom. 8:14,19;9:26; 2 Cor. 6:18). Through God's election the Church has received adoption to sonship (Rom.8:15,23;9:4; Gal.4:5; Eph.1:5). The present sonship of the Church is that of promise (Gal.4:22-31) whereas those who rely on the Law have a sonship "after the flesh" (Gal.4:22-31) and are still in a state of servanthood (Gal.4:1-7). Only through Christ is the adoption into divine sonship possible (Gal.4:4-5). The Spirit of the son in the Christian confirms the fact of

his sonship (Rom.8:15-16). The believing Jews and Gentiles (Gal.3:26) are now co-heirs with the son (Rom.8:17; Gal.4:6). (26)

By their incorporation into Christ (Gal.3:27) the Church becomes not only the "sons of God" but also the "sons of Abraham" "If you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to the promise" (Gal.3:29). It is clear then that the description "sons of God" is a collective term which, like the others we have examined, has special reference to the Church as the "new Israel".

THE CHURCH AS A BUILDING/TEMPLE

Building imagery is frequently used in the Old Testament to describe God's people. They are the "house of Israel" (Ruth 5:11; Jer.31:6; Amos 9:11,12) and can be "built up" and "cast down" by God (Jer.12:16;31:4; Ps.89:4). Paul applies the term "building up" to the Church in 2 Cor.10:8, a reference to the God-given growth that comes through the apostle's ministry. This expression is used similarly in Eph.4:16, where it is closely related to ^{the} understanding of the Church as a body. Thus the "building" concept is used in references to the growth and building up of the church. This is brought out clearly in those passages where Paul describes his Apostolic work as a "laying of a foundation" (1 Cor. 3:16-17). Paul by his preaching of Christ lays the foundation which is Christ (1 Cor.3:11). In a slightly different metaphor, that of the Church as a Temple, Christ is the cornerstone, the apostles and the prophets the foundation.(Eph.2:20-22).

The Corinthian correspondence contains Paul's fullest descriptions of the Church as a Temple, ~~that is in~~ (2 Cor.6:16; 7:1 and 1 Cor. 3:16,17), 2 Cor. 6:16; 7:1 follows on Paul's statement concerning the impossibility of close union between a Christian and a non-Christian. His aim is to show that this new community is called, like Israel of old, to be separated from pagan uncleanness. God had previously dwelt among His people in the Tabernacle (Exod.29:43-45 Lev. 26:11,12) and in the Temple (1 Kings 8:11-13; Ps.122:1,9), but now He dwells in the Christian community. So the Corinthians are the "temple of God" (2 Cor. 6:16),

a statement that is substantiated by various quotations from the Old Testament (2 Cor. 6:16-18). The latter part of verse 16, a quote from Lev.26:12, reads that, like Israel of old, the Church is God's people, among whom he dwells. Paul, however, envisages a different, closer relationship between God and His people, for he alters the LXX verb "walk among" (Lev.26:12 ἐμπεριπατήσω) to "live in". "In other words, God no longer dwells with his people in a sanctuary which they make for him, he dwells in them, and they are his temple. ⁽²⁷⁾ As such they are called to leave their pagan past and its unclean associations. The ^{TEXT} quote here (2 Cor. 6:17) is originally a reference to the priests and Levites in exile (Isa. 52:11), which Paul, by omitting the words "you who bear the vessels of the Lord" (Isa. 52:11b RSV) applies to the Christian community. If the community is separate they indeed will be blessed, God will receive them (2 Cor. 6:17) from Ezek. 20:34) and they shall be his sons and daughters (2 Cor.6:18 from 2 Sam.7:14 which only speaks of "son", but Paul widens its scope of reference). The Christian community, called and set apart in the light ⁽²⁸⁾ (2 Cor. 6:14) is indwelt by God, thereby becoming His temple.

The Christian community is also called a temple in 1 Cor. 3:16,17 but with the reference to the fact that as such a temple, the community also has the spirit of God. Paul deals with the disunity caused through party strife (1 Cor. 1:3-13; 3:5-6) by showing the true relationship that holds between himself, his fellow-workers and their mutual work. Their work is likened to a cultivated field (verses 5-9) and then to a building (verses 9-11), whose foundation Paul has set and upon which others build. This is a divine task, for God calls the workers and sanctifies the work. Thus the Church is indeed a temple (vv 16,17). The workers ⁹ must proceed with care, for God will punish them for any negligence. Disunity caused by men is sacrilege, for it destroys the temple of God, the Church. Now the people of God are the temple and the Spirit of God dwells in them (1 Cor.3:16 compare the "I (God) shall dwell in them" of 2 Cor. 6:16). In fact, it is the presence of God's Spirit that makes the community into a temple. ⁽²⁹⁾ The Spirit who

unifies, for it is ^{by} the "Spirit that all are baptized into one body (1 Cor.12:13).⁽²⁰⁾
The temple imagery also serves to bring out the complete unity of the Church.
There is only one temple, but one that consists of all those included in the plural "you" (ὁ... ναὸς... ὅτι πάντες ἑστε ὁ ἴδιος).

The temple image is applied in 1 Cor. 6:19,20 to the individual Christian's body.
The Christian's body is the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6) His body is no longer his, but God'sth. The conception of the body (σῶμα) of the individual Christian believer as the temple of God in (1 Cor. 6:19,20) is best explained as a particularization of the concept of the Church as the temple⁽³¹⁾ Yet the use of the plural forms (οἴδατε, ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν) indicates that the corporate understanding is still present.

In combining the concepts of the community as the temple and the place of the "indwelling Spirit," Paul was asserting the claim that the Christians were indeed the eschatological people of God, the fulfilment of the prophetic promise of a divine dwelling among (in) men (Isa. 35:15th); 44:3; Ezek. 37:14,39:29).

In Ephesians the temple image is one of many that are used by the author to describe the Church. The Church is described as the temple in which both Jew and Gentile are united to form one people.

The discussion of the Church as a Temple (Eph. 2:20-22) is set in a doctrinal rather than a paraenetic context (as in 1,2 Corinthians). Further, while the Temple elsewhere refers to the local community, in Ephesians it refers to the whole, universal Church. This is clear from the continual linking of the image, and indeed the others also, to Christ and His place in the cosmos, "Head over all things for the Church" (Eph. 1:22), and from the continual reference to the new universal man that has been created by the removal of the division between Jew and Gentile.

The Gentiles were once strangers and aliens to the promises (Eph. 2:19) apart from Christ, uncircumcized, separated from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenant of promise and without hope (Eph.2:11-12). However, through

the sacrificial death of Christ they have been brought near (Eph.2:13).

This was made possible by Christ's death, whereby the μεσότοιχον dividing Jew and Gentile was removed. It is unlikely that this dividing wall (Eph.2:14) referred to the veil that separated the Holy of Holies from the rest of the sanctuary (Heb.10:9; 6:19), for this was a division that only affected the Jews. Rather, the "dividing wall" is a reference to the wall in the temple that divided the "court of the Gentiles" from the rest of the Temple, which was reserved for Jews. As the temple was part of the Jewish cultic and legal system, the "dividing wall" can also be a reference to the Law, for this also demarcated the Jew from the Gentile. Christ, by His sacrificial death, has rendered such divisions obsolete, for in Him there is "one new man in place of the two ... one body" (Eph. 2:15b, 16).

This new unity, is variously described as "one new man" (Eph. 2:15) one "body" (2:16) or as having "access in one Spirit to the Father (2:18). The passage continues, the Church being likened to a building of which the apostles and prophets are the foundation, Christ the cornerstone ⁽³²⁾ (2:20). The structure that is raised upon this foundation ⁽³³⁾ "in him" (ἐν ᾧ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἡρώδης οὐκ ᾔδειξε ναὸν κατασκευάσειν, both referring to Christ), is described as a building that is "joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord" (2:21) and as "a dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (2:22).

The dynamic nature of the Church is revealed here, for the church is described as something that is complete ("a holy temple" "a dwelling place") yet is still being built and fitted together (into a holy temple). As in 1 & 2 Corinthians, the Church is regarded as the dwelling place of God, with the difference that here its relationship to Christ is clearly set out. Christ, depicted as the cornerstone is portrayed as the most important and essential part of the structure, without whom it could not grow or hold together. Christ is the vivifying and unifying element, around whom all revolves. In this respect the content of the temple/building imagery is identical to that of the "body" imagery used in Ephesians, Colossians and the other Pauline letters. Christ is part, yet distinct, no

confusion is made between Christ as saviour and Lord and the community over which he rules.

Paul then, clearly regarded this new community as the "New Israel." Consequently it, like the ethnic Israel, is characterized by the application of the attributes, titles and images of Israel. Indeed "it was a Christian Jew who first drew out the implications of the word (ἐκκλησία) and formulated a clear conception of the Church. To St. Paul we are indebted for a doctrine which rightly emphasizes both the continuity of the Old and New Covenants of God with men, and also the universality, oneness and novelty of the society on earth which is God's ἐκκλησία in Christ". (34)

CHAPTER TWO: THE WHOLE CHRIST

According to Paul, the limits of the new people of God are no longer defined by circumcision or the adherence to Law, but by faith in Christ. Through faith man is identified with Christ in His redemptive act of death and resurrection (Rom.6:3-6). This identification of the Christian with Christ presupposes a certain understanding, not only of the work, but also of the person of Christ. In order to describe this identification Paul uses certain Old Testament figures to represent Christ. Their use is governed throughout by Old Testament and Jewish conceptions of human solidarity. Jesus Christ is seen as the true Israelite, the true man, whose redemptive work affects all who are united with Him. Christ's death and resurrection are not regarded as remote events of the past, but as events that affect man in the present. This is so only because of the close union that Paul envisages between Jesus Christ and the Christian. Thus what happened to Christ, happens to the Christian (Rom.6:3-6) and this is only possible because the Christian is "in Christ" (2 Cor. 5:17a). The Church then can be regarded as all those who are "in Christ", indeed as the whole Christ.

Not only does Paul use certain figures (Adam, Abraham) to express the union of the Christian with Christ, he also uses phrases such as "in Christ" and "with Christ" and "participation in". The "with Christ" terminology is particularly associated with the act of incorporation into Christ, with baptism, while that of "participation in" is associated with the Eucharist and the Holy Spirit. An examination of the usage of these phrases and concepts will enable us to more fully understand the Pauline conception of the Church as the body of Christ.

What is meant by the phrase "in Christ"? Does it describe a personal or mystical experience or a ritual event/experience similar to those experienced by the initiates of the Hellenistic mystery cults? The phrase itself occurs about 164 times in the Pauline letters, rarely in the non-Pauline corpus. Further, the preposition "in" is used more often with the words Christ (Jesus)/Lord than any

other words. Those who are described as being "in Christ" have the blessings of redemption (Col. 1:14; Eph.1:7), eternal life (Rom.6:23), sanctification (1 Cor.1:2), grace (Eph.1:6), forgiveness (Eph.4:32), "being made full" (Col.2:10) "being comforted" (Phil.2:1) and "being made free (Gal.2:4). To be "in Christ" then, is to possess salvation in all its fulness.

While the "in Christ (Jesus)/Lord" phrase can be taken as a meaningful theological statement, it is not used with the same uniform meaning throughout the Pauline corpus. For instance, in the Pastoral Epistles persons are only once described as being "in Christ" (2 Tim.3:2). When "in" is used in 1 and 2 Timothy, it is used rather to describe a gift of salvation (faith 1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 3:15; Love 2 Tim.1:13; grace 2 Tim. 2:1; salvation 2 Tim. 2:10) which is available in Christ, than the persons who are "in Christ". Naturally, as those gifts are only available "in Christ", to possess them is also to be "in Christ". Other usages of "in" that do not concern us are those that could be termed "normal uses", such as "in Him dwells all the fullness" (Col.2:9) and "in Christ" meaning Christians (Rom.16:10; 1 Cor. 3:1; Rom.9:1) where the relationship of Christians to Christ is not directly in view.

What is important is that in many cases the preposition "in" does have a locative meaning, in that it is used to denote Christ as the place or sphere in which Christians are and in which they receive the benefits of Christ's redemption. This meaning emerges in statements such as "to all the saints in Christ Jesus" (Phil.1:), "I know a man in Christ (2 Cor. 12:2) and "those in Christ" (Rom.8:2), and brethren in the Lord " (Phil. 1:4). The plural form (saints, brethren) shows that the state of being "in Christ" implies a relationship with others. This "social" aspect of the "in Christ" formula is brought out in other statements such as "you receive her in the Lord (Rom.16:2) or "we ask and beseech you in the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. 4:1), where the implication is that a certain standard of behaviour is expected among Christians, because they are all "in Christ".

Not only does the phrase "in Christ" denote both the "locality" and social nature of the Christian community, but also the fact that salvation and the consequent benefits are only communicated to those who are "in Christ", for Christ is the source and "place" of salvation.

This locative understanding of Christ is evident in a passage such as Galatians 3, where the significance of Abraham for both Christology and the concept of the Church is set out. In his interpretation of Gen. 13:15-17; 17:8 Paul asserts that the "seed" promised to Abraham was singular in reference and therefore represents Christ (Gal. 3:16).

Christ is the son of Abraham. However the "seed" of Abraham is not merely regarded as an individual, but as a corporate figure including, in Himself all the true sons of Abraham. In verse 8 Paul, repeating the promise of Genesis, says of Abraham that, "in you shall all the nations be blest", then in verse 14 that the "blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus". The parallelism here leads us to interpret the preposition "in" identically in both cases. ⁽⁴⁾ Thereby the fact that as Abraham's posterity are included in his blessing through family solidarity, so also, Christians, by virtue of their solidarity with Christ (in Christ) receive the blessings of Abraham.

It is this corporate figure that Paul refers to when he states that "you are all one in Christ Jesus", and if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3:28b, 29). Christ is regarded as a corporate being, who by including in Himself all of Abraham's sons, destroys old barriers such as race, social status and sex (Gal. 3:28a). The new community is formed by inclusion, incorporation into a person (one man Gal. 3:28), who in turn creates the community through its union with Him. Through faith the Gentiles have been identified with Christ, in their (Gentiles) receiving of the promise they represent their forefather⁽⁵⁾, who in the reception of the promise represented his successors. ~~(1)~~

The "in Christ" phrase is also defined by the way in which Paul compares and contrasts it to the "in Adam" concept. Paul regards the Church as the new humanity through its

identification with the last Adam. By describing Adam, his disobedience and its results, Paul shows Adam's role as the bringer of cosmic ruin and sin. In contrast to Adam's disobedience, the obedience of Christ brought life and righteousness. This use of the Adam figure brings out clearly the corporate nature of the Church in Paul's thought.

1 Cor. 15:22 states that: "as in Adam all men died, so were all made alive in Christ", revealing that Paul regarded Adam and Christ as the "heads" of two communities, of the old and new creations respectively (2 Cor. 5:17). Their action involved those who are in them in the consequences of that action. This is made clear in Rom. 5:12-21 where Paul deals at length with the Adam-Christ parallel.

In context, Rom. 5:12-21 follows on his conclusion in chapter 4 that Jesus is the true Jew and Abraham the father of all who have faith, whether they be Jew or Gentile. He continues, in 5:1-11 to describe the results of justification, results that are cosmic in scope as the Adam-Christ parallel in 5:12-21 shows. Adam's sin brought sin and death into the world (5:15). However, by contrast, Christ's obedience led to righteousness and life abounding to many in the one man Christ (5:15).

The only point of similarity between Adam and Christ is that their actions had universal significance, in that they by their actions affected many beyond themselves. Mankind is thus seen as being under two heads, either under Adam in sin or under Christ in life and righteousness.

This conception, of one man's actions affecting the many, only has meaning if all humanity is regarded as being ⁽⁶⁾ "solid" with Adam. As men are "solid" in Adam, so are they "solid" in Christ, an equation which raises the question as to who this solidarity with Christ involves. The text refers to "all" (Rom. 5:12,18) and "many" (Rom. 5:15,19) which, being equivalent, ⁽⁷⁾ lead to the conclusion that as "all" are in Adam (5:12,15), so "all" must be in Christ (5:15,18). This conclusion seems to contradict the Pauline stress on faith in the previous chapters. However, it is possible that Paul stated the passage in this way because he wanted to stress the universality, not only of sin, but of Christ's redemption. For, in chapter 6, he states, in response to some libertines, that "Do you not know that all of us who have

been baptized "(6:1,3). the "all" being clearly limited to those who share in the new creation (2 Cor. 5:17) in Christ by faith and baptism.

In 1 Cor. 15: 20-23 Paul uses the Adam-Christ contrast to show the fact of death in Adam and resurrection in Christ. In Adam, all men are subject to death; in Christ there is the hope of resurrection, because Christ has been raised from the dead. Christ's resurrection is described as "the first fruits" of those who have fallen asleep", the "first fruits" being the guarantee of the rest to follow. In this usage a close union is implied between Christ and Christians, for the argument runs from the fact that what affects Christ, also affects the Christian. Thus, because of the solidarity between Christ and Christians, "as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22). It is only by union with Christ that resurrection is possible. Here again, as in Romans 5, the solidarity of mankind as in Adam or in Christ is presupposed. The solidarity of mankind in Adam is guaranteed. A similar solidarity exists in Christ, thus Christ can be called the "Last Adam, who, while the first, is from heaven (1 Cor. 15:47) and is "a life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor.15:48). The future heavenly, resurrection state of Christians is only possible because Christ Himself is from heaven and has been raised.

Paul's argument in these passages is only viable if Adam (and Christ) is ~~not~~ viewed as somehow greater than an individual, if he is a corporate being. The concept of corporate personality, whereby the one represented the many, is seen in the interchangeability of the first person singular pronoun with a plural form in passages such as Exod. 33:15; Num. 20:18-20, the personification of the nation as an individual (Num. 11:12 Dt. 8:2-20) and in the unification of the nation's experience so that it is regarded as shared by future generations (Dt. 5:3; Lev. 25:42). This is the conception of Christ that enables Paul to speak of Christians participating in that which occurred to Christ. Thus Paul's concept of the Church is inextricably interwoven with His Christology.

Christians are not only described as being in Christ, but also as being "with (σὺν) Him", a phrase that occurs especially in baptismal contexts and seems also to show the solidarity of Christians with Christ in all that happens to Him. For not only do Christians die and rise with Christ, they also live with Him (Rom. 6:8; 2 Tim. 2:1), are made alive with Him (Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:13), suffer with Him (Rom. 8:17; 2 Cor. 1:3-7, Col. 1:24), are fellow-heirs (Rom. 8:17), shall reign with Him (2 Tim. 2:12), become like Him (Phil. 3:10) and be glorified with Him (Rom. 8:17). It is however in the passages where Paul discusses baptism that the meaning of "with Christ" is most clearly brought out. The Locus Classicus for Paul's understanding of baptism is Rom. 6:1-11, which significantly follows on from the Adam-Christ parallel in Rom. 5:12-21. There Paul showed that the Christian is united to Christ, here he reveals the nature of the union, that by the very act of union in baptism a death to sin occurred, which makes a continuance in sin impossible. (Rom. 6:1). In Rom. 6:1-11 the actual process of baptism is described in detail, unlike other passages (such as Eph. 4:4f; 1 Cor. 1:13-17; 10:2, 12:1f) where baptism is only mentioned as the basis of appeal for the Christian's ethical life. However, it would be wrong to divide Paul's thought into "doctrinal" and "ethical" compartments, for he does not view them separately, but as one. Thus, even in the detailed description in Rom. 6:1-11, baptism is related to Christ's death and resurrection and the ethical consequences stated (Rom. 6:4 "walk in newness of Life").

(9)

Paul sees a close relationship between baptism and Christ's death, between Christ's death and resurrection and the Christian's death to the power of sin and resurrection to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). He can regard this relationship, this understanding as well-known and accepted (see verse 3: "do you not know")

(10)

for he bases his argument on it without needing to explain or defend it. Baptism is "into Christ", into His death. The preposition εἰς used in verses 3 & 4

("were baptized into Christ Jesus", "into his death", into the death (of His)),

(12)

is synonymous with εἰν or ἐπί. Thus while "into Christ Jesus" can mean "under the

authority of", it has, especially in the light of its usage in verses 3 and 4 (ἵνα into His death), a strong local sense, implying close union.

This union in Christ's death logically results in the consequence, outlined in verse 4, that Christ's resurrection is the cause of the Christians renewed life and resurrection. In this respect the use of the comparative conjunctions ὡςπερ - οὕτως καὶ in verse 4 shows the link between Christ's death and resurrection and its ethical outworkings in the life of the Christian.

In baptism then the Christian does not undergo some mystical experience, or repeat a rite, but rather he participates in the event of redemption. Thus he shares the one baptism of Christ (ΜΚ 10:38 Eph.4:5) through union (σύνψυτοι γεγούσαμεν)¹³⁾ in the likeness of His death (Rom.6:5), thereby enabling him to share in the resurrection (Rom.6:5,8) "When Christ died something happened once for all, not only to Him who died, but to all for whom he died. They also died with Him upon the Cross".⁽¹⁴⁾ Paul is primarily concerned with the effect of baptism, not its mode, is shown by verse 6, where he speaks of "our old men" being crucified (with him", a figure which does not fit if Paul is here merely referring to a rite of immersion. Rather, his concern is union with Christ, so that the Christian participates in His redemption. Only such union brings about the moral change that Paul envisages. Through being "with Christ" in his crucifixion, death and resurrection, the Christian is indeed "in Christ" (Rom.6:116).

Again, the involvement of Christians in the event of the cross and resurrection is only possible because Christ is seen as a "corporate personality", who in Himself, the one, incorporates⁽⁵⁾ "the many". Christ is seen as the head of a new race (as Adam is head of all men), thus His humanity is stressed. He is man (Rom. 5:15; 1 Cor. 15:21, 42). All men, by virtue of their birth, are united with Adam in sin and death. Christ, through becoming man, becomes the head and representative of a new community, "one man" (Gal. 3:28), made in the image of God (Col. 3:10). This "one man" comes about through the work of Christ, whereby

divided mankind is reconciled to God. Man can only appropriate this reconciliation by faith, the confession of Christ (Rom.10:9; 1 Cor. 1:13) and baptism (Gal.3:27; 1 Cor. 12:13,27). Baptism is the means whereby, in faith, man participates in the reality of redemption in Christ. This explains Paul's references to Christ and Christians collectively as "one man" (Gal. 3:28; Eph.2:15, 4:13). This union, this state of being "one man in Christ Jesus" is only possible because Christians through baptism have been united with Christ. "The formula "with Christ" suggests to us the inclusion of Christians in Christ. What happens to Him - death, resurrection etc. - happens to them; in this they are solid with him".⁽¹⁶⁾

Of course, this stress on incorporation does not mean the Church is a multiple of people, with no individuality. All men are "in Adam", but each man is in Christ by faith and baptism. In baptism man is identified with Christ, yet at the same time he is now called upon to live a new life in Christ. "That which happened to Christ happens also to Christians; dying and rising with Him becomes a rule in the Christian life, which works itself out in all areas and in every aspect of life."⁽¹⁷⁾ This daily "dying" (2 Cor. 4:10, Rom. 6:4,5,6 Col.2:13,20) can only occur because there was a death once for all with Christ (Rom.7:4). The resurrection of Christ also makes possible the future life and resurrection (Rom. 6:8; 8:17; Phil. 3:10; Col. 3:3; 1 Thess. 4:14; 5:10; 2 Tim. 2:11). This interrelationship of the historical with the ethical and eschatological, this tension between the indicative and the imperative, expressed in the oft heard statement "become what you are", is only possible because the Christian in Christ forms "one man".

In Paul's letters, the Lord's Supper as well as baptism is viewed corporately. It is essential for the Life of the Church, for it is a means of revealing and strengthening the unity that was created through baptism by faith. This unity is described as a "participation in" or as "fellowship with" the risen Lord or the Spirit.

In 1 Cor. 10:16-17 Paul states that : "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation (κοινωνία) in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake (μετέχομεν) of the one bread". His words stress the fact that participants at the Lord's table enter into personal communion when they sit at the same table with the risen Lord. He "bases his argument on the conception of the κοινωνία which is established through the Lord's Supper: if one partakes of the Lord's Supper he becomes κοινωνός Χριστού: if he eats at the table of the demon he becomes κοινωνός σατανίου (1 Cor. 10:20). But these are mutually exclusive conditions, and so the Christian must not take part in a heathen sacrificial feast."⁽¹⁸⁾

Paul states that the taking of the bread is a κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ and the drinking from the cup is a κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. These phrases do not mean "fellowship with" as it would be strange to have fellowship with inanimate objects. Rather they mean "participation (with others) in the body of Christ" and "participation (with others) in the blood of Christ"⁽¹⁹⁾. Elsewhere the phrase "blood of Christ" refers to Christ's death (Rom. 3:25; 5:9) through which salvation was made possible. Thus in 1 Cor. 10:16, 11:27, Paul regards the drinking of the cup as a participation in the saving benefits that Christ's death obtained for the Church. Further, the phrase "the body of Christ" also refers to the community, so in 1 Cor. 10:17 the common participation of the one bread corresponds to membership of the body of Christ. This close relationship between the eucharistic bread, the Lord's body and blood and the community is brought out in 1 Cor. 11:23-29 where the solidarity of the Church as the "body of Christ" is the central theme. Some of the Corinthians, by their selfish behaviour, were despising the community. Paul warns the community that "only one who eats and drinks without discerning the Body eats and drinks judgement upon himself" (1 Cor. 11:29). Here he refers to those who did not realize that participation

In the Lord's Supper entailed not only participation in Christ, but also in their brethren, who are one in Christ. The unity then of the community is uppermost in Paul's mind, hence the dire warning to those who threaten it by their behaviour. This unity is only possible through the death and resurrection of Christ, and the incorporation into that death and resurrection by baptism and faith. Christ is alive and present in the community, so the Lord's Supper is the witness to and declaration of the presence of the risen Christ within the Church.

Closely related to the Church as the body of Christ is the Holy Spirit; "For by (ἐνί) one Spirit we were all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13). The unity of the body is a Living Unity created and sustained by the one Spirit. This is possible only because after the resurrection Jesus moved into a πνεύμα - existence (1 Cor. 15:49) in which the Christian through his union with Christ, also participates (Rom. 8:9). Christians have indeed been born of the Spirit (Gal. 3:29) and participate in Him (Rom. 8:9) for "he who is united to the Lord becomes one Spirit with Him" (1 Cor. 6:17).

The whole Church participates in Christ and the Spirit, as is stated in 1 Cor. 1:9⁽²²⁾ "God is faithful, by whom you were called into the fellowship of His son, Jesus Christ our Lord". Here the meaning is "participation along with others in something", participation in His Son. Elsewhere, reference is also made to participation in the Holy Spirit, namely in Phil. 2:1 and 2 Cor. 13:13. In Phil. 2:1⁽²³⁾ κοινωνία πνεύματος means "participation in the Spirit" and not "fellowship in the Spirit". This is the meaning of the identical phrase which occurs in the unique threefold benediction in 2 Cor. 13:13⁽²⁴⁾. Of course it is true that participation in the same Spirit necessarily creates fellowship between those who participate, but this is not the primary intention of the verses quoted above. Rather, community and fellowship flow from the common participation in the one Spirit. Thus the κοινωνία πνεύματος⁽²⁵⁾ also expresses the corporate nature of the Christian community, for all Christians share in the Spirit. Indeed, Paul can

use the accepted fact of the common possession of the Spirit~~s~~ as the basis for the appeals (2 Cor. 1:21f; Gal. 3:2f) he directed to his readers (so also he bases appeals on the fact of baptism Rom. 6:14). The possession of the Spirit can even stand as a definition of belonging to Christ (Rom.8:9).

The Christian is indeed united to Christ and to other Christians. Paul conceives of his Christology and soteriology in terms of their goal, which is to be incorporated with Christ in the act of redemption. Redemption is appropriated by the individual Christian in the act of baptism, which is described in Rom.6:1-11 as a "being with Christ" in His death and resurrection. The resulting state of "being in Christ" is also described as "participation in Christ" or as "participation in the Holy Spirit". The unity brought about by Christ and appropriated by man in baptism is made visible and affirmed in the Eucharist. Those statements are descriptions of an objective state, not descriptions of ecstatic mystical experiences, for they describe the realistic incorporation of the Christian into the saving event of Calvary.

The corporate nature, both of Christ and of the Church, is clearly shown in the Pauline descriptions of the community being "in Christ", "with Christ" "participating in" and the "body". It is this concept, that of the "body of Christ", that we will now examine.

CHAPTER 3 THE BODY OF CHRIST

There are only two passages in Paul's writings where the Church is directly described as the body of Christ. These are Col. 1:8 ("He is the head of the body, the Church .. ") and Col. 1:24 (" for the sake of his body, that is, the Church ")

In Paul's other letters, it is never actually stated that the Church is the body of Christ, but rather that Christians consist of a body, the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:27 "Now you are the body of Christ"). This is mainly a verbal difference, for it is clear that all Christians, who are the Church, are united to Christ and thus are the body of Christ. The most significant occurrences of this phrase all occur in Romans and 1 Corinthians.

Those are:

- Rom.12:4,5 "For as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another."
- 1 Cor.6:15 "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ"?
- 1 Cor.10:17 "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body for we all partake of the one bread"
- 1 Cor. 12:12,13 "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body."
- 1 Cor.12:27 "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it."

As the word "body" was widely used in the ancient world, in Stoic and Gnostic speculation, the origin and hence in large part the meaning of "body" has been sought in such usage. Its origin and meaning has also been sought in Rabbinic

speculation concerning Adam, in Jesus^{p7} (and the Church's tradition) words over the bread and wine and in other closely allied phrases such as "in Christ".

Some commentators see the origin of Paul's "body of Christ" language in contemporary Stoic literature concerning the body and its members. For instance, the account of how Menenius Lanatus⁽²⁾ Agrippa, brought the patricians and plebians together, relating on that occasion the fable of the body and its members, was well known. This metaphor was also applied to the cosmos as a whole and to the state.⁽³⁾ ⁽⁴⁾

The universe or state is likened to a body, of which men are parts or members. Another view, similar to that expressed in the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians, is that of the state as a body, of which the king is the head.

These parallels to Paul's words are not sufficient to show that he consciously used them. Nowhere in extant Stoic literature is the cosmos regarded as the "body of a God". Paul describes the Church as the "Body of Christ", which focuses attention on Christ. In 1 Cor. 12:12-27 the figure of the body is used, the digestive organs and stomach being regarded as inferior. However, in Menenius' fable the stomach represents the wealthy patricians. The difference between Paul's teaching and that of the Stoic is even more radical, for according to Paul it is not nature that makes us members of the body, but grace. Thus it is unlikely that the source of Paul's "body" language is to be found in Stoic parallels.

Other scholars⁽⁵⁾ regard a gnostic origin of the phrase as more likely. In particular, the gnostic view of the cosmos as the body of a god, who is its head, is seen as the background to Paul's usage, especially in the Colossian and Ephesian Letters. In Gnosticism the metaphor has, as an essential feature, the relationship of the head to the body. However, in the earlier Pauline Letters, the figure of the "head" in relationship to the "body" does not appear. In fact, the "head" refers to a member of the body, certainly not to Christ (1 Cor. 12:21).

Further, in Gnosticism the metaphor is more concerned with the relationship of the head to the body than with the relationship that exists between the members of the body.

The Gnostic and Pauline understanding of "body" differ in that, whereas Gnosticism regards the body merely as a garment or prison of the soul, Paul regards it as denoting man as being and existing in this world. Finally, the most damaging criticism of the above view is the fact that it is only in Post-Pauline, especially Mandaean writings (2nd Century A.D) that the conception of men being members of a heavenly body (man) is found. It is probable that this literature was influenced by Christianity, rather than the reverse process occurring.

Another suggestion⁽⁷⁾ is that the origin of the phrase lies in its use at the Eucharist of the Early Church. Christians, by partaking of the bread, partake of the body of Christ. So 1 Cor. 10:16,17 states that "the bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Because there is one bread, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." The major difficulty with this rather attractive thesis⁽⁸⁾ is the difficulty in identifying the term "body" used in 1 Cor. 10:16 with the identical term "body" in the next verse.

Clearly the "body" and "blood" mentioned in 1 Cor. 10:16 are a reference to Jesus Christ. It has in fact been shown that in Hebrew thought the body ($\aleph \psi \zeta$) and blood ($\beth \daleth$) referred to the constituent parts of an animal/man and the two together are often used in sacrificial contexts. So Paul is here referring to the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross. The problem now arises as to the exact signification of the same term "body" in verse 17. It is here that one commentator suggests that "There is a jump here, from "feeding on" to "becoming", which is not explained. What was it within his own understanding of Christ that made him - and no one else - take this at first sight, extraordinary leap from the eucharist to the $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\sigma'$ itself as the extension of Christ's human personality"⁽¹⁰⁾?

Here a straight identification of the literal physical body of Christ on the Cross

with the eucharistic elements, with the Church which is His body, is made. However, it is not certain that the "jump" in meaning between the word "body" as it is used in verse 16 and in verse 47 can be justified. Undoubtedly the participants share in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice and by this participation their unity in a body is demonstrated. But to identify the literal, physical body of Christ with the body of Christians is not thereby shown.

⁽¹¹⁾ Schweitzer states that the Pauline conception of "body" is to be derived from the predestined solidarity of the elect with the Messiah. Further, "in Christ" is merely a brachology for "in the body of Christ" which is so named from the most exalted personality who shares in it. This elected solidarity is to be found in Jewish Apocalyptic writings (Dan.7:27; Enoch 38:1-5). So he states that: "once it is perceived that we have to start from the conception of the predestined solidarity of the elect with one another and with the Messiah, the mystical body of Christ is at once explained. The participation of the elect with Christ in the same corporeity becomes a being part of the body of Christ". ⁽¹²⁾

When the Apocalyptic writings of later Judaism are examined though, significant differences between them and Paul's writings are to be noted. In context, the "one like unto a Son of Man" in Daniel 7 is equated with the Saints of the Most High" (Dan.7: 13,14 18,22), not the Messiah. ⁽¹³⁾ It is only in the Similitudes of Enoch that the figure of the Son of Man is clearly regarded as an individual, the Messiah. He is clearly associated with a faithful remnant who are called by his titles and will be with him in the New Age. The underlying concept of a union and solidarity between Messiah and his people is certainly present here, but Paul does not seem to have used the language that is employed by the Apocalyptic writers. Neither does he use the term "Son of Man" nor is his theology based on the determinism, ⁽¹⁴⁾ time schemes ⁽¹⁵⁾ and the avenging Messiahs ⁽¹⁶⁾ of their writings. It has also been held that the "body of Christ" originated from the phrase "in ⁽¹⁷⁾ Christ". The "in Christ" phrase was then related to the Christians dying and rising

again with Christ. However this still does not explain how Christians are "in Christ". Both terms("body of Christ and "in Christ") refer to union and participation in Christ and in fact, are really descriptions of the same reality, that of solidarity with Christ. In the case of "body" language, this will be shown later.

For clear parallels to Paul's thought is found in Rabbinic speculation concerning the being of Adam. It has been shown ⁽¹⁸⁾ "Paul accepted the traditional Rabbinic doctrine of the unity of mankind in Adam. That doctrine implied that the very constitution of the physical body of Adam and the method of its formation was symbolic of the real oneness of mankind. In that one body of Adam East and West, North and South were brought together, male and female ⁽¹⁹⁾ The body of Adam included all mankind. Was it not natural then, that Paul, when he thought of the new humanity being incorporated "in Christ" should have conceived of it as the "body" of the second Adam, where there was neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond or free (Gal. 3:28).

Indeed, not only did Paul view Christ as the one in whom social and sexual barriers were overcome, he also regarded the body of Christ as universal and corporal. This was similar to Rabbinic thought concerning Adam as the one who filled the space between heaven and earth and in whom all men were included as members of his body. As Adam was representative of mankind, so Christ and the Church are so identified that Paul can even refer to the "body" as "Christ" (1 Cor. 12:12). However, the above parallels do not necessarily show that Paul took over Rabbinic speculation in toto to express his own teaching. It is to be noted that there is no actual evidence that the phrase "body of Adam" was ⁽²⁰⁾ actually used to designate mankind, and further, the examples quoted by Davies refer only to the physical body of Adam, whereas Paul refers to "many" being included in the "body".

Certainly, the Rabbinic speculation does not necessarily have to be the source

of Paul's concept and in fact, in view of the varied and forcefully presented cases ⁽²¹⁾ for one or another origin of the phrase, it is perhaps wise to consider ⁽²²⁾ that the term "Body"/is an original Pauline creation. What is to be particularly noted is the uniqueness of Paul's usage, for he adds the qualifying genitive "of Christ", not as might be expected, "of Christians". This raises the question of Paul's meaning - is the term "body" simply a metaphor or is it something ⁽²³⁾ more, perhaps "something not corporate but corporal"?

In view of the variety of views as to the origin of the figure, which might not be helpful even if known, for Paul's usage might well be original and unique, an examination of his body-concept becomes necessary.

1 Corinthians is the earliest letter to refer to the "body of Christ" and, interestingly, all the occurrences of the phrase are in paraenetic contexts, where Paul is rebuking the community for failing to live as the "body of Christ". In 1 Cor.6:15-17 Paul refers to the bodies of Christians as the members of Christ (6:15). Consequently, a union of a Christian with a prostitute results in both becoming one body (6:16). Ignoring the distinction between the terms "Body" and "flesh" he states that "he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her." (6:16). This he then substantiates by quoting from Gen.2:24 which states that in the marriage union, man and woman become one flesh. From this passage then, Paul concludes that the marriage union of the flesh is comparable to the Christian's union with Christ. The same verb κολλησθεσιν ("Cleave") from Gen.2:24, denoting close union between a man and woman, is used of union with the prostitute (6:16) and of union with Christ (6:17). A crass materialism is avoided by Paul's words "But he who is united to the Lord becomes one Spirit with Him" (6:17). "In compressed form this expresses the thought "But he who joins himself to the Lord constitutes one body with him - a pneumatic body."⁽²⁴⁾ While, then the corporate union of Christians with Christ is not the ⁽²⁵⁾ subject here, but rather the treatment of the physical body, the underlying

understanding is clearly that of the union of the Christian with Christ.

(26)

In 1 Cor. 10:16-17 reference is made to the one body (10:17) as well as to the blood and body of Christ. Through the eucharist they participate in the blood and body of Christ, in the benefits of his sacrifice. Thus, as the bread of which they partake is a unity, so also is the body.

Here Paul is warning the Corinthians about idolatry. Yet, although he is using Old Testament examples (10:1-6,7f), he does not appeal to the Law which forbade idolatry, but rather to the fact of participation and union with Christ (10:16-21).

Union with Christ makes union with demons impossible, for such unions are mutually exclusive (as that with prostitutes 1 Cor.6:15,17). Some commentators, as was

(27)

noted earlier, "jump" from the mention of the eucharistic elements to identify the Church with the historical and glorified body of Jesus Christ. However, it is more likely that the word *σῶμα* is being used with different meanings in verses 16 and 17. In verse 16 it is a reference to the sacrificial body of Christ. Here Paul is referring to the Christian's participation in the benefits of Christ's sacrificial death. The words "blood" and "body" are themselves part of Jewish sacrificial terminology which denote the true aspects of Life which, once separated, meant death. (28)

The terms "body" and "blood" are used again in an Eucharistic context in 1 Cor. 11:27,29. In verse 27 the one who partakes of the Eucharist unworthily becomes "guilty of profaning the body (*τοῦ σώματος*) and blood of the Lord". This is not a reference to Christ's actual physical body and blood, but rather to the means whereby participation is obtained in Christ's sacrifice. "Body" is not a reference to the Church here, as is shown by the addition of the word "blood". (29)

What then about verse 29 which states that "any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body (*τὸ σῶμα*) eats and drinks judgement upon himself"? The "body" which the Corinthians failed to discern, in the light of verse 27, is probably Christ's sacrificial giving of Himself for them. (30) The implication of

this for their own lives is that they in turn should be sacrificial in their behaviour towards others in the one body. "To be partakers in Christ's sacrificial action ... is to be ourselves the organs of that sacrificial action towards the brethren in Christ. To discern the body then is to recognize the true nature of communal life". (31)

It is only in 1 Cor. 12:12-27 that specific reference is made to the Church at Corinth as the body of Christ (12:27) and its organic unity through the work of the Holy Spirit dealt with in detail. Only here and in Romans 12:4-8 is the "body" language used as a figure to describe the unity and diversity of the local congregation. 1 Cor. 12:12-27 follows Paul's rebuke to the Corinthians for their behaviour at the Eucharist (1 Cor. 11:17-34) and his statement of the various gifts that are given to the community (1 Cor. 12:1-11). The gifts of God are diverse, yet in their diversity they should reveal their common origin in God and the Holy Spirit. In verses 14-20 Paul describes the community as a body, which has various parts. All the parts are essential for the body. He stresses that it is God who "arranged the organs in the body, each one of them, as he chose", who gave the diversity of function to the body, the Christian community. Likewise, there is a God-given unity "there are many parts, yet one body" (1 Cor. 12:20). Connecting Paul's teaching on the gifts (1 Cor. 12:1-11) and the nature of the community as a body (1 Cor. 12:14-27) are verses 12 & 13 which root the unity of the community in Christ.

Verse 12 introduces the figure of the body, stating that "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ". Paul here seems to take two steps at once, for if he is drawing out the similarities between a body and the Church, why does he not conclude "so it is with the Church"?

Then in verse 27, he states that "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it." Thus Christ himself can be said to be a body, made up of many members.

Here then a close connection if not identity seems to be posited between the "body" and "Christ" (versel2) and the "body of Christ" (v 27).

How is this identification to be understood? It does not seem possible that a simple identification is being made between Christians and Christ, for Paul in 1 Cor. 12:3 has just stated that "Christ is Lord", that is, Lord over the Church and distinct from it.

The word $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is important here - is it a metaphor or a statement of an ontological fact? It has been traditionally recognised that whatever the precise signification of the term, there was a metaphorical element present. (32) However, many contemporary commentators have denied this in preference for a "realistic" view which results in the eventual obliteration of the traditional distinctions between the historical (incarnate) resurrected (glorified), sacramental and mystical body of Christ. Thus it can be stated that "Christ has only one Body, that which he took from His mother the Virgin Mary, but that Body exists under various modes. As a natural Body it was seen on earth, hung on the Cross, rose in glory on the first Easter day and was taken into heaven in the Ascension: As a mystical Body it appeared on earth on the first Whitsunday and we know it as the Holy Catholic Church: as a sacramental Body it becomes present on our altars at every eucharist, when, by the operation of the Holy Spirit and the priestly act of Christ, bread and wine are transformed into, and made one with, (33) the glorified body which is in Heaven." So also it is said that "In the same way no clear distinction can be drawn between the flesh body of Jesus and the body of His resurrection, so there is no real line between the body of his resurrection and the flesh bodies of those who are risen with Him: for they are members of it". (34)

(35) Robinson in particular, basing his argument on "the holistic meaning of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ (36) takes a liberal, physical ("it is almost impossible to exaggerate the materialism and crudity of Paul's doctrine of the Church as literally now the resurrection

(37)

body of Christ") interpretation of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ and totally identifies Christ's physical body with the body of Christ, the Church.

This interpretation is certainly attractive as it stresses the "Wholeness" of man and the Church, as well as providing a link between redemption and its application to the Church. However, to insist on such literal "physicality" is to absolutize and give ontological reality to only one of the terms which Paul uses to describe the Church. Elsewhere Paul describes the Church as a "pure virgin" (2 Cor. 11:2 Eph. 5:22-32), as an "olive tree" (Rom. 11) or as the "temple of the Lord" (1 Cor. 3:16). The Church cannot literally be all of these. Further, Paul's description of the Church as a body itself varies. In 1 Corinthians and Romans the "head" is a "member" of the "body", whereas in Colossians the "head" is Christ. Both usages of the body and its members cannot be treated as descriptions of an actual ontological reality.

It is common Hebraic usage to omit the comparative "as" or "like" and to present the metaphor in bald terms such as "Israel is a scattered sheep" (Jer. 50:17) or "I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and fastness (Ps. 91:2). There is indeed a close link between the symbol and reality, but the figure is not regarded as more than metaphor.

This is not to deny the union of the Christian with Christ, what is being denied however, is the view that this union is "crudely" physical. Rather, in line with other terms that Paul uses to describe the Church, the "body" language is to be regarded as powerful, metaphor - like language. In support of the metaphorical use of "body" terminology it should be noted that the conjunctions $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon$ and $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma$ which are used of comparisons/metaphors and which are, significantly, found both in 1 Cor. 12:12 and Rom. 12:4,5, where the "body" terminology occurs. One tendency of absolutizing the "body" terminology is to regard the Church as an actual "extension of the incarnation". The danger of pushing this view to extremes is that the distinction between Christ and his people becomes obscured.

If the Church is regarded as an "extension of the incarnation" to what extent then does it become an extension of the atonement? Further, the body-figure as used by Paul is not used to describe the Church's mission in the world. Rather, it occurs in paraenetic contexts, where the relationships between Christians and also between Christ are elucidated. Body terminology then is concerned with the inner structure and Life of the Church, not its mission. This severely mitigates against any view that regards "body" language as grounds for an "extension of the incarnation", the extension of Christ's mission. Paul then, is using metaphor-like language when he describes the Church as a "body". Yet, in spite of the denial of a "crassly physical" understanding presented above, Paul's language is not and cannot be "mere metaphor." ⁽⁴²⁾ As has been shown, the danger in a total physical identification of Christ and His Church results in the obscuring of the distinction between them. For as "we cannot completely identify Christ and the Church, no more can we completely distinguish them. The Body of Christ is Christ and the members of His body are His members. We cannot go beyond this logically". ⁽⁴³⁾

This is only possible because the Christians are incorporated into Christ and thus become one with Him. So in a way, predicates of Christ can be transferred to Christians because they are "in Him". This union is not however, a physical one, but one that is brought about through the action of the Holy Spirit, to create a spiritual body (1 Cor.6:17).

In the passage 1 Cor. 12:12-27, the action of the Holy Spirit in the body is brought out in verse 13." For by (in) one Spirit we were all baptized into one body - Jews or Greeks, slaves or free - and all were made to drink of one Spirit." Union in Christ results in the annullment of racial and social differences, which are replaced by differing Spirit given functions. There is a functional diversity, but only one Christ and one Spirit, for "here Paul speaks only of the unity which is brought about by the abrogation of the (physical and social)

differences between believers. This idea is not deniable from the figure of an organism. For the latter is designed to emphasize the belonging together of different elements. Thus.... an indication in favour of the interpretation (44) that the body of Christ is pre-existent in relation to the "parts". Here there is no suggestion that the Spirit is the "soul" of the body, or that it is the (45) Spirit that incorporates or joins the Christians to Christ by baptism, but rather that it is baptism that incorporates and releases the Spirit. This is seen in the form εἰς εἴς σῶμα which implies that Christians are by baptism brought into relation with an already existing unity. Christians share in the one Spirit by virtue of their incorporation in the body. (47) This conclusion, that union with Christ is the essential and primary feature of baptism, is clearly brought out in Rom.6:1-11 a passage discussed earlier. (48) This baptismal and "body" language is the language of solidarity and participation in Christ. The whole passage dealing with the body metaphor (1 Cor.12:14-26) is ended by Paul, in verse 27 moving from a strongly metaphorical handling of the "body" to state: "Now you are the body of Christ, and individually members of it." The particularly emphatic position of the "you" in the Greek is to be noted. For emphasis it is placed first in the sentence. For the Christians "in Christ" are the new men of the new age and their behaviour is to be adjusted accordingly. Further, it is the "body" of Christ, not of "Christians". The genitive "of Christ", a genitive of possession, not identity, means that it is a body over which Christ rules and which belongs to him. (49) This usage shows that the community is not simply a "body of Christians", but the body of Christ, for it is through Him alone that the community has its being. Now the body is no longer determined by the parts, but vice versa the parts by the whole. The figure may still be echoed in the expression ἐκ μερῶν. While the thought of verse 27 does link up with the figure, namely with the idea of

unity which it, too, contains, yet it stands in isolation in between the figure and verse 28. This shows that Paul does not construct his view of the Church on the basis of an organism, but can use the latter merely as an illustration." (50)

Once again, the fact of union and participation is primary. (51)

This fact is clear from Rom.12:3-8, where, in a similar context to 1 Cor.12:12-27, reference to various gifts is included in a description of the Church as a "body". Rather than the "body of Christ", it is here "one body in Christ", that is, in whom the members are one body. The intention here, as in 1 Corinthians, is to stress the unity of the Church in the midst of the variety of gifts exercised by its members. The members "are one body and that in Christ; our unity is created by Christ, and only by Christ: It does not exist independently of him". (52)

The "body" formula is also used in Ephesians and Colossians, but with the difference that a distinction is drawn between the "head" and the "body". The term "body" has, in these letters, also acquired "a fixed technical significance". The Church is called the "body of Christ" (Eph.1:23;4:13) as well as simply the "body" in an absolute sense (Eph.4:4; Col.1:18,24; 2:19;3:15). Not only is the Church described as a "body" but Christ's relationship to it is described in terms of Christ being the "head". Eph.1:22,23 states that God has "made him the head over all things for the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him who fills all in all." As "head", he also gives spiritual gifts to the body (Eph. 4:8-16). Christ is described as "head" of all things, but particularly as head of the Church (Eph.4:15f; Col.1:18, 2:10,19). While these passages speak of the "body" and "head" as the Church and Christ respectively, other passages seem to imply a close union, by referring to the "body" (Eph.4:12) being built up "until we all attain to unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph.4:13), or of growing" up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by

every joint with which it is supplied .."(Eph.4:15,16). Likewise Col.2:19 describes the state of some "not holding fast to the head, from whom the whole body, nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments, grows with a growth that is from God."

An examination of those texts show that we are not dealing with one composite metaphor (body and the head thereof), but rather with two different metaphors.

This is shown from Eph.1:22,23 "and he has put all things under his (Christ's) feet and has made him head over all things for the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him who fills all in all." The verb πληρουμένους can be inter-

(53)
preted as a passive or a middle (with an active meaning) participle. If it is regarded as passive, it leads to an understanding of the Church as being filled by Christ, who is filled by God. However, the verb need not be passive, and (54)
nowhere else does Paul use the passive with this verb to refer to Christ.

Further, if it is a passive participle, then the τὰ πάντα of verse 23 must be taken as an adverbial construction or as an accusative of respect, a usage

that is doubtful in Paul. (56) Rather, τὰ πάντα should be taken as the object of πληρουμένους (being then a middle with an active sense). This is similar

to the construction in Eph.4:10 where the verb is the same, the object, τὰ πάντα. (57)

The noun πλήρωμα is then in apposition to σῶμα, which, together with the previous suggestions, produces an understanding of Christ as filling everything in all ways, Christ being the fulness, which in turn refers to his body (Eph.1:22).

(58)
Although some commentators regard the "head" terminology as an extension of the body metaphor, this is to be doubted, for if it is an extension, certain incongruities result. First, Paul refers to the "head, from whom" (not which)(Col.2:19) and "him, who is the head" (Eph.4:15) which show that the head is regarded as a person, Christ. Further, the body is described as growing, but Christ is already complete (Eph.4:15). Secondly, in Ephesians 5, if the "body - head" language is regarded as a unity, the wife becomes the torso, the husband the "head", the Church

likewise a torso, Christ the "head".

Paul in fact has, in Eph.1:22,23, stated the fact of Christ's headship over the body very carefully. The two terms "body" and "head" are separated in the sentence construction by the word "Church". For Christ to be the head of the Church as His body requires the verb "give" ($\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$) to be translated as "appointed" or "made" a meaning this verb does not have in Paul, and when it is used, always has an indirect object.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Rather the term head is to be linked with the word "feet" (Eph.1:22), for "Christ is head, not because the Church is His body, but because all things have been subjected under His feet."⁽⁶¹⁾ Thus the "head" terminology derives from the fact of Christ's cosmic rule and the subjection of all powers, principalities and dominions (Eph.1:20-22 Col.1:15-20, 2:9). The origin of such a "head - feet" language can be seen in Ps. 8:6.⁽⁶²⁾ This conclusion is appropriate to Paul's argument. For while no exact evidence is available as to what the Colossian heresy was, it seems that it was being asserted that Christians were still subject to the principalities and powers of this world. Paul responds by asserting the cosmic power, authority and significance of Christ." In him the whole fulness of deity dwells bodily" (Col.2:9) or "the beginning, the first-born from the dead" (Col.1:18), where "first-born" ⁽⁶³⁾ is a technical term, denoting the first of a new race. Christ, by his activity in creation is prior to and above all things" in heaven and on earth, invisible and visible" (Col.1:16). Thus the Colossians need not fear the elemental powers, or be concerned about "human precepts and doctrines" (Col. 2:22) for in Christ are "hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col.2:3). This is why Paul places his statement concerning the relationship of Christ to the Church in a cosmic setting.

The words "fulness" and "fill" are used frequently by Paul in Colossians to describe this cosmic significance of God and Christ. Further, such terminology is also used to describe the relationship of the Church to Christ. This was in

response to, it seems, the claims that Christians were subject to various powers. In Greek thought, Hellenistic philosophy in particular, the gods and men were thought to so "fill" up space that there was no "empty space." Paul seems to use this concept here, when he describes God as "the fulness", outside of whom nothing had any existence or power. This "fulness theology" is used not only to describe God but also his relationship to the rest of creation. This is so in Christ, for it is in Him that the "fulness of Godhead dwells bodily" (Col.2:9). What is true of God's being and relationship to creation, is also true of Christ. "that is, the whole might and glory of God with respect to all things becomes manifest in him, makes its appearance in him and asserts itself in him". Thus, in Christ, the Colossian Christians have no need of either intermediaries or esoteric knowledge (Col.2:6,7,9,19).

Christ, by virtue of his being "head over all things" is also head over the Church. Thus the Church can be described as His "fulness", the sphere that is created, controlled and held together by him (Eph.1:23). This understanding of "fulness" obviates the necessity of holding views that regard the Church as in some way "Completing" or "fulfilling" Christ. To hold those sort of views or to interpret Paul's ~~Words~~ in Col.1:24 as implying any incompleteness in Christ or His work is to destroy Paul's argument against the Colossian heretics.

Christ is complete, the Church's only task is to "hold fast to the head" (Col.2:19) and to receive the nourishment and gifts that the head gives to the Church (Eph.4:11-14). As in the earlier letters, Colossians and Ephesians stress the unity of the Church in Christ (Eph.4:3-5), in fact, the unity and ultimate completion of "the fulness" in Christ (Eph.1:10). This does not imply that the Church includes everything, for a clear distinction is made between those who recognise Christ's headship and are united with Him and those who are not. These are the powers from which the Church has been redeemed (Eph.2:2,5,6) and against whom the Church battles (Eph.5:7,6:12). A clear distinction is thus made between the new redeemed humanity,

comprising of Jews and Gentiles (Eph.3:2-6) and the powers that previously held them in subjection. The "head" metaphor serves to set forth Christ's position as Lord of the Church and the creation. Christians are "in Christ" already (Eph.1:23), yet this is also a state to be gained by growth (Eph.3:19 Col.2:19). This growth comes about through the gifts which the Lord, the head of the Church, pours into the body His Church (Eph.2:14-16; 4:11-16). Paul also deals with the relationship of the head (Christ's) to the body (the Church) in terms of the relationship between husband and wife (Eph.5:22-33). In a specific application of Gen.2:24 to the Church as the Bride of Christ, Paul states that the unity effected by marriage is parallel to the relationship between the head and the body. He does state that this is a "great mystery" (Eph.5:32), but this analogy shows again the solidarity that exists between Christ and His Church.

"For ecclesiology we may observe that it is on the heights of this theology of the Body of Christ that what is new, specific and unique in the Christian idea of the Church clearly emerges, even when the background of Old Testament thought regarding the people or community of God, the Covenant and eschatological promises is remembered or comparison is made with certain gnostic, Hellenistic conceptions. The further development of the ideas, their penetration by speculation and the Christian distinctions drawn, are guided by the revelation of Christ. The Church of Jesus Christ is only intelligible as a result of the saving event which took place in Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection and as a continuation of his activity in the Holy Spirit; its relation to the exalted Lord, however, its link with him and its dependence on him and union with him, its life deriving from him and striving directed towards him, cannot ultimately be further understood: that is the deepest mystery of the Church."
(65)

CHAPTER 4: LUKE, JESUS AND THE CHURCH.

"Jesus came preaching the kingdom of God, what came was the Church"

E. LOISY.

Loisy's statement has become famous, but for the wrong reason. He meant it to be a positive statement, but it has in fact been taken as implying that somehow, the Church was not quite what Jesus had intended. Jesus came preaching the kingdom of God and the imminent end, not the Church.

In fact many contemporary exegetes regard the failure of the Parousia to materialize soon as a constitutive factor in the Lukan conception of the Church. For the early Christians awaited the Parousia expectantly, having no need for any institution, any "Church" at all, as "You do not write a history of the Church if you are expecting the end of the world to come any day." (1) In fact "the imminence of the End has ceased to play any part in Luke." (2)

With the loss of such an expectation a work like Luke-Acts can be written. This writing is regarded as the acceptance of an institutionalized "early Catholic" Church. As eschatology is removed, so it is claimed, the present institution becomes all important, a substitute for the eschatological expectation.

However, it is not all clear that this is in fact the position. The imminent expectation of the Parousia does not necessarily mean that a Church and Church organisation are superfluous. Some interval between Christ's ascension and the Parousia must have been expected, or else why did the Church continue to preach the Gospel or Paul embark on his extensive missionary journeys? No matter how long or short this interval was expected to be, its length does not necessarily make the existence of a Church irrelevant. This Luke's eschatology must be examined as well as his conception of Jesus' mission, ^{to see} whether it comprehended the founding of a new community.

When Luke is in fact examined, far from eschatology being of little concern, it

is seen to occupy a substantial section of his work. He quotes the words of John the Baptist : "Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees" (LK.3:9), words that clearly imply coming judgment. He also states the Baptist's words that Christ's winnowing fork is in His hand, to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire" (Lk 3:17). He also sees the coming of the Kingdom in the person of Christ, when he states that Christ says "The Kingdom of God has come near to you (Luke 10:9). Further, when the messengers^s Jesus is addressing have their message rejected, they are to say: "Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off against you; nevertheless know this, that the kingdom of God has come near " (Lk 10:11). Neither of these references to the kingdom are found in the Matthean parallels, a fact which scarcely shows that Luke has little interest in eschatology.

Then of course there is the material in Lk 21:5-37 and 17:20- 18:8 which shows that Luke was interested in the End and clearly saw a period of time between the Ascension and the Fall of Jerusalem and the End. Jesus had already spoken of the destruction of the Temple (Lk 19:42-44) of the desolation of Jerusalem (Lk 19:42-44) and of the unexpectedness of the End (Lk 12: 35-45), but these events had not yet been related to the coming of the Son of Man. So, in Chapter 21:5-37 Luke presents an answer to the question of the relationship of the End to the fall of Jerusalem. Jesus, who is still teaching in the Temple (in Mk 13:3 Jesus is addressing the disciples on ^{the mount} Mt. of Olives; this shows Luke's stress on the place of Jerusalem and the Temple) about its destruction (Lk 19:42-44; 21: 5-6), is asked when "these things shall be" (Lk 21:7) and what the sign will be. Jesus replies by warning his listeners about speculating about the End, as to how and when it will come about. In his reply the destruction of the Temple seems to be separated from the End. For in the section dealing with the coming of the Son of Man, Luke records words not found in the other Gospels, "Now when



these things begin to take place, look up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near "(Lk 21:28). He, that is Luke, seems to distinguish more exactly those parts of the speech that refer to the fall of Jerusalem and those that deal with the coming of Christ, than the other Gospels do.

⁽⁴⁾ Ellis suggests that the narrative in chapter 21 falls into "four sign sayings", the first warning against the teaching of false prophets and wars, which do not necessarily imply that the End is near (Lk 21:8-11). The second states that before the End comes the disciples will be subject to persecution (21:12-19), the third that the surrounding of Jerusalem is a sign of its prophesied fate (21:20-24) and finally, the fourth "sign saying" warns that there will be cosmic disturbances heralding the coming of the Son of Man and thus the approach of final redemption (Lk 21:25-28). Then practical advice follows, on how the Christian should conduct himself so as not to be taken unawares when the Son of Man comes. Further, all four of these "sign-sayings" refer to the End, but from different perspectives. The first two deal with the whole period from the resurrection onwards, while Lk 21:20-24 moves from the judgement that falls upon the Jews and Jerusalem and Lk 21:25-28 deals with the cosmic signs of that End. That this is the case, that a clear distinction is drawn by Luke between the events surrounding the fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia, is seen by Lk 21:12a("But before all this" - referring to V.11 back) and the close parallelism between verses 11 and 25 which refer to another, cosmic event, apart from the occurrences narrated in verses 12b-24.

It seems certain that Luke did know and use Mark 13 as a basis for his work, especially in the light of the almost identical wording in Lk 21:5-11a, 16f, 21a, 23a and 29-33 with Mark's account. He has, further, omitted those sections of Mark that he has used already (Lk 17:23 = Mk 13:2P-33/Lk 12:39-48 = Mk 12:35-36). It is sometimes suggested that Luke had another source here as he, very oddly, leaves out Mark's references to the Gentile mission and the gift of the Spirit

(Lk 13:10, ~~11~~). However this omission could be accounted for by the fact that this is given great attention in the accounts of the exaltation and the subsequent mission of the Church.

Luke has modified his source in that the signs of the End are not presented as some apocalyptic scheme, as in Mark, but rather as events that witness to the reality of the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. It is this which gives hope in the present suffering (Lk 21:29-32). He carefully separates the persecutions (Lk 21:12a) from the apocalyptic signs; death indeed can intervene before the End (Lk 21:16, ~~17~~). The destruction of Jerusalem is seen more as a fulfilment of "all that is written" than as the action of God, at the Parousia for instance. Clear reference is made to an End, separate from the fate of Jerusalem: "until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Lk 21:24); and, the disciples must be vigilant" lest .. that day come upon you", for when the cosmic disturbances occur they must "look up and raise (their) heads, because (their) redemption is drawing near" (Lk 21:28). This clear distinction between the judgement of Jerusalem and the signs of the Parousia is indeed "Luke's .. own peculiar contribution to New Testament Eschatology." (5)

Similarly, Lk 17:20ff shows, by its modification of tradition and addition of material, that Luke was interested in eschatology. The passage states that although the Kingdom of God is present, the Son of Man is coming again, a coming that cannot be predicted by signs. It consists of three closely related sections (6) (Lk 17:20-21; 22-37; 18:1-8) which are set in the context of teaching about the necessity of faith (Lk 17:5 - 18:8) in situations where the Jews have failed to respond to the Gospel (Lk 17:11-19) and the End has not yet come (Lk 17:20-21; 18:8). The first section contains the dialogue with the Pharisees about the coming of the Kingdom of God. Jesus' answer to the Pharisees that the "Kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν) is in Luke only. Here Jesus is recorded as dealing with one of the central concerns of Jewish apocalyptic,

the time and place of the Kingdom. As the copula (is) is not expressed in Aramaic, this answer refers either to a present or more probably, to a future event.⁽⁷⁾ The second section, containing teaching addressed to the disciples, warns of false teaching concerning the signs of the End. The End, when it comes, will be sudden and consequently the disciples must be constantly on the watch. Here, only Luke has the reference to the days of Lot, although Matthew (24:37f) has the material, altered though, dealing with the conditions of the End times, "in the days of Noah" (there is no Markan parallel). Matthew also has the command not to come down from the housetops, but in the context of the destruction of Jerusalem (24:11), whereas Luke connects it with the Parousia. Matthew refers to two in a field and two grinding a mill (24:40f), whereas Luke refers to two grinding and to "two in one bed" (Lk 17-34). The third section, the story of the unjust judge, stressing the vindication of God's people when the End comes, only appears in Luke. Thus it is clear that Luke had an interest in and was concerned about eschatology. This is not to deny that Luke has, by his clear delineation of the events surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem and of those surrounding the End, removed the Parousia to some far and distant future. It must not be forgotten that Luke also records Jesus' words to the effect that " .. this generation will not pass away till all has taken place." (Lk 21:32). The exact meaning of those oft-debated words is not our concern. Rather, it is hoped that it has been shown that a statement such as "the imminence of the end has ceased to play any part in Luke"⁽⁸⁾ is a manifest misreading of Luke.

In the light of Luke's teaching concerning the imminence of the End and his interest in eschatology, how did He view Jesus's mission? Was Jesus envisaged as the founder of a new community or not? The word "Church" (ἐκκλησία) only occurs twice in the Gospels, and then in the same passage in Matthew, where Jesus is recorded as saying that "on this rock I will build my Church" (Matt.16:18).

This has seemed to many commentators to be an early insertion into the account of the Confession, evidence of early attempts to justify a hierarchical Church. (9)

However, if we avoid giving the term $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ the meanings it has accrued and translate it, as it probably should be, as "people of God" or "community" (10) much of the difficulty in accepting the genuineness of these verses is removed.

However, those verses are only found in Matthew, and not in the Luken parallel. What is common to the synoptic Gospels is the record of Jesus going about proclaiming the Kingdom of God by His words and actions (Mk 1:15 Lk 3:17-19).

There is much debate over "presentist", "futurist" or "presentist-futurist" eschatology and as it is not within the scope of this essay to deal with this issue in detail, it will be taken that Jesus in Himself brought about the Kingdom of God on earth, which yet awaits its consummation in the future.

The "Kingdom of God" does not so much denote a kingdom or area as express the fact of God's actual rule. The expression as such does not appear in the Old Testament, but the understanding of God as ruling is certainly present (Exod 15:18). The book of Daniel does in fact speak of a universal kingdom (Dan. 2:44; 7:27) that God will bring into being and give to His people. In Rabbinic literature the term "Kingdom of God" is regarded as a way of expressing God's reign, as in the saying "to take the yoke of the kingdom of God upon oneself", which means to "recognise God as King."

The kingdom is the rule of God over his creation, which rule can be acknowledged and accepted by men. The rule of God then implies the existence of those over whom this rule is exercised. Jesus, by His words and works of healing was regarded as the Messianic inaugurator of the Kingdom, as the one in whom God acted. Thus Jesus is recorded as saying that "... if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you". (Lk 11:20).

The term "finger of God" is used in the Old Testament in contexts describing God's act of Creation (Ps. 8:5), His act of redemption out of Egypt (Exod 8:19) and of the giving of the Law (Exod. 31:18). Thus Jesus is claiming that He casts

out demons by the same power, that of God. When messengers from John the Baptist came enquiring if Jesus is " .. he who is to come" (Lk 7:20), Jesus does not directly reply to the question, but performs a healing miracle and then asks the messengers to look at His works. Here Jesus is claiming to fulfil the Messianic promises of such passages as Isaiah 28:18f, 35:5f and 61:1f. The kingdom then, is actually present in the life and deeds of Jesus. However, this is not enough, for Jesus then goes on to praise John, who is seen as the fulfilment of the promise that one would prepare the way of the Messiah (Malachi 3:1). Further,⁽¹²⁾ in Lk 16:16 a contrast is drawn between the time before and the time after John the Baptist, a time marked by men "entering the Kingdom of God violently". Yet, even references to "entering the Kingdom violently" do not clearly establish the fact of a community, for, out of the sixty synoptic sayings and parables in which Jesus speaks of the Kingdom, the concept of community is only prominent in about one sixth of them.⁽¹³⁾ In Luke, community is suggested by only two of these passages, that is, 7:28 ("yet he who is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he.") and 16:16 ("the Good News of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every-one enters it violently").

Other passages in Luke need to be examined, particularly those in Luke 13 that deal with the Kingdom. In Lk 13:18,19 a comparison is drawn by Jesus between the Kingdom of God and a seed which, when planted, grew into a tree, upon whose branches the birds of the air nest. The purpose of this saying, together with the one on heaven in the next two verses, is to describe the growth of the Kingdom of God from small and humble origins into something extremely large (this is the reason for the extremes in sizes in the sayings.) Now, in Daniel 4:12 a tree with branches is used to describe the greatness of Nebuchadnezzar and his vassals. In Ezekiel 31:3-6, the birds that settle on the branches of a tree represent peoples dependent on the king. The verb used in Luke 13:19 (κατασκηνοῦν) is a technical eschatological term (cf. Ac 2:26) for the incorporation of the

(14)

Gentiles into the people of God. As regards the reference to the "Leaven" in Lk 13:20,21, the people of God are likened to "dough and a "lump" in Romans 11:16. Further on, in Lk 13: 22-30, the matter of entry into the Kingdom of God is dealt with. In response to a question about the number of the saved, Jesus warns of those who have heard His message, have even been with Him, but have not responded. This opportunity to respond will not last for ever (Lk 13:25-28).

The Jews will be cast out and the Gentiles, those from "the North and South, East and West" will be at the Messianic banquet instead (Lk 13-29,30).⁽¹⁵⁾

These passages reflect the current idea that, in the last days, the Messiah would gather His community together. The Messiah is to be seen in terms of the reign of God, for the message of the reign of God is one of salvation for man (Lk 2:30-32).⁽¹⁶⁾

This saving message is primarily directed to Israel, but in the face of Israel's hardness of heart and rejection of the Gospel, it is also directed to the nations. Thus the concept of the Messiah and the reign of God demand, as their correlate, the existence of a people, a people that consists of those who have responded to the message of the Kingdom and are awaiting the consummation, the "sitting at table in the Kingdom of God" (Lk 13:29).

A Messianic community is envisaged in the vision recorded in Daniel 7, where the "one like to a son of man" (Dan.7:18) is later likened to the "saints of the most high". Significantly, the title "Son of Man" with one exception (in Stephen's speech Acts 7:56) occurs only in the Gospels, and then only by Jesus of Himself.⁽¹⁷⁾ It seems likely that, in Judaism, the term "son of man" was regarded as a description of the eschatological, messianic bringer of salvation. Jesus used the term to refer to His present work, of His future coming on the clouds (Lk 9:26, 17:24,30; 21:27) "to bring redemption near" and, particularly, with reference to His suffering that was to be accomplished in Jerusalem (Lk 9:28; 18:31-34). It is of great significance, in the Light of the close identity between the figure of "one like unto the Son of Man" and the "saints

of the most high" in Daniel, that Luke stresses that Jesus' followers are called to be with Him and to share in His trials and sufferings (Lk 14:26,⁽¹⁸⁾ 22:28).

A new community is also suggested by the parable of the barren fig tree (Lk 13:6-9). In this account Jesus stresses that repentance is essential and that the Jews still have time to repent. The parable reinforces Jesus' message by describing a fig tree that, although it has not borne fruit for three years (a reference to the time of Jesus' ministry?), is given a period of grace through the intercession of the gardener. The fig tree is of course, a well-known symbol of Israel (Hosea 9:10; Jeremiah 8:13; 24:1-8; Micah 7:1) and by its use here the danger of judgement falling on Israel for her failure to repent, is graphically portrayed. It is in fact possible that Jesus is here actually referring to his own mission to Israel, that he is the gardener who asks for a delay in cutting down the tree. Judgement though, is near, and the reference to "cutting down" (Lk 13:7) does recall the Baptist's words that those Jews who relied on works and race without repentance are like a tree and "even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down" (Lk 3:9). The natural Israel will be visited with judgement and cut away; and in this account of judgement there is the suggestion that another people will take Israel's place (Lk 13:7 in the words "why should it use up the ground").

A community is clearly implied in the saying of Jesus "Fear not, little flock, for it is your father's pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Lk 12:32), in the phrase "little flock", Jesus is warning his disciples, the "little flock", not to be anxious about earthly things, for they have a father who will look after them.

The figure of a "flock" is used in Old Testament contexts⁽²¹⁾ (Micah 5:4; Isaiah 40:11; Ezekiel 34:12-24); Psalms of Solomon 17:45) which describe the messianic king as the one tending the flock of God. The flock is particularly regarded as the "remnant", those who have been faithful to God. So, "in the two prophecies of the exile

(Ezekiel and Deutero - Isaiah the Remnant doctrine bifurcates: and in all later religious teaching, where it is present, it takes the form either of a saved Remnant or a saving Remnant". This ^{COMMENT} ~~quote~~ describes well the nature of the new community as Luke envisages it, for mission, the spreading of the saving Good News by the saved is a primary theme of this work, particularly of Acts. It is also an illustration of the purpose of Jesus' life and work, that of being the saviour of His people (Lk 2:30). This is well shown by another story with pastoral imagery, that of the parable of the Lost Sheep (Lk 15:4-7) which Jesus uses to justify the Pharisees' charges that he "receives sinners and eats with them" (Lk 15:2). For God, the "shepherd" in terms of the parable, does not desire that anyone should be lost. Jesus' mission then, is one of gathering the lost, the sinners and tax-collectors into the Kingdom of God (Lk 13:22-30).

The existence of such a community of repentant sinners is the goal of John the Baptist's ministry, for the essence of his preaching was "baptism and repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Lk 3:3). Luke's stress on true repentance is echoed throughout Luke's work ($\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ Lk 3:3-8; 5:32; 15:7; 24:47; Acts 5:31; 11:18; 13:24; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20), but only used once in Mark: Mk 1:4 and twice in Matthew ~~3:8,11~~ the verb $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\epsilon\omega$ Lk 10:13; 11:32; 13:3,5; 15:7,10; 16:30; 17:3,4 Acts 2:18, 3:19; 8:22; 17:30; 26:20 but only twice in Mark; ~~1:15~~ 6:12, and five times in Matthew ~~3:2~~ 3:2; 4:17; 11:20,21; 12:41). Their repentance would be seen by their works. Luke sees John's activity as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, in terms of the Isaianic forerunner who prepares the way of the Messiah. John, by calling for repentance is preparing the way, by having a repentant people prepared for the coming of the Messiah. Luke is the only Synoptic writer to quote in full from Isaiah the words: "... and all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (Lk 3:7; Mk 1:3 Matt. 3:3), words that are taken up again in Acts 2:17 where in a quotation from Joel used to describe the significance of Pentecost, John indeed sees his baptism as a preparation for the "one greater than I", who "will baptize with Spirit and fire" (Lk 3:16). The words "the salvation of God"

are used at the end of Acts of the Gentiles (28:28). Thus John's ministry was fulfilled in that of Jesus and the Church, in the gathering of a community of repentant Jews and Gentiles. That John's mission resulted in the establishment of a community is evident from the request that Jesus's disciples make, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples" (Lk 11:1). This request shows that Jesus' disciples, like John's regarded themselves as a clearly defined group that needed a distinguishing prayer. The disciples' request was not so much one of how to pray, but rather for a prayer to mark them^{out} as belonging to a specific community. Thus the disciples at least regarded themselves as Jesus' community.

Luke sees the choice of the Twelve as of great significance. Unlike the other Evangelists, he often refers to the twelve as apostles (Lk 9:10; 11:59; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10)^{and} only he records Jesus naming them "Apostles" (cf. Mk. 3:14, Matt. 10:2). Luke describes how, after prayer, Jesus calls His disciples and chooses twelve, whom he calls Apostles. This pattern of prayer and choice is reflected in the life of the ^{early} Holy Christian Community, as in the account of the choosing of Matthias (Acts 1:24-26), in the sending of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:2) and in their appointing of presbyters, (Acts 14:23).

The Apostles' role as constitutive members of the new community is clearly brought out in the Lukan account of Jesus' words at the Last Supper (Lk 22:31-38). Jesus gathers the Apostles around Him as he prepares to celebrate the Passover (Lk.22:14). It is stressed that the consummation of this celebration will only be in the Kingdom of God (Lk 22:16,18,30). However, the Apostles are those ^{to} whom Jesus has appointed the kingdom "that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Lk 22:30). Participation in the Lord's Supper entails obedience and faithfulness. Thus Luke changes the position of Jesus' prediction of Judas's betrayal, for Mk 14:18f (Matt 26:21f) places it before the Supper, Luke afterwards. This is because Luke cannot conceive of one participating in the Lord's Supper with the deliberate intention of betraying Jesus.

Obviously then for Luke the Lord's Supper, as practised by the Church, was a manifestation of constancy in trials (Lk 22:28) and of a fellowship of love (Lk 22:24-27). The position of this last incident (Lk 22:24-27) is very significant. Jesus has joined in the Passover prior to His suffering (v 15), he has looked forward to the consummation of the Kingdom (vv 16,18), and He has identified the broken bread with his body (verse 19). The account of the supper is immediately followed by the prediction of the paradosis by Judas (vv 21-23), and the dispute among the disciples for pre-eminence, contrasted once more with the Σιλωβια of their Lord (v.27) and followed by the promise of rewards to those "who have persevered with me in my trials" (verse 28). The whole series of incidents is recorded by Luke in such a way as to contrast the attitude of the treacherous and faithful disciples ~~και των μαθητων~~ of every age, and not simply as a historical record of a single event. Once again Luke seems to indicate that the death of Jesus is to create a community of those who are united in their loyalty to Christ and who will share with him at the Messianic banquet at the eschaton (22:29f), where the reference links these verses to the Last Supper (vv 16,18), which is seen as the anticipation of the Eucharist.⁽²⁵⁾

The Twelve are seen by Luke as the guarantee that the community gathered by Jesus is indeed the eschatological community of the End, which awaits the fulfilment of the promises made to God's people. It is noteworthy that in the Judaism of the period, the belief prevailed that only two and a half tribes survived the exile and that at the End the other nine and one half would be brought in from the world. The twelve then are indeed the eschatological sign, that God is calling out a people for His name.

Thus there is sufficient evidence to show that Luke regarded Jesus as calling into being a community of faithful disciples. It is the calling and constituting of this community that must now be examined.

CHAPTER 5: THE RESTORATION OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD (ISRAEL).

"As Acts unfolds the reader discovers that at each critical chapter the Lord $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ τοῦ πνεύματος employs extraordinary means to instruct the Church in the universality and unconditionality of the Gospel ... the Church learns the nature of the Gospel (and of the Holy Spirit) as promissory, free and universal, apart from the Law ... Thus Luke-Acts becomes an object lesson in the nature of the Church and its mission". (1)

The most striking feature of Acts' portrayal of the people of God is Luke's seeming reluctance to apply the Old Testament descriptions of the people of Israel to the new Christian community. "The Saints" is used sparingly, in 9:13,32,41; 26:10 and then only in accounts of Paul's conversion, when his persecution of the new community is being described. Even more striking is Luke's use of $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$. $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a common Septuagintal designation of the people of God and Luke has more instances of this word in his double work than in any of the other gospels or even Paul (who only uses it eleven times, and then in paraenetic contact, in Old Testament quotations). While $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ can refer to a crowd, (a Jewish one at that)⁽²⁾ or the nations, Luke uses it particularly in the signification as Israel. This can be seen in the contrast that is drawn between people ($\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$) and the nations, Gentiles ($\xi\theta\nu\eta$) (Lk 2:32 Ac 26:17,23;28:27,28) and in the qualifying words that often go with the word $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ itself ($\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ Ἰσραηλ Acts 4:10; 13:24; $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ αὐτοῦ Lk 21:21; Acts 28:26,27; $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ αὐτοῦ Ἰου Acts 13:17; $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ τῶν Ἰουδαίων Acts 12:11). $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ then is used by Luke in its essentially religious signification, as denoting the people of God, Israel. This is in keeping with his understanding of the history of redemption, of the coming of Jesus Christ, for Jesus Christ is pre-eminently a Jew, who is the fulfilment of Jewish hopes. Thus, in the Birth Narratives (Luke 1,2), Jesus' birth by the action of the Holy Spirit is presented as the eschatological event, for which the faithful in Israel have waited and longed. The Old Testament promises to

Abraham and to David have found their fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The accounts of Mary meeting Elizabeth and of the various prophecies given by those who are closely attached to the Temple all serve to stress the Jews' place in the history of God's saving action.

John the Baptist is particularly seen as the link between Jesus and the Old Testament. He is the last of the prophets, whose task (Ezek.1:13-17; 3: is to prepare Israel to meet the Messiah. His mission emphasizes the fact that Israel has been unfaithful and needs to be called back to obedience (1:17,76,77) and that the Old Testament is incomplete, for it looks forward to Him whom John will proclaim. So, when Mary meets Elizabeth, Luke records that "John leapt in his mother's womb" (1:41) thus signifying the importance of Jesus.

Zachariah is a Temple priest, devout and faithful, and to him is given revelation and promise that he will have a son who will prepare the Messiah's way. After John's birth his father is filled with the Holy Spirit and prophecies, telling how these events that are taking place are the fulfilment of Jewish expectations, of the promises to David (1:69) and Abraham (1:73). Likewise Simeon gives ~~promises~~^{Praises} to God when he takes Jesus in his arms (2:28f) and Anna (Lk 2:36f) likewise.

The characters present in the account of the birth as shown, are devout Israelites "seeking the consolation of Israel" (Lk 2:25). Luke, by presenting the births of John and Jesus in the context of Old Testament piety and by centring the narrative around the Temple and Jerusalem seeks to show that the Old Testament and its institutions clearly point to and witness to Jesus Christ as their fulfilment.

Jesus is thus presented primarily as the fulfilment of Jewish hope and prophecy. His mission is to the people of Israel first and foremost. This is recorded in the Gospel, which devotes about one third of its contents (the central section 9:51 - 19:44) to describe Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, where the climax of his

ministry is revealed, the completion of the salvation promised to Abraham (1:32,54,72). The events in Jerusalem are presented as the climax, not only (3) of the Life of Jesus, but also of God's covenantal activity with the Jewish people. The elements of Judgement and rejection present in the Markan account of the Entry and Cleansing of the Temple are much reduced by Luke. He completely omits the Markan account of the cursing of the fig tree, and shortens the account of the cleansing of the Temple. The Entry into Jerusalem is seen as a regal event, the group of followers in Mk 11:8-10 having become a multitude, praising God and acknowledging the present Jesus (19:37-40). Luke records the cleansing of the Temple but removes from it the Markan element of rejection. Rather, for Luke it marks the possessing of the Temple by Jesus, who uses it as a place for giving daily teaching (19:47; 20:1,9,45). The temple then, correctly understood is the institution which must give way to Jesus and his teaching.

However, at the same time that Luke portrays the person and mission of Jesus as the fulfilment of Messianic hope, he also clearly reveals the division that this caused among God's people Israel. This division, this refusal of God's own people to recognise his salvation is prophesied in the very Birth narratives themselves. Zachariah himself has to break with past custom and call his son John (1:61-67), Mary in her song of praise speaks of the removal of rulers, the putting down of the mighty, the calling of those of low degree, the filling of the hungry, the sending away of the rich (2:53-54), for "his mercy is on those who fear him"(Lk 1:52) Likewise Simeon speaks of the "rising and fall of many in Israel" (2:24). All words which stress the necessity of obedience to God, an obedience which it was John's mission to restore. John's mission itself assumes the failure of God's people (Lk 3:7, 7-9) their need of repentance and obedience (Lk 3:3, 4-6) in fact, the calling together of a new, repentant and obedient people.(4)

It is in the context of the birth narratives, with their joint themes of fulfilment and division, that Luke hints at the forming of a new people of God, one that

includes even the Gentiles. In Luke 1:17 Luke states that John "will go before him in the Spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared." This prophecy, based on the Old Testament book of Malachi (3:3, 22) and Sirach 48:6, ~~which~~ shows that John's ministry was one of reconciliation. The acceptance of John's message will produce a new generation of children who possess the wisdom of the just, children who could (and would) come from among the gentiles (Lk. 3:8)(5)

It is important to note that Luke does not portray a total rejection of the Gospel by the Jewish people, but rather the division within Israel that the message brings. Luke sees only one Israel, the one to which the promises were made in Abraham and David and in which these very promises are now being fulfilled in the life of John the Baptist, Jesus and the restored Israel.

The promises are fulfilled in the restored Israel for it is to Israel that the promises were made. Jews who repent and believe are part of the true, restored Israel. From the beginning, the Gospel is for the Jews (up to C.10 of Acts) and this brings division within Israel itself, between those who accept the message and thus remain in the restored Israel and those who reject it and thus exclude themselves from Israel. In Acts, Luke never speaks of a "New Israel" (6), because for him there is only one Israel. "Israel" is never used as a term for a Church that includes both Jews and Gentiles (7). Israel continues to be a reference to the Jews, and "Gentile" the term for non-Jews. (Certainly, while the terms "New Israel" or the understanding of a "Tertium Genus" are not present in Luke's work, this is not to deny that they are present in germinal form). The Gospel then is an intensely Jewish affair, it is the fulfilment of Jewish hope and expectation; first promised to Abraham, but a fulfilment that also includes the Gentiles, as Lk 1:17 indicates (e.g. also Lk 2:29-32; Ac 2:39; 3:25; 13:47). This understanding is justified by an examination of the only two references in Acts where $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ is used of the community that is not completely Jewish. In

Acts 15 James replies to the Apostolic council's queries by relating the entry of the Gentiles under Peter's ministry. This event occurred under divine guidance (15:12) and is in fact the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (15:10-18). In this context James speaks of how "God first visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people (λαόν) for his name". If, as has been suggested⁽⁸⁾ the background to those verses is not Dt. 4:2; 7:4 Exod. 19:5; 23:22, but rather Ezekiel 36:24,28 and Zachariah 2:11("and many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people") James's argument becomes clear. He sees the conversion of Cornelius as the fulfilment of the Jewish hope of a conversion of Gentiles who would join the restored Israel in the new age. James's words in Ac 15:16 & 17 are also significant. In verse 16 the ⁽⁹⁾quotation comes from Amos 9:11f (LXX) where the literal reference to the "tent of David" refers to the restoration of the undivided kingdom of Israel, as in the reign of David. Verse 17 continues by referring to the presence of Gentiles in the Church as a further fulfilment of prophecy. However this depends on the LXX reading, for the Masoretic text states "that they (Israel) may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations which are called by my name". Not "that the rest of men may seek the Lord."

So it is stated that, in addition to the people to whom God gave the promises, God has also "taken from the Gentiles a people for His name". Likewise in Ac.18:10 the reference is to many who will become Christians in Corinth, meaning not so much a "big nation" but "a great group of people"⁽¹⁰⁾. In these passages then, the only ones where λαός refers to others outside Israel, the conversion of the Gentiles is seen as the fulfilment of God's promise, a theme that is prominent in Lk (Lk 2:29-32 Ac.1:8; 2:39; 3:25; 15:47).

In line with this interpretation, it is incorrect to hold that Luke portrays the Jews as rejecting the Gospel, this rejection leading directly to the Gentile mission. Rather, as has been noted, and will now be examined in detail, Luke sees the

Church as the restored Israel, in whom the promises are fulfilled, promises which also include the Gentiles.

It is essential then to Luke's purpose that the promises are shown to have been fulfilled in Israel first. Thus, in accordance with his purpose of showing the restoring of Israel in the fulfilment of prophecy, Luke has distributed accounts of the conversions of Jews in large numbers throughout the whole of Acts (2:41,47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:1,7; 9:42f; 12:24f; 13:43f, 14:1f; 17:1; 21:20). Thus, for instance, in the first part of Acts, that is, up to the account of the Conversion of Cornelius (10,11) and the Apostolic Council (C.15), the descriptions of Jewish conversions increase from 3,000 (2:41) to 5,000 (4:4) to the statements that "still even more were added (5:14)⁽¹¹⁾ and that "the number of the disciples increased greatly in Jerusalem, and a great many of the priests were obedient to the faith (6:7). Until indeed Luke can report in Ac. 21:20 "you see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed". This concern of Luke's is also revealed in the way in which many of the conversions are described as occurring in Jerusalem among the most devout Jews and indeed included priests (2:41,47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:1,7; 21:20).

Luke shows that it is the most devout (2:42; 18:8; 21:20) Jews, the priests (6:7) indeed the "noble" Jews of Berea (17:11) that accept the Gospel. He seeks to demonstrate that the Jewish Christian Church is indeed truly Israel. This is shown right in the beginning of the Gospel, where its characters are all depicted as devout Jews, believing and hoping for the restoration of Israel (Lk.1:5,9,27,28, 46-55, 64, 68-79) and throughout Acts (Ac.1:6;2:46;3:1;5:2;10:4;11:2;15:1;16:3;21:20) Paul is seen as a loyal Jew, who is persecuted, not so much because of his adherence to "the way" but for his support of the very Pharisaic concept of a resurrection from the dead (23:6; 24:15;21; 26:6,27; 28:20). Even the Jews in the Diaspora, the result of Paul's missions, do not become a different group, but are closely related to the Synagogues (26:11f). The Christian Jews belong to Israel, a fact further brought out by Luke's use of *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* He does

indeed refer to Christians as brethren, but typically, it is a peculiarly Jewish form of address. ⁽¹²⁾ "On the other hand, the address "brothers" for Gentiles is consistently avoided (2:29,37; 7:2; 13:26,38; 22:1,6; 28:11). Thus for example, in his address in the Synagogue at Pisidian Antioch, Paul speaks of "Brethren, sons of the family of Abraham, and those among you that fear God" (13:26), clearly distinguishing between the Israelites and God-fearing Gentiles. Here "the designation "brothers" is more than a polite address, and can .. be applied only to Israelites. Hereby the solidarity and inner connection in the people of God is expressed. To be a brother means to belong to the family of Abraham, to share in the promises, ἀδελφός means Israelites (1:16; 3:12; 7:23,25; 13:26).⁽¹³⁾ Even when Luke describes the conversion of Gentiles, for instance Cornelius, he is described as "a devout man, who feared God with all his household, gave alms liberally to the people, and prayed constantly to God" (Ac. 10:2), that is, his Jewishness is stressed. Likewise the description of "Jews and devout converts to Judaism" (13:43), of Greeks (in the Synagogue (14:) who believed, and a great many of the devout Greeks (17:4,12) believed. Thus Luke shows that many Jews believed and the Gentiles who were added were, with exceptions, devout and God-fearing.

At the same time as he describes the great advances of the Gospel among the Jews and the Gentiles, Luke portrays opposition coming largely from the Jews. This pattern of acceptance and rejection is rooted in Luke's work. It is prophesied in the Birth Narratives, in the statement that "he has put down the mighty from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree" (Lk 1:15; 1:51) and "this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel and for a sign that is spoken against" (Lk 2:34). Particularly significant is the account of Jesus' sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-30) which by describing the listeners' wrathful reaction (verses 28-29), prefigures the Passion itself and indeed the progress of the

Church's mission in Jerusalem and in the Diaspora. It is also notable that the "central section" (9:51; ~~18:14~~) is cast in the form of a journey, undertaken by Jesus and his disciples, which reveals that Jesus' (and thus by implication the disciples also) mission includes suffering.⁽¹⁴⁾ Likewise, in Acts, the disciples mission is marked by great successes accompanied by persecution. The results of Peter's speech in c.3 is the conversion of 5,000, and persecution by the Jewish Leaders (4:1). After 5:14 and 6:7 both references to the great growth of the Church, there follows trial, imprisonment (5:17) and the stoning of Stephen (6:7) respectively. At Pisidian Antioch the mission results in both conversions and blessings (Ac. 13:42,45f) as at Iconium (14:2) and Berea (17:12). Luke shows that while many Jews accept the Gospel, others reject it and lead opposition to the Christian mission. In particular, Luke seeks to show that it is not the Jewish people as a whole who oppose the gospel, but rather some of their leaders, in particular the Sadducees (24:1; 5:17f; ~~5:17f~~) (who of course did not believe in a resurrection). This persecution marked both the mission of Jesus and that of His disciples. Persecution is indeed linked to the gentile mission (after all the persecution at Jerusalem does cause the Church to scatter) but is not its cause. Rather, the Gentile mission is the result of the fulfilment of prophecy to Israel, of the restoration of Israel. This is why, in spite of the command in Ac.1:8 the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius and his household (God fearers none the less) are only reached later in the narrative. This is not the result of laxity or failure to understand on the part of the Apostles, but rather part of Luke's plan. Luke first seeks to demonstrate that the promises have indeed been fulfilled in Israel and that Israel is being restored. Only when this identity between the restored Israel and the Christian community has been clearly established does Luke describe the inclusion of the first Gentiles.⁽¹⁵⁾ Part of this process of restoration is the inclusion of the Samaritans. In the Lukan perspective, it is unlikely that the Samaritan mission is viewed as a half-way house" between the Jewish and the Gentile mission (Ac.10 onwards).

In fact, it is not even quite correct to speak of a Gentile mission in the latter part of Acts, because c.12-28 describes, not so much a Gentile mission as the mission to the Jews⁽¹⁶⁾ of the Diaspora. The Gentile mission as such really only begins at Ac.28.

In other New Testament writers, such as John and Matthew, it is clear that the Samaritans are not regarded as Jews.⁽¹⁷⁾ However, in Luke, more material is devoted to the Samaritans than anywhere else in the New Testament. Luke has a parable (Lk.10:25-37) and a miracle (Lk 17:11-19) dealing with Samaritans, as well as the account of the rejection by the Samaritans in Lk.9:55f. Then of course there is the lengthy account of the Samaritan mission in Ac.8. Significantly for Luke's view is the fact that both the Gospel miracle and parable come from Luke's special material (L) and the account of the rejection (9:55f) is inserted into the Markan framework at this point.

The Samaritans are also mentioned at important points in Luke's narrative, such as Luke 9:55f (beginning of "Journey" to Jerusalem), Ac.1:8 (missionary mandate) Ac.8:1; 9:31 (summary of Church's prayers before the Peter-Cornelius episode) and 15:3 (Apostolic Council).

Luke, it must be noted, assumes that his readers know about the Samaritans, who they are and what their customs are, for he nowhere gives explanatory comments such as we find in John's Gospel (John 4:9; cf 4:20; 8:48). He clearly does not regard them as Gentiles, for the account of the mission comes before that of the Cornelius episode (Ac.10), which Luke presents as the coming of the Gospel to the Gentiles.⁽¹⁸⁾ Acts 8 has a place in Luke's purpose, Samaria is mentioned in Ac.1:8; 9:31 and at 15:3 and Luke connects the Jerusalem Apostles with the mission (Ac.8:14).

That Luke does not regard the Samaritans as non-Jewish is evident from a comparison of Acts 8 with the Cornelius episode in Acts 10. As a Jew, Peter is severely criticized for even associating with Gentiles (11:1-3, 18), who are uncircumcised and unclean." He has done something unheard of (ἄθεμιτόν) by associating with a Non-Jew (ἄλλοφύλω) (10:28) because a non-Jew is impure (10:28b).⁽¹⁹⁾

No such reaction is noted when the gospel is accepted in Samaria. Philip preaches the word and two Apostles, Peter and John, come down from Jerusalem and after laying on of hands, the Samaritans receive the Holy Spirit (8:14f).⁽²⁰⁾ Rather than regarding the Samaritans as non-Jews, Luke seems to view them as Jews⁽²¹⁾ who are not Orthodox. This explains the story in Lk 9:51-56 when Jesus is rejected by the Samaritans - because he is going to Jerusalem, because he is an orthodox Jew (to his father's house Lk 2:49). This is a significant episode, portraying as it does the Samaritans' enmity towards Jerusalem (9:53 because his face was set towards Jerusalem), particularly in the light of the important role Jerusalem and the Temple play in Luke's theology.⁽²²⁾ The centrality of Jerusalem is crucial for Jesus's claim to be the Jewish Messiah. Thus for Luke the Samaritans are Jews who have strayed from orthodoxy, but by the preaching of the gospel they are reunited with Israel centred in Jerusalem. This is the significance of the two Apostles' visit, for it is they who are the eschatological rulers of the restored Israel (Lk 22:29 Ac. 11:54), who acknowledge the acceptance of Samaria into the restored Israel. Thus, at the Apostolic Council James can say that the Gentiles have now been included into the restored Israel (15:16f). Thus it seems this far, that Luke's eschatology is extremely "Israeli"-orientated, for the centre of his thought is the restored Israel, centred in Jerusalem, to whom the Gentiles are added. This understanding of a restored Israel is clearly revealed in James's speech to the Apostolic Council (15:13-21), where he, agreeing with the account of Cornelius' conversion, proceeds to substantiate Peter's action and its results by quoting the Scriptures (Amos 9:11-12; Jer. 12:15 LXX)

In verse 16 the words "dwelling of David" refer to Israel,⁽²³⁾ which has now (by implication) been restored (the reason for Luke describing the conversion of many Jews and Samaritans Ac. 1-8) and thus enables the Gentiles ("rest of men" "all the Gentiles") to come into salvation. The priority of Israel in salvation is again asserted, the restoration of which leads to the inclusion of Gentiles, an inclusion

prophesied by Scripture and thus, warranted by God Himself. Here Luke expresses his view of mission, "to the Jew first and then to the Gentile"⁽²⁴⁾ The gentiles are not regarded as establishing a Church that stands in opposition to or in contrast to Israel. Rather Israel, the restored Israel that consists of those who repent, is the people of God. To this people then are the Gentiles added. The question the Council was dealing with was that of the Law. Could Gentiles be saved without adherence to the Law? The Council's reply as summed up in James's speech reveals the ecclesiological importance of the Law for Luke, for the Law was one of the distinguishing marks of Israel. Luke records that the charges made against the Christians were those of being against the Law and against the people (Ac.6:11,13,14); 21:21,28; 25:8; 28:17) and those charges are linked (Ac 21; 21,28). Thus to speak against the Law is to speak against the people. So it can be seen that the Law is regarded as an essential part of the definition of the "people".

Luke's treatment of the Law shows that he does regard the Church as Israel, restored no doubt, but Israel none the less, thus it obeys the Law. For Luke's handling of the Law is totally different to that of other New Testament writers. This is seen in his terminology, for only Luke uses νόμος Κυριοῦ or νόμος τῶν πατρῶν (Lk 2: 23;24:3f;Ac 22:2) refers to the Mosaic Law as "the customs" (Ac 6:14; 15:1; 22:21), speaks of "Moses being preached" (Ac 15:21) and of "speaking against Moses/ or the Law" (Ac 6:4, 13,14; 21:21,28,35:8). The expression the "Law of Moses" occurs five times in Luke-Acts (Lk 2:22; 24:44; Ac 13:38; 15:5; 28:23), but only three times in the rest of the New Testament (John 7:23; 1 Cor. 9:9; Heb 10:28). The essential sign of adherence to the Law, of thus belonging to Israel, was circumcision (Ac 15:1, 15; 16:3). Luke does not "spiritualize" circumcision as is done elsewhere in the New Testament (Col. 2:11, ~~12~~; Rom. 2:29 - although see Stephen's speech Ac 7:51, but here of course he is stressing that they have not

been acting as the circumcised should. cf. Deut. 30:6.) Neither does he spiritualize Abraham, who is not the father of all (as in Paul: Romans 4; Gal.3) but only of the circumcised and the promises belong to Abraham and his children (Lk 1:68-75; Ac 3:25; 7:18). (But see Ac. 2:38,39, "Those afar off") Thus Luke sets out to show that the early Church was truly the people of God, that they did observe the Law. So, in the Birth Narratives, Luke shows the obedience and devotion of all concerned in the births of John and Jesus, to the Temple and its institutions, especially circumcision (Lk 2:21,22). Luke shows that Jesus was a true Jew, and so are his followers. This is particularly evident in the account of Stephen's trial and consequent stoning (Ac 6:8-7:60). Stephen is charged with blasphemy against Moses, the Law, the Temple and against God; in particular, that he teaches that "Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place, and will change the customs which Moses delivered to us." (Ac 6:14). Luke regards these accusations as being false as Stephen's speech shows (Ac 7:2-60). Further, every such accusation is absent in ^{the} gospel. Luke's treatment of his sources shows careful handling, any derogatory word about the Law in his sources being modified or excluded. Like the Rabbis, Luke does not view one commandment in principle being raised above the others (Matt. 7:2; 22:24-30; Mk 12:28). Luke's account of Mark 12:24-34 is concerned rather with eternal life than with the first commandment. The statement about the first commandment in Luke is placed in the Lawyers' mouth, not in Jesus' as in Mark. In his treatment of the Markan passage on divorce (Mk. 10:1-10) Luke does not mention Moses or cast doubts on his legislation. He does not speak of rejecting God's law to keep the traditions of men (Mk 7:8; Matt. 15:3); rather he asserts that the customs of the fathers are kept by the Church especially by Paul, (Ac. 21:21f; 28:17). He also regards alms-giving as in accordance with the Law and vitally important (Lk 11:21; 12:33; Ac. 9:35, 10:2,4,31; 24:17). He does indeed record four instances of disputes concerning

Jesus and the observances of the Sabbath, but in each case he seeks to show that all Jesus did was within the Law. (e.g. Lk 10:13-17). In fact, Luke alone of the evangelists can refer to the "Living Oracles" of the Mosaic Law (Ac 7:38) and indeed, he regards the Law as eternally valid (Lk 16:16 and 17ff). He even describes the Christians, who as Jews, are "all zealous for the Law" (Ac.21:21).

This stress on adherence to the Law is important for Luke because it is a constitutive element of Israel, and he only knows of one Israel. Thus his stress on the promises to Israel (Lk 1-2; Ac 1:8, 2:36,39; 3:35, 13:26) and the particularly Jewish nature of, for example, his titles for God ~~our~~ "our Fathers" (Ac 3:13; 5:30; 7:32; 22:14; 24:14) "of" Israel" (Lk 1:68 Ac 13:17), of "thy people" (Ac 13:17) of "Abraham Isaac and Jacob" (Ac 3:13; 7:32) and or "Jacob" (7:46). It is precisely in its adherence to the Law that the Church proves itself to be the people of God. Luke stresses that it is the Christians who keep all the Law (Ac 21:21; 24:14) while the Jews do not. However, the promises to Israel, to the restored people of God, contained, as we have seen, a place for the Gentiles, who will join Israel (Ac 15:14). The decrees then of Ac 15:13-17 show that the Law is not abrogated, but is still in force. What the decrees do seem to suggest, is that the minimum requirements as laid down in the Law (Leviticus 17-18) concerning "strangers" (I.e. gentiles), that dwell among Israelites, are applied to the Gentiles.

Naturally there are Jews who reject the Gospel, and by so doing they no longer are part of the people of God, but are excluded. This Luke shows in the ~~quote~~ text from Dt. (18:15-16) that Peter used in his speech (3:17-26) just before his arrest by the Sadducees and Temple Leaders (Acts 4:1). In the statement in verse 23 "Every soul that does not listen to the Prophet shall be destroyed from the people". The underlined words have been added for they are not in the original text of Deut. The people referred to can only be Israel, thus Luke shows that the rejection of

the Gospel will result in exclusion from Israel.

This understanding of Israel's priority in salvation and mission is also shown in the passage (Lk 24:45f) where the resurrected Lord explains the Scriptures to the eleven. The scriptures are witness to Him and his ministry, to His death and resurrection, and to the fact that "repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem." This understanding of the Church's mission is reiterated in the words of Ac.1:8 "you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all ~~Judea~~ and Samaria and to the ends of the earth,"

Again, in Peter's speech, ⁱⁿ Cornelius' house (10:34-43), the coming of salvation in Christ is described purely in Jewish terms (except for verse 34 which sets the context), of the salvation that has come to the Jews (λαός 10:4). Jesus is described as "Lord over all" (verse 36) and "judge of the living and the dead (v.43) for it is through Israel that the gentiles will gain salvation. (25)

It is only through Israel that salvation is possible, a salvation that includes Gentiles. Thus Luke shows, in his speeches to the Jews, that the Gentiles are included. Peter on the day of Pentecost, appeals to all the Jews gathered in Jerusalem, local and foreign (from ^{the} Diaspora), stating that "the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off" (2:39). Here "all that are afar off" can indeed refer to Jews, but it seems probable, in the light of Lk.24:47 and Ac.1:8 that a reference to the future inclusion of the Gentiles is meant. (26) Peter's speech in Ac.3:11-26 also refers to the position of the Jews and Gentiles in the history of salvation. In his appeal to the Jews, they are recognised as the "sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God gave to your fathers" (3:25a). From the scriptures he shows that Christ's coming (3:22) and sufferings (3:18) were all foretold, that both the prophets and Moses (3:18,22,24) foretold his coming. Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of Jewish hope and scripture. Not to respond now is to be "destroyed from the people". Part of this restoration of

of Israel is the inclusion of the Gentiles which has been promised by God in scripture. So Luke depicts the Jews in Pisidian Antioch as responding (13:43f), along with some proselytes (13:45), while others reject Paul's message. Here again a clear appeal to prophecy (13:47 based on Isa.49:6) to legitimize the Gentile mission is made. Yet, Luke promptly proceeds to describe, not preaching to Gentiles, but further preaching in synagogues (14:1; 17:1,10,17; 18:4, 19,26; 19:8 etc.) These accounts of Paul's preaching in Synagogues (although he is a missionary to the Gentiles) continue right up to the end of Acts, at which point the mandate of Act.1:8 has been fulfilled; the gospel has been preached to all the Jews, in Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria and in the Dispersion. Israel has been restored by its acceptance of the Gospel message. Those who rejected it have been cut off from the people (3:25). The believing Jews are Israel, in whom the promises are fulfilled and to whom the Gentiles have been added, also, in fulfilment of promises." The Jews (who believe) are the cornerstone of the true Israel into which the Gentiles have also now been incorporated". (27)

If then the mission to the Gentiles is embedded in the structure of Luke-Acts, why is a direct vision (reported) and command from God necessary to spur Peter on to Cornelius? The issue in Ac.10,11 and Ac.15 (Apostolic Council) is not so much the fact that the Gentiles have received salvation (15:1), but the fact that they have received salvation just like the Jews (15:4,11), but without becoming Jews. The Christians at Jerusalem are horrified that Peter has associated with Gentiles (Ac.11:1-3). This is the issue that is set before the Council - can the gentiles be saved without circumcision (15:1)? What is the relationship between the Jewish Church and the Gentile Christians, when, as is made clear in the text by the repetition of the Cornelius account for the third time (Ac.10,11) God has so decisively acted, giving them the Holy Spirit, the gift of salvation (Ac.11:17,18)? God, in his saving action, has included the Gentiles, who are now included with Israel, though not requiring circumcision. We will now proceed ~~to~~ further ^{to} examine the characteristics of the restored people of God.

CHAPTER 6. THE APOSTLES, THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE COMMUNITY

How does Luke view the apostles, their place and function in the new community that has been brought about by the events of Jesus' life, death, resurrection and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost? The concept of apostleship that is presented by Luke is the source of much debate, views ranging from the apostles being the first ecclesiastical officials and guarantors of the Jesus tradition, or missionaries par excellence, to their being of hardly any significance at all, their existence being merely due to the traditional material that Luke happened to utilize in Lk 22 and Ac.1:15-26.

An examination, not of Luke's sources, for this is not the purpose of this work, but of his over all purpose will enable us to come to a clearer understanding of his conception of the apostles. Further, it will be seen that, far from being "a curious survival",⁽¹⁾ the apostles are integral to Luke's conception of the Church.

First we will deal with conception of the apostleship which do not do full justice to the peculiarly Lukan presentation of the Church. Many commentators⁽²⁾ regard the apostles, in Luke's scheme, as being primarily the witnesses to Jesus, his life and work. They are the guarantors of the ecclesiastical tradition about Jesus. However, in Ac. 1:21, while it is stated that the qualifications of an apostle demand that he be an eyewitness to Jesus' ministry, nothing else is said about the significance of this. What is said, is that the apostles are the witnesses to the resurrection. Further, the speeches as recorded in the rest of Acts contain very little information about the earthly life of Jesus, apart from the fact of his death. (e.g. 2:23,30; 3:14, 4:10,27; 5:2f). This is significant, for if the apostles were regarded by Luke as guarantors of the events of Jesus' life, would not the speeches have had far more references to his earthly life than they do?

Rather, in Luke's presentation, the apostles, all the disciples and all the Jewish

people already knew about Jesus. Thus in the speech that Luke presents through Peter on the day of Pentecost, reference is indeed made to "Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through Him in your midst... " (Ac.2:22b), but this is immediately followed by the words "as you" yourselves know (Ac.2:22), Words which look back to the comment of the ~~Emmours~~ ^{to Emmaus} travellers who, amazed that their new travelling companion "does not know the things that have happened there (in Jerusalem) in these days (Lk 24:18), state that the events were "concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet might in deed and word before God and all the people" (Lk 24:49). Again, in the speeches of Acts 3-4, there is no reference to Jesus apart from the statement about his death and its significance (Ac 3:15; 4:10). However, it is stated that the Apostles are witnesses to the resurrection (Ac.3:15).

In Peter's speech to Cornelius (Ac 10:34-43) we find the fullest references to the life and work of Jesus, of which the apostles are indeed eyewitnesses (Ac.10:39), but so are the people, for it is assumed that even the Gentiles (Cornelius) know about these events (Ac.10:36" You know the word which he sent to Israel"). However, in the following verses (~~3~~40-42) it is to the apostles in particular that God manifested the risen Christ, for Peter says "not to all the people, but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead" (e.g. Lk 24:30,48; Ac 1:4,8). Here Luke clearly shows the apostles are not necessary to guarantee the account of the life and ministry of Jesus, for this is well known among the people (" Israel" 10:36; "all Jews ,.... from Galilee" 10:37; "in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem" 10:39). It has even reached the ears of the God-fearing Gentiles, Cornelius (10:36). Rather, he stresses that they are the witnesses of the resurrection, they were with Jesus after the resurrection and they understand and are called to preach on the significance of the resurrection for Israel (10:41-43). Note in connection with "Israel", the use of the words $\tau\omega\ \lambda\alpha\omega\varsigma$ in verse 42 which refers to the Jews, ⁽⁴⁾ which shows that Luke conceives of a Jewish mission, which as part of its fulfilment,

includes the Gentiles (10:44-48). The apostles bear witness to the resurrection, for they saw the risen Christ and they understood the scriptures that refer to it (10:43).

This view of the apostles' function as witnesses to the resurrection is confirmed by Paul's speech in the Synagogue at Antioch, recorded in Ac.13:15-41. Here reference is made to the history of Israel, John the Baptist, the trial, death and resurrection of Jesus. The whole speech presents the good news as the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promises to his descendants (13:26,32). However, it is significant that Paul does not refer to his meeting with the resurrected Lord, but rather to the testimony of the Twelve (13:31).

The way in which Luke treats the Twelve in his gospel also indicates that he did not regard them as the guardians of special tradition, as the guarantors or authenticators of the facts concerning the life of Jesus. Rather, in his presentation Luke, in contrast to Mark, clearly states that Jesus' teaching and acts were done before all the people. This is seen in Luke's handling of the Markan material. For instance Mark 4:10 records the fact that Jesus gave private teaching to those with him and to the Twelve on the meaning of the parables. Luke, in his account, (LK 8:4-19) omits to state that Jesus explained the meaning privately (LK 8:9 "his disciples asked him what the parable means") and set the whole story in a public context (Lk 8:4, 8:19). Again, in Mark 9:14f an account of an exorcism is followed by private teaching (9:28), whereas in Luke the private teaching is omitted and replaced by a statement concerning the crowd's reaction (Lk 9:43). So also, the Markan saying about divorce (Mk 10:2f) is followed by an account of the disciples enquiring privately (MK 10:10), an account which in Luke, placed in a different context (that of the speech concerning wealth Lk 16:) clearly envisaged the teaching as being public, for it is recorded that the Pharisees heard it (Lk 16:14) ⁽⁷⁾ Thus Luke makes it clear that as to the events of Jesus' life, the followers, the crowds, even the Pharisees, in fact all the people, knew about them - not just the Twelve. In no way can Luke be held to view

the Twelve as the guardians of an authentic Jesus tradition. For Luke the tradition was common knowledge among friend and foe. What for Luke distinguished the Twelve, and will be dealt with in depth later, is their unique witness to the ~~post~~-resurrection event and their significance for Israel.

Another conception of the apostleship is the ~~one~~ which sees their task primarily as a missionary one. Yet it remains a fact that the apostles are presented as doing very little missionary work, ⁽⁸⁾ in fact only Peter and John are recorded as doing any missionary work, that of visiting and laying hands on the Samaritans (Ac.8:25), and that after Philip had preached and baptized the Samaritans (Ac.8:5-8), and of course, there is also Peter's mission to Cornelius.

In fact the term "missionary" does not even seem very appropriate as apart from there being hardly any record of their missionary activity, the apostles, (and that being mainly Peter) are presented as proclaiming the message of Jesus' vindication by resurrection to the people of Israel. It would be perhaps more appropriate to view the apostles as prophets, as those who proclaim God's message of salvation and judgement to his people (2:22f; 2:36,39; 3:13,19,24; 4:10; 4:47; 5:10).

Neither does Luke regard the sending out of the Twelve as pertaining to the essence of their role. Mark records the calling of the Twelve and immediately delineates their function as "being with Jesus" and being "sent out to preach and cast out demons" (Mk 3:14ff). Luke however, while he does record that the Twelve are "with Jesus" (Lk 8:1), also notes that others are also (Lk 8:2). Further, he has separated the accounts of the calling (Lk 6:12) and of the commission (Lk 9:1). Even then, the account of the mission of the Twelve finds a parallel in the next chapter, where Luke records the mission of the Seventy, who have the same message, and mission. In fact, the "Seventy" have better claim to "Apostleship" in the sense of mission, for they not only proclaim the Kingdom of God (Lk 10:9) and cast out demons (Lk 10:17) but are representative of Christ

himself:" He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me" (Lk.10:16) (9) Thus it seems evident that Luke does not particularly regard the essence of apostleship as being their missionary activity.

A popular notion of the apostles is that they are the founders of the "Institutional church", the founders of the various ecclesiastical offices. Yet it is undoubtedly strange that if Luke did conceive of the apostles as ecclesiastical founders, that he hardly mentions them in such a role. Certainly, on Jews' demise another apostle is elected, (Ac.1:15-26), yet after the death of James (Ac.12:2), no attempt is made to replace him. A fact which is very odd if the Twelve were essential to the Church.

The Twelve are recorded as organising the appointment of the Seven in Act.6:1-6 but it is noteworthy that the people elected them, the apostles laying on hands. Even the Seven do not have a clearly defined office. At the election the reason is given that they are necessary so as to obviate the apostles "waiting on tables" (Ac 6:2). Yet, shortly afterwards we read of how Philip "the deacon", one of the Seven, is preaching to the eunuch and baptizing him (Ac.8:26-34) a Samaritan village (Ac.8:5-8) - a function that supposedly belonged to the Twelve (Ac.6:2) Luke just mentions the fact that the churches had "elders", making no reference to their origin or constitution.

the Elders
They are not linked in any formal way with the Apostles. Luke refers to Jewish elders (4:5,8,23; 6:12; 23:1f; 24:15) quite often, the first reference to "Christian" elders appearing with no explanation at all (11:30). From then on he simply refers to the fact that Christian congregations had elders (Ac.15:4; 6:22; 16:4; 20:17; 21:18). The only statement about their "origin" is a reference to Paul and Barnabas (neither of them apostles, i.e. of the Twelve according to Luke) appointing elders in every Church (Ac.14:23). Again, Luke makes quite frequent reference to Christian prophets (Ac.11:27; 13:1; 15:32; 21:10) without

making any attempt to explain their origin or even to relate them to the ~~ap~~ostles. Then of course there is the well-known fact that after the so called "Apostolic Council" (Ac.15) (which is not even presided over by an ~~ap~~ostle) and a brief reference in Ac.16:4 the ~~ap~~ostles disappear completely from Luke's account. Thus there is "no basis for claiming that Luke traces ecclesiastical office back to the ~~ap~~ostles. The reason is that Luke's eschatology, coupled with his view of history, has no room for an ἐκκλησία as a specific religious institution".⁽¹⁰⁾

For Luke sees the apostles as closely linked with Israel and the kingdom of God. Thus, while he follows Mark in some instances (6:13; 9:1,10; 12:18; 31; 22:3,47) he, in contrast to Mark and Matthew, lays stress on the ~~ap~~ostles, for he makes special reference to the ~~ap~~ostles (8:1; 11:49; 17:5). But unlike Mark there is very little "secret" teaching given to the ~~ap~~ostles by Jesus (for Jesus is shown before all Israel) (3:7,10,21; 4:23,37; 5:17; 7:1,3,17 etc.)

Only in the account of the Last Supper and in the events between Jesus' death and resurrection do the ~~ap~~ostles play a determinate role. In the account of the Last Supper, the role of the "twelve" becomes prominent. Jesus addresses his farewell speech to them, in which they are linked with Israel, for they will be judges and rulers over Israel.⁽¹¹⁾ Here their future role as the eschatological rulers

(not Church leaders) of Israel is set forth. The number twelve is important for Luke, an observation that can be verified from a study of his source material.

Mark does refer more often to the "twelve", but Luke seems to regard the number itself as vital, without which the group is incomplete. Thus, in the account of Judas' betrayal (Lk.22:3) while Mark refers to Judas as "one of the twelve"

(Mk.14:10 ; Mtt.26:14), Luke speaks of him as "of the number of the twelve."

Luke's version does make the number constitutive⁽¹²⁾ Again, he says in Ac.1:17 of Judas "he was numbered among us", the same word being used as in Lk.22:3. It

is doubtful that this is a synonym for "belonging to", for when Luke wishes to express membership he uses other words⁽¹³⁾. So the election in Ac.1, is essential

to complete the number 12, where it is recorded that Matthias was enrolled
(συνκαταψήφισθη)⁽¹⁴⁾ with the eleven. The verb used, has numerical significance
for Luke (Lk 19:19; 22:3; Ac.1:17).

Luke also seeks to show that the Twelve are derived from God's call. This is
seen in his account of their call (Lk.6:12ff). Instead of Mark's "and he went up"
he uses the more formal "and in those days" which he uses elsewhere for
accentuation (6:12/cf 1:5; 2:1; 9:51). He further adds that Jesus had spent the
night praying (not in Mk 3:13) thereby before the election of the Twelve stress-
ing their divine sanction. He also omits Mark's reason (to be with Jesus and to
be sent out, Mk 3:14) for he sees their role as being in the future. This stress
on the divine ordering of the Twelve is seen again in Lk 11:47 with its
reference to prophets and apostles being sent to Israel. This is mentioned again
in Acts 1:1-26 which stresses the role of God and the Holy Spirit in their
election. The election of the new apostle is shown to be demanded by scripture
(Ac.1:20b-21) and approved by God (Ac.1:24-26). Peter explicitly states in
Ac.10:39f that the apostles were chosen by God as witnesses to the ministry
(10:39) and resurrection (10:41).

Not only are the Twelve commissioned by God, but they are specifically commissioned
to Israel (e.f. Ac.10:36,42) for as Lk 22:30 asserts, they will serve as
eschatological regents of Israel.⁽¹⁵⁾ - The connection between the apostles' role
as witnesses to the Resurrection and as eschatological rulers⁽¹⁵⁾ is found in
Luke's conception of the Kingdom and Messiahship. For Luke the resurrection is
central, it is in fact characterized as "God's promise to the fathers (Ac.26:6)
or as "Israel's hope" (26:6-7). It is particularly seen as the fulfilment of
Scripture (Ac.26:22,23; 24:44-46). He also links the concept of the Messianic
kingdom to the Resurrection (Ac.2:30; 13:33f). Thus, as the primary task of the
Twelve according to Ac.1:22 is to witness to the Resurrection, the connection

between this and their role as eschatological regents (Lk 22:30) becomes clear, for the resurrection is the fulfilment of Jewish eschatological hope. For, the twelve are linked to the Kingdom (Lk.22:29).and to Israel (Ac.26:6 shows that Israel is described as the "people of the twelve tribes" - and there are twelve apostles ~~cf~~ Lk:22:29).

This is the significance of the Resurrection accounts in Lk.22-24, where Twelve are especially associated with the Resurrection. Thus the message of the Resurrection in Mark is given to "his disciples and Peter" (10:7) in Matthew to "his disciples" (28:8) but in Luke to "the eleven and all the rest" (24:9) and to "the apostles" (24:10). The Emmaus travellers come to tell the disciples, but discern that the eleven already know of the resurrection (24:34) and Jesus has appeared to Peter. The speech of Lk.24: 36-49 is primarily directed to the apostles (24:9,33) also Ac. 1:2 ^{ἐν τῇ} ἀμενοῖ refers back to Lk 4:44; 14). The first chapter of Acts is totally directed to the account of Jesus' last meeting with the eleven and choice of the twelfth apostle. The opening verses are important for they not only look back to Jesus' last appearance, but also set out the coming events. The Resurrection has convinced the disciples of Jesus' Messiahship and the significance that this has for the Kingdom of God. For they have no doubt now that the Kingdom will be restored to Israel, the only question is when? (Ac.1:3,7). Rather, the Jewish hope is placed in immediate connection with Pentecost (Ac.1:8) and with the Ascension. (Ac.1:9).

The Kingdom that Jesus proclaimed is the one Israel awaited (Lk 1:32f) and the Resurrection is the sign of this. For in Ac.2:25-30 the quotation of Ps.16:8 relates the Resurrection and the Ascension to an enthronement. The Resurrection and Ascension show Jesus to be the Messiah and it is of this that the apostles are witnesses and messengers of (Ac.2:36; 3:11; 5:31f; 13). So "they are set apart whenever the Resurrection, the Messiah of Israel, or the redemption of God's people is discussed.

Luke's references to the Twelve are arranged and constructed to indicate a special relationship between the Resurrection ... and the Twelve".⁽¹⁶⁾

This explains why the Apostles disappear after Ac.15:2,6; 16:4 for, according to Luke, after the Apostolic Council their task is complete. This is shown in James' speech,⁽¹⁷⁾ when in verses 16-18 Israel's restoration is presented as a fact, for the Twelve are the eschatological rulers of Israel and, by Acts 15, the faithful Jews, Samaritans and believing Gentiles had been included.

Thus the fulfilment of promise cannot occur until the number of the Twelve is complete. For Luke, the fulfilment of Jesus' ministry is not the Cross, but rather the Resurrection/Ascension/and Pentecost.⁽¹⁸⁾ While it is true that the Resurrection and Ascension show Jesus as Lord and Christ, the promises made by John (Lk 3:15-17) and Jesus (Ac.1:5) still have to be fulfilled. As Peter's speech (Ac.2:29:33) points out, only the events of the Cross, Resurrection and Ascension have made Pentecost possible. The rest of Acts shows how, through the action of the Spirit, the restoration of Israel occurs and the Gentile mission gets under way through Paul. Pentecost is the constitutive factor in this, for it is indeed the fulfilment of the "promise" (Lk.24:49 Ac.1:4-8; 2:33) the promise made to Abraham and his posterity (Lk.1:55 Ac.2:39 c.f. Gen.17:1-10).

Through the Spirit men can now receive the blessings of Abraham. Here it is likely that Luke sees the coming of the Spirit as the fulfilment of the promises in Ezek.36:27 and Jer. 31:33 that the Law would be written on men's hearts. ~~the~~ The Spirit then inaugurates and maintains the new covenant, which is characterized by his (the Spirit's) presence. This seems probable in the light of the Spirit's coming at Pentecost, which was the Jewish feast which celebrated the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai.

Luke shows that the action of the Holy Spirit is in fact a continuation of the work of Jesus. This is brought out by the opening words of Acts 1:1 which refer to the Gospel as a record of "all that Jesus began (ἤρξατο) to do and preach" which

that, in Acts, Jesus' ministry is centring in the Church through the Holy Spirit. (19)
This is seen in the frequent accounts in Acts of the Spirit empowering the disciples for preaching, (Ac.2:14ff, 42; 3:8; 4:31; 7:55) and the performing of miracles (Ac.3:2-10; cf. 4:7,8-10; 6:8). The restoration of Israel by the calling to repentance of Israel (Pentecost Ac.2), Samaria (Ac.8) and the Gentiles (Ac.10) is marked by the power and guidance of the Holy Spirit (Ac.2:2-4; 8:14-18; 26-39) (29)
10:19,20; 44-48).

Yet, the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost is not just a continuation of what went before. Pentecost is a new beginning, the beginning of the restoration of Israel. This is seen particularly in Luke's division of his work into two parts, the Gospel closing with an account of the Ascension related to the Crucifixion and Resurrection; Acts opening with an account of the Ascension, the times related to Pentecost and the subsequent events. "In other words the Ascension from one standpoint brings to an end the story of Jesus, and from another begins the Age of the Spirit." (20)

Between the occurrence of the Ascension and Pentecost in Ac.1,2 lies the account of the election of Matthias. Certainly his election is of God (Ac.1:20,24), but the absence of any reference to the Spirit is notable, especially when after Pentecost, election to any function depends on the Spirit and Spirit possession (Ac.6:3,13:2-4). This again shows the difference of the situation before and after Pentecost, and shows the importance of the Twelve in Luke's ecclesiology, as representatives of Israel.

Pentecost is then an epochal event, as significant as the Resurrection and Ascension, for "as the exaltation was the climax of Jesus's ministry for Jesus himself, so Pentecost was the climax of Jesus' ministry for the disciples." (21) At Pentecost the Spirit comes upon the disciples (22) "and there appeared to them tongues as of fire, distributed and resting on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them

utterance (Ac.2:3,4). The "wind" (Ac.2:2) is a reference to the Spirit of God in Gen. 2:7 (cf Ezek 37:9; John 3:8), while the reference to fire denotes both the presence of God (Exodus 3:2) and purification (Lk 3:17). The precise meaning of the account of "speaking in other tongues" has been the centre of much debate, but for our purposes it is sufficient to note that, apart from it signifying the Spirit's control of their speech, it is also an event that causes the many "Jews, drawn from every nation under heaven" (Ac.2:5) to exclaim "how is it that we hear, each one of us in our own native language." (Ac.2:8). For here is the beginning of the restoration of the tribes of Israel, dispersed since the Exile.

It is not likely that the reading "the Jews" of Ac.2:5 need be rejected, following the reading. This omission may have been an attempt to widen the scope of reference, but this is done by the whole account of the tongues speaking, which is probably a sign that the curse of Babel had been reversed and a new Spirit-given unity created. (23)

The immediate result of the Spirit's activity is that Peter preaches to those present, recounting the prophecies that have been fulfilled by this event and the significance of all this as showing Jesus to be both Lord and Christ (Ac.2:22-36). This causes the listeners to say "Brethren, what shall we do?" to which Peter replies "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are far off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to "him" (Ac.2:38,39). The community comes into being then by the preaching of Jesus' Lordship and Messiahship, so that it can be said that "with this affirmation of faith a new community is born. The scattered disciples congregated once more in Jerusalem, the focal point of the coming reign of God". (24)

This new community is described in Ac.2:42 as "... devoted ... to the Apostles²⁴

teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers". This translation (RSV) obscures the fact that "fellowship" has an article and should be rendered as "the fellowship."⁽²⁵⁾ Various meanings have been given to this word⁽²⁶⁾ but the most likely meaning is that of "the sharing of a common life whose source was in God".⁽²⁷⁾ This life of course has manifested itself in the communalism described in Ac.2:44,45 and 4:32-37, where the Christians are described as "all who believed were together" (2:44) and "of one heart and soul" (4:32). This unity and fellowship is given by the Spirit who is given by Jesus the Lord (Ac.2:34). The Spirit is not a possession of the Church, as the account of Ananias & Sapphira (Ac.5:1-11) clearly shows. Their behaviour was hypocritical and a denial of the Spirit-given unity and communalism. The continuity of the new community is shown by the Twelve who link the present events with the events of Jesus' life. They teach, and their teaching is closely connected with the person of Jesus, for the goal of their teaching is obedient faith (e.g. Acts 2:14-40). The term "the breaking of bread" is found elsewhere only in Lk 24-35 (Travellers to Emmaus *cf.* Ac 10:41) and probably does refer to the Lord's Supper, for here "the emphasis is on the act of "breaking" the bread shows this circumstance wholly trivial in itself to be the significant element of the celebration ... But it could only be significant when it was a signum, viz. of Christ's being broken in death."⁽²⁸⁾ However Acts has little to tell us about it, but from the account of the Last Supper, dealt with earlier⁽²⁹⁾ the participation in the Supper was held to be such that treachery and unfaithfulness was a denial of the unity so expressed. Ananias and Sapphira's deceit like Judas' betrayal, leads to death. The prayers are also mentioned as a mark of the new community, the article "the" meaning that the reference is to the daily Temple prayers which the Christians, as true Israelites, would attend (Acts 3:1).

The activities of the new community lead almost immediately to persecution by the Jewish authorities (Ac 4:1-3, 5:17-19; 27-28,40; 7:57-60; 8:1-3; 9-1f) which

results in the Church's spread to Samaria (Ac.8:1). Philippi preaches and it is clearly stated that the Samaritans believed and were baptized, yet the Samaritans only received the Holy Spirit when Peter and John laid hands on them (Ac.8:17). While much controversy surrounds these verses, what seems to be the case is that only when the Apostles, as representatives of Israel, receive the Samaritans, is the Spirit given. For Salvation is "from Israel" and for the Samaritans to have received the Spirit apart from the sanction of the Twelve and Jerusalem could have precipitated schism in the new community.

As the preaching and wonder-working (Ac.3:18;5:12-16;6-8 that led to persecution and the eventual inclusion of the Samaritans was inspired by the Spirit (Ac.4:8,13,31; 6:8) so Peter's mission to Cornelius was divinely led (Ac.10:3,9-16). Peter, obedient to the vision, preached to Cornelius' household. While he spoke "the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word ... Then Peter declared can any one forbid water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have? (Ac.10:44-47). This event causes the Jerusalem Apostles to seek an explanation from Peter, who answers that "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them just as on us at the beginning (i.e. Pentecost) ... If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God? ... And they glorified God saying "Then to the Gentiles also has God granted repentance unto life" (Ac.11:15-18).

Here then that which occurred to the Gentiles is shown to be similar to the events of Pentecost. Indeed "the Lord $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ employs extraordinary means to instruct the Church in the universality and unconditionality of the Gospel ..

"The Holy Spirit is essential in the process of becoming a Christian, for without (31) it there is no "repentance unto life". Here, the coming of the Holy Spirit is closely linked with baptism by water .. This is shown by the account of Paul's conversion, when he states (Ac. 22:16ff) Ananias' words "why do you wait? Arise and

be baptized and wash away your sins, calling on His Name" which are compared with Ac. 2:21" ...whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved". In Ac. 9:17 of course it is related that at this time he received the Holy Spirit. That "Holy Spirit Baptism" is the initiatory Christian experience is also seen in the conversion of the Ephesians ⁽³²⁾(Ac. 19:1-6). It is the Holy Spirit who guides the Church and includes into its fellowship "every one whom the Lord God calls" (Acts 2:39).

Luke's theology then "presents the disciples as the eschatological community, possessing the promises of the Covenant, living in unity, empowered by the Spirit, engaged in universal witness, built upon the Twelve, created at Pentecost, and including the Gentiles in its embrace."⁽³³⁾

CONCLUSION

In recent times the concepts of Salvation-History and eschatology have come to dominate the interpretation of Luke-Acts. However, it is misleading to view Luke as the only New Testament writer who dealt with history. Rather, Paul and indeed the other New Testament writers write from within an understanding of God's saving action in history. Luke does not view "Salvation-History" and thus an institutional Church as a development caused by the failure of the End to occur. Rather, Luke sees both the history of God's people and the fact of the Church's existence as a vindication of the Gospel. Neither history nor the Church possess salvific powers in themselves, but rather both are the subject of the God who has exalted Jesus as Lord and Christ. There is thus very little evidence of a Lukan "early Catholic" conception of the Church as an institution dispensing salvation. Such an understanding of the Church is not present in the Pastoral Epistles either. It is true that Paul is making provision for successors (2 Tim. 2:2; 4:1f), dealing with family matters (Titus 1:6; 1 Tim. 3:4cf; 1 Cor. 6,7) and regards the Church not so much as the body but as the "pillar and bulwark of truth" (1 Tim 1:10; 4:1; 5:17, 6:3,20; 2 Tim. 2:2; 3:10; Tit. 1:4), that is, a guardian of truth and true doctrine. However, this does not necessarily imply that a change in the conception of the Church has occurred, due to the delay of the Parousia or the development of an "institutional" Church. Here Paul could be responding to a different situation than that addressed in his earlier epistles.

This of course immediately reduces the differences that are supposed to prevail between Paul's "primitive" concept of the Church and Luke's late developed "Early Catholicism".

Luke in fact views the Church in its essential continuity with Israel and the Old Testament Scriptures. This is shown by his accounts of Peter's and Paul's speeches, which stress God's action towards his people and his stress on the

Resurrection (Ac.23:6) as a common Pharisaic-Christian belief. In particular, the first Christians in Jerusalem and later, Paul, are all portrayed as exemplary Israelites, attending the Temple and attending prayers (Ac.2:42,46). In fact, the Church is actually Israel itself, the restored "people of God", from which unbelieving Jews have been cut off. The restored Israel comprises believing Jews, Samaritans and indeed even Gentiles. This is all in accordance with Old Testament Scriptures, in fulfilment of the promises made to the fathers. This unique Lukan ecclesiology is particularly shown in his attitude towards the Law, which is vital to his conception of the people of God. As Israel which is being restored, in whom the promises of Jer.31:31-34 and Ezekiel 36:26,27 are being fulfilled, obedience to the Law is essential as a hallmark of the true people of God. Consequently the Apostolic Council dealing with Salvation without adherence to all the Law, is necessary and indeed, Luke can even describe the Jewish Christians as being "zealous for the Law".

While Luke does stress that the Church is Israel, one with the Israel of the past and indeed inheritor of its titles such as "people" or "brethren", which he uses preferably of Israelites, he is forced thereby to use new terms to express the uniqueness of the Christian community. The community is described as "the disciples" (Lk.6:17; Ac.19:9), "Christians" (Ac.11:26) "believers" and as the "way" (Ac.9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4, 24:2), not merely a sect (Ac.24:14) as the Jews claimed, but the very way of Life itself, for it was Israel. This in turn is related to Luke's understanding of Jesus' person and work. Jesus is viewed as the fulfilment of Jewish promise and hope, a fulfilment that is shown by Jesus' Resurrection and Ascension. The Resurrection and Ascension are central for Luke as they are the vindication of Jesus' claims. Such stress and importance are placed on these events that there is little mention or even understanding of the Cross as an atoning sacrifice. The only real reference is Ac.20:28, which, as it is in a speech by Paul, probably does not reflect Luke's view.

Rather, Jesus is seen in terms of the "suffering servant" of Isaiah, an emphasis that comes out clearly in the Birth Narrative and the "Central Section" (Lk.9:5 - 19). In the latter it is shown that the "Path of Glory" is through suffering and persecution, which the disciples also share. In Acts Luke, by parallelism between Christ, Stephen, Paul and the accounts of persecution shows the Christian's relationship to Christ in terms of participation in Christ's suffering.

Luke depicts the unity of the Church by describing the beginnings and common origin in history. Instrumental in bringing this unity into being is the Risen Lord, who through His Spirit, directs the Church into its universal mission. Here the tension arises in Luke's concept of the Church for, as the Church expands, its relationship, not to the Old Testament, but to Christ and His Spirit becomes decisive. The Spirit, while connected with baptism, is seen more as an epochal inaugurator and consequently the understanding of individual participation in the Spirit is not as personal as in Paul.

The Church is seen as Israel, in whom the promises of the Old Covenant are fulfilled. This understanding of the Church would explain the omission of the word's "new covenant" in the shorter text of the account of the institution of the Last Supper, as well as showing genuineness of that text.

All this is only possible through the vindication of Christ by his Resurrection and Ascension whereby the Holy Spirit has been given to create a new community that is characterized by the new life through participation in that Spirit.

Paul by contrast, does not view the Church so much as "Israel" as "New Israel", for he still sees the Church as an entity apart from Israel as a nation, whom God will still redeem. Luke has avoided this tension by identifying the Church with the Israel of God in whom the promises are fulfilled.

Instead of using "Israel" as the basis for his concept of the Church, Paul has an understanding of Christians being "with Christ" in His redemptive work and as

a consequence, "in him". This corporate unity is expressed by Paul in the concept of "the body of Christ". The ~~unity~~^{unity} of the Church is seen (not so much as being in its common historical origin (although Paul does not exclude this (cf Eph.2:11,20) but in ~~the~~ and through the sacrificial body of Christ, whereby "all are one man in Christ" (Gal.3:28). The Church enters new life through participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, an understanding totally absent^(from) indeed alien, to Luke's thoughts, Paul, unlike Luke, clearly relates his understanding of the Church, baptism and the Lord's Supper to Christ's sacrifice. For Paul Christ's death and Resurrection are central, for Luke the Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost take precedence. The closest Luke comes to Paul's doctrine of the "body of Christ" is in the account of Saul's conversion in Acts 9 which experience might have indeed been the source of Paul's doctrine, which Luke does not seem to use although the parallelism that he draws between the suffering of Christ and the Christian does come close. So the difference here between the Pauline and the Lukan conception of the Church stems from their differing Christologies.

One is tempted, on the basis of the conclusions drawn above, to assign Paul or Luke to this or that stage in the development of the early Church, but such comparisons are invariably subjective and rest on prior assumptions. Rather, the diversity reflected in Luke and in Paul's concept of the Church can also be understood in terms of their purpose. Paul used incorporative language and the body concept to express the unity of the Church. Luke stressing the Church as the restored Israel expresses a similar concept by rooting the Church's unity in its common historical origin and the work of the Holy Spirit. "Thus there is an essential unity .. in the teaching of St.Luke and St.Paul in this respect .. all go back in thought to the appearances of Jesus Christ on earth as a new creation.."⁽¹⁾ The differences in their conception lie in their differing understandings of that Christ event which is the ultimate unifying factor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALAND, K. : Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum Stuttgart, 1976.
- ALAND, K. (and others) : The Greek New Testament. U.B.S., 1975.
- ALLAN, J.A. : The in Christ Formula in Ephesians. N.T.S. 1958. pp. 54-62.
- ARNDT, W.E. and GINGRICH, F.N. : A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- BARRETT, C.K. : The First Epistle to the Corinthians. A.&C.Black, 1968.
: Commentary on Epistle to the Romans. A.&C.Black, 1957.
: The Holy Spirit & the Gospel Tradition. SPCK, 1954.
: Luke the Historian in Recent Study. Epworth, 1961.
- BEST, E. : One Body in Christ. London, 1965
- BLASS, E., DEBRUNNER, A. (trans. & edited by R.W.FUNK) : A Greek Grammar of the New Testament & other Early Christian Literature. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1975.
- BORNKAMM G. : Paul. Hodder & Stoughton, 1975.
- BRUCE, F.F. : The Acts of the Apostles. Tyndale Press, 1970.
- BRUNER, F.D. : A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Eerdmans, 1970
- BULTMANN, R. : Theology of the New Testament. (2 vols.) SCM.
- CAIRD, G. B. : The Gospel of St. Luke. Penguin, 1963.
- CAMPBELL, J.Y. : "Koinonia and its Cognates in the New Testament" in J.B.L. 51, 1932. pp
- CERVAUX, L. : The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. Herdon & Herdon, 1959.
- CONZELMANN H. : The Theology of St. Luke. Faber, 1960
A Commentary on I. Corinthians. Fortress Press, 1955.
- DAHL, N.A. : "A People for His Name". N.T.S. IV, 1957/8. p.319-326.
- DOWNING, G. : The Church and Jesus. (SBI 2nd Series) SCM, 1968.
- DUNN, J.D.G. : Holy Spirit Baptism. SCM. 1973
Unity & Diversity in the New Testament. SCM, 1977
- ELLIOTT, J.A. : "A Catholic Gospel. Reflections on Early Catholicism in the New Testament". CBQ, vol.31, 1969, pp.213-233.
- FLEW, R.N. : Jesus and His Church. Epworth. 1957.
- FLENDER, H. : St. Luke, Theologian of Redemptive History. SPCK, 1975.

- FOAKES- JACKSON, J.J. and LAKE, K. (Ed.) : Beginnings of Christianity. Macmillan, 1929. vol. I, pp.321-344 : vol. II, pp.489-510.
- FRANKLIN, E. : Christ the Lord (a study in the purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts). SPCK, 1975.
- GASQUE, W. & MARTIN, R.P. : Apostolic History and the Gospel. Paternoster Press '70.
- GUNDRY, R.H. : Sweden Biblical Theology with emphasis on Pauline Anthropology. C.U.P., 1976.
- HAENCHEN, E. : Acts of the Apostles. Blackwell, 1971.
- HERING, J. : The First Epistle of Paul to Corinth. Epworth, 1962.
- HORT, E.J.A. : The Christian Ekklesia. MacMillan, 1897.
- HOWARD, G. : "The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians" in N.T.S. vol.20, 1974, p.350.f.
- JEREMIAS, J. : The Eucharistic Words of Jesus SCM, 1977
The Parables of Jesus. S.C.M. 1972.
Theology of the New Testament. vol.1. S.C.M.
- JERVELL, J. : Luke and the People of God. Augsburg. 1972.
- KÄSEMANN, E. : New Testament Questions of Today. S.C.M. 1969.
- KECK, L.E. and MARTYN, J.L. (Ed.) : Studies in Luke-Acts. Nashville, 1966.
- KEE, H.C. : Jesus in History (An approach to the Study of the Gospels.) Harcourt, Johanesvitch & Brace. 1977.
- KUMMEL, W. : Theology of the New Testament. S.C.M. 1976.
- KÜNG, H. : The Church. Search Press. 1976.
- LADD, G. E. : Jesus and the Kingdom. SPCK. 1966.
- LAMPE, G.W. : The Seal of the Spirit. SPCK. 1966.
- LEAHEY, A.R.C. : A Commentary on the Gospel According to St.Luke. A. & C. Black. 1958.
- MARSHALL, I.H. : Luke : Historian & Theologian. Paternoster, 1970
- MCKELVEY, R.J. : The New Temple. Oxford. 1969
- MOULTON & GEDEN : A Concordance to the Greek Testament. T.&T.Clark. 1899

BIBLIOGRAPHY contd.

(3)

- NEUGEBAUER, E. : "Das Paulinische 'in Christo'" N.T.S. 4. P.124.
- RACKHAM, R.B. : The Acts of the Apostles. Methuen, 1930
- RAHLES, A. (Ed.) : Septuaginta. Stuttgart. 1935.
- RIDDERBOS, H. : Paul. Eerdmans. 1975.
- ROBINSON, H.W. : "The HEBREW Conception of Corporate Personality" in Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Beiheft 66, 1935.
- ROBINSON, J.A.T. : The Body. (S.B.T. 1st Series). SCM. 1961.
- SANDAY, W. & Headlam, R.W. : The Epistle to the Romans (ICC) T.&T.Clark, 1962.
- SCHNACKENBURG, R. : The Church in the New Testament. Burns & Oates 1974
- SCHWEIZER, E. : Church Order in the New Testament. (S.B.T. 1st.) S.C.M. 1961.
The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. A. & C. Black. 1956.
- STREETER, B.H. : The Primitive Church. MacMillan, 1943.
- TAYLOR, V. : Jesus and His Sacrifice. MacMillan, 1929.
- THORNTON, L.S. : The Common Life in the Body of Christ. Dacre Press, 1946.
- WEDDERBURN, A.J.M. : "Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I.Cor." in S.J.T. 24.
- WHITELEY, D.H. : The Theology of St.Paul. Oxford. 1961
- YATES, R. : "A Re-examination of Ephesians 1:23." in E.T. 83:5. 1972. p.146 f.

QUOTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS :

INTRODUCTION

1. Kaseman op. cit. p237

2. Elliott op. cit. p214.

Chapter I

1. Bornkamm G. Paul p.176.

2. Strathmann: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament vol IV (λαός) p.32.

3. Ibid p. 51/52.

4. Used ten times in Paul : Rom. 9:25 (Hos.2:25), 9:26 (Hos.1:10), 10:21 (Isa.65:2) 11:1,2 (Ps.94:14), 15:10 (Deut.32:43), 15:11 (Ps.117:1), I Cor.10:7 (Exod.32:6), 14:21 (Isa.28:11) ,2 Cor.6:16 (Lev.26:16), Titus 2:14 (Exod.19:5, Deut. 4:20).

5. This is not only a reference to converts from among the circumcised but to all, Jew and Gentile. The "and" is epexegetic and should be rendered "even". Another view maintains that the phrase "Israel of God" refers to a faithful remnant who have as yet not believed, but are marked for salvation. This, however, is unlikely in view of the thrust of Galatians where, for instance, both Jews and Gentiles are treated as the sons of Abraham. (3:7). See R.N.Frew, op.c.it p.150.

6. A popular interpretation of this term is that it is related to καλεῖν plus ἐκ and this means a "called out body". However, this meaning cannot be derived from the word itself. See Deissman, A. Light from the Ancient East, 1920, p.112, and Johnston op.c.it. p.35.

7. See K.L. Schmidt, The Church. (Bible Key Words) A. & C. Black. P.51.

8. Johnston. op.cit. P.36. n.2.

9. Hatch & Redpath I. p.433. "Synagogue" and Ekklesia are also used more or less interchangeably. (Prov.5:14, Judges 20:1, Joel 2:16). in the LXX.

10. Johnston op.cit. p.38. n.1.

11. ibid. p.41.

Chapter 1 (contd.)

12. Cervaux. op.cit. p.104. notes that the Psalms consistently translateedah as synagogue and qahal as ekklesia.
 13. ibid. p.105.
 14. See also Phil.3:6. According to Acts, Paul was en route to prospective Christians in Damascus, which fact implies another community there. Does this mean that Ekklesia has a wider reference than to a local community ? D.E.H. Whiteley, op.cit. p.187, regards 1.Cor.15:19, Gal.1:13, Phil.3:6, as being inconclusive for either a local or universal meaning
 15. Thus K.L. Schmidt's paraphrase of 1.Cor.1:2, the one church of God, such as it exists in Corinth, is not quite correct. ~~C.F.~~ Cervaux, p.108.
 16. D.E.H.Whiteley p.187. Cervaux p.108 regards it as a reference to a worship service.
 17. Didache XI: 3-6
 18. Col.1:18,24.
 19. Eph.1:22, 3:10,21, 5:23,24,25,27,29,32.
 20. Cervaux op.cit. c.4.
- K.L.Schmidt. op.cit. "Each Community, Large or Small, represents the Universal Community, the Church."
21. D.F.H.Whiteley op.cit. p.189/190.
 22. Johnston. op.cit. p.45.
 23. I am indebted to R.N.Flew, op.cit. p.102., for this material.
 24. In later Judaism it was common to describe the redeemed people of the new age, or those who were expecting the final judgement, as the holy ones or saints. (Daniel 7:18,22 Enoch 38:4,5) R. N. Flew. op.cit. p.102.
 25. "The Elect" is common Messianic title, Enoch Chapters 39 - 71.

Chapter 1 (contd.)

26. L.S.Thornton. op.cit. p.51.

27. McKelvey. op.cit. p.95.

28. This radical separation, denoted by words such as "light" and "darkness", is a common theme in the Qumran writings (C.R.iii,)

29. McKelvey. op.cit. p.101, points out that the καί in Cor.3:16 is really explicative. i.e. is really "even"

30. Does the Spirit place the Christian into an already existing entity or create it ? Whichever is preferred, the Spirit is still regarded as bringing about unity.

31. McKelvey. op.cit. p.102.

32. Some commentators take ἀπογῶνιδος as a reference to the key-stone of an arch, the stone that holds all the others. However, this interpretation fails to present a coherent picture, for Christ is the stone upon which the others are built. Christ is pictured as an essential part of a foundation not as the last locking-stone to be inserted.

33. Johnston. op.cit. p.45.

CHAPTER 2

1. The view of A. Deissman, who in his Das in Christo Formel first brought the significance of "in Christ" to the fore. The phrase described of close personal union between Christ and the Christians. He failed, however, to stress the phrases roots in the historical events of the cross and its social nature.
2. A view propounded by A.S. Schweizer in the Mysticism of St. Paul the Apostle, who regarded 'in Christ' merely as a brachology for being partakers in the mystical body of Christ. He based his concept of the body of Christ, which he regarded as the primary figure from which all other expressions were derived, on the understanding of the predestined solidarity of the elect with the Messiah.
3. Reitzenstein, Perdelewitz ~~of~~ E.G. Selwyn 1 Peter pp. 305-313
4. AJM Wedderburn SJT 1971 p. 89
5. AJM Wedderburn SJT 1971 p. 94
6. E. Best's phrase
7. C.K. Barrett Romans A. & C. Black. p.114.
8. See especially H. Wheeler Robinson The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality in Zeitschrift fun die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Beiheft 66, 1935. pp. 49-62.
9. This was not only limited to Paul, but emerges in other N.T. writings - e.g. MK.10:38 John I: 29,35.
10. That Paul does take this understanding of baptism for granted is seen in his using $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ not $\gamma\alpha\rho$ (see Schnackenburg Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul p.45).
11. "Into death (of His)" - Sanday & Headlam Romans p.157 (v.3., v.4).
12. Blass - Debrunner, Funk A Greek Grammar. 206 (2)
13. Some commentators suggest $\sigma\upsilon\rho\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ as a botanical image - "grow together". However, it seems more likely that it means "united with". C.K. Barrett Romans p.123: E. Best op.cit. p.51.
14. A $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ -compound verb with "Him" understood. So RSV.

15. L.S.]Hornton The Comm. Life and The Body of Christ .. p.46.
16. E. Best. op cit. pg. 57.
17. R. Schneckenburg. op.cit. pg.157.
18. Lietzmann quoted in Campbell op ~~cit~~ p.375.
19. Campbell. op.cit. p.375/6.
20. L.S.Thornton. op.cit. p.94.
21. A. Deissmann claimed that $\epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\nu\zeta\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ is equivalent to $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$.
He gives parallels which are, as E. Best points out, merely verbal. Rather
"in Spirit" should be contrasted with "in flesh" (Rom.8:9, Gal.5:16)
"in Christ" to "in Law" ,
22. Christ and the Spirit identified : 2 Cor. 3:17, I Cor.5:17/13:45.
Christ and the Spirit seen as distinct : 1 Cor. 12:4,5, 2 Cor. 12:11, Eph. 2:18.
23. "The Fellowship" - this ~~reading~~^{version} (RSU) is rendered impossible by the
absence of the article in Greek : Campbell op.cit. p.80.
24. Campbell op.cit. p.380.
25. So RSV & Vincent ~~166~~ 1897 ad loc.
26. Campbell op.cit. p.379.

Chapter 3.

1. e.g. W.L.Knox Paul & Jerusalem.
2. Livy bk.2.
3. As in Epictetus
4. See E.Best. op.cit. p.223.
5. Particularly R. Bultmann. op.cit. p.37.
6. J.A.T.Robinson. op.cit. pp 1-16
7. J.A.T.Robinson. article Corpus Christi:Mysterium Christi. Ed. Bell & Deissmann
also E.Best op.cit. pg.87 No.2.
8. Supported by J.A.T.Robinson The Body p.56-58.
9. J. Jeremias. Eucharistic Words of Jesus. p221

10. J.A.T.Robinson. The Body. p.57
11. E. Schweitzer. The Mysticism of St.Paul the Apostle. pp.76, 99, 103, 110.
12. *ibid.* p.117.
13. Some Rabbinic interpreters give these verses a Messianic interpretation.
E.Best. *op.cit.* p.210.
14. Note his stress on faith (Rom.3:22) and individual responsibility. (Rom.6:1).
15. Note his warnings against desiring to know the time of the 2nd coming.
(1.Thess.5:1f).
16. Christ came to save the world (Rom.3:21,22, 5:1, 8:1). Contrast 2 Baruch
72:4-6. Ezra.12:32 (Der Leib Christi).
17. The view of Percy in Der Leib Christi. E. Best. *op. cit.* p.93f.
18. W. D. Davies. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. p.57.
19. *Ibid*
20. E. Best. *op.cit.* p.91,92.
21. See list of views and defenders. E. Best. *op.cit.* p.
J.A.T.Robinson. *op.cit.* p.55.
22. J.A.T.Robinson. *op.cit.* p.50.
23. J.A.T.Robinson. *op.cit.* p.31 shows that Paul did sometimes use
them interchangeably.
24. R. Bultmann. *op.cit.* vol.1. p.209.
25. A.J.M.Wedderburns. *op.cit.* p.75.
26. C.K.Barrett. 1 Corinthians. p.233 suggests that it was so placed to
facilitate the flow of the argument into v17.
27. There need be no Liturgical significance in the fact that Paul
mentions the cup first. C.K.Barrett.
28. J. Jeremias. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. p.144.
C.K. Barrett. 1. Cor. p.232.
H. Ridderbos *op.sit.* p.172.
29. C.K.Barrett. 1 Cor. p.273.
30. C.K.Barrett. 1 Cor. pp.274f ~~pp.274f~~

31. L.S.Thornton. op.cit. p.343.
32. H. Ridderbos. op.cit. Chapter 9. Section 59.
33. E. Magall. Christ, The Christian and the World. p.161.
quoted in E. Best. op.cit. p.101.
34. J.A.T. Robinson. op.cit. p.53.
35. ibid.
36. The holistic meaning of $\sigma\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is difficult to prove: R.H.Gundry. op.cit.
Chapters 1 - 5.
37. J.A.T.Robinson. op.cit. p.51.
38. Notice that J.A.T.Robinson describes Paul's other non-body references
to the church as 'metaphor'. op.cit. p.52,53.
39. See also Ps.80:5, Hosea 10:1, Isea. 52:2.
40. E. Best. op.cit. p.98.
41. Blass, E, Debrunner. Grammar of N.I. Greek, cup. 453.
42. Source lost.
43. Source lost.
44. Conzelmann. 1.Corinthians. p.212.
45. A common reformed view.
46. H. Ridderbos. op.cit. p.372.
47. Not as E.Best. op.cit. "The Spirit brings Members into the Body". p.97.
48. In Chapter 2.
49. C.K.Barrett. 1.Cor. p.292. This will be seen later when Ephesians
and Colossians are examined.
50. Conzelmann. 1.Cor. p.214.
51. E.Best, in discussing this verse, doesn't seem to be able to decide
between 'metaphor' ("it is like the body of Christ".p.105) and 'realism' -
("Christians are the Body of Christ".p.104.n2.
52. Ridderbos. op.cit. p.376/7.
53. J.A.T. Robinson. Eph. (1939). p.57-61.

54. Yates R. E.T. vol. 83. pp. 146-151 : lists 5 possible interpretations.
55. Howard.G. N.T.S. 20. 1970. p.352.
56. ibid. p.352. Arndt & Gingrich. op.cit. p.339
57. Not. αὐτοῦ (v22) as Yates (E.T.83) claims. Why in opposition to a word 12 places back in the sentence ?
58. Best. op.cit. p.146/7. Robinson op.cit. p.66.
59. Howard. G. op.cit. p.353.
60. Eph. 1:17,22, 3:2,7,8,16, 4:7,8,11,27,28, 6:19, Col. 1:25.
61. Howard, G. op.cit. p.753.
62. Note its use in I.Cor.15:27.
63. See Proverbs 8 : 22,23.
64. Ridderbos. H. op.cit. p.389.
65. Rudolf Schnackenburg. op.cit. p176.

Chapter 4.

1. Kaseman, Essays in New Testament Themes p.28.
2. Source lost.
3. Morris L. p.68 in Studying the New Testament Today. Vol. I. (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. 1975)
4. Marshall I.H. Luke p.153
5. Caird G.B. Luke (Penguin) p.229
6. Franklin, Christ the Lord
7. See Jeremias J. Theology of New Testament Vol. I. p. 100/101 and the summary of views: Ladd G.E., Jesus and the Kingdom p.224 ~~22~~ 25: Conzelmann in his Theology of Luke interprets this as "the Kingdom of God is with you in your hearts" p.120f.
8. Conzelmann op. cit.
9. Cullmann O. op. cit.
10. Jeremias J. Theology of the New Testament Vol. I. p.167-170
11. Strack-Billerbeck Vol. I. p.173
12. Luke 16:16 (see 7:28) does not denigrate the position of John as the final prophet. He is not in fact excluded from the Kingdom of

God (Luke 13:28). His work is regarded as the beginning of the Gospel. John is indeed even regarded as "preaching the Good News" (Luke 3:18 cf Ac 1:22). This, together with the fact of demon activity in the ministry of Jesus (e.g. Luke 11:20f) severely damages Conzelmann's division of Luke-Ac into 3 periods of salvation history:

- (i) Age up to and including John
- (ii) Age of Jesus, marked by the absence of demon activity, "die Mitte der Zeit", and
- (iii) the age of the Church.

13. Taylor V. Sacrifice p.9²
Lists Matthew 13:38, 41, 43; 5:19; 16:19
Mark 9:47 Matthew 7:21 Luke 7:28; 16:16
14. Jeremias J. Theology of the New Testament p.147
15. The words "some who are last will be first K.T.L." are probably a reference to the response of the Jews and the Gentiles to Jesus. Marshall Luke p.568
16. Flew R.N. op. cit. p.53
17. For discussion of Jewish Messianic hope, see : Taylor V. op. cit. p.12-20
18. Bultmann in his History of the Synoptic Problem denies that Jesus refers to Himself, but rather to a future figure. This is based largely on its occurrence in Enoch. (However, Matthew Black, in a public lecture at Rhodes' University, 1979, points out that Enoch c.37-71 is the only place in pre-Christian literature that deals with the apocalyptic Son of Man. But, in the Qumran discoveries fragments of every one of Enoch's¹ 118 chapters have been found, except chapters 37-71. This is probably a later development and insertion, inspired by the

Gospel account. If this is so, one of the main props of Bultmann's arguments falls away.

19. Jeremias J. The Parables of Jesus p.171.
20. It is not a late community formulation as Bultmann suggests. The presence of Aramaisms point to an early Palestinian origin.
21. Flew R.N. op. cit. p.39
22. Flew R.N. op. cit. p.39 quoting Manson T.W. Teachings of Jesus 1971, p.181
23. Matthew's version is different in that it is used to illustrate the necessity of seeking apostate brethren.
24. Jeremias J. Theology of the New Testament p.170
25. Suggit J.N., in his paper; Luke's understanding of the Eucharist p.3

Chapter 5.

1. Bruner F.D. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Eerdmans, 1973 p.161
2. Not therefore just "popular" with no religious signification, as Strathmann claims in his Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IV. p.50
3. Franklin E. op. cit. p.88
4. See Chapter 4.
5. Brown R. The Birth of the Messiah p.278/9
6. The term "New Israel" is not used in the New Testament at all.
7. Dahl N.A. op. cit. p.324
8. Dahl N.A. op. cit. p.324-327
9. Bruce F.F. Acts p.298
10. Dahl N.A. op. cit. p.326

11. See Arndt and Gingrich op. cit. p.490 (μαλλον n.i.)
12. Jervell J. p.50
13. Jervell J. p.50/51
14. Conzelman H. Theology of St. Luke
Caird J.B. Luke
15. Jervell J. p.
16. Jervell J. p.123
17. Luke, of all the New Testament writers, takes the most interest in the Samaritans. John contains the narrative of Jesus and the Samaritan woman, the comment of 4:9 revealing that they are a group of which his readers know little. In Matthew 10:5 a mission to Samaria is described; from the contrast that Matthew draws between the "House of Israel" and the Samaritans, it seems that he does not regard the Samaritans as Jews. This view of Luke is strengthened if Stephen was actually a Samaritan. See Anchor Bible Commentary on Acts where an article shows that Stephen in his speech (Ac 7:1-56) was using the Samaritan Pentateuch.
18. It is doubtful if Luke included traditional material here to illustrate the expansion of the Church. The language of Acts 8 is quite Lukan (Jervell J. op. cit. p.114 contra Conzelmann op. cit. p.71) and if it is Luke's purpose to depict Cornelius as the first Gentile convert, why did he place the Samaritan episode before Acts 10 and thus lessen its impact? The answer lies in the fact that Luke did not regard the Samaritans as non-Jews (Jervell J. p.129)
19. Jervell J. p.117

20. Geographical references also indicate the Jewishness of the Samaritans. In Acts 1:8, mention is made of Galilee, Judaea, Samaria and the rest of the world. Then in Acts 9:31 before the mission to the Gentiles, a reference is made to the "whole church of Judaea, Galilee and Samaria". Finally Acts 10: refers to the Gospel being preached throughout Judaea, an implicit reference to Samaria.
21. I am indebted to Jervell J. for the following point (p.111-127)
22. Conzelmann C.F. esp. p.35f
23. Haenchen regards this as a reference to the resurrection of Jesus (Acts p.448) but as Jervell J. comments (p.52) this would be odd as the second half of the verse refers to Gentiles. Therefore, the first half should refer to the Jews.
24. A very early view. Dahl op. cit. p.326/327
25. Jervell J. op. cit. p.57
26. Haenchen Acts p.184 denies the reference to Gentiles here, but see Bruce F.F. Acts p.99
27. Jervell J. op. cit. p.64

Chapter 6.

1. Lindars, quoted by Jervell J. op. cit. p.107 n.43
2. e.g. Conzelmann p.216; Haenchen p.163; 353
3. This time the statement is corroborated, not as in Peter's first sermon, by Scriptural proof, but by the testimony of the eye-witnesses, the Apostles. Haenchen Acts p.206.
4. Haenchen Acts p.353
5. See Chapter 5.
6. Jervell J. op. cit. p.99; Haenchen Acts p.410
7. See also Mark 10:17f (rich young man) and Luke 18:24

Mark 12:41 (the widow's mite) and Luke 21:1

Mark 13:1f (the Apocalyptic discourse) and Luke 24:5,7.

8. Haenchen Acts p.144 n.i.
9. It has been argued that this is a parallel account to the calling of the Twelve. This need not be so and even if the account were traditional, Luke didn't have to include it if it didn't suit his purpose. Notice in Luke 10:16 the understanding of Shaliach upon which the concept of the Apostle has been built. The problem with this view is that here it applies to the Seventy, not the Twelve.
10. Jervell J. op. cit. p.96
11. The speech is made up from material from Mark (10:41 ff) Q (22:30 ; Matthew 19:28) and L (22:28,29).
12. Jervell J. op. cit. p.84
13. *ibid.* p.84
14. This verb is used as, by it "the human factor is excluded"
Haenchen Acts p.162
15. Haenchen Acts p.164 asserts that the eschatological function of the Twelve in Luke disappears in Acts through a historicising tendency. Or, they are the accounts of traditional remembrances.
16. Jervell J. op. cit. p.81
17. Discussed in Chapter 5.
18. Dunn J.D.G. op. cit. p.44
19. Bruce F.F. op. cit. p.66 states that ἵπστατο is emphatic and not merely a Semitic auxiliary. But see Arndt and Gingrich op. cit. p. 11B whereby they say that this means "simply what Jesus did."
20. Dunn J.D.G. op. cit. p.45.

21. *ibid.* p.44
22. It is debatable if all the disciples (Ac 1:15 - the 120) or just the Twelve are being referred to by "they were all together." (Ac. 2:). Haenchen Acts p. 167 denies that "all" just refers to the Twelve. Yet, it could, for Luke has just mentioned them explicitly in Acts 1:26 (and see 2:14) as well as devoting 1:15-25 to the election.
23. For a discussion of this position see : Bax D.S. A Different Gospel. (A critique of the Theology behind Apartheid). Presbyterian Church of South Africa 1979. p.19.
24. Küng H. *op. cit.* p.80.
25. Thornton L.S. *op. cit.* p.5.
26. See Flew R.N. *op. cit.* p.109/110 and Thornton L.S. *op. cit.* additional note G. p. 448.
27. Thornton L.S. *op. cit.* p.6.
28. Bruce F.F. *op. cit.* p.100
29. See Chapter 4.
30. Dunn in Holy Spirit Baptism pp.63-69 suggests that the account shows that salvation is impossible without the Holy Spirit, even though the Samaritans had been baptized in water. He further suggests that the parallel between the accounts of Simon Magus and the Samaritans leads to the possibility that as Simon's was not a genuine act of faith, neither was that of the Samaritans. Even granting Dunn's point, why was it then necessary for Apostles from Jerusalem to come to Samaria? Couldn't Philip have rectified the situation? Rather, this is a crucial step in the restoration of the "New Israel". It is unlikely that this should be taken as an example of delayed confirmation. See Bruner F.D. *op. cit.* pp. 173-188.

31. Bruner F.D. op. cit. p.161.
32. It is not at all clear that the Ephesian disciples were Christian disciples. They were probably disciples of John. See Dunn J.D.G. : Baptism in the Holy Spirit pp.83-90 and Hoekema : Holy Spirit Baptism (Paternoster 1972) for detailed argument.
33. Franklin E. op. cit. p.147.

CONCLUSION

1. C.F. Burney .. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel pp 43ff quoted in SJT vol. 1954 p.170.