

Rhodes University Grahamstown

CHRISTO - CENTRIC RECONCILIATION

H.D. Jeannot

RHODES UNIVERSITY GRAHAMSTOWN

C H R I S T O - C E N T R I C R E C O N C I L I A T I O N

being

a dissertation considering reconciliation

with particular reference to;

The Baptism of Jesus,

the Temptations of Jesus,

the Title of Son of Man as used by Jesus,

and the Pauline texts which refer to reconciliation,

Submitted to the

FACULTY OF DIVINITY

RHODES UNIVERSITY

in candidacy for the degree of

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

by

Hugues Donald Jeannot

15th January, 1973.

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>I</u>	1
RECONCILIATION AND THE WORLD	1
<u>II</u>	7
Jesus of Nazareth THE ANOINTED SON OF GOD	7
The Baptism of Jesus	11
The Anointing with the Spirit of God	16
The Kingdom Come	19
The Kingdom Proclaimed	23
<u>III</u>	27
Jesus of Nazareth NEW MAN OF THE NEW AGE	27
The Temptations of Jesus	27
the FIRST temptation	30
the SECOND temptation	32
the THIRD temptation	35
In ALL THREE temptations	37
<u>IV</u>	41
Jesus of Nazareth SON OF MAN	41
Jesus and the Son of Man	42
Jesus and the (Saints of the Most High) Many	51
A Ransom for Many	57
The Son of Man and the Suffering Servant	61
<u>V</u>	67
THE RISEN LORD	67
<u>VI</u>	75
THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION	75
II Corinthians 5 : 18-20	75
Romans 5 : 10,11	83
Colossians 1 : 15-23	94
Ephesians 2 : 14-18	101
<u>VII</u>	107
AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	120

IRECONCILIATION IN THE WORLD

"God, ... through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation."¹

"Among all churches throughout the world there is a growing conviction that God's great reconciliation in Jesus Christ is still the answer desperately needed by modern man."²

The United Presbyterian Church U.S.A.'s Confession of 1967 made "reconciliation the all embracing category for describing God's work and man's response, including especially his response in social and political action."³ The Uniting General Council of the WORLD ALLIANCE OF REFORMED AND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES and the INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL was held in August of 1970 in Nairobi, Kenya. The theme for the conference, chosen in a "serious attempt to listen and to be sensitive to what the Spirit is saying to the churches",⁴ was God Reconciles and Makes Free.⁵

The churches' concern and involvement in a mission of reconciliation between man and man, may be noticed, amongst other examples, in the World Council of Churches' programmes to combat racism⁶ as well as the similarly en-

-
1. II Corinthians 5:18.
 2. Reconciliation in Today's World: Ed. Allen O. Miller, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1969. p.6.
 3. Op.cit. p.6. See p.105 e.g. "God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ is the ground of the peace, justice and freedom among nations ..."
 4. Op.cit. p.6.
 5. The book "Reconciliation in Today's World" referred to consists of six papers introducing this theme.
 6. Quite apart from its controversial help to "liberation movements" and its equally debated withdrawal from financial involvement in Southern Africa.

titled programmes initiated in 1971 by the S.A.C.C. and its member churches.⁷

Reconciliation is, however, a term that is meaningfully alive to people, quite apart from the Christian Gospel. The experience of being unreconciled is widespread, or at least widely noticed. University students and sophisticated persons have been influenced by prestigious thought-formers such as Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Fromm, Tillich and others. This kind of influence has filtered into daily usage in expressions such as, "this isn't living; it's a mere existence".

It is certain that the term reconciliation has acquired a purely secularized meaning, which has no links with the biblical motif of reconciliation.

People, instead of feeling estranged from God and cut off from entry into "heaven", because of their sin, are mostly conceiving of their estrangement as a loss of contact with their own true selves. Or they feel estranged from others by a lack of freedom, imposed by socially conditioned norms and guilt complexes.

Ever since Feuerbach declared that theology was in fact no more than anthropology,⁹ reconciliation has been the ideal towards which man must strain, by overcoming a variety of obstacles. These obstacles may variously be identified as class, economic, or race distinctions and the subsequent prejudices and discriminations. Or the obstacles

7. See minutes of Council meeting, Durban, 1971 and reports, and minutes of Council meeting, Johannesburg, August 1972.

8. Black Power and Black Theology movements are symptomatic of this unreconciledness.

9. Kenneth Hamilton; "Reconciliation and the New Humanity". Paper II of "Reconciliation in Today's World" op.cit. whom we have followed closely up to this point.

may be middle class morality, imperialism, colonialism, or outdated establishments of governments and the church.

The proposed remedy is to remove all such obstacles so that people may be free to make love not war, without interference from either establishments of state or church, nor will any man suffer from pre-conditioned complexes, of guilt or otherwise. Once the obstacles to reconciliation have been removed, mankind will automatically find wholeness and harmony in a life of 'freedom' and, mutual tolerance and 'love'.⁹

The kind of anthropological subjectivity described above is of direct concern to the churches intent on a mission of reconciliation. All too often christian terminology does not convey any distinctively christian meaning, nor does it confront people with the options of the faith as set out by the scriptures. The tendency is to confuse the christian terminology of faith with the subjective state of individual consciousness. Reconciliation is one such term as we have seen above.

Reconciliation has been denuded of any distinctively christian meaning. Reconciliation is confined to the decision of human beings to get along together and sing,

"When your friends are my friends,
And my friends are your friends,
The more we are together
The happier we'll be",

as a hymn to Reconciliation.¹⁰

10. An old popular song quoted by Donald G. Miller; "God Reconciles and makes Free", paper one of Reconciliation in Today's World op.cit. on whom we are now depending for our discussion.

It may be granted, in all seriousness, that the humanist concept of reconciliation has relevance to the christian's understanding of the need for social, economic, and political changes, and that this in turn helps him to understand the distinctively christian meaning and implications of the term. Christian reconciliation must of necessity be worked out in human society in terms of the needs of that society. The christian, however, must guard against making the social, economic or political aspects decisively determinative of the meaning of reconciliation, for his mission of reconciliation in the world.

The churches have always to interact with the "world" as environment. They must do so without detaching themselves from their environment¹¹ in spite of their not being primarily dependent on this environment.¹² Rather the churches interact with their environment because they are set there to live out their destiny in terms of that interaction.¹³

"The problem today, in a world where the human longing for reconciliation and freedom is unquestionably widespread and deep, is to christianize this authentic urge and to save it both from becoming a new idolatry by absolutizing the human natural desires and capacities for goodwill and freedom, and from becoming a delusive hope which will end in tragic disillusionment and despair."¹⁴

In such a situation as we have had described for us above,¹⁵ christians must not jump to the conclusion that people and "society" are going to recognize of their own effort that the "ministry of reconciliation"¹⁶ has been

11. John 17 : 6

12. John 17 : 16

13. John 17 : 11 and 18; Phil. 2 : 12,13

14. Donald G. Miller op.cit. p.16 whose paper we have followed closely to this point.

15. As in any and all environmental situations.

16. II Cor. 5 : 18

entrusted to the church, and therefore call on the church for solutions to their problems of alienation or estrangement.

Both secular humanism and political ideologies are recognising the need and opportunity for providing a meaningful goal for man, and are powerfully competing for man's acceptance. There is nothing new in the churches having to compete against secular forces, or principalities and powers, for man's spirit.¹⁷

The church needs to be reminded of how it received its ministry of reconciliation, as and when it seeks to reconcile an alienated world to God and to itself. The christian received reconciliation himself, as he "received Christ Jesus the Lord", and so must live in Him, "rooted and built up in Him and established in the faith", preaching the "message of reconciliation" to every creature; "God making his appeal" through the churches as the churches beseech the world (and each other) on behalf of Christ to be "reconciled to God". The churches on behalf of Christ must preach peace and reconciliation to those afar off and those who are near, for through Christ all have access in one Spirit to the Father, and through whom also the dividing walls of hostility have been broken down that he might create in Himself one New Man, reconciling all to God in One Body through His cross; thereby bringing hostility to an end.¹⁸

It is by way of recalling the whence of the mission of the churches and by way of deepening the understanding of the ministry of reconciliation entrusted to the christian today and always; and in order that the mission of reconciliation may be understood to be necessarily built up and firmly rooted in the faith that received

17. John H. Reisner, "Reconciliation and Creation", paper four of "Reconciliation in Today's World" op.cit. p.86.
 18. II Cor. 5:19,20; Eph. 1:14-18; Col. 1:23; 2:6,7 which in this paragraph we have used eclectically.

Christ Jesus as Lord that we pursue the present study
under the theme of reconciliation.

II

Jesus of Nazareth

THE ANOINTED SON OF GOD

"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (II Cor. 5:19)

We shall see how the term reconciliation in the Pauline¹ and post-Pauline² epistles is in fact to be understood only in terms of God's action in and through Jesus called the Christ. Not only is this so as regards the risen and ascended Lord, but specifically also of the Jesus who was crucified on the cross. We shall also start with the person of Jesus called the Christ as we encounter Him in the Gospels, and especially in the synoptic Gospels.³ Having made a study on the three topics; the baptism of Jesus, the tempting of Jesus in the wilderness, and Jesus as Son of Man,⁴ we shall then turn our attention to the New Testament passages particularly concerned with the reconciliation realized in Christ.⁵

Our chief sources on the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, are the Gospels. The gospels themselves are part of the apostolic church's proclamation and witness to the crucified Jesus of Nazareth as the risen and ascended Lord and Christ.

-
1. II Cor. 5:18-20; Romans 5:6-11; Col. 1:15-23, and
 2. Eph. 1:11-22 if Ephesians is not of Pauline authorship but see below.
 3. The synoptics being the more 'historical' of the Gospels but see below.
 4. Because of the limitations set on our study we confine ourselves to these three topics. From the first two we hope to form some understanding of what the evangelists thought and believed of Jesus of Nazareth, and from the last we hope to form some understanding of what Jesus understood and believed of himself.
 5. In the epistles we have the earliest theological

In turning to the gospels as sources on the life of Jesus, it is impossible to ignore the form-critical understanding of the formation of the gospels, of the nature of the gospels and of the history of the gospel tradition. This form - critical approach proposes that all we can be absolutely sure about in the gospels, is that they are a record of what the early church believed about Jesus and his earthly ministry. Hardly a logion remains unchallenged as authentically historical.⁶ The gospels as we have them are written in response to a total encounter with Jesus, both as the crucified one and as the risen and ascended Lord who exercises his Lordship through the Holy Spirit in the church. As post pentecost documents they are too subjected to the effects of the resurrection and ascension and pentecost, to be objective about the events of the pre-crucifixion life of Jesus of Nazareth.

While not denying any value at all to this view, we must ask ourselves whether the writers of the gospels were so naïvely unaware of what they were about that they projected, like conditioned automations, the church's christology at the time of writing, backwards unto a historical Jesus of Nazareth, thereby creating a purely mythological Jesus, now called Christ.

It has been argued, by C.F.D. Moule, that the synoptic gospel writers⁷ were in fact doing their best to

-
5. (cont.) formulations of the church's response to the person of Jesus as Lord, and the one in and through whom God had reconciled the world to himself.
 6. The large amount of sub-conscious influence and the lack of memory that the form-critics presuppose the evangelists to suffer from, leads one to hold their critical faculties suspect.
 7. Unlike John's gospel which presents later christological thinking as part of Christ's own teaching.

remember rather than christologize existentially - and that they knew the difference. That there is accretion and interpretation is not doubted, but the synoptic gospels were written specifically to fill the need in the church for a historically orientated record of the life of Jesus. The gospels were written for both kerugmatic and didactic, and apologetic purposes.⁸ There is difficulty in being certain where reporting ceases and interpretation starts; and which is remembered teaching, and which contemporary teaching, being projected backward unto the historical Jesus. Event and report of event can never in fact be separated completely from interpretation.⁹

To indulge in the sorting out of actual words of Jesus from possible constructions of the church, is not our present task. For our purposes we shall accept the synoptic gospels at least, as substantially a fair and interpretive record of the events as remembered and passed on in the church by the disciples and apostles.¹⁰ This would include events as factual, though variously interpreted¹¹ and even actual sayings of Jesus which were remembered.¹²

8. Moule: The Phenomenon of the New Testament pp.100 ff.

9. And perception is conditioned by learned categories, and this is where the methods of form-criticism are useful and valid.

10. See Luke 1 : 1 - 4

11. The baptism of Jesus for instance is attested by all the synoptics and perhaps, indirectly by John's Gospel. But there are variations in the narratives which lead to some uncertainty of detail and therefore of interpretation.

12. The self-appellation of Jesus by the title Son of Man. That Jesus did call himself Son of Man is best attested by the fact that in the New Testament this title is used once only in reference to Christ by disciple or apostle after pentecost. (Acts 7 : 56). What purpose would there be in the Evangelists' using an unknown title unless it was historical. What Jesus called himself would be carefully dealt with.

Even if the actual words were not remembered verbatim, certainly we can accept recurrent themes and certain turns of phrase as actually remembered and as accurate guides to the essentials of events.

We wish to know what events, sayings of Jesus, and what actions of his before the crucifixion, and perhaps the crucifixion itself helped to convince the disciples that here was the Christ, or the Son of God.¹³

What was it in the life of Jesus of Nazareth that prepared the disciples to recognise him as the risen Lord and as the Christ.¹⁴

13. Matt. 16:16 and parallels.

14. Acts 2:32-36. Pentecost is part of the experience of Christ as Lord and God (John 20:19-23, 28) and is therefore part of the kerugma which when proclaimed leads to the conclusion in Acts 2:36. From a christian point of view the title Christ is to be understood post-pentecost. It is because of certain projections back into the time before the crucifixion, (Matt. 16:16 perhaps) that form-criticism has a positive contribution to make, despite our mock-cynicism above.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

All the gospels attest to the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist.¹⁵ "John's baptism was conceived (and practised) under the influence of a vivid expectation of the End-Age, of the coming of God to exercise judgement. It was, we may say with Dr. Schweitzer, an 'eschatological sacrament'."¹⁶

It is precisely because the baptism of John is eschatological that it deals with sin, and that it has a communal aspect. The only kind of Israel fit to meet judgement was one cleansed from sin;¹⁷ and John knew

-
15. John's gospel, though it deals with the Baptist at length, does not record the event of Jesus' baptism. The story of the baptism in its synoptic form is presumed. (John 1:32-34)
16. C.K. Barrett; "The Holy Spirit and Gospel Tradition", p.33 quoting A. Schweitzer: "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle" p.229 f. From this point in our discussion we follow Barrett's relevant discussion closely. Through the baptism of John, the penitent became one of the prepared people of God, able to await the coming judgement without fear of being cast into the fire. John had substantial authority from the language of the prophets for adopting washing as a symbol of cleansing: Is. 1:16; 4:4; Jer. 4:14; Ps. 51:4,9; Ez. 36:25 etc. He also had adequate precedent for turning metaphor into symbolic action: (II Kings 13:15-19; Jer. 19; 32:6-15; Ezek. 4:1-3). Barrett, op.cit. p.33.
17. For John, the whole of his work was overshadowed by the imminent judgement. Every unfruitful tree would be cut down (Matt. 3:8,10 e.g.). It was necessary to act quickly, and pluck if possible, at least a few brands from the impending fire; to assemble a remnant of Israel, truly prepared to meet their God. The purity he preached, and to which his baptism contributed, was no general requirement of goodness; it was an urgent necessity of the last times /cf. Davies: "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", p.224 - "Whether Jeremiah's words be understood to imply a New Torah or merely a perfect conformity to the old Torah, (Jer. 31:31-34) the age to come would mark the triumph of obedience to the law, it would be a time when the rebelliousness of the people of 'Israel' would cease. This was, however, not incompatible with Ezekiel's vision of the Age to Come as that of the Spirit, because where the Spirit is poured forth there is fulfilled the hope of Jeremiah." Moreover, in the very chapter where Ezekiel looks to the coming of the life-giving Spirit

from the scriptures of the hope that before the time came, God would cleanse his people with water.¹⁸

To one who recalled the deeds of the prophets and who himself lived in the thought-world where such deeds were natural, it would be an easy step to translate the prophesied cleansing into a national act of repentance and purifying. If the baptism of John had not dealt with sin¹⁹ it would entirely have failed in its purpose in preparing men for a judgement at which guilt of sin or the converse was to be the decisive factor.

Those who were, by the baptism cleansed of sin and made secure against the future judgement were, at the same time, banded together in the ranks of the true Israel. Their security lay in their membership of the purified people of God, which they had entered in a manner analogous to the entry of a proselyte into Judaism.²⁰

17. (cont.) he also speaks, like Jeremiah, of a New Covenant. (Ezek. 37: 26 cf. Matt.3: 11 ff. e.g.)⁷ "The rite of baptism in this context is closely akin to the marking of the faithful in Ezek.9: 4-11, and in various parts of the New Testament". (Schweitzer; *The Mysticism of Paul and the Apostle*, p.333.) We should recall too, Old Testament passages (e.g. Is.4: 4; Ezek.36: 25) where a cleansing of the people with water is promised before the final coming of God to judgement and vindication. Barrett, op.cit. p. 33.
18. The baptism of John is comparable to proselyte baptism. Paradoxical as this might have seemed to Jews, John asked them, the sons of Abraham to be baptised and cleansed - as were proselytes entering Judaism. This paradox is one fundamental axiom of John's preaching; "Think not to say in yourselves, we have Abraham as our father; for I say to you that God is able to raise up of these stones children to Abraham." Jewish descent is no guarantee of security in the day of the Lord. Hence the necessity for some act by which those, who had forfeited the right of membership in the chosen people of God, might regain their membership. Barrett, op.cit. p. 32.
19. John the Baptizer appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. Mk.1: 4.
20. We have, as mentioned above, followed Barrett closely, up to this point but cf. G.W.H. Lampe: "The Seal of the Spirit" pp. 20 - 32.

The evangelists' use of the baptizing of Jesus by John, to introduce His ministry in the Gospels is christological in that we are to understand Jesus' ministry in the light of the baptism event. The baptism event itself in the Gospels is no mere literary device but the recording of history.²¹

"Christianity, in fact, sprang from John's mission of preaching and baptizing, a truth that the synoptic gospels clearly indicate. According to the 'Q' tradition,²² Jesus explicitly declared that the Baptist fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi²³ and was the "Messenger sent to prepare the way"; the natural interpretation of the passage is that He regarded John as the "forerunner" of Himself. A similar attitude to John's work on the part of Jesus is indicated in the Markan tradition²⁴ by the reply which he gave to the question about authority."²⁵

Besides signifying a cleansing in preparation for judgement, John's baptism was also preparatory for a future baptism with the Holy Spirit.²⁶ A general outpouring of the Spirit of God was an important part of Israel's eschatological expectations.²⁷ The baptism of Jesus by John was, "set forth at the beginning of the Gospel (of Mark) to assert that the person of Jesus could be understood only in terms of Messiahship and the Spirit of God."²⁸

21. Barrett, op.cit. p. 33. It seems that the apostolic church could not avoid testifying to the baptism of Jesus, despite the difficulties it created (cf. John 1: 6-8; 15; 19-23). The Markan narrative for instance seemed to later evangelists, open to the false interpretation that Jesus was a sinful man, inferior to the Baptist; consequently they took precautions against such misunderstanding (e.g. Lk. 3: 15-16 and Matt. 3: 11, 12, 15). Whatever the validity of Barretts argument we believe that there was a stronger reason for the evangelists' inclusion of the baptism, namely that the beginning of the gospel starts with the

It seems evident from Barrett's survey as we have followed it, that Jesus' acceptance of baptism from John meant that he was moving in the same circles of prophetic and eschatological expectations as the Baptist.²⁹

According to Mark, Jesus presented himself for baptism in the same way as any other of the sons of Abraham who wished to "break"³⁰ with the disobedience and unfaithfulness, which had brought upon them destruction in the past, and which were now holding back the promised Kingdom.³¹

Jesus by accepting baptism associated himself with a community of God's people who were of a mind to bind themselves, by this baptism of John's, together in a fresh allegiance to God.³²

-
21. (cont.) preaching of John as the forerunner.
(cf. Mark 1: 1 f. with Matt. 11: 7-14 and parallel.)
However, see below for Barrett's agreement with this.
22. Matt. 11: 11; Luke 7: 27.
23. Mal. 3: 1 - cf. Luke 7: 24 ff.
24. Mark 11: 30 ff.
25. G.W.H. Lampe: "The Seal of the Spirit" p.20. The point of the argument between Jesus and his questioners, is that His authority is the same as John's with whose proclamation of the Kingdom as imminent, Jesus' own words and works are connected by way of fulfilment.
26. Mark 1: 8; Matt. 3: 11.
27. G.W.H. Lampe: op.cit. pp. 29 ff. cf. Davies: "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism" pp. 223 ff."the Age to Come was regarded in Rabbinic thought as an Age of the Spirit". (p. 223).
28. Barrett: op.cit. p. 34. See note 21 above. My italics.
29. Barrett: op.cit. p. 35 and in what follows we follow him closely.
30. Barrett's use of "break", which we have used as well, for the more conventional term "repentance", raises the question of the meaning of repentance. To repent of evil may mean to repent of evil or sin committed, but it could also mean, not in contradiction to the above, to break away from, or abandon evil or sin in principle. That is to renounce evil ways as a future mode of action. Repentance is in the New Testament sense, not only a breaking from the past sins (and hopefully their consequences), but a commitment to disown evil ways and ends from henceforth.
31. "Messiah cannot come until the people repent and perfectly fulfil the law" Sanh. 97a: Schürer: "Jewish

-
31. (cont.) People in the time of Christ", II, ii, 163, quoted by Barrett op.cit. p. 35 notes, cf. the claim of Jesus in Matt. 5: 17 and cf. John 15: 10.
32. Barrett: op.cit. note on p. 35. "Matthew's variant in the baptism narrative, and his added verse, are secondary; but the motive supplied for the submission to baptism, "it is fitting for us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 4: 15) is worthy of consideration. Righteousness means complete obedience to every ordinance, which, according to some Rabbinic sayings, was necessary before the Messiah could come; "the Messiah cannot come until the people repent and perfectly fulfil the law". (See note 31 above). The Interpreters Dictionary notes that, "the word righteousness in the report of Jesus' baptism (Matt. 3: 15) is best understood in relational terms. John's baptism constituted part of his call to repentance in preparation for the coming Kingdom of God. As such, it was a demand that all men, including the Jews, admit by repentance and baptism that a radically new relationship to God was necessary. Thus by his submission to John's baptism, Jesus also recognised the necessity of this New Covenant relationship, (see Isa. 59: 21; 61: 1 ff.; Jer. 31: 31-34; Ezek. 36: 25-27) by which God will bring about the establishment of his Kingdom God's Kingdom and his righteousness are closely identified in the message of Jesus. (Matt. 6: 33; 13: 43 cf. Matt. 5: 10; Ro. 14: 17; I Cor. 6: 9)". P.J. Achtmeier, Vol. 4, p. 93, Righteousness in the New Testament.

Jesus by accepting baptism from John accepted God's reign in his own life within the new community being formed by John's preaching and baptism; committing himself to the complete obedience of righteousness. This was made possible in terms of the New Covenant in the Spirit, as indicated by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus in the form of a dove.

THE ANOINTING WITH THE SPIRIT OF GOD

In their narratives of the baptism of Jesus¹ Mark and Matthew say Jesus saw the Spirit (Spirit of God : Matt.) descending upon himself like a dove. Luke writes that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus in bodily form as a dove. "In Rabbinic literature, the dove several times represents the community of Israel; that it was also treated as a symbol of the Spirit of God appears only to a very limited degree."² The references to the dove in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus probably symbolize that the gift of the Spirit is given for the building up of the community of the New Israel, in terms of the New Covenant in the Spirit.³ We are not bound to interpret the dove as a symbol of the Spirit as Strack and Billerbeck seek to do.⁴

A voice from heaven is reported by the evangelists at the time of the descent of the Spirit, declaring Jesus to be God's (understood) beloved son in whom He was well pleased.⁵ The gospel testimony is that Jesus' sonship,

-
1. Mk. 1: 10; Matt. 3: 16; Lk. 3: 22 cf. John 1: 32-34.
 2. H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck: "Kommentaar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch", Munich; 1922 ff. of Vol. I, p. 23, quoted by C.K. Barrett, op.cit. p. 38.
 3. Abrahams: Studies I 47-50 as referred to by Barrett op.cit. pp. 38, 39.
 4. Cf. I Cor 14: 12. See Davies, op.cit. p. 203 where reference is made to Ezek. 37: 11-14 in terms of the Holy Spirit as the organizing principle of national unity. But cf. also 203 - 208. "As in other things so in his emphasis on the communal nature of the Spirit (I Cor. 12:-14), Paul then was a Hebrew of the Hebrews". p. 208 Davies op.cit.
 5. Mk. 1: 11; Matt. 3: 17; Lk. 3: 22. (cf. John 1: 33,34 where the voice 'from heaven' is not coincidental with the descent but what it declares is relevant to the descent). The sonship ascribed to Jesus, is that of beloved or elect Son. If the allusion is to Is. 42: 1, or 44: 2. (Beloved is equivalent to chosen or elect, as a comparison of Is. 42: 1 and 44: 2, and the variants in Lk. 9: 35 show.) The allusion may also include Is. 11: 2; 52: 13; 61: 1, because for the evangelists Isaiah was considered as one whole.

whether messianically conceived in terms of the "suffering servant" of Isaiah or not, can only be understood in the light of his being anointed with the Holy Spirit.⁶ If the Son is the Servant of Is. 42, the declaration that Jesus is the Servant of God is inevitably accompanied by the gift of the Spirit, since the Servant must be equipped with the Spirit for the performance of his services. If the reference is to adoption as Son of God,⁷ then Jesus at his baptism 'becomes' or is revealed as such, not as the result of divine begetting,⁸ but as the one anointed to be the King Messiah, the true successor of David.⁹

When Saul and David are anointed to be kings, the immediate consequence is that the Spirit of the Lord begins to work upon them.¹⁰ It is not strange then, in view of Isa. 61: 1; "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me", to find the explanation of the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit interpreted outside the Gospels by words put into Peter's mouth at Acts 10: 38; "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with Him."

Whatever we may decide on the historicity of the 'dove' and the 'voice' we can certainly conclude that the evangelists wish us to understand Jesus' ministry as

-
6. Cf. Luke 4: 18-21; Matt. 12: 9-23 e.g. We shall discuss this issue below.
 7. Psalm 2: 7; Luke 3: 22 reading of D "Today I have begotten thee" cf. II Sam. 7: 8-14 e.g.
 8. The birth narratives in Luke may be anti-adoptionist apologetic declaring Jesus to be God's son eternally - but see Barrett's discussion of the role of the Spirit in birth narratives, as compared to the baptism narratives. Barrett, op.cit. p. 45.
 9. See also I Samuel 16: 12-13.
 10. I Sam. 10: 1,6,10; 16: 13. Thus closely connected with

somehow linked with John's baptism and in keeping with its eschatological motif, Jesus as baptised anointed with Spirit for his task. The evangelists are asking their readers to understand all that follows in terms of "God anointed Jesus with Spirit and power. All the healing and good he did subsequently was because God was with him."

We cannot in fact understand Jesus' ministry apart from His fellowship, in one Spirit, with the Father.¹¹

10. (cont.) the symbolic anointing with oil, is the anointing with Spirit. Cf. I Kings 19:16 for the anointing of Elisha to be prophet. Barret, op.cit. p.42.

11. Eph. 2:18,20b,22.

THE KINGDOM COME

In view of the above, it seems strange indeed that the synoptic gospels are so lacking in teaching on the Holy Spirit by Jesus. What teaching there is has often been contested as being projections and not genuine logia of Jesus.¹²

One of these sayings concerns blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. At Mark 3: 29 we find; "... but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness." In its context of vv 22-30 this saying can only mean that to reject the demonstration of God's Kingdom by the works of the Holy Spirit,¹³ to call the exorcisms of demons by the power of the Holy Spirit the work of Beelzebub;¹⁴ is to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. The claim, whether made by Jesus or not, is that Jesus casts out demons by the Spirit of God with which he was uniquely anointed.¹⁵

12. Cf. A.W. Wainwright: "The Trinity in the New Testament" p. 207, 214 e.g.

13. a) Cf. Matt. 12: 28; Luke 11: 20.
b) "by the finger of God" and "by the Spirit of God" means much the same thing. It could be said, "by the power and presence of God". cf. Ex. 8: 19; 3: 18; Ps. 8: 3; Ezek. 3: 12-15 e.g.

14. Or Satan's, cf. Mk. 3: 23.

15. Barrett, op.cit. p. 104, agrees that, "the decisive question was whether a man accepted the works of Jesus as due to divine or diabolical inspiration. To take the latter was in itself to reject God's salvation, (for Jesus is thought of as 'pneumatic' because he is also the Messiah, i.e. the one anointed with the Holy Spirit) and to exclude oneself from the Kingdom of God, and the sphere of forgiveness". But see also Fuller: "Foundations of New Testament Christology", p. 109; "Jesus here indicates that his words and works are those of the Holy Spirit". Fuller then wonders if Jesus understood his baptism in terms of Isa. 61: 1 ff. If so Jesus then understood his role eschatologically, in terms of eschatological prophecies. Cf. Luke 4: 18. Wainwright, "The Trinity in the New Testament", p. 208, comments, "To accuse the Holy Spirit of being Beelzebub was the gravest possible sin." (Wainwright defends the authenticity of the saying as against Barrett, who questions it.

The Matthean parallel¹⁶ expressly claims that Jesus casts out demons by the Holy Spirit.¹⁷

The point of the controversy over the Holy Spirit as present and active or not, was more than an unforgiveable offence, it concerned the reality of the eschaton.¹⁸ The eschatological Kingdom was to be the age of the Spirit.¹⁹ If therefore the presence of the Spirit is evident in the words of authority and in the works of Jesus, then is the Kingdom truly come upon the hearers and beholders.²⁰ The complementary interdependence of the presence of the Holy Spirit and the presence of the Kingdom, or reign of God, is obvious. If the Holy Spirit is so obviously at work then is the Kingdom come.

The Baptist had proclaimed the imminence of the Kingdom and prophesied the outpouring of the Holy Spirit,²¹

-
15. (cont.) See also Wainwright, p. 212 on Luke 4: 18 e.g.v) The sin against the Holy Spirit is that rejection of God's evident presence, which obduracy seals the ears and blinds the eyes in that the blasphemer is ever beyond the reach of God's forgiveness, since he has denied that God has acted when He did. The blasphemer will never recognise God. Cf. John 8: 18-19; 5: 36 ff.
16. Matt. 12: 24-32.
17. Matt. 12: 28 cf. Luke 4: 18-20.
18. Cf. Mk. 2: 5-11 where the argument is over Jesus' authority to forgive sins, and his being accused of blasphemy when he does forgive sins with authority by healing the paralytic. Jesus' authority to forgive sins (v.5) is demonstrated in the healing (vv. 10-12). The authority to forgive and the power to heal are both from the same source - the Holy Spirit. See M.D. Hooker's exegesis of this passage in, "The Son of Man", p. 86 ff., "It is sufficient that popular opinion in Jesus' time did consider physical misfortune to be the direct result of sin (cf. John 9: 1-3). A remark in the Talmud (B.Ned. 41a) that, "No one gets up from his sick-bed until all his sins are forgiven", is relevant here to all of Jesus' healings as signs of the Kingdom in which Israel is purged of sin and dominion by Satan."
19. Isa. 61: 1 ff., Jer. 31: 31 ff., Ezek. 36: 25 ff., Joel 2: 28 ff. and our discussion earlier. Also see note 43 below.
20. Matt. 12: 28.
21. Matt. 3: 11, Luke 3: 16 cf. John 1: 33.

within a short space by the one of whom he proclaimed himself to be the forerunner. Jesus identifies himself with this preaching of the imminent kingdom, submits to baptism and the outpouring of the Spirit takes place, He is anointed Son of God. As a result of this anointing he is directed by the Holy Spirit and commences his ministry of preaching and good works which evidence the presence of God in the Spirit and thus the arrival of the Kingdom. Jesus in His own person thus brings the Kingdom.²²

At his baptism Jesus' sonship is declared in terms of a community of the Holy Spirit - a new Israel - as indicated in the descent of the Spirit like a dove. The descent of the Spirit on Jesus signals the commencement of his ministry of preaching the gospel of the Kingdom to the poor; the releasing of the captives of sin, and the consequent misfortunes of such a captivity; the recovery of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty those oppressed of the devil,²³ in short to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God in His own person upon whom the Spirit of the Lord had come,²⁴ Furthermore the descent of the Spirit like a dove indicates that this is He by whom God shall pour out the Spirit on the new spirit-community of the New Covenant. The Spirit is given to the Son who will establish the community. Jesus' mission is completed at pentecost.²⁵

22. Jesus' own authority was inseparably bound up with that of John as we have seen above (Mark 11:27-33). In other words, it was in his baptism by John that Jesus received the authority (by the anointment with the Holy Spirit) from Heaven, i.e. from God, for his eschatological ministry. (Cf. Matt. 11:12, 16-19). Commenting on Matt. 11:12, 16-19 Fuller, op.cit. p.117 writes, "Here again for Jesus, his baptism marks the point when the eschatological salvation burst through".

23. Cf. Acts 10:38.

24. We have paraphrased Luke 14:18 ff.

25. See note 21 above.

There may be few logia of Jesus on the Holy Spirit in the synoptics, but the whole "Gospel of Jesus Christ" as written by the evangelists, by putting the baptism of Jesus as the event initiating the ministry, makes it quite clear that Jesus is the one anointed with the Spirit and therefore all that follows in his ministry is done in the power of the Spirit. The Kingdom prophesied by John is being realized in Jesus' ministry because Jesus is the anointed one, the Son of God, the Messiah. Through his baptism²⁶ Jesus is understood to have been the Man of the Spirit in whom the kingdom of the end was being realized. It was this anointed one who later dispensed the same Spirit to all who repented and believed in him.²⁷

Perhaps the most apt commentary on this dual aspect of the Sonship of Jesus and his relation to the Holy Spirit is by a juxtaposition of the personal pronoun singular interpolated into Romans 8:14.

"For all who are led by the Spirit
 For he who was led by the Spirit
 of God are sons of God ...
 of God was the son of God ...

You received the Spirit of sonship
He received the Spirit of sonship

whereby we cry, Abba! Father!"
 whereby He cried, Abba! Father!

It is because Jesus himself is Son of God in the Holy Spirit that the community he forms by that Spirit are the Sons of God

26. Or earlier through his birth as in Luke.

27. In Romans 8:14. We are of course not advocating adoptionism. The baptismal narratives in the Gospels are based on event which the evangelists interpret to witness that Jesus' deeds and likewise his proclamation of the Kingdom, are present actualisation of the eschatological Kingdom of God. In His works, as in His words, God is present, acting eschatologically through Jesus. Fuller, op.cit. p.105, concludes that Jesus' own understanding of his words and works is, that God, present by the Holy Spirit, is acting eschatologically through Himself. And this understanding is demonstrated by logia which pass all criteria of authenticity e.g. the "Truly, I say to you" phrase so characteristic of Jesus' utterances. See note 33 below.

THE KINGDOM PROCLAIMED

From the very beginning of his ministry Jesus proclaims the immediate presence of the Kingdom, with a call to repentance and belief in the gospel of the Kingdom.²⁸

The ethical teaching of Jesus also points to Jesus' presupposition that he is acting in union with God. The only authority for Jesus' ethical demand upon his hearers is, "Truly, I say to you",²⁹ which is the same formula that introduces his eschatological sayings.³⁰ With this "I say to you", Jesus confronts men with the direct demand of God. In his words God's demand is directly spoken.³¹ Jesus is not reporting God's message to himself as a prophet would,³² nor is he interpreting a tradition or passages of scripture as a rabbi might. The word is direct, addressed from the speaker to the hearer. God is directly present, actively demanding unreserved obedience to his will from those who can believe that Jesus is the embodiment of the eschatological age.

The works of Jesus also immediately proclaim the immediacy of the Kingdom as we have seen.

Jesus' teaching about God has an immediate quality about it too. For Jesus, God is not distant but a living present reality. This he expressed by the use of the intimate address, "Abba",³³ and in his teachings about God's

28. Mk. 1: 14, Matt. 4: 17, Luke 4: 19,21.

29. Cf. Matt. 5: 18 ff. where the, "But I say to you" is contrasted to, "you have heard that it was said"... is peculiar to Matt., but it catches the point and authority of "Amen, I say to you". Cf. Luke 6: 27. See Fuller: op.cit. note 17, p. 132.

30. It is noteworthy that one of the contexts in which Jesus uses this formula is in sayings that speak of the presence of the Kingdom now, and its relation to the future. E.g. Matt. 10: 15, 42. Mk. 9: 41. Luke 12: 8-9.

31. Mk. 1: 27, cf. Matt. 7: 28 ff.

providential care which removes all ground for anxiety.³⁴

The nearness of God is now a reality precisely in His drawing near in Jesus' eschatological ministry. This sense of God's intimate closeness is then to be expected in Jesus.

Not only is Jesus capable of calling God "Abba" in reverent intimacy, because he has known God as the one who has drawn nigh in His very words and deeds, but Jesus admits to the same privilege³⁵ those who have responded to his own, and therefore the Father's, eschatological message and call in both words and deeds.³⁶

Jesus accepted the possibility, if not the inevitability, of his own death as part of his ministry in the Kingdom. Not only because he had the very recent example of John the Baptist's death, but because at the heart of Judaism martyrdom was considered to be inherent in a prophetic vocation.³⁷ Jesus himself quite out of context from the predictions of his death, and in reply to the warning of Herod's plans to kill him, says "..... it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jeru-

32. Isa. 42: 5, etc.

33. Fuller: op.cit. note 18 p. 132, notes that Jeremias (Expository Times 71 (1960) p. 144) claims, that an examination of the whole of later Jewish literature of prayer failed to yield a single instance of "Abba" as an address to God. See Kittel for the meaning of "Abba". Perhaps best explained as meaning Father but equivalent to the intimate "pappa" or "daddy" of a child to his own father. Such an intimate term does not of course evidence any disrespect.

34. Matt. 6: 25-34

35. "Matt. 11: 27 is an explicit expression of the implicit Christology of Jesus' own use of 'Abba'." Fuller, op.cit. note 20 p. 133 (cf. Lk.10:22).

36. The eschatological aspect is emphasised by Fuller because he is concerned with Christology in terms of eschatological prophet, but we must not lose sight of the complementary interdependence with the presence of the Holy Spirit. Fuller: op.cit. p.105-6 whom we have followed in our discussion.

37. Fuller: op.cit. p.107. We shall have more to say of

saalem".³⁸ At the Last Supper Jesus links his death with the eschaton saying "Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God".³⁹ Jesus in contrast to the disciples is having his last meal on earth. He is to be taken away to die but on the other side of death he will feast in the Messianic banquet. "Between Jesus at the supper and the consummation of the Kingdom lies the decisive event of his own death. Here Jesus brings his death into direct association with the eschatological message of the Kingdom of God which he had proclaimed throughout his ministry."⁴⁰ The association is even more explicit in Luke 13:31-33 where his death was to be the result of his deeds. "His death, as understood by Himself, is a part of God's eschatological action in Him."⁴⁰

In preparing the disciples for his death Jesus brought it into the orbit of the whole of His ministry, thus creating an expectancy amongst his disciples that even his death said something of his relation to God.

The evangelists in placing the baptism of Jesus and the anointing with the Spirit at the beginning of their written gospels were presenting an apologetic⁴¹ for Jesus

37. (cont.) Jesus' death as part of His obedience in His relationship of righteousness vis-a-vis the Father.

38. Luke 13:33.

39. Mk. 14:25.

40. These two passages are given by Fuller: op.cit. pp. 107-8 as two which are authentic words of Jesus Himself for the reasons he sets out. Others such as the passion predictions or Mark 10:45b and Mark 14:24 are assigned to early church additions. Not only the evangelists understood Jesus' death as somehow linked with His ministry in retrospect, but apparently Jesus taught them before His death, as the evangelists say he did (though the content is in dispute).

41. Cf. Moule: "The Phenomenon of the New Testament" p.102.

as the spiritual foundation stone of the spiritual temple of God.⁴² Jesus the Spirit filled man, because of this anointing, is He, in and through whom God was active, as his words, works, his whole life and even his death witness. It is He who is also the risen and ascended one as witnessed to by the apostles. Let those who have 'eyes' and 'ears' see and hear!⁴³

42. Eph. 2:20-22.

43. Luke 10:21-24. See also note 35 above on Matt. parallel at 11:27. Davies: op.cit. p.216, points out that it cannot be doubted that the Rabbinic Judaism of the first century would have regarded the Messianic Age or the Age to Come as the Era of the Spirit. "We may assume that Paul was reared within a Judaism which, tended to relegate the activity of the Holy Spirit to the past. We now point out, however, that it was also a Judaism which cherished a strong expectation of the coming of the Holy Spirit in the future. ...What lent reality to the Messianic claims of Jesus was the presence of the Spirit, the advent of the power of the Age to Come". (cf. note 19 above.)

Jesus of Nazareth

NEW MAN OF THE NEW AGE

"..... he is a new creation, the old has passed away, behold, the new has come." (II Cor. 5:17b)

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

All three synoptic gospels narrate that Jesus was tempted after his baptism and anointing of the Holy Spirit.¹ The synoptics agree on five points:

- a) that Jesus faced temptation,²
- b) in the wilderness,³
- c) for forty days,⁴
- d) that he was directed by the Spirit,⁵ and
- e) enticed by Satan.⁶

1. Mark 1:12-13, Matt. 4:1-11, Luke 4:1-13 (cf. Heb. 2:18, 4:15). Mark's reference is brief and stark. He refers to beasts and omits the fasting. Matt. and Luke present a threefold temptation in form of dramatic dialogue between Jesus and Satan. "While God has cause to test the faith and loyalty of fickle men, man has no ground whatever to test God. In the New Testament God tests men's faith and understanding (e.g. John 6:6), it is Satan and not God who entices men to evil (cf. 1 Chr. 21:1 and II Sam.24:1)." Interpreters dictionary article on TEMPT, Vol.IV p.568.
2. See our discussion below but cf. e.g. Matt 4:5 ff. and 16:21 ff.
3. Deut. 8:16; Ps.95:8,9; Is.32:16; 35:6; 40:3; Ezek. 20:13; Matt. 3:3; 15:33; etc.
4. Cf. Ex. 24:18; Deut. 9:9; 29:5; Josh. 5:6; I Kings 19:8 with the role of Moses and Elijah at Matt.17:3 (and parallels). It may be that the theme of Jesus as the Prophet promised by Moses (John 1:45 e.g.) is here expressed.
5. A man of God could prove his faith through trials, as Job had done. Empowered by the Spirit, Jesus faced and defeated his adversary. (Interpreters Dictionary article on "TEMPT" by J. Marsh, Vol.IV p.568.) See also our discussion above, that the whole of Jesus' life and ministry was empowered by the Spirit.
6. Satan (or Beelzebub) is the New Testament Adversary of Jesus in his ministry against all forms of evil. See our discussion above on blasphemy against the Holy Spirit for instance.

The accounts may be regarded as purely the result of devout imagination, although Mark's stark account would negate this theory; or they may be autobiographical, as only Jesus could have told of this experience. Jesus, however, is rarely autobiographical in his teaching. Thirdly the narratives may be an introduction to the ministry of Jesus to highlight the issues that will be discussed in what follows.⁷ The probable answer to the question of the temptations is that, as they reflect careful thought about Jesus,⁷ they are, as we have them recorded in Matt. and Luke, reflections on the life of Jesus expressed in the form of a dramatic highlighting of issues in the form of temptations. That Jesus went into the wilderness after his baptism is not necessarily negated by the evangelists use of the event, and it is quite possible that Jesus related some of the temptations that did occur to him as he prepared himself for his ministry in thought, prayer and planning. For our present purposes the historicity of the event as narrated is of lesser importance.

The temptations⁸ are said to be under the in-

-
7. Interpreters Dictionary Vo.IV p.568: Temptation of Jesus by D.M. Beck.
8. In the Old Testament the righteous, or the people of God are tested, not by any of the powers of evil, but by God himself: Gen. 22:1; Exod. 15:25; 16:4; 20:20; Deut. 8:2; 13:4; Judg. 2:22; 3:1,4. In the case of Job, where the word 'tempt' is not used, there is no exception, for in Job, Satan is a subordinate to God acting as God's agent. Elsewhere the 'proving' is by an evil power: e.g. in Judges 3:1 ff. The proving however lies within the purposes of God (Barrett, op.cit. p.48 note). See also Interpreters Dictionary TEMPT Vol.IV p.568: "Perhaps the inner core of all temptation, of all forms of testing, is the enticement to apostacy, found especially in persecution (I Pet. 4:12). This understanding of temptation underlies the petition in the Lord's Prayer: 'Lead us not into temptation' (Matt. 6:13). The Christian like the Old Testament Saint knows that it is not God who entices

fluence of the Spirit.⁹ The narratives in Matthew and Luke indicate that Jesus acted under constraint of the Spirit to face his adversary, fully equipped with divine power.¹⁰ The tests are probably a highlighting of the Messianic role of Jesus. That is, the temptations are not those of an ordinary individual. The victorious over the tempter Satan is the newly anointed Son of God. It is this anointed one, who is attacked by Satan (Matt. 4:3b if ...) as no other could be. Only he could be enticed to establish himself over against God as an independent divine being, as Adam had. The presupposition and force of the devil's enticement is the authority that Jesus has as God's anointed son. The temptation to be like God of Gen. 3:4-5 is here repeated. (Cf. Rom. 5:12 ff. and II Cor. 5:17.) The reversal of the Genesis tragedy is here evident.

The scene of the temptations was the wilderness, a habitation of demons.¹¹ The temptations are thus set in a milieu pointing to the conflict of Jesus with demons in his ministry. The confrontation between the Kingdom of God and that of the "Prince of this world".¹²

Jesus, according to Mark, was with the wild beasts. This may be an allusion to Adam's friendly relations to the beasts in Eden before the fall.¹³ Dominion over the beasts is sometimes associated with conquest over Satan,¹⁴ and the beasts of Daniel, chapter seven, represent the evil nations

-
8. (cont.) him to evil, but his own desires. (I Chr. 21:1 ff.; II Sam. 24:10; Jas. 1:12-15).
9. Matt. 4:1; Mark 1:12,13; Luke 4:1.
10. From this point we return to Barrett's discussion of the subject and follow that discussion closely. Barrett, op.cit. pp. 49 ff.
11. Barrett: op.cit. refers to Strack & Billerbeck op.cit. p.49.
12. Matt. 9:34, John 14:30; 16:11.
13. See Kittel T.W.N.T.; I. Adam by J. Jeremias.
14. E.g. The Messianic prophecies in Is. 11:6; Ezek. 34:25; cf. Ps. 91:11-13, Job 5:23.

which have falsely ruled over the saints of the Most High, and over whom the Son of Man, as representative figure of the saints, will be given dominion. "On the one hand we have the initial victory of the hostile powers which have conquered and crushed Israel; their triumph is temporary, however, for the decree of the divine court is followed by their defeat and subjugation, and dominion over them is given to the Son of Man, representing the faithful remnant of Israel. On the other hand, we have the motif of Yahweh's conquest over chaos symbolised by the fourth beast, who, at this final battle, must be slain and destroyed. As in other applications of the myth, whether cultic or historical, it is the people who suffer initial defeat, and Yahweh who gains victory; the rule of righteousness is restored to them, but it is the gift of God, not the result of their own achievement. The Saints of the Most High have the same passive rôle in the explanation of the vision."¹⁵

Whether the allusion is made to Adam or to the Son of Man we seem to be brought to the same milieu of divine initiative in creation. The temptations of Jesus are in themselves a new beginning, undertaken in the power of the Spirit.

The FIRST temptation points to the giving of Manna as food for the people of God, as it was expected that in the Messianic Kingdom the supply of Manna would

15. M.D. Hooker: 'The Son of Man' pp. 22-23. But see also pp. 11-30. The conquest of Yahweh over chaos strikes a note reminiscent of Gen. 1:2 when the Spirit of God moved over the formless waters (cf. I Cor. 6:2). The contrasting between first Adam who is subjugated by Evil and God's second Adam in Jesus who conquers evil may be in the mind of the evangelists. Whether Mark in fact had a 'Son of Man' allusion in mind or an allusion to Adam and the beasts, is not clear.

be renewed.¹⁶ The posing of the question is, in view of the preceding anointment by the Spirit and the declaration from Heaven, particularly messianic as well: "If you are the Son of God" Jesus answers that, what is important as Son of God, is to obey God's will.¹⁷ This temptation touches the whole relationship between "Father" and "Son". If you are God's son then and the answer, If I am God's son then my baptism was undertaken that righteousness might be fulfilled,¹⁸ and righteousness is wholehearted obedience to God's will.

The first temptation is also adamic. Adam was tempted to eat to assert his equalness to God, knowing good and evil.¹⁹ Jesus is tempted to eat to assert his power and authority as Son of God - to assert his divinity in the face of his obvious human weakness, as he hungers

16. Thus Barrett: op.cit. p.49 f.

17. Matt. 4:4; Deut. 8:3.

Barrett: op.cit. p.50 states in connection with the Markan, "and he was with the beasts" (Mk. 1:12) that Jesus effects the eschatological conquest over Satan, which results in a salvation that means the restoration of primeval bliss. Jesus has just been anointed "Son of God" ("My Son") in the descent of the Holy Spirit. The devil tempts with, "if you are the Son of God", Jesus replies "Man shall not live by bread alone", (Deut. 8:3). Jesus thus identifies himself with man - or perhaps Son of Man - in contrast to "Son of God" - i.e. as one of God's people of the Saints of the Most High, whom he has identified himself with in his baptism. See also Manson: "Jesus the Messiah" p.159 ff. Cullmann: "The Christology of the New Testament" p.163 and his reference to, Jonathan Targum which has "Son of Man" in the text of Deut. 8:13.

18. Matt. 3:15. See our discussion on righteousness. Chapter VI, footnote 30. Jesus as Son of God in human form, or in adamic form, was in a dependent (but independent) relationship to God as Adam had been. To assert his given authority and power for his own ends, would be to deny that authority and power was dependent on God having given it. Cf. Phil. 2:6,7. Cf. Matt. 3:15 and 4:17,20.

19. Gen. 3:4 f.

after forty days of fasting.²⁰

The First temptation also foreshadows what is made more explicit in the others. The temptation is to think of Sonship in terms of worldly limits and needs. If Jesus is the Son of God then he can do as he wills in this world.²¹ The temptation is to limit the scope of God's Kingdom to the bounds of his creation - it is the eternal temptation to secularize, to reduce theology to anthropology, to reduce God's Kingdom to equivalence with man's authority.²²

At the first temptation, the whole fate of mankind is jeopardized. The whole of the adamic tragedy could be repeated and affirmed. But Jesus reverses the process of the ages, he starts his sonship with obedience, not disobedience. A new beginning in relationships between God and Man is made - a New Man has arrived on the scene, a New Age is born. The age of disobedience is past - the age of righteousness is inaugurated.

The SECOND temptation²³ is to perform a compulsive sign that will put the fact of Jesus' sonship beyond all possible doubt.²⁴ The temptation to prove that

20. Matt. 4:2,3.

21. Cf. Rom. 6:1-10 and Gen. 1:28b ff.

22. An authority which is in any case derived in reality, but the temptation to deny this and to exercise that authority autonomously. Cf. Genesis 1:28B ff., Rom. 1:22 ff.

23. Matthean order.

24. Cf. Matt. 12:38-39; 16:3-4; Mk. 8:11,12; Luke 11:29. Davies, op.cit. p.206 ... "The diminution of prophecy or the cessation of the Spirit ... was traced to the increasing sinfulness of Israel." In Sitre Deuteronomy, R. Eliezer (AD 80-120) when he came to the scriptural verse; "And because of these abominations the Lord thy God is driving them out before thee" (Deut. 18:12), used to remark, "What harm we cause ourselves! since he who clings to impurities, a spirit of impurity rests on him ...", and he goes on to ask: "Why is the Holy Spirit so little in evidence in Israel?" and answers with the quotation: "But your iniquities have separated between you and your God" (Isa. 59:2). A sinful nation is no longer a suitable environment for the Holy Spirit.

he is anointed of the Spirit by performing spectacular deeds is a possible obverse to the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. It is to abuse the Holy Spirit and to use the power and authority for self glorification rather than God's purposes.

The second temptation is a variant of the temptation which Jesus faces at Mark 8:12. Again the issue is the relationship between God and the Son of God. It is faith that opens the gates of the Kingdom - not the proofs and signs, which compel. The temptation is put in the form of a quotation from Psalm 91:11 and 12. At verse 9 of the same Psalm the psalmist writes, "Because you have made the Lord your refuge, the Most High your habitation, no evil shall befall you", and in verse 14 God says, "Because he cleaves to me in love, I will deliver him." The Spirit of Sonship is one of faith, love and obedience. Jesus meets the temptation by quoting from Deut. 6:16, "You shall not put the Lord your God to the test, as you tested him at Masah."

Masah was the name given by Moses to the place where the Israelite found fault with God and Moses, and put "The Lord to the proof saying, Is the Lord among us or not?"²⁵ The temptation is thus doubly barbed - not only is it asking for signs as proof of Jesus's Sonship,²⁶ which is a variation of the first temptation, but it goes deeper as Jesus' reply indicates, it is a challenge to put God's anointing by the Holy Spirit to the test. The temptation is no longer merely, "if you are the Son of God ...", but "... as you are the Son of God, God's Spirit is with you, or is it?" The temptation is cruel as it links directly

25. Ex. 17:2-7

26. As Barrett: op.cit. suggests this temptation to be. The irony of this temptation is that Jesus the Son

with Jesus' ministry. For the sake of the people he came to serve, if not for his own needs, he is asked to abuse his relationship to God. As at Mark 8:12 where Jesus sighed in his spirit and said, "Why does this generation seek a sign? Truly, I say to you no sign shall be given to this generation", here at the temptation Jesus refuses to accommodate the evil enticement.

The second temptation may be set forward as a recapitulation and reversal of the Israelite failure at Masah, as the first temptation was a recapitulation and reversal of Adam's failure, as indicated by the reply of Jesus. The psalm from which the temptation is formulated is one of trust in God as protector of the faithful, and thus a Psalm which would indicate God's community amongst men. The cruelty of this temptation as we have seen is its appeal to the community sentiment and community solidarity.

The second temptation is the eternal temptation of God's people to put their rôle in God's world above the God who gave them that rôle. It is to make Judaism or Christianity more important than God. It is to make the church's mission in the world the measure of its worth. It is to exchange the divine ordination to priesthood in the world for the adulation and approval of the world as the measure of validity for service to the world. It is the temptation to interpret the clamourings of the world for sensation as the guidance of God for Christian activity in the world. It is the very modern temptation to interpret anthropological desires and wants as divine imperatives.

26. (cont.) of God is tempted to prove his faith in God, whereas it is forbidden to test God, to see if His Spirit is really with Jesus as His Son.

The THIRD temptation²⁷ is again peculiarly messianic. The high mountain is Pisgah - the mountain where Moses viewed the promised land - from which Jesus has in prospect a possible kingdom, which he rejects;²⁸ the messianic kingdom was not to be acquired by submission to Satan, but by the obedience of righteousness, faith and love, to which Jesus had submitted in baptism.²⁹

The third temptation is aimed at Jesus' role in the bringing of the Kingdom of God. The allusion to Moses' sighting of the Holy Land from Pisgah³⁰ may be an allusion to Jesus as the prophet greater than Moses of whom Moses himself spoke.³¹ The restoration of Israel as envisaged by Moses is apparently offered to Jesus. The full weight of Jewish expectations is flung at Jesus in this temptation. The temptation to be Messiah of Israel in conformation with the political, religious, social and economic aspirations of Israel and of Judea in Jesus' own life time.³²

The third temptation appears crude and blunt, but its force can be seen when it comes from the disciple Peter, whose recognition of Jesus as the "anointed" is one that makes its own demand and temptation.³³ Jesus' reply to the devil is similar in both instances.³⁴

The third temptation is the temptation to implement God's plans, to establish God's Kingdom in terms of worldly powers, principalities, and to measure God's power

27. Matthean order.

28. Thus Barrett: op.cit.

29. Cf. e.g. Mark 8:36, 37; Luke 11:28, 12:15-21, 12:28-31, and John 18:33-38 for the true nature of God's Kingdom - which cannot be confused with the Devil's offer of worldly glory.

30. Deut. 34:1.

31. Numbers 27:12; Deut. 34:1 ff.; 34:10 ff.; 18:15-22; John 1:45.

32. Cf. other "Worldly Kingdom" temptations of Jesus at John 6:15; Mark 10:35-37, 11:10.

and authority by worldly standards of Glory. It is the temptation to reduce the Kingdom of God to an earthly utopia. The glory of worldly kingdoms, or political power, cannot be sought by Jesus as a means to establish God's Kingdom. His strategy is to obey and serve one Lord and Father.³⁵ The reply of Jesus to this third temptation, "you shall worship the Lord your God and Him only shall you serve",³⁶ clearly indicates that he is not deceived by the enticement. He sees it for what it is. A call to abandon God's Kingdom in exchange for worldly kingdoms. He sees that he is asked to abandon God and set himself up as sole ruler over the world. The shallowness of this glory is seen when it is realized by worshipping satan or the devil - which is to say - when Jesus is asked to abandon thinking as God leads him and to think as men think.³⁷

The third temptation is not only a temptation that Jesus faced as the Messiah of Israel, to become a political davidic ruler, in order to restore the worldly glories of Israel. It is the temptation of Israel to interpret its relationship to God in terms of dominion over other nations instead of as God's servant and priests to those nations. It is the temptation of Christians to trust in their political influence, or their moral influence, to establish world peace. It is the temptation of all men to measure themselves within the limits of their history rather than in terms of the divine image and its eternal qualities.

33. See Fuller's treatment of this event, op.cit. p.109.

34. Matt. 4:10; 16:23.

35. Matt. 7:21; 4:4.

36. Cf. Mark 12:29-31; Matt. 22:34-40; Luke 10:25-28; and Mark 10:42-45.

37. See our comments above on Matt. 4:10 and 16:23.

It is mankind's temptation to chase utopias rather than to seek the Kingdom of Heaven.

True greatness, true humanity, true divinity, is in God's service to one's fellow being. The Sonship of Jesus (and all Christians) is that of the Son of Man, who is anointed to be the Saints of the Most High, in order to serve, not to be served, in order to give his life a ransom for many.³⁸

In ALL THREE of the temptations there are scriptural allusions,³⁹ and to all three Jesus replies with the inspired scriptures.⁴⁰

In the temptations Jesus is faced with the meaning and purpose of his baptism, and of his own rôle as the anointed of God. Jesus faces the enticements of the Devil, with the forces of God's Holy Spirit. In the temptations we see the aligning of the forces of the Heavenly Kingdom against those of earthly powers and demons - those of the prince of this world.

The sonship which Jesus 'receives' immediately involves him with Mission. The relationship of Jesus with the Father in the Holy Spirit, directly involves Jesus with the problems of his relationship to other men.

The temptation narratives as we have them in the gospels may be 'mythical' or not, but the three temptations as we have them give us a better understanding of how the baptism and ministry of Jesus was understood by the apostles and evangelists. The baptism is directly related to the daily events of Jesus' life. The three temptations highlight the issues that underly the daily clashes, controversies

38. Mark 10:42-45.

39. Only the second is offered in scriptural form.

40. See Davies: op.cit. p.215, for Judaic belief in inspiration of the scriptures by the Holy Spirit.

and even discussion with the disciples. The clash of the two kingdoms, the question of who do men think that I am? The defeat of the Devil, with the defeat of every disease-demon.

The whole of Jesus' ministry of teaching, preaching, healing, arguing, and exorcising are the realization of the victory gained in his temptations, and it will be carried out even over the last enemy - death itself, for the Kingdom that Jesus was establishing is not limited by the limitations of human creaturely existence - the Kingdom of God is not to be conceived of in terms of space, time, social, economic or political glories. The Kingdom is the present active power of God in Human affairs, by faith acting in love. There are no Angelic powers to obrogate the created order, no compulsive invasion of man's freedom to believe with proofs and signs. The Kingdom does not limit itself to political, social or economic glories, however farspread these may be in time and space. The Kingdom is established through faith, hope and love, as men are reconciled to God and one another.

The battle of the kingdoms will be 'hidden'.⁴¹ The presence of the Kingdom is as a seed planted in the soil, a piece of leaven in the lump, a hidden treasure in a wide field,⁴² a treasure hidden in heaven, not evident on earth, a priceless pearl for which it is worth trading all the glories of worldly kingdoms.⁴³

41. The 'Messianic Secret' of Mark is more than an editor's device.

42. Matt. 13:1-45.

43. Matt. 6:19-21 and Col. 3:3. As we have seen the 'kingdom' is present in the presence of the Holy Spirit in and through Jesus. One wonders therefore if the 'parables of the kingdom' are not the teaching of Jesus on the Holy Spirit.

The Kingdom of God, as the evangelists have made clear through their narratives of the baptism and temptation of Jesus, is not to be conceived of within the limitations of existence. The temptation to think purely existentially, to make life on earth the whole, and therefore the only standard of reference, the temptation to secularize God in terms of anthropology is to be rejected in the face of the evangelists' gospel.

Jesus in Himself reconciles the tension between the demands of God upon Man as fellow person - and the demands of creaturely instincts for survival and acceptance by one's fellow creatures. Jesus refuses to let his manhood set up a barrier between himself as son and God as his father. Jesus is man as God desired man to be - man as God's son - full of God's spirit, and by that spirit having dominion over the whole of creation.⁴⁴ Jesus is man as man should be - the son of man who has nowhere to lay his head, so preoccupied is he with serving his fellow-man.⁴⁵

Whatever the historicity of the narratives we have studied; the baptism and temptation of Jesus, we have some idea of what the evangelists understood these events to have meant.

Jesus is anointed by God for a purpose. That purpose can only be fulfilled in and through the active presence of the Holy Spirit.

44. Gen. 1:26, 2:7.

45. Matt. 8:20. The "foxes have holes," etc. saying is a warning to the over-enthusiastic, that to follow Jesus does not lead to worldly advantages - to follow Jesus is to take up a cross (Matt. 16:24-27). But the 'reward' will be given in terms of heavenly glory. (Matt. 25:31 ff.)

The presence of the Holy Spirit in and through Jesus is seen to be God's act in establishing the eschatological kingdom long promised by the prophets. The kingdom, itself is understood as an age of the Spirit. Thus the presence of the Holy Spirit and the presence of God's kingdom are interdependently complementary.

The evangelists see the Ministry of Jesus as being motivated by a new departure in the affairs between God and man. Jesus is seen as recapitulating the past history of man and Israel and reversing the present order of tragedy resulting from man's and Israel's past errors and sin. In Jesus the New Age has dawned by the birth of New Man in the "birth" by the Holy Spirit.⁴⁶

The evangelists see in Jesus the Messianic King establishing God's Kingdom - by the power of the Holy Spirit. They see God acting in and through Jesus to save man from the dominion of evil in this world; freeing man to love God with all his heart, soul, strength and mind, and to love and serve his fellow man with the same impartial love, with which God has loved him.⁴⁷

46. The anointing of Jesus in his baptism - the birth narratives of Luke and Matthew and cf. John 3:5 ff. etc.
47. Luke 10:25 ff.; 15.

IV

Jesus of Nazareth

SON OF MAN

"Who do men say that the Son of man is?"

(Matt. 16:13)

In the last two chapters we have been looking at the baptism and temptation of Jesus. By doing so we acquired an understanding of how the evangelists interpreted those events.¹ Whereas then we were not so concerned with the historicity of the narrative, in this chapter we will be concerned with historicity because we want to find out, if possible, what Jesus of Nazareth thought of his own ministry, if anything.²

For our purposes in this chapter we shall turn to the self-appellation of Jesus as Son of Man. Not only is what a man calls himself indicative of his self estimation, but some Son of Man sayings seem to be the only words of Jesus about himself in the gospels, which can be trusted as ipsissima verba.

-
1. If there were actual events to interpret or not, was secondary to the interpretation for we wished to know, not what happened, but how did the evangelists understand whatever happened. We are of the opinion that there was a baptism, and a period of reflection and meditation at some time where Jesus had to formulate a "policy" for his ministry. That the interpretation of the evangelists has been influenced by subsequent events, the resurrection and pentecost is not denied either. In fact if this is so then it is an indirect witness to the fact of the resurrection and pentecost.
 2. There is a difference between historicity of event and historicity of narrative reporting and interpreting such an event. In this chapter, whether Jesus did or did not actually refer to himself as Son of Man is basic to our findings for we wish to know what Jesus thought not what the evangelists thought.

"The question whether and in what sense Jesus designated himself the Son of Man is one of the most discussed and contested problems of the New Testament scholarship."³ This being so, we may find in this current historical debate the latest available material for our purposes.⁴

JESUS AND THE SON OF MAN

The title Son of Man has long been understood to be a title of exaltation applied to the "heavenly man", with eschatological functions.⁵ By using this title of himself Jesus therefore would be ascribing to himself the highest imaginable role in the eschatological drama.⁶ With this concept of Son of Man is tied up the role of judgement for the Son of Man as a future event.⁷

There are, on the other hand, sayings which contradict the exalted idea of the Son of Man: "The Son

-
3. Cullmann: op.cit. p.152. See also M.D. Hooker: op.cit. p.182 e.g.; V. Taylor: The Names of Jesus, p.25.
 4. We cannot do justice to the whole debate in the confines of this study. Only very briefly can we sketch out the relevant issues and draw conclusions.
 5. Taylor: op.cit. p.152 - We cannot follow his arguments. Cf. Cullmann: op.cit. pp. 137-192.
 6. This role is attested by sayings such as those about "the day of the Son of Man" (Lk. 17:22 f.), "the coming of the Son of Man" (Matt. 24:27, 37 f.) and about "coming in the glory of his Father with holy angels" (Mk. 8:38). To accept these as genuine but deny that Jesus designates himself in them raises more problems than it solves, thus Cullmann, *passim*, in reference to Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament I*, pp. 22 ff., who accepts the sayings as genuine but says that they refer to someone else than Jesus in Jesus' meaning, on the grounds that "future" sayings say nothing about death, and the "death and resurrection" sayings about the Son of Man say nothing about the future. Cullmann: *passim*.
 7. E.g. John 5:27, Matt. 25:31 ff. etc.

of Man also came not to be served but to serve", and

"... that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins".⁸

There are sayings which would confuse anyone favouring either of the above two extremes: "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels",⁹ which in its context associates Jesus very closely with the Son of Man, if it does not actually identify him as Son of Man, both on earth, and as coming at the end with the holy angels. Of this ambivalence Cullmann writes, "In view of his conviction that with his person the Kingdom of God was already introduced Jesus can call himself the Son of Man already during his earthly incarnation, although he did not descend to earth 'on the clouds of heaven'. The view then arises which we found nowhere in Judaism, that the Son of Man is incarnate in a man in the ordinary human framework, a man among men. This is new, not only with respect to Philo and the Jewish Christians but also with respect to Daniel and Enoch."¹⁰

The resolution to the Son of Man paradox in these Son of Man sayings is found by Cullmann in an original synthesis of two titles, "As soon as Jesus in decisive passages¹¹ writes the title Son of Man with the Suffering Servant of God (i.e. when he relates it to his earthly vocation), his designation of himself as the Son of Man

8. Mk. 10:45 cf. Dan. 7:14 and Mk. 2:10 cf. Dan. 7:13,18.

9. Mk. 8:38.

10. Cullmann, op.cit. p.159. Note Cullmann's presupposition that the Son of Man is a Heavenly man, whose exalted being is foreign to human existence.

11. E.g. Mark 10:45, 8:31.

becomes also a declaration of humiliation. Thus he combines ebed Yahweh and barnasha, the two decisive concepts for his self-consciousness, in a really classical way in Mark 10:45."¹²

Dealing with the same problem of reconciling the Son of Man title to the context of a human life, R.H. Fuller corrects his own earlier findings, that, "Jesus while not dictating any interpretation of his own person, understood himself to be called to a mission of obedience in terms of the Suffering Servant, the fulfilment of which would lead to his vindication as Son of Man".¹³ Fuller now concludes, however, and mainly because of the inherent "contradictions" in the "Son of Man" sayings, that; "Jesus understood his mission in terms of eschatological prophecy, and was confident of his vindication by the Son of Man at the end.

As eschatological prophet, he was not merely announcing the future coming of salvation and judgement, but actually initiating it in his words and works. It is the unexpressed, implicit figure of the eschatological prophet which gives a unity to all of Jesus' historical activity, his proclamation, his teaching with authority, his healings and exorcisms, his conduct in eating with the outcast, and finally his death in the fulfilment of

12. Cullmann: op.cit. p.160. The tension that Cullmann here resolves in terms of Servant of God is the tension of the third temptation: How to fit a heavenly rôle into an earthly existence without denying the heavenly dimension, i.e. how can the Son of God be a son of man or man. Cf. Alan Richardson; "An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament", p.135. "A brilliant new synthesis of Old Testament themes had been effected, not merely as a new theological teaching, but as a programme of action for the ministry of Jesus". The tension however is not to be resolved by theological synthesis, however brilliant - it is to be resolved in the fact of a new beginning in, and a new understanding of God-man relationships.

13. In his "The Mission and Achievement of Jesus", as cited

his prophetic mission. Take the implied self-understanding of his rôle in terms of the eschatological prophet away, and the whole ministry falls into a series of unrelated, if not meaningless fragments..... Jesus did not define his own person as that of an eschatological prophet. It was simply the working concept which guided him in the tasks of his earthly ministry. The basic datum of New Testament Christology is not the concept of Jesus as eschatological prophet, but his proclamation and activity which confront men and women with the presence and saving act of God breaking into history and his utter commitment and entire obedience to the will of God which made him the channel of that saving activity. To interpret this datum in terms of explicit Christology was the task of the post-easter church, in whose kerugma the Proclaimer became the Proclaimed."¹⁴

13. (cont.) in "Foundations" op.cit. p.130.

14. Fuller: op.cit. p.130-131. The acceptance of the inconsistencies of the Son of Man sayings, as based on Bultmann's findings, (Theology of the New Testament, I p.29 ff.) makes Fuller reject the gospel witness that Jesus referred to himself as Son of Man, directly or at all. Consequently the title for Fuller must be a Palistinian Christological title which soon dropped out of use, as there is so little evidence of its use in a Palestinian church. Thus Fuller is reduced to a Jesus as eschatological prophet, eventually to be vindicated by the Son of Man who was another person. One of the reasons why Fuller is driven to such minimal statements of Jesus' self understanding is the "traditio-historical criticism" which he follows. By this critical method Jesus cannot be known to have said anything, as attested by the Gospel, which the gospel does not somehow reflect as a natural development within palestinian Judaism and its categories. Such sayings should also reflect an aramaic style of language. Nor does it seem that Jesus is allowed to quote scripture, especially if the Gospels have the LXX version rather than an Aramaic or Hebrew form. Sayings that reflect the faith and practice, and situations of the post-easter church as known from outside the gospels, must be eliminated, thus denying any originality or creativeness to Jesus himself - except insofar as the post-easter church may have neglected to incorporate it into its post-easter gospel, faith and practice. See Fuller, op.cit. p.18 ff. We have already stated

It would seem however, that quite naturally in their context, that there are sayings of Jesus in which he refers to himself as the Son of Man.¹⁵ "Some scholars have asserted that this title as a self-designation by him was an invention of the evangelists based on the theology of the early church, but this all too simple a thesis is disproved by the fact that Son of Man was not at all a common title for Jesus in the early church.... If the evangelists were really the first to introduce the title, why do they use it only when they represent Jesus himself as speaking?¹⁶

They themselves never call him by this name and they never report another's doing so in conversation with Jesus. This would be completely inexplicable if they were really the first to attribute the title to Jesus as a self-designation. Actually, they have preserved the memory that only Jesus himself used it in this way."

The division of the "Son of Man" sayings into separate groups which are never combined or reconciled, and thus leads to speculation about genuine sayings and non-genuine sayings, has been opposed by M.D. Hooker.¹⁸

-
14. (cont.) that the evangelists were consciously making an effort to record the historical aspect of their preaching as a response to such a need in the post-easter church. See our discussion above. Chapter II, p.8 ff.
15. We need not enumerate them all: Mk.2:10; 2:28; 8:31; 9:9,12; 10:45; etc.
16. Cullmann's own footnote at this point, "The fact that in isolated passages (certainly Matt.16:13) they do so wrongly does not lessen the force of this argument - the title Son of Man is applied to Jesus by another only once in the New Testament; in Acts 7:56 by Stephen. The very fact that it is a Hellenist who uses this expression seems to me to go back to a correct memory of the author". Cf. Hooker, op.cit.p.197, where Hooker gives Stephen's use of the Son of Man title a meaning complementary to the use by Jesus as self appellation.
17. Cullmann: op.cit. p.155. Cf. Hooker: op.cit. p.186 and see also her p. 78 ff. and 174 ff. for a discussion in greater detail on other aspects of "Son of Man" as used

This tendency to divide the sayings, is attributed by Dr. Hooker, in part at least, to the prejudiced view that the Son of Man title can only refer to the "Son of Man appearing with clouds"; i.e. to an exalted heavenly Son of Man with no connection to an earthly person.¹⁹

The solution to the apparent contradictions in the Son of Man sayings is found by Dr. Hooker in the Danielic visions: "The authority, necessity for suffering, and confidence in final vindication, which are expressed in the Marcan sayings, can all be traced to Dan. 7."²⁰ Scholars have apparently failed to understand that in this vision of Daniel is is "written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things, and be treated with contempt".²¹ With reference to Mark 14:18-21²² Hooker says that it is

-
17. (cont.) by Jesus especially p. 182 ff. Cf. also V. Taylor: *The Names of Jesus*, p.25.
18. Hooker: op.cit. p.180 e.g. in reference to R. Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*, 1 p.29 ff.
19. Hooker: op.cit. p.182 ff. e.g. where Hooker discusses the 'psychological' difficulty of thinking of Jesus as a sane man identifying himself with an eschatological supernatural figure travelling on clouds. "Here, however, we must question the assumption, that this is what Jesus must have meant", in assuming this title.
20. Op.cit. p.192. We cannot here recapitulate all of Dr. Hooker's arguments for this conclusion, but see pp. 11-30 which end with the conclusion, "It is easy to understand, however, why, when the 'one like a son of man' ceased to be understood of Israel and became a distinct and separate figure, he was thought of in connection with the glory of the future, and not the sufferings of the present. Both because it was a title fitting for one given authority by God, and because the emphasis was thrown more and more upon the future glory, in contrast to the all too familiar reality of the present, the Son of Man grew apart from concepts of suffering and humiliation".
21. Hooker: op.cit. p.192. Quotation from Mark 9:12.
22. "For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed."

precisely the ideas of obedience and suffering "which are brought out in the antithesis between 'Son of Man' and 'he who betrays me'".²³ "Here the title Son of Man is, paradoxically an appropriate one since it expresses both obedience to the will of God and authority. The irony of the situation is again found in the fact that this authority is denied: the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners, who refuse to acknowledge him; he is handed over into the power of those who do not obey God. As in Daniel, the usurping powers of evil are triumphant:²⁴ the Son of Man is handed over in the hands of sinners - i.e. into the power of Gentiles,²⁵ who have appropriated an authority which does not belong to them."

The binding factor in the apparent disjunction of the Son of Man sayings, is found by Hooker in the Authority of Jesus, and in the Suffering - vindication theme. All the sayings are expressions of Jesus' authority as Son of Man, "whether it is an authority which is exercised now, which is denied (now) and so leads to suffering, or which will be acknowledged and vindicated in the future. This theme binds the three 'groups' of 'Son of Man' sayings together, for each, paradoxically, implies the other two. The sayings in chapter two²⁶ do not in themselves involve the others, but because they are rejected by the Jewish leaders they are inevitably followed by the sayings about suffering and final vindication. These two themes of

23. Hooker: passim and in what follows.

24. "Cf. H.E. Tödt; Menschensohn, p.185, Eng. Trans. p.200." (Hooker's own footnote.) Cf. Davies, op.cit. pp. 263-273 "... obedience to the law (Torah) was ... thought of in terms of death".

25. "Cf. D.E. Nineham, The Gospel according to St. Mark, 1963, in loc." (Hooker's own footnote.)

26. Mark 2: 10, 28 e.g.

suffering and vindication are also linked together. It is sometimes maintained that the two groups of sayings are entirely separate and are never combined.²⁷ Here, however, we see dangers of dividing sayings into groups ... the belief in the ultimate vindication of the Son of Man is contained in every one of the Marcan passion predictions, expressed in terms of the resurrection.²⁸ Equally significant is the fact that all three of the parousia sayings are in contexts which are concerned with suffering: the coming of the Son of Man in Mark 8:38 and 13:26,²⁹ represent the vindication of those who have suffered for Jesus' sake, and the shame of those who have not been prepared to share in his suffering; in 14:62³⁰ it signifies the vindication of Jesus himself, now standing before the high priest, about to bear the sufferings which he has foretold for the Son of Man The triumph of the Son of Man is thus no isolated event, but it is firmly linked with the present sufferings of Jesus and his disciples.³¹ The sayings at Mark 10:45, 14:21 and 41,³² also contain within themselves the paradox of the Son of Man, for each depicts the Son of Man in a situation where he does not exercise the authority which is properly his."³³

27. "R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I p. 29 f." (Hooker's footnote.)

28. Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34.

29. Mk. 8:38. "For whoever is ashamed of me of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed, when he comes ... Mk. 13:26. "And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great glory."

30. Mk. 14:62. "And Jesus said, 'I am; and you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.'"

31. "A similar situation is, of course, found in Dan. 7, where the triumph of the one like a Son of Man in verse 13 is set in the context of Israel's present sufferings," (Hooker's own footnote.)

32. "The Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as ransom for many." Mk. 10:44; Footnote 22 above for Mk. 14:21 and "The hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners", Mk. 14:41.

33. Hooker: *op.cit.* p.180-181.

Hooker's arguments seem to us as probably acceptable even to Fuller in terms of the "tradition-historical criticism". The understanding that Hooker expounds for the title Son of Man could easily be reflected within palestinian Judaism and its categories.³⁴ The only demand such an understanding makes is that the Danielic rather than the Enochian and later writings about one like unto a Son of Man, have been taken as a basis for that understanding. This is much more probable than the alternatives proposed by Fuller himself. It is anybody's guess as to what working, but undeclared, concept Jesus used to give his ministry the unity it apparently has.³⁵

It is, in our view, not only possible but also probable that Jesus could conceive of his rôle and ministry in terms of the Son of Man idea, and that this idea would fit in with Jesus' acceptance of John's baptism to fulfil righteousness. That this righteousness would bring him into conflict with the beastly powers of evil, and an apparent defeat by them, but that he could nonetheless hope for, and express faith in, a vindication in the idea of resurrection,³⁶ is quite in keeping with the Son of Man idea as expounded by Hooker.

34. See above: footnote 14.

35. See above: Text to footnote 13 and 14. (Manson: *The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels*; *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, 32, 1950, pp.171-193.)

36. Hooker: *op.cit.* p.181 and in what follows. The consequences of Jesus' authority for others in Mark 2:10, 28 are obvious. In Mark 10:45 also, the Son of Man is linked with those for whom he gives his life.

JESUS AND THE (SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH) MANY

The corporate aspect of the Son of Man is also important for our study, not only because it affects the veracity of its actual use by Jesus as a title, but because the corporate nature of the title will help us to understand what Jesus did think of himself vis-a-vis any community with which he might be associated. This is important for we have seen in our study of the baptism and the temptation that Jesus was understood to be related to a community.

It is in fact the corporate nature of the title Son of Man, "which led scholars such as T.W. Manson to maintain that the Son of Man, as in Daniel, was in fact a corporate figure."³⁵ The Son of Man in the gospels, however, is not a truly corporate figure; rather, it is true to say that the consequences of the Son of Man's authority always extends to others; that as in Enoch, he is no isolated figure, but the one on whom the fate of others depends.³⁶ In all the sayings which predict suffering for the Son of Man, Jesus is linked in the context with his followers, who are expected to share both his sufferings and his glory.³⁷ Similarly the fate of those who have followed Jesus or been ashamed of him is linked with the vindication of the Son of Man in Mark 8:38 and 13:26. Only in the context of the passion narrative does the Son of Man emerge as a solitary figure. Even the saying in Mark 14:21, however, is set within the context of the last supper, and is immediately followed by the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine, symbols of the share which the disciples have, both in the death

37. My italics, not Hooker's.



of the Son of Man, and in his place of honour in the coming kingdom."³⁸

On examining the corporate nature of Son of Man in the Danielic vision Hooker found that, "Daniel's imagery suggested that the vision of 'one like a Son of Man' was not used simply as apocalyptic symbolism, but was intended to express a very real and fundamental truth about the righteous nucleus of Israel. The vindication of those who were faithful to God was certain, because he had acknowledged them as his chosen people, destined to inherit the rule once given to Adam;³⁹ their present suffering was due to the fact that this authority was at the moment unacknowledged by the rebellious (beasts) nations over whom they should be ruling.⁴⁰ This theme of Israel's divine right to rule the earth, usurped by other nations, was found in much inter-testamental literature, expressed sometimes in terms of Adam, though the phrase 'Son of Man' is not used. In I Enoch, in spite of the fact that the Son of Man has become an individual or supernatural character, he is still closely associated with the themes of election and obedience. Both he, and the community which is so closely linked with him, are defined as the 'elect' and 'righteous'.⁴¹ The fact that

38. Hooker: op.cit. pp.101-102. "In Mk. 14:41, and 14:62 the Son of Man is found alone - in the sayings and in the context. Nevertheless the words of 14:41 echo and fulfil those of 9:31, similarly 14:62 affirms the vindication mentioned in 8:38; Mark 10:45 reminds us that the solitary Son of Man is not in fact alone, and that events of the passion finally link the Son of Man and the 'many' firmly together." Hooker; passim.

39. See our discussion above under the temptation of Jesus.

40. Ps. 44 cf. Ro. 8:36. Matt. 10:24,25 (cf. Mk.3:22).

41. Hooker: op.cit. pp.189-190, who also notes that A. Schweitzer concludes much the same, "The Son of Man described in those sayings which seem to be original is a man who lives a lowly life on earth, rejected, humiliated, handed over to his opponents, but eventually exalted by God and to be the chief witness in the last judgement". Schweitzer in Journal

in Daniel, 'the one like a Son of Man' is a corporate term, need not occasion any difficulty. Daniel itself, and the interpretation given by Enoch, are evidence of the oscillation between corporate and individual."⁴²

"There is no psychological problem involved in Jesus' use of the term for himself;⁴³ for it is not taken with hubris as a claim to supernatural power and position, but is the consequence of his obedient relationship to God⁴⁴ and his acceptance of the will of God,⁴⁵ and it expresses, not self-aggrandizement, but rather his faith in God,⁴⁶ who will fulfil his purposes and vindicate those who are faithful to him. Jesus himself is the embodiment of this ideal, the one true Israelite who is able to accept the mission and destiny of his people; but as in I Enoch, he is closely linked with those who are prepared to join themselves to him. Jesus proclaims the Kingdom of God, the kingdom which he himself accepts⁴⁷ and embodies, and calls other men to accept the same yoke of obedience, which will involve them in the same experience

41. (cont.) of Biblical Literature; Philadelphia, U.S.A., 79, 1960, pp.121 ff. Hooker then comments, "Schweitzer links this picture primarily with the suffering, righteous man in Wis. 2-5, but he compares also the exaltation of the righteous Enoch in Enoch 70-71, and the representative character of the Son of Man in Daniel".

42. Cf. Ryder-Smith; The Bible Doctrine of Salvation: "Man is always both individual and societal.... though one cannot resolve this paradox - or "antinomy".... no one denies that it is there." See the whole chapter, and book on the societal concept of salvation through vicarious action of a societal person. Cf. also Davies: op.cit. pp.268, 272 e.g.

43. See above: note 19.

44. What we find in the term righteousness as it applies to the righteousness Jesus seeks to fulfil in submitting to John's baptism. See above: Chapt. II, note 32.

45. See our discussion on the FIRST temptation above; p.30.

46. See our discussion on the temptations, and the possible typological association of Jesus with Adam. See also footnote 81 below.

47. As we saw in Jesus' relationship to John the Baptist in Chapter II above.

of suffering and vindication; yet he stands apart from them by the fact that it is in him that men are faced by decision, and ultimately the path which they take is determined by their attitude to him."⁴⁸

When Jesus "acts as the one destined to be the triumphant Son of Man already during his ministry and humiliation"⁴⁹ it is because he is already the Son of Man of whom it is written "that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt" (Mark 9:12), and is therefore "destined to be triumphant".⁵⁰ Jesus as the Son of Man may rightly hope in the resurrection even when faced with persecution and death.⁵¹ The faith of Jesus refuses to accept that the Kingdom of God is to be conceived of in terms of an earthly kingdom and its temporal glories of gentile-like authority which commands the service of others.⁵² God's Kingdom is realized in the exercising of an authority which declares that life's treasures are in heaven not earth,⁵³ and that participation in the heavenly glories finds its counterpart in a participation of God's people's righteousness and obedience to God, in faith and hope. The priority of the divine dimension over the merely existential, and God's ultimate victory over the present conditions, however apparently contradictory this victory may seem, is the good news of God's

-
48. See our discussion on the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit above, Chapt. II, "THE KINGDOM COME", p.19.
 49. Fuller: op.cit. p.108, as quoted by Hooker: op.cit. p.188.
 50. The basis of Jesus' faith in his own vindication and resurrection is precisely in his being the Son of Man who serves and dies, a ransom for many.
 51. Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33.
 52. Mark 10:41-45. See also our discussion on the temptations above, and especially the THIRD temptation.
 53. Matt. 6:19, 20; 13:44; 19:21. See also our discussion under the THIRD temptation.

Kingdom, present and active through the presence and action of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit being sent to create a community, the church, as the saints⁵⁴ of the Most High who, while participating in the sufferings of the Son of Man, are assured of sharing in his vindication.⁵⁵

Hooker's conclusion that it is because the Son of Man is to suffer many things that he shall also be triumphant, should resolve Fuller's dilemma of the "inconsistencies" in the Son of Man sayings, which prevent him from accepting these sayings as genuine and thus in turn prevent him from accepting the idea of 'Son of Man' as a self-understanding of Jesus. The Son of Man understanding would allow Fuller to see Jesus' ministry as a coherent whole - and not a 'series of unrelated and perhaps meaningless fragments', which he can find only in the self-understanding by Jesus of himself as 'eschatological prophet'.⁵⁶

54. Rom. 1:7; 8:27. I Cor. 1:2; 6:2; 14:33; 16:15; etc.

55. Rom. 6:3 ff.

56. Fuller: op.cit. as discussed above. The text following the ref. to footnote 12 above.
Fuller's 'eschatological prophet' turns out to be much more than prophet, and does not give enough recognition to the position of John the Baptist as the prophet of the eschatological kingdom (Lk. 7:24 ff. e.g.). If Jesus' baptism by John was as crucial for his ministry as we suggested above, and as Fuller admits, (p.129) in terms of the eschatological prophecies - then the whole of those prophecies were open to him as sources of self-understanding; if not for self-identification. In this regard we have some sympathy with Alan Richardson's comment, in which he revolts at the idea that, "Jesus was, (according to Bultmann: Theology of the New Testament I p.31) entirely unaware of the synthesis of Son of Man and Suffering Servant as a programme for his ministry, and the credit for this profoundly original reinterpretation of Old Testament theology must go to some unnamed genius of the Hellenistic Church before St. Paul's conversion." (Richardson: op.cit. p.135-136).

"The bold new teaching about the Son of Man; was the original work of Jesus himself, and no other plausible suggestion has ever been put forward."⁵⁷ We do not necessarily agree with Richardson and Cullmann that Jesus did synthesize the Son of Man and Servant ideas into a new kind of messiahship.⁵⁸ Hooker has shown us that this is not necessary to explain the idea of a suffering Son of Man, or to explain the apparent contradictions in the Son of Man sayings.

We do agree with the idea that Jesus should be given his due in being able to think, and to apply his thought to the Old Testament scriptures as much as any other man, and not to conceive of him as a mere "channel" (Fuller's term), but as a free choosing co-operative participator in his mission.

In order to exercise this freedom of co-operative participation,⁵⁹ some concrete self-assessment and some definite role must be implied in Jesus' self understanding that makes sense, historically, textually, and theologically, and fits into the whole picture as given to us in the New Testament. We must allow the witness of the gospels, that Jesus did teach about himself and the Kingdom of God⁶⁰ with a self consciousness that he was somehow central to the events he was involved in, and the kingdom he was preaching and teaching about. The one defined self understanding that we have from all the gospels is that contained in the title Son of Man.⁶¹

57. Richardson: op.cit. p.136.

58. See our discussion above - text to note 12 and note 12, p.44.

59. If we wish to preserve the "two-nature" christology.

60. See above where Fuller admits that Jesus did do this at least twice, and in connection with his death. See notes 27, 29, 38, 39, 40 and relevant texts of Chpt. II: The Anointing with the Spirit of God.

61. Hence surely its centrality to the whole Christological

A RANSOM FOR MANY

Jesus, as we have seen above when considering THE KINGDOM PROCLAIMED,⁶² considered his martyrdom and death as part of his obedience to God. This was so, not only in the view of the evangelists, according to Fuller, but by sayings which could be accepted as authentic, Jesus himself taught his disciples about his forthcoming death.

There are two sayings of Jesus in which he compares his fate with that of the prophets.⁶³ Despite Fuller's conviction to the contrary, we see no use of 'prophet' such that it would lead the reader to conclude that Jesus thought of himself as a prophet or eschatological prophet.⁶⁴ Fuller uses Friederich's views as an argument that Jesus while not calling himself a prophet thinks of himself as a prophet. It is illogical to argue that from two sayings where Jesus directly refers to himself as associate of the prophets as against the dozens of Son of Man sayings where he equally associates himself with the Son of Man, that Jesus thought of himself a prophet and not Son of Man. Was Jesus deliberately trying to hide

61. (cont.) debate in New Testament studies at present - a debate we have not been able to ignore.

62. See footnotes 38 - 40 and text to these.

63. Mark 6:4; Luke 13:33: There are others where an allusion may have been intended. Matt. 5:12 and Luke 13:34, 4:21, and 20:14, etc.

64. "In neither case is 'prophet' a self designation. Each time Jesus is quoting a proverb or a commonly accepted truth. As Friedrich (Messianische Hohepriestererwartung inden Synoptikern)⁼ however, has pertinently remarked about the second passage - and it applies equally to the first - "By not only identifying himself with this view point, but engaging himself to make it a reality he is ranging himself in the company of the prophets." In other words, without using 'prophet' as a direct self designation, Jesus clearly indicates that he understood his role in prophetic terms insofar as it involved rejection and martyrdom." Fuller: op.cit.p.127.

⁼ In Z. Th. K. 53 (1951) 3, p.265-311.

that he thought of himself as prophet by raising a Son of Man smokescreen? On grounds conceded by Fuller, that Jesus does not make 'prophet' a self-designation in the two sayings we would suggest that Jesus knew that like the prophets he would be martyred. This does not mean that he thought of himself as a prophet - as the parable at Mark 12:7 indicates, but only as sharing their fate of a 'death for righteousness sake'.⁶⁵

Jesus at his third prediction of the passion and resurrection⁶⁶ is asked by James and John for a share in the glories of the coming kingdom.⁶⁷ Jesus replies that they do not understand the implications of their request nor the nature of the kingdom, "are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptised with the baptism with which I am baptised?"⁶⁸ In the companion saying in Luke 12:50, "I have a baptism to be baptised with; and how I am constrained until it is accomplished!", it seems that when Jesus spoke of his baptism he not only thought of the baptism received from John but also thought that, that to which he was baptised included his suffering many things and even death.⁶⁹ The baptism to fulfil righteousness is a baptism into obedience and serving of God as we have seen in our discussion of the temptations.

Baptism is linked with the cup at Mark 10:38. The cup was the "symbol of a lot ordained by God. In the Old Testament the phrase is commonest in the prophets, and with them, since their message was usually one of doom, it

65. Matt. 5:10, 11.

66. Mark 10:32-34.

67. Mark 10:35-37.

68. Mark 10:38.

69. Cf. Rom. 6:3.

is a 'cup of vengeance', but a psalmist for instance could speak of 'the cup of salvation'".⁷⁰

Jesus used the idea in Gethsemane; "Father, all things are possible to thee, remove this cup from me", the cup here clearly refers to Jesus' suffering and martyrdom. Jesus would know, if he understood himself to be the Son of Man who was to suffer many things, that it was his Father's will that he should accept death as part of his Sonship - and he wanted to fulfil all righteousness even to the drinking of this cup.

Righteousness or obedience to God's law even unto death was considered the acme of obedience.⁷² The inspiration of the Maccabean revolt was loyalty to the Torah.⁷³ Although the Maccabean party had lost militant support, the obedience unto death by which the Maccabean martyrs bore witness of their loyalty, left a profound impression. The militancy was rejected but "the idea of obedience unto death, a passive acceptance of death out of loyalty to the revealed will of God as the crown of loyalty to the Torah, was 'in the air' in first century Judaism".⁷⁴

70. Psalm 116:13. Ryder Smith: op.cit. p.155.

71. Mark 14:36.

72. "there is evidence" says Davies, op.cit. p.263, "that for certain sections within first-century Judaism, martyrdom for the sake of the Torah was considered the acme of obedience".

73. Davies, op.cit. refers us to see W.O.E. Oesterly and T.H. Robinson: The History of Ksrael, Vol. II pp.217 ff.

74. Davies, op.cit. p.264-265. Davies comments further, "we should expect that in his (Paul's) thinking on the death of Jesus he would apply to it this concept of obedience; (Phil. 2:8) the death of the Messiah could only have one meaning for him, it would be the expression of obedience to the demands of God". See also Romans 5:13-18 where the second Adam can be connected to the Son of Man as discussed above and Phil. 2:8.

"When we go on to ask in what sense Jesus fulfilled the will of God or how he became aware of the demands of that will, we must answer that that will was revealed to him in scriptures."⁷⁵ Not only his own righteousness through obedience but that of his disciples is also revealed to Jesus through the scriptures, and so in reply to James and John Jesus explains that, "those who appear at his right and left hands in glory will be those who have drunk his cup of suffering and who have been baptised with his baptism of death. Jesus not only mentions their suffering, but apparently links them with his own".⁷⁶ There is an apparent link between Son of Man and Saints of the Most High.

The discussion of glory and baptism, leads to a discussion of authority and service,⁷⁷ and concludes, "For the Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as ransom for many".⁷⁸ "The fact that the words emerge incidentally, just to point a lesson, shows that they express a truth that Jesus took for granted, and that his disciples ought by now to take for granted. This means that its ideas were integral to Jesus' thoughts about Himself".⁷⁹ The relationship between Jesus and the

75. Davies: op.cit. p.266.

76. Hooker: op.cit. p.127

77. We are in these verses 10:42-43 confronted with the gentile or beastly powers of authority as in Daniel, chapter 7.

78. Mark 10:45.

79. Ryder-Smith: op.cit. p.156. The passage goes on "... here unmistakably the concepts of the Son of Man and the Suffering Servant blend. It is the term ransom that is novel". The term lutron is then shown to have been used in the LXX only for ransom and redeem. Lutrosis is not used to render any other terms besides 'ransoming' and 'redemption' and not 'kipper' which is to 'cover' or 'make atonement' for sin.

community is summed up in this verse. Because Jesus as Son of Man finds greatness through service, not domination,⁸⁰ and authority through obedience even to suffering, that the disciples must follow the same way.⁸¹

THE SON OF MAN AND THE SUFFERING SERVANT

That the Son of Man should be called upon to give his life as a ransom for many does recall the demand upon the Servant of Isa. 53 to offer his life as a sin offering for others. We must continue with Mark 10:45.

Ryder-Smith,⁷⁹ and others such as Cullmann find this verse and its ransom theme an allusion to Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant. Cullmann says, "that the identification of the Son of Man with the Servant most clearly appears, (the phrase "for many", in particular, recalling the greatest servant song where "many" occurs no less than four times) but it is probable that the identification lies behind every passage where the suffering of the Son of Man is mentioned".⁸²

80. See our discussion under the Temptation of Jesus and especially the THIRD.

81. Cf. Mark 8:34-38. "The expectation of Daniel suggests that the Son of Man would come to be served not to serve (Dan. 7:14a). As the inheritor of Adam's dominion, the Son of Man's destiny is to rule others and not serve them. (Dan. 7:14b) However the Son of Man who is to suffer, is one who is obedient to God's law, the Son of Man reverses the transgressions of Adam, and is not subject to death - an idea which has no difficulties in Daniel, where he signifies the nation, or even in I Enoch, where the Son of Man is identified with Enoch, who was 'taken' by God." Thus Hooker, op.cit. p.141. Cf. Cullmann, op.cit. p.163-4 (See also note 46 above.)

82. Cullmann, op.cit. p.152, goes on - "the 'one like unto a Son of Man' in Daniel typifies sufferers who are to triumph; the Servant of the Lord in Deutero Isaiah is also a sufferer who triumphs, the idea is added that his triumph is to save others from sin by his own death and resurrection".

This view is contested by Hooker⁸³ who turns once more to Dan. 7, where contrary to expectation, suffering and death are integral to the concept of the Son of Man. "What of the ideas of service and of ransom?" Hooker argues that because the Son of Man is a corporate figure,⁸⁴ "we must recognise that while the destiny of the 'saints' as a whole is to move through suffering to glory, the destiny of particular individuals may vary considerably: for some it meant death, and if the author's hope were ever fulfilled, it would be truly said of them that they served their fellows and gave their lives as a ransom that God might save his people. This is the basis of the idea found in 4 Maccabees, that the sufferings and prayers of the martyrs atoned for Israel. These are the few whose lives were given for the many, and whose deaths proved their obedience to God. Moreover it is the martyrs of the Maccabees who are 'the people of the Saints of the Most High', symbolized by the one like a Son of Man in Dan. 7.

If Jesus is now seen as fulfilling the rôle of the Son of Man, the startling paradoxes of Mark 10:45 are, after all, comprehensible. As Son of Man he is destined to pass through suffering and death to glory, and authority; but since he alone is the Son of Man, it is part of his destiny also to serve others and to give his life as a ransom for them. The 'few' have been narrowed down to one, who stands over against the many."⁸⁵ Yet in this very verse where Jesus stands alone over against the many, he

83. Hooker, op.cit. p.142.

84. Ryder-Smith's concept of "societary" already referred to would be of help in understanding the "individual-to-many" relationship.

85. Hooker, op.cit. p. 142-3.

seems to be using the term Son of Man in a societary way, in the context. Already the followers have been urged to serve, not to seek dominion - for them too the path of glory lies through suffering and humility which they will share with him (Mark 10:39). Yet there is distinction between Jesus and his followers. It is the Son of Man (implied Jesus himself, in the context) who will ransom the many. It is the word ransom that seems to some, like Ryder-Smith,⁸⁶ to be "novel" and out of place.

The judgement of novelty or foreignness, says Hooker, is based on the presupposition of interpreting this verse in the light of Isa. 53:10, an association for which there is no justification.⁸⁷ Ransom is never used for sin-offering in the LXX and refers to the deliverance of God's people from bondage, both at Exodus and from Babylon.⁸⁸

"The most likely background for the use of this word is the Jewish hope that God himself would redeem his people - a hope expressed by the later prophets and by the apocalyptists. Yet this hope of redemption is the hope which has taken hold of Jesus' disciples: (Lk. 24:21)⁸⁹ it is one with the inbreaking of God's Kingdom into the world, with the restoration of Israel, with the new era

86. See note 79 above. "Out of place" and 'novel' because of the expectation that the term hilasmos or expiation, to fit in with the offering for sin of Isa. 53:10, be found.

87. Hooker: op.cit. p.144 and note passim for her argument. The point of Hooker's argument is that there is no justification for lutrosis to be associated with "an offering for sin". Even Ryder-Smith who does see a reference to Isa. 53 here, as we saw above, rejects the sin offering association, but for different reasons. (Ryder-Smith, op.cit. p.156 f.)

88. E.g. Ex. 6:6; Deut. 7:8; Isa. 43:1; Mic. 6:4; Isa. 52:3, 62:12; Mic. 4:10; Jer. 15:21.

89. And the same hope may be behind the request by James and John. Mark 10:36,37.

visualised in Dan. 7, and with the gospel which Mark proclaimed in 1:1. It is, in fact, the message of the whole ministry of Jesus, who restores men to wholeness and casts out devils by the finger of God: the life that has been spent in freeing men from bondage is now given as their ransom.⁹⁰ Far from introducing a foreign concept into the verse, therefore the word lutrosis expresses the supreme example of the "service" which is spoken of in Mark 1:43-45a."⁹¹

Surely, if the Son of Man is as Hooker points out, rightly seen by Jesus as one who must go through suffering and death to vindication and glory - then the most obvious commentary on the service rendered by the redeeming Son of Man as servant, would be the Servant Songs from Isaiah. The societary concept present in both the Son of Man and the Servant would lead naturally to such a cross-reference. Should we be forced to choose either the Son of Man concept or the Suffering Servant and Son of Man synthesis, as the basis of Jesus' self understanding then Hooker's Son of Man thesis seems more plausible than the thesis of a 'brilliant synthesis'. (Cf. Hooker, op.cit. p.146).

90. Jesus restores the Israel as God's people - he restores estranged men and women to fellowship with God - he reconciles sinners to God.

91. Hooker: op.cit. p.144-145. We have taken quite some time to discuss the Son of Man in regard to Jesus and his ministry - while at the same time arguing for the authenticity of the Son of Man sayings as a basis for concluding that Jesus did think of himself as associated with the Son of Man complex of ideas. We have quoted at length from various authors, and especially Hooker, with whose viewpoint we agree to a large extent. While conceding her arguments for a suffering Son of Man, we wonder why Hooker is so adamant that Jesus did not use the Suffering Servant idea, especially as many scholars find this idea not only in the Son of Man sayings, as we have seen, but elsewhere?

If Hooker is right in concluding that the Son of Man in addition to suffering is also to die as a ransom for many, then it seems all the more probable that the Suffering Servant should be assimilated and fused with the Son of Man concept, not in an "original synthesis", but in a most natural way. If Jesus did not do so, the apostolic church very soon did so - it was inevitable, especially once Jesus the Son of Man was vindicated in the resurrection.

The emphasis that Jesus places on service, on being servant for others' sake seems to us quite a natural development from the Son of Man as the "man for others". We suggest that the association between Son of Man and Servant in Jesus' ministry was made, not by Jesus sitting aside and synthesizing Old Testament themes of theology, but as a consequence of events and experience. As a result of his anointing with the Holy Spirit Jesus was called to a ministry of Service,⁹² which was to be expressed as complete obedience to God to fulfil righteousness. This call to obedience soon led to a situation where he suffered and would die for righteousness sake. Having at his baptism conceived of himself as associating with an eschatological community, the call to be God's Son, God's elect, God's Man, the New Adam, the Son of Man is quite understandable as we have seen from Hooker's discussion.

To associate to this experience the prophecy of Isa. 53 of a servant who is called to suffer, but whom

92. Luke 4:18 cf. Isa. 61:1,2. And in New Testament times Isaiah was considered as one whole work of one prophet.

God will vindicate in resurrection is not at all difficult.⁹³ As we mentioned earlier the ministry of Jesus is not the result of a theological synthesis, it is the consequence of a new beginning, in God-man relationships, as interpreted to us by the evangelists in the baptism narratives. It is as a consequence of the baptism of Jesus, his anointing with the Holy Spirit as God's Son and Servant, as a Second Adam, as the Son of Man who is to triumph over all adversity, suffering and death, that Jesus in himself not only marks the new beginning, but fulfils it - thus ransoming, redeeming the captives of beastly powers to freedom where they may be reunited with God.

93. To limit Jesus to the use of one theme from the Old Testament as Hooker tends to do in her desire to get her ideas accepted is not only unrealistic, it just does not reflect the wide spectrum of Old Testament scriptures alluded to by Jesus in his preaching and teaching. And if the variety of Old Testament sources were available to the writers of the New Testament would they not also have been available to Jesus.

V

THE RISEN LORD¹

"... and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power." (Mark 14:62)

The Son of man went as it was written of him that he should go,² offering himself in the complete obedience of righteousness to what he considered to be his Father's will,³ which in the event meant giving his life as a ransom for the many.⁴ He was betrayed into the hands of sinners⁵ and delivered to the Gentiles, as he had warned his disciples.⁶

Yet in the face of his impending death he looks forward in faith to a vindication beyond death,⁷ and gives instructions to his disciples accordingly. Also as he faces his captors he looks forward, beyond the present suffering, to his vindication.⁸ Ironically it

-
1. There is a hiatus between the forsaken Jesus and the scattered disciples at the time of Jesus' crucifixion, (Mark 14:50) and the Apostles as gathered on the day of pentecost, and preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:1,36). This hiatus is filled with the resurrection and ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the former disciples of Jesus, as witnessed by themselves. These "events" are events of faith rather than events of history. It is not possible within our limits, nor necessary for our purposes to study and discuss them in detail. We are bound to indicate in part, however, how it is believed these "events" are to be understood for a proper consideration of God's reconciling action in Jesus Christ, such as we have undertaken.
 2. Mark 14:21.
 3. Mark 14:36.
 4. Mark 10:45
 5. Mark 14:41; 10:33.
 6. Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33 cf. Luke 13:33 as discussed by Fuller: op.cit. pp.107-108 and see above, footnotes 38 and 40 - THE KINGDOM PROCLAIMED.
 7. Mark 14:25, 28.
 8. Mark 14:62.

was as King of the Jews that Jesus was finally crucified, after having been deserted, betrayed, and mocked.⁹ In utter desolation he died.¹⁰

It is at this point in the story that a veil is drawn over. The next point of the story is the witness of the Apostles to Jesus as Lord and Christ.¹¹ Those who had deserted the Son of Man as a frightened bunch of disciples now unitedly proclaim that man's appointment by God as Lord and Christ. They explain themselves and the change brought in them in terms of resurrection, ascension and descent of the Holy Spirit. It is plain that the absolute despair on the part of the disciples after the crucifixion¹² is matched by the undeniable conviction of the Apostles after Easter. "There is a hiatus here. What was it that made disciples apostles? What was it that brought men across this gulf? What was it that changed them?"¹³

The narratives of the Apostolic Church indicate both a continuity and a discontinuity. "The continuity resides in the identity of the crucified Jesus with the risen Christ... But it is the discontinuity that initially impresses. The resurrected one does not come as the simple fulfilment of inchoate longing and unconscious expectations.

9. Mark 15:18, 26; 14:50; 14:71; 14:65; 15:20, 30.
 10. Mark 15:34 cf. Ps. 22. Some say that Jesus' use of the first line of the Psalm indicates, not despair but faith, as indicated in verses 19 ff. of the psalm. Fittingly therefore we may add that Jesus gave his life to the Father saying "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit!" (Luke 23:46)
 11. Acts 2:36
 12. It was not even a close disciple who buried him - and the women could only look on. Mk. 15:43, 47 cf. Luke 24:19-21.
 13. Neville Clark: Interpreting the Resurrection, p.19.

He encounters doubt, incredulity, perplexity, unbelief (Matt. 28:17; Luke 24:11, 38, 41; John 20:25, 27; 21:4). Recognition is achieved slowly and painfully. Faith is won not because of human expectation but in the teeth of false hopes already disappointed (Luke 24:21).

Therein it is made decisively clear that no simple unbroken line joins Golgotha to the Resurrection morning. The Cross is a terminus. It is set starkly in the path of all natural expectations, and on its cross-beam is inscribed the caption: 'No through road'. It is an impenetrable darkness, extinguishing the flickering candles of human desire."¹⁴ The cross to the disciples was the end of the Son of Man, despite all that Jesus had taught them, despite the repeated warnings of persecution and martyrdom, they had expected a redemption of Israel contrary to the evidence before them now.¹⁵ The man from whom they had asked for privileges when he came to his glory¹⁶ had accepted the bitter cup from his Father in Heaven, and left them disillusioned. "Only a new act of God, a light which is divine, can turn night into day, make of the terminus a fresh beginning."¹⁷

The words, actions, the whole life of Jesus the Son of Man considered in abstraction from the resurrection and ascension are as dead as the crucified Jesus, and as relevant to life as his body buried by Joseph of Arimathea. "Only when the risen Lord is seen and known.... Then, and only then, do disciples to whom the scriptures have been expounded find their minds opened."¹⁸ Only when the

14. Op.cit. p.100.

15. Luke 24:21a

16. Mark 10:37

17. Clark, op.cit.

18. Op.cit. p.100: Commentary on Luke 24:25 ff., 45.

discontinuity has imposed itself in all its shattering power, is the true continuity unveiled. "This means that the 'happenings' to which the apostles bear witness are not finally to be explicated.... They create faith; they are not its creation.

The Resurrection is not a symbolic expression of the real meaning of the Cross. It is the new deed of God which makes Calvary significant. The event of the Resurrection is first and foremost a transaction between God and Jesus Christ,¹⁹ and only then and therefore, a transaction between Christ and the believer. It is God's acknowledgment of their Lord."²⁰

Not only has Jesus triumphed over death, He has also ascended into heaven to sit at God's right hand. "The two are not identical. To have triumphed over death is to have reversed the adverse verdict passed upon the sons of Adam, but the consequence is not, as might have been expected, a return to the earthly Paradise but an entrance into the heavenlies - an entrance which has been effected through the Ascension which therefore consummates the economy of redemption, while being an integral part of it.... To be restored to the condition of unfallen Adam would no doubt be an occasion for rejoicing, but to enter with the second Adam into heaven itself is something which surpasses even that which the Resurrection by itself would have effected."²¹ "The Resurrection and Ascension of Christ

19. The vindication of Jesus as Son of Man triumphant.

20. Clark, op.cit. p.101.

21. J.G. Davies; He ascended into Heaven, p.182.

This is theologizing after the event as Luke is said to have done in Acts. Cf. John's Gospel where if Luke's chronology is followed theologically, Jesus was raised from the dead, ascended to his Father returned to insufflate the disciples with the Holy Spirit, + thus enabling them to wield the power of forgiveness of sins: John 20:17,19 (cf. John 7:39;

are two moments in the anticipation of the ultimate home-gathering of the whole people of God".²²

But if the Ascension is the fulfilment of the Telos of Man in union with God, "the new humanity which appeared in Christ" is also to be universalized, "and for this the Ascension is the necessary precondition, issuing in the mission of the Spirit and so of the Church".²³

At this stage we might sum up with J.G. Davies the recurring movement in the reconciliation of man to God; "Christ descends in order that He might ascend with our humanity: He ascends in order that the Spirit might descend through that assumed humanity which is the fount and source of this blessing: the Spirit descends in order that we, in season, might ascend whither our Head has preceded us. On earth the immanent Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, the first fruits of our risen and ascended human nature."²⁴

The Ascension is not only the vindication of the triumphant Son of Man over all the beastly powers in creation,²⁵ it is also the prerequisite to the establishment of the Son of man in the societary aspect - the Saints of the Most High. It is the prelude to the creation of the community of the Son of Man by the same spirit that initiated Jesus of Nazareth to his role as the Son of Man

21. (cont.) John 15:26; 16:7) 20:22, 23. John's theological "chronology" or sequence is the same i.e. resurrection, ascension, pentecost, but the 'events' all take place on one day.
22. J.G. Davies, op.cit. p.184, quoting; "C.F.D. Moule, 'The Ascension - Acts 1.9', Expository Times, No. 68, 1957, p.209."
23. J.G. Davies, op.cit. p.177. Cf. Also Künneth, The Theology of the Resurrection." p.292.
24. J.G. Davies, op.cit. p.177.
25. Eph. 1:20, 21, 22.

who must suffer many things and give his life as a ransom for the many who are now enabled through that offering to receive the Holy Spirit and become born again²⁶ by the Holy Spirit, become new men of the new creation in the community of the Son of Man.²⁷

The presence of the Spirit is now sometimes equated to the promised presence²⁸ of Christ himself. This however does not mean the presence of the Spirit, or of Christ in the Spirit, supersedes the historical presence of Jesus the Son of Man and of the Holy Spirit in Him, such that one may relegate the earthly ministry of Christ to past history.²⁹

"The work accomplished by Christ in his incarnate life remains central, and it cannot be superseded. Thus, although the presence of the Spirit is equivalent to the presence of Christ,³⁰ it is necessary at the same time to observe the distinction between them. The presence of the Spirit is ... consequent upon, the presence of the incarnate Christ, who wrought in history the work of God",³¹ for the redemption of men.

"... the Spirit continues the presence of Christ beyond the brief span of his historical appearance and completes it by effecting its inward apprehension among men.

26. John 3:1-16.

27. Or now in terms more familiar: in the community of "Christ's body", "the Church", whose unity with Christ, its head is in the Holy Spirit.

28. Matt. 28:20 cf. John 14:18.

29. We have Bultmann in mind here: Cf. e.g. "Kerugma and Myth". Insofar as the dispensation supersedes the historical manifestation of God in Christ, modalism strikes at the basis of the Christian faith, which rests on the decisiveness of the incarnation krisis.

30. As it was the equivalent of the presence of God in and through Jesus of Nazareth as Son of man.

31. Hendry: The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, p.23.

In both emphases,³² however, the Spirit is presented in a purely Christo-centric reference. There is no reference in the New Testament to any work of the Spirit apart from Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the Spirit of Christ."³³ "The Father is present and active in the Son, who in turn continues to be present and active in the Spirit."³⁴

The easter-pentecost experience of the disciples is not to be reduced to theological synthesizing or speculation. Just as Adam's disobedience was reproduced in the sons of Adam so also the Second Adam's obedience now reproduces the new sons of God. It is an experience that can be experienced only "when a man is confronted by the eschatological deed of God, veiled in the ambiguities of history and challenging his very being in its own historicity",³⁴ only when the offence of the cross is truly confronted. This means following the disciples through the gospel narratives. Hearing the words of Jesus of Nazareth, seeing the works and deeds of the Son of Man who came to serve, not to be served. "The Gospels

-
32. Op.cit. in relation to Johanine and Pauline views of the role of the Spirit, p.26.
33. Op.cit. p.26. Hendry's extreme view is questionable of course. E.g. in Luke 1:35 the Holy Spirit there can hardly be called the Spirit of Christ in the same sense as at Romans 5:5. But the point is made that post pentecost - the Holy Spirit is associated with Jesus Christ such that without Jesus of Nazareth crucified, risen and ascended there was no Holy Spirit. Calvary and pentecost are inseparable.
34. Op.cit. p.31 and that whole chapter on "The Holy Spirit and God". Nowhere in his assertions that the Spirit is Christ's does Hendry take the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist into consideration - thus he overlooks that God was present and active, at least in the understanding of the evangelists, by the Holy Spirit and Christ then, post pentecost, continues to be active as God's Son, in the Holy Spirit. Clark, op.cit. p105.

do not begin with the Resurrection and the exalted Lord. In the fullest sense they do not anticipate. Of course it is true that the Evangelists write as men of faith. They write because they know that Christ is risen. Otherwise they would have no testimony to bear, no story to tell..... The surprising thing is that the story should be told with so deep and pervasive a sense of the significance of the historical Jesus, and that for this purpose - the 'Gospel' - should be created.³⁵ Is this not the reason for the Marcan 'messianic secret'?"³⁶ What was explicit post-pentecost had to be veiled and rendered implicit. Only thus could post-pentecost pericopae be given a 'historical' presentation which moved towards the Cross and Resurrection as the anticlimax and climax of the narrative.

"So it is that the spiritual pilgrimage of the disciples is not wholly hidden from us. They are not presented as those who, from the beginning, understand and believe. Rather it is made decisively clear that it is only as they companied with the earthly Jesus, listened to his teaching, wondered at his authority, questioned his identity, fled from his Cross, that they came at last to know him as the risen and exalted one to whom all power had been committed. They carried their false hopes to his grave. Only a new act of God transformed their past, and made them see There is no human way from the crucifixion to the Resurrection morning..."³⁷ The doors being shut..... but Jesus came and stood among them.... he breathed on them, and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit".³⁸

35. A new literary genre.

36. Clark, op.cit. whom we are still following closely.

37. Clark, op.cit. p.106-107.

38. John 20:19-22.

VI

THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

"All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation." (II Cor. 5:18)

In the New Testament there are but four passages of any importance in which the reconcile - reconciliation complex of terms is used. If the letter to the Ephesians is of Pauline authorship¹ then the theme of reconciliation is used exclusively by Paul in a Christological sense.

These four passages are at II Corinthians 5:18-20; Romans 5:10,11; Colossians 1:20,21 and Ephesians 2:16.²

II CORINTHIANS 5:18-20

The canonical II Corinthians text is not the single unity the title suggests.³ II Corinthians 6:14;-7:1 interrupts the connection between 6:13 and 7:2, differs in theme and temper from what precedes and follows, and is probably out of place in its present context.⁴

-
1. See introduction to Ephesians passage below.
 2. The terms appear also at I Cor. 7:11 with reference to the reconciliation of a wife to her husband; at Romans 11:15 where the "reconciling of the world" is said to be possible by casting away of the Jews; at Matthew 5:24 where Jesus speaks of a person being reconciled to his brother before making sacrifices; and at Acts 7:26 where Stephen refers to Moses trying to reconcile two Israelites in Egypt. These four references are not included in our study as they do not bear directly on Christology. The Greek words used in the passages by Paul are: the noun katallagē and the verbs katallassō and apokatallassō. In Matthew diallagē (thi) is used and in Acts sunnallagē (sunēllassen).
 3. See e.g. Moffat: New Testament Commentary. Guthrie: New Testament Introduction. The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, which we have used as a basis, Peake's Commentary on the Bible, etc.
 4. This may be part of the letter warning his readers not to associate with immoral men. I Cor. 5:9-11.

The thesis that II Cor. 10-13 is part of the so-called 'severe' letter⁵ implies that these last chapters of II Cor. were written some weeks earlier than the first nine chapters, and were addressed to a situation where Paul reluctantly but vigorously defends his apostolic authority and the genuineness of his ministry and gospel.⁶

Titus is charged with the delivery of the severe letter and returns to join Paul in Macedonia. He brings good news from Corinth and Paul writes a "letter of reconciliation".⁷ This last of Paul's letters to Corinth, of which we have any record, apparently consists of II Cor. 1:1 - 6:13; 7:2 - 9:15 and 13:14. In this letter Paul is grateful that the previous letter written out of anguish of heart and many tears (the severe letter) has had the desired result in that the ringleader of the revolt has been punished. Now that the crisis has been surmounted, it was the duty of all to forgive and comfort the offender. Reflecting on the happy ending to the Corinthian affair, Paul bursts into thankfulness to God and undertakes a general vindication of his ministry.

The passage we are to study is an expression of gratitude and an apologetic for Paul's and the churches ministry, and forms part of the "Letter of Reconciliation". But this letter is written against the background of the previous conflict over Paul's ministry and authority.⁸

5. See II Cor. 2:3-4, 7:12.

6. If chapters 10-13 are the severe letter sent after the painful visit II Cor. 2:1, then we obviously have lost part of it.

7. Title given to Chpts. 1-9 (excluding 6:14 - 7:1) by Interpreters Dictionary.

8. After the writing of I Cor. and giving rise to the writing of the severe letter, a band of teachers came to Corinth, boasting of their pure Jewish descent, stressing that they were Palestinians rather than Hellenistic Jews, they claimed to be Christians (II Cor. 11:22-23) and flourished letters of commendation from

It seems that the false prophets were not Judaizers such as Paul attacks in the letter to the Galatians, nor were they emissaries from James and associates in Jerusalem. It appears that the heresy these "superlative apostles" (11:5) were propagating was related to the heresy Paul has to combat at Colossae, a type of Gnosticism.⁹

The probable date of writing lies from 54 - 56 A.D.¹⁰

II Corinthians 5:

"¹⁸All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; ¹⁹that is, God was in Christ reconciling⁼ the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. ²⁰So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.

⁼Or in Christ God was reconciling.¹¹

All this is from God; The old has passed away, the new has come.¹² Anyone who is in Christ is a new

8. (cont.) Christian communities they had already visited (II Cor. 3:1), presenting themselves as true Apostles and as servants of righteousness (II Cor. 12:15). They attacked Paul's person, reputation, and apostolic credentials: 10:1,8,10; 11:7-9,16; 12:1,2,16,17 and cf. 1:17-18; 3:1; 5:13 and 8:20-21. Paul counter attacked their allegations: 10:12,15-16,18; 11:4,5,12-15,20; and 12:11.
9. Interpreters Dictionary: Vol.I p.696. See our introduction to the Colossians passage below.
10. See Commentaries, etc.
11. Footnote, alternative reading given in the Oxford Annotated Bible RSV. OUP. 1962 whose text we use throughout except when quoting other's works.
12. Cf. Ro. 5:12 ff.

creation.¹³ The relationship of being in Christ by faith¹⁴ saves anyone from the death of Sin.¹⁵ The initiative of reconciliation is always with God.¹⁶

Who through Christ reconciled us to himself;

God takes the initiative in and through Jesus Christ to reconcile the estranged-in-sin to himself.¹⁷ God does away with the old enmity to introduce the new peace with God, through Christ.¹⁸

and gave us the ministry of reconciliation;¹⁹

From reconciliation to God through Christ - God has also given to the reconciled the ministry of reconciliation. What may be personal at this stage is universalized in verse 19. The ministry of reconciliation is given by entrusting to believers, those who have been reconciled and therefore who can witness to the message,²⁰ the message of reconciliation. This message is also the witness that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them." This is the

13. II Cor. 5:17. The new creature is the new spiritual man (Ro. 8:3 ff.) created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness (Eph. 4:22-23), which is the full stature of manhood in Christ (Eph. 4:13). See commentary on "For if while we were sinners" Ro. 5:10 below and cf. Stewart, J.S.; A Man in Christ, p.177 ff.
14. Stewart, op.cit. p.177 ff.
15. II Cor. 5:14,14 cf. Ro. 5:12 ff. 6:23.
16. Cf. Ro. 5:1,6.
17. Cf. Ro. 5:10 below. Paul never speaks of a reconciliation of God to man. God is always the subject of reconciling action - and always in Christ. All the reconciliation passages in Paul emphasize the role of Christ.
18. Ro. 5:1 below.
19. The plural 'we' presents a problem in these verses, because Paul distinguishes between himself as "we" and "you" in 20b. In 20a Paul may be including all apostolic and prophetic ministers of the gospel (Cf. I Cor. 1:12 f. and 3:3-9 and II Cor. 1:1; 4:13; 6:1) in contrast to the converts at Corinth. Paul, however, argues from his own sufferings for a defense of his ministry (4:7 ff.; 6:4 ff.) but the conclusion in 4:17,18 is not without reference to the converts at Corinth (cf. I Cor. 11:1; Gal. 4:12 and Phil. 1:27-30). See also II Cor. 1:3-7, and the inclusive "I" of Ro.7:7 ff.
20. We shall return to the witness aspect later.

responsibility to receive and propagate the reconciliation received in Christ.²⁷

be reconciled to God; The basis of Paul's appeal to be reconciled to God is Christ's death in which God made Christ to be sin, though Christ himself knew no sin.²⁸ God shows his love for us in that Christ dies for our sakes²⁹ - that we might become the "righteousness of God".³⁰

"We"³¹ have received God's righteousness in Christ who reconciled us to God. This is for "our sakes" - "so that in Christ 'we' might become the righteousness of God".³² Jesus Christ's death as expiation set forward by God is the evidence and realization of God's righteousness and love,³³ which reconciles men to God. In being reconciled through the faith relationship in Christ the Risen Lord,³⁴ the reconciled become the reconciling instruments of God's righteousness,³⁵ witnessing as Christ's ambassadors to the world that God is righteous in Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit.³⁶

27. II Cor. 1:3-4.

28. Cf. Col. 1:13-15,18,19; Ro. 3:25; 8:3; Gal. 2:17 ff. Heb. 4:15; 9:26 f.; I Pet. 2:21-25 Paul avoids saying Christ is a sinner. Christ suffered the consequences of sin like a sinner though he was not a sinner.

29. Cf. Ro. 5:8.

30. II Cor. 5:21c cf. Ro. 3:21,22,25b,26; 5:17,19,21; 6:13,20-23; 8:9-11; Gal. 5:5-6; Phil. 1:9-1; 3:8-11. Righteousness is not merely moral purity but rather the positive action resulting from a right relationship, i.e. from love. God is righteous in that he reconciles the world to himself, Jesus can be referred to as God's righteousness - and so can the ministers of reconciliation for they become the instruments of God's reconciling love and its action. See our discussion below on righteousness and reconciliation.

31. See note 19, etc. above.

32. II Cor. 5:21.

33. Ro. 3:21 ff.; 5:6 ff.

34. Ro. 5:1 etc. below.

35. II Cor. 4:13,14,15; 4:1; 3:4-6 cf. Ro. 6:13.

36. II Cor. 4:13 - 5:5.

This understanding of verse 21 is not only justified by the exposition of Ro. 3:21 ff. but it follows naturally from the preceding verses, especially 18 and 19.

The "ministry of reconciliation" given to Paul³⁷ (and the church), is an entrusting of the "message of reconciliation" effected by God in Christ,³⁸ so that the church may by firstly itself being reconciled to God, become the righteousness of God.³⁹ That is the church by participating in Christ, by being the body of Christ, participates in Christ's mission of reconciliation. Reconciliation being the realisation of God's righteousness, of God's love, active through Christ, is also active through Christ's body in the church. Because the ministry of reconciliation is God's action in Christ, the ministry is one of witness to the Risen and ascended Lord,⁴⁰ His work of reconciliation, and to the promised giving of the Holy Spirit,⁴¹ through whom the witnessing is done.⁴² Paul's witness⁴³ to the Risen Lord is, by him, expressed as Apostleship.⁴⁴

Where the writer of Acts uses the term witness in connection with proclaiming the gospel, Paul uses the terms, Apostle or Ambassador,⁴⁵ in connection with the message of reconciliation, the gospel.

37. II Cor. 5:18 See note 19 above.

38. II Cor. 5:19

39. II Cor. 5:21

40. Acts 1:8,21; 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:39,41,42; 13:31; 22:12-16; 26:16.

41. Acts 2:32,38,39; 5:32; 11:15-18; 20:26-28 passim.

42. Acts 2:4,14; 3:8; 5:32; 6:8-10; 9:31; 13:2-4 etc. Cf. Luke 12:11,12.

43. Gal. 1:11 ff.

44. Gal. 1:1

45. An Apostle is a witness (Acts 1:21) to Christ's resurrection primarily. (Acts 2:32; 26:16).

All such witnesses, apostles, ambassadors, and ministers of the Gospel, are these through participation in the reconciliation they witness to or minister. They are ambassadors of the Lord Christ, the reconciler of God, in whom they are reconciled to God.⁴⁶

God's love and righteousness are manifest in Jesus Christ, reconciling to God, those who in responding by faith to Christ, have also received through the Holy Spirit the gift of God's love and righteousness. With this same gift they receive the ministry of reconciliation; are entrusted with the gospel message of reconciliation as ambassadors for Christ, making God's appeal to the unrighteous to be reconciled to God. Thus the reconciled become God's instruments of righteousness - peacemakers and therefore sons of God.⁴⁷ Working together with God, in Christ, in reconciling the world to God in Christ, they have the guarantee of the salvation for which they are working, by participation.

46. Ro. 1:1; Col. 1:1,7. Servant of the Gospel, minister of Christ, apostle by commission of Christ: All these point to the ministry of reconciliation. Even elders are ministers of reconciliation. Acts 20:17, 28,32,35; Col. 4:17; I Pet. 5:1.

47. Matt. 5:9; Ro. 8:15; Gal. 4:5.

48. Phil. 2:12 cf. Eph. 4:11-16.

ROMANS 5:10,11.

The letter to the Romans is the longest extant letter of Paul, and offers the most comprehensive account of his understanding of the Gospel of Christ.¹

The letter seems to come to a natural ending at the end of chapter 15. Chapter 16 which starts with the commendation of the deaconess Phoebe and lists many persons known to Paul has been thought to be addressed to a different church.² The interpretation of the letter as a whole is not affected by the critical conclusion that may be reached concerning chapter 16.

Paul himself indicates why he writes to the Romans. He had long hoped and prayed to visit them and now at last it seemed possible to do so, as he had accomplished what he had set out to do in the Eastern provinces. He was now planning a mission to Spain and hoped to pass by Rome on his way, hoping that the Romans might support such a mission. First however he had to take the contribution for the poor to Jerusalem where he fears the kind of reception he may get.³

The letter is obviously paving the way for Paul's visit. As Apostle to the Gentiles he not only feels some responsibility to the Romans, as he does towards all nations,⁴ but desires to share in Christian fellowship with them, in the belief that it will benefit both them and himself.⁵ He refutes any thought that he might be criticising or correcting their faith and knowledge of the gospel,⁶ and almost apologises for his boldness in writing to remind them of what they already know.⁷

1. See Commentaries, etc. as for Corinthians.

2. See arguments for and against this thesis in Interpreters Dictionary and Guthrie.

3. 1:9-13; 15:17-32.

4. 1:5-6, 13-15.

5. 1:11-12.

Although not mentioning it, Paul is manifestly removing misunderstandings of his gospel which he fears may have been formed at Rome.⁸ Also if he is to ask the Romans for their support for the Spanish mission, they have the right to know the substance of his teaching.

Though Romans retains some elements of a letter it most nearly approaches a theological treatise. Theological exposition is not related to particular problems at Rome, as the letters to Corinth are written in response to particular events, errors, and problems of the Corinthian church. The letter to the Romans therefore tends to be more formal and apologetic of Paul's Gospel, as he preaches it, and consequently more comprehensive.⁹

The probable date for Romans extends from 54 to 59 A.D.

Romans 5:

¹⁰"For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life. ¹¹Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation."

6. 15:14.

7. 15:15.

8. 3:7-8; 6:1; 9:1-2.

9. This letter has been called the "Gospel according to St. Paul". It is the first conscious effort at a complete statement of the Christian faith that we have and probably predates Mark's Gospel (60 - 70 A.D.) See Commentaries, etc. for dates.

For if while we were sinners: There is no distinction, all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, both Jew and Gentile.¹⁰ Enmity towards God, estrangement or Sin consists of falling short of the glory of God - the image of God that man should manifest,¹¹ and for which he was created. The whole of mankind is enslaved in sinful enmity or godlessness,¹² through the sin of Adam,¹³ to which all men are consigned by God.¹⁴

The enemies of God include the Jews whose covenant law only increased their trespass,¹⁵ and the gentiles who are without law, but nevertheless are in the dominion of sin and are doomed to death¹⁶ as were those from Adam to Moses.¹⁷

Christ dies while men were sinners "at the right time":¹⁸ that is eschatological time, in the fulness of time as predicted by the prophets. Christ's life, death and resurrection are all eschatological events.¹⁹

We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son:

Paul does not refer to the death of Jesus without at the same time implying the resurrection.²⁰ Justification and

10. Ro. 3:22b,23 taking up the arguments from Chapters 1 and 2.
11. See Dodd: Epistle to the Romans, p.75. The glory of God is seen in God's image - Jesus Christ: Col.1:15 ff.
12. Ro. 5:6.
13. Ro. 5:12 ff. Adamic Sin should be considered as societary rather than contagious or hereditary. See note 25 below.
14. Ro. 11:32. Sin as Paul understands it, is an objective state in which man finds himself, even apart from his own choice cf. Ro. 5:14. The law came in through the Jews, only to make guilt apparent - not to create sin. Ro. 5:20; 7:7 f. The law discloses to man his predicament in his relation to God.
15. Ro. 5:20.
16. Ro. 6:23.
17. Yet the Gentiles are not without guilt for there is knowledge of God in the world outside the Law Ro.1:18 ff.
18. Ro. 5:6 cf. II Cor. 6:2.
19. Ro. 3:21. See Dodd, Apostolic Preaching and its Development. p.21.
20. And ascension as we have distinguished definite parts

redemption are achieved by the expiation²¹ made in Christ's blood (sacrificial death), on the proviso of faith in God's action in and through Christ.²² Under three metaphors; a) forensic justification, b) emancipation of slaves, c) sacrificial expiation - Paul attempts to give meaning to God's action in Jesus Christ.²³ This is described as reconciliation at 5:10. By faith in this action of God in Christ - believers have peace with God.²⁴ The bondage of sinful estrangement from God is broken - the believer is freed, emancipated from the estranging powers of existence that separated him from God.²⁵

Much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life: Justification, emancipation, or expiation, is only the initial stage of God's reconciling action through Jesus Christ.²⁶ It is the necessary first

-
20. (cont.) to the raising of Christ. Ro. 6:4; 8:10 etc. Paul speaks of the now risen and ascended Lord of whom it must not be forgotten that he was crucified. See Jerusalem Bible note "k" on Ro. 4 Cf. I Cor. 5:17.
21. Hilastērion is now divorced from propitiatory meaning given to it in former times. God is always the subject - man or sin the object. Jesus does not propitiate God's wrath. He was put forward by God as an expiation for man's sin. Ro. 3:24,25a. It must be noted that in this study we are concerned primarily with the reality of "atonement" not in theories or explanations of "atonement".
22. Ro. 3:25a.
23. See Dodd, Epistle to the Romans, p.80. (Emancipation = ransoming).
24. Ro. 5:1 cf. Eph. 2:14,17 e.g.
25. Dodd, op.cit. p.81. Cf. Montefiore, "Truth to Tell", p. 18 ff. who describes the state of sin to which God consigns men, as the existential evolutionary background, to which man is heir to, as an existant organism. This "demythologizing" of Adamic original sin (Ro. 5:12 ff.) in terms of man's existence should be taken together with the socio-psychological gestalt that a person is heir to and has to live in. However Adamic sin is demythologized it does not detract from the personal guilt of sin (Ro. 1:18 f.)
26. Ro. 5:9.

step towards reconciliation, or peace with God, or salvation.²⁷ C.H. Dodd sees in the "much more now ..." phrase, the transition point, in Paul's argument, from justification to salvation.²⁸

Salvation is the new life which the faithful now enters. The believer shall be saved²⁹ by Christ's present life - i.e. by being in Christ by the Holy Spirit given by the ascended Lord.

We have already noted that Paul always implies the resurrection and ascension of Christ when mentioning Christ's death. It is the risen and ascended Lord of whose death he speaks. We must understand resurrection to include ascension, for Paul speaks of the reigning Lord, who is to appear at the parousia when the saints will join Him in his resurrection.³⁰

If Christ's death and victory over death in the resurrection ransoms man from the wages of sin; death; how much more will a man who is in a faith relationship with the ascended and reigning Lord be saved, i.e. live in union with God and therefore be beyond the grasp of death and sin.³¹ The aim of Salvation or its fulfilment is the "rejoicing in God", of verse 11, at present through the living "Lord Jesus Christ", through whom the reconciliation has been received.

27. Ro. 5:1.

28. Dodd; Apostolic Preaching and its Development, p.93.

29. Salvation is in Paul's thought, a present reality working towards a final consummation. The reconciliation now lived in Christ by the Holy Spirit is to be consummated at the last day - in union with God, when Jesus returns the kingdom to God so that God may be everything to everyone. (I Cor. 15:28).

30. I Thes. 4:13 ff. cf. Ro. 6:3.

31. The "much more now" of verse 10 is an enlargement of the same theme expressed differently in verse 9. Christ's death justifies - shall be saved from the wrath of God; Christ's death reconciles - much more now by life shall we have salvation.

The reconciliation received through Christ is God's love poured into christian hearts through the Holy Spirit³² given to the faithful. It is because of this reconciliation which has been received through Christ, that christians may rejoice in their sufferings.³³

To die with Christ to sin is also to rise with Christ to resurrection (and ascension) life.³⁴ Just as Christ accepted death as God's ransoming action from sin for the many,³⁵ so the believer must die to sin, i.e. accept severance from the old life that he knew, in order that he might receive the new life. Baptism into Christ implies receiving the baptism of Christ in both its aspects; not only receiving the new life in the Holy Spirit, but also drinking the cup of the baptism of the cross.³⁶

For Paul it is inconceivable that a person who is baptised into Christ, i.e. has become a member of Christ's Body, the church, should continue to live in sin, i.e. live separated from God. To be baptised is for the old man to die and for the new man to come alive by the Holy Spirit, in Christ.³⁷

32. Ro. 5:5.

33. Ro. 5:3.

34. Ro. 6:4.

35. As we saw earlier in dealing with Jesus as Son of Man.

36. Mk. 10:39 and our discussion above.

37. We are not here concerned with baptismal theology as such - that is beyond the scope of our present discussion. Just as Jesus of Nazareth by his baptism became the societal Son of Man, and establisher of the eschatological community, the church, so also the individual by his or her baptism into Christ becomes part of the Body of Christ, part of the eschatological community. The selfish individualism of the old man dies and is transformed into the new manhood of the Son of Man, it is to become one of the many for whom the Son of Man died.

The salvation received from God in Christ has a built-in future tense which contains in it the eschatological hope of final consummation. That is, the salvation or union with God enjoyed now, through Christ, by the same spirit with which Christ has union with God, is anticipatory of the union to be had with God when Christ returns and presents the church to God.³⁸

The new life given by the reigning living Lord Jesus Christ³⁹ gives the assurance whereby we may hope for an eventual complete union.⁴⁰ This assurance and hope are given in the guarantee of the Holy Spirit pouring God's love in our hearts.⁴¹ The present reconciliation in Christ, by the Holy Spirit, carries with it the promise of future salvation from the wrath of God which befalls all sinners in the end of time,⁴² and the promise of future consummation of reconciliation in full union.

With the doom of God's wrath, is contrasted the final salvation unto ascension life which is already guaranteed now by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ.

There appears to be a threefold dynamic in the reconciling of man to God.

1) Firstly as man is captor of sin and beastly powers, and thereby estranged from God, Christ is set forth by God as expiation, ransom or as justification for God's forgiveness. This is done on God's initiative and is achieved in Christ offering his life as a "ransom for many". The cross is the symbolic focus of this action of God in Christ - but this action looks forward to a response from man.⁴³

38. Cf. Eph. 2:18. I Cor. 15:20 ff. - 28.

39. Ro. 5:11 cf. 5:1b-2.

40. 5:1b,5.

41. II Cor. 5:5. Ro. 5:5.

42. Ro. 5:-b; 6:23.

43. The future salvation assured now in Christ's ascended

2) Faith in which man's response is involved is to receive the "knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ".⁴⁴ This knowledge is twofold: a) it is the knowledge of God as hidden in Jesus of Nazareth which leads man to the disappointment of the cross; b) and it is the recognition of this knowledge in the risen Lord. But this easter experience which gives birth to the relationship of faith is an act of God - not an act of human volition.

The human response can follow Jesus as far as the cross and from there despair of the hopes raised by the knowledge of God's glory glimpsed in the face of Jesus the Son of Man. Only God, by the giving of his spirit brings life from death.⁴⁵

From this new standpoint⁴⁶ of grace through faith, from this new relationship of having been redeemed by Christ's cross and reconciled to God in the resurrection⁴⁷ there comes through the gift of the Holy Spirit, the third dynamic.

3) Having been brought into Christ,⁴⁸ there comes through the gift⁴⁹ of the spirit reconciliation to God, which in itself has two aspects. Because reconciliation has been received⁵⁰ in the guarantee of the Holy Spirit not only is it a new reality bringing the new creation,⁵¹

43. (cont.) Lordship in verse 10, is at the end of verse 11 referred to as the reconciliation now received. Salvation and reconciliation both refer to peace with God. (Ro. 5:1.) Salvation as anticipated may be expressed therefore as reconciliation consummated.

44. II Cor. 4:6.

45. Ro. 8:11.

46. Ro. 5:2.

47. Ro. 5:5-10.

48. Cf. Ro. 8:1,2 with 5:1,2.

49. Ro. 5:2b,5 cf. II Cor. 1:22 and 5:5.

50. Ro. 5:11

51. II Cor. 5:17.

but it is that reality of the new creation which is eternal, i.e. of one nature with God's being.⁵² It is that reality given by God in the "easter experience" which promises fulfilment of what it is - union with God in the one Spirit through Christ. The giving of the Spirit thus marks the participation of the many in the eschaton.⁵³

The giving of the Spirit also gives to the new creature a foretaste of God's telos for him. The Spirit is the guarantee of being given the final fulfilment of God's glory, as seen in the face of the ascended Christ.⁵⁴ This goal is the hope given in the present reconciledness, given in Christ. Through participation in the present life of Christ as Lord shall we be saved both from the wrathful suffering that is in the world - and be saved to the life already alive in us by the Holy Spirit.⁵⁵

52. II Pet. 1:4.

53. Acts 2:14 ff. The hope given by the guarantee of the Holy Spirit, transforms the hardships and sufferings of existence from wrathful agencies into disciplinary agencies Ro. 5:3,4 c.f. Ro. 8:31 ff. "The supreme greatness of christianity lies in the fact that it does not seek supernatural remedy for suffering, but provides a supernatural use of it." Simone Weil quoted by F.R. Barry: The Atonement, p.175. Cf. II Cor. 7:10.

54. Ro. 5:2b. The Glory of God is the divine likeness which man is intended to bear - but from which he has fallen short (Ro. 3:23). It is the fulness of God's image in humanity as revealed in Jesus Christ as Lord, i.e. the ascended Christ in full communion with God the Father. Eph. 4:13,15; II Cor. 4:4,66; Col. 1:27,28.

55. Participation in the Holy Spirit or the koinonia, is participation in or koinonia with Christ who is himself in union with God by that spirit. See notes on Ro. 5:9-10 and II Cor. 1:22 in Oxford Annotated RSV and notes e and f on Ro. 5:5 in Jerusalem Bible.

In verses 10 and 11 of Romans chapter 5, the threefold dynamics of God's dealings with men in Christ are summed up in the use of the term reconciliation: The death and resurrection⁵⁶ of Christ ransoms or releases⁵⁷ man from the state of sin and transfers him into a standing of reconciledness⁵⁸ through the relationship of faith. This reconciliation⁵⁹ is realized in a faith relationship involving man's response but depending for its realization upon the revelation of the resurrection. It is realized as man is brought into Christ by the Holy Spirit. In this reconciliation by grace through faith, rejoicing in God⁶⁰ is possible because the promise and guarantee of fulfilled reconciliation is received now, in the giving and receiving of the Holy Spirit, who unites the believer to God in the fellowship of those who live 'in Christ'.⁶¹ This rejoicing anticipates the consummation of the reconciliation now received through Christ in the Holy Spirit.

In Christ the Messianic peace has come,⁶² and is bestowed by Him and⁶³ His disciples are its messengers.⁶⁴ It is through the reconciling act of God in Jesus Christ that the believer has peace with God.⁶⁵ This peace is "our reconciliation"⁶⁶ which assures us of the future salvation.⁶⁷

56. See Dodd, Epistle to Romans. pp.94-95.

57. God is always the subject of Christ's ransoming by his death. See above.

58. Or 'Peace with God'.

59. Salvation is the actual word used in Ro. 5:10. Salvation is associated with peace between God and Man. Is. 2:2-4; 11:1-9; 52:7-10 e.g. cf. Ro. 5:1.

60. Ro. 5:11.

61. Cf. Eph. 2:18.

62. Is. 9:6 cf. Lk. 1:79; 2:14,29 f.

63. Mk. 5:34; Lk. 7:50; Jn.14:27; 16:33; 20:19,21,26.

64. Lk. 10:5 f. Acts 10:36.

65. Ro. 5:1.

66. Ro. 5:11.

67. Ro. 5:10. See also I Pet. 1:5,9 cf. Ro. 10:15 with

The terms reconcile - reconciliation, point to a change being effected,⁶⁸ a change from enmity to reconciliation. Biblical language speaks of this change-over, as brought about by God, as salvation. Paul refers to God's salvific action as reconciliation. Reconciliation as a dynamic, is an action of God working towards the ultimate and final salvation consisting of peace and union with God.

67. (cont.) II Cor. 5:19 'Gospel of peace' - 'message of reconciliation', and Eph. 1:13 - 'Gospel of your salvation', and Ro. 1:16 "The Gospel ... the power of God for salvation".

68. See Kittel's: Katallassō in the New Testament.

COLOSSIANS 1:15-23

Paul writes to the Colossians to remind them of the gospel he preached to them.¹ The finality of Jesus Christ as reconciler between God and man was being challenged by 'heretical' teachers. Gnostic tendencies as well as Judaic ritualism seem to have been part of the heresy.²

The Colossian heresy seems to have been a mystery cult in which visions played a part.³ Christianity was assailed as immature and Christ's redemption as insufficient.⁴ The angelic powers were to be worshipped with or above Christ.⁵ It is believed that the heretics regarded the angels as intermediaries between holy, transcendent deity and the material world where man lives.⁶ Certain ascetic and liturgical practices were considered essential to maturity and perfection of salvation.⁷

Paul vigorously objects that the Colossians are falling into negative legalism and are denying the reality of the reconciliation achieved by Christ and maintained by union with him, who is Lord above all powers on earth or in heaven.

The heresy seems to have been a syncretism of pagan and Jewish religious features, and possibly a pre-Christian Jewish 'gnosticism'.⁸

-
1. Pauline Authorship has been contested but unsuccessfully we feel, but see Commentaries, etc.
 2. See Moffat's Commentary also Interpreters Dictionary etc. and Stewart, A Man in Christ, p.64 ff.
 3. 1:26-27; 2:2. With the attendant danger of hyper-pneumatism.
 4. 1:13-20; 2:15.
 5. 1:16; 2:8-20. The stoicheia are the planetary and starry spirits that affected man's birth and destiny; probably also the angels standing behind the Mosaic law.
 6. See Interpreters Dictionary, p.660 on Colossians and article on ESSENES.
 7. 2:11 ff.
 8. Interpreters Dictionary.

The date of the letter probably lies between 56 and 57 a.d. if it was written from an Ephesian jail, and between 61 and 62 A.D. if it was written from a jail in Rome.⁹

Colossians 1:

"¹⁹For in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell, ²⁰and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross.

²¹And you, who once were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, ²²he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him,"

Paul deals with the Colossian situation by pointing firstly to the absolute priority of Christ in relationship between God and his creation,¹⁰ and secondly to the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ in the reconciliation of the whole world to God.¹¹ In Christ all things cohere, or hold together,¹² even the elemental powers and angelic beings¹³ are subject to him, as not only were they created in Him,¹⁴ but he has disarmed them as he did the law.¹⁵

Christ's victory over the powers was gained through his death and resurrection.¹⁶ Christ as the risen and

-
9. See commentaries, etc. on question of dating.
 10. Col. 1:15,16,19. cf. Phil. 2:6; Jn. 1:1-3; Heb. 1:1-4.
 11. Col. 1:20 cf. Phil. 1:9,10; Eph. 3:9 f.
 12. Cf. Acts 17:24,25,28; Heb. 1:4-14; Jn. 1:9,10.
 13. Col. 2:18,20.
 14. Col. 2:15.
 15. Col. 2:14,15 cf. Heb. 2:8; John 1:5 (Col. 1:13).
 16. and ascended of course! Col. 1:18; 2:10-15 (Cf. Eph. 1:19 f.) 2:15; 3:4 f.; 6:10 ff. and I Cor. 15:26-28. The classical theory of atonement of "Christus Victor" is based on Christ's defeat of elemental powers and angelic beings which kept men in bondage of sin and therefore death. See Col. 2:20,23; 3:1-11 cf. Heb. 1:10-13; Ro. 8:37-39; I Pet. 3:22. See also Gustaf Aulen, "Christus Victor" p.69 ff.

ascended Lord has become the head of the church - and the new creation - the new man in Christ, thus becoming preeminent in all things concerning God and man.¹⁷

The emphasis of Christ's reconciling role is the heart of Paul's argument against the mediatory roles of the elemental spirits and angelic beings.¹⁸ Christ by Paul's account out-mediate all the elemental spirits and angelic powers, of which he is the creator in the first place and over whom he now reigns.

The emphasis on the reconciliatory role of Christ is also the basis of Paul's appeal for morality.¹⁹

The means whereby the reconciliation between God and all creation,²⁰ including man,²¹ is achieved; is by God in Christ,²² in the incarnation²³ of Christ, God's eternal Son;²⁴ is in the Son's death and resurrection.²⁵

To worship the powers subsumed under Christ's power, is idolatry²⁶ and legalistic rituals are blasphemously autosoteriological.²⁷ In Christ, having been freed from the authority and power of these spirits and

17. Col. 1:18-20 cf. Eph. 1:22-23; 4:15; Acts 26:23
Ro. 14:9; I Cor. 15:20; II Cor. 2:14b-18.

18. Col. 1:20; 2:18,20,15 cf. Eph. 6:12.

19. Col. 3:1 ff. The aim of religious life which is to put on new nature in which they must grow (3:10), to the image of the creator. This aim cannot be accomplished outside of faith in Christ. Cf. Gal. 5:4-6; I Cor. 15:50; John 3:6.

20. Col. 1:20.

21. Col. 1:21.

22. Col. 1:19 cf. II Cor. 5:19.

23. Col. 1:22, 15-16; cf. Heb. 2:14-18; Jn. 1:14,10,11.

24. Col. 1:13 cf. Heb. 1:2,5; Jn. 1:14c.

25. Col. 1:20,18. In which the spirits and angelic beings are disarmed (2:15) of their shadowy powers (2:17) of which powers, Christ was the substance anyway.

26. Col. 2:18.

27. 2:8, 21-22.

angels, the Colossians are free to worship God in Christ²⁸ who will lead them to and present them to God.²⁹ "First things first", says Paul, "Christ is pre-eminent and to become like Him, Holy and irreproachable³⁰ is within His power to give. It is also the hope of those who trust in Him.³¹ The old nature is to be cast away - the new nature taken up,³² and the whole of life is to be lived in Christ."³³

The old nature is immoral, full of evil,³⁴ the new nature is compassionate, loving.³⁵ It is on the basis of the new nature given in Christ that Paul makes his appeal for morality, love, etc. The new life is a life filled with God's Holy Spirit - a spiritual life in Christ must evidence the fruits of the Holy Spirit.³⁶

God in Christ,³⁷ has reconciled the estranged and hostile sinner to Himself, through the incarnation³⁸ and by the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ³⁹ who

28. 3:1.

29. 1:22 cf. I Cor. 15:28.

30. 1:22; 3:9-10.

31. 1:23.

32. II Cor. 5:17; Ro. 5:5 cf. Col. 2:20.

33. 3:3,9,16,17.

34. 3:5.

35. 3:12 cf. I Cor. 12:31 f.

36. This same principle is the basis of James' argument. Jas. 2:14 f. James has often been considered to contradict Paul's "justification by faith" with a doctrine of "justification by works". In Jas. 2:14 ff. faith is not rejected, rather the works are considered as "fruits of righteousness". (Cf. Phil. 1:9-11). Both Paul and James base their ethical exhortations on the presupposition that if God's righteousness in Christ is given in the Holy Spirit - then one can rightly expect evidence of this in the life of the Christian. This evidence is called works by James, and called fruits by Paul. James is not without the idea of faith bearing fruit (1:16-18,22 James presupposes a knowledge of the Gospel in his exhortation on faith and works), nor is Paul without the idea of working out one's own salvation (Phil. 2:12).

37. Col. 1:21.

38. Col. 1:13,15,16 now enfleshed at Col. 1:22.

See note 23 above.

39. Col. 1:20c, 18b.

now reigns supreme over the church and over all things and creatures.⁴⁰ The news of the reality of God's reconciling action in Jesus Christ is brought to both those near and afar off through the ministry of the church in the preaching of the gospel of reconciliation.⁴¹ This preaching evokes the response of faith in Christ.⁴² In the faith relationship, through baptism,⁴³ the believer in Christ⁴⁴ enters a process of reconciliation whereby the individual and the whole body of the church is transformed and recreated⁴⁵ towards the ultimate goal of being presented⁴⁶ before God, holy, blameless and irreproachable at the end,⁴⁶ but also in the present.

The present aspect is contained in the 'hope' of the future fulfilment⁴⁷ - the Holy Spirit being the guarantee of the "hope of the gospel", as we have seen above, though it is not mentioned here. The guarantee is spoken of as "Christ in you"⁴⁸ the hope of glory which is

-
40. Col. 1:18a,c, 20.
 41. Col. 1:23b,c, 25,26,27; 1:5-8 cf. II Cor. 5:18-20 cf. Eph. 2:17.
 42. Col. 1:4,5,6,23; 2:6,7 cf. 3:3.
 43. Col. 2:12,20- 3:1,3,4. "If with Christ you died If then you have been raised with Christ. (Cf. Ro. 6:3 ff. and 2:11-15)
 44. Col. 2:9,10,11; 3:3,11,15,16,17; Col. 1:13,14.
 45. Col. 1:6,10,17 - 22, 25-29 : Col. 2:2,6,12,19.
 (The positive of the exhortation would read "Hold fast to the Head grows with a growth that is from God") Col. 3:1,10,11 (Cf. Eph. 2:14-18) Col. 2:19; II Cor. 3:18 : Col. 3:2-4. The goal of this growth is to appear irreproachable (1:22) before God in the glory of God which appears in Jesus Christ - in its fullness. Col. 1:19.
 46. 1:22; 3:4. (he has reconciled ... in order) This "presentation" may be immediate in terms of Christ's priesthood (Heb. 7:23-25; Ro. 8:34) and would be a strong argument against elemental mediators. Or it may be future in terms of eschatological fulfilment. Whether present or future, and probably both, the proviso of verse 23 would hold good.
 47. Col. 1:23.
 48. Col. 1:27. See also Col. 3:4 - the argument following in verse 5 picking up the provided of 1:23.

laid up for you in heaven,⁴⁹ the fulness-of-life they have come to in Christ⁵⁰ and which is hid with Christ in God.⁵¹

When Christ appears⁵² in whom the fulness of deity (God)⁵³ dwells, then they too will appear with Christ in Glory:⁵⁴ The goal of christian life and faith is ultimately to share in Christ's resurrection and ascension life, which is entered into now by baptism of cross and spirit, by entry into the Body of Christ⁵⁵ which is now being prepared for that glory by a growth which is from God.⁵⁶

The reconciliation (peace of Christ)⁵⁷ must rule the heart for it is to this reconciliation, that the estranged were called in the one body.⁵⁸ In this body with the new nature being renewed after the image of God,⁵⁹ by the love of God which binds everything together in perfect harmony,⁶⁰ there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all.⁶¹

49. Col. 1:5; 3:3,4.

50. 2:10.

51. Col. 3:3.

52. Col. 3:4.

53. Col. 2:9; 1:19.

54. Col. 3:4 cf. I Cor. 15. The glory of God in Christ, the image of God, of which man has fallen short (see our discussion above under Romans 5). This glory of manhood as the image of God, God's glory, is hidden in the ascended life of the ascended reigning Lord Jesus Christ (3:3) who's spirit God has sent into the hearts of believers as guarantee of their sonship in Christ, his beloved Son (Col. 4:4 ff.) Cf.

55. Col. 2:19; 3:10,11 and 12-15 cf. Eph. 2:16 below.

56. Col. 2:19.

57. Col. 3:15.

58. Col. 1:24.

59. Col. 3:10.

60. Col. 3:14.

61. Col. 3:11 cf. II Cor. 4:13 - 5:10,14. John 14:1-3 and Eph. 2:14 ff.

The letter to the Colossians is devoid of explicit teaching on the Holy Spirit. At 1:8 the reference to the Spirit implies that the love of the Colossians for all christians is in the Spirit.⁶² If we then look at 2:2 f. and 2:19 it becomes clearer that the knitting together in love, which comes as growth from God is in fact growth in love by the Holy Spirit whose greatest gift is love.⁶³ As the aim of the letter is to combat heresies by showing the pre-eminence of Christ, Paul tactically speaks of "Christ in you".⁶⁴ Christ is the content of Christian spirituality,⁶⁵ to whom the Spirit bears witness.⁶⁶ The omission of specific teaching on the Holy Spirit⁶⁷ in Colossians is tactical not theological, but it does show that what is central to Paul's Gospel is Christ as reigning Lord, and He as Lord because it was He who was also crucified.

62. All the saints = christians (cf. 1:4).

63. I Cor. 12:31 ff and 14:12.

64. Col. 1:27.

65. Cf. I Cor 12:3.

66. John 16:8-11,13,14.

67. True worship in Spirit and in truth can only lead to the high christology of Col. 1:15 ff. This deficiency is corrected in Eph. 2:18,22; 3:6.

EPHESIANS 2:14-18

The Pauline authorship of Ephesians has been strongly contested,¹ by some who consider the letter as dependent on the known corpus of Pauline letters and modelled on the letter to the Colossians. Ephesians thus becomes an eclectic composition by a brilliant Paulinist. Such a thesis appears possible when one is confronted with a synoptic study of Ephesians and other accepted Pauline letters. If this thesis, known as the Goodspeed-Milton thesis, is accepted then the authorship of Ephesians does not for our present purposes affect our method of considering Ephesians as part of Pauline theology, for there is nothing in Ephesians that is contrary to Pauline writings elsewhere, and that cannot be developed from what Paul has written elsewhere.

Guthrie however makes a strong case for Pauline authorship despite the difficulties of determining the occasion and purpose of the letter. The supposed destination found in some texts and given as Ephesus is in doubt because Paul would not be so detached towards people he knew well.

Guthrie assumes a kind of circular letter theory and seeks for the circumstances in the writer rather than with the readers. Paul incarcerated in prison has had time to reflect on the theme of Christ and the Church. This he formulates more quietly once he has dealt with the Colossian heresy, in terms of the high Christology first met in Colossians.

"The direct link between this letter and the one to Colossians has a direct bearing on its purpose. The

1. See Commentaries, etc. of which this introduction is a brief resumé.

same themes are dealt with although in modified form. It seems probable that the apostle, with the positive doctrine of "Colossians" still in mind, wrote down again in a general way without the specific background of heresy. Something of the same process may well have taken place in the case of the Galatian and Roman letters."²

The background more generally is a concern for unity in the church and its obligation to grow in the love and power of Christ.

The date of the letter to the "Ephesians" is later than 70 A.D. and possibly as late as 115 A.D. if not written by Paul. If it is written by Paul then it reflects the same conditions as Colossians and shares the dates of 56 - 57 A.D. if written from Ephesus, and 61 - 62 if written from Rome.

Ephesians 2:

¹⁴"For he is our peace who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, ¹⁵by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, ¹⁶and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end. ¹⁷And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; ¹⁸for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father."

2. Guthrie, op.cit. p.135 (Pauline Epistles). We may add that a similar process seems to have taken place between the 'severe' letter of II Corinthians (10-13) and the letter of reconciliation (II Cor. 1-9). The severe letter being a passionate defence of Paul's apostleship and ministry in various aspects, and the latter letter a more contemplative exposition on the ministry of Paul and other apostles and the church's ministry of reconciliation in general.

In this letter the reconciliation of men to God³ is closely associated to the peace between men.⁴ The reconciliation to God takes place in the "one body where the dividing walls of hostility"⁵ between Greek and Jew are transcended in the new society.⁶

The Gentiles or Greeks, living outside the law were once dead in their sins.⁷ They were without God and hope in the world.⁸ The Jews had the covenant of promise in the commonwealth of Israel,⁹ which witnessed to Christ. Israel, however, shared like the rest of mankind, in the doom of God's wrath and consequent death.¹⁰ The hostility towards God of both Gentile and Jew is displayed in their social divisions.¹¹ The dividing wall of hostility between Jew and Gentile¹² - even on the grounds of the God given law¹³ is a denial of Godliness.

By abolishing the law of commandments and ordinances (i.e. the religious differentiations of the Jews which erected the dividing wall against gentile entry into the inner courts of God's temple. Cf. Mk. 15:38) Christ created in himself¹⁵ the new worshipper and the new temple.¹⁶

-
3. Eph. 2:16 cf. Col. 1:24; 3:10,11,14 as discussed above.
 4. Eph. 2:14,15,16,17.
 5. Eph. 2:14.
 6. Cf. Ro. 10:12; Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11 e.g.
 7. Eph. 2:1, 11-21.
 8. Eph. 2:12 cf. I Thess. 4:13.
 9. Eph. 2:12.
 10. Eph. 2:3 cf. Ro. 2:1 ff. 3:21-31.
 11. Cf. Gal. 5:20 f.
 12. This metaphor may be a general one but it probably derives from the dividing wall in the temple at Jerusalem which separated off an outer court for Gentiles from the inner wherein Jews only were allowed. See Commentaries etc. (It was the outer court that Jesus cleansed of money changers Mk. 11:15-19 and parallels.)
 13. Cf. Romans 9:4-5
 14. Cf. Romans 2:17 ff; 3:9 ff; 3:21-23.
 15. Cf. Gal 4:4 where Christ by living under the law, in himself and in his death abolishes the laws custodianship. (Gal. 3:24) Relationship to God as sons is no longer under the law in which only the promise of sonship is present, but through faith in Christ (Gal.3:25).

The temple (or household of God)¹⁶ is built up into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit.¹⁷ Christ himself, the new worshipper, is the corner-stone, the key to the whole temple structure.¹⁸ This whole household is built up step by step, apostles, prophets, Jews, Gentiles, all keyed in Christ as Lord;¹⁹ the whole structure of the church is a dwelling place for God in the Spirit -- in which God shall be everything to everyone.²⁰

The unity of the temple or household structure with Christ as corner-stone is clearly emphasized.²¹ In this temple, in which God can dwell in the Spirit, men not only need to be reconciled to God in Christ who is part of the structure, but need to be reconciled to one another.²² The reconciliation between men can only take place in and through the reconciliation of men to God in Christ -- who is "our peace".²³

"It is not difficult to see what the New Testament means by designating Christ as cornerstone of the new temple. It refers, in the first instance to, his pre-eminence, both in dignity and in time."²⁴

16. 2:19.

17. 2:22.

18. 2:20 cf. Col. 1:18.

19. 2:21.

20. 2:22; II Cor. 15:28.

21. Eph. 2:20b-21 cf. Eph. 4:10-16; Ro. 12:4 ff; I Cor. 12:4 ff; Col. 1:18-20 and 3:14; I Cor. 14:12b.

22. Eph. 2:16-17 cf. Eph. 4:2 ff. Matt. 5:22-24; Col. 1:4; I Cor. 12:27-13:13. It is unthinkable that differences especially of religious function (I Cor. 12:29-30) should break the unity of love in the Holy Spirit. Cf. Eph. 4:30-32 and Matt. 6:14.

23. Eph. 2:14,21 cf. Eph. 4:17-25; Gal. 5:16-25; John 20:20-23. See Moffatt's commentary on Eph. 2:11-18.

24. McKelvey; The New Temple, p.181 f. Christ is thus designated the beginning of the Church, the first born among many brethren, or first fruits of the resurrection.

Secondly in this structure "Christians are joined primarily to Christ and secondarily to one another."

"There is also the suggestion that Christ presupposes Christians as Christians presuppose Christ. The two belong together and together form the Church."

"The Church is the temple of God, or God's Spirit; it is never the temple of Christ. Christ is placed alongside believers as part of the temple, and the temple is still God's."

"The temple image is particularly suggestive in what it has to teach us concerning the life of the church. This is conveyed under the image of building (construction), and is conceived of in different ways." The gifts of the ascended Lord are for this specific purpose (Eph.4:7 ff.).²⁵ The church possesses its own inherent powers of growth by virtue of its union with Christ the living stone, and 'upbuilds itself in love' (Eph. 4:16).

"The conception of the church as a building under construction, with no suggestion of when the work will be completed, and at the same time as a temple in which God is actually dwelling and worship is being offered ... is a paradox which is basic to much New Testament thinking, the paradox of present possession and future hope."

In the New temple Christians have sacrifices to offer on behalf of others as Christ offered himself for others. "This in fact is the whole point of the New Testament in calling Christians priests: a priesthood exists not for its own sake but for others."

"Thus First Peter says, 'You are ... a royal priesthood ... that you may declare the wonderful deeds

25. That is the apostles, pastors teachers have received the gifts of these ministries for the building up of the church.

of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light'. (2:9). Similarly, Paul states, 'My priestly service is the preaching of the gospel of God, and it falls to me to offer the Gentile to him as an acceptable sacrifice consecrated by the Holy Spirit' (Ro. 15:16 NEB cf. 11:13). Those converted are the sacred first fruits (I Cor. 16:15; II Thes. 2:13; cf. Rev. 14:4 f.). In turn, the converts are themselves sacrifices, to which the missionary's life is added as a libation (Phil. 2:17)."

"In all this it is of paramount importance to remind ourselves that the priestly and sacrificial nature of the Christian life depends upon the sacrifice made by Jesus Christ." The Lord and Head of the Church.²⁶

Through Christ all men, have access in one Spirit to the Father.²⁷

26. We have quoted McKelvey at length because he summarises very succinctly what we may discern in the study of Ephesians and Colossians.

27. Eph. 2:18.

VII

AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST

"God making his appeal through us: We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God." (II Cor. 5:20)

It is in the setting of sinful Israel, which is being called to repentance and righteousness by the voice of one crying the wilderness,

"prepare the way of the Lord
make his paths straight",¹

that we are introduced to Jesus of Nazareth. It is in this setting of a people being prepared that Jesus makes his appearance - and comes to be baptized by John into the prepared community.

The evangelists make it clear that Jesus stands in relationship to God only in a societal context. This is emphasized in the dove symbol used in the baptism narratives. Also by the Holy Spirit with which Jesus is anointed to be the Christ, or Messiah² who will himself baptise with spirit, the community aspect is implied; in the light of earlier prophecies concerning the Spirit.

If we are correct in concluding that Jesus understood himself, his rôle and ministry, in terms of the Son of Man who had to suffer many things, despite his authority and eventual triumph and vindication by God, then Jesus also understood his relationship to God in a societal context. He did come to offer his life as a ransom for many. Jesus' sonship is both a sonship in which God is his Abba, Father; and a sonship which is shared with men as Son of Man.

1. Mark 1:3.

2. In the evangelists' view at least it was so.

The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism indicates what is confirmed in his ministry: that Jesus is what he is, does and says what he does and says in the Spirit. The presence of God's Kingdom is present because Jesus casts out demons by the power of the Holy Spirit. The evangelists certainly understood Jesus' ministry as a pneumatic ministry. Jesus' own awareness of God's closeness seems to be expressed in terms of the Kingdom of Heaven or God. But we saw that Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom might as well be teaching about the Holy Spirit.

The evangelists witness that Jesus of Nazareth was received as a prophet, as a man of God, and to some he was "the one to redeem Israel".³ Some even asked Jesus for privileges of glory in the coming kingdom.⁴

Jesus by his life, words and deeds had impressed on his followers a knowledge of himself that raised hopes and longings for God's Kingdom to be established soon and they even believed that he, Jesus, would somehow do it. Despite Jesus' warnings and teachings to the contrary they seemed to hope for a restoration of Israel in socio-political terms.

No wonder then that Jesus' arrest, trial and crucifixion left them confused, desolate and afraid of sharing his fate, so that they gathered secretly with doors closed.⁵ And it was in their despair that Jesus appeared to them, commissioned them and breathing on them said "Receive the Holy Spirit".

3. Luke 24:19-21.
4. Mark 10:35 f.
5. John 20:19.

Just as the appearance of the Second Adam coincides with the anointment in the Holy Spirit,⁶ so the appearance of the brothers of the first born coincides with the descent of the Spirit.⁷

Jesus as the anointed and tempted Son of God plays a determinative or Adamic role. He reverses the sinful order of Adam's fall. He refuses to make himself equal to God but lives by faith and obedience to his Father's will. He does so in the Spirit.⁸ The same Adamic role is found in the Son of Man role - the Son of Man is the obedient sufferer of many things, to whom authority is given, but, by whom authority is never abused. In spite of the world's denial of that authority, by faith in God and obedience even unto death, the Son of Man remains in the bounds of created manhood and is vindicated by God - as witnessed by the apostles.

The death of Jesus is the acme of his obedience and faith. It is here that he proved himself as true Son of Man; offering his life a ransom for many. It is here too that he proved himself true Son of God - for to have avoided this baptism and cup would have been to yield to the temptation provided in the glories of existence. He chose rather to obey God trusting that God would vindicate him as Son of Man. He is the true man, the man created in God's image, in whom the fullness of God's glory dwells, and in whose face we may see that Glory, who is also true Son of God.

There is a continuity of function between God and Jesus, brought into being in the anointing of the Holy

6. Jesus' baptism.

7. "Pentecost".

8. Mark 1:12 cf. Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1,14.

Spirit. The indwelling of Jesus by the Holy Spirit is God's witness to Jesus that he is God's son - the true Son of Man. It is also at the same time that Jesus thus becomes God's agent among men. In his presence God is present by the Holy Spirit, for the manhood that Jesus displays is the image of God. In responding to Jesus men respond to God. In and through Jesus of Nazareth the power of God in reality does break through into the world of men, to liberate the captives from existential estrangement. To cast out the demons that captivate men's minds and bodies in false commitments.

Those who deny that God works in and through Jesus, and thus in the world, blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, and thereby condemn themselves to alienation from God for they will neither 'hear' nor 'see' that the worldly glories are subject to God's authority. To such, God is dead and irrelevant in the world.

The morality or ethics that Jesus taught and practiced were based on a relationship to God - a relationship of righteousness towards God. He himself did only what the Father wanted him to do - because as God's Son - as Son of Man his desire was to please the Father.

One cannot conceive of Jesus' power in the Spirit, to cast out demons for example, without the prior baptism and 'election' to Sonship. One cannot conceive of that Sonship without both the desire to fulfil righteousness - nor the power of the Holy Spirit to fulfil that righteousness.

It is precisely as God's Son in righteous relationship to the Father in obedience and faith, even unto death - that Jesus is truly Son of Man, the New Man created in God's image. It is by this relationship of trust and obedience as Son of Man even in the baptism of death that Jesus

realizes the New manhood, and thus by this new reality ransoms man from the bondage of the old manhood which is lived in alienation from God.

But our assessment of Jesus as Son of Man and Son of God is determined by the inclusion of the resurrection in our thinking. And so it must be!

Whoever Jesus might have been, apart from the resurrection the evangelist would never have recorded the story of this person who called himself the Son of Man. We notice the same trend in Paul's writings. He lives in the time of the risen and ascended Lord - yet he constantly returns to a man called Jesus who was crucified. It is God, by the resurrection who puts the sign and seal on Jesus' life and reveals the reality of its New manhood. Without the resurrection the hope of the restoration of Israel would have remained a disappointed hope. It is the resurrected Jesus who is Lord and Christ. The anointment was by John symbolically with water. The Sonship was realized in Jesus of Nazareth as Son of Man but the vindication and authority was given in the resurrection and ascension.

Since Jesus is Lord, since the New manhood is accepted by God and received into the heavenlies - therefore is the New manhood also given by the Lord to his fellow-men - to the many for whom he offered his life that they may be redeemed from the captivity of 'powers' and 'principalities' whether in the skies or on earth.

Paul who was a 'second generation'⁹ Apostle, also claims to have been a witness to the resurrection.¹⁰ We

9. There is no evidence that Paul knew Jesus 'in the flesh'. II Cor. 5:16. This is a matter of standpoint.
 10. I Cor. 15:7-9. In spite of the fact that the 'ascension' must have taken place. We see here the danger of putting

find that he too was confronted with the presence of God in Jesus Christ, but through the church. His first reaction was as is well known - to crucify that humanity which dared to speak on behalf of God. In the end it took a 'resurrection appearance' of Jesus on the Damascus Road to recreate Paul and make of him also - an apostle and ambassador.

Paul in his letters gives us the earliest extant writings on Christianity. Whenever he attempts to summarise what it is he is talking about he is reduced to the reconciliation theme.

In defence of his ministry Paul can only reply and say, "I once regarded Jesus Christ from a human point of view, I no longer do. In being in Christ I am a new creature. All this is from God who through Christ reconciled me to himself, and gave me the ministry of reconciliation."¹¹

When trying to apologize for the gospel he was preaching, trying to reassure the Christians in Rome, and gain their support for his mission to Spain he summarises his gospel, "while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation."¹²

At Colossae the Christians were in danger of submitting themselves to elemental powers, becoming slaves of existential powers. Also it seems that there were angelic powers behind the mosaic law to which Jews would turn for

10. (cont.) theological interpretation of experiential realities into temporal categories - we land up with 'mythology'.

11. Cf. Ro. 15:16 and cf. 11:13.

12. Ro. 5:10,11.

mediation with deity. Gentiles would turn to the planetary and starry powers and spirits. Again Paul writes in terms of reconciliation, "You who were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him, provided that you continue in faith. For in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross."¹³

At Ephesus the heresies had reached a stage of development where Jews and Gentiles were separating from one another. Again the exhortation is based on the reality of God's reconciliation in Christ Jesus; "Christ is our peace, who has made us both one, and 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 two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end ... for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father."¹⁴

If the church is to undertake a mission of reconciliation in a world that feels itself estranged, the church must understand the world situation and itself in relation to that situation. But more than that, the church must understand its own situation in relation to God.

The church must know that it is God who reconciles. The church itself is God's church, and as the temple in which God dwells by the Spirit, the church because of its

13. Col. 1:21-23, 19-20.

14. Eph. 2:14-18.

corner-stone Jesus, may become the reconciling agency in the world. It is in Christ that the church can take a reconciling role. It is as ambassadors of Christ, the Head, that the church has a mission and a message of reconciliation. But it is only as it works together with God as His righteousness¹⁵ that it may effectively appeal on behalf of Christ, "be reconciled to God".¹⁶

The church cannot identify itself with any utopian plan¹⁷ of salvation for man. Utopias, whether economic, social or political are all kingdoms seen from the top of Mt. Pisgah. The Devil has to be worshipped to obtain them. Salvation is promised now, and guarantee is given of it, by the Holy Spirit who witnesses with the Christian's spirit that he is indeed a Son of God, and by this spirit of adoption may cry out Abba! Father! But Salvation is also to come, "at the Parousia".¹⁸ The Christian understands Salvation in terms of the Telos given by God, in the ascended Christ. A Telos in terms of earthly "peace in our time", or "equal pay and opportunity for all", is a false and utopian Telos which can only bring disillusionment.

The church must know that man feels estranged in this world. Man may diagnose it as estrangement from his own true self and propose remedies. God's diagnosis is that man is estranged from the Glory of God. Man is estranged from his true self - as God intended him to be.

15. II Cor. 6:1.

16. II Cor. 20.

17. Utopian plans such as that of Karl Marx, overlook the dependant (yet independant) nature of man upon God, and suggest that man being master of his own fate must grasp control of history and build a perfect world.

18. "Theological" time not temporal time.

Man can only become truly Son of Man as he becomes Son of God in Christ.

The church is a royal priesthood, called into being to suffer many things and offer itself as a ransom for many. It can do so only in Christ. It is inconceivable that the church should have power to cast out the demons of society and heal men and women without the prior "election" and anointing in the Holy Spirit. One cannot conceive of a church without both - the desire to live in Christ, by the Spirit, and the spirit whereby to fulfil that desire.

The church as the household of God in whom God dwells by the Spirit, is so primarily because of Jesus Christ who is the corner-stone. The church cannot exist without Him. The reality of the church's mission of reconciliation depends upon the reality of its own reconciliation in him to God. Because of this dependence on prior reconciliation to God in the Spirit, members of the church are in reconciliation one to another. Christ is their peace. The reality of reconciliation has to be evident - as fruits of the spirit in the church - if the church is to witness effectively - that Christ is risen and ascended and is the Lord of creation. That this Lord of all died on the cross, that God may reconcile through him, all men to himself and to each other.

The church must understand its own paradoxical position as an open ended process in time, "until the Lord comes". The church as the focus in which God is present by the Spirit, yet which is in itself not yet the locus in which God dwells fully is well illustrated by the New Testament symbol of the household or temple of God.

"The conception of the church as a building under construction, with no suggestion of when the work will be completed, and at the same time as a temple in which God is actually dwelling and worship is being offered, looks like a contradiction. What we have here, however, is a paradox which is basic to much New Testament thinking, the paradox of present possession and future hope. Like each of its members, the church is called to become what it is, the dwelling place of God in the Spirit. Recognition of this fact¹⁹ preserves the church from the twin evils of complacency and despair."²⁰

The church cannot become complacent for it is still building - the gifts it has received, of Apostleship, teacher, prophet, healing, etc. are for the building of the Body.²¹ The church cannot 'arrive' at its end without God's initiative in the parousia. The church may build itself up in love,²² but only so that it may be presented before God irreproachable by Christ its Head, who it must be remembered is pre-eminent in the church because of his perfect obedience to the Father. The church can never afford itself any complacency. "The church that is called to serve men on earth is the church that serves God in heaven; the degree to which it is able to make its own particular contribution to the world's life depends upon the degree of its nearness to God."²³

Nor need the church despair. That it will probably suffer for righteousness sake, it has been told by its own Head. "The outward circumstances which govern it may - and

19. Fact of open endedness leading to the paradox of now and then.

20. McKelvey, op.cit. p.182,183.

21. Eph. 4:7 ff. I Cor. 14. See McKelvey, op.cit.p.182.

22. Eph. 4:16.

23. McKelvey, op.cit. p.187.

certainly will - include suffering, defeat, apostasy, the rise of false messianic claims."²⁴ But it is in these very times that its hope²⁵ will not turn to disappointment, "because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us,²⁶ as a guarantee that what is mortal will be swallowed up by life."²⁷

The significance of the church is that it should be focus of "where men are confronted with the reality and power of God's Kingdom. The rest is in the hands of the Father. It is sufficient for the church²⁸ that it be faithful. But this is not a matter of anxiety. The witness to the Kingdom is not the work of men but of the Spirit. The mission of God is not to be prosecuted after the manner of a human crusade. It is the participation of the church in the Spirit's witness to what the Father is doing with the whole maze of events which make up human life - namely to sum up all things in Christ, in whom they were all created."²⁹

Such a faith gives us a place for free, responsible action. It gives the assurance that what we do is not lost in the abyss of meaninglessness, but that it is part of the fulfilling of God's purpose for history. It delivers us on the one hand from the alternations of optimism and pessimism which beset any undertaking not rooted in faith concerning God's whole action in history. It delivers us on the other hand from the kind of over-heated apocalypticism³⁰ which is not content to leave 'the day and the

24. Newbigin: The Relevance of Trinitarian Doctrine for Today's Mission. p.50.

25. Ro. 5:2-4.

26. Ro. 5:5.

27. II Cor. 5:5,4.

28. And Christians.

29. Newbigin, op.cit. p.50.

30. Which is a kind of utopianism.

hour' in the Father's hands. "In this faith we can go out into every nation to preach Christ as Lord, knowing that, whatever be the result, we are thereby sharing in the work of God and shall share in his joy."³¹

As it seeks to reconcile estranged man to God in Jesus the church should ever remember that Jesus was reconciled to his own manhood ³² only as he was reconciled in being God's Son who as man was to live by every word that proceeded from the mouth of God,³³ and that he was so reconciled by his baptism in the Spirit.³⁴

"We are invited to become through the presence of the Holy Spirit, participants in the Son's loving obedience to the Father.

All things have been created that they may be summed up in Christ the Son. We are invited to participate in an activity of God which is the central meaning of creation itself.

All history is directed towards that end. All creation has this as its goal. The Spirit of God, who is also the Spirit of the Son, is given as the foretaste of that consummation, as the witness to it, and as the guide of the church on the road towards it.

The church is not promised success; it is promised the peace of Christ in the midst of tribulation. And for the present it has the assurance: 'Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world'. For the future it has the promise: 'it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom'."³⁵

31. Newbigin: op.cit. p.51.

32. As his acceptance of death indicates.

33. Matt. 4:4.

34. As we have shown in the study of the baptism - temptation narratives in the Gospels.

35. Newbigin: op.cit. p.78.

"For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life. Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation; for through him we have access in one Spirit to the Father.

From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view. If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old has passed away, behold the new has come. All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation.

So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us, We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God."³⁶

36. Ro. 5:10,11; Eph. 2:18; II Cor. 5:16-20.

B I B L I O G R A P H YWORKS REFERRED TO IN TEXT

- AULEN, Gustaf, Christus Victor, SPCK, 1965.
- BARRET, C.K., The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, SPCK, 1954.
- BULTMANN, R., The Theology of the New Testament.
- CLARK, Neville, Interpreting the Resurrection, SCM, 1967.
- CULLMANN, The Christology of the New Testament, SCM, 1967.
- DAVIES, J.G., He Ascended into Heaven, Association Press, 1958.
- DAVIES, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, SPCK Paperback, 1965.
- DODD, C.H., Epistle to the Romans, Fontana, 1968.
The Meaning of St. Paul for Today, Fontana, 1960.
The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, Hodder & Stoughton, 1960.
- FULLER, R.H., The Foundations of New Testament Christology, Fontana, 1969.
- GUTHRIE, Donald, New Testament Introduction, Tyndale, 1965.
- HENDRY, G.S., The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, SCM, 1965.
- HOOKE, M.D., The Son of Man in Mark, SPCK, 1967.
- KUNNETH, Walter, The Theology of the Resurrection, SCM, 1965.
- LAMPE, C.W.H., The Seal of the Spirit, SPCK paperback, 1967.
- McKELVEY, R.J., The New Temple, OUP, 1969.
- MILLER, A.O., Ed., Reconciliation in Today's World; Eerdmans, Michigan, 1969.
- NEUBIGIN, Leslie, The Relevance of Trinitarian Doctrine for Today's Mission, Edinburgh House, 1963.
- RICHARDSON, A., An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, SCM, 1961.
- MOULE, C.F.D., The Phenomenon of the New Testament, SCM, 1967.
- RYDER-SMITH, C., The Bible Doctrine of Salvation, Epworth, 1955.
- STEWART, J.S., A Man in Christ, Hodder & Stoughton, 1954.
- TAYLOR, V., The Names of Jesus, Macmillan, 1953.
- WAINWRIGHT, A.W., The Trinity in the New Testament, SPCK, 1962.

GENERAL REFERENCES

The Oxford Annotated Bible RSV is used throughout except in quoted passages.

Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, Abingdon, 1962.

Jerusalem Bible, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966.

Moffat New Testament Commentary, Hodder & Stoughton.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Thomas Nelson & Son, 1963.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (Kittel's),
Eerdmans.

WORKS NOT REFERRED TO IN TEXT

ANDERSON, G.H., Ed., The Theology of Christian Mission,
London, 1961.

BAILLIE, D.M., God was in Christ, Faber & Faber, 1963.

BARCLAY, W., The Mind of St. Paul, Collins, 1958.
The Daily Study Bible, St. Andrews,
Relevant Volumes.

BARRY, F.R., The Atonement, Hodder & Stoughton, 1963.

BARTH, Karl, The Epistle to the Romans, Oxford Paperbacks,
1968.

BARTH, Markus, The Broken Wall, Collins, 1960.

CAIRD, G.B., Principalities and Powers, Clarendon, 1956.

CONZELMANN, H., An Outline of the Theology of the New
Testament, SCM, 1969.

DODD, C.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel,
OUP, 1965.

DILLISTONE, F.W., The Christian Understanding of Atonement,
James Nisbet & Co., 1968.

MASCALL, E.L., Christ the Christian and the Church,
Longmans, 1946/1963.

MACQUARRIE, John, The Scope of Demythologizing, SCII, 1960.

PANNENBERG, W., Jesus God and Man, SCM, 1968.

TAYLOR, V., Forgiveness and Reconciliation, Macmillan, 1952.
Jesus and His Sacrifice, Macmillan, 1959.

YATES, J.E., The Spirit and the Kingdom, SPCK, 1963.

WOTHERSPOON, H.J., What Happened at Pentecost, T. & T. Clark,
1937.

