

NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY
FROM THE LIBRARY

T. 1723

Acc. No. 71/462

IN COMMUNITY IN CHRIST

- A Study of the Theological Setting of the Sacraments
in the New Testament -

Basil S. Moore, B.Sc., B.D

(A Ph.D dissertation submitted to Rhodes University Grahamstown, 1969)

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T SINTRODUCTION

a) A Pointer from Sociology.....	1
b) Selection of material.....	4
c) Summary of conclusions.....	6

P A R T I - THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRISTCHAPTER 1 The 'ebhed Yahweh

A. <u>Old Testament Background</u>	11
a) i) The unity of Isa. 40-55.....	11
ii) The date of the prophesy.....	12
iii) The 'ebhed Yahweh; his mission, equipment and method of accomplishment.....	12
b) The 'ebhed in later Judaism.....	35
B. <u>The New Testament</u>	38
a) The baptism of Jesus.....	38
b) The transfiguration, ascension, and Pentecost.....	39
c) Other usages of the 'ebhed Yahweh in Acts.....	49
d) The passion of the 'ebhed.....	51
i) Lk. 22.37.....	51
ii) The Eucharistic words.....	53
iii) Mk. 10.45.....	56
e) The 'ebhed in John's Gospel.....	58
f) The 'ebhed in Paul.....	61
i) 1 Cor. 15.3-5.....	62
ii) Rom. 4.25.....	62
iii) Rom. 8.32-34.....	64
iv) Rom. 5.16,19.....	65
v) Gal. 1.4; 2.20; Eph. 5.2,25; 1 Tim. 2.6; Tit. 2.14.....	65
vi) Phil. 2.6-11.....	65
vii) 2 Cor. 5.21.....	66
g) Conclusion.....	66

CHAPTER 11 The Messiah

A. <u>Old Testament Background</u>	68
a) The pre-exilic period.....	69
b) The post-exilic period.....	73
c) The inter-testamental period.....	78
i) The Messiah an historical person.....	81
ii) The Messiah immortal.....	81
iii) The Messiah mortal.....	81
iv) The dying Messiah and the suffering Messiah; different traditions.....	82
v) The equipment of the Messiah with the Spirit.....	82
vi) The people's participation in the Messiah's endowment with the Spirit.....	83
vii) The restoration of Israel.....	83
viii) Messianic forerunners.....	84
ix) The hidden Messiah.....	84
x) Summary.....	85
B. <u>The New Testament</u>	86
a) The narratives of the baptism of Jesus by John.....	86
i) The mission and message of John.....	87
ii) The authenticity of John's saying that the mightier one would baptize with the Spirit.....	90

iii)	The messianic significance of his baptism to be attributed to Jesus	92
iv)	Summary of conclusions.....	98
b)	The temptation narratives and the associated incidents in the Gospels.....	100
i)	The baptism and the temptations.....	100
ii)	The authenticity of the Q account.....	100
1.	The originality of the 'fast' associated with the baptism.....	101
2.	The authenticity of the three temptations in Q.....	104
iii)	The bread temptation and the feeding miracles.....	106
-	Summary of conclusions and interpretation of the temptation.....	115
iv)	The temple temptation and the cleansing of the temple...117	
-	Summary of conclusions and interpretation of the temptation.....	126
v)	The temptation of world dominion and Caesarea Philippi...128	
-	The authenticity of Mt. 16.17-19.....	133
-	The context of Mt. 16.17-19.....	137
-	The interpretation of Mt. 16.17-19.....	147
1.	The 'rock' saying.....	147
2.	'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it'.....	148
3.	The keys of the kingdom.....	148
4.	Binding and loosing.....	149
-	Summary of conclusions and interpretation of the temptation.....	151
vi)	The Markan temptation narrative.....	152
-	The baptismal renunciation of Satan.....	154
1.	1 Pet. 5.8.....	156
2.	Eph. 4.27 and 6.11.....	159
3.	James 4.7.....	161
4.	Acts 26.18.....	163
-	The interpretation of the baptismal renunciation....	163
-	Summary of conclusions and interpretation of the Markan temptation narrative.....	164
c)	Conclusion.....	169

CHAPTER 111 The Son of Man

A.	<u>Old Testament Background</u>	172
a)	Introduction.....	172
i)	What material is to count as background material of the concept in the New Testament?.....	172
ii)	The tenability of T.W.Manson's collective interpretation of the Son of man concept.....	173
iii)	The Son of man as a self-designation by Jesus.....	175
b)	The 'One Like a Son of Man' in <u>Daniel 7</u>	178
i)	Who or what is the figure 'like a Son of man' in Dan.7.13?178	
ii)	Old Testament mythological background	181
iii)	The suffering Son of man coming with the clouds to receive dominion	183
Conclusion	186
c)	The Son of man in the Similitudes of <u>Enoch</u>	187
i)	The eschatological role of the Son of man.....	187
ii)	The fusion of different traditions	189
1.	Messianism.....	189
2.	Urmensch mythology	191
3.	Daniel 7	192
4.	Conclusion	193
iii)	The epiphany of the Son of Man	194
iv)	Community and the Son of man.....	196
v)	A suffering Son of Man?	198
vi)	The equipment of the Son of man	199
Conclusion	200
d)	The Son of man in <u>2 Esdras</u> (1V Ezra)	200
i)	The doctrine of the two ages	201
ii)	Nationalism and individualism	201

iii) The eschatological deliverer.....	203
1. The Messiah.....	203
2. The one having the 'form of man' in 2 Es. 13.1-13..	204
iv) Community and the Son of man.....	206
v) Son of man, individual or community in 2 Esdras?.....	207
vi) A suffering Son of man?.....	208
Conclusion.....	208
e) The Son of man in <u>2 Paruch</u>	209
i) The concept of eschatology.....	210
ii) The figure of the eschatological deliverer.....	211
f) Summary.....	214
B. <u>The New Testament</u>	
a) Method of study.....	218
b) The Son of man in <u>Mark</u>	218
i) Mk. 2.10.....	218
ii) Mk. 2.28.....	222
iii) Mk. 8.31.....	224
iv) Mk. 8.38.....	226
v) Mk. 9.9 and 9.12.....	229
vi) Mk. 9.31 and 10.33f.....	231
vii) Mk. 10.45.....	234
viii) Mk. 13.26f.....	240
ix) Mk. 14.21 and 14.41.....	246
x) Mk. 14.62.....	249
xi) Summary.....	255
c) The Son of man in <u>Q</u>	259
i) Lk. 6.22f and Mt. 5.11f.....	259
ii) Lk. 7.34 and Mt. 11.19.....	264
iii) Lk. 9.58 and Mt. 8.20.....	267
iv) Lk. 11.30 and Mt. 12.40.....	271
v) Lk. 12.8f and Mt. 10.32f.....	276
vi) Lk. 12.10 and Mt. 12.32.....	278
vii) Lk. 12.40 and Mt. 24.44.....	282
viii) Lk. 17.22,23f,28ff and Mt. 24.26f,37ff.....	286
ix) Summary.....	297
d) The Son of man in <u>Luke</u>	301
i) Lk. 5.24.....	301
ii) Lk. 6.5.....	301
iii) Lk. 6.22f.....	301
iv) Lk. 7.34.....	302
v) Lk. 9.22.....	302
vi) Lk. 9.26 and 12.8f.....	303
vii) Lk. 9.58.....	304
viii) Lk. 11.30.....	304
ix) Lk. 12.10.....	304
x) Lk. 12.40.....	305
xi) Lk. 17.22-30.....	305
xii) Lk. 18.8b.....	306
xiii) Lk. 9.44 and 18.31ff.....	309
xiv) Lk. 19.10.....	313
xv) Lk. 21.27.....	315
xvi) Lk. 21.36.....	318
xvii) Lk. 22.22.....	322
xviii) Lk. 22.28-30 (cf Mt. 19.28).....	323
xix) Lk. 22.48.....	326
xx) Lk. 22.69.....	327
xxi) Lk. 24.6f.....	328
xxii) Summary.....	330
e) The Son of man in <u>Matthew</u>	333
i) Sayings in which Mt. has made no changes, or minor changes to the text or context of Mk. and Q, preserving the original sense of his source: Mt. 8.20; 9.6; 11.19; 17.9; 12.22; 20.18f,28; 26.24,45,64.....	333
ii) Sayings in which Mt's alterations to the text or context of his source have altered the original meaning: Mt. 12.8,31f,40.....	335
iii) Sayings in which Mt. has removed the title 'Son of man' and replaced it by 'I' or 'he': Mt. 5.11; 10.32f; 16.21.....	337

iv) Sayings in which Mt's emendations of his sources give them a clear eschatological and/or parousia interpretation: Mt. 12.31f; 16.27; 24.27,37,39; 24.30f; 24.44.....	338
v) Sayings which are peculiar to Matthew	
1. Mt. 16.13.....	340
2. Mt. 19.28.....	340
3. Mt. 13.37-43.....	341
4. Mt. 25.31.....	342
5. Mt. 26.2.....	344
6. Mt. 10.23.....	344
vi) Summary.....	347
f) The Son of man in <u>John</u>	349
i) Jn. 1.51.....	350
ii) Jn. 3.13.....	352
iii) Jn. 3.14f.....	356
iv) Jn. 5.27.....	359
v) Jn. 6.27,53,62.....	360
vi) Jn. 8.28; 12.34.....	365
vii) Jn. 12.23.....	367
viii) Jn. 13.31f.....	369
ix) Jn. 9.35.....	371
x) Summary.....	372
g) The Son of man in the <u>rest of the New Testament</u>	374
i) Acts 7.56.....	374
ii) Heb. 2.6.....	375
iii) Rev. 1.13; 14.14.....	376
iv) The Son of man in <u>Paul</u>	377
1. 1 Cor. 15.45-49.....	377
2. Rom. 5.12ff.....	380
3. Phil. 2.5-11.....	381
h) Conclusions.....	382

P A R T 11 - THE CHURCH

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	385
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 1 The Church as a corporate body 'in Christ' - Semitic background

a) Life as 'felt'.....	386
b) Reality as dynamic.....	387
c) Unitive conceptualisation.....	388
d) The Hebrew concept of time.....	389
e) The ancestors and corporate personality.....	391
f) Yahweh the source of all life, unity, and blessing.....	395
g) An attempted interpretation.....	397

CHAPTER 11 The Pauline conception of the Church as a corporate body 'in Christ'

a) Paul's soteriology.....	402
i) Man's bondage.....	403
1. Man's solidarity 'in Adam' and thus his bondage to sin and death.....	403
2. Man's bondage to the Law.....	406
3. Man's solidarity in bondage under the rudiments (στοιχεῖα) of the world.....	409
ii) Christ's complete self-identification with man in his bondage.....	414
1. In relation to sin.....	415
2. In relation to death.....	416
3. In relation to the 'powers'.....	417
4. In relation to the Law.....	417

iii) Christ's triumph over his bondage.....	418
1. In relation to sin.....	418
2. In relation to death.....	419
3. In relation to the 'powers'.....	420
4. In relation to the Law.....	421
iv) How Christ's triumph is for many.....	422
1. In relation to sin.....	432
2. In relation to death.....	434
3. In relation to the 'powers'.....	435
4. In relation to the Law.....	437
b) Paul's ecclesiology.....	438
c) God, Christ, and the Church.....	445
d) Paul's ethics.....	450
e) Conclusion.....	457

CHAPTER 111 The Johannine conception of the Church as a corporate body 'in Christ'

a) Salvation.....	460
i) Creation of community.....	460
ii) Being in Christ.....	464
iii) Deliverance from this world.....	468
iv) From death to life.....	472
b) God, Christ, and the Christian.....	476
c) Johannine ecclesiology.....	482
d) John's ethics.....	487
e) Conclusion.....	489

P A R T 111 - THE SACRAMENTS

CHAPTER 1 Baptism

a) Introduction (Summary of study).....	492
i) The Baptism of Christ.....	492
ii) Baptism and Christology.....	494
iii) Baptism and Soteriology.....	495
iv) Baptism and Ecclesiology.....	497
v) Baptism and the Spirit.....	498
b) The ordering of baptism.....	501
i) Infant baptism.....	501
1. The baptism of children of parents joining the Church in the earliest period.....	501
a. The $\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ formula and Jewish proselyte baptism.....	501
b. The promise 'to you and your children' in Acts 2.39.....	512
c. Baptism and circumcision.....	515
2. The baptism of children born to Christian parents in the earliest period.....	516
a. 1 Cor. 7.14.....	516
b. Acts 21.21.....	518
c. Mk. 10.13-16 (cf Mt. 19.13-15; Lk. 18.15-17).....	518
3. Summary.....	522
ii) Baptism and faith.....	523
1. Faith after baptism.....	524
2. Faith before baptism.....	524
3. Faith during baptism.....	526
iii) Baptism and New Testament 'body' ethics.....	527
iv) Baptism and unity.....	532
v) The practice of Infant Baptism today.....	535
1. Is it justifiable for the divided Church to baptize at all?.....	535
2. Is it justifiable for the Church to baptize the infants of Christian parents?.....	537

CHAPTER 11 The Eucharist

a) Introduction (Summary of study).....	541
i) The Eucharist is a fellowship meal with the risen and ascended Christ.....	541
ii) Christ himself is the eucharistic food and drink.....	542
iii) The Eucharist and becoming parts of Christ.....	543
iv) The Eucharist as community-creating and community experience.....	543
b) The eucharistic words of Jesus.....	547
i) The occasion of the Last Supper.....	547
1. The problem.....	547
2. The Last Supper a <u>Kiddush</u> meal?.....	548
3. The Last Supper a <u>Ḥaburah</u> meal?.....	550
4. The Last Supper an Essene meal?.....	550
5. The Last Supper a Passover meal?.....	553
a) Major objections to the Last Supper as a Passover meal.....	553
b) Major arguments in favour of the Last Supper as a Passover meal.....	563
ii) The words of interpretation.....	567
1. Their context in the Passover meal.....	567
2. The eucharistic words : Their form.....	568
a) The various accounts as independent traditions.....	568
b) The influence of liturgical practice on the accounts.....	571
i) The proclamation of the Lord's death.....	571
ii) The separation of the eucharist from the meal.....	572
c) The most probable form and order of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper.....	575
i) Jesus' avowal of abstinence.....	575
ii) The words of interpretation over the bread.....	579
iii) The words of interpretation over the wine.....	581
d) A re-construction of the events and words at the Last Supper.....	586
3. The meaning of the events and words in the setting of the passover meal and eucharist.....	587
a) The avowal of abstinence.....	587
b) The meal.....	589
c) The words of interpretation.....	591
d) The ἀνάμνησις.....	601
e) The <u>Hallel</u>	604
c) Some practical considerations.....	610
i) The Eucharist and unity.....	610
ii) The Eucharist and community.....	611
iii) The participation of children in the eucharist.....	613
ABBREVIATIONS.....	616
TRANSLITERATIONS.....	616
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	617

INTRODUCTION

Neville Clark has rightly warned against the attempt to approach the theology of the sacraments from a broad and general definition of a 'sacrament' from which we 'read off' a Christian doctrine of the sacraments^{1.} without paying due regard to the biblical statements. Such an approach could not but obscure the essential differences between the sacraments, and the fact^{2.} that they stem from historical roots. On the other hand, the specialist treatment of the sacraments which begins by making a detailed analysis of the biblical material fails to do justice to the wholeness of biblical theology and tends to treat the sacraments in isolation not only from each other but also from other aspects of Christian theology with which they are inalienably connected. Bearing in mind the difficulties inherent in both of these approaches, a fresh and more systematic approach is required.

(a) A Pointer from Sociology

At the outset it is important that we should bear in mind the minimum requirements for the performance of any cultic rite. This is important because it has too often been neglected by theologians. Quite simply, and quite obviously, the minimum requirements for the performance^{3.} of a cultic rite is a self-conscious group worshipping God or gods (or ancestors) connected in some way with the life of the group.

Wach has drawn a useful distinction between the religion of natural groups, i.e. groups composed of members related to one another by blood (actual or supposed) or by marriage^{4.}, and specifically religious groups which often cut across the natural groups. It is clear that these natural groups are self-conscious entities; family and kinship (tribal or national) units. Furthermore in most 'primitive' societies these natural groups have deities intimately connected with the life of the group, and this connexion is given expression in the regular or specific ritual acts ~~such as cultic ritual acts~~ such as cultic meals, sacrifice, and prayers by the group; and

-
1. N. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments, 1956, p. 71.
 2. J. Barr, 'Further Thoughts about Baptism', S.J.T., Vol. 4, 1951, p. 278.
 3. This is not intended to mean that every member of the group should be able to give a sophisticated statement of its self-awareness or be able to state the theological relationship between the group and the God of the group. Such a theological interpretation, however, must always be possible whether the relationship is stated by a leading member of the group or by someone interpreting the symbolism of the group.
 4. J. Wach, Sociology of Religion, 1947, Chs. 4 and 5.

from these acts all but those who are members of the group are excluded. No less clear is it that the members of the great world-religions are conscious of themselves as a distinct group within society or 'the world'. Sociologically the grouping may not be natural, i.e. not definable in terms of natural social organisation, but rather based on allegiance to the founder of the religion. But whether the group be 'natural' or 'specific' it remains the basic minimum for the performance of any cultic rite that the group be conscious of itself both in relation to the deity, ancestor, or founder and in distinction from other groups. As Hammond-Tooke has pointed out, whatever else may be contained in religion it is not simply a psychological phenomenon^{1.} but is intrinsically social.

Many have been the attempts to define the basis of religious behaviour.^{2.} Durkheim, whose monumental work in this field remains a classic, has submitted the animistic theories of Tyler and Spencer and the naturistic theories of Max Muller to severe criticism. His own theory of the identity of god and society has been no less severely criticised. Perhaps the most trenchant criticism has been that of Beattie. His criticism is based on Durkheim's too simplistic notion of society. Society is not a 'thing' but a system of ordered relationships. It is one thing to say that 'what a man is worshipping is an actual group of people' but quite another that 'what he is revering is a complex system of moral imperatives, of rights and observances, the observance of which is a condition of ordered social life'.^{3.}

Despite these valid criticisms the attention Durkheim has drawn to the close parallels between social and religious systems, and the intimate relation between the group and its God or gods, remain objectively observable phenomena in both the natural and founded religions. How is this to be explained? The simplest explanation seems to be that the group practising religious rites does not regard itself merely as a group of individuals coming together for a common purpose, even if that purpose be worship born out of a sense of their utter dependence on something or someone beyond themselves for the achievement of health, social stability, or life both 'here' and 'hereafter'. Even the loftiest of such purposes are not enough to explain why such worship is almost universally a social phenomenon and not individualistic, or to provide a rationale for the structural parallels

1. W.D. Hammond-Tooke, 'In Search of the Sacred', 1965
 2. E. Durkheim, 'The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (E.T.), 1957.
 3. J. Beattie, 'Other Cultures', 1964, p. 221.

between social and religious groups so often observed in natural religious
1. groups. This structural parallel, while not indicative of the identity of the god and the society, points to the fact that a religious cultic group is an entity self-conscious not merely socially but also theologically. It offers a theoretical explanation of itself in terms of the god worshipped by the group. Thus when Durkheim, observing Australian totemism, noted that the sacred totemic emblem symbolized two things - on the one hand the totemic principle or god, and on the other a social group, the clan - he concluded that the god and the society were one and the same. While this conclusion may be unsound, it does point to the society's self-interpretation in terms of the god worshipped.

In totemism, the society is conscious of itself being in the closest possible relation to the totemic principle; in ancestor worship the group is the real or mythological descendant of the ancestor who must be appeased to ensure the well-being of the group; in national religions like Judaism, Yahweh is pre-eminently the god of Israel, and Israel the covenanted, chosen people of Yahweh; and in Christianity, Jesus the Christ is the head of the Church and the Church is the body of Christ. Religious ritual is carried out by such theologically self-conscious groups.

It is important to stress the elementary and yet fundamentally important fact of the religious group for cultic rituals. Without the theological self-awareness of the group in relation to the deity, cultic meals and initiation rites rapidly lose meaning and significance. This process can be seen within Christianity. When Christians interpret their religion individualistically and so conceive of their relationship with God (or Christ) as essentially, if not solely, that of a personal communion - rather than of themselves as members of a group in relationship with God - then frequently the first aspects of the religious life to suffer are the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. To the vast majority of Christians in the 'individual religion' tradition these rites are strangely empty of meaning or frankly superstitious intrusions. It is probably true that they have held their own in the Christian life because of their undeniable scriptural warrant rather than because of their inner significance. The strange

1. J. Wach, Sociology of Religion, 1947, Ch. 4.

combination of an essentially individualistic theology, which places all the emphasis on personal 'conversion', and an essentially corporate cultic practice, which demands a group life, has led to an attempt to spiritualise and personalise (in an individualistic sense) the sacraments in a way that cannot do justice to the New Testament teaching.

The enigma of cultic rites for an individualistic religion and the fact of the close relationship which believers hold exists between a cultic group and its deity should warn us against trying to understand the Christian sacraments in isolation from the theological relations that are believed to exist between Christ and his Church. The sacraments are essentially the activities of a group who understand their existence as a group in terms of Christ. Stated in theological terms, the Christian sacraments can only be understood in relation to christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology.

Our approach in this study will therefore be to study the New Testament doctrine of the sacraments from the basis of New Testament ecclesiology, and New Testament ecclesiology from the basis of the doctrines of the person and work of Christ. This we shall see is the indispensable setting for the interpretation and practice of the Christian sacraments.

(b) Selection of Material

Having chosen this method of approach we are immediately confronted with the problem of how to reduce the New Testament material to manageable proportions. Here the choice is between making a superficial survey of the whole of New Testament theology and selecting certain key concepts for more detailed examination. Both methods of study have much to commend them. The first allows a more complete picture to emerge and the second permits more detailed argument to support conclusions. The strength of the one is the weakness of the other. As we are concerned to show that the New Testament doctrine and practice of the sacraments springs from a highly developed corporate ecclesiology which in turn rests upon a community-creating concept of the atonement arising out of the New Testament christological titles, it is necessary for us to establish these conclusions by more detailed examination of the material. It is necessary because these conclusions are not generally recognised.

Such a procedure makes it necessary to limit the material studied

by making a selection of that material. In our study of the person and work of Christ (Part I) we shall limit our investigation to the conceptual 'titles' of the Suffering Servant, the Messiah, and the Son of man. These titles have been chosen because of their cruciality for the primitive community (if not for Jesus himself) in interpreting the person and work of Jesus. In addition they have been chosen because of their apparent incompatibility in pre-Christian and contemporary Judaism. As we shall see, the Suffering Servant presents us with a figure who brings redemption through suffering, the Messiah is the conquering hero who brings victory to Israel over her national enemies and unheard of prosperity and peace, and the Son of man belongs to a more dualistic view of the world and transcendental concept of salvation. Despite the incompatible concepts of the nature of these redemptive and eschatological figures and the way in which they achieve salvation they have been chosen for our study because, as we shall see, in each instance the redemption they bring is a redemption for the community, Israel. Our task will be to see how these various titles are applied to Jesus, and that the essentially community or corporate character of salvation is taken over into New Testament teaching.

In our study of the New Testament doctrine of the Church we shall limit our investigation to the teaching of Paul and John (Part II), though in the course of dealing with the person and work of Christ we shall show that the understanding of the nature of the Church is fundamentally the same as that in Paul and John. Thus, though our more detailed examination of the New Testament teaching concerning the Church will be more limited, proof that this teaching is not limited to Paul and John will be gained from the more complete coverage of New Testament writers in Part I.

Just how impossible it is to treat the biblical teaching concerning the sacraments in isolation from christology, soteriology and ecclesiology will be seen from the fact that in dealing both with the person and work of Christ (Part I) and the doctrine of the Church (Part II), we have been unable to avoid anticipating a great deal of baptismal and eucharistic theology which should more properly belong to Part III. Our procedure will be to deal with the sacramental teaching as and when it demands our attention and in Part III to summarise our conclusions and deal further with particular aspects not covered in the other parts of the work.

Further limitations have also been necessary. Every aspect which we

shall examine has roots extending back into pre-Christian Judaistic and Old Testament teaching with undoubted Hellenistic influence. This means that attention must be given to this background. While there is a great deal of difference of opinion regarding the extent of Hellenistic influence on New Testament theology the aspects we have chosen to study arise primarily out of Judaism and thus we shall confine our examination of the background material to Jewish teaching and raise the question of Hellenistic precursors only where necessary. Even this limitation requires a further limitation. There is by no means a unanimity of opinion on the interpretation of Old Testament and contemporary Judaistic teaching on any aspect of our study. A full and detailed examination would therefore require taking into consideration these conflicting opinions. Such a procedure is impossible within the scope of this study. Yet as many of these conclusions relating to the background study are vital if we are to interpret the New Testament rightly we shall have to give some consideration to the debate, but only where it is absolutely necessary. In the main we shall draw on the conclusions of authoritative Old Testament and Judaistic scholars. Equally in the new testament sections we have had to avoid the temptation to lose the argument in a mass of detailed exegesis and textual criticism. In the section on the Son of Man, however, where scholarly opinion is deeply divided, a more detailed examination of the New Testament text has been unavoidable.

(c) Summary of Conclusions

In order to facilitate keeping the main development of the argument in focus through the more detailed discussions, a summary of the major conclusions is given here.

The Old Testament and inter-Testamental soteriological concepts presented under the titles of the ʿebhed Yahweh, the Messiah, and the Son of man all express essentially a hope for the community of Israel, the covenant people of God. Whether this salvation is thought of in essentially 'this worldly' political, social, and religious terms or in more transcendental terms the hope is essentially for the restoration of Israel and her deliverance from suffering and bondage. It is a hope for the redemption of the community and not simply of individuals within the community. Even when the hope for the restoration of all Israel is abandoned it is replaced by the hope for the deliverance of the righteous remnant within Israel who would become the true Israel when God acted to redeem through the coming deliverer.

In the background material it is not always clear whether the deliverer is a single individual or a community (the true Israel who are the righteous remnant). The Messiah is unmistakably an individual, yet he is a representative individual who sums up in himself all that is best in Israel and as such is endowed by God with every blessing and power which Israel shares in her solidarity with him. He is in effect Israel in miniature enabling Israel to be God's true people, and thus prosperous and victorious. The ‘ebhed Yahweh appears at times to be an individual, and yet he is also called 'Israel' (Isa.49.3) whose task is to restore Israel (Isa.49.5). We shall see that there is good reason to suppose that he is the righteous remnant, the 'true Israel', who is identified with the Jewish community in exile as opposed to those who remained in Judah. Similarly, in Daniel 7, the Son of man is a corporate figure standing for the 'saints of the Most High' though in the later apocalyptic literature this corporate concept is not consistently maintained.

In the new Testament the corporate character of the deliverer is replaced by a concept of Jesus alone as the ‘ebhed Yahweh, the Messiah, and Son of man. He is alone the righteous remnant within Israel. He is thus himself the true Israel. Now we see two simultaneous developments of the concept of Christ alone as the true Israel. On the one hand the community character of the eschatological hope is retained; Jesus is the one whose life, death, resurrection, ascension and bestowal of the Spirit has created the new covenant community which is the true Israel. On the other hand Jesus is and remains the one who is himself the true Israel. Consequently the community which he created through the redemption he achieved is not thought of as something existing alongside Jesus, rather it is Jesus himself. Jesus and the Church form one single corporate entity so that to be 'in Christ' is to be in the community and conversely to be in the community is to be 'in Christ'. The Church is the 'true Israel' not because it consists of a number of individuals who give a common allegiance to Christ or who believe the same things. It is the 'true Israel' only as the corporate personality of Christ who alone is the true Israel. Consequently to receive or reject any member of the Church is to receive or reject Christ himself. He is the whole who is manifest in every part.

This concept of Christ as the true Israel and the Christian community as the corporate personality of Christ leads to two further consequences. On the one hand since Christ is the eschatological deliverer he stands over against

'the world' which is in need of his deliverance by incorporation into him. Thus a dualism between Christ and the world, even if not consistently presented in incarnational terms, is implicit in New Testament christology. But since the Church consists of those who are incorporated into him the christological dualism implies a parallel dualism between the Church and 'the world'. On the other hand since the Church is a corporate body which is 'in' Christ the most intimate bonds link not only Christ and the community but also the individual members of the community to one another. We shall see in our examination of both Pauline and Johannine ethics how this unity of the members of the Church with one another is conceived in the most intimate ethical human inter-relationships. Yet so dependent on a prior union with Christ are these inter-relationships that they can scarcely be called philosophical ethics. The love that the Christian manifests is believed to be causally dependent on that union with Christ in which he communicates his own nature to the believer.

It is to be noted at the same time that New Testament ethics reflect the dualism between the Church and the world. The ethics within the Christian body are the ethics of a complete inter-involvement in dependence, love, and sharing based on the presupposition that since every Christian is a part of Christ he is consequently a part of everyone else who is 'in Christ'. It is this ethics of intense inter-personal relationships and unity which is evangelical (cf Jn.17.21) and evangelism is to call men into this ethical community (cf 1 Jn.1.3). In this sense the ethics of the New Testament is evangelical. But the ethical relationships with the world are presented in less intense terms. It is true that the Christian's ethical relationships with non-Christians are not to fall below the general standards of ethical behaviour (Rom.12.18), but equally there is a strong tendency towards independence of and separation from the world (cf 1.Cor.6.14ff). In any event the ethical prescriptions for the relationships between the Church and the world lack the warmth and intensity of the relationships demanded between those who are 'in Christ'.

It is essential to bear in mind the ethical dimensions of the community-creating soteriology and also of the doctrine of the Church as the corporate personality of Christ, because New Testament ethics is not the application of universal ethical rules to people who also happen to be Christians, but it is logically dependent upon the nature of Christ. Thus Paul's ethical teaching is not to be separated from his doctrinal teaching. In his ethics he is

stating what it means to be 'in Christ' as a member of his body which has been made possible by who Christ was and what he did.

Against this background when we are told that in baptism we are united with Christ to share in the salvation which he has won it is clear that baptism is also our inclusion into the Christian community. Alternatively we could say that our baptismal inclusion into the Christian community is our inclusion into the community's union with Christ. It would be as true to say that in baptism a man 'puts on Christ' (Gal.3.27) as to say that he is added to the Church (Acts.2.41). If we do not wish to ignore New Testament ethical teaching, to be included into Christ by being included into the body of Christ means to be included into an intensely caring and sharing fellowship. This means that baptism is both a community-creating experience, in that the new member is added to the community, and a community experience, in that the new member is received into the community of those who love one another. While we can give formal liturgical expression to the concepts of being added to the body of Christ to share in its unity with Christ, for baptism to be experienced as an event in community it needs to grow out of the life of the Church in community.

The doctrine of the eucharist is essentially a renewing ever and again of the corporate union of the community with Christ and thus with one another. In other words it is a renewal of baptism. As such the pre-supposition of eucharistic practice is a life in community in union with Christ in order that this ethical and religious community might be renewed. As Paul states quite clearly the disunity and unloving behaviour of the Corinthians makes it impossible for them to celebrate the Lord's Supper (1.Cor.11.20).

Consequently both baptismal and eucharistic doctrine and practice have their roots firmly embedded in the community-creating soteriology and corporate ecclesiology of the New Testament. As dependent on the finished work of Christ in creating the New Israel which is his corporate personality they are fundamentally an experience of ethical community. As including us into that finished work, or renewing it, they are community-creating occasions. When either the community or essential ethical aspects of the community are lost sight of in interpreting New Testament sacramental theology and practice, justice cannot be done to the whole New Testament teaching and the sacraments stand in permanent danger of degenerating into little more than superstitious or magical

rites for a large number of Christians.

In urging a reconsideration of the New Testament doctrine and practice of the sacraments, particularly in the light of the ethical-community ecclesiology, we are concerned not simply that the Church be true to New Testament teaching, but also believe that its teaching has never been more relevant than it is now. It does not necessarily follow that because something was believed and practised in a particular form in the New Testament that the belief and practice must be maintained unaltered in all succeeding generations. But to abandon New Testament teaching demands the most convincing reasons: I can think of no sound argument for abandoning the central community teaching of the New Testament. Certainly individualism is no viable alternative in a world which cries out to be shown the social relevance of the Christian gospel; and which totters on the brink of personal and inter-national disaster through the individual, racial, and national animosities which tear us apart. In such a world there is no religious teaching more relevant than that contained in the New Testament, and which is the heart of sacramental practice.

P A R T I.THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST
(Christology and Soteriology)CHAPTER IThe ebhed YahwehA. OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND (Deutero-Isaiah = Isa. 40-55)

1.
As Zimmerli has shown, the word ebhed is used in the Old Testament
2.
with a variety of meanings. Its primary secular usage denotes a state of servility though it is also used as an expression of humility. In its religious usage it denotes primarily the attitude of humility in the presence of God. Because of the nature of the covenant relationship between God and his people, which is the relationship of the strong with the weak, it comes to be used in the singular to refer to Israel. At the same time, since the covenant is mediated through divinely chosen, outstanding individuals it comes also to be used of such specially distinguished figures as a title of honour.
3.
4.

Our concern, however, is with the meaning and significance of the title as used by Deutero-Isaiah because it is undoubtedly this conception of the ebhed Yahweh which is used in interpreting the person and work of Christ in the New Testament.

(a)(i) The Unity of Isa. 40-55

Deutero-Isaiah 'seems to be guilty of every conceivable breach of good writing; he repeats himself, contradicts himself, indulges in ambiguities and abrupt breaks of context'. This fact has been variously interpreted.
5.
Simon, for example, regards this as part of the unique style of the prophet who has used almost every means to communicate his message. Others have argued that this points to many hands at work in the composition of the section.
6.
A decision on this problem is clearly necessary for those who wish to discover the original message and its meaning. Our concern, however, is to discover what meaning the title ebhed Yahweh would have had for Jesus and the early Church. There can be no doubt whatever that Jesus and his contemporaries did

-
1. Transliterations throughout follow A.B. Davidson, An Introductory Hebrew Grammar, 1923, p.4.
 2. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, pp. 11-29.
 3. *ibid* p.19.
 4. *ibid* pp. 20ff.
 5. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, p.19.
 6. Cf. C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, 1964, pp. 4ff for a useful summary of the varying evaluations of the unity of Isa. 40-55.

regard not only Isa. 40-55 as a unity, but the whole of the present book comprising chapters 1-66. Thus the so-called 'Servant Songs' cannot be treated in isolation from their context, nor from the other references to the ʿebhed in Isa. 40-55.

(ii) The Date of the Prophecy

The traditional date of the work is c 540 B.C., i.e. during the exile in Babylon. This dating accepts that Cyrus refers to the Persian king who was responsible for the fall of Babylon and is still widely supported. The traditional view has been seriously questioned by Torrey who, deleting the references to Cyrus and Babylon, dates the prophecy c 400 B.C. as belonging to the period of the diaspora. This view has been enthusiastically supported by Simon who, noting that there is no textual support for the excisions of Cyrus and Babylon from the text, interprets these typologically.

With these two rival views we consequently have to interpret the historical situation of a prominent section of Israel either in captivity in Babylon or widely dispersed through the ancient world, and that the return to Jerusalem envisaged by the prophet is either that of the exiles or the diaspora. In any event both theories present us with a divided Israel which the prophet envisages being re-united through the work of the ʿebhed Yahweh.

(iii) The ʿebhed Yahweh; His Mission, Equipment and method of Accomplishment

The setting of the prophet's message is given in his opening assurance of comfort to God's people (40.1) because, though they have sinned will yet receive a double measure of God's mercy (40.2). For this coming manifestation of God's mercy Israel is to prepare (40.3-5) and the prophet commands;

O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountain; O thou that tellest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold, your God! Behold the Lord Yahweh will come as a mighty one, and his arm shall rule for him; behold his reward is with him, and his recompence before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that give suck. (40.9-11)

From the highest mountain God's return to Jerusalem is to be announced with ringing joy. This is the basis of Jerusalem's comfort. But when he

-
1. C.C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah, pp. 15ff; His argument is reiterated in Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 44, pp 121ff.
 2. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, pp. 16ff (cf also G. Dahl, 'Some recent interpretations of Second Isaiah' in JBL, Vol. 48, 1929, p.376, who hails this work of Torrey as comparable in importance to Wellhausen).
 3. ibid. especially 125ff.

returns he comes not in one glorious theophany, but bringing his people back to their own land.

This is the heart of the prophetic message, and everything else that follows - whether it be the declaration of God's control of history (41.1-29), the futility of idols (40.12-26), the great revenge on Babylon (47.1-15), or the necessity of the purge of Israel (48.1-22) - is an expansion on this basic theme; God's deliverance of his people by leading them back in overwhelming joy to Jerusalem. To this same theme of God's return to Jerusalem with his people is related all that we are told of the sebhed Yahweh.

The first reference to the sebhed we find in 41.8ff

8. But thou, Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend;
9. Thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth and called from the corners thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away;
10. Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea I will help thee; yea I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.
11. Behold, all they that are incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded: They that strive with thee shall be as nothing, and shall perish
14. Fear not thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith Yahweh, and thy redeemer is the Holy One of Israel.
15. Behold I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument having teeth; thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and thou shalt make the hills as chaff.....

Here Israel, dispersed and scattered, fearing that she has been forgotten by God because of all her afflictions which have made her a 'worm', is addressed as Yahweh's sebhed who has been called and chosen by God and, for this reason, will never be forgotten by God. Though at present she is suffering, God's purpose with her is not at an end. He is still with her, and will help her. She will become an instrument of war in the hands of Yahweh, and all of those who oppress her will be 'ashamed and confounded they shall be as nothing, and shall perish'. Yahweh as the Lord of history will achieve his purposes through his sebhed, Israel.

1.

On the question of the identification of the sebhed we need to note that he is here identified with Israel, and yet he appears to be that part of

1. For excellent summaries of the major views taken on the identification of the sebhed Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah, cf H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord, 1952, pp. 1-58; C.R.North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, 1948 Part 1

Israel which is scattered (or in exile). This makes it impossible to identify the anonymous 'righteous one' who has been called from the East with Cyrus as the sebhed Yahweh (41.1, 2 cf 44.28; 45.1 where Cyrus is actually named). Even if Deutero-Isaiah did think that Cyrus was to be the one through whom God would bring about the deliverance of his exiled (or dispersed) people, the suffering figure of Isa. 53 certainly cannot be identified with Cyrus. Equally certainly neither later Jewish nor Christian exegetes around the time of Jesus made this identification. What we are told is that God's suffering people, who believe themselves to be forsaken by God, are his chosen 'ebhed through whom he will work out his purposes in history.

The next reference to the sebhed Yahweh is given in the so-called first Servant song, Isa.42.1-9.

1. Behold my servant, whom I uphold:
My chosen in whom my soul delighteth:
I have put my spirit upon him;
he shall bring forth mishpat to the Gentiles.
2. He shall not cry, nor lift up
nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.
3. A bruised reed shall he not break,
and the smoking flax shall he not quench:
he shall bring forth mishpat in truth.
4. He shall not fail nor be discouraged
till he have set mishpat in the earth;
and the isles shall wait for his torah.
5. Thus saith the Lord Yahweh,
he that created the heavens, and stretched them forth;
he that spread abroad the earth and that which cometh out of it;
he that giveth breath unto the people upon it,
and spirit to them that walk therein:
6. I Yahweh have called thee in righteousness,
and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee,
and give thee for a covenant of the people,
for a light of the Gentiles;
7. To open the blind eyes,
to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon,
and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.
8. I am Yahweh; that is my name:
and my glory will I not give to another,
neither of my praise to graven images.
9. Behold, the former things are to come to pass,
and new things do I declare:
before they spring forth I tell you of them.

This passage clearly continues the preceding controversy and answers the champions of paganism and the void in the heart of Israel. It is significant that since there was no man to respond to the challenge of Yahweh in official Israel (cf Isa.41.28) the title 'Israel' is not repeated in the address. Yahweh presents his sebhed to Israel and unfolds his equipment, task, and manner of accomplishment.

In addition to what we already know of the sebhed's divine election we are told that he, like the Messiah (cf Isa.11.1ff) is to be equipped with

the spirit of Yahweh to accomplish his task.

Of the task of the rebhed we are told that it is to establish mishpat. Mowinckel has rightly said that the verb yoçi means not to proclaim or announce something, but to establish it or bring it about. Mishpat he exegetes as 'right religion' 'and so also the good fortunes and ideal conditions which will result when God's will is obeyed'. Johnson is probably more correct when he notes that the parallelism mishpat-torah (Isa.42.4) is ancient and takes us back to cultic origins. The mishpat governed civil and criminal cases, the torah guided ceremonial law. Moses, the law-giver in Israel, gave both to promote the welfare of the community. Subsequently the two concepts nearly fuse. Mishpat came to refer mainly to law suits and the torah to the divine will governing human law. The association of mishpat with the bruised reed and dimly burning wick glances back to the administration of justice in a lawful trial. The accused man is examined and, if found guilty, his wick is extinguished after the verdict, and the staff broken over the convicted criminal. Occasionally a complete amnesty can be proclaimed. What therefore the servant will accomplish by establishing the human law (mishpat) among all the nations is the merciful reprieve of God. The wick will burn again and the criminal not be beaten with the rod because, through the rebhed, men will stand not only in right relationship with one another (mishpat) but also be obedient to the divine will (torah).

Quell and Schrenk have shown the intimate link between the concept of righteousness and mishpat in the Old Testament. God is supremely the Righteous One who manifests his righteousness in establishing the rights of his people. But the rights of Israel are always intimately bound up with their obedience to Yahweh, which means living according to his will (mishpat and torah). Thus the establishment of Israel always carries within it the concept of establishing a people who are both ethically and religiously right. When we are told that the servant is called in righteousness to establish mishpat in all the earth because of his endowment with the spirit of Yahweh, the implication is that he is the righteous one (cf Isa.41.2) who will manifest the righteousness of God when Israel is re-established in Jerusalem as ethically and religiously righteous.

-
1. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p. 190.
 2. ibid.
 3. A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many, 1942, pp. 6, 9, 63.
 4. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, p.83.
 5. ibid. C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, 1964, ad. loc.
 6. ibid. and cf n.5 for supporting authorities cited.
 7. G. Quell and G. Schrenk, art. δικαιοσύνη κτλ, TWNT, Vol. IV.

Already within this passage we see the universalistic note which is to be sounded even more clearly in Isa. 45.20-25. The sebhed's task is by no means limited to bringing this right community and relationship with God to Israel alone. The mishpat which he brings is 'to the Gentiles' and the whole earth is waiting for it. The sebhed himself is to be a light to the Gentiles. This does not mean that Deutero-Isaiah has abandoned Jewish nationalism in favour of non-Jewish universalism. There can be no doubt at all of the universalism in Deutero-Isaiah, but this stems from a clear conviction that it is Israel that Yahweh has chosen (Isa. 41.8) and that in the coming salvation Jerusalem is to be restored to her rightful central position and ^{1.} glory. The faith that inspires this is that Yahweh is Israel's God and she is his covenant people. To turn to Yahweh and to be accepted by him means to be counted among his people, Israel. Consequently it is the Jewish mishpat and torah for which the world waits and which the sebhed Yahweh is to establish.

The link between this exclusivism and universalism is found in the unique concept of the servant himself as a covenant of the people. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is there such a personification of the covenant. The most natural interpretation of it is that for Deutero-Isaiah the covenant is that which has been established between Yahweh and Israel. Since in Isa. 41.8 the servant has already been identified with Israel, what we are told here is that the sebhed-Israel is to be the means by which all people will forge the covenant link with Yahweh. When the people surrender to Yahweh's covenant-making sebhed then they will be brought out of the pagan darkness and prisons of futility. The universalism of Deutero-Isaiah is an all-including nationalism which is religious and ethical to the core.

Equipped with the spirit of Yahweh and his righteousness, and made to be the one who is himself the new covenant the sebhed is to accomplish his mission not through the exercise of tyranny. He is certainly no Cyrus who comes with ^{2.} military prowess. He comes not to destroy but to relieve. How he is to achieve this we are not yet told, all we are told is that he makes no vulgar display of his power, humility, or righteousness.

Against this magnificent description of the equipment, mission, and method of its accomplishment, the next reference to the sebhed comes as a complete

1. Cf U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, pp. 138f.

2. cf above p.15.

surprise, and apparently contradicts all that we have learned of the sebhed

Yahweh. We read in Isa. 42.18-20;

18. Hear, ye deaf: and look ye blind, that ye may see.
19. Who is blind but my servant?
or deaf as my messenger that I send?
who is blind as he that is at peace (with me)
and blind as Yahweh's servant?
20. Thou seest many things, but thou observest not;
his ears are open, but he heareth not.

The key-word in this section is 'blind' and recalls the promises made to the blind in verses 7 and 16 who are promised deliverance by Yahweh's covenant sebhed. But the problem is that the sebhed himself is classed among the 'blind'. This contradiction has led not a few commentators to treat the introduction of the sebhed as a gloss. This may rescue the consistency of Deutero-Isaiah, but is it really credible that a redactor would have made such an astounding error? It is surely better to accept this as a genuine oracle and interpret it in the light of what follows;

21. It pleased Yahweh, for his righteousness' sake,
to magnify the torah, and make it honourable.
22. But this is all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison
houses:
they are for a prey, and none delivereth;
for a spoil, and none saith, restore.
23. Who is there among you that will give ear to this?
that will hearken and hear for the time to come?
24. Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?
did not Yahweh? he against whom we have sinned,
and in whose ways they would not walk,
neither were they obedient unto his torah.
25. Therefore he poured upon him the fury of his anger, and the strength
of battle;
and it set him on fire round about, and yet he knew not;
and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart.

Clearly Isa. 42.21-25 depicts the sad state of Israel, scattered and imprisoned, and, above all, dispirited. In their despair they can see no hope of deliverance or restoration. To them comes the prophetic word that their present condition is no sign of God's absence. On the contrary, their suffering is because they have despised Yahweh and his torah. Because of this Yahweh's anger has been poured out upon them, and they have been defeated. Yet, despite all that has happened to them they remain blind and deaf to the truth. They have read their defeat as the impotence of Yahweh and not as the enormity of their apostasy.

In the light of this Yahweh's reference to the blindness of his sebhed is to be interpreted as an anticipation of a cynical questioning about the great sebhed Yahweh, who, according to Isa. 41.8, is this same despairing, dispirited,

hopeless Israel. How is it possible that this powerless rabble is Yahweh's spirit-endowed ʿebhed who will bring light, liberty, and mishpat to all the world? Here is seen the poetic and dramatic genius of Deutero-Isaiah. Indeed, he declares, Israel is a dispirited rabble. Indeed she is powerless. Indeed she is suffering. But her suffering is Yahweh's punishment not his impotence in the face of stronger forces. Israel's conquerers have no room for pride. She is still God's elect ʿebhed, and when she has learned to see and hear the meaning of her ignominy, then will she become God's instrument of salvation, not only for herself, but for the world also.

This interpretation is confirmed in the glorious description of the coming new Exodus which follows on immediately in Isa. 43.1ff. It begins with the affirmation that it is Yahweh who created Israel and redeemed her when he delivered her in the first Exodus from Egypt (Isa. 43.1-4). Now God is to bring about a new and even greater Exodus as he gathers Israel's seed from all the quarters of the earth and brings them back to their own land (Isa.43.5-9). Israel, God's servant, is the witness of what God has done and will witness the new Exodus (Isa.43.10-13), and he is to accomplish it in order that 'the people which I formed for myself... might set forth my praise' (Isa.43.21). But just as the glorious description of the ʿebhed in Isa. 42.1ff is followed by a description of the pitiful blindness of Israel, so here God's ʿebhed, Israel, is now depicted as those who have turned away from Yahweh (Isa.43.22) and, despite all their cultic performances have 'wearyed' Yahweh with their iniquity (Isa.43.23-24). Again the passage concludes with the affirmation that Israel's suffering is the just punishment of Yahweh.

Just as this whole section opened with the description of the equipment and momentous task of the ʿebhed Yahweh, which led to all the doubting whether Israel, scattered, imprisoned, and dispirited could be this servant, so it ends by re-affirming (Isa.44.1-5):

1. Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant;
and Israel, whom I have chosen;
2. Thus saith Yahweh that made thee,
and formed thee from the womb, who will help thee:
Fear not, O Jacob my servant;
and thou Jeshurun, whom I have chosen.
3. For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty,
and streams upon the dry ground:
I will pour my spirit upon thy seed,
and my blessing upon thine offspring:
4. And they shall spring up among the grass,
as willows by the watercourses.

5. One shall say, I am Yahweh's;
and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob;
and another shall subscribe with his hand unto Yahweh,
and surname himself by the name of Israel.

Again we are left in no doubt at all that this scattered Israel is indeed Yahweh's rebbed. In the power of God's help she shall become great and then many will rally themselves to her wishing to be a part of Israel in offering allegiance to Yahweh. Then the spirit which Yahweh has poured upon his rebbed will be poured upon this new 'seed'. All those who unite themselves to God's covenant rebbed will share in his endowment with the spirit of God. The whole is a message of hope to God's chosen people temporarily under his rod because of their folly, iniquity, and disobedience, who are nevertheless his chosen rebbed through whom his universal salvation will be wrought.

This same affirmation that Israel in captivity (or dispersion) is God's rebbed who will not be forgotten is repeated in Isa.44.21f;

21. Remember these things, O Jacob;
and Israel, for thou art my servant:
I have formed thee;
thou art my servant:
O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me.
22. I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions,
and as a cloud thy sins:
return unto me;
for I have redeemed thee.

Here, in the call on the rebbed is made explicit what is implied throughout what has gone before. Israel is Yahweh's chosen and redeemed rebbed, but for the fulfilment of her mission in the world she must return to Yahweh from her rebellion. Then the ringing cry of God's victory will break forth (Isa.44.23).

What is implied in 'returning' to Yahweh is made more explicit in Isa. 44.26f which, at the same time, suggests that the rebbed is the righteous remnant within the captive or dispersed Israel;

Thus saith Yahweh....
that confirmeth the word of his servant,
and performeth the counsel of his messengers;
that said of Jerusalem, She shall be inhabited;
and of the cities of Judah, They shall be built,
and I will raise up the waste places thereof:
that saith to the deep, Be dry,
and I will dry up thy rivers.

What Yahweh will accomplish is that which his rebbed proclaims; the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem when, as at the first Exodus, he commands the rivers to be dry that Israel might come out of her captivity into the land given her by Yahweh. The rebbed is he who knows that Yahweh is indeed Lord of history and therefore proclaims the faith that the people of God will be restored to their

land in the power of Yahweh.

Whether we identify the Cyrus of Isa.44.28 with the Persian king of that name who in Isa.45.1 is called God's messiah, or treat him typologically as the messianic deliverer from Babylon, the type of historical wickedness, apostasy, and cruelty,¹ it is clear that no simple identification of this messianic figure and Yahweh's ebhed can be made. It cannot be made because we are told quite explicitly that Cyrus has been called for the sake of Yahweh's ebhed, Israel;

For Jacob my servant's sake,
and Israel my chosen,
I have called thee (Cyrus) by thy name:
I have surnamed thee,
though thou hast not known me. (Isa.45.4)

Yahweh's ebhed is and remains Israel. If we accept the traditional dating of the prophecy during the Babylonian exile and that Cyrus is the Persian king, then the passage is probably to be interpreted as showing that Deutero-Isaiah cherished the hope (falsely as it turned out) that Cyrus was to be used by God to deliver Israel back to her own land which miracle, as we shall see, will be the seed out of which the universal Israel will grow. If we accept the later dating of the work during the diaspora, and the typological exegesis of Cyrus and Babylon, then the passage is to be interpreted messianically indicating that Yahweh's ideal ebhed-messiah would emerge in the midst of his elect ebhed-people to effect his purposes for Israel and for the world through Israel.

This passage is followed by the announcement of God's retribution against Babylon (Isa.47), and then in Isa.48 the focus returns to Israel. Here a new theme is introduced which plays an increasingly more important rôle until it reaches its climax in Isa.53. Until now we have heard repeatedly of Israel's and the ebhed Yahweh's suffering. This suffering we have been told is not to be interpreted in terms of the impotence of Yahweh, but rather in terms of his power to punish Israel for the enormity of her apostasy and disobedience. This theme is continued in Isa.48.8f, but in verse 10 we learn that this suffering has a redemptive purpose;

Behold, I have refined thee, but not as silver;
I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction.

Israel, the ebhed has been chosen in the 'furnace of affliction' to be

1. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, pp 125ff. For a full discussion of the conflicting interpretations of this section of C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, 1964, ad. loc.

his mighty sebhed.

Now to this sebhed chosen in the furnace of affliction goes out the command of Yahweh to gather themselves together to remember what Yahweh did for his people in the first Exodus (Isa.48.12-19), and in the light of this

20. Go ye forth from Babylon,
flee ye from the Chaldeans;
with a voice of singing declare ye,
tell this even to the end of the earth:
say ye, Yahweh hath redeemed his servant Jacob.

As the following verse makes abundantly plain with its references to being led through the desert and the water flowing from the rock, this is a call to begin the new Exodus of God's people from their affliction and enslavement to their own land.

This leads immediately into the so-called second Servant Song (Isa.49.1ff)

1. Listen, O isles, unto me;
and hearken, ye peoples from far:
Yahweh hath called me from the womb;
from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name:
2. And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword,
in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me;
and he hath made me a polished shaft,
in his quiver hath he kept me close:
3. And he said unto me, Thou art my servant Israel, (1)
in whom I will be glorified.
4. But I said, I have laboured in vain,
I have spent my strength for nought and vanity:
yet surely my judgement is with Yahweh,
and my recompense with my God.
5. And now saith Yahweh
that formed me from the womb to be his servant,
to bring Jacob again to him,
and that Israel should be gathered unto him:
(for I am honourable in the eyes of Yahweh,
and my God is become my strength:)
6. Yea, he saith, It is too light a thing that thou shouldst be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
and to restore the preserved of Israel:
I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles,
that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.

To the concept of the sebhed certain notable features are added. He tells us of his being prepared from the womb to fulfil his mission, and being held in readiness by Yahweh, like a sword in the scabbard or an arrow in the quiver, until he received his explicit call to appear to Israel as the sebhed. Whether we identify the sebhed with the dispersed or exiled Israel, or a righteous remnant

1. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp 462-464 has given the reasons for the exclusion of the word 'Israel' from the text. His main reasons are stylistic. If we do not follow Mowinckel in treating the Servant Songs in isolation from the rest of Deutero-Isiah, a procedure which would have been unknown in the time of Christ, when we must note that in 8 of the previous 13 references the sebhed has been identified with Israel (i.e. Isa.41.8,9; 44.1,2,21 (twice); 45.4; 48.20). In any event the text is supported by the text of Isaiah discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls and thus would have undoubtedly been in the scriptures used by Jesus and the early Church and have been part of their understanding of the concept of the sebhed.

1.
within Israel, or a single individual who alone in the sight of God is Israel, it is clear that the 'ebhed already exists to lead his people back in the New Exodus. He simply awaits the explicit call of Yahweh.

Here the task of the 'ebhed is more explicitly defined. He is 'to bring Jacob again to him, and that Israel should be gathered unto him'. His task is the conversion and restoration of Israel. The words about the gathering in of the dispersed and the whole context of the new Exodus makes it plain that the conversion of Israel will lead to the restoration of the nation Israel when it will be gathered together again in the homeland.

It is the concept of the 'ebhed Israel having the task of converting and restoring Israel which has cast doubts on the originality of the word 'Israel' in verse 3. But, as we have seen, Israel as seen with the eyes of God, that Israel which despite everything that has happened persists in the faith that Yahweh is the Lord of history and will redeem his people and restore them to their
2.
homeland, that Israel already exists and awaits but the command of Yahweh. That faithful remnant (or individual) is Israel being prepared by God in the fires of affliction (Isa 48.10) for the appointed time to be the new Moses of the new Exodus.

When the 'ebhed is in despair, and rests his cause on Yahweh, he is brought to the main point of his mission. In answer to his prayer and complaint, Yahweh tells him that to restore Israel is too limited an aim. He will be made the bearer of light, the bringer of mishpat (Isa.42.1 etc.) and so a mediator of salvation for all peoples, that the whole world may share in the salvation.

3.

Again, as in Isa.44.5, the universalism is viewed through the eyes of nationalism. It is the miracle of deliverance from servitude to foreign kings which will lead to the conversion of the nations for, through it, they will know that 'Yahweh is faithful, even the Holy One of Israel, who hath chosen thee' (Isa.49.7). The 'ebhed in Isa.49.8, just as in Isa.42.6 is himself to be the 'covenant of the people', i.e. he is the true covenant people through whom, by joining themselves to him, the nations will share in God's covenant with Israel. This faith is firmly rooted not in any theophany, but in the deliverance within

-
1. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, p.163.
 2. Cf above p.19
 3. On this cf above p.18f.

history by God of his afflicted people (Isa.49,9-13).

This poem is followed by a dialogue between Yahweh and Jerusalem. In Isa. 49.14 Zion complains that she has been forgotten by Yahweh, which brings forth the assurance that Yahweh's love for his people is stronger than that of a mother for her child; though a mother may forget her child Yahweh will never forget Jerusalem (Isa.49.15) and in the coming new Exodus he will clothe Jerusalem with those who have destroyed her (Isa.19.17,18) and she will receive her scattered children again (Isa.49.20). Again Yahweh anticipates the cry of despair that Jerusalem has been robbed of her children (Isa.49.21) and assures her that the nations will come bearing her sons and her daughters home again (Isa.49.22) and he will destroy those who continue their oppression (Isa.49.26) and do not join themselves to her (Isa.23). The passage concludes by reiterating that Israel's present sorry plight is not a sign of Yahweh's impotence to redeem, but of Israel's sin and Yahweh's punishment.

This then leads into the great third Servant Song (Isa.50.4-11) in which so many of the previous themes are gathered up. Here are combined the themes of the suffering of the ebhed Yahweh who has 'returned to Yahweh' (Isa.44.21) and in quiet confidence knows that Yahweh will redeem him (cf Isa.44.26) by giving him victory over his enemies. He is in this passage indeed the ebhed chosen 'in the furnace of affliction' (Isa.48.10), but he is nonetheless the ebhed upon whom the spirit of Yahweh has been poured (Isa.42.1) in whom and through whom God will work his miracle of restoration (Isa.49.5 ff). If he is at present the suffering ebhed he will be the miraculously vindicated ebhed Yahweh.

4. The Lord Yahweh hath given me the tongue of them that are taught,
that I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary;
he wakeneth morning by morning,
he wakeneth mine ear to hear as they that are taught.
5. The Lord Yahweh hath opened mine ear,
and I was not rebellious,
neither turned away backward.
6. I gave my back to the smiters,
and my cheeks to them that pluck off the hair:
I hid not my face from shame and spitting.
7. For the Lord Yahweh will help me;
therefore have I not been confounded:
therefore have I set my face like a flint,
and I know that I shall not be ashamed.
8. He is near that justifieth me;
who will contend with me?
let us stand up together:
who is mine adversary?
let him come near to me.

9. Behold, the Lord Yahweh will help me;
who is he that shall condemn me?
behold, they all shall wax old as a garment;
the moth shall eat them up.
10. Who is among you that feareth Yahweh,
that obeyeth the voice of his servant?
He that walketh in darkness, and hath no light,
let him trust in the name of Yahweh,
and stay upon his God.
11. Behold, all ye that kindle a fire,
that gird yourselves about with firebrands:
walk ye in the flame of your fire,
and among the brands that ye have kindled.
This ye shall have of mine hand;
ye shall lie down in sorrow.

This poem adds little that is fresh to our understanding of the rebhed. Its great value is in its drawing together the teaching that has been building up throughout the previous chapters. His task and equipment are, however, made yet more explicit. His mission is to strengthen by his word the 'weary', those who stand in need of salvation, i.e. all Israel and the world through Israel. As a preacher of the word of Yahweh he is instructed and inspired by Yahweh. Mowinckel notes that 'as elsewhere in later Judaism, the conceptions of the learned (the wise) and of the inspired, who are endowed with the spirit, are blended.'¹ In the light of this blending of the two conceptions we do wrong to treat the idea of inspiration by the spirit as if this were simply subjective experience of an individual unconnected with his message and life of quiet brave endurance in the face of severe opposition. The rebhed, possessed of the spirit (Isa.42.1), is also and by this same possession the preacher of the word of Yahweh, and it is because his word is inspired by Yahweh that he knows it will be fulfilled giving him the grounds of his confidence in the face of his suffering. He knows that Yahweh will 'justify' him, i.e. maintain his cause by the outcome of events.² The core of this psalm rests not in the suffering of the rebhed but in the confident trust in Yahweh's ability to vindicate him through his bringing to pass the prophetic message. His message and his vindication are both Yahweh's work through him.

This poem is followed by a reciting again of the lessons of history as the basis for the trust in the coming miraculous act of deliverance (Isa. 51.1ff) and leads to the thrice repeated 'Awake!' (Isa.51.9,17; 52.1); the call to Jerusalem to know that God has removed the cup of his anger from her (Isa.51.22f), and to prepare herself for her coming deliverance, and the return of Yahweh to Zion (Isa.52.9) bringing his people with him (Isa.52.10ff).

1. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.194.
2. ibid, p.195.

This leads into the great climax of the prophetic message in the final Servant Song (Isa. 52.13-53.12).

1. Behold my servant shall attain his aim
he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high.
14. Like as many were astonished at thee
(his visage was so marred more than any man,
and his form more than the sons of men)
15. So shall he startle many nations;
kings shall shut their mouths at him:
for that which had not been told them shall they see;
and that which they had not heard shall they understand.
1. Who hath believed our report?
and to whom hath the arm of Yahweh been revealed?
2. For he grew up before him as a tender plant,
and as a root out of a dry ground:
he hath no form nor comeliness;
and when we see him there is no beauty that we should desire him.
3. He was despised, and rejected of men;
a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief:
and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised,
and we esteemed him not.
4. Surely he hath borne our griefs,
and carried our sorrows:
Yet we did esteem him stricken,
smitten of God, and afflicted.
5. But he was wounded for our transgressions,
he was bruised for our iniquities:
the chastisement of our peace was upon him;
and with his stripes we are healed.
6. All we like sheep have gone astray;
we have turned every one to his own way;
and Yahweh hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.
7. He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself
and opened not his mouth;
as a lamb that is led to the slaughter,
and as a sheep that before her shearers is dumb;
yea he opened not his mouth.
8. By oppression and judgement he was taken away;
and as for his generation who considered
that he was cut off from the land of the living?
for the transgression of my people was he stricken.
9. And they made his grave with the wicked,
and with the rich in his death;
although he had done no violence,
neither was any deceit in his mouth.
10. Yet it pleased Yahweh to bruise him:
he hath put him to grief:
when thou shalt make his soul an ʔasham,
he shall see his seed,
he shall prolong his days,
and the pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper in his hand.
11. He shall see the travail of his soul,
and shall be satisfied:
by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many:
and he shall bear their iniquities.
12. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great,
and he shall divide the spoil with the strong;
because he poured out his soul unto death,
and was numbered with the transgressors:
yet he bare the sin of many,
and made intercession for the transgressors.

1. Following the translation of Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.196 which rightly in the R.V. margin is translated 'prosper' rather than 'deal wisely'.
2. So R.V. margin.

This great poem falls most naturally into five main sections which are indicated in the form in which it has been quoted above.

The first section continues the theme of the coming glory. Here we are told of the great and incredible things which will befall the ebhed which will occasion amazement and recognition of Yahweh's might by the kings who before had been disgusted at and disdainful of him.

In the second section (Isa. 53.1-3) certain persons ('we') witness to his previous humiliation. We are not told who these persons are, but Simon¹ is doubtless correct in interpreting them as the watchmen of Jerusalem (Isa. 52.8). If this is so then the watchmen, who sing out the welcome to the returning exiles as Yahweh leads them home, here justify themselves for their inability to discern that the utterly humiliated and suffering ebhed is in fact Yahweh's messianic deliverer.

In the next section, particularly verse 4, the normal Jewish theological grounds for the non-recognition of the ebhed are given. They had seen the sufferings of the ebhed as the judgement of God against the sinner. But now, in view of the fact of the glorious miracle that Yahweh has wrought, such an interpretation is no longer possible. It is now that the 'we' recognise the truth of what has been a constantly recurring theme throughout the prophecy; it is the sin and apostasy of Jerusalem which has lain behind all her suffering and defeats. The basis for the suffering of the ebhed Yahweh is this same disobedience, and he has suffered although it is continually asserted that he is innocent and righteous (cf Isa. 53.9).

In the next section (Isa. 53.7-9) the theme of the innocent suffering of the ebhed because of 'our' sins is continued, and to it is added that in his suffering the ebhed was totally unimpressive and submitted to this apparent injustice without a murmur. If the text is taken literally it implies the death of the ebhed (Isa. 53.8, 'he was taken away', 'he was cut off from the land of the living'). But it is not clear that we should interpret these verses literally, for if the disease was leprosy, as is suggested by Duhm, Nyberg, Mowinckel and

1. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, p.204

i.

Simon among others, then the suffering sebhed (whether he be regarded as an individual or a righteous remnant) was cut off from all normal social and cultic activities until he had offered his asham or guilt-offering and had undergone extensive rites for his re-incorporation into the life of his people. Thus the sufferer could, with little forcing of the natural sense of words, be spoken of as being 'taken away' or 'cut off from the land of the living' without implying his actual physical death.

Again the reference to his grave being made with the wicked and his sepulchre with the rich (Isa. 53.9) need not imply a literal burial of the sebhed. Cut off from the community the sufferer is cut off not only from social activities but also from the religious activities by which the life of Israel was maintained. Cast off from both Yahweh and his people as a sinner he would be for all practical purposes dead and buried, unless he recovered from his sickness and was restored to the community.

In the final section of the poem a new element is added to what we have already seen of the innocence of the sebhed who suffers because of sin, not his own but 'ours', his fellow-countrymen, 'the many'. Now we are told that the suffering of the sebhed is in the purposes of Yahweh for the redemption of the 'many'.

The significance of this for the speakers is not to be seen simply in what might be termed the psychological effect of innocent suffering which arouses the confession of guilt and penitence. The significance lies also in the 'reward' of the sebhed which, according to traditional Jewish belief, must come to the pious and the innocent. Thus Yahweh gives the assurance that he will restore the sebhed which restoration was stated in the opening section of the poem (Isa. 52.13-15). For the writers this restoration still lies in the future; it is prophecy. This is corroborated by the literary form and by the tenses; from v.10 onwards the imperfect is used in contrast

-
1. Cf S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.200; U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, p.207. This view has been rejected, among others, by C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, 1948, p.148, who lists supporting authorities. No decision on this question is possible in a final and authoritative sense. Interpretation is based on whether we are dealing with factual reporting or poetic imagery. I am inclined to the view that the pitiful lot of the sebhed is being depicted poetically against the background of Jewish laws concerning leprosy.
 2. Cf P.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice, 1953, pp. 187ff; H. Ringgren, Sacrifice, 1962 p.34
 3. Isa. 53.11,12 should read 'the many' and not simply 'many' as in the R.V. The article is omitted in poetical style. It refers to the community as contrasted with the individual, and so means 'all' (cf S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.202 n.1.)

to the perfect of the preceding verses.

What is announced is that the suffering and 'death' of the ebhed is part of the divine purpose. It was by this gracious purpose of Yahweh that the ebhed was bruised for the sins of others. This was necessary that they might recognise their sins, do penance, and be converted to Yahweh, and thus, by the way he opened for 'the many', to be restored to Yahweh through him. Now by God's gracious act the ebhed will be caused to 'stand forth as righteous' before them, in the light of which they will be compelled to acknowledge that he was no sinner though he suffered. This will happen by the great miracle of Yahweh. Then will not only the sinners know that the ebhed was in the right, suffering because of their sins, but also the kings and nations will be amazed when they see the great miracle. The miracle is that Yahweh will restore the despised outcast or, if we take his death literally, raise up the dead man from his grave. Then he will 'see his seed' (presumably this means that he will be restored to fellowship with his spiritual children),^{1.} prolong his days, see his work crowned with success, and reap all the glory that an eastern poet could possibly describe.

The restoration of the ebhed, and his bringing the exiles home in triumph to Jerusalem is the crown of the divine purpose. Through it the blessing will be brought to 'the many', which means the restoration of fellowship with Yahweh, and true mishpat not only in an obedient Israel but through all the world. Thus the end of the poem is linked with the opening. This restoration is the glorious hope of the future. From the standpoint of the poem the sufferings of the ebhed have already taken place, and the supreme concern of the poet is to proclaim this coming miracle for 'the many'.

To describe how 'the many' will participate in the blessings of the ebhed the poet speaks in terms of the sacrificial asham or guilt offering (Isa. 53.10).

If ever we are to understand the meaning of sacrifice in ancient Israel then due recognition has to be given to the Israelite understanding of the fine inter-relationship that was believed to exist between the eternal and temporal worlds. The source of all life was Yahweh, and only by maintaining the covenant relationship with Yahweh could life and well-being be maintained.^{2.}

1. Of Isaiah 8.16, 18; S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.205.
2. J. Pedersen, Israel, 111-1V, 1959, pp.299ff.

At the same time the fine inter-relationship between the individual and the community is to be borne in mind. Judaism was not just a collection of more or less like-minded individuals. Their worship was a group activity, and their solidarity depended on the cult. Through it Yahweh and his people renewed the covenant which ensured the well-being of Israel. The centre of the covenant-restoring cult in post-exilic times was the sanctuary in Jerusalem. It was here that the life of Israel was maintained by the gracious condescension of Yahweh through the cultic rites that he had ordained. Consequently he who incurred uncleanness of any kind, moral or ceremonial, tainted the whole group; and the sanctuary was the focus of the taint; 'the man that is unclean and does not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from the midst of the assembly, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of Yahweh.'

As Eichrodt has convincingly demonstrated the corporate concept of sin did not belong simply to the earlier days of Israel's life. Even as the more objective concept of sin became filled in with an ever-increasing awareness of its inwardness as a revolt against God, it was still perceived that the will of God was relevant to the totality of human life, and individual offences against this will could not be regarded atomistically. Sin is any act that breaks the order set by God for human life in this world and is seen to spring from the desire of man to live 'by himself' without God.

When sin is seen thus as a failure to maintain the standards set by God which has dire repercussions on the life of the community, because they defile the sanctuary, the place of renewing the covenant with Yahweh, it is obvious that cultic rites should grow up to deal with the problem of sin, guilt, and taint. There were two such rites; the ḥatv'ath (commonly translated as sin offering) and ʾasham, (commonly translated as guilt offering). Most scholars have noted the great difficulty in defining precisely the differences between the two rites, That they over-lap to a great extent cannot be doubted. In view of the fact that it is by no means improbable that in Isa. 53.8,9 the prophet is depicting the pitiful lot of the 'ebhed against the background of Jewish laws concerning leprosy

1. P.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice, 1953, p.180; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 1961, p.418
2. Num. 19.13, 20.
3. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 11, 1967, pp. 380ff, especially pp. 384-387.
4. H. Ringgren, Sacrifice, 1962, p.32. (cf Ps. 10, 2,3,4,6.)
5. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, 111-1V, 1959, p.369; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 1961, pp. 419f; H. Ringgren, Sacrifice, 1962, pp.28F.
6. Cf above p.27

it is not without significance that in the laws concerning the recovery from leprosy it is required that the individual offer an 'asham (Lev.14.12ff) and also that the laws relating to the offering of an 'asham in Lev.5.1-6 deal mainly with instances of ceremonial impurity or taboo, such as touching a corpse.

In the Hebrew view of the world divided, in the sight of God, into clean and unclean, and what was unclean covered a wide variety of things, it was believed that by coming into contact with that which was unclean contaminated the person with that uncleanliness, which rendered him 'unfit for regular fellowship with the rest of the community, and above all, unfit for any communication with the divine world, with God'.^{1.} Such an unclean person had to be 'cut off' from the community until he recovered from his leprosy or any other form of uncleanliness and the taint of it, and removed the impurity by libations and the offering of an 'asham.^{2.} Such sacrifices were thought to remove the impurity from the person in question and to effect his reintegration into the normal life of the community.^{3.}

The rituals of the hatt'ath and 'asham rites need not detain us here.^{4.} One item that is obviously original and essential is the laying of the hand on the head of the sacrificial animal (cf Lev. 4.4,15,24,29,33). Most scholars are agreed that this act was not to transfer the sin of the individual to the animal, but rather to indicate that this particular animal is that being offered by the individual. It expresses the close association of the offerer and the victim.^{5.}

With this in mind we can return to try to understand what is meant when we are told that the 'ebhed is himself the 'asham (Isa.53.10). It is significant that the prophet tells us explicitly that the 'ebhed is innocent and that it is 'we' who are conscious of 'our' guilt. This is a reversal of the normal use of 'asham by which an offender was restored to the community, or the community itself was made ceremonially clean. Mowinckel explains this as presupposing the belief that an offender can be purified by the vicarious

1. Cf H. Ringgren, Sacrifice, 1962, p.34.

2. ibid.

3. P.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice, 1953, p.156.

4. The ritual of the hatt'ath is described in Lev. 4.3-31; 6.25-30. The ritual of the 'asham is not described in detail, but must be inferred from two shorter references in Lev. 5.6-13; 7.1-7, in which it is stated that the rites are essentially the same.

5. Cf R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 1961, pp.416, 449; J Pedersen, Israel, 111-1V, 1959, p.366; H. Ringgren, Sacrifice, 1962, p.30.

offering of a sacrifice for purification such as Job offered for his sons.

'According to the ancient mode of thought the family, the tribe, or the people is a unity; and thus the decisive factor in atonement for an offence is not that the culprit should himself pay the penalty but that the community to which he belongs should do so. Accordingly, one with whom one is in fellowship can intervene as his redeemer.'² Since, however, one could hardly suggest that for Deutero-Isaiah a 'fellowship exists between the 'ebhed and the many who have oppressed, scorned, and cut him off as a sinner, this interpretation fails to satisfy. In speaking of him as the 'asham for the many, clearly the poet is calling on the many to recognise him as the sacrificial victim for their sins. And when it is recognised that he is the innocent one and that 'the many' are guilty, and that the 'asham was offered to restore the unclean to the ceremonially right community, then it is clear that he is the heart of the new community. The suffering and vindication of the 'ebhed is his 'asham which, together with his message, is to 'bring back Jacob unto him, and that Israel should be gathered. to raise up the tribes of Israel' and to be a 'light to the Gentiles' (Isa. 49,5,6) We might interpret the effects of the suffering in psychological terms, bringing about a true penitence in those who witnessed his humiliation and restoration. But to a Jew the relationship between the 'ebhed and the community is far more intimate and concrete than that. His 'asham creates the new community for worship and mishpat in which the many may participate. His relationship with the community is expressed in the most intimate of ways, for it is expressed in terms of the cultic ceremonial, which we have seen was to effect the incorporation of the offender into the life of the community. His work is not to achieve a reconciliation between God and man by exercising a psychological effect on those who have witnessed his suffering and will witness his restoration, it is to create a restored community in which Jacob, or Israel, or 'we', or the nations may participate. He is not merely the example to the community but its creator under Yahweh.

While this community aspect cannot be ignored, and is confirmed by what the prophet has repeatedly told us through the course of his prophecy, nor must the element of the covenant communion with God. We have seen that the 'ebhed is himself to be the 'covenant of the people' (Isa. 42.6; 49.8), and

1. Job 1.5. However we need to note that Job offered an 'olah not a hatt'ath or 'asham, i.e. his sacrifices were not purificatory or expiatory.

2. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.210

that through his work the divine acquittal of guilty sinners will be declared
 1.
 (Isa. 42.3)

That which the 'asham and hattath rites effects is kipper. This word is inordinately difficult to translate or exegete. Its root meaning is probably to be discerned in the explanation of kopher money in Ex. 30.15ff which means money paid to redeem a life which has been forfeit.
 2. This would then link up quite simply with the declarative meaning 'to regard as expiation, to grant forgiveness, to forgive'
 3. But, as de Vaux has pointed out, since forgiveness means to restore the right relationship between man and Yahweh, which is the covenant relationship, kipper, which is effected by Yahweh through the rites, is the re-establishment of the covenant with Yahweh
 4.

The careful analysis of the use of kipper made by Yerkes cannot be dismissed and needs to be set as a complement to what has just been said of
 5. kipper above. He notes that when kipper takes a direct object in Hebrew the object is never God or a person, but may be the temple, sanctuary, altar or iniquity.
 6. Most often the verb is followed by the prepositions for, upon, or concerning. None of these is ever followed by the word God, 'the object "kippered" upon was always a person about to worship or something used in worship'.
 7. He concludes, therefore, that the basic meaning of kipper is purification of an object used in worship or of the person about to worship, and supports this conclusion by the prescription for yom hakippurim when the priest is directed to 'kipper for you to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before Yahweh' (Lev.16.30).

In examining various purificatory rites in Judaism, which were demanded
 8. for ceremonial, social, ethical, and religious offences, he notes how frequently the demand for restitution is made and draws from this the conclusion; 'The lesson of all these purifications is simple. Approach to the presence of God is a group act in which each individual participates by reason of his constituent membership of the group. Faults on the part of the group or its constituent members automatically invalidate the approach. If the faults are deliberate,

1. Cf above p.15

2. So J. Pedersen, Israel, 111-1V, 1959, p.358; E. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 11, 1967, p.444.

3. This follows the explanation given by J. Herrmann, TWNT, Vol.111, pp.302ff.

4. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 1961, p.418; cf. also J. Pedersen, Israel, 111-1V, 1959, pp. 380ff on the cruciality of the covenant relationship in Israel's cultus.

5. P.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice, 1953, pp. 178-196.

6. ibid p.182.

7. ibid.

8. ibid p.183ff.

or responsibly committed, any consequence must be rectified before the approach can be made. If the faults are unconsciously committed any untoward consequences must be rectified and they who committed the faults must at least direct their minds at the seriousness of their acts.¹ This attitude demanding right relationships within the worshipping community is reflected in our Lord's demand that before a man brings his gift to the altar he must rectify his relationships with his brother (Matt. 5.23-24).

These two conceptions of kipper as forgiveness and renewal of the covenant, and as purification demanding right relationships within the worshipping community are by no means incompatible. Israelite religion is based on a corporate covenant relationship with Yahweh and is never simply individualistic. Thus an essential aspect of the covenant is obedience to the laws of Yahweh, i.e. the keeping of the mishpat and torah. To be in the covenant entails a way of life determined by Yahweh in the covenant community, and kipper, which Yahweh effects through the 'asham, sums up this whole complex of covenant fellowship with Yahweh, forgiveness, and the restoration of right relationships and an obedient way of life within the covenant community.

Thus when Deutero-Isaiah speaks of the 'ebhed being an 'asham for the sinful people this whole complex of ideas is present; he is the one through whom Yahweh will create his new community, through whom he will forgive the guilty sinners, through whom he will restore his covenant, and create that way of life which God has set forth in his mishpat and torah. In other words he is the one through whom Yahweh will create that morally, ethically, and religiously right community in covenant fellowship with himself.

It is, however, important to emphasise that the 'ebhed achieves his end and fulfils his mission not by his suffering alone. It is the 'ebhed's fervent belief in his vindication which is the basis of his confidence in the third song (Isa. 50.4ff) and it is the restoration of the 'ebhed 'cut off from the land of the living' in the final song (Isa. 52.13ff) that will lead 'us' to know that he was innocent, that he suffered for 'our' sins, and that will cause the 'amazement' of the nations. By this he will 'attain his aim' (Isa. 52.13). It may be a misnomer, therefore, to call him the 'suffering servant', although this far it may have been his lot. It would be closer to the thought of the poet to call him the vindicated 'ebhed Yahweh. The suffering may be emphasised in the psalms, but

1. ibid p. 195f.

the faith which is held out to the hearers is that he will be vindicated and restored by Yahweh and, through this, the new Exodus will take place for the many who make him their 'asham.

We need not concern ourselves with a detailed examination of the question of the identity of the 'ebhed.¹ What is significant is that in 9 out of the 19 references to the 'ebhed he is explicitly identified with Israel.² It is even more significant that he is identified with Israel in Isa. 49.3 when 49.5 states that the mission of the 'ebhed is to Israel. This would make it appear virtually certain that we are to reckon here either with an individual or righteous remnant within Israel who, in the eyes of God and Deutero-Isaiah, is truly Israel and whose task is to restore the nation Israel and, through this, to bring the Gentiles into the restored covenant community. In view of the use of 'we' in the final song, whom Simon is almost certainly correct in identifying with the watchmen of Jerusalem mentioned in Isa. 52.8 and who are contrasted with the 'ebhed,³ it is certainly not impossible that the 'ebhed is to be identified with the exile or diaspora community, or an individual or righteous remnant within that community. But whether he be individual or community he is 'Israel' and his task is to create through his suffering and exaltation the redeemed community who shall return in triumph to Jerusalem. Even the final song which scales the heights of religious insight in the Old Testament leads on into the joyous rapturous song of joy as the scattered people of God return (Isa. 54) and the banquet is prepared (Isa. 55).

Summary.

The task of the 'ebhed Yahweh is to bring mishpat to Israel and to the world, and to be a 'covenant of the people', i.e. his task is to create a people wholly right in every aspect of their lives and thus free to enjoy the covenant fellowship with Yahweh. For this task he is chosen and prepared by Yahweh, and equipped with the spirit. By his daily waiting upon Yahweh he is given his message and teaching. He is called in the 'furnace of affliction' and in the fulfilment of his task he suffers opposition and rejection. He is wounded and 'cut off from the land of the living', though he is innocent. But his voluntary acceptance of this suffering and his glorious vindication by Yahweh makes 'the

1. Cf above p. 13. n.1 for references to comprehensive discussions on this question.
 2. Isa. 41.8,9; 44,1,2,21 (twice); 45.4; 48.20; 49.3. This identification, though not made explicitly, is certainly implicit also in Isa. 42.1, 19 (twice); 43.10; 44.26; 49.5,6.
 3. U.E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, 1953, p.204.

many' aware that he is suffering not for his own sins but for theirs. This suffering is not punishment but rather Yahweh's plan for the salvation of 'the many', the creation of a new, righteous community, forgiven and accepted by Yahweh, and restored to their own land. When Yahweh exalts his 'ebhed then will his mission be accomplished and those who acknowledge their guilt and make him their 'asham will be included in the coming glorious restoration of God's covenant people. His message, suffering, and restoration is a community-creating event for the right worship of Yahweh, and is in accordance with the will of Yahweh. This community, which is the 'seed' of the 'ebhed (Isa. 53.10) will then share in his endowment with spirit (Isa. 44.3)

(b) The 'ebhed Yahweh in later Judaism.

Before turning to the use of the 'ebhed Yahweh in the New Testament it is important to note the persistence of the title 'ebhed and its use in the period after c 100 B.C.

In addition to the more general usage of the title 'ebhed in the singular or plural as a description of the pious worshipper(s) or as a title of honour for outstanding instruments of God it is used in both Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism around the time of Christ both collectively of Israel and of the Messiah.

Examples of the collective use of the title outside of quotations from Deutero-Isaiah are not numerous. In the Qumran texts although the title 'ebhed is lacking, concepts derived from that figure in Deutero-Isaiah are applied collectively to the Essene community. This collective interpretation is found most strikingly in Hellenistic Judaism and this trend was apparently set by the LXX which, in addition to the nine passages in the Hebrew text which refer to the 'ebhed as Israel (Isa. 41.8,9; 44.1,2,21 (twice) 45.4; 48.20; 49.3), extends

1. For a detailed survey of all the evidence cf W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1956, pp. 45-79. What is presented here is essentially a summary of the major conclusions of Jeremias.
2. The Targum on Isaiah which follows the Hebrew text retains the phrase 'servant of God' and understands it to mean Israel collectively where it is demanded by the text, i.e. Isa. 41.8,9; 44.1,2,21 (twice); 45.4; 48.3. Only in 48.20 has the Targum replaced the singular of the Hebrew text by the plural.
3. Bar.3.36; Ps.Sol.12.6; 17.21. Rabbinic applications of the collective use outside the Targum are Isa. 41.8f in Gen. R.44.3 on 15.1; Isa.44.2 in Midr. Ps.111.1; Isa. 49.3 in Siphre Deut.355 on 33.26 par Mekhilta Ex.15.2; Lev.R.2 on 1.2; Ex.R.21 on 14.15.
4. For the evidence cf M. Black, 'Servant of the Lord and Son of man', SJT, Vol. 6, 1953, pp. 4-8; W.H. Brownlee, 'The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls', Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vol. 132, Dec. 1953, pp.8-15; Vol. 135, Oct. 1959, pp.33-38.

1.

the collective interpretation to other passages. The generic interpretation of Isa. 42.1 in the LXX is particularly significant in view of the fact that in Palestinian Judaism it is interpreted messianically, suggesting a bifurcation of Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism in interpreting Isa. 42.1ff.

In wisdom the Hellenistic Jew is apparently drawing on Isaiah 53 for

2.

his type of the just man. This does not prove that it was generically interpreted of Israel, but shows that Hellenistic Judaism did not follow Palestinian in its interpretation of Isa. 53 messianically.

We find evidence of the messianic interpretation of the 'ebhed in

3.

4.

5.

IV Ezra, 2 Baruch, and in the Targums. In addition to this we find a broad allusion to Isa. 49.6 in Eccles 48.10 where one of the three tasks ascribed to the returning Elijah is to restore the twelve tribes of Israel. If this is not clearly a messianic reference it does at least indicate that Isa. 49.6 was

6.

not interpreted collectively. In chapters 37-71 of the Ethiopian Enoch, which

7.

may or may not be pre-Christian we find that in addition to the titles of the central figure as the Messiah and Son of man he bears constantly the name 'the

8.

9.

chosen one' and occasionally 'the righteous one'. The allusions to Isa. 42.1

and 53.11 where the 'ebhed is the 'chosen one' and the 'righteous one' are

10.

generally recognised. It is clear that throughout the Ethiopian Enoch the figure of the triumphant messianic Son of man dominates thus fixing attention almost exclusively on his glory, which indicates that it is in this sense of the glorious eschatological deliverer that he has interpreted the 'ebhed of Isa. 42.1ff and 52.13ff. Further evidence of the messianic interpretation

of Isaiah's 'ebhed is found in the Greek translation of the Old Testament by Aquila in Palestine at the beginning of the second century. This is seen

-
1. Isa. 42.1 in the Heb. reads only אֲנִי הַיְהוָה but in the LXX reads Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου ; Isa. 42.19 in the Heb. text has אֲנִי הַיְהוָה and $\text{וְהוֹרֵתִי אֲנִי הַיְהוָה}$ which in the LXX = $\text{ὁ παῖς ὁ ἐσθλός μου}$ and ὁ δούλος τοῦ Θεοῦ respectively;
 - Isa. 44.26 in Heb. reads אֲנִי הַיְהוָה and in the LXX παῖδων αὐτοῦ ;
 - Isa. 48.20 in Heb. reads בְּרִי הַיְהוָה and in the LXX $\text{τον λαὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ}$
 2. For the evidence of W Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1956 pp. 54f.
 3. 1V Ezra 7.28; 13.32, 37, 52; 14.9 (in each instance 'my servant' is the expression).
 4. 2 Bar. 70.9 ('my servant, the Messiah').
 5. Targ. Isa. 42.1; 43.10; 52.13; Targ. Zech. 3.8 (in each text $\text{חִי וְיָרֵךְ אֲנִי הַיְהוָה}$) and Targ. Ezek. 34.23f; 37.24f (in all four instances אֲנִי הַיְהוָה).
 6. J. Jeremias, art. Ἰακώβ , TWNT, Vol. II, 1933, pp. 12ff.
 7. On this cf below pp 172 f.
 8. En. 39.6; 40.5; 45.3; 49.2; 51.3, 5; 52.6; 55.4; 61.5, 8, 10; 62.1.
 9. En. 38.2; 53.6 cf 39.6; 46.3; 71.14.
 10. For supporting authorities of W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, p. 60, notes 249, 250, 251.

particularly in his interpretation of Isa. 53.8f as referring to the judgement
1.
which the servant holds.

The best known messianic interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah's 'ebhed is that found in the Aramaic translation of Isaiah. Although the Targ. on Isaiah in its present form is not older than the fifth century A.D. Jeremias has demonstrated conclusively that the text is much older and that a great
2.
deal of it must go back to pre-Christian times. What is significant is that of the nineteen 'ebhed passages of the Hebrew text only Isa. 42.1; 43.10; and 52.13 are interpreted messianically.
3.
The Targ. interprets the whole of Isa. 52.13-53.12 messianically. While the Targum wrenches all references to the passion from Isa. 53, which is undoubtedly the result of Jewish Christian
4.
polemics and is probably to be dated c 100 A.D., it is impossible to believe that the Jews followed the Christians in giving Isa. 52.13ff a messianic interpretation. It is certainly more credible to suppose that a messianic interpretation was pre-Christian and that the complete distortion of Isa. 53 in the Targ. Isa. was intended to discredit the use of it made by the Christians.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that the title 'ebhed was current in both Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism at the time of Jesus though there is clearly no consistent use of it, and the Targum on Isa. 52.13ff makes it self-evident that this passage played an important role in the primitive Christian community's interpretation of the person and work of Christ. The fact also that the Targum goes to such extreme lengths in distorting the text proves beyond reasonable doubt that it was to this passage rather than current interpretations of it that they turned.

-
1. For further evidence in Aquila cf. ibid pp. 64f.
 2. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1956, pp. 67ff.
 3. Of the remaining sixteen texts the Targ. refers (i) to Israel, 41.8,9; 44.1.2.21 (twice); 45.4; 48.20; 49.3; and possibly 49.5,6; (ii) to penitent sinners 42.19 (twice); (iii) to prophets (50.10; (iv) 44.26 was read as a plural; (v) 53.11 in the Targ. is an infinitive: 'in order to make servants of the law'.
 4. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1956, p. 72, and for a translation of the relevant passage from the Targum. pp.69-71.

B. THE NEW TESTAMENT

We turn now to examine the use of the ʿebhed Yahweh in the New Testament. Our concern will be with those texts where there is little scholarly difference of opinion that they are references to the ʿebhed Yahweh.

(a) The Baptism of Jesus

Assuming that in the narratives of the baptism of Jesus we have an accurate record of the way in which Jesus saw the significance of his baptism,¹ and not simply the way in which the Church interpreted it, then we have here the earliest tradition of the application of the ʿebhed Yahweh to Jesus.

There are three important features to note in the accounts of the baptism of Jesus. The first is that all four Gospels contain a clear reference² to the descent of the Spirit on Jesus at his baptism. This being endowed with the Spirit is, as we have already noted, the divine equipment of the ʿebhed Yahweh³ for the fulfilment of his mission. The second feature is that in all the Gospels this baptism and endowment with the Spirit stands at the beginning of his mission and we can conclude that his preaching is consequent upon and associated with his mission as the ʿebhed Yahweh. Again this is the characteristic feature of the third Servant Song.⁴ The third feature strengthens the conviction that at his baptism Jesus saw his mission to be that of the ʿebhed Yahweh. This is the recording of the words from heaven which accompanies the bestowal of the Spirit⁵ in the Synoptic Gospels. The saying: 'Thou art my beloved son, with thee I am well pleased' is a quotation from Isa. 42.1, the same verse in which reference is made to the endowment of the ʿebhed with the Spirit.

I am in complete agreement with Cullmann, who writes, 'We may consider it certain that the words of the voice from heaven are really a citation of this passage in Isaiah. Nothing to the contrary may be deduced from the fact that Mk. 1.11 translates ʿebhed with $\omega\delta\omicron\varsigma$ instead of $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$, the translation in the LXX

-
1. The thesis that the application of the ʿebhed Yahweh title to Jesus at his baptism stems from the early Church and not from Jesus cannot be sustained, for this would make it impossible to explain why there are so few clear references to the application of this title to Jesus in the New Testament, and why it so soon disappeared from the writings in the first and second century Church.
 2. Mk. 1.10; Mat. 3.16; Lk. 3.22; Jn. 1.32.
 3. Isa. 42.1. cf above pp.14, and on Isa. 50.4ff, p.24.
 4. Isa. 50.4ff, cf above p. 24.
 5. Mk. 1.11; Mat. 3.17; Lk. 3.22.

1. and in Mat. 12.18.¹ In fact, as Jeremias has demonstrated, the fact that the LXX is not followed here proves that the tradition springs from a very primitive Semitic tradition.² Without assuming that the LXX has provided the translation of Isa. 42.1 for Mk. 1.11, υἱός which can bear the meaning of both 'son'³ or 'servant', is a perfectly legitimate Greek rendering of the Semitic original. Moreover, the word baḥir, which is connected with the ʿebhed in Isa. 42.1, and which Mk. 1.11 translates as ἀγαπητός, suggests the idea of 'son'. In the direct citation of Isa. 42.1ff in Mat. 12.18f we find ʿebhed rendered as παῖς and baḥir as ἀγαπητός.⁴ The LXX uses ἐκλεκτός for baḥir. According to a well documented and probably original reading, Jn. 1.34 also records the words from heaven and translates baḥir with ἐκλεκτός.⁵ This shows that the fourth Gospel recognises these words from heaven as a citation of Isa. 42.1, and that the uncertainty of translation points to a Semitic tradition which must have been very primitive. We must, of course, reckon with the possibility that the thought of Ps. 2.7 ('You are my son, today have I begotten you') suggested itself as a parallel and facilitated the translation of ʿebhed as υἱός. This possibility is supported by the western text reading of Lk. 3.22, according to which the voice from heaven simply quotes Ps. 2.7.

From this analysis of the baptism of Jesus it is reasonable to conclude that from the time of his baptism Jesus was conscious of being the elect ʿebhed Yahweh, endowed with the Spirit to fulfil his mission. Does the New Testament, however, envisage this task of Jesus, the ʿebhed Yahweh, as a community-creating task as we have seen is implied in the ʿebhed passages in Deutero-Isaiah?

(b) The Transfiguration, Ascension and Pentecost

In electing to approach this question from the glorious issue of the mission of Jesus rather than his suffering our procedure may be unusual, but then Deutero-Isaiah himself declared first his ringing assurance of the vindication of the ʿebhed before declaring that this vindication would be via redemptive suffering. Further, all the evangelists report John the Baptist as saying at the baptism of Jesus that he is the one who would baptize with the

1. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.66.

2. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, pp. 95ff. It is noteworthy that the LXX interprets Isa. 42.1 collectively by identifying the ʿebhed with 'Jacob', i.e. Israel (cf above p.36 n 1) whereas Palestinian Judaism interpreted it messianically (cf above pp. 36f). This indicates that the source of the tradition lies in Palestinian and not Hellenistic Judaism.

3. cf Arndt and Gingrich, on υἱός.

4. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p.62 n. 261.

5. Mk. 1.8; Mat. 3.11; Lk. 3.16; Jn. 1.26,33.

1.
 Holy Spirit. This bears witness to a common tradition, accepted by all the Gospel writers that the fulfilment of the mission of Jesus the ʿebhed Yahweh was to be his baptising others with the Spirit he had received in his baptism. According to Jn. 7.39 we are told that this was to be fulfilled only after Jesus had been 'glorified'. As Dodd has convincingly demonstrated the 'glorification' of Jesus in John's Gospel is represented as a single act comprising three distinct events, his death, resurrection and ascension.² Similarly Deutero-Isaiah tells us that the ʿebhed will be 'exalted and lifted up' (Isa. 52.13) and when we make him our ʿasham (i.e. unite ourselves with him) he will 'see his seed' (Isa. 53.10), upon which 'seed' Yahweh will pour his Spirit (Isa. 44.3). Thus Yahweh's Spirit-endowed ʿebhed must go through his redemptive suffering before it issues in his glorious vindication when the new community will be gathered (his seed) and participate in his endowment with the Spirit. The conceptual parallels between the ʿebhed of Deutero-Isaiah and the New Testament picture of Jesus are indeed striking.

Acts 2 records this fulfilment of the mission of the ʿebhed in the events of the day of Pentecost of the Jews, coming fifty days after his resurrection. Scholars have not been slow to see the difficulty in accepting uncritically the historicity of this account. Possibly the most thorough treatment of this problem is that of Davies,³ whose analysis is based on an interpretation of the ascension of Christ.

Accepting the historicity of the Acts account, the Church has celebrated the ascension forty days after Easter.⁴ Yet it is implied in the final chapter of Luke's Gospel that the ascension took place on the evening of the resurrection.⁵ This is supported by the longer ending of Mark which, as has been noted by many scholars, appears to be a summary of the final chapter of Luke. Mk. 16.19 states: 'So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven'. The undoubted continuity of this passage substantiates the claim that the Lukan narrative, upon which it is probably based, equally implies no break in the action, implying that the ascension took place during the evening after the resurrection. It is at least clear that this is what Luke believed to have happened. How then are we to account for the 'forty days' in Luke's record in Acts 1?

1. Mk. 1.8; Mat. 3.11; Lk. 3.16; Jn. 1.26,33.
 2. C.H. Dodd, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1960, pp. 201 ff.
 3. J.G. Davies, *He Ascended in Heaven*, 1958.
 4. Acts 1.3; 13.31.
 5. Lk. 24.51.

The theory that in the interval between writing the Gospel and Acts Luke came across further evidence which he deemed more reliable and therefore included it in his second volume (thereby correcting by implication what he had written in the first) cannot be substantiated. Firstly, a comparison of Acts 1 with the Transfiguration story of Luke 9 points to Luke's deliberate use of the Transfiguration narrative as a prefigurement of the ascension.¹ As Davies has shown the complex of ideas to be found in Luke 9 1-34 and Acts 1.1-12 reveals an identity of which the most reasonable explanation is that the one was used by its author as the prefigurement of the other. Further, Luke 9.51 makes explicit reference to the ἀνάληψις of Christ. This is found in the opening verse of the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Jesus and the subsequent request of James and John to call down fire from heaven upon them. The allusion to Elijah is unmistakable here, and indeed a great number of Western manuscripts make it patent by adding the words ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν.² That incident was the final one of Elijah's career before his ascension. It is fairly certain that the ascension of Elijah was used typologically by Luke in Acts 1.³ Hence ἀνάληψις in conjunction with the saying about fire from heaven reveals a direct reference to the ascension of Christ. In addition there are significant alterations in Luke of the Markan account of the Transfiguration; (i) ἀναβαίνω is employed instead of ἀναφέρω⁴; (ii) καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο is inserted in Luke 9.31 and repeated in Acts 1.10; (iii) ἔξοδος is added in Luke 9.31, a word which in view of Luke's use of εἰσόδος to describe Christ's entry into the world in Acts 13.24 must mean not only his death but also his resurrection and ascension; (iv) δόξα is explicitly mentioned (Lk. 9.31) and, whereas this word does not appear in the Acts account of the ascension, it is evident that Luke considered the ascension to be the occasion of Christ's entry into his δόξα.⁵ All of this indicates that Acts 1 is not the product of fresh evidence that has come to hand but that Luke has used the transfiguration account as a prefigurement of the ascension, which suggests that the 'forty days' has a symbolical or typological meaning, and not an historical one.

Secondly it is to be noted that a 'forty day' tradition is unknown

-
1. cf J.G. Davies, He Ascended into Heaven, 1958 pp. 39f and 186 for detailed evidence of the parallels between Lk. 9 and Acts 1; also 'The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel, JTS, Vol 6, 1955, pp 229-233.
 2. 2 Ki. 110ff.
 3. Cf below pp 45 ff.
 4. Mk. 9.2, Lk. 9.29
 5. Acts 3.13; 7.55; 12.11.

in the rest of the New Testament.

In 1 Cor. 15.5-8 Paul lists the witnesses of the resurrection, of whom the last is himself. Now whether we say that the ascension took place on Easter day or forty days later it is quite clear that the appearance of the Lord to Paul on the Damascus road was a post-ascension and not merely a post-resurrection appearance. Yet Paul admits no distinction between his experience and that of Peter and the twelve, whose experience is usually taken to be a specifically post-resurrection appearance. The possible implication is that even their experience was of the ascended Lord.

It is probable that Matthew shared this view. On the analogy of the other Gospels the charge which Jesus is represented as giving at the close of his Gospel implies that the ascension has already taken place.

According to John the gift of the Spirit was consequent upon the ascension: 'The Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified'.² Similarly it is when Jesus leaves the world to 'go to the Father' that the Comforter is sent.³ On Easter day Jesus' first action after saluting the disciples is to breathe on them saying; 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit'.⁴ The implication is clear that the ascension has already taken place. This is confirmed by Jesus' statement to Mary at the tomb that she was not to touch him; 'for I am not yet ascended unto my Father and your Father'.⁵ When he appears to the disciples he shows them his hands and later bids Thomas to handle him.⁶ Again the clear implication is that the ascension is an accomplished fact. Thus for John most clearly the occasion of the ascension was Easter day.

As Davies has shown this tradition persisted well into the second century.⁷ The extent of the tradition in the New Testament and its persistence after tells strongly against the historical chronology of Acts, and the lack of any supporting evidence of this chronology in the New Testament militates against the view that new material was to hand when Luke wrote his second volume.

For our investigation of the use of the ʿebhed Yahweh in the New Testament this examination has been important in revealing that Luke at least has used the Transfiguration narrative as a pre-figurement of the ascension,

-
1. Acts 9.
 2. Jn. 7.39; and cf above p.40.
 3. Jn. 16.28
 4. Jn. 20.22
 5. Jn. 20.17
 6. Jhn. 20, 20,27.
 7. J.G. Davies, He Ascended into Heaven, 1958, p.51.

and also for the doubt it casts on the historicity of the events of Pentecost recorded in Acts 2.

Turning firstly to the association of the Jewish feast of Pentecost with the gift of the Spirit we have already noted that in John's Gospel the gift of the Spirit is closely associated with the 'glorification' of Jesus, and that John records the tradition of the gift of the Spirit to the disciples on Easter Day. It is by no means certain that this tradition belongs to John alone.

If we are right in assuming that for Matthew the ascension took place on Easter day, then it seems that it is at least possible that he also understood the gift of the Holy Spirit to have been that same day. This assumption gains more credence when we consider that the charge which Jesus is held to have delivered at the close of the Gospel; 'Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' The reference here to baptizing in the name of the Holy Spirit comes in most surprisingly. It is a commonplace in modern biblical studies not to regard this saying as comprising the ipsissima verba of Christ, but Matthew makes only five other specific references to the Holy Spirit in his Gospel; two of these are related to the birth of Jesus (Mat.1.18,20), one is in the saying of John the Baptist at the baptism of Jesus (Mat.3.11), and the final two occur in the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mat.12.31, 32). Thus apart from the connection of the Holy Spirit with the baptism of Jesus there is nothing in Matthew's Gospel by which we could interpret this saying. The sense then would seem to be that as Jesus himself received the Spirit at his baptism so will those whom the disciples baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son. But this implies that the Spirit has already been given. The promise of the continuing presence of Christ also points in this direction. The New Testament is unanimous in understanding that Christ is present by the Holy Spirit. In Acts 2.38 it is explicitly stated that baptism which is in the 'name of Jesus Christ' is for the remission of sins and the reception of the Holy Spirit.

It seems most reasonable therefore to conclude that when Matthew

1. Cf above p.40, 42.

2. Cf above p.42.

3. Mat. 28.19,20.

4. E. Schweizer, art $\pi\nu\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$, TLNT, Vol VI pp.394ff.

records the charge to baptize in the name of the Holy Spirit and asserts the
 1.
 continuing presence of Christ he understands that the gift of the holy spirit
 is an already accomplished event, and accomplished on the day of the resurrection
 and ascension.

There is no evidence that Paul was familiar with a tradition of the
 historical association of Pentecost and the gift of the Spirit. In his letters
 2.
 there is only one reference to Pentecost. Writing to the Corinthians he tells
 them of his plans to pay a return visit to them, and to spend some time with them,
 but he does not wish to come immediately, 'But I will tarry at Ephesus until
 Pentecost; for a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many
 3.
 adversaries.' There is no hint here that Paul wishes to celebrate the coming
 of the Holy Spirit with the disciples in Corinth, nor that he wishes to spend it
 with those in Ephesus. Pentecost is simply a time-limit that he has set on his
 stay in Ephesus to take advantage of the opportunity that opened up to him.
 This paucity of any reference to Pentecost is strange when we consider the vast
 number of references to the 'Holy Spirit', 'the Spirit of Christ', 'the Spirit
 of God', or simply 'the Spirit' in Paul's letters. Acts itself contains one
 reference to Paul's hurrying to be at Jerusalem for the Pentecost, but here again
 there is no hint of any celebration of Pentecost as the Christian festival of
 the Holy Spirit.

A study of the final chapter of Luke's Gospel itself indicates that
 Luke shared the view that the Holy Spirit was given on Easter day, and in the
 same close association with the ascension that we have noted in John and Matthew.
 Lk. 24.51 records the ascension, and proceeds immediately to state; 'And they
 worshipped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually
 5.
 in the temple blessing God.' This accords poorly with what Luke tells us in
 his second volume of the activities of the apostles before Pentecost. Luke
 does not say that the disciples gathered in the upper room of the house where
 6.
 they were staying and 'continued stedfastly in prayer' because they feared the
 7.
 Jews, but certainly there is nothing in the account of the great joy with which
 the Gospel closed. This joy and continual worship in the temple, however, is

1. It is to be noted that Matthew 28.20 is an assertion of Christ's presence
 (ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἶμι) not a promise for the future.

2. 1 Cor. 16.8

3. 1 Cor. 16.8,9.

4. Acts 20.16

5. Lk. 24.52f.

6. Acts 1.12-14

7. Jn. 20.19

1.
is definitely stated to follow Pentecost. It is clear that Luke shared
the view of Paul that this great joy is the characteristic gift of the Holy
2.
Spirit. Acts 4.31 records the great boldness of the disciples following the
gift of the Holy Spirit; In Acts 10.44ff the ecstatic speaking in tongues by
Cornelius and those to whom Peter ministered is interpreted as their reception
of the Holy Spirit; Acts 13.52 identifies being filled with joy with being
filled with the Holy Spirit; and Acts 19.6 records the ecstatic speaking in
tongues accompanying the reception of the Holy Spirit.

There seems thus no good reason to doubt that Luke linked the gift of
the Holy Spirit with the ascension of Jesus on Easter day, and that the reference
to the 'great joy' and continual worship in the temple is intended to convey this
belief. We are consequently again faced with the problem of the discrepancies
between Luke's first and second volumes.

We have already noted that Luke's account of the ascension in Acts is
strongly influenced by the typology of the ascension of Elijah, whose ascension
3.
is seen as a prefigurement of the ascension of our Lord. It is instructive to
note the large number of features in the story of the ascension of Elijah which
have their parallels in Luke. When Elisha requested a 'double portion' of the
4.
spirit of Elijah, Elijah replied 'if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it
5.
shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.' This request and
promise is fulfilled when Elisha witnesses the ascension of Elijah in the whirl-
6.
wind and takes up the mantle which has fallen from Elijah and immediately performs
7.
the miracles Elijah has performed. It is clear that Luke makes use of the
essential features of this story. Like Elisha the disciples are told to wait
8.
in a certain place and are promised 'power from on high' when the Holy Spirit
9.
comes upon them. As with Elisha the disciples are to witness the ascension
10.
to receive the Spirit. When Elisha clothes himself with the mantle that has
fallen from Elijah 2 Kings records that he immediately took up the work of
Elijah. Acts records the promise of the Lord that when the Holy Spirit comes

2. Gal. 5.22, cf Rom. 7.4; 8.5; Eph. 5.9.

3. For details of the parallels between 1 Ki.19 and Acts cf J.G. Davies, He Ascended into Heaven, 1958, Table E. p.189.

4. 2 Ki. 2.9.

5. 2 Ki. 2.10.

6. 2 Ki. 2.11,12.

7. 2 Ki. 2.13ff.

8. 2 Ki.2.6; cf Lk.24.49; Acts 1.8.

9. 2 Ki. 2.9,10; cf Lk. 24.49; Acts 1.5,8.

10. 2 Ki. 2.11f; Acts 1.8.

1. cf Acts 2.46f.

upon the disciples they will receive 'power' and 'ye shall be my witnesses both
 1.
 in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and unto the uttermost part of the earth'.

When the Holy Spirit does come upon them, the whole record of Acts witnesses to
 the spread of the Gospel of Christ by the apostles in the power of the Holy Spirit,
 2.
 and the miracles they performed in the 'name of Jesus'.

Thus it is clear that the typology of the Elijah story is never far
 from Luke's mind. Luke, like John, however, does not see this 'transference of
 power' to be to one man (as of Elijah to Elisha) but to the group, the primitive
 Church. In John the ascended Lord comes to the disciples behind locked doors,
 3.
 breathes on them, and says, 'receive ye (plural) the Holy Spirit'. Similarly Acts
 4.
 emphasises that the disciples were 'all together in one place' when the events of
 Pentecost took place. The coming of the Holy Spirit is seen to be a group event.
 His coming in such close association with the ascended Lord is what constitutes
 the new group. He is a 'group possession' and the possession of the individual
 believer as a member of the group.

In order to reinforce this, Luke drops the typology of ^{the} Elijah story to
 describe the coming of the Holy Spirit and uses rather the symbolism of Pentecost.
 In order to understand the significance of the Pentecost symbolism, we need to
 understand the significance of Pentecost in the Old Testament and its close con-
 nection with the offering of the sheaf of 'firstfruits' during the Passover
 celebrations.

The ritual associated with the offering of the sheaf is described only
 in Lev. 23.10-14 where we are not told its significance. What is important here
 is that we are told that this offering of the firstfruits was to take place on
 'the morrow after the sabbath'. According to the Sadducees this was taken to
 mean Sunday. On the other hand the Pharisees interpreted it as Nisan 16 whether
 5.
 or not it was a sabbath. We shall see below that the Synoptic claims that the
 Friday of the Last Supper, and crucifixion was Nisan 15, i.e. the first day of
 6.
 the passover week, cannot be dismissed. When Jn. 19.31 mentions the 'high
 sabbath' it is probable that it is Nisan 16 which is meant, the day on which,
 7.
 according to the Pharisees, the offering of the firstfruits was made. On the

1. Acts 2.8.

2. Cf Acts 3.16.

3. Jn. 20.22.

4. Acts 2.1.

5. Cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. II, p.848.

6. Cf below pp 553ff.

7. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.81.

other hand Paul, Luke's great associate, speaks of Christ as the 'firstfruits of them that are asleep'^{1.} and unmistakably links this with the resurrection which would have been Sunday Nisan 17. We cannot be sure therefore whether the interpretation of Lev. 23.11 of the Sadducees or the Pharisees was followed in the year of Christ's death. All we can be sure of is that Paul links the offering of the firstfruits with the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and this has probably influenced Luke.

The rule governing the offering of the firstfruits is found in the book of the Covenant; 'The first of the firstfruits (re³ shith bikkurim) of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of Yahweh thy God.'^{2.} The first (bikkurim) is that part of the crop which ripens first and is reaped first, while the firstfruits (re³ shith) denotes both the first, the beginning, and the best. It is in effect the offering of the whole harvest. As Pedersen remarks, 'every totality is concentrated in its first origin'.^{3.} This is true not only of crops but also of time. 'The first day of a period embodies the character of the whole period, so that the following days unfold from it'.^{4.} So also the first Israelite is the archetype of the whole nation. In him the whole nation is inherent. This is the importance for the Hebrew offering of the firstfruits. As the first they represent the whole; the entire harvest is consecrated in them.

If the offering of the firstfruits is the dedication of the whole harvest in and with the dedication of the first cutting of that harvest, Pentecost the feast of weeks following fifty days after, is the fulfilment of the promise of God inherent in the offering of the firstfruits. The beginning and the end are intimately connected. According to Ex. 34.22 it is the feast of the ingathering. It represents the fulfilment of everything that the offering of the firstfruits stands for.

Applying these concepts to our understanding of the Pentecost story, we must note that while Luke himself does not make use of the concept of the firstfruits, Paul, whom he accompanied on part of his missionary journeys, was very familiar with this idea. He was familiar with the underlying principle and made use of it in his writings. Thus he enunciated the rationale; 'If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump'.^{5.} As the Second Adam, Christ is the beginning

1. 1 Cor. 15.20

2. Ex. 23.19; 34.26.

3. J. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, 1959, p.301.

4. J.G. Davies, He Ascended into Heaven, 1958, p.172.

5. Rom. 11.16.

of the new creation. As the firstborn he must be offered to God that the race of which he is the origin may draw its life from his self-consecration.¹ As the firstborn of the dead Christ is not only the first to attain to the resurrection and ascension, he is also the fons et origo of those who draw their life from this event. Thus as the firstfruits is fulfilled at Pentecost in the Old Testament, so Luke sees the ascension fulfilled at the new Pentecost. 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear'.² In this gift of the Holy Spirit the work of Christ is fulfilled, the new age of the firstborn has dawned, and the new community gathered to share in the life which he has made possible, and in his endowment with the Spirit.

This new community is constituted in the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ which is so intimately connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit. But we have already seen that this gift of the Holy Spirit was already promised in all the Gospel narratives of the baptism of Jesus when Jesus understood his mission to be that of the ʿebhed Yahweh and was already foreshadowed in the ʿebhed prophecy in Isa. 44.3.³

This interpretation of the ʿebhed Yahweh in the New Testament as the risen, restored, and exalted ʿebhed who creates the new community is confirmed by an analysis of the transfiguration stories of the New Testament, especially that of Luke which, as we have seen, is treated by Luke as a prefiguration of the ascension.⁴

In Matthew the voice from heaven at the transfiguration reproduces exactly the voice from heaven at the baptism of Jesus; 'This is my beloved son...'⁵ Mark too reproduces the voice at the baptism in his transfiguration account, though he changes the direct 'thou art' to 'this is', which is the form of words found in Matthew.⁶ The purpose of this alteration of the form of the words seems to be to suggest that it is not here that Jesus receives his vocation as the ʿebhed but to announce the certainty to Peter, James and John. If we are correct in accepting that the voice from heaven in the first two Gospels at the baptism of Jesus is a reference to the ʿebhed Yahweh of Isaiah 42.1, then there is no reason for not accepting the same reference in their transfiguration⁷

1. Col. 1.18; cf Rev. 1.5.

2. Acts 2.33.

3. Cf above p.39 n.5

4. Cf above p.41.

5. Mat. 17.5 = Mat. 3.17.

6. Mk. 9.7; cf Mk. 1.11.

7. Cf above n.38 f

narratives. Boobyer and Ramsey have argued that the transfiguration accounts^{1.} in the first two Gospels are presented as pre-figurations of the parousia. This is certainly true of Matthew's account, but, as we shall see below, it is more^{2.} likely that the account in Mark is, as in Luke, a prefiguration of the ascension. This suggests that Matthew understands the task of the sebhed to be to create the eschatological community which in Mark and Luke is already present in the Church.

In Luke's account of the transfiguration he most significantly introduces the LXX rendering of βασιρ, ἐκλεκτός, of Isa. 42.1.^{3.} In the baptismal narrative he followed Mark.^{4.} On the basis of the Elijah typology and the firstfruits-Pentecost symbolism of Luke, there can certainly be little doubt that for Luke the mission of the sebhed Yahweh is fulfilled in his glorious exaltation when he creates the new community of which he is the fons et origo and which participates in his endowment with the Spirit poured out upon him at his baptism. It is noteworthy in this regard that Luke has introduced into his account of the transfiguration the word ἔξοδος (Lk. 9.31) which in addition to pointing to his^{5.} ascension links very closely with the theme of the new Exodus which the sebhed is going to accomplish for the people of God when he re-unites them in Jerusalem, which is such a prominent theme in Deutero-Isaiah's conception of the work of^{6.} the sebhed. The task of the sebhed is to create the new people of God who will share in his endowment with the Holy Spirit, and he accomplishes this by his death and exaltation.

(c) Other usages of the sebhed Yahweh in Acts

The other passages in Acts where the sebhed Yahweh concept is present confirm this interpretation. Most significant here is the account of the^{7.} conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch. In Acts 8.32, 33 Isa. 53.7,8 are quite unambiguously cited. Starting from this great sebhed Yahweh passage Philip^{8.} of the eunuch. The Spirit does not then come upon the 'preached unto him Jesus'. The passage continues to relate the baptism of the eunuch as we should expect, but rather snatches Philip away. However this curious incident is explained, what is preserved here is the use of the sebhed Yahweh connected

-
1. G.H. Boobyer, St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, 1942.
 - A.M. Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, 1949.
 2. Cf below pp. 240ff.
 3. Lk. 9.35
 4. Lk. 3.22 = Mk. 1.11.
 5. Cf. above p. 41.
 6. Cf above p. 18 (Isa. 43.1ff) and 19 (Isa. 44.26f).
 7. Acts. 8.26ff.
 8. Acts 8.35.

with the baptism of the eunuch into the new community, and a reference, even if a dubious one, to the Holy Spirit. Here again the ‘ebhed is seen in a twofold relationship, namely to the community, and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Besides this account there are other passages in Acts which do not contain a direct quotation ~~from~~ Deutero-Isaiah, but are still important for our consideration. These passages openly give Jesus the title $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, the usual LXX translation of the Hebrew ‘ebhed Yahweh. We find this title four times in Acts but nowhere else in the New Testament. On two occasions it is used con-
 1. nected with the suffering and humiliation of Jesus, once with the 'raising up'
 2. of Jesus, and finally 'that signs and wonders may be done through the name of
 3. thy holy servant Jesus.' This last reference is followed immediately in verse 31, 'And when they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spoke the word of God with great boldness.'

The two references where specific mention is made of the suffering of the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ are most instructive. Acts 3.13 refers not only to the servant's suffering but also that the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his servant Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate.....' The main point of the assertion is not the suffering of the servant but that God has glorified him. Acts 4.27, 28 refers to the anointed servant against whom was arrayed Herod, Pontious Pilate, the Gentiles and the people of Israel, who did to him according to God's fore-ordained plan. Luke continues immediately to speak about the threatenings against the community and their prayer 'and grant unto us thy servants ($\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$) to speak thy word with all boldness' (Acts 4.29). As the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ was threatened and suffered, so the $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ are threatened and face suffering. They pray for power to continue the works of the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (Acts 4.30) and are filled with the Holy Spirit. Here we find all the complex associations of the suffering servant, the glorified servant, the gift of the Spirit, and the new community.

This confirms the use by the early Church of the Christological title, the ‘ebhed Yahweh, and also that this was understood not simply in terms of his humiliation and suffering, but in terms of his suffering, resurrection and

-
1. Acts 3.13; 4.27.
 2. Acts 3.26.
 3. Acts 4.30.

ascension, and the creating of the new community filled with the Spirit which, we have seen, was the work of the Spirit endowed ʿebhed of the Old Testament.

(d) The Passion of the ʿebhed

I have emphasised the exaltation and community-creating as an essential aspect in understanding the work of the ʿebhed because the emphasis on the 'suffering servant' has obscured this essential aspect both in the Old and New Testaments. Thus Cullman can speak of the vindication (he does not even mention the meaning and significance of the ʾasham) in the Old Testament songs as a mere ^{1.} 'epilogue' to his work. I do not wish to imply by this that his suffering has no significance for the New Testament ʿebhed but to stress that concentration on this aspect to the exclusion of his vindication and the creation of the community and to understand the significance of the ʿebhed only in terms of his suffering is to be false to the Old and New Testaments alike.

We turn to those Gospel passages in which reference is made to the suffering servant to see whether a decisive theological significance is attached to the suffering of Jesus, the ʿebhed Yahweh, without reference to his creation of the community through his vindication.

(i) Luke 22.37

There is only one direct citation from Isa. 53 in a saying of Jesus; 'For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors, for what is written about me has its fulfilment'. (Lk.22.37). The genuineness of this saying has been contested, but there is no textual support for its excision, and the fact that the quotation is dependent on the ^{2.} Hebrew and not the LXX text of Isa. 53.12 indicates that the tradition is very old and stems from a Semitic tradition within the Church. The genuineness of the saying has also been contested on the grounds that nowhere else does Luke ^{3.} connect the suffering of Jesus with Isa.53. This is not entirely true as Jesus' words at the Last Supper and the passages we have examined in Acts prove. Since it cannot be shown that there is a tendency to multiply allusions to Isa. 53 in the New Testament, it must be assumed that Luke has derived this saying from ^a pre-Lukan Semitic source which increases its claims to authenticity,

Does Luke see this citation merely as a reference to Jesus' coming

1. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.80
 3. H.W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, 1952, p.57.
 2. cf W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p.90 n.404.

death? Or does he, in accordance with his use elsewhere of the ‘ebhed Yahweh, refer also ~~to~~ the new community of the ‘ebhed? In answering this attention must be paid to the setting of the saying.

In the immediately preceding pericope (Lk. 22.24ff) reference is made to the argument about who would be greatest in the community of the new covenant, to which Jesus replies that he has been among them as 'he that serveth' but, in the kingdom which he has appointed for them 'even as my Father appointed unto me', they will sit at his table and eat and drink with him and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Since Luke sets this pericope in the account of the Last Supper it cannot be doubted that we have here an allusion to the coming glorious messianic banquet in which the new community would participate.

Following this pericope there is the reference to Satan's desiring to have Simon 'that he might sift you (plural ὑμᾶς) as wheat' (Lk. 22.31) but Jesus has made supplication for him that his faith fail not. The introduction of the plural ὑμᾶς signifies that on the faith of Simon more than his own steadfastness is dependent. Clearly a community in which Simon is to play a significant role is envisaged. This steadfastness of Simon will not be manifested at the crucifixion for Jesus predicts Peter's denial of him (Lk. 22.34) but 'when once thou has turned again, stablish thy brethren'. (Lk. 22.32). The occasion of Peter's conversion and the life of the community lies beyond the cross.

Luke now records our Lord going on immediately to speak of the life of the new community in words which are 'among the saddest words in the Gospels'.¹ He speaks metaphorically about the conditions in which the disciples will find themselves after his death.² 'The conditions will be entirely different from those which obtained when he first sent them forth to announce the good news of the kingdom. Then there was no need to provide purse, wallet, and shoes, since normally a friendly reception might be expected. Now the conditions are different; he is about to die, and the hostility which faces him may well confront them.'³ The conditions which they will be called on to face are those which would normally call for the carrying of a sword. He will suffer soon as also will they. He in his suffering will be 'numbered among the transgressors' and so will they.

1. F.C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission, 1906, p.140f.
 2. So V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, 1943, p.192.
 3. ibid p.192

We have here two contrasting pictures. The first of the glorious messianic banquet in which the disciples would eat and drink with Christ in his kingdom and share in his rule. The second is of a persecuted suffering community. In this context the reference to Isa. 53.12 is both apposite and inappropriate. There can be no doubt that Deutero-Isaiah saw the fulfilment of the work of the ‘ebhed in bringing glory to a universally extended Israel; they would come home to Jerusalem in triumph to share in the messianic banquet (Isa. 55) of the new Exodus. Then their sufferings would be at an end. Luke 22.24ff confirms the concept of the glorious messianic banquet of the victorious ‘ebhed for the new community, but cautions the interpretation of this in terms of instant glory for the community in the world. Like their Master they too would suffer. That Jesus should have been misunderstood is both perfectly natural and part of the dramatic irony of the situation. The cry: 'Lord, behold, here are two swords' reveals the fact that they have thought solely in terms of the dawn of the glorious kingdom of God for them and understand Jesus' words to mean that they must take up arms in defence of the kingdom. They fail to see that not only is the fruit of the mission of the ‘ebhed Yahweh to be theirs but also his way. Thus the section closes with words which are both a formula of dismissal and an utterance of deepest sadness.

Jesus thus uses the ‘ebhed Yahweh concept in this passage not only to point to his suffering but also to the fact that out of that suffering will grow the new community which, like himself, will face suffering. Disciple and Master are held together in the closest possible union.

It is most informative to note that Luke records not only the fulfilment of Peter's denial of Jesus, but also Peter's new boldness and strengthening of the disciples in the face of opposition after the gift of the Holy Spirit which, as we have seen, is intimately connected in Luke with the vindication of the ‘ebhed, his resurrection and ascension and the creation of the Spirit-endowed community.

(ii) The Eucharistic words

We shall see later that the tradition which dates the occasion of the Last Supper at the beginning of Nisan 15, i.e. as a Passover meal, is to be

-
1. Lk. 22.38 cf Deut. 3.26 (LXX)
 2. V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, 1943, p.193
 3. Lk. 22. 54-62.
 4. Cf Acts 2.14 and especially 4.23-31 where the theme of the ‘ebhed Yahweh is used again (cf p.50)
 5. Cf above pp.39 ff.

1. accepted as authentic. Since it was traditional at the Passover to interpret the various elements of the meal, the tradition which ascribes to Jesus an interpretation of the bread and wine is also to be accepted as authentic, even though the normal procedure was to make the interpretation during the haggadah which preceded the meal while Jesus is reported to have added his words of interpretation during the grace over the bread with which the meal began and the cup

2. with which it closed. Further, we shall see that the New Testament accounts are

3. dependent on a Semitic original and that the most primitive tradition of the words over the wine was probably $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\acute{o}\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\varsigma$ (or $\acute{\eta}\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$).

It is wellknown that the concept of the covenant did not play a vital rôle in Jewish thinking concerning the Passover in pre-Christian times, and that it is inordinately difficult to render the covenant saying in Aramaic. This has led many to doubt its authenticity. Similarly the fact that 'covenant blood' in Judaism referred to circumcision and not the Passover has strengthened this conclusion. We shall see, however, that a perfectly legitimate rendering of the phrase is possible in Aramaic. Further the fact that Paul in Col. 2.11 speaks of Christ's death as his circumcision suggests that he has interpreted this eucharistic saying in normal Jewish terms. But whence the use of 'Covenant' at the Last Supper? Since the phrase $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ is certainly derived from Isa. 53.11,12 it is not improbable that the concept of the sebhed Yahweh as a berith for the people (Isa. 42.6; 49.8) is the source of the concept. In Deutero-Isaiah we noted that the unique personification of the sebhed himself as the covenant meant that by attaching themselves to him the people would participate in his covenant relationship with Yahweh. While the words of Jesus about his blood being the covenant point unmistakably to his sacrificial death, the Hebrew concept of the blood being the life shows that Jesus himself understood himself to be the 'covenant for the people', i.e. Jesus understood himself to be the one through whom the new covenant community of those who attached themselves to him was to be created. Thus the covenant saying points to his death

1. Cf below pp. 553ff.

2. Cf below pp. 567, 586.

3. For a detailed examination of the Semitisms of all of the New Testament accounts cf J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.173ff.

4. The evidence cited in support of the connection between 'covenant' and 'Passover' by Jeremias, ibid, p.225 n 5 is all post-Christian.

5. But cf ibid pp 173f.

6. cf A.J.B. Higgins, Lord's Supper, p.34

7. ibid

8. cf below p. 583.

9. cf above pp. 16, 22.

10. Lev. 17.11.

as creating the covenant people of God.

This interpretation is confirmed by the assertion that the covenant blood of Jesus is 'for many'. In the LXX version of Isa. 52.13-53.12 the preposition ὑπέρ is lacking. There we find διὰ with the accusative (Isa. 53.5,12. In 53.12 it renders the Hebrew barabbim and περί with the genitive (Isa. 53.4 cf 10). Mat. 26.28 alone renders the eucharistic 'for many' as περί πολλῶν. Mark 14.24 renders it ὑπέρ πολλῶν, while Paul and Luke have ὑπέρ ὑμῶν (I Cor.11.24; Lk. 22.20). It is significant that in Mk.10.45b the phrase is rendered ἀντί πολλῶν. This variation in the preposition used, and especially by Mark who uses both ὑπέρ and ἀντί, proves that these are variant translations of a Semitic original. Similarly ἐκχυνόμενον in Mk.14.24; Lk.22.20; Mat.26.28 and δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν in Mk.10.45b are best explained as variant translations of heterah lamaweth naphsho (Isa.53.12). There can be little doubt, therefore, that the Hebrew (or Aramaic) text of Isa.53.12 stands behind Jesus' interpretation of the wine at the Last Supper. Thus Jesus, like the ebhed Yahweh knows that the significance of his death is 'for many'.

Who are 'the many'? In Deutero-Isaiah this saying comes at the climax of his great descriptions of the new Exodus which the ebhed is to accomplish (Isa. 43.1ff; 44.26f) not for Israel alone but also for the Gentiles. Yet, as we have seen, the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah is rooted in his nationalism so that in the new Exodus a universally extended Israel is created. What he establishes is the covenant people of God, Israel, but no longer limited by race. In Jewish exegesis at the time of Jesus the rabbim of Isa.53.10,12 was always interpreted to mean Israel. This is a departure from Deutero-Isaiah only in that Israel is this later Judaism means the nation. It is probably true that Jesus intended 'the many' to refer to Israel in its original sense in Deutero-Isaiah, though the difficulties experienced in launching the Gentile mission in the early Church indicate that he cannot have made this intention explicit. In any event the clear meaning of these words is that through his death Israel, the new people of God, is to be established. This is proved not only by the fact that Deutero-Isaiah presents the work of the ebhed to accomplish the new Exodus, but also by the fact that Jesus used these words at a Passover

1. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p.96

2. cf above p.16

3. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.229

meal whose intention was to celebrate the Exodus from Egypt by which God created his people, but added these significant words indicating that what he was about to accomplish was God's new Exodus of deliverance by which the new people of God would be created.

But again we cannot assume that Jesus understood his work as the people-of-God-creating ἄβηδ simply in terms of his death. Luke records that at the beginning of the meal Jesus told his disciples that he would not share in the meal with them, for he will not share in the passover celebration until it is fulfilled in the kingdom. (Lk.22.14-18). We shall see that this tradition is to be accepted as authentic. Quite clearly, therefore, Jesus looks beyond his passion to his exaltation when God's new Exodus for his people will be accomplished and will be accomplished soon so that the next meal of Jesus and his disciples will be the glorious messianic banquet (cf Lk.22.29f). This interpretation of the ἄβηδ who must suffer and enter into his glory to accomplish the new Exodus of God's deliverance and to create the community who would share with him in the messianic banquet, is confirmed by Luke's account of the Emmaus walk when the risen Christ appears to the two dispirited disciples and says; 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?' (Lk.24.26) and then made himself known to them as he broke bread (Lk.24.30f). Here the glorified ἄβηδ, who is understood to be the messiah, turns the meal of the disciples into the promised messianic banquet.

(iii) Mark 10.45 (cf Mt.20.28)

As we shall see, there can be little doubt that this Son of man saying (For the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many [λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν]) has been composed by Mark by combining two originally distinct sayings; the λύτρον saying (Mk.10.45b) and the saying concerning the service of the Son of man (Mk.10.45a).

Despite the linguistic differences between Mk.10.45b and Mk.14.24 the parallels between the two sayings are so close that it is highly probable that they are variant translations of the semantic original spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper. If this is so the reference to serving in Mk.10.45a would help to explain how the eucharistic words of Jesus have been attracted to

1. Cf below pp. 515ff.

2. Cf below pp. 234ff.

3. Mk.10.45b δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν
Mk.14.24 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου ----- τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον

this context.

Miss Hooker has contested that the saying is a reference to the ‘ebhed on the grounds that ‘asham is rendered by Περὶ ἁμαρτίας in the LXX of Isa. 53.10, that λύτρον is never used to translate ‘asham in the LXX, and that λύτρον is used in the LXX especially of God's acts of deliverance by which he freed his people from bondage at the Exodus and at the long-awaited return from exile. All that this proves, however, is that Mk. 10.45b is not dependent on the LXX, and there is no good reason why Mark should have confined his translation to that used by the LXX. Fuller regards it as 'a perfectly adequate rendering' of ‘asham.

We conclude, therefore, that behind Mk. 10.45 lies the Son of man saying about serving which has attracted to it the ‘ebhed saying taken from the eucharistic word of Jesus and dependent on Isa. 53.10ff.

Since the word λύτρον occurs only here and in its parallel in Mt. 20.28 and its background is most probably the ‘asham saying in Isa. 53, the most likely exegesis of Mk. 10.45b is that Jesus is presented as the ‘ebhed who gave his life as an ‘asham to create the new Israel by the new Exodus he was to accomplish. The doctrine of salvation that it presents is therefore thoroughly Jewish and not, as Bultmann suggests, a 'Hellenistic-Christian doctrine of salvation.'

Further, since Mark also knows of the tradition of Jesus' avowal of abstention at the Last Supper (Mk. 14.25 which, appearing after the words of institution, suggests that Jesus did eat the Passover meal with his disciples but now declares that he will not do so again until the kingdom of God has come) he knows that closely associated with the suffering of the ‘ebhed is his glorious vindication through which his mission will be accomplished. Thus it is not insignificant that Mk. 10.45 follows on the contention among the disciples about who is to be greatest (Mk. 10.35f) and Jesus' promise to them that they will drink the cup he drinks and be baptized with his baptism (Mk. 10.39). As verse 40 shows this means that they most certainly will be with him in his kingdom,

-
1. M.D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, 1959, pp. 76-78; Son of Man, 1967, p.144 cf also C.K. Barrett, 'The Background of Mark 10.45' in New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, 1959, p.6; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1957 pp. 72 ff.
 2. R.H. Fuller, Mission and Achievement, 1954, p.57; cf G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 1922, p.119 'the expression has probably its biblical background in Isa. 53.10f.'; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.45ff.
 3. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.154

though it is not within his power to grant any of them positions of authority in that kingdom. Then follows Jesus' new conception of power as service (Mk. 10. 41ff). In other words this εβηδ saying is set by Mark in a context which speaks of an assurance to the disciples that they will share in the new community which will be created, and of the concept of power that must characterise that community.

Although Mk. 10. 45b is not to be ascribed to Jesus in this context, the use to which Mark has put this piece of tradition shows us that he has understood the work of the εβηδ Jesus to be to suffer and to die and yet to be exalted to create through this the new community who would derive their life from Jesus and share with him in the messianic banquet of the kingdom.

(e) The εβηδ in John's Gospel

In John's Gospel only in Jn. 12. 38 is a specific quotation of an εβηδ passage from Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 53. 1) applied to Jesus. In fact there are remarkably few such quotations in the New Testament. It is probable, however, that Jn. 12. 38 is traditional in both form and content. This is so because while Jn. 12. 38 follows the LXX of Isa. 53. 1, the citation of Isa. 6. 10 in the immediately following verse (Jn. 12. 40) departs radically from the LXX; and while the introductory formula of Jn. 12. 40 reveals a typically Johannine style this is not so of the introductory formula of Jn. 12. 38. Bultmann ascribes Jn. 12. 37f to the 'σημεία source' used by the evangelist. Be that as it may the fact that the LXX of Isa. 53. 1 is used also by Paul in Rom. 10. 16 makes it probable that John was familiar with a primitive tradition which applied Deutero-Isaiah's εβηδ to Jesus.

What is significant is the context in which John applies this primitive citation of Isa. 53. The text is cited as scriptural proof of the unbelief concerning Jesus (Jn. 12. 37), but the immediately preceding context has spoken of

1. Mat. 8. 17 (Isa. 53. 4): 12. 18-21 (Isa. 42. 1-4); Lk. 22. 37 (Isa. 53. 12); Jn. 12. 38 (Isa. 53. 1); Acts 8. 32f (Isa. 53. 7f); 13. 47 (Isa. 49. 6 LXX. It cannot be said with certainty that the twofold σε is related to Jesus and not to the apostles. But the introduction, οὕτως γὰρ ἐνέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, and a comparison with Acts 26. 18 makes it probable that the saying is related to Jesus); Rom. 15. 21 (Isa. 52. 15). This has led M. D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, 1959, to the conclusion that neither Jesus nor the early Church attached any particular Christological or soteriological significance to the εβηδ texts of Deutero-Isaiah. This distortion of the picture (cf. E. Lohse, Martyrer und Gottesknecht in FRL, Vol. 64, 1963, pp. 220-224) is occasioned by her unwarranted limitation of her study to explicit quotations and to the idea of vicarious suffering. Cf. also Review by J. Jeremias in JTS, 1960.
2. διὰ τούτο ὅτι cf. R. Bultmann, Johannes, 1950, p. 346, n4; 177, n5.
3. ibid p. 346, 422.

the 'hour' of Jesus (Jn. 12.23, 27, cf 31), his 'glorification' (Jn. 12.23, 28) and his being 'lifted up' (Jn. 12.32).

In John's Gospel the 'hour' of Jesus refers sometimes quite explicitly to his death. Thus in Jn.7.30 we read that no man laid hands on Jesus despite their angry reaction to his words 'because his hour was not yet come' (cf also 8.20). Equally explicit is the use of Jesus' 'Hour' to refer to his ascension. Thus Jn.13.1; 'Now, before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father....' and Jn.17.1; 'These things spake Jesus, lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that the Son may glorify thee...' and then in Jn.17.5 he continues 'and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' In our passage in Jn.12.27 Jesus prays; 'Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour' which 'hour', we are told in Jn.12.23, is the 'hour' when he is to be 'glorified'. Immediately John records Jesus as going on to say; 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.' It is clear, therefore, that the 'hour' for which Jesus came is his death and exaltation by which he would bear 'much fruit' and so
1.
bring in the new age.

Little needs to be added to what Dodd has said about the way in which John holds together in the closest possible way the death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, which complex event he describes as the 'glorification'
2.
of Jesus. In this passage, as Jn.12.24 makes plain, the glorification of Jesus is associated with his death (the death and burial of a grain of wheat) and his rising to bear much fruit.

The saying about the 'lifting up' of Jesus in Jn.12.32 is derived from
3.
the Son of man saying in Jn.3.14. The primary meaning of the 'lifting up' must be to the ascension in Jn.3.14 in view of Jn.3.13 which speaks quite explicitly of his ascending into heaven. To Jn.12.32 John adds the interpretative comment; 'this he said, signify¹¹⁴ by what manner of death he should die.' However, the addition of the phrase ἐκ τῆς γῆς and the repetition of the theme of Jn.12.24 in the assertion that the 'lifting up' of Jesus is in order that he 'will draw

1. Cf C.K. Barrett, John, 1955 on Jn.2.4; C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 300ff.

2. ibid pp.120ff.

3. cf below pp365ff.

all men unto' himself, makes it evident that 'lifting up' here means not only the cross but also the resurrection and ascension.

The context of Jn.12.38 contains the three essential themes of Isa. 52 and 53; the passion of the ebhed, his vindication, and the creation of the community. This indicates that it was in this way that the ebhed Yahweh of Deutero-Isaiah was interpreted and applied to Jesus in the primitive community. The introduction of the theme of the Son of man in Jn.12.23, 32 (cf 3.14),¹34, where the emphasis lies unmistakably on the glory and triumph, proves that the primitive Church never did isolate the theme of redemptive suffering from the redemptive exaltation of Jesus.

In addition to this direct quotation from Isa.53.1 there are allusions² to the ebhed in the baptismal narrative. We have already seen this in Jn.1.34. It is now widely recognised that the peculiar phrase; ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in Jn.1.29,36 is a translation of an Aramaic phrase which spoke of the talya' de'laha³ and which can mean (a) the Lamb of God, (b) the boy, the servant of God. This is supported by the reference of Jn.1.29b ὁ ἀίρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου⁴ the ebhed phrase Isa.53.12 (wehu' het' rabbim nasa').⁴

Most clearly, therefore, a primitive aramaic source stands behind John's account of the baptism of Jesus which sets the whole of the mission of Jesus in⁵ the context of the spirit-endowed ebhed Yahweh of Deutero-Isaiah. But if Jesus is the spirit-endowed ebhed he is certainly the one who is to baptize with the Holy Spirit. It is a pity that Cullmann's otherwise excellent analysis of the ebhed in John limits the task of the ebhed to the death of Jesus. As Jn.7.39 makes plain the bestowal of the spirit is consequent upon the 'glorification' of Jesus. The death of Jesus is certainly not merely incidental to his glorification,⁶ but nor is it the whole of it. The fulfilment of the work of the ebhed in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit is consequent upon his 'glorification'

6. cf above p 59

5. Jn.1.33

4. Cf J.Jeremias, art ἀίρων, ἐπαίρων, TWNT, Vol 1, pp 25ff. 185.

1. Cf below Part 1, chapter 3.

2. Cf above p 39.

3. J.Jeremias, art. ἀμνὸς κτλ in TWNT Vol 1, 342f; 'Ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ - πᾶσι Θεοῦ' in ZNW, Vol 34, 1935, pp 115-123; C.F. Burney, Aramaic Origin, 1922, 107f; G.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, 1947, p 91, n.4; O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p. 21, n.1; Early Christian Worship, 1953, p 65f; Christology, 1959, pp71f. The doubts expressed by C.H. Dodd (in his discussion of the ἀμνὸς article in TWNT) in JTS, Vol 34, 1933, p 285 based on the fact that the Targ. Isa renders ebhed by abhda' not talya' cannot be sustained in view of the fact there is evidence of talya' as the Aramaic equivalent of 'ebhed, cf J.Jeremias, Servant, 1965p 47 n 156, 83 n 356

in his death, resurrection, and ascension. This is fulfilled when on Easter
 1.
 day the ascended Jesus appears to the disciples and breathes on them and says
 'receive ye the Holy Spirit' (Jn.20.22).

The task of the ebhed Jesus, who is endowed with the Spirit, is thus
 seen to be to raise up the Spirit-endowed community through his life, death,
 resurrection and ascension (cf Jn.12.32, 11.52).

(f) The ebhed in Paul

Here we note again that Paul's use of the ebhed Yahweh is dependent
 on a pre-Pauline stock of tradition and formulae. Mention must first be made of
 2.
 the archaic confession of 1 Cor.15.3-5 which contains Semitic features, and of
 which the κατά τὰς γραφάς of verse 3, in view of the ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ,
 3.
 must be a reference to Isa.53. To this pre-Pauline tradition belong also the
 4. 5.
 eucharistic words of 1 Cor.11.23-25, the christological formula of Rom.4.25,
 6. 7.
 the christological hymn in Phil.2.6-11, the confessional formula of Rom.8.34,
 and the expression (παρ)έδωκεν ἑαυτὸν (Gal.1.4; 2.20; Eph.5.2,25; cf 1 Tim.2.6;
 8.
 Titus 2.14) which in all instances is connected with the ὑπὲρ formula. The

1. Cf above p.42.

2. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.129ff.

3. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.76; J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p.89

4. Cf above p.54f; below pp. 569ff.

5. Παρέδοθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν Rom.4.25a corresponds to Targ. Isa.53.
 5b, 'ithmesar ba'awiyathana', and, by contrast the LXX of Isa.53.12 (διὰ τὰς
 ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρέδοθη differs both in vocabulary and the personal pronoun. For the
 pre-Pauline character of the formula, cf E.Stauffer, New Testament Theology,
 1955, pp.132, 136; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol.1 1, 1959,
 p.31.

6. For the pre-Pauline and Semitic character of the hymn cf E.Lohmeyer, 'Kyrios
Jesus in SHA, No.4, 1927-28 (for excellent summary cf R.P. Martin, Carmen
 Christi, 1967, pp.38-41.) The connection between Phil.2.6-11 and Isa.53 is
 supported among others by E. Lohmeyer, op.cit. pp.32f,35ff,40-42; G.Kittel, art
 ὑπάκοη, ὑπήκοος TWNT, Vol. 1, p.225,234-237; G. Stählin, ἴσος, κτλ TWNT
 Vol.111,p.354; G.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, 1947, p.193f; W.D.Davies, Paul
 and Rabbinic Judaism, 1955, p.247; O.Cullmann, Christology, 1959, 76f. This con-
 nection has been disputed by K.H. Rengstorf, art δούλος κτλ, TWNT, Vol.11, pp.
 281f. It is to be noted, however, that Phil.2.10f follows the LXX, but in Phil.
 2.6-9 the terminology is derived from the Hebrew text of Isa.53. The decisive
 proof of this is the expression ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (Phil.2.7) which is attested
 nowhere else in Greek and is grammatically very harsh, but is an exact rendering
 of he'erah napshe of Isa.53.12. (So J.A.T. Robinson, The Body 1952, p.14.n.1.;
 C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1953,p.93; J.Jeremias, Servant, 1965,p.98
 and n.445). The semitic character of the hymn removes the objection of Rengstorf
 for δούλος is a perfectly legitimate translation of ebhed even though the nor-
 mal translation of the LXX is πᾶσις. Apart from other verbal echoes (cf J.Jere-
 mias, Servant, 1965, p.98 n.446) allusion to Isa.53 is seen in the contrast of
 humiliation and exaltation, and in the mention of obedience and death.

7. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1953, p.94 shows that this is taken from
 the end of Isa.53.12 but is independent of the LXX. In Apostolic Preaching,
 1956, p.14 he shows that this is derived from a pre-Pauline kerygma.

8. The pre-Pauline age of the tradition rests on translation variants of barabbim
 in Isa.53.12 (cf J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p.96 and n.435).

references to Isa. 53.12 in Rom. 5.16,19 (πολλοί, οί πολλοί) are probably also ^{1.} traditional as suggested by the fact that the Hebrew text is in the background. The use of Isa. 53.1 (LXX) quoted in Rom. 10.16 is probably traditional in view ^{2.} of its use in Jn. 12.38. Rom. 8.32 is dependent on the LXX of Isa. 53.6 and so ^{3.} cannot be ascribed with any confidence to a pre-Pauline tradition. The only reference to an ebhed passage which can undoubtedly be ascribed to Paul himself ^{4.} is Rom. 15.21 where he grounds his missionary activity in Isa. 53.12 (LXX). This proves that the christological use by Paul of Deutero-Isaiah's ebhed was derived from a very primitive and largely semitic tradition.

More important than this, however, is the use to which Paul puts this ebhed christology and soteriology in his letters.

(i) 1 Cor. 15.3-5

Jeremias is undoubtedly correct when he says 'that scripture proof for the death on the cross belonged to the most primitive kerygma and that it was carried out with the help of Isa. 53, is shown conclusively by 1. Cor. 15.3. Its importance may be measured by the great number of instances and variety of the ^{5.} formulae.' Yet it is equally true, though seldom noted, that 1. Cor. 15.4 also speaks of the resurrection of Jesus being *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*. If the scriptural proof in 1 Cor. 15.3 is to Isa. 53, so probably is the scriptural proof in 1 Cor. 15.4. It is clear, therefore, that the primitive kerygma based on Isa. 53 was of the death and resurrection of the ebhed, and most certainly Paul understood the resurrection to be a vital aspect of the forgiveness of sins for in this great passage on the resurrection he states explicitly 'if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins' (1 Cor. 15.17). Thus Paul knows that Christ, as much as the ebhed of Isa. 53 suffers and dies 'for our sins' and that the redemption that is brought through that suffering is inalienably linked with the miracle of the exaltation.

(ii) Rom. 4.25.

This is confirmed by Rom. 4.25; 'Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification'. While we have seen that the ^{6.} first half of this verse is dependent on the Targ. Isa. 53.5b, the second half is

1. J. Jeremias, art *πολλοί*, TWNT, Vol. VI, pp. 543; A. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p. 77. 543;

2. Cf above p. 58.

3. Rom. 8.32 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, Isa. 53.6 (LXX) καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν

4. J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p. 89

5. Ibid p. 90, n 405, p. 91, n 414; p. 94.

6. Cf above p. 61 n 5.

probably a free rendering of the Hebrew text of Isa.53.10,11. The fact that Paul elsewhere couples justification with the death of Christ (cf Rom. 3.24f; 5.9) suggests that this whole verse is derived from a pre-Pauline tradition concerning the ^{1.} ebhed Jesus.

As Quell and Schrenk have shown in the first clause *διὰ* is causal, meaning that Christ was delivered up because of our trespasses, and in the second ^{2.} it states purpose, meaning that Christ was raised up to effect our justification. This does not mean that Paul is inconsistent when he couples justification with both the death and resurrection of Christ, but rather that both belong inseparably ^{3.} together. Together they constitute our justification.

But how are we to understand the concept 'justification'? The root meaning of the verb *δικαιόω* is 'to account or pronounce right'. It is thus a ^{4.} forensic metaphor describing the sovereign act of God in acquitting the guilty. But for the Hebrew mind, and Paul was a Hebrew, the concept of justification meant 'an act by which a wronged person is given his rights, is vindicated, ^{5.} delivered from oppression.' When Deutero-Isaiah looked forward to the coming righteousness of Yahweh, he thought of it in terms of the 'justification' of his people, i.e., their deliverance from bondage and suffering. It is clear that both the Greek and Hebrew senses are to be understood here. By the sovereign act of God he has delivered the many, His people, and acquitted them.

In Rom. 3.24f Paul links justification with the *ἀπολύτρωσις* which is in Christ, and with Christ himself as being set forth as a *ἱλαστήριον*. In the writings and inscriptions of this period *ἀπολύτρωσις* is commonly used with reference to the liberation of slaves or prisoners of war, which was frequently effected by the payment of a sum of money as a ransom. But Paul's use is not concrete, as the English word 'ransom' suggests, but refers to the act of ^{6.} delivering. Again Paul's usage is coloured by his Hebrew background. When the children of Israel were liberated from bondage in Egypt, they were regarded as slaves 'redeemed' by Yahweh; and Deutero-Isaiah spoke of the liberation from ^{7.} captivity in Babylon (or from the dispersion) as redemption. In Gal. 3.23-4.5 ^{8.} Paul speaks of the work of Christ as being the emancipation of the people of God

1. A. Nygren, *Romans*, 1955, p. 184.

2. G. Quell & G. Schrenk, art *δικαιοσύνη* κτλ *TWNT*, Vol IV, p.124ff.

3. *ibid*; A. Nygren, *Romans*, 1955, p. 184.

4. C.H. Dodd, *Romans*, 1959, p. 75, G. Quell & G. Schrenk, *op. cit.* p. 130.

5. C.H. Dodd, *op.cit.*, p.76.

6. *ibid* p. 77.

7. e.g. Deut. 7.8.

8. Isa. 51.11.

from bondage - a parallel to the redemption of Israel from Egypt and Babylon. What is essential to this concept is that this 'justification' which means 'liberation' is an act of God performed on behalf of his people, Israel. In fact these acts are the very cause of Israel's life. They are Israel-making acts.

The word ἱλαστήριον, which is usually translated 'propitiation', and is found only here in the New Testament, is the LXX translation of the Hebrew ^{1.} kapporeth, rendered in English as mercy-seat. Kapporeth is derived from the same root as kipper which we have seen bears the complex meaning of 'to forgive', 'to restore the covenant', 'to purify for worship', and 'to restore to the commu-^{2.} nity'. Thus kapporeth would be better rendered as the place of the restoration of the covenant community with Yahweh. When Paul speaks of God setting forth Christ as a ἱλαστήριον through faith in his blood, the most natural understanding of this for a Hebrew would be that Christ is the one through whose sacrifice the community in a covenant relationship with Yahweh is created.

Thus for Paul the death and resurrection of the ἱεβhed Yahweh which is for the purpose of our justification in Rom. 4.25 means that Jesus is the means whereby God has acquitted the guilty, has liberated the captive, has forgiven the sinner, and has created the new people of God. The death and resurrection which is for 'our justification' does not refer to the justification of so many individuals as individuals, but of the justification of the new community and thus of all its members as members of the community. This contention, as we shall see later, is borne out by Paul's use of his favourite metaphor^{3.} of the community, the body of Christ.

(iii) Rom. 8.32-34.

For our purpose it is particularly significant to note that the citation of Isa. 53.12 in Rom. 8.34 links the intercession of the ἱεβhed with the resurrection and ascension; that the community creating significance of the 'delivering up' of the ἱεβhed (Rom. 8.32) is asserted in the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων and in the assertion that God justifies his elect (Rom. 8.33); and that this citation of the ἱεβhed is embedded in Paul's great chapter on the Spirit (Rom. 8.1ff)

1. Cf Lev. 16.14. The only biblical references to it are as follows: (i) those having to do with the construction of the 'ark'; Ex. 25.17,18,19,20,21,22; 26.34; 30.6; 31.17; 35.12; 37.6-9; 39.35; 40.20 (ii) those having to do with the rites of Yom Kippur; Lev. 16.2.13-15; (iii) Nu. 7.89, where Yahweh spoke from the kapporeth.
2. cf above pp. 32f.
3. cf below pp. 438ff.

(iv) Rom. 5.15, 19.

The Israel-making significance of the ‘ebhed is enforced not only by the use of οἱ πολλοί as a translation of the rabbim of Isa. 53.12, but also by the nature of Paul's argument in Rom. 5.12ff. The whole argument depends on semitic totality thinking. Paul has argued that through the sin of the first man, Adam, all men have been caused to become sinners and are thus subject to death (Rom. 5.12). His argument is that because of the sin of Adam no man is a free agent but in the historical and social solidarity of all men in Adam, Adam's sin continues to hold man in bondage. Now in Christ a new thing has happened, and the possibility of a new solidarity has opened up for man. Because of Christ's obedience (Rom. 5.19) 'The many', included in the new solidarity in Christ, are caused to become righteous.

There is no doubting that the note of universalism found in Deutero-Isaiah is present here, but it is equally clear that it is not an individualistic universalism any more than was that of Deutero-Isaiah. For Paul, Christ alone is the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3.16), i.e. he alone is Israel, and salvation is by being included in Christ. Thus οἱ πολλοί are justified by being included in Christ, i.e. included in Israel, and therefore the phrase must bear the same corporate meaning as 'the body of Christ', being the corporate personality of Christ.

(v) Gal. 1.4; 2.20; Eph. 5.2,25; 1 Tim. 2.6; Tit. 2.14.

The concept of Christ 'giving himself' associated with the ὁ υπέρ formula in most of these verses expresses the unity of ^{the} Christian with Christ (Gal.2.20) or the corporate significance of the community which is 'in Christ' (Gal. 1.4; Eph. 5.25; Tit. 2.14).

(vi) Phil. 2.6-11.

For our purposes the significance of this hymn is firstly that its theme is not simply that of the humble life and obedient death of the ‘ebhed, but also his exaltation' by God (Phil.2.9ff). It is particularly significant that while Phil. 2.10f follows the LXX, verse 9, which explicitly mentions his exaltation, is widely held to follow the Hebrew text of Isa. 53. This suggests

1. Cf below pp. 388ff.
2. Cf below p. 403ff.
3. Cf below p. 403ff
4. Cf above p. 16, 30ff.
5. Cf below pp. 422ff
6. Cf below pp. 438ff
7. Cf above p. 61, n.6.

that this very primitive hymn depended on Isa 53 not simply for its interpretation of the death of Christ but also his exaltation. Secondly, Paul has used this hymn to illustrate the quality of love for and service of one another which should characterise the Christian community.

(vii) 2 Cor. 5.21

It is probable that τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίας¹ of 2 Cor. 5.21 is derived from Isa. 53.9b. Here Paul states that Jesus fulfilled the rôle of the *ebhed 'that we might become the righteousness of God in him'. Such a turn of phrase is unusual to both Greek and modern European minds. It was not unusual to a Hebrew for whom there was little distinction between the 'righteous' character of Yahweh, and his 'righteous acts' in delivering his people. Thus the rôle of the *ebhed is fulfilled when we are incorporated into Christ to participate in the deliverance that God has brought about through him. In this the righteousness of God is revealed, and it can therefore be said that we are the righteousness of God 'in him'.

(g) Conclusion

As a result of this analysis we see that the use of the *ebhed Yahweh as applied to the person and work of Christ was very primitive, and belonged to a Semitic rather than Hellenistic tradition. More important is the fact that the title was never applied corporately by the primitive Church but was used to refer to the individual, Jesus. The only possible 'corporate' use is that Jesus alone is regarded as Abraham's seed, Israel, but it does not refer to Jesus and his disciples in a collective sense. At the same time the early Church quite clearly did not restrict its use of the *ebhed Yahweh to the redemptive death of Jesus but as in Isa. 52, 53 points to the miracle of God's vindication of the *ebhed in his exaltation (resurrection and ascension). But this vindication is intimately associated with the bestowal of the Spirit. He who was anointed with the Spirit at his baptism is he who baptizes with the Spirit. Finally, the concept of the work of the *ebhed being barabbim is applied to Christ as the one who has achieved man's deliverance through his death and resurrection and created the new community which is 'in him' (2 Cor. 5.21). As the *ebhed Jesus is seen not simply as the historical founder of a group of religious associates, but as the creator and sustainer of the new people of God. As we saw in the ὁ ἴσους

1. W. Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, Servant, 1965, p. 97 n.441; O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.77.

^{1.}
 πολλῶν formula of the eucharistic words and the λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν of
^{2.}
 Mk. 10.45 the redemption wrought by the εἰς is conceived of corporately and
^{3.}
 not individually, and as we saw in our analysis of the εἰς in Paul the identity
 of the community is that of Christ himself; it exists as the redeemed community
^{4.}
 only 'in Christ'. In this sense, while it would be true to say that the title
εἰς is used only of Jesus, the title comes to bear a corporate and inclusive
 sense of establishing the closest possible links between the Christian community
 and Christ. It is this that makes the title of Jesus as the εἰς significant
 to the Christian community which understands itself as a closely knit corporate
 entity rather than to Christians who believe themselves to be redeemed individually
 without this necessarily implying a community existence.

It is not without significance that the work of the εἰς in Deutero-
 Isaiah is barabbim and that the clearest traces of the εἰς in the New Testament
 are to be found in the cultic rites of baptism and the eucharist. This in itself
 demonstrates that the early Church clearly understood the community significance
 of the title and the corporate character of their existence in relation to the
^{5.}
εἰς. At the same time this points to the necessity of placing the sacraments
 in their fundamental New Testament setting of the corporate Christian community
 and its theological self-interpretation.

1. Cf above pp. 54f.

2. Cf above pp. 56f.

3. Cf above pp. 61f.

4. For a more detailed analysis of the meaning of this cf below pp. 422ff.

5. Cf above pp. 3f.

CHAPTER 2.THE MESSIAH.A. OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND.

The second important title to which we must give our attention is the familiar one of Messiah or Christ. 'Christ' is a transliteration of the Greek $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ which is the translation of the Hebrew mashiah and the Aramaic meshiha and means 'the anointed one'. What did the title involve?

In later Judaism the term 'Messiah' denotes an eschatological figure. As Mowinckel has noted 'to use the word "Messiah" is to imply eschatology, the last things.' I hope to show that to use the term 'Messiah' implies not only eschatology but also the messianic community. There can be no Messiah without a messianic community, and the application of the title to an historic person implies that those who use this title are aware of themselves as the eschatological messianic community.

The word 'Messiah' as a title originated in later Judaism. It does not occur as a technical term for the king of the final age in the Old Testament, yet it is in the Old Testament that the basic essentials of the later concept are laid, and it is these which we must examine in order to grasp the significance of the later usage.

The expression hammashiah is really a shortened form of meshiah Yahweh (Yahweh's anointed), referring to the reigning king in Israel. In Practically every passage in the Old Testament where the expression 'Yahweh's anointed' or 'the anointed one' occurs, the reference is to the contemporary king of David's dynasty. As Yahweh's anointed he is king of Yahweh's people, Israel. The connexion between the designation of an actual historical person as 'Yahweh's anointed' and the later technical use of hammashiah referring to an eschatological deliverer is inherent in the early double meaning of the term; namely, that the Messiah was not only an eschatological figure but was also of political significance. The Messiah is he who will restore Israel as a people, free her from her enemies, rule over her as her king, and bring other nations under her political and religious sway. This conception of the future king as an earthly political figure is clearly and explicitly present in most, if not all, the passages in the

1. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p. 3.

Old Testament which refer to him. It remained the dominant popular conception at the time of Jesus. While the word gains an eschatological significance the early political sense is never entirely lost and remains the basic, if transformed concept of the Messiah in later Judaism.

(a) The pre-exilic period

Mowinckel has shown most convincingly that the concept of the Messiah was derived from the ideal of kingship in Ancient Israel, which in turn was borrowed from Israel's neighbours.¹ But Israel did not take over unaltered either Canaanite religion nor the sacral kingship connected with it. The king was not regarded as a god. The attitude of Israel to their king is characteristically expressed in the terms used of his relation to Yahweh, Yahweh's anointed. Anointing was the cultic act which first and foremost ratified the king's status as the chosen of Yahweh, and as divinely installed.² This cultic act conveyed extraordinary 'holy' or 'divine' faculties and qualities.³

The enthronement of the king was carried out with elaborate ceremonial,⁴ in which the crucial act was the anointing of the king. Through it Yahweh's choice was confirmed and consummated, the king was 'made king', and divine power and equipment were conferred upon him.⁵ Not only is he thus made chief and ruler of God's people but he also receives power to deliver his people from her enemies.⁶⁷⁸

Israel believed that the king was endowed with these powers as a result of Yahweh's spirit which had 'come into him', had 'clothed itself with him', had been 'poured into him'. It is the charismatic, divine equipment with power, the ability to perform extraordinary deeds, the quality of 'holiness' as a miraculous power which is akin to that of a divine being, which is expressed by the concept of being endowed with the spirit of Yahweh. The later tradition says explicitly that when David was anointed 'the spirit of Yahweh leaped upon him'. When the earlier tradition relates that the first experience which Saul had after being anointed was that Yahweh's spirit came upon him so that he raved in ecstatic frenzy with the nebi'im,⁹ the writer does not regard this as a mere coincidence,

1. ibid pp. 21ff; also in S. Mowinckel, Psalmen Studien, 11 esp. pp. 67ff.

2. Ps. 2.6

3. C.J. Gadd, Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East, 1948, pp. 49ff.

4. Cf 2 Sam 15.10ff; 1 Ki. 1.32-53; 2 Ki. 11.9f.

5. 2 Ki. 11.12.

6. 1 Sam 10. 1-6; Isa. 11.2ff.

7. 1 Sam 10.1

8. 1 Sam 9.16

9. 1 Sam. 10

but as the appropriate and natural consequence of his anointing. In Isa. 61.1 too, the prophet presupposes as generally acknowledged the connexion between anointing and endowment with the spirit.

By this anointing with the spirit the king receives a 'new Heart', he is changed into a new man. This is expressed, according to Oriental custom, in giving him a new name which indicates his new and intimate relationship with the god who has chosen him and whom he represents.

By this same anointing with the spirit, the king is endowed with wisdom, power, and 'eternal (i.e. extremely long) life'. In the legend about the birth of Saul, the founder of the monarchy, we hear not only of his election from the womb but also of the marvellous birth of the child. The requested saviour king is born as a gift from Yahweh to the childless mother. It is this wonderful divine pre-destination and gift of Yahweh to his people that is confirmed in the oracle pronounced at the enthronement of the king.

All of this points to the belief that the king stands closer than any other Israelite to Yahweh. He is his 'son', begotten of him. The people say to the king 'Yahweh your God'. But as Yahweh is the God of all the earth, his 'son' has a rightful claim to dominion over all the earth. The prophetic author of Psalm 2 sees this coming fulfilment at the enthronement of a new king in Jerusalem.

The endowment with the spirit confers upon the king those gifts which are summed up in two terms, 'righteousness' and 'blessing'. This 'righteousness' means basically 'being right' with Yahweh, or living according to Yahweh's justice according to Israelite custom. In a wider sense it means not only the king's own will to live by these customs, but also the God-given ability to

-
1. 1 Sam. 10.6, 9
 2. On the change of name among the Hebrew's at the king's enthronement of A.M. Honeyman, 'The evidence for regnal names among the Hebrews' in *JBL*, Vol. 67, 1948, pp 13ff; among the Egyptians and Sumerians of H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 1948, pp 103, 246.
 3. 2 Sam. 14.17ff; 23.1ff; Ps. 2.7
 4. 1 Sam. 10.1ff; cf 9.6ff.
 5. 1 Ki. 1.31; Ps. 21.5; 72.5 (cf E. Jenni, 'Das Wort Olam im Alten Testament' in *ZAW*, Vol. 65, 1953, pp.1ff.
 6. 1 Sam. 1. It was observed long ago that the legend about the birth of Samuel was originally associated with Saul, the first king. This is evident from the explanation of the child's name in 1 Sam. 1.20-28; 'I have asked him (She'iltiw) from Yahweh' ... he is one who is asked (Sha'ul) of Yahweh', which is clearly an explanation not of the name Shemu'el but Sha'ul.
 7. Ps. 110.
 8. Ps. 2.7
 9. 2 Sam. 14.17
 10. Ps. 2.8; 72.8-10; 89.20ff.
 11. Ps. 72.2

maintain the customs, rights, and prosperity of the community under the covenant.

This means, firstly, the king's ability to 'save his people from their enemies'. At home and abroad he secures justice, prosperity and salvation for his people. It also means that the king rules Yahweh's people with justice and equity. Therefore the righteous (i.e. Yahweh's people who live by his laws and customs) will flourish in his days, and the land will enjoy great prosperity.

This bringing about of blessing to the people is not to be understood simply in terms of political administration and military acumen. Being possessed of Yahweh's spirit and holiness he is able to bestow it on the community and its land. Without him and his blessing the people would be spilt as water on the ground which cannot be collected again. In his time too there will be an abundance of corn on every hill in the land; its fruit will shake like Lebanon; and men will blossom forth from the cities like the grass of the earth. Thus under Yahweh's king the land and the people will reap all that the Israelite hoped for, all that is meant by shalom, peace or wholeness of life: fertility of man, beast, and crop; health; a large family; long life; victory over enemies; and the ideal social relations within the community. He is the instrument whereby Yahweh realizes every blessing for his community, Israel.

According to a common primitive mode of thought, which Israel shared with her neighbours, the king is the 'visible embodiment of the supreme ego, society. The entire soul of the society is embodied in the king in a special way; and, in particular, the soul of the ancestor lives on through him.' The entire land and people are his household and family, just as the family is the household of the ancestor of the family. As the family lives in the ancestor or head of the family in whom its life is concentrated, so the life of the nation is concentrated in the king. In a sense the king and the people are identical, since the entire people is embodied in the king. He therefore should reflect in his own person the highest ideals of the people and bring into reality those ideals not only in himself but also in the people. 'Since Israel, through her faith in election and covenant, became conscious of her special vocation, of being chosen for

1. 1 Sam. 9.16; 10.1; Ps. 110.2, 5f; 132.18; 21.9f.

2. Ps. 72.2-4, 12-14.

3. Ps. 72.7

4. 2 Sam. 14.14.

5. Ps. 72.6, 16

6. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.69f.

7. Thus Bit-Humri, 'the household of Omri' is the oldest name given to Israel by the Assyrians, who first encountered it during the dynasty of Omri.

8. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, 1959, pp.46 ff.

a glorious future, it would naturally be the task of the king to make real to the people her peculiar destiny in the world. In other words the king became (or should have become) the visible bearer and expression of the religious and moral ideals of Israel.¹

If the king fulfilled this requirement it would react on the people by virtue of the mutual participation in each other's being which, in ancient thought existed between the leader and the community. The people would become what the king was. If he was righteous, pious, and godly, so would the people be. If on the other hand the king turned away from Yahweh and worshipped him wrongly (i.e. not according to Israelite custom) or worshipped other gods, then the people would, by virtue of the same principle, be ungodly and guilty. This is the fundamental idea of the Deuteronomic book of Kings.² This principle applied no matter what the attitude of the individual in the community was to Yahweh and his law. Thus it was believed that the king held the destiny of the people in his hands according to the kind of man he was.

With this link between the community and the king, Israel's miseries and suffering became associated with the failures of her kings and equally her hope of restoration and prosperity became inextricably linked to the hope of a coming 'anointed one' who would be truly righteous. While the monarchy still stood as an institution, this was never an eschatological hope, but was centred on some actual historical person who would fulfil and realize this hope for the community. Thus the hope of the famous 'messianic' passage in Isa. 9.1-6 about the coming child, probably refers to the anticipated birth of a prince who would come to the throne to fulfil this great hope.³ This is true also of the 'Immanuel' prophecy of Isa. 7.⁴

In its earliest expression, then, the messianic hope is not associated with eschatology but with a dream of shalom to be brought about by Yahweh through his 'anointed one', the actual reigning king of Israel or his legitimate successor. The failure of Israel's kings meant that the dream was not fulfilled and so lived on as a hope for the future, but it was always within the present

-
1. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.70 (on the basis of this embodiment of the people in the person of the king it is easy to see how the ancient Israelites could interpret the bestowal of divine gifts and blessings on the king as the bestowal of such gifts and blessings on the nation itself.)
 2. Cf 1 Ki. 11.12f, 32; 2 Ki. 20.6; 22.18f.
 3. For a full discussion of this cf S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, pp. 102-110.
 4. ibid pp.110-122.

existing order, and what it looked for was the establishment of Israel in peace and prosperity.

(b) The post-exilic period

This hope of ancient Israel becomes specifically a hope for the future with the events of 586 B.C. when the monarchy fell and Israel became a captive people under foreign dominion. The prophets of doom had long foretold this event, and in it Jeremiah and his few friends saw the triumph of Yahweh. From that time onwards the hope of restoration became a constant element of the prophetic message. The national and political restoration for which they hoped and longed, and in which they fervently believed, on the basis of Yahweh's election of and covenant with them, is depicted in patterns drawn from the ideas associated with the enthronement of the king. The main features of this 'new' hope were:

1. the political and national deliverance of Israel, the restoration of the dynasty of David as Yahweh's instrument for the fulfilment of the restored community,
2. the reunion of the two kingdoms,
3. the destruction of heathen powers,
4. the return of the Diaspora,
5. the religious and moral restoration of the people including judgement on sinners and traitors,
6. and a marvellous fertility of land, people, and cattle,
7. and peace among the nations.
- 8.

Bound up with this was the restoration and glorification of Jerusalem as the political and religious centre of the world, to which pilgrims will come from all the nations to pay homage to the God of Israel, where they will not hurt or destroy because they will all know Yahweh, and all be consecrated to him. A

- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.

-
1. Isa. 9.3; 10.27; 14.25; 52.2; Jer. 30.8; Ezek. 34.27.
 2. Isa. 11.13f; Jer. 3.18; 31.27; 33.7; Ezek. 37.15-22; Hos. 2.2f; 3.5; Obad. 18; Zech. 8.13; 9.10-13; 10.5f; 11.4-17; 13.7-9. For the restoration of the dynasty Isa. 4.2; 7.10-17; 8.8b, 10b; 9.1-6; 10.21; 11.1-9,10; 16.5; 32.1-8; 55.3f Jer. 17.25; 23.5f; 17; 30.9,21; Ezek. 17.22-24; 34.23f; 37.22-25; Hos. 3.4f; Amos 9.11; Mic. 4.8; 5.1-3; Zech 9.9f.
 3. Isa. 11.13f; Jer. 3.18; 31.5f, 27; 33.7; Ezek. 37.15.-22; Hos. 2.2ff, 16-25; 3.5; Obad. 18; Zech. 8.13; 9.10-13; 10.5f.
 4. Isa. 13.23; Jer. 46-51; Ezek. 25-32; Zeph. 2; Zech 9; cf Amos 1f.
 5. Isa. 43.5f; 48.20; 49.17f, 22; 52.8,11f; 56.7; 57.13; 60.4,8f; 66.20; Jer. 2.18; 23.3; 30.3; 31.7-12; 32.37; 33.7,11; Ezek. 11.17; 20.34,41; 28.25; 34.11f; 36.24; 37.12; Hos. 11.10f; Mic. 2.1ff; 4.6f; Zeph. 3.19f; Zech. 8.7f; 9.11f; 10.8-10
 6. Isa. 1.18-31; 2.20; 3.11,18-23; 4.3f; 17.8; 28.9; 29.20; 30.22; 31.6f; 33.14-16; Zeph. 1.6; 3.11f; Ezek. 14.1-11; 20.36-38; 22; 34.17-22; 36.25; Jer. 33.8; Mic. 5.9-13; Zech. 13.2-6; Mal. 2.10-13, 17-3.5; Isa. 52.1,3ff; 58.1-7; 59.2-8, 12, 15; 64.4; 65.2.
 7. Amos 9.13; Joel 4.18; Isa. 7.21f; 49.20; 60.22; Jer. 3.16; 31.37; Ezek. 36.11f, 33-38; Mic. 4.7; Zech 8.4f; 14.10.
 8. Isa. 2.4; Mic. 5.9ff; Zech. 9.10
 9. Isa. 49.16-19, 51.3; 54.1f; 58.12; 60.10; 61.4,6f; Ezek. 36.33ff.
 10. Isa. 45.14,23; 56.7; 60.3; 66.18f, 23; Mic. 4.1-4; Jer. 3.17; Zeph. 3.10; Zech. 8.20-23; 14.16-19.
 11. Isa. 11.9; 62.25
 12. Isa. 11.9; Jer. 31.34.
 13. Isa. 4.3; 6.13; 62.12; 61.6; Zech. 14.21

1. A new covenant is made and Israel is changed by the spirit of Yahweh. 2. At times more emphasis is laid on the religious, super-terrestrial elements, and then it is expressly stated that this decisive change in fortunes is the day of Yahweh or simply 'that day'. 3. 4. 5.

This victory of Yahweh will eclipse all previous ones, and will secure victory not only over Israel's traditional enemies but also imaginary distant peoples who existed in fables and mythology (e.g. the king of Gog and Magog). 6. When Yahweh has defeated the world power outside Jerusalem, eternal peace (i.e. uninterrupted historical peace) will prevail. 7. Suffering and disease will be at an end, and men will live to a ripe old age. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. Peace and joy, light and life will prevail when the old things are passed away and heaven and earth have been created anew. 13.

Clearly in this picture drawn by the prophets of the glorious coming future, which will be in sharp contrast to Israel's present unhappy lot under foreign dominion, a great deal is the language of poetry and not sober reality. But the political, national, and social restoration of Israel is the vital and essential element in the hope. 14. Even in Deutero-Isaiah as we saw, universalism is not a vague and undefined hope with no clear idea of how it is to be brought about. The God of all the earth is Israel's God, Yahweh. She alone knows him, and he has chosen her as his instrument in bringing the nations to know him too. Thus the universal worship of Yahweh will be achieved through the restoration of Israel through the miraculous restoration of the nation.

-
1. Isa. 55.3f; Jer. 31.31ff.
 2. Ezek. 11.19f; 36.26; 39.29; Joel 3.1ff.
 3. Deut. 30.3; Jer. 29.14; 30.3,18; 31.23; 32.44; 33.7,11,26; Ezek. 15.1, 53; 29.14; 39.25; Hos. 6.11; Joel 4.1; Amos 9.14; Zeph. 2.7; 3.20.
 4. Amos 5.18; Isa. 2.12; Zeph. 1.8, 14ff; 2.2; Ezek. 30.3; Joel 1.15; 2.1; 3.3f; 4.14; Obad. 15; Zech. 14.1.
 5. Isa. 2.20; 3.18; 4.2; 5.30; 7.18; 20f, 23; 10.20,27; 11.10f; 12.1, 4; 17.4, 7, 9; 22.20, 25; 23.15; 24.21; 25.9; 26.1; 27.1f,12f; 28.5f; Jer. 4.9; 30.7f; 46.10; Amos 2.16; 8.9.13; 9.11; 13.1f,4,6,8,13,20; (In most of these passages 'that day' serves merely to connect two contemporaneous events, but in several it has clearly an eschatological use; and the later prophetic tradition tended more and more to take it in the absolute and specific sense as referring to the dies illa.)
 6. Ezek. 38f.
 7. Ps. 46; 47; cf 71.
 8. Isa. 4.9; 11.6-8; 32.17f; 33.6; 60.17; 65.25; Jer. 23.6; 30.10; Ezek. 34.25-27; 36.8ff, 29f, 33; Mic. 4.3f; Zeph. 3.13; Zech. 3.10; 9.10; 14.11; Ps. 46.10
 9. Isa. 65.20
 10. Isa. 12.3-6; 35.5f; 65.18f; Jer. 31.10-14; 33.9;
 11. Isa. 9.1; 30.26; 60.19f; 62.1.
 12. Isa. 65.20, 22; 25.8.
 13. Isa. 65.17; 66.22.
 14. cf above p.16.

This by no means implies that the political and social character of the hope replaced the religious aspects. Rather, the very nature of Israel's faith makes the two aspects inseparable. Her faith is that Yahweh is Israel's God who reveals his power in and through the fortunes of Israel. Yahweh's restoration will bring glory not only to Israel but also to Yahweh himself, 'It is through the glorification of Israel that the glorification of Yahweh is achieved'.^{1.}

It is against the background of the hope of the national restoration that we must consider the 'messianic' expectation of post-exilic Judaism and the ideas associated with it. There can be no doubt that the expectation of a Messiah came into existence as a hope for the future as an essential part of Israel's hope of national restoration.^{2.}

In the Old Testament the coming king, the Messiah, was always thought of as a legitimate descendent of the royal house of David.^{3.} Sometimes it appears that the expectation was connected with a particular descendent of David who was alive at the time. It is possible that Isa. 9 refers to an actual newborn prince of the ancient dynasty. It is in all events certain that Zechariah and Haggai associate all the expectations of the future with a specific historical person, Zerubbabel, the grandson of king Jehoiakin.^{4.} He will establish the glorious restored kingdom. Isa. 11.1ff may also belong to the same period as these Zerubbabel prophecies, but it may also be a purely future expectation.

During this period the Messiah is not an eschatological figure in the sense of having no successors. What is anticipated is that when Israel is restored through the messianic deliverer, then also will be established the Davidic monarchy.^{5.} His successors are explicitly mentioned in Jer. 23.1ff. They are the 'good shepherds' who will now be over the people in contrast to the 'bad shepherds' of former days.

When the exiles have returned and the state of bliss is being established then, says Deutero-Isaiah, Yahweh will again make his covenant with his people.^{6.} According to Jer. 30.21f it is as a result of the coming of the

1. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.149.
 2. ibid pp.155-157.
 3. Isa. 11.1, 10; 9.6; 14.5; 55.3f; Mic. 5.1; Jer. 17.25; 23.5; 33.9; Ezek. 34.23f; 37.24f; Amos 9.11.
 4. I Chron. 3.18f; Hag. 2.6f; 21ff; Zech. 2.4,13,15; 3.8; 4.6-13; 6.10-13.
 5. This is clear from such passages as Jer. 17.25; 33.15ff; Isa. 55.3f; Amos 9.11; Mic. 4.8.
 6. Isa. 55.3f.

messianic king that 'you shall be my people and I will be your God', i.e. it is
 1.
 through the Messiah that the covenant of Sinai will be affirmed with the people of
 God. As Isa. 55.3f makes plain, together with the restored covenant through the
 restoration of the royal house will come dominion over other nations as of old.
 It is the 'former dominion, the kingdom over Jerusalem' which will come to the
 2.
 'daughter of Zion' when Zion once again has a king in her midst says Micah. The
 work of Yahweh, presaged by the birth of the royal child in Isa. 9, 1-6, is

To increase the dominion
 and make good fortune endless
 upon the throne of David,
 and in his kingdom.

The same prediction is made when it is emphasised that, in contrast with the
 unhappy present, in the restored kingdom the king 'will come forth from his
 3.
 (i.e. Jacob's) midst'; Israel will no longer be under the rule of foreign kings.

4.

Thus in this early period the Messiah is a mortal son of David whose
 political restoration will be the sign and the means of Israel's restoration and
 glory. His restoration on the throne means also the re-establishment of Israel
 as a political, social, and religious unit.

Just as the ideal historical king was not a mere mortal ruling in his
 own might, but was equipped with divine powers and qualities, so will the future
 king of the restored community be. The source of this divine equipment is not
 a supernatural birth or conception, but the fact that the 'spirit of Yahweh'
 5.
 rests upon him.' With it comes all the royal virtues,

a spirit of wisdom and discernment,
 a spirit of counsel and strength, 6.
 a spirit of knowledge and reverence for Yahweh.

This endowment with the spirit of Yahweh is the source of all the future
 7.
 king's powers, he rules 'in the strength of Yahweh, in the majesty of the name
 8. 9.
 of Yahweh his God,' to secure peace for his people from foreign oppression
 10.
 and also every well-being for the nation. In this sense the king's endowment
 with the spirit is the source of the blessing of the community. When Isaiah

2. Mic. 4.8; 5.1-3.

3. Jer. 30.21.

4. That he is not immortal is borne out by the persistence of the idea in later
 Judaism that the Messiah will die at the end of the millenium; cf 2 Esdras
 7.28ff; 12.34; 2 Bar. 30; cf 29.3

5. cf R. Koch, 'Der Gottesknecht und der Messias', in Biblica Vol. 27, 1946,
 pp. 241ff.

6. Isa. 11.2

7. Zech. 4.6

8. Mic. 5.3

9. Isa. 9.4; Mic. 5.4; Zech. 9.10

10. Isa. 4.2; 9.1; Jer. 23.6

1. Ex. 19.5f; Lev. 26.12; Jer. 24.7; 31.33; 32.38; Zech. 8.8; Ezek. 11.20;
 36.28; Hos. 2.25 etc.

states that he re-establishes and lays the foundations of the Davidic kingdom¹ 'with justice and with righteousness' the context shows that the main emphasis falls on the victorious power by which he wins for his people 'justice' and 'salvation' in a more 'political' sense. But the ethical and social side of 'righteousness' is quite evident in the promise about the shoot which comes forth from the stump of Jesse;

He will not judge after the sight of his eyes,
neither reprove after the hearing of his ears,
but with righteousness shall he judge the poor,
and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth:
and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth
and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.
And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins,
and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. (2)

3.

This appears again and again. Accordingly his rule will also result, as we should expect from the old kingship ideal of the king as the embodiment of the people, in a moral and religious revival. The religious aspect of conditions in the future kingdom is emphasised in Ezek. 37.24ff;

'I will set my sanctuary among them for evermore.
My dwelling place shall be with them;
and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.
And the nations shall know that I, Yahweh, sanctify Israel.'

Every material blessing and moral and religious renewal of the community is realised by Yahweh through his endowment of the future king with his spirit. As the embodiment of the people the king's endowment with the spirit of Yahweh, and thus of every royal virtue, means that in him Yahweh constitutes and 'blesses' the restored community. It means further that the new community itself will be endowed with the spirit in and with the coming king. The great hope of a land 'full of the knowledge of Yahweh' (Isa. 11.9; cf Jer. 31.34) and moral and religious obedience will be realised when Yahweh fulfils his promise; 'I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes... and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.'⁵ This promise finds a specific echo in Joel;⁶ 'I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh.'

It would be true to say that in the Old Testament the messianic hope is really the longing for the new, restored community in which the Messiah is a vital and indispensable instrument of Yahweh. Their hopes are focussed on him. The high ethical hopes of the new community are quite clearly inspired by the

1. Isa. 9.6

2. Isa. 11.3-5.

4. Ezek. 37.24; cf also Jer. 23.16; 30.9, 21f; 33.16; Isa. 32.3-8.

3. Isa. 9.6; 16.5; 32.1; Jer. 23.4f; 33.15; Ezek. 34.22f; Zech. 9.9

5. Ezek. 36.27f.

6. Joel 2.28.

great prophets. The longing is not simply for a national restoration (though it is never less than this), but for one in which the religious and moral ideals of the prophets will be realised. These hopes quite naturally centred in the coming king. But the coming king implies the coming restored community, or, in converse, the coming restored community implies the coming king. It is impossible for the Old Testament to conceive of a 'Messiah' without thinking also of the messianic community. They belong inseparably together.

(c) The Inter-Testamental Period

This hope of renewal; political, social, moral and religious, is not yet the eschatological messianic hope of later Judaism. It is essentially an earthly hope for the future which is thought of as the beginning of an endless period of bliss and, in the more universalistic of the prophets, of world evangelism. It is in the inter-testamental period that the Messiah becomes a specifically eschatological figure who inaugurates the eschatological messianic community.

The roots of this later concept of the work of God's Messiah are already present in the Old Testament. As greater emphasis came to be laid on the restoration of the nation as the work of Yahweh, it came to be thought that this would be the final act of God's redemptive deliverance when the formative, educative, onward march of history would be at an end. This would come to pass
1. 2.
'in the latter days' when all things would return to their original perfection.

This 'new thing' which Yahweh will accomplish in the 'last days' is not, as it is in the Old Testament, simply the beginning of the restored national life. It is the consummation of all that has gone before. But it was never forgotten that the starting point for the future hope was faith in the restoration of Israel as a free people among the other nations on this earth and in the land of Canaan.

The emergence of a dualistic view of the world brought tensions which were never reconciled into the older earthly hope, and they lived together in unsystematic confusion in later Judaism. Nevertheless each undoubtedly
3.
influenced the other and some attempts at reconciliation were made.

-
1. Gen. 49.1; Num. 24.14; Deut. 4.30; 31,29; Isa. 2.2; Jer. 23.20; 30.24; 48.47; 49.39; Ezek. 38.16; Hos. 3.5; Mic. 4.1; Dan. 10.14; cf Ezek. 38.8
2. Ep. Barn. 6.3
3. e.g. millenarianism cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 2, pp.323-395.

Characteristic of the dualism of later Judaism is the thought of the two ages or aeons; 'this age' and 'the age to come' which were separated by a sharp transition, each with its own definite time and character. This aeon, under the rule of Satan, abounds with all his manifestations - misfortunes and evils of every kind. These dreadful conditions will become intensified and sin and hostility increase and reach their climax in the throes of the messianic age. Then the coming aeon would dawn and be the very reverse of this. God will overthrow Satan's dominion, end all misfortune and suffering, and establish his kingdom and assume his kingly rule. Israel, or the pious in Israel, will then receive their reward of happiness and bliss on a re-created earth or in the realm beyond, in paradise or in heaven.

Here we find a real dualism of a world of evil on earth, under the rule of Satan, and a world of bliss beyond the present scheme of things, under the rule of God. The whole picture of the future is a description of a world entirely different from the present one. It is truly to be seen as a consummation of history.

This consummation of history is undoubtedly the key factor in Jewish eschatology but a second and most important common factor is its corporate character. History is consummated in the establishment of the new community, the true Israel. In its more national form the thought centres on the restoration of Israel as the eschatological community when Yahweh destroys her enemies. Then in the sweeping world catastrophe only Zion will remain unshaken and all who worship Yahweh, the righteous 'remnant of Israel' will find refuge and deliverance there. In its more dualistic form the thought centres on a resurrection to judgement. After judgement the righteous enter upon eternal life when they

-
1. Cf G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. 2, p.378 and Index 1, s.v. 'World to Come.
 2. G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. 2, pp.361ff; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1934, pp.147 ff.
 3. P. Volz, *op. cit.*, pp. 88, 309ff, 318.
 4. *Ibid* pp. 359-406.
 5. *ibid* pp. 408ff.
 6. S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 1956, p.268.
 7. 1 En. 92 ff; 90.18; T. Dan. 5; T. Asher 8.
 8. Ps. Sol 17; Ass. Moses 10; 2 Bar.21.1; 29.2; 36.40; 1 Esdras 12ff.
 9. 2 Esdras 6.25; 7.28; 9.8; 12.34; 13.24, 26, 48f; 2 Bar. 29.4; 40.2; Sib. Or. 4.384; Bab Yeb. 47a.
 10. Dan. 12.2,13; 1 En. 92.3; 100.5; 2 Esdras 5.42; 7.32f, 78ff; 2. Bar. 50.2 51.1ff; 52.3; Sib.Or. 4, 180f; T. Sim6; T. Lev. 18; T. Jud. 25; T. Zeb. 10; T. Dan. 5; T. Benj 10; 2 Mac. 6.26; 7.9, 14, 36; 12.43f; 14.46.
 11. Dan. 12.2; Ps. Sol 9.18; 2.5; 13.11; 14.10; 15.10; 1 En. 27.4; 40.9; 53.8; 2En. 68.10; 2 Mac.7.9,14,30.

live together with God in his kingdom where all sin and injustice have been
 1. destroyed and evil men sentenced to an irrevocable perdition. It is after
 2. this that a new heaven and a new earth appears after the destruction of this
 3. earth. Sometimes this dualistic other-worldly perfected community and the
 more original nationalistic eschatology meet in the concept of Zion being trans-
 formed into paradise. The new Jerusalem is a heavenly city, which comes to
 4. earth radiant with the splendour of God.

In neither concept is there pure individualism. In both there lives
 the basic concept of God creating the final ethico-religious community in which
 Yahweh is truly worshipped. In the other-worldly eschatology it is true that a
 great deal of emphasis is placed on the individual who will be judged according
 to what he has done as an individual and not simply on his being a member of
 5. Israel, but this is Yahweh's way of creating the pious community in the world to
 come.

With these two conceptions of the 'last things' there arose two quite
 distinct concepts of the Messiah. The one more transcendental associated with
 the figure of the Son of man and reflected chiefly in the apocalyptic literature
 of the period, and the other the more popular national Messiah of this world
 and reflected mainly in the Psalms of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve
 Patriarchs, the Targums, the ancient synagogue prayers and the rabbinic literature
 (in which apocalyptic elements have been suppressed by normative Judaism with its
 more nationalistic and mundane spirit). We shall deal with the figure of the Son
 of man in the next chapter, our concern here is with the nationalistic Messiah
 of the period. This is not to imply that the two figures remained distinct.
 However contradictory and irreconcilable the two concepts might be, the thought
 of later Judaism is with one and the same royal figure who belongs to the
 6. eschaton in whom this-worldly and other-worldly traits are blended. The
 blending is never complete but traits taken from the one figure certainly
 influence the other. Depending on the circles from which the writings are
 derived the nationalistic or transcendental aspects dominate the messianic
 figure and the eschatology associated with him.

-
1. Cf S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.276
 2. Dan. 12.2; 1 En. 91.15; 103.8; 2 En. 9f; 2 Bar. 4.12; 51.5; 78.6; 83.10, 85.13; 2 Esdras 7.36, 75, 84; 8.59.
 3. Isa. 65.17; 66.22; 1 En. 91.16f; 72.1; Jub. 1.29; 50.5; 2 En. 65.7; 2 Esdras 7.75; 2 Bar. 31.5; 32.6; 44.12; 57.2.
 4. Rev. 22.9ff.
 5. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 2, p.377
 6. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.281

(i) The Messiah an historical person

Well into the later period of Judaism when the transcendental view of the Messiah was more common there persisted the idea that he would be an historical person. The proof of this is seen in the persistent declaration of certain historical persons as the Messiah. The Talmudic interpretation of Isa. 9.5 is that the reference is to king Hezekiah who should have been the Messiah but was found unworthy. The Hasmonem dynasty was held to be the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the restoration and Simon was regarded as the Messiah. The title Messiah was at one time conferred upon Phreoras the brother of Herod, and there were a series of false Messiahs branded by Josephus and the Roman authorities as brigands, rioters and saboteurs. This indicates that the Messiah was generally regarded as an earthly man like other men. This was also the universal view of the rabbis in spite of the impressive epithets they applied to him.

(ii) The Messiah immortal

The concept of the two aeons helped to make the Messiah not only a specific eschatological figure but an immortal being who would rule in an eternal Messianic kingdom. Throughout the rabbinic literature it is taken for granted though seldom stated that the Messiah is an eternal being. Nevertheless the rabbis did not lose sight of the earlier idea that the days of the Messiah belonged essentially to this world as its glorious conclusion. where the concept of the messianic interim-kingdom (the millenium) prevailed the resurrection of the dead was explicitly postponed until after the days of the Messiah. But the thought of the eternal Messiah as an eternal being in an eternal kingdom was the dominant concept in the time of Jesus. The New Testament bears record to the fact that the idea of a dying Messiah was impossible for Jews to accept.

(iii) The Messiah mortal

The tradition of the Messiah being an historical individual usually

-
1. B.b. San. 94a.
 2. 1 Mac. 14. 4ff.
 3. Josephus Antiq. XVII.47f.
 4. Josephus Antiq. XIV. 160; 18.85f; Bab. San. 98b, 99a; cf Acts 5.36; 21.38
 5. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 2, p. 349; S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.285
 6. Bab. San. 99a. where the different rabbinic opinions are quoted. cf. Rev.20.4f.
 7. Strack & Billerbeck Vol. 3 p.827; Vol. 4 pp. 971, 1166.
 8. Mat. 16.21ff; Mk. 8.31; 9.31f; Lk. 24.20f; Acts. 17.3; 1 Cor. 1.23; Gal. 5.11, etc.

1.
of David's line and of the millenium led to a strand of tradition in which it was taught that the Messiah would die at the end of the millenium when the glorious eschaton would dawn.
2.

(iv) The dying Messiah and the suffering Messiah - different traditions

Where the concept of the Messiah as a mortal man prevailed, there was the thought of a dying Messiah, but to this death no redemptive significance was attached. His death marked the end of the 'days of the Messiah' and the inauguration of the 'coming age' at the general resurrection. Where the concept of an eternal Messiah prevailed, under the influence of the Son of man theology, there are references to his suffering in the travails of the messianic age. This always ends in his glorious victory not in his death. The suffering and death of the Messiah are never associated with one another. They belong to different traditions of his person, i.e. whether he is mortal or immortal, and neither the suffering nor death of the Messiah is given atoning significance in Judaism. What is essential is the establishment of the glorious eschatological community.
3.
4.
5.

(v) The equipment of the Messiah with the Spirit

As in the older conceptions of the coming deliverer it is taught that the eschatological Messiah will be equipped with the spirit of Yahweh for his mission. Thus we read:

For God will make him mighty by means of (his) holy spirit,
And wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength
and righteousness. (6)

His equipment with the spirit is the source of all his moral qualities and victorious power.

His righteousness as a result of his endowment with the spirit is seen both in the ethical sense of 'justice' and also in the older sense of obtaining his people's right against the heathen oppressors and securing their deliverance from suffering and danger. The righteousness of the Messiah consists in saving
7.
8.

-
1. Ps. Sol. 17.4f, 21, 23; T. Jud. 22-24; Shem. Es. 14; 2 Esdras 12.32; Targ. Jon. on Isa. 11.1; Jer. 23.5; 33.15; Hos. 3.5. (Other concepts were a Levitical Messiah during the Hasmonean dynasty Jb. 11.13ff; T. Reu. 6.10-12; T. Lev. 18; Post-Hasmonean Judaism sometimes spoke of the Messiah ben Joseph or ben Ephraim, cf. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, pp. 290f).
 2. 2-Esdras 7.28f.
 3. ibid . . .
 4. Cf the treatment of Isa. 53 in the Targums (above p 39)
 5. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, pp. 329ff.
 6. Ps. Sol. 17.42; cf T. Jud. 17.7
 7. Ps. Sol. 17.28f, 35, 48.
 8. Cf below p. 83 para (vii)

his people. Here righteousness and salvation are identical.^{1.}

As a result of his endowment with the spirit the Messiah has also
the charisma of teaching and wisdom.^{2. 3.}

(vi) The people's participation in the Messiah's endowment with the Spirit

Because the Messiah possesses wisdom and the fear of God, he can both be leader and example to his people when they live

Under the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed in the fear
of his God,
In the spirit of wisdom and righteousness and strength;
That he may direct men in the works of righteousness by the
fear of God,
That he may establish them all before the Lord,
A good generation (living) in the fear of God in the days of mercy. (4)

This passage makes it clear that it is not simply as a result of his leading that the people are made godly; rather they share not only in the fruits of his endowment with the spirit but also in the 'spirit of wisdom, and righteousness, and strength'. He is the embodiment of the messianic community and as such brings them every blessing of the messianic age, including an endowment with the spirit. In his 'blessing' his people share.

And the blessing of the Lord (will be) with him: he will be strong and stumble not (5)

therefore

He will bless the people of the Lord with wisdom and gladness (6)

(vii) The restoration of Israel

The Messiah is accordingly the supernaturally equipped instrument in the establishment of the eschatological kingdom, the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. He frees Israel from her enemies, crushing the heathen powers which hold her in bondage, and establishes a universal dominion with Jerusalem as the centre of the world whither all the nations will come to pay homage to Israel's God who will have become king of the world. When the

1. T. Jud. 24 (with reference to Mal. 2.20)

2. 1 En. 49.3.

3. Ps. Sol. 17.42; 1 En. 49.2f; 51.3; T. Lev. 18.

4. Ps. Sol. 18.8-10.

5. Ps. Sol. 17.43.

6. Ps. Sol. 17.40.

7. Acts 1.6

8. Sib. Or. 3.653; 1 En. 46; 51-53; 2 Esdras 11.46; 12.34; 13.5. 37f, 49; 2 Bar. 35ff; 70.9; T. Jos. 19; Ps. Sol. 17.24-27.

9. Ps. Sol. 17.32; Cf Nu. Rab. 13 (170b); Gen. Rab. 1 (196a); Pirk. Eliezer 11 (6c)

10. Ps. Sol. 17.33f.

1.
world power has been crushed then the dispersed of Israel will return. The people
2.
will become a holy people and no injustice will be found among them. The Messiah
3.
will restore all those good things which were at the beginning but which were lost
4.
through the fall of Adam and will feed his people with the manna from heaven, the
5.
miraculous food of the desert wanderings.

In this we see the persistence of the messianic hope as fundamentally
a hope for the restoration through deliverance of the community, Israel. The
features mentioned above, derived mainly from Old Testament concepts of the coming
king, indicate the persistence of the religious and ethical and also the political
and social character of the messianic hope.

(viii) Messianic forerunners

The wide-spread belief in a forerunner of the Messiah is encountered
first in Mal. 3.23f where he is identified as being Elijah. In later Judaism
Elijah became the forerunner of the Messiah to bring about repentance of the
6.
people in preparation for his coming. The rabbis have much to say about his role
7.
as 'restorer' and deciding questions of 'clean' and 'unclean' and separating
8.
foreign elements from Israel.

9.
Other forerunners are mentioned alongside Elijah. Most frequently it
is Moses; undoubtedly the result of rabbinic exegesis of Deut. 18.15. In the
10.
Enoch circles we hear also of Enoch as the messianic forerunner, or all those who
11.
have not died but been translated to heaven.

According to the Fourth Gospel the Jews at the time of Jesus also
12.
believed in 'the prophet' who was to appear before the Messiah, but who was expli-
13.
cantly distinguished from Elijah. This prophet may have been thought to be the
Messiah himself and account for the fact that the Jews wanted to make Jesus king
14.
when they called him 'the prophet who should come into the world'.

(ix) The hidden Messiah

There was already the notion that the Messiah was a mortal man. See

-
1. Shem. Es. 10; Targ. Jon. on Jer. 33.13; Targ. Ps-Jon. on Ex. 40.10; Nu.24.7
Deut. 30.4; Ps. Sol 17.28-31, 35f.
 2. Ps. Sol. 17.48ff.
 3. Ps. Sol. 17.46
 4. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 1 p.19; Vol. 4 pp. 88ff.
 5. *ibid* Vol. 1 p.87; Vol. 2 p.481; Vol. 4 pp. 890, 954.
 6. Eccles. 48.10; cf 1. En. 89.52; 90.9, 31.
 7. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 4 pp. 781ff.
 8. G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. 2 pp. 375ff.
 9. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 4, p.787.
 10. 1 En. 90.31
 11. 2 Esdras 6.26.
 12. Jn. 1.21; cf 6.14; 7.40.
 13. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 2, pp. 363, 378.
 14. Jn. 6.14

might quite easily be understood to be living in the world unconscious of his own future task and mission until God called and equipped him with his spirit. Such a teaching is made quite explicit in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, in which the representative of Judaism says: 'Even if the Messiah should have been born and be living somewhere, yet he is unknown; indeed he does not even know himself; nor has he any power, until Elijah comes, anoints him, and reveals him to all.'¹ Further, 'Even if men say that he has come, he will not be known for what he is until he becomes famous and renowned'.²

This thought of the hidden Messiah also occurs in the rabbinic literature, where the Messiah lives unknown, often suffering, until the day comes for him to reveal himself.³ This day comes in the Targums to be called 'the day of the Messiah'. The day when the Messiah appears and accomplishes his messianic work of salvation is the day when he 'is revealed' as what he is destined to be, the Messiah. Thus the brothers of Jesus say to him; 'Reveal yourself to the world' i.e. declare yourself as the Messiah by miracles and works of wonder.⁴

Often this revelation of the Messiah is told in fantastic imagery. In one passage we read, 'At the time when the King Messiah reveals himself he will come and stand on the roof of the temple', from there he will announce to Israel the message of redemption.⁵ This passage is later than the time of Christ, but the temptation narratives suggest that it was held at an earlier period.

(x) Summary

The main features of the eschatological hope of the coming Messiah in later Judaism are;

1. His coming is often thought of as being heralded by forerunners, especially Elijah and Moses.
2. He remains hidden until called and anointed by Elijah, then, endowed with the spirit of Yahweh, he himself is conscious of his mission and reveals himself in striking acts and miracles.
3. His task is to realize and consummate Yahweh's purpose in history by saving Israel and creating the righteous eschatological community which is sometimes conceived of as an interim between this evil aeon under the sway of Satan

1. Dial. 7.

2. Dial. 90.

3. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, pp. 305-308 for details and references.

4. Jn. 7.3ff; cf 14.22.

5. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 3, p.9.

and the coming glorious aeon under the rule of God, and at other times the messianic community itself is eternal under the perpetual rule of the Messiah.

4. Where he is thought of as a mortal man he may die at the end of the millenium and so usher in the final other-worldly kingdom of God. If he is thought of as an immortal being he may suffer in accomplishing his mission but will not die, for his suffering will issue in the glorious victory of the Messiah and blessing of the nation. Neither suffering nor death have redemptive significance.
5. Most commonly he is thought of as the 'Son of David', the religio-national king of the gloriously restored Israel.
6. His coming results in the conquest of Satan, the end of history, and the creation of the final perfected community of the redeemed - the kingdom of God.
7. To this community he brings every ideal and hope of the community and prophets. They share in his 'blessing' whether in the glorious golden age of the Jews on earth, or in the other-worldly eschatology in heaven or paradise.

B. THE MESSIAH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

We must now try to discover how far Jesus applied to himself, or altered or rejected these particular Jewish ideas connected with the title Messiah; how it was applied to Jesus by the Church; and what its significance was for the self-understanding of the Church in relation to Jesus whom they called 'the Messiah'.

(a) The Narratives of the baptism of Jesus by John

All the Gospels bear witness to the importance of the baptism of Jesus by John. In them all, it marks the commencement of his mission and the moment in which he became conscious of his own 'status'. Several references in Acts testify to the importance of John's baptism as that which marked the upper limit of the apostolic testimony. This indicates that John was regarded as the prophetic forerunner of the eschatological Messiah, Jesus, by the early Church. John's message and mission is seen solely in this light. To them all, he is 'the voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths

1. Acts 1.22; 10.37; 13.24-25.

1. straight.' In the synoptic Gospels John is identified with the Elijah who was
 2. to return before the coming of the Messiah and, according to Justin's Trypho,
 3. to anoint him for his task, or 'the prophet' who was to come to prepare the way
 4. of the Lord. According to the Fourth Gospel John the Baptist expressly denied
 5. these designations of himself although he saw himself to be the one who would
 'prepare the way of the Lord' and who bore witness to Jesus. There can be no
 question, therefore, that the mission and message of John is of great significance
 in interpreting the baptism of Jesus.

(i) The mission and message of John

Our first question must be to ask whether it can be established that John did associate himself with the national messianic eschaton. Our primary sources here are the New Testament narratives. According to Matthew the preaching of John was summed up in the words, 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of
 6. heaven is at hand'. In the parallel accounts in Mk. 1.4 and Lk. 3.3 these words are found in the more general statement that 'John came baptizing in the wilderness, and proclaiming the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' The further narratives of these two evangelists make it clear that they also regard John as the herald of the kingdom of God. As Flemington has noted, it is against this eschatological background of God's breaking into history for this final judgment that the words of John the Baptist must be set, in which he
 7. speaks of the 'mightier one' (i.e. the Messiah) to come.

There is no reason to suppose that John was not a thoroughly representative Jew who viewed this eschaton as national as well as ethical and religious. Evidence of his orthodoxy is to be found in the Gospel narratives themselves. In one passage the 'disciples of John and of the Pharisees' are classed together
 8. as observing the Jewish fasts. This passage is set as an introduction to the saying of Jesus about pouring new wine into old bottles. His message is thus contrasted not only with the teaching of the Pharisees and their ceremonial primness, but also with that of John whose views were, presumably, in conformity with those of the Pharisees. Further, there is no evidence that there was ever

-
1. Mk. 1.3; Mat. 3.3; Lk. 3.4; Jn. 1.23 (cited from Isa. 40.3)
 2. Mk. 1.6; Mat. 3.4 (cf 2 Ki. 1.8; the dress of John the Baptist appears to be a conscious allusion to the dress of Elijah); Mat. 11.10; Lk. 7.27, and quoted in the context of the baptism of Jesus in Mk. 1.2.
 3. Dial.7.
 4. Lk. 1.76
 5. Jn. 1.21
 6. Mat. 3.2
 7. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, p.18, Cf also E.F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, 1929, pp.66ff; J.M. Creed; Luke, 1942, p.50.
 8. Lk. 5.33

any real antagonism between John and the orthodox religion. Unlike Jesus, he was left unmolested by the religious leaders. If they suspected danger and innovation in his preaching they would have taken measures to suppress him, especially since he was clearly so popular with the people. Luke records John's investiture: 'Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?'^{1.} as addressed to the 'multitude' whom he distinguishes from the 'publicans and sinners' who came to John, i.e. he addresses these words to the whole community of Israel. For whatever reason, Matthew alters this as an address to the Pharisees and Saducees.^{2.} Both accounts make it plain that John's audience was thoroughly Jewish and may have included the religious leaders. The high evaluation of John, reflected by the Pharisee Josephus,^{3.} indicates that by this time the work of John was endorsed by the Pharisees, and Justin, writing in the second century, includes the Baptist community among the orthodox Jewish sects.^{4.} Such a recognition would have been impossible if the accredited representatives of the Law had been hostile to its founder.^{5.}

In view of this we should expect that in his presentation of the eschatological hope John remained concerned with the restoration of Israel. Scott has rightly argued that the enthusiastic responses that John excited shows that

-
1. Lk. 3.7f = Mat. 3.7f.
 2. E.F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, 1929, p.70 suggests that so scathing a rebuke against the whole elect nation was intolerable to Matthew with the predilection for the Jews with which his Gospel was written, and so he alters the reference to the religious authorities.
 3. Antiq. XVIII, 5.2
 4. Dial. 80.
 5. In the light of this the narratives of the discussion of Jesus with the chief priests and elders about his authority for cleansing the temple (Mk. 11. 27-33; Mat. 21.23-27; Lk. 20.1-8) are not evidence to the contrary. The leaders' refusal to reply to Jesus' question about the authority of John is not to be interpreted as their discrediting him or as a 'trick' question placing ^{them} in the dilemma that if they say John's authority was from God, then Jesus would affirm the same of himself, and if they denied the divine authority of John risk the wrath of the crowd (so V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.468). Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on the ass, which Matthew saw as the fulfilment of Zech. 9.9 (Mat.21.5) and the cleansing of the temple form the background of the discourse on the ἐξουσία of Jesus. These were clearly acts done in conscious fulfilment of messianic prophecies. The question of the Pharisees is therefore a question about the authority of Jesus to declare himself to be the Messiah. Since Jesus believed that he was anointed to his messianic status by John (cf below p 92) at his baptism, it is perfectly natural that he should reply with a question about John's authority. If they, like himself and the mass of the people, believed that John was the appointed herald of the messianic kingdom and had affirmed this in reply to Jesus then, presumably, he would have pointed to his baptism by John as the source of his messianic authority. The refusal of the leaders to reply is thus not a discrediting of John but a refusal to acknowledge the messianic anointing of Jesus by John. It is probable therefore that the saying was preserved by the Church as Jesus' acceptance of his messianic status and not simply because the refusal of the leaders to reply contained a 'veiled allusion' to the fact that the authority of Jesus was from God (so V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.468) i.e. the significance of the saying for both Jesus and the early Church was messianic.

1.

his aim was patriotic as well as moral and religious. There seems to be nothing in his recorded message to account for this enthusiasm; and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the people saw in him something other than a preacher of righteousness who bitterly upbraided them and warned them to flee from the wrath to come. They identified him with the hopes that lay deep in the heart of the

2.

nation under the Roman dominion.

This conclusion is supported by the circumstances of his imprisonment

3.

and death as recorded by Josephus. This passage is generally accepted by scholars

as an authentic, independent witness of the work of John as a 'baptizer' and

4.

exhorter to virtue and 'righteousness' to one another and piety towards God. In

Josephus' account we find on the one hand that the apocalyptic element in John's teaching is played down and that he asserts that his baptism was for the purification of the body after the forgiveness of sins. This is in all probability

5.

owing to his desire to commend his history to an educated Gentile public. On the other hand Josephus records that John's preaching alarmed Herod Antipas so that, fearing a popular uprising, he seized John and sent him in chains to Machaerus where he had him put to death. This is most easily explained if John did proclaim the advent of the Messiah which would have flamed to life the people's longing for deliverance from Rome.

This is supported by the song of Zecharias in Lk. 1.68-79 which expresses a semi-political view of the coming age. God is shortly to restore the dynasty to David, to effect the deliverance of Israel from oppressors, and to bring in the reign of righteousness by 'remembering', i.e. by establishing again, the covenant. John is celebrated as the forerunner of this new age of bliss. With Luke's manifest interest in the Gentile mission in Acts it is hard to believe that this song has not its basis in the historical facts of John's mission and teaching.

'To a certain extent, no doubt, John shared in the national expectations; and we must be careful not to infer too much from those passages in his teaching which seem to transcend them altogether. He was a Jew, and remained, so far as we can judge, within the limits prescribed for him by Jewish tradition. He took for granted that the community of the future would be the restored Israel, and that its members would be the pious Israelites. His allusion to the "children of Abraham" (Lk. 3.8) does not imply that Jewish descent was of no value, but merely that it must

1. E.F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, 1929, p.69

2. J.V. Bartlett, 'Baptism' in ERE, Vol. 2, p.375

3. Antiq. XVII. 5.2

4. J.M. Creed, Luke, 1942, p.311; I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospel, 1917, pp.30ff.

5. J.M. Creed, Luke, 1942, p.312

be supplemented by moral worthiness before it can be a passport into the kingdom. It is not suggested - and the thought was wholly beyond John's horizon - that the kingdom would be opened to all men irrespective of race.' (1)

Yet while assuming that it was Israel who was heir to the kingdom he insists that only the righteous would be counted as the true Israel. We have seen that this feature of a purged Israel was part of the eschatological expectation of Judaism even in its national form and was not itself an innovation in his teaching. It is true that this moral renewal was the predominant aspect of his teaching. It was not the nation as such that would have its triumph in the coming kingdom but the morally purified nation.

Thus there is no reason to doubt that John was a prophet who saw his task to be that of preparing the people for the coming Messiah, the 'mightier one', who would usher in the messianic age and purge and restore the nation. This means that the baptism of Jesus takes place against the background of this very traditional messianic mission of John the Baptist.

(ii) The authenticity of John's saying that the 'mightier one' would baptize with the Holy Spirit.

All the evangelists attribute to John a contrast between his baptism with water and the coming 'mightier one's' baptism with the Holy Spirit. Two references in Acts suggest that the earliest disciples saw this contrast between John's baptism with water and the Christian baptism with 'Holy Spirit' and believed that they had the authority of Jesus for this interpretation.

Whether or not this distinction was drawn by Jesus, many scholars have argued that there is a difficulty in the claim that it formed part of the teaching of John. Lampe has shown that there is abundant connexion in the Old Testament between the ideas of water, the Holy Spirit, and the Messiah. There is no difficulty therefore, in saying that he could have made these associations. The difficulty is whether he did in fact do so.

Manson has argued that these references to the Holy Spirit are not an original part of John's teaching but represent an interpretation of the early

-
1. E. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, 1929, p. 71f.
 2. Mat. 3.11; Mk. 1.8; Lk. 3.16; Jn. 1.26, 33.
 3. Acts 1.5; 11.16.
 4. W. F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, pp. 18-20; T. W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp. 40f; H. G. Marsh, The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism, 1941, p. 28f; M. Dibelius, Die urchristliche Ueberlieferung von Johannes dem Taucher, 1911, p. 50, 56f; J. M. Creed, Luke, 1942, p. 54
 5. G. W. H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, 1951, pp. 25-31; also W. F. Flemington Baptism, 1953, p. 18f.

1. Church. He points out that in Acts 19.2 the 'disciples' at Ephesus have not even heard 'whether there is a holy spirit'. 'This is very strange if John did in fact teach that his own baptism was only a preliminary to another and richer baptism with the spirit.²' Manson suggests that John originally spoke only of baptism 'with fire' and that this was interpreted as 'baptism with the spirit' by the early Church and was read back into the record of John's teaching. According to this thesis the Matthaean and Lukan forms of the saying contain the symbol (fire) together with the interpretation (spirit). The Markan form has only the interpretation without the symbol. The original saying in Q had the symbol without the interpretation - i.e., Q read, 'he shall baptize you with fire'. From the context this was understood as the fire of judgement.

The chief argument for this Q form of the saying is that in Matthew both the verse before and the verse after the statement about the two contrasted baptisms use 'fire' as a symbol of judgement.³

...every tree... that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire... he will gather his wheat into the garner but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.

Thus, it is argued, the intervening verse should also speak of fire in the sense of judgement.

Eisler has suggested that in the record of John's saying πνεύματι might be retained without ἀγίω in the sense not of 'Spirit' but of 'wind' - the wind that separates the wheat from the chaff. This would preserve the sense of judgement.⁴

The weakness in these arguments rests in their starting point. It is assumed here that the 'disciples' at Ephesus had never even heard about the Holy Spirit. If we are right in accepting the Jewish orthodoxy of John and the essential 'nationalism' of his teaching, then these disciples at Ephesus must themselves have been orthodox Jews or at least 'God-fearers'. This being so it is impossible to imagine that a Jew had never heard about the 'Holy Spirit' in the sense of the spirit of Yahweh. If, on the other hand, they were Christians in the sense that they accepted Jesus as Messiah and had submitted to John's baptism, it is again impossible to conceive that they had not heard about the

1. F.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p. 40f.

2. ibid p. 41

3. Mat. 3.10, 12; cf Lk. 3.9, 17.

4. R. Eisler, The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, 1931, p. 275f.

promised general outpouring of the Spirit. The most natural interpretation of the words 'we did not so much as hear whether there is (a) Holy Spirit' (Acts 19.2) is that though they had heard about the Holy Spirit, they had not yet heard whether their hope of sharing in the messianic endowment with the Holy Spirit had yet been fulfilled. This interpretation would agree with Jn. 7.39; 'But this he (Jesus) spake of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive; for the Spirit was not yet; because Jesus was not yet glorified.' The 'disciples' at Ephesus would then be in exactly the same position as the disciples who heard these words; aware of the promise but not the fulfilment.^{1.}

Further, John's message was one of repentance and 'baptism for the remission of sins' in preparation for the coming 'mightier one' who would both purge and restore Israel. He would possess the spirit of Yahweh and purify Israel; then Israel would share in his endowment with the Spirit, his 'blessing'. As in Jewish messianic teaching, the concepts of judgement and hope belong inalienably together. The message as we see it in Q is not simply that he will burn with fire the trees which fail to produce good fruit and the chaff of the wheat, but also that he will gather the wheat into his granary. While the symbol of 'fire' is appropriate for the destruction of the fruitless trees and useless chaff, i.e. those members of the nation who are not the true Israel, the notion of the general outpouring of the Spirit is the typical way in which the blessedness of the restored nation is described (the gathering of the wheat into his granary).^{2.}
^{3.}
^{4.}

Therefore, there seems to be no solid grounds for doubt that John contrasted his baptism with water 'for the remission of sins' with the coming baptism by the 'mightier one' with 'Holy Spirit and fire'.

(iii) The messianic significance of his baptism to be attributed to Jesus

In view of the difficulty it created in the minds of some early Christians, it is to the highest degree improbable that the incident of Jesus' baptism was invented by the early Church. We have seen that Josephus spoke of John's baptism being for the purification of the body provided that the soul had already been purified beforehand by righteousness, and that this was probably

1. It must be remembered that John did not connect the 'Spirit' with his baptism but was purely a promise associated with the baptism of the coming 'Mightier one'. The ignorance of the 'disciples' at Ephesus does not indicate that the coming baptism with the Holy Spirit was not an integral part of the original message of John himself.

2. Mat. 3.10; Lk. 3.9

3. Mat. 3.12; Lk. 3.17.

4. Cf. above p.83.

owing to his desire to commend his history to educated Greeks who would not have
 1. accepted the concept that a washing itself could remove sins. The same process
 can be seen at work in the records of Matthew and John. Matthew drops the
 reference to John's baptism being for the remission of sins and merely states
 that John 'preached. 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' and that the
 2. people 'were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.' In
 John's Gospel all reference to 'repentance' and 'the forgiveness of sins' is
 dropped and John is seen simply as the forerunner of Jesus, whose message is
 concerned solely with his anticipation of and witness to him 'that cometh after
 me'. That these are attempts to avoid the difficulty in Jesus' submission to a
 baptism which John proclaimed to be 'for the remission of sins' is shown in the
 3. well-known passage quoted by Jerome from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Behold the Lord's mother and brethren said to him, John the Baptist is
 baptizing unto remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. Then
 he said unto them, what sins have I done that I should be baptized by him? -
 unless perchance this very saying of mine is a sin of ignorance.

In view of the difficulty about Jesus' baptism by John it is much
 easier to believe that it was an authentic part of the message of John that his
 baptism was 'for the remission of sins' than that the early Church, believing that
 4. Christian baptism was 'for the remission of sins', read this back into the
 tradition concerning John.

Flemington, arguing on the basis of Wheeler Robinson's discussion on
 5. prophetic symbolism, rightly says that this effective realism of John's baptismal
 rite was perfectly natural to the semitic mind. 'If we would "think Semitical"
 we have to see ~~that~~ the symbolic action of a Hebrew prophet not only as a vivid
 means of expressing the will of God but also in some sense as that which helped
 6. to bring about its fulfilment. John's rite is to be seen not merely as
 expressive of human repentance but the means by which Yahweh would act, bestowing
 forgiveness, in order to prepare a people for the coming Messiah.

It was this realistic belief about John's baptism that occasioned the
 difficulty for the early Christians. Why did Jesus submit to a baptism for the
 'remission of sins'? It is noteworthy that Mark's account of the baptism of
 7. Jesus reveals nothing of the difficulty felt by the other evangelists. Having

1. Cf above p. 89.

2. Mat. 3.2, 6.

3. Jerome, Contra Pelag., 3.2

4. Acts 2.38.

5. H. Wheeler Robinson, 'Prophetic Symbolism' in Old Testament Essays (ed D.C. Simpson), 1927, pp.1-17.

6. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953 p.21f.

7. Cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.158f.

described John's baptism for the remission of sins, he can say objectively that
 1.
 Jesus was baptized by John. The difficulty has not occurred to him. The reason
 for this seems to be that Mark has already quite explicitly identified John with
 2.
 Elijah, the prophet of Malachi 3.1 who was to come to anoint the Messiah for his
 work. Mark is also quite aware that John did not identify himself with Elijah,
 and does not record that John taught that his baptism was for the reception of
 the Spirit. He records what seems to be historical fact about the message of
 John and the significance he attached to his rite, but then goes on to state the
 significance Jesus saw in his submission to baptism at the hands of John. It is
 Jesus, not John, who sees the heavens opened and the Spirit descending upon him
 like a dove, and it is Jesus who hears the voice from heaven 'Thou art my beloved
 son; with thee I am well pleased.' This is all the personal experience of Jesus.

We have seen that the gift of the spirit of Yahweh to the Messiah, by
 which he would fulfil his mission, was a prominent feature of the Messianic
 3.
 expectation. So also was the expectation that the Spirit-filled Messiah would be
 the instrument of God in realizing the hope of the outpouring of the Spirit on
 4.
 the new messianic community. We have also seen that the words of the voice from
 heaven contain a clear reference to the ebhed Yahweh, but that the use of υἱός
 5.
 and not παιδίς may be the influence of Ps. 2.7 which was early regarded as messianic
 and used as a 'proof text' in the early Church. Thus while the baptism of Jesus
 clearly reflects the 'moment' of Jesus' consciousness of his work to be that of the
ebhed it no less clearly reflects his understanding that he was God's Messiah,
 anointed at his baptism by John with the Spirit.

It is the ebhed-Messiah significance of the baptism of Jesus which is
 central in Mark's record of the baptism and causes the fact that John's baptism
 was for the 'remission of sins' to recede into the background and occasions no
 difficulty for Mark. This is surely the significance that the early Church
 attached to the baptism of Jesus so that her kerygma quite naturally began 'after
 6.
 the baptism which John preached'. What is important to remember in this most
 primitive account of the baptism is that it is Jesus and not John who attached
 this messianic significance to it. The story of the descent of the Spirit and
 7.
 the voice from heaven must have come ultimately from Jesus himself.

1. Mk. 1.9

2. Mk. 1.2

3. Cf. above p.82

4. Cf. above p.83

5. Cf. above p.38f.

6. Acts 10.37; Cf C.H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, 1956.

7. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, p.29

The other evangelists, aware of the difficulty of Jesus submitting to John's baptism 'for the remission of sins' have altered the details of the story. In Luke, while the words of the voice from heaven are preserved in the Markan second person, the descent of the Spirit 'as a dove' is made objective and visible to all.^{1.}

This process is carried further in Matthew who omits that John's baptism is 'for the remission of sins' and introduces the dialogue between Jesus and John in which John recognises Jesus as the 'mightier one' to come.^{2.} It is hard to accept that this dialogue is a record of historical fact. Apart from these verses there is no hint in the synoptics that John was aware at this stage that Jesus was the 'mightier one'. The narrative of the message brought by John's disciples is, on its most natural interpretation, strong evidence to the contrary.^{3.} It is true that this could be interpreted as John's doubt that the man he had anointed was the Messiah,^{4.} but it remains true that none of the synoptics record John as teaching that he had come to anoint the Messiah.^{5.} His teaching is that he came to prepare the way for the 'mightier one'.

The intention of Matthew in his record is to emphasise its messianic significance. Thus it is John who recognises Jesus as the 'mightier one' and it is he who sees the descent of the Spirit of God alighting like a dove on Jesus, and heard the declaration of the voice from heaven. Here the experience of Jesus has become wholly objectified and John is transformed into a self-conscious Elijah anointing the Messiah for his work.

It is in the light of this that the difficult saying of Jesus to John must be interpreted; 'Let it be so now; for thus it is fitting for us to fulfil all righteousness.'^{6.} Though this passage appears to be a relatively late development of the baptism story,^{7.} the actual words attributed to Jesus may be related to his other saying 'John came to you in the way of righteousness', which also finds an echo in the Lukan tradition and may well be authentic.^{8.}

-
1. According to the Western reading of the voice from heaven in Luke simply quotes Ps. 2.7. This proves that the significance of the baptism was seen to be messianic.
 2. Mat. 3.14-15.
 3. Mat. 11.2ff; Lk. 8.18ff.
 4. So. J.H. Bernard, *St. John*, ICC, 1928, Vol. 1 p. ci.
 5. If John had recognised Jesus as the coming Messiah it is hard to explain the Gospel references to the continuing work of John (Jn. 3.22ff) or the existence of the community at Ephesus (Acts 19) and into the second century as an orthodox Jewish sect (Justin Dial. 80).
 6. Mat. 3.15
 7. Mat. 21.32.
 8. Lk. 7.29.

Assuming the authenticity of these words, what significance are we to attach to them? Taylor has argued that it is only by a complete misunderstanding of the human personality and psychology that we cannot accept Jesus submitting to a baptism for repentance and 'remission of sins'. Jesus did not see his work in isolation from the sinful community, and he identified himself with them, repenting in and with them and becoming one with them in his submission to the baptism of John. It is significant, however, that these words appear in this context only in Matthew's Gospel in which the statement is suppressed that John's baptism was for the remission of sins, and there is no indication elsewhere in the Gospels of a corporate or 'vicarious' repentance. Jesus does indeed feel sorrow at the sins of the people, but this is very different from saying that he repented either 'for' or in and with them.

1. 2.
Both Flemington and Lampe have pointed out that according to Josephus John's baptism was a corporate rite. This is implied in his use of the phrase βαπτισμῶν συνίεναι,³ i.e. coming together by baptism. John's baptism signified cleansing and entry into the 'remnant' community of the Messiah. It is with this 'remnant' community, Flemington holds, that Jesus identified himself. 'Jesus could not exclude himself from this movement. He could not separate himself from the sinners he would save. For this acceptance of John's baptism need imply no consciousness of sin save in a corporate sense, but this identification of himself with the people of God was involved in the conception of messiahship which we know our Lord found in Deutero-Isaiah.'⁴

This interpretation I believe to be unlikely in the highest degree. If it implies our Lord's identification of himself with this 'remnant' messianic community, then it also implies that it is John and not the Messiah who creates the messianic community and that the Messiah merely 'completes' the work of John. If we are to accept that the baptism of Jesus was his identification of himself with the people he came to save, we have no evidence that Jesus did so see the significance of his baptism other than in this interpretation of this passage. There can be little doubt that Jesus did associate himself with the work of John the Baptist and thus 'authenticated' his mission, but to say that this is the theological significance he attached to his baptism and that this is the way in

1. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, p.22.

2. G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, 1951, pp. 22,37.

3. Antiq. XVII 5.2

4. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, p.27

5. V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, 1941, pp 30ff.

which this saying must be interpreted is another matter.

1.
As we have already noted 'righteousness', for the Hebrew mind is not simply an ethical quality, but is also the act of God in which he displays his righteousness in the 'salvation' of Israel. The highest hope of Jewish messianism was that 'righteousness' in both these senses would be seen in the work of the Messiah, and both of these aspects would be consequent and dependent upon his endowment with the Spirit. By his being anointed with the Spirit the Messiah would establish righteousness in Israel, i.e. restore Israel both ethically and nationally. Jewish messianism looked to the Messiah to be the instrument of Yahweh for establishing his righteousness, i.e., to create the ethically and religiously purified community who would share in the Messiah's endowment with the Spirit.

2.

Thus the most natural interpretation of the answer of Jesus to the reluctance of John to baptize him is 'Let it be so now; for this is the divinely appointed way in which the promises of Yahweh for the establishment of the messianic community will be established.' Matthew can then immediately relate the baptismal experience of Jesus; the descent of the Spirit and the heavenly voice, without any break in the sense. In the descent of the Spirit and the sounding of the voice John, according to Matthew, sees the significance of this act and the fulfilment of his mission.

There is no good reason to believe that it was John who attached this significance to the baptism of Jesus. It is far more likely that it was Jesus himself who did so, who saw in John the expected Elijah and his baptism as his anointing to his task as the Messiah. Matthew has objectified that interpretation.

In the Fourth Gospel this process is carried even further. There John goes out of his way to witness repeatedly concerning Jesus, and expressly describes him as 'the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' and as 'the Son of God'. Further the Fourth Gospel knows nothing of a 'baptism of repentance unto remission of sins' or of a baptism 'with fire', and it does not record the baptism of Jesus by John. Here too John explicitly repudiates that he is 'Elijah' or 'the prophet'.

3.

4.

-
1. Cf above p. 82f.
 2. Cf above p. 82 ff
 3. Jn. 1:7, 19-27; 3.30
 4. Jn. 1.21.

The reason for most of this is probably apologetic. It was at Ephesus, the probable origin of the Fourth Gospel, that the Baptist community^{1.} was apparently strong. The conscious effort in the Gospel to subordinate John to Jesus, in words spoken by John, is probably to prove to the disciples of John that their own leader acknowledged his subordination to Jesus. It is perhaps significant here that John is not even regarded as the anointer of Jesus; he merely bears witness to God's anointing him with the Spirit to his task as the ʿebhed-Messiah, and declares him to be the one who will fulfil the messianic task of baptizing with the Spirit.

(iv) Summary of Conclusions

1. There can be little doubt that Jesus did submit himself to baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, and in this way associated himself with the ethico-national messianism of John's teaching.^{2.} It is note-worthy that none of the evangelists record any word of Jesus to correct or modify this essentially orthodox Jewish messianism of John, which Luke clearly recognized to be semi-political in his tradition of the song of Zecharias.^{3.}

2. The disciples learned the messianic significance of his baptism from Jesus and not from John, and it is probable that it was Jesus who identified John with Elijah. The denial of this identification in the Fourth Gospel is explicable on apologetic grounds.

3. The significance of this incident for Jesus he expressed as the descent of the Spirit upon himself. In terms of Jewish messianic eschatology the most natural understanding of this would be that Jesus understood himself to have been anointed by God as his Messiah. We have seen in our discussion of the ʿebhed that this bestowal of the Spirit was also associated with the work of the ʿebhed. Jesus' reporting of the voice from heaven shows that Jesus saw his work to be a combination of Deutero-Isaiah's ʿebhed and traditional messianism. Thus he sees that an essential aspect of his work as the Messiah is to suffer and to die and be 'glorified' to create the messianic community.

4. In terms of the message of John and of Jewish messianic hopes this bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus is not for him alone but that through him

1. Acts 19.

2. It is the association of Jesus with John which causes Jesus to move into Galilee after the arrest of John by Herod Antipas (Mat. 4.12; Mk. 1.14; Lk. 3.19, 20; 4.14)

3. Lk. 1 68-79

the messianic community might share in his endowment with the Holy Spirit, or, in John's language, he will 'baptize with the Holy Spirit (and with fire)'.

In our discussion of the ebhed we saw how the early Church saw this hope to be fulfilled in the life, death, and 'glorification' of Jesus. But this hope for a general outpouring of the Spirit was an essential aspect of the community hope associated with the coming Messiah. It is only when, after the ascension, the Holy Spirit is given to the disciples that they understand themselves as the community of the Messiah or the 'Body of (the) Christ'. His work as the ebhed-Messiah is fulfilled only in the creation of the Spirit-filled community.

5. It is important that while the ebhed Yahweh is clearly implied in the baptism of Jesus, this does not mean that the messianic consciousness of Jesus is to be ignored. If Jesus had merely associated this incident with his awareness that he was the elect ebhed it would be quite impossible to explain the identification of John with Elijah. Only on the assumption that Jesus himself saw himself to be the Messiah, which he understood in terms of the ebhed, can this identification be understood.

6. While the combination of the ebhed and the Messiah implies a radical change in the way that Jesus understood that he was to 'fulfil all righteousness', this does not mean that the essentially communal aspect of his task was also changed.

7. It is significant to note that Christian baptism in the early Church was held to be a combination of the baptism performed by John and John's unique baptism of Jesus. Thus after Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost, in reply to the question 'what shall we do?', Peter says: 'Repent ye and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' What was promised in the baptism of Jesus is fulfilled in Christian baptism. But what was promised in the baptism of Jesus was a community hope. It is entry into the Spirit-filled community created by the ebhed-Messiah, Jesus.

1. Cf above p. 83.

2. Acts 2.37

3. Acts. 2.38

4. Luke makes the link between the baptisms of John and Christian baptism clear in the 'baptismal formula' (O.Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, pp.71ff) 'what shall I do?' In Luke's record of John's preaching to the 'multitudes', 'publicans', and 'soldiers' each group asks John τί ποιήσωμεν (Lk. 3.10, 12, 14) This formula is reproduced exactly in Acts 2.37 when the crowd asks Peter τί ποιήσωμεν. Before his baptism the Phillipian jailor asks Paul τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ. (Acts 16.30). Similarly Paul asks the voice on the Damascus road before his baptism to 'wash away his sins' (Acts 22.16) τί ποιήσω κύριε (Acts 22.10). Whether we have here a reading back of a Christian formula into the baptisms performed by John, or the borrowing of the Johannine formula by the Church, it is impossible
continued..../

(b) The temptation narratives and the associated incidents in the Gospels(i) The baptism and the temptations

All the synoptics record the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness as
 1. the first event after his baptism. In Matthew and Mark there is no break in the narrative between the baptism and the temptation. In Luke the connection is obscured by inserting the genealogy of Jesus between them, but is evident in the introduction to the temptation 'And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit for forty days in the wilderness, tempted
 2. by the devil.'

As the immediate sequel to the baptism the main themes of the baptism appear here again. They all present Jesus as being 'filled with' or 'led by'
 3. the Holy Spirit, and the voice from Heaven in the baptismal narrative has an echo
 4. in Satan's hypothetical question: 'If you are the Son of God...' in the Q account.

That the temptations of Jesus are to be understood as temptations of the Messiah is clear from the messianic emphasis of the baptismal narrative, the
 5. use of the title 'Son of God' by Satan, and reference to Jesus entering into
 6. immediate conflict with 'Satan' or the 'devil', which we have noted above to be
 7. part of the later messianic eschatology. Thus they form an essential part of
 8. the synoptic presentation of Jesus as the Messiah.

(ii) The authenticity of the 'Q' Account?

In the narrative introduction to the temptations in Matthew and Luke, there is little agreement apart from the words they have in common with Mark. Against Mark they agree in calling the adversary of Jesus 'the devil' rather than 'Satan'. They also agree in describing Jesus' fast, which is not explicitly mentioned by Mark. But the wording of the two accounts is different except for

4. from previous page continued...

to say. What is clear is that Luke sees the most intimate connexion between John's baptisms and Christian baptism, save that the Christian rite contains what was absent from John's baptism, namely, the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. The connexion might be stated in this way. As the baptism of Jesus inaugurated his messianic work through the bestowal of the Spirit upon him, so the Christian rite inaugurates the life of the Christian in the messianic community through participation in that same Spirit.

1. Mk. 1.12-13; Mat. 4.1-11; Lk. 4.1-13.

2. Lk. 4.1

3. Mk. 1.12; Mat. 4.1; Lk. 4.1

4. Mat. 4.3, 6; Lk. 4.3, 9. On this as a reference to the Messiah cf below p. 106

5. Cf below p. 106

6. Mk. 1.13:

7. Mat. 4.1; Lk. 4.2.

8. Cf above p. 79f. The concept of the conflict with Satan was equally an essential aspect of the work of the eschatological Son of man (cf below p. 181).

the verb 'hungered'. Luke's account appears to be an unsuccessful attempt to harmonise his Markan and Non-Markan sources. Matthew relates the temptations at the close of the forty days fast (Mat. 4.2f). Luke agrees with Mark that the temptations continued throughout the forty days (Lk. 4.2a), but then with Matthew places the three temptations at the close of the period (Lk. 4.2bf). Luke appears to have conflated the Markan tradition of a forty day temptation with the non-Markan tradition of a (forty day?) fast as a preliminary to the temptations. It is clear, therefore, that we are dealing here with two distinct sources.

1. The originality of the 'fast associated with the baptism?'

In favour of the originality of the association of the fast with the baptism is the fact that both Matthew and Luke link the account unmistakably with the baptism, and that Satan's question 'If you are the Son of God...' is an unmistakable echo of the voice from heaven. How much importance is to be attached to this satanic question is problematical, since all the synoptics present as a recurring theme the demoniacal recognition of Jesus as the 'Son of God'. It is possible that this demoniacal confirmation of the voice from heaven may have helped to fuse together the Markan tradition of the temptation immediately following the baptism of Jesus with a self-contained section in the non-Markan source which contained a more detailed account of the nature of Satan's temptation of Jesus, the 'Son of God'.

A number of factors make it probable that the non-Markan source was a self-contained section not associated with the baptismal narrative. The first is that Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in introducing the name Jesus at the beginning of the story. (Mat. 4.1; Lk. 4.1). The insertion of the genealogy between the baptism and temptation makes this necessary in Luke but is redundant in Matthew. Manson rightly concludes that 'if the name Jesus did stand in Q at this point, it would be an indication that the Q account of the temptations was a self-contained section.'

Secondly, as we shall see below, while there is a great deal of evidence in the New Testament which associates the idea of a satanic temptation with baptism, only in Acts 9.9 (cf v.19) is fasting associated with baptism in the New Testament. This is found in Luke's account of Paul's experience on the

1. J.M. Creed, Luke, 1942, p.62.

2. Mk. 3.11; 5.7; Mat. 8.29; Lk. 4.41; 8.28.

3. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.42

4. Cf below pp 154 ff.

Damascus road in which he refers to Paul's blindness and that for three days he 'did neither eat nor drink' (Acts 9.9), and subsequently to his healing by Ananias (Acts 9.18) and his baptism and breaking of his fast (Acts 9.19). In Luke's accounts of Paul's own telling of the story, while the blindness and healing motif remains we are given no hint of a fast but, significantly, the idea of deliverance from Satan does appear in the second account.

The historicity of this fast is rendered doubtful by Luke's realistic account of Paul's blindness and his healing. In Paul's own accounts there is a gradual 'spiritualization' of his healing. In his account before the angry Jews he does not say that 'he saw nothing' or that when Ananias laid hands on him 'there fell from his eyes as it were scales and he received his sight' but that he could not see 'for the glory of the light' and when Ananias laid hands on him 'in that very hour I looked upon him. And he (Ananias) said, The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the righteous one, and to hear a voice from his mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.' In the account before Agrippa the whole event is interpreted in spiritual terms as a heavenly vision and is stated as being the command of Christ to him to witness 'of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee' and commissioning him to the Gentile mission 'to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of their sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me.' Here we have a theology of baptism without any mention of the rite itself. That Paul should have omitted reference to his baptism before Agrippa but not the Jews is easily understandable, but surely the miracle of his healing, if it were historical fact, would have impressed Agrippa as much as the Jews.

That this healing of Paul was not historical may be borne out by his profession of innocence after his intemperate 'reviling' of the high priest; 'I wist not brethren that he was the high priest.' Such a claim is unintelligible

1. Acts 22.11, 13; 26.18

2. Acts 26.18

3. So Luke in Acts 9.8

4. So Luke in Acts 9.18

5. Acts 22.11

6. Acts 22.13f.

7. Acts 26.16

8. Acts 26.18

9. Acts 23. 1-5

unless Paul, the ex-Pharisee, was not able to see the man who gave the order to have him struck. Such bad vision may also be the explanation of the 'large letters' with which he writes to the Galatians.¹ If so Luke's account may not be historical but may reflect in concrete terms the theological significance which Paul attached to his conversion experience, his meeting with Ananias, and his baptism. This would cast doubt on the historicity of the fast mentioned by Luke.

Be this as it may, neither Luke nor Paul (either in his recorded speeches in Acts or in his epistles) attach any theological significance to such a fast and do not mention it in conjunction with baptism.

It is possible that Luke's record of the fast of Paul may not have been associated specifically with his baptism but rather with his commission to the Gentile mission. Clearly Paul interpreted the laying on of hands by Ananias in this way.² When Luke records the separation of Barnabas and Paul for the work of the Gentile mission, he mentions the fasting before hands are laid on them.³ Similarly fasting accompanies the appointment of elders in the Churches at Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch by Paul and Barnabas.⁴ Thus while there is New Testament evidence for a fast being an essential part of setting men aside for their specific task in the Church, there is no certain evidence to associate fasting with the rite of baptism.

We cannot ignore the fact, however, that there is abundant evidence for a pre-baptismal fast in the early post-New Testament Church.⁵ In view of the lack of evidence for pre-baptismal fasting in the New Testament but evidence for pre-commissioning fasting, and the fact that Christ's baptism was understood as his anointing for his messianic task, it is probable that very early Christian baptism came to be understood as a commission. It is possible also that the Q account of the fast and temptation stood as an independent introduction to Q before the account of the baptism but has been attracted to the post-baptismal temptation in Matthew and Luke by the more primitive account in Mark. Since there is no evidence for fasting being a part of John the Baptist's rite, its pre-baptismal position in Q is probably secondary. Such an hypothesis would

1. Gal. 6.11

2. Acts 22.15; 26.17

3. Acts 13.3

4. Acts 14.23

5. Justin Martyr, Apol. 61; Hippolytus (Apost. Trad.) in Apost. Const. 20.7; Tertullian, De. Bapt. 20.1

explain how fasting came to be a pre- and not post-baptismal practice in the early Church. The Gospel accounts as they stand would have suggested the reverse.

2. The authenticity of the three temptations in Q.

Bultmann has suggested that the account of the temptation of Jesus is a residue of an earlier detailed legend about Jesus or, more probably, a nature-myth like that of the conflict of Marduk with the Chaos-dragon, or a story of the temptation of Buddha, or Zarathustra, or later Christian saints. Of these suggestions Taylor notes; 'it may be said that while all things are possible, less speculative explanations are to be preferred.' Manson argues against Bultmann's implied syllogism:

All temptation stories told about great religious leaders of antiquity are legendary.

Mat. 4.1-11 = Lk. 4.1-13 is such a story.

Therefore it is legendary. (3)

He argues that the major premiss may be doubted. The first two temptations (in Matthew's order) contain the demands to perform miraculous 'signs' of the messiahship of Jesus, and such demands recur in the course of his ministry, i.e. the temptations correspond to real incidents in his ministry. In the Fourth Gospel the multitude demand a messianic bread sign patterned on the Mosaic manna. This Jesus rejects and declares himself to be the true bread which leads to eternal life. In the discourse with the Samaritan woman Jesus answers the request of the disciples that he should eat in words whose import is precisely that of his reply to the tempter. John also records a demand by the Jews for a messianic 'sign' coupled with his account of the cleansing of the Temple. To this Jesus replies 'Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.' Both Matthew and Mark record that this saying of Jesus was brought as a charge against him at his trial before the high priest and as a taunt hurled at him on the cross, though neither records this as an actual saying of Jesus at any point in their narratives. While it is true that both record this as part of the false accusations brought against Jesus, if this is taken to mean that Jesus never did make

1. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p. 270f.

2. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.163

3. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p. 45.

4. Cf Mk. 8.11-13, Mat. 12. 38-42 = Lk. 11.29-32; Lk. 23.8; Mk. 15.32 and par.

5. Jn. 6.30f.

6. Jn. 6.48ff.

7. Jn. 6.31-34 (cf Mat. 4.4; Lk. 4.4)

8. Jn. 2.18f.

9. Mat. 26.61; Mk. 14.58

10. Mat. 27.40; Mk. 15.29

this claim it is difficult to understand why John deliberately records Jesus as making it. This would indicate that John's account of the reply of Jesus to the demand for a 'sign' is historical, and the most natural place for such an announcement would be in the Temple itself.

The same is true of the temptation to world dominion in both a general and a specific sense. As Manson notes 'the whole history of the Jewish people from 200 B.C. to A.D. 130 is solid testimony to the fact that if Jesus had wished to raise a revolt against Gentile domination, he would have found a following

1. without difficulty.' Again John bears independent testimony to such a temptation

in the demand of the brothers of Jesus that he go up to Jerusalem from Galilee

and 'manifest thyself to the world', to which John adds the rider 'for even his

2. brethren did not believe in him', the implication being that even they could not believe that Jesus was the Messiah until he fulfilled the typical politoc-

3. national Jewish expectations. Cullmann has also shown convincingly that through-

4. out his life Jesus opposed not only the Sadducees, who assented without reserva-

tion to the Roman domination, but also the political ideals of the Zealots. He sees this political temptation most clearly in the saying about paying taxes in

5. Mat. 12.13 and par.

It would thus appear that we cannot assign the Q account to the fertile imagination of the early Church. The regularity with which the Gospels present us with occasions in which Jesus refused to accede to the demands to perform messianic signs which would show him to be the Messiah of normative Judaism, and the witness of the Gospels to the inability of the disciples and the Jews to understand the teaching of Jesus, points to the fact that these temptations were real, that they continued throughout his ministry, and that it was Jesus himself who rejected these ideals as false.

At the same time Creed's conclusion seems to be sound: 'It seems likely that the picture as given in Q has been filled in by the imagination of the early Church. The balanced structure of the three temptations with the three quotations of scripture in reply suggests a reflective dramatisation of the rejection by Jesus of false messianic ideals.'

1. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p. 46.

2. Jn. 7.4

3. Jn. 7.5

4. O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 1957, pp.8-49

5. ibid p.35

6. J.M. Creed, Luke, 1942, p.62

It is thus improbable that the form and position of the three temptations in Matthew and Luke can be ascribed to Jesus himself, though there can be little doubt that the concept of the rejection of the false messianic ideals by Jesus as Satanic is to be ascribed to him. As they stand in Matthew and Luke they reflect the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah by the early Church and also an acceptance of his rejection of some of the expectations of normative Judaism as Satanic. As such they form a summary of the teaching of Jesus about his messianic office and presumably stood as such in the introduction of the non-Markan source. Because of their obvious similarity to the more primitive and probably more historical account of the post-baptismal temptation in Mark it is easy to see how the two sources became conflated.

We shall, therefore, interpret the account of the three temptations of Q as a summary of the teachings and not simply as an early teaching of Jesus.

(iii) The bread temptation and the feeding miracles.

The first temptation, like the temptation on the temple is prefixed by the words 'If thou art the Son of God'. The term Son of God for the Messiah is curiously rare in Hebrew and Jewish literature. In the Old Testament it was a fairly common designation of the king of Israel, though more commonly it was the name given to Israel as a whole, and in the later period to angels. In the LXX the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha the name is given to Israel, to the godly and upright in Israel, and in 4 Ezra to the Messiah. In the rabbinic literature it is used for Israel and for the Davidic Messiah, but of the Messiah only when an Old Testament 'son of God' text is interpreted as messianic. Strack and Billerbeck suggest that the rabbis may have avoided the term because of its use by Christians as a designation of Christ. In any event 'it is difficult to see what else Son of God can mean in the present context'.

Accepting the title of 'Son of God' as messianic, the most natural interpretation of the bread temptation is in terms of the belief that the messianic age would be marked by a miraculous abundance of material goods, and in particular the well-attested Jewish beliefs about a renewal of the gift of manna. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch;

-
1. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 2 pp. 588f.
 2. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.43. W. Manson, Luke, 1930, p.37 rejects the messianic interpretation of 'Son of God' and accepts the Q account as teaching derived directly from Jesus.

'it shall come to pass at that self-same time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time.' (1)

Similarly;

But they who honour the true and everlasting God
inherit life, throughout the aeonic time
dwelling in the fertile garden of paradise,
feasting on sweet bread from the starry heaven. (2)

In later rabbinic literature the renewal of the gift of manna becomes a fixed
3.
part of the eschatological faith.

It is significant that both Mark and Matthew conclude the miracle of the
4.
feeding of the four thousand with a demand for a 'sign from heaven'. In interpreting this demand for a 'sign' we cannot ignore the narrative setting of the miraculous feeding. If confirmation of this were necessary it is provided by the Fourth Gospel in which the demand for a sign is specifically connected with the feeding miracle, and in terms which clearly imply the expectation that the
5.
Messiah will restore the Mosaic manna 'out of heaven'. Thus it is false to say with Taylor that 'the purpose of this narrative is to illustrate the attitude of
6.
Jesus to the demand for signs' if this implies that this is all the significance we can attach to the demand and Jesus' rejection of it. The significance of the demand is that the feeding miracle is recognised as being messianic by the Jewish authorities, and Jesus' refusal to perform the 'sign' indicates how he viewed his messianic mission. Confirmation of the messianic character of the demand is seen in the fact that it is only here that we find in Matthew and Mark the demand for a sign $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\hat{o}\hat{\upsilon}\ \sigma\hat{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\hat{o}\hat{\upsilon}$.
7.
This indicates that the demand is for a messianic bread (manna from heaven) miracle.

The loss of connexion between the feeding miracle and the subsequent
8.
'temptation' by the religious leaders in their demand for a 'sign' seems to have been occasioned by the change in geographical setting in Mark and Matthew. Such a change is necessitated by the fact that the religious leaders would not have been among those who partook of the miraculous bounty. In John no such change is necessary since it is the 'multitude' who request the 'sign'. It is

-
1. 2. Bar. 29.8. The Apocalypse is probably to be dated as nearly contemporaneous with the Fourth Gospel (E. V. Manson, *Sayings*, p. 44) and probably reflects an earlier and wide-spread belief.
 2. Sib. Or. 3.46-49. This passage may also be pre-Christian.
 3. Cf the abundant evidence cited by Strack & Billerbeck Vol. 1 p.87; Vol. 2 p.481; Vol. 4 pp. 890, 954. Most of this is later than the Gospels, but the evidence of 2 Baruch and the Sibbyline Oracles is sufficient to indicate that the belief was present at the time of Jesus. The fact that the tradition is so wide-spread in later times suggests that it was not a new belief which arose only after the time of Christ.
 4. Mk. 8.11; Mat. 16.1 (cf Lk. 11.29)
 5. Jn. 6.30f.
 6. V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, p.361.
 7. Mk. 8.11; Mat. 16.1 (Luke introduces this at 11.16; 21.11)
 8. Mk. 8.11; Mat. 16.1

not possible to decide which of the two accounts is historically accurate, but that the change of setting does not indicate the commencement of a pericope unconnected with the feeding miracle is proved by the fact that both Mark and Matthew record that Jesus went on to discuss the feeding miracle immediately after the demand of the Pharisees.^{1.}

In Mark the demand for a sign 'from heaven' is met with an absolute refusal. εἰ δὲ δοθήσεται (= οὐ δοθήσεται in Mat. 16.4) is a strong negation in which εἰ (= the Aramaic 'im) implies an imprecation ('if I do such a thing may I die'). In verses 14-21 there is introduced a saying regarding the 'leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' which is connected with a strong rebuke of the disciples for their failure to understand the significance of the loaves of the miraculous feeding. This saying concerning the Pharisees is left unexplained, but it may refer to their failure to understand the significance of the feeding or, more probably, to their refusal to believe.

After verse 16 the reference to the Pharisees is ignored and all attention is focussed on the disciples who themselves do not yet understand the significance of the feeding.

Whether the original feeding incidents were miraculous will be variously estimated, but it is clear that the stories were prized in the early Church because of their symbolic relevance to the eucharist. The account of the blessing and distribution of the loaves is modelled on that of the Last Supper and points to a custom of fellowship meals of Jesus with his disciples of which the Last Supper was the last and culminating example. It is also significant that the 'broken pieces' (κλάσμα) is used in the Didache of the broken bread of the Agape and eucharist.^{5.} It is clear, therefore, that whatever the nature of the original events, in the early community Jesus's feeding of the 'multitude' was interpreted in the light of the eucharistic faith that in this sacrament Christ feeds the faithful with miraculous food.

Taylor is therefore probably correct in accounting for the form of Mk. 8.1-21 in the liturgical and catechetical interests of the early Church. The feeding of the four thousand is viewed as a sign to the disciples of the coming

1. Mk. 8.14ff; Mat. 16.5ff.

2. Cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955 p. 362 and supporting authorities.

3. Mk. 8.6; cf Mk. 14.22

4. Mk. 6.43; 8.8, 19.

5. Did. 9.3f.

6. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.361ff. See also P. Carrington, Primitive Catechism, 1940, p.176

kingdom in which Christ will feed the faithful with the 'miraculous' eucharistic food. According to Mark's account of the Last Supper, this food is Christ himself. In John's account of this feeding miracle as we shall see below this is precisely the way in which Jesus does interpret the significance of it.

Consequently the most natural interpretation of Mk. 8.11ff is that Jesus did understand the feeding of the multitude as a fore-taste of the messianic banquet. According to popular belief this meant that he would realize the ideal of material abundance and that he would renew the miracle of manna 'from heaven'. It is this 'sign' that the Pharisees demand in response to the obvious messianic claims of Jesus in the feeding. This demand is viewed by Jesus as showing that to the Pharisees no 'sign' had been given because they refused to accept the 'sign of Jesus' fellowship meal with the multitude. Even the first disciples had failed to understand the 'sign' given to them. They were the prototypes of many Christians in Mark's day who had no true understanding of the eucharist as the true messianic banquet, the fulfilment of the work of the Messiah Jesus. But this fulfilment would come only after Jesus had completed his messianic mission in his death and resurrection. Knowing that the messianic fulfilment lay via death, the demand for a sign ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, which the Jews interpreted as restoring the Mosaic Manna, is rejected by Jesus. To perform any such miraculous 'sign' in response to their demand would be a denial of his concept of his work.

In Matthew's version of the demand for a 'sign' to the flat refusal in Mark is added an important exception εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάννου, which is certainly secondary and derived from a saying preserved in a different context in both Matthew and Luke, and possibly derived from Q. Whatever the saying may have meant in Q, our task is to try to understand the meaning to be given to it in this context by Matthew. In Mat. 12.40 the 'sign of Jonah' is interpreted as; 'For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' We shall see that this undoubtedly refers to the death and resurrection of Jesus. Thus the 'sign of Jonah' is Jesus himself whose messianic work will be completed in his death and resurrection. Then will be realized the 'sign' ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in the messianic banquet of the eucharist. From this the Pharisees and the

1. Mk. 14.22

2. Cf pp. 112ff.

3. Mk. 8.31, 9.31; 10.33, 34.

4. Mat. 16.4

5. Mat. 12.39, Lk. 11.29.

6. Cf below p 271ff.

7. Cf below p 271ff.

Saducees will be excluded because of their unbelief. Matthew concludes with
 1.
 the solemn warning 'beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Saducees', which
 2.
 is not their bread but their 'teaching'.

Matthew has carried the interpretation of Mark a step further by
 introducing into the narrative a definite allusion to the death and resurrection
 of Jesus as the 'sign' which will be given. In Mark this allusion is not
 3.
 contained in the narrative itself, though it appears only ten verses later which
 4.
 would indicate that this thought is not very far from his mind.

This interpretation of the synoptic accounts is confirmed in detail
 by the independent record in the Fourth Gospel.

1. Firstly the messianism of the feeding miracle is made quite explicit
 5.
 when Jesus is recognised by the multitude as the coming prophet who in the more
 common tradition was identified with the herald of the Messiah, but in some
 6.
 circles with the messiah himself. As such they quite naturally wanted to make
 7.
 him king. At this Jesus separates himself from the people but is united with
 them again in Jn. 6.25, and the stage is set for the great discourse on the
 8.
 feeding.

-
1. Mat. 16.11
 2. Mat. 16.12
 3. Mk. 8.31
 4. Luke does not record either the feeding of the four thousand or the demand for the messianic bread miracle. It is significant, however, to note Luke's record of the Emmaus walk with the two disciples 'on the third day after' the crucifixion (Lk. 24.13ff). There Jesus answers the grave doubts of the disciples with the rhetorical question; 'Behoved it not the Messiah to suffer these things, and to enter his glory?' (Lk. 24.26). It is clear that this cannot be taken to mean simply that the Messiah should suffer, die, and rise again. The entry into his δόξα refers most naturally to the ascension. Thus it is the ascended Christ who appeared to the disciples and expounded 'in all the scriptures, beginning from Moses and all the prophets' the things which concerned himself. (cf above p40 on the dating of the ascension).
 It is the crucified but ascended Messiah who then entered the house of the two disciples where he 'took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them' (Lk. 24.30). It is then that the disciples (knew him' (Lk.24.31) This surely does not simply mean that they recognised him, but that here is the fulfilment of the messianic bread miracles. In Breaking bread they knew him to be the Messiah who would feed his people with the miraculous food.
 By a second movement the clear indications of the eucharist in this passage and its parallels with the Last Supper, make it certain that this is also eucharistic teaching, which is regarded as the fulfilment of the dream of the messianic banquet. As such this passage confirms our interpretation of the feeding miracle and the demand for a 'sign' in Mark and Matthew.
 What this passage makes clear is the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, the understanding of his fulfilling his mission through his suffering, death, and entry into 'glory', and of the eucharist as the glorious messianic banquet with the present Messiah.
 5. Jn. 6.14 (so also by the Samaritan woman, Jn. 4.19, by some of the people at the feast of the tabernacles, Jn. 7.40, and by the blind man, Jn. 9.17).
 6. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, pp. 301f, 322.
 7. Jn. 6.15
 8. For interesting suggestions on the significance of the narrative of the walking on the water to the subsequent discourse, cf. C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 344f.

In the first part of the discourse Jesus tells us that the feeding miracle was itself a 'sign'. Although the multitude had witnessed this 'sign' they had not really 'seen signs', and so the multitude comes to Jesus not because they had 'seen signs' but because their hunger had been satisfied. Their inability to grasp the significance of that in which they had partaken was their lack of faith in him as the one whom 'God hath sent'.

Clearly the multitude understand that Jesus is making a messianic claim, and consequently ask for 'signs' to establish his messianic pretensions. John shows here his familiarity with the specific nature of the messianic expectation that the Messiah would restore the Mosaic manna. It is this that they understand to be what Jesus meant when he promised βρῶσις μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (Jn. 6.27). This demand is met by Jesus not with the Markan flat refusal (Mk. 8.12) or the Matthaean qualified refusal (Mat. 16.4) but by the denial that the Mosaic manna was the true 'bread out of heaven' (Jn. 6.32). That manna was certainly miraculous but it was βρῶσις ἀπολλυμένη not βρῶσις μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον and so could not be part of the 'coming age'. The bread of God is that which will give eternal life, and not a glorified physical existence. Thus Jesus refuses to perform the sign they demand and bend his concept of his task to theirs.

The people do not understand what is meant. Their request κύριε πάντοτε δός ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον (Jn. 6.34) is parallel to the uncomprehending request of the Samaritan woman κύριε δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ (Jn. 4.15) and provides the opening for the second part of the discourse (Jn. 6.35-50) in which the main theme is that Jesus himself is the 'bread from heaven', implying that not simply is he the Messiah but that he himself is the 'blessing' of the messianic age (Jn. 6.35) and the one who gives 'eternal life' or 'Life of the age to come' (Jn. 6.40).

1. Jn. 6.14

2. Jn. 6.26

3. Jn. 6.29. The need for 'faith' is a recurring theme of the discourse Jn. 6.35f, 47, 64, 69.

4. Jn. 6.30f.

5. Jn. 6.33; cf Jn. 6.40. Dodd interprets this passage as pointing to Hellenistic influence. For him the thought is moving on the level of the contrast between the Platonic ideal as the real, and the physical world as a mere shadow or copy of the real. Such an hypothesis is unnecessary and unlikely as the whole passage is so thoroughly Jewish. We have already seen how in Judaism the hope of a glorified physical existence in a this-worldly messianic 'golden age' lived side by side with a more 'other-worldly' hope of an eternal kingdom which would be inaugurated by the Messiah (cf above pp. 78ff). What we have here is a repudiation by Jesus of the more materialistic hope, but the thought is still essentially Jewish.

6. Jn. 6.33, 35, 38, 41, 48.

7. C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp.144ff.

These claims of Jesus immediately raise an objection. How can he have come from heaven when his parentage is known (Jn. 6.41f)? It is doubtful that Cullmann is correct in interpreting this as a reference to the humble origins of Jesus. It is more probable that John has preserved the Jewish idea of the hidden Messiah whose origins may have been humble but not known. John stresses not the humbleness of his parentage, but the fact that it is known, and reveals that the Jews are still thinking in terms of normal Messianic expectations. They still cannot believe that he is the Messiah. In his reply Jesus does not deny his parentage but points to the necessity of faith which is possible only to those whom the Father 'draws' to Christ (Jn. 6.44). The implication of this is that Jesus accepts his well-known parentage, but declares that the eye of faith sees in him the deeper reality; that he has come from the Father and that those who 'come' to him in faith 'see' the truth about him and have eternal life.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that like the synoptics John presents the Jews as seeing the messianic significance of the feeding miracle and that Jesus is making messianic claims. The Gospel tradition presents Jesus not as denying that he is the Messiah, but transforming the content of the messianic hope.

2. Secondly, like the synoptic accounts, eucharistic allusions abound throughout the Johannine account pointing unmistakably to the eucharist as the fulfilment of the hope of the glorious messianic banquet. The first hint of the eucharistic significance of the whole incident is John's setting of it in the context of the Jewish passover (Jn. 6.4). Dodd is surely correct in seeing in this a significance deeper than historical dating. 'The Christian reader could hardly have failed to remember that the Christian Passover was the eucharist, and it is possible that the evangelist intended at the outset to give a hint of the eucharistic significance of the narrative which follows.'

In his record of the distribution of the miraculous food John does not mention the solemn breaking of the bread so characteristic an action of the eucharist. It is significant, however, that whereas in Mk. 6.42-43 and 8.8 the filling of the baskets is to emphasize the abundance of the supply by which the multitude were satisfied (ἐφάγον καὶ ἔχορταίσθησαν), in John the satisfaction

2. Cf above P. 84.

3. The words τὸ πᾶσχα are present in all Greek MSS and versions, and the fact that Iranaeus and others ignore them is not sufficient reason for excising them from the text.

4. C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.333.

1. O. Cullmann, Worship, 1953, p.97

of hunger is mentioned only in a subordinate clause (ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν) (Jn. 6.12) and the gathering in of the κλάσματα introduced by a command of Jesus συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύοντα κλάσματα ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται. It may be that John is pointing to the contrast he will draw later between βρωσις μένουσα and βρωσις ἀπολλυμένη (Jn. 6.27) which in verses 51ff is identified with the eucharistic bread.

A eucharistic allusion would also have been apparent to the discerning Christian reader in the introduction of the word πάντοτε in the uncomprehending request of the multitude κύριε πάντοτε δός ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον (Jn. 6.34). 'This gift should not be restricted to the single act of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand nor indeed to the historical incarnation at all, but after Christ's death too this bread should continue to be given 'evermore', not as the Jews meant it, but rather as Jesus did and expressed it in his answer; "I am the bread of life" (v. 35). Since he is the bread of life he will never be withdrawn from his own. The close of the verse (Jn. 6.35) shows that we are to think of the Lord's Supper for it speaks of satisfying not only hunger but also thirst. Here are two eucharistic elements although the context only concerns bread.¹

As Dodd has suggested there is also an ambiguity in Jn. 6.33 which was probably intended by the evangelist to provide a crucial link between the second part of the discourse in which Jesus is identified with the bread from heaven and the eucharistic discourse in the third part.² In the sentence ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ it is possible to treat ὁ καταβαίνων adjectively supplying the substantive ἄρτος from the context. This sense would then be 'the bread of God is the bread which comes down from heaven, and gives (eternal) life to the world'. In this sense the verse would point forward to the eucharistic bread which gives eternal life to those who eat it (Jn. 6.58). At the same time the phrase recalls ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς (Jn. 3.13), and it would be equally possible to construe it substantively in the sense; 'The bread of God is he who descends from heaven and gives life to the world' - and this we know from Jn. 3.13 is the Son of man, Jesus. This would then point forward to Jn. 6.35, 38 in which Jesus claims to be the bread of life come down from heaven. This ambiguity would indicate that these

1. O. Cullmann, worship, 1953, p. 96.

2. C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, p. 337f.

are not two distinct things but one and the same reality - Christ the bread of life. This is confirmed when in the eucharistic discourse we find that eating Christ himself (Jn. 6.57) and eating the eucharistic bread (Jn. 6.58) are made parallel to one another, giving 'life'.

The indignant and presumably horrified question 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (Jn. 6.52) in response to the assertion $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota\ \delta\ \alpha\acute{\rho}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \zeta\omega\acute{\nu}\ \delta\ \epsilon\acute{\kappa}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\ \rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha$ (Jn. 6.51a) meets with no answer; but that the eucharist is here in the mind of John cannot be doubted. The introduction of the idea of 'drinking the blood of the Son of man' (Jn. 6.53) in the reply of Jesus when the context would lead us to expect a reference only to 'eating his flesh' makes this clear. It is probable that this has been introduced to avoid any possibility of not seeing the eucharistic significance of the whole discourse. Dodd has also rightly observed that the Johannine expressions, $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota\ \delta\ \alpha\acute{\rho}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma\ \dots\ \delta\ \alpha\acute{\rho}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\nu}\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega\ \eta\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota\nu\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$ (Jn. 6.51) amount to an expanded transcription of the words of institution as we have them in 1 Cor. 11.24 ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$).¹

Bearing this sacramental reference in mind, the reply of Jesus attributes to the sacrament exactly that 'eternal life' and the promise of a resurrection at the 'last day' which he attributed to himself in the second part of the discourse. This parallel is made even more explicit when John contrasts again the manna which the fathers ate and died with the eucharistic bread which gives eternal life (Jn. 6.58, cf. 6.49). In the eucharist the 'sign' demanded by the Jews will be fulfilled. It will not be in a crude quasi-physical manna miracle. In Jesus that for which the Jews hoped was already a reality, if only they had the faith to see it, and would be fulfilled in the eucharist.

3. The synoptic allusions to this fulfilment being via the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Messiah Jesus are made still more explicit in John. The expressions $\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ and $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ can hardly fail to suggest death. In these veiled terms the evangelist suggests that it is through death that Christ is to become the life ~~of~~ the world.

Yet it is not simply by death. When the disciples reply that this is a 'hard saying' (Jn. 6.61) Jesus accepts that at the moment it is hard and so points to his coming ascension (Jn. 6.62). It is by his ascension that the

1. C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.338. So also J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p.165.

sacramental bread will become 'bread from heaven', the bread which gives eternal life, for it is by his ascension that he will draw all men unto himself and give eternal life to those who believe. Thus it is on the ascended Christ that the believer will feed and find eternal life.

Following hard on the reference to the ascension comes a reference to the Spirit. (Jn. 6.63). It is a recurring theme of the final discourses that the bestowal of the Spirit is consequent upon the ascension. It is the Spirit who gives life (τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζωοποιούν) of itself ἢ σὰρξ οὐκ ἰσχύει σῶσαι (Jn. 6.63). We know from what has gone before that it is Christ and the eucharistic food, which is Christ, who gives 'life', and that the sacrament will gain its power through the ascension of Christ. Thus the reference to the Spirit here is probably to be taken as a reference to the ascended Christ himself.

It is in this way that Christ will fulfil the requested messianic 'sign'. He will feed his people with bread from heaven, but this will be no quasi-physical miracle which will restore the Mosaic manna. This would be to give them flesh which would profit nothing. The bread which he will give is himself in the messianic banquet of the eucharist which would be fulfilled only after he had completed his messianic mission in his passion, death, resurrection and ascension.

Summary of Conclusions and Interpretation of the Temptation

The essential features of the story as it was preserved in the early Church are clear. They are that after some form of fellowship meal of Jesus with his disciples, which may or may not have been miraculous, in which he distributed food in a way which became characteristic of the eucharist, and which he undoubtedly spoke of as a 'sign' of his messianic office, the Jews came to Jesus and demanded that he establish his messianic claims with a manna miracle. To this demand Jesus refused to accede. Rather he points to himself, his teaching and works as the 'sign'. But by their unbelief men are blind to who he really is.

1. Cullmann (Worship, 1953, p.100) is surely not correct in saying that 'the miracle of the ascension is intended to help the disciples comprehend the miracle of the eucharist.' Jesus has already stated that the Son of man is going to be 'lifted up' and thus give eternal life to the world (Jn. 3.14f). As the context makes quite explicit (cf below p.356f) this does not mean simply his being lifted up on the cross but his ascension (cf Jn. 3.13). This is an essential part of the work by which he will bring eternal life to the world. In this passage it is the sacrament which brings eternal life, and by the ascension that it is life-giving. Thus there is a far greater realism in the concept than is given to it by Cullmann.
2. Unless we accept this we must explain why it is that Mark has preserved the demand of the Pharisees for a 'sign' ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in this passage only in his Gospel, a passage in which it has such peculiar significance.

Yet the 'sign' which the Jews demanded will be fulfilled when Jesus has finished his work in the cross, resurrection and ascension. Then the people will share in the great messianic banquet and be fed with bread 'from heaven', but in a far deeper sense than the Jews expected. In the eucharist he will feed them with the true bread which brings eternal life - himself.

All this teaching moves in genuine semitic thought-forms. The faith which it expresses is inalienably Jewish, though its concepts receive a fairly radical transformation. The hope is transformed from a community hope for a coming earthly 'golden age' in which the people would know physical abundance, to a faith which is still essentially a community faith, but which community is now fed with the miraculous food in which the Messiah, who has died, risen and ascended, is present to the believers.

On this interpretation of the feeding miracles the bread temptation of Q is to be interpreted that Satan says to Jesus in effect: 'If you are the Messiah, produce the food miracle and feed the people with this miraculous food'. The reference to stones is probably designed to show how utterly physical such a miracle would be. In John's language it would be food the people could eat, but not bring them eternal life. It is not for this that Jesus has come.

The reply attributed to Jesus is a quotation from Deut. 8.3; 'Man shall not live by bread alone'. The force of this quotation appears when we consider the context of the passage, which is primarily a call to obedience to God who, the children of Israel are reminded, wonderfully provided for them during their forty year wandering in the wilderness. The parallels of this to the passages which we have examined as the 'occasion' for this introductory summary in Q are perfectly clear. Throughout the Gospels record Jesus' obedience to the will of God which means that he must suffer and die before he is exalted. Then will be fulfilled the miraculous messianic banquet for the new Israel, the eucharist, in which the miraculous 'bread from heaven' would not be simply a restoration of the Mosaic manna, but the ascended Christ himself.

1. Not, as J.M. Creed, (*Luke*, 1942, p.62) suggests to counter the magical feats ascribed to Simon Magus (*Ps. Clem. Hom.* 2.32) who is reported to have turned stones into bread. It is more probable that the feats of Simon are modelled on the Temptation narrative than the narrative¹⁵ designed to counter them.

(iv) The Temple Temptation and the Cleansing of the Temple

Like the first temptation, the temptation relating to the roof of the temple is also messianic. While there was a tradition of the Messiah appearing on the roof of the temple to proclaim deliverance to the people, there is nothing to parallel the idea of his jumping from the roof to a miraculous deliverance from hurt.

We have seen that there is good reason to believe that the Q account of the temptations is not to be ascribed to Jesus. We are given a clue to what that occasion was when we consider the Malachi passage which appears to stand at the fountain-head of the later Judaistic teaching about the Messiah on the roof of the temple;

Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold, he cometh, saith Yahweh of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like a fuller's soap: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver; and they shall offer unto Yahweh offerings in righteousness. Then shall the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto Yahweh, as in the days of old, and as in ancient years. (4)

Here we have coupled together the idea of the prophetic forerunner of the Messiah with the concept of the sudden appearance of the Messiah in the temple to purify it and its worship.

In addition to this concept must be taken the old and common idea in the Old Testament and later Judaism that when the Messiah comes he will destroy the enemies of Israel, restore Jerusalem making it the political centre of the world, and the temple in Jerusalem as the focal point of the world's worship. A brief allusion to this belief is found also in Mal. 3.12.

Following these clues we shall not be far wrong in seeing the occasion of the second temptation in Jesus' 'cleansing' of the temple, record of which is preserved in the Gospels. The thorny question of the dating of this narrative need not detain us here, but there are indications in the narratives

1. We are not concerned with the problem of the change in order of the temptations in Matthew and Luke. Matthew's order builds up to such a natural and fitting climax that we shall deal with the temptations in his order.
2. Cf above p. 35.
3. Cf above p. 104 ff.
4. Mal. 3.1ff.
5. Cf above pp. 71f.; 73ff.; 79f.
6. Mat. 21.12-13; Mk. 11.15-19; Lk. 19.45-48; Jn. 2.13-17.
7. For arguments for the Markan dating cf. J.H. Bernard, The Gospel According to St. John (IJK), 1928, ad. loc; A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1940, ad. loc. J.V. Bartlett, St. Mark, 1922, ad. loc; B.H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark, 1937, ad. loc; G.K. Barrett, John, 1955, ad. loc. For argument in favour of the Johannine dating of J. Weiss, Das Markusevangelium, 1906, ad. loc.; M.J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Jean, 1948, ad loc; A.H. McNeile, Matthew, continued next page.....

which suggest that John has retained elements of an older tradition than the
 1. synoptics. We shall, therefore, treat the Johannine tradition as the more original and attempt to interpret it in order to arrive at some understanding of the tradition of the Church on which the second temptation is based.

Most commentators are agreed that John's placing of the tradition of the cleansing of the temple has theological significance appearing as it does
 2. between the miracle at Cana and the discourse with Nicodemus. The significance of this position, however, does not appear to be simply for the progressive development of theological concepts. To any reader the change of scene from Cana in Galilee to the temple in Jerusalem must come as a sudden and unexpected change. This theme of a sudden and unexpected appearance in the temple is
 3. repeated in the Fourth Gospel and it can scarcely be doubted that it is intended to be a fulfilment of Malachi's prophecy, 'The Lord who ye seek shall suddenly
 4. come to his temple' (Mal. 3.1.)

5. In the synoptic tradition there is no insistence on the unexpected suddenness of Jesus' appearance in the temple, nor is there any break in the geographical setting. The story is embedded in the context of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Despite this there is a dramatic suddenness in the synoptic account which is enhanced by the unexpected vehemence of his expulsion of the traders. Apart from the Lukan childhood stories, this cleansing of the temple, as in John, is the first recorded incident of Jesus in the temple. This

7. from previous page, continued...

- 1910, ad. loc; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad loc. The suggestion of K.L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen Geschichte Jesu, 1919, p.292, that the narrative was current as an isolated unit of tradition not tied to any particular occasion is possible.
1. Jn. 2.19 (destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up) is to be attributed to Jesus and in this context (cf above p.104f; also V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.461; C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.302 n.1.) Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.58f has shown that the Johannine saying Jn. 2.16 ('Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise') is closer to the semitic original than the synoptic 'My house shall be called a house of prayer (for all nations), but you have made it a den of robbers' (Mk. 11.17 and par.). M. Dibelius, Tradition, 1934, pp. 43ff and V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.460f have shown that the plotting of the religious leaders against Jesus, which forms the immediate sequel to the cleansing in Mark and Luke, is a non-original addition to the narrative. Cf also below p.124 n.1.
 2. For this significance cf. C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 297-317. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.163f; O. Cullmann, Worship, 1953, pp. 71-74.
 3. In John's record of the second appearance we are told that the 'brethren' of Jesus tried to persuade him to go up from Galilee to 'manifest' himself 'to the world' (Jn. 7.1.4) (For the messianic significance of this cf above p.85) In reply Jesus tells them to go to the feast (of tabernacles) but 'I go not up unto this feast; because my time is not yet fulfilled' (Jn. 7.8) ('yet' is textually doubtful, and probably a secondary intrusion.) No sooner have they left than Jesus follows them secretly (Jn. 7.10) and then in the middle of the feast he appears in the temple publicly (Jn. 7.14).
 4. Cf also C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.351.
 5. Mat. 21.1ff; Mk. 11.1ff; Lk. 19.28ff.

would suggest that in the tradition of the Church this was the first thing that Jesus did on his first appearance in the temple during his public ministry, and that it was sudden and unexpected in accordance with the messianic prophecy of Mal. 3.1. These facts, coupled with the 'cleansing' of the temple which was part of the Malachi prophecy, prove that the incident was messianic for Jesus, his disciples, and the Jewish authorities alike.

The messianic nature of the incident is made more clear in the citations placed in the mouth of Jesus while driving out the traders. Mark's citations of Isa. 56.7 and Jer. 7.11 are replaced by two different testimonia in John. In the first, which is probably original, Jesus says; 'Do not make my Father's house a trading-place (οἶκον ἐμπορίου)' (Jn. 2.16) which is probably an allusion to Zech. 14.21 in which kena'ani has legitimately been translated as 'trafficker' rather than 'Cananite'. In the second incident of Jesus in the temple there are clear allusions to Zech. 14, and it is probable that the evangelist intends us to have in mind here the prophecy of the 'Day of the Lord', and to see it fulfilled in the expulsion of the 'traffickers' from the temple.

The second testimonium is not placed in the mouth of Jesus, but is what the disciples later remembered; 'The zeal of thy house shall eat me up' (Jn. 2.17). It is a citation from the group of Psalms which refer to the righteous sufferer which provided many testimonia of the Passion. The implication is that as the Righteous One in the Psalms suffered for his loyalty to the temple, so will Jesus suffer for his action in cleansing the temple. In the synoptic tradition this incident is the stormy prelude to the passion. Thus we have an early hint of the passion in John's account, but a hint which is attributed to the disciples. In the Markan tradition this is made more explicit in the plotting of the religious leaders which gathers momentum from this point onwards. While we cannot accept this Markan tradition as historically accurate with any degree of confidence, it is significant that both the Johannine and Markan traditions link this messianic incident in the temple with the passion.

-
1. Cf above p.118n. 1
 2. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.58f; C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960 p.300. As the prophet has just invited 'all the families of the earth' to come up to Jerusalem to the feast of the tabernacles, there seems no reason for the last-minute exclusion of the Cananites.
 3. Cf below p.121
 4. Ps. 69.9
 5. Ps. 69.4 cited in Jn. 15.25; Ps. 69.9 cited in Rom. 15.3; Ps. 69.22 cited in Mat. 27.48; Jn. 19.28-29; Ps. 69.25 cited in Acts 1.20.
 6. Cf above p. 118 n.f.

That the religious leaders understood Jesus to be making messianic claims by his actions in the temple is made clear by their demand for a 'sign' in justification of his action - as in the synoptics the leaders in the temple demand to know his 'authority'. Jesus replies, 'Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.' In characteristic Johannine fashion this saying is misunderstood. This misunderstanding then provides the opportunity to draw out the true significance of the saying; 'But he spake of the temple of his body ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon$). When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he said this; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus said' (Jn. 2.21f).

The interpretation of this passage moves at a number of different levels.

1. In the first place the action of Jesus in the temple is itself a messianic sign, but a sign of the destruction and replacement of the system of religious observance of which the temple was the centre. This forms a recurring theme in the Fourth Gospel where the great Jewish festivals are filled with new and specifically Christian meaning. Three times mention is made of the passover. On the first occasion the significant act is the cleansing of the temple signifying the end of the old order. The second occasion is at the feeding of the five thousand where the Christian passover - the eucharist - replaces the old Jewish rites. The third occasion tells of the death, resurrection (and ascension) of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit when the new order of being which he inaugurated becomes a reality in the Church. The other festival referred to is the feast of the tabernacles whose significant moments become charged with a new and Christian significance.

A similar theme of the destruction of the temple and the suppression of the old order is found also in the synoptic tradition and most clearly in Mat. 23.38 where Jesus addressed his final warning to the Jewish religious community; 'Behold, your house is forsaken (and desolate).' Gosser correctly interprets this as meaning that the heir of David has come, but by rejecting him

1. Jn. 2.18; Mk. 11.28; Mat. 21.23; Lk. 20.2

2. Jn. 2.19

3. Jn. 2.13, 6.4; 11.55

4. Jn. 7.2

5. Cf. C.H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, 1960, pp. 345-354.

6. Mk. 13.2 and par (Mat. 24.2; Lk. 21.6); Mk. 14.58 and par ('I will destroy this temple made with hands and in three days build another not made with hands.')

Jerusalem with its focal point in the Temple has ceased to be the house of
 1.
 God.

We may conclude, therefore, that the saying about the destruction of the temple, coupled in John with the significant act of the cleansing, was from the first associated with the idea of the supersession of the older order of Jewish religion.

2. At a second level we are told that 'this temple' is not just the building in Jerusalem, but is the 'temple of his body'. The new temple which is to replace the old is no other than Jesus himself. This idea is worked out in a number of places in the Fourth Gospel.

In the Old Testament the temple is the place where God reveals his
 2. glory. In John it is ^{3.}the Word made flesh that we may contemplate the glory of
 3. God. It is he who mediates the vision of God which brings eternal life. The
 4. temple was also the source of 'living water'. John states that the second
 5. sudden appearance of Jesus in the temple was at the feast of tabernacles when the traditional lection was Zech. 14, which describes the approaching 'day of the Lord':

And it shall come to pass in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem... And the Lord shall be king over all the earth, In that day shall the Lord be one and his name one... And it shall come to pass that every one that is left of the nations that came up against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.

In expositions of the ceremonial pouring of the water from Siloam over the altar of burnt offerings on each of the seven days of the feast, the rabbis used the famous Ezekiel passage in which the prophet looks forward to the great coming day when water will issue in an ever-growing stream from the right side of the temple bringing life wherever it flows and healing even the waters of the Dead
 6. Sea. Although evidence for a messianic interpretation of the feast of the tabernacles is rare and not unquestionably pre-Christian, the use of Zech. 14 as the lection for the feast with its clear reference to the coming 'day' must have made a messianic expectation at the feast fairly common and may have given rise to the vague tradition of the messianic advent in the month of Tisri to
 7. which the feast of tabernacles belonged.

1. W. Cossier, 'The House of God' in *The Livingstonian*, Vol. 1, No.5, 1965, p.44.
2. Cf. Ex. 40.34; 1 Ki. 8.11; Isa. 6.1-5; Ez. 43.5
3. Jn. 1.14
4. Jn. 14.9
5. Jn. 6.20
6. Ez. 47.1-12. cf *Strack & Billerbeck*, Vol. 2 pp. 774-812; G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. 2 pp.43-48. This association may have been early though the first definite evidence occurs in R. Eliezer ben Jacob (circ. A.D. 90)
7. C.H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, 1960, p.350f.

It is the association of living water with the temple coupled in Deutero-Zechariah with the messianic age, and the application of these ideas to the water libations at tabernacles which give significance to the saying of Jesus on the last day of the festival: 'If anyone thirst, let him come to me; and let him drink who has faith in me. As the scripture said, Out of his body shall flow rivers of living water.'¹ In him this prophecy of Deutero-Zechariah is now fulfilled. He is the new temple (Jn. 2.21), the source of the true 'Living water' which brings salvation (Jn. 4.14). Thus it is to him that the thirsty are to come, and of him that the believer is to drink.

If the 'old temple' is to be destroyed, so also is the new. In this reply of Jesus to the demand of the Jews for a sign of his messianic status (Jn. 2.18f) we have a clear reference to the death of Jesus. It is significant that in John's interpretation of this saying he says 'But he spoke of the temple τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ'. In John σῶμα is used elsewhere only of the dead body of Jesus.² So also it is on the cross that blood and water flow from the pierced side of the dead Jesus (Jn. 19.34). In Mark it is at the trial of Jesus that the accusation about destroying the temple is brought against Jesus (Mk. 14.58). So it is clear that the saying was associated in the early tradition not only with the supersession of the old order but also with the death of Jesus. As such part, at least, of the reply of Jesus to the demand for a messianic sign points to his death by which he is to fulfil his messianic work.

As surely as the saying 'destroy this temple' refers to the death of Jesus, so does the reference to 'raising it up in three days' or 'building another in three days (not made with hands)' refer to the events of Easter Day.³ The 'third day' is too intimately linked in the tradition with Easter day for it to be used without an implicit reference to it.

1. Jn. 7.37f, C.H. Dodd's translation, *ibid.*, p.349. This punctuation does make better sense. In our discussion on Jn. 6 (above p.111ff) we saw that faith was the pre-requisite of 'coming to' Jesus (Jn. 6.44) and that the man who believes will never thirst (Jn. 6.35). It also allows αὐτοῦ (Jn. 7.38) to refer to Christ as the source of living water, the Holy Spirit. That Christ is the source of living water, (Jn. 4.7-14) and the bestower of the Holy Spirit (Jn. 20.22) are well-known ideas in John (cf also Jn. 19.34). That the individual believer is the source of living water, the Holy Spirit, is unparalleled elsewhere in the New Testament. This does not solve the difficulty of the citation, but it is more probable that John understands the γραφή as referring to Christ and not the individual believer, as the source of living water.
2. Jn. 19.31, 38, 40; 20.12. Cf C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p.167
3. I choose to speak generally of the 'events of Easter day' rather than more specifically of the resurrection because, as we have seen (cf above pp.40f), probably in the synoptic tradition and certainly in the Johannine the 'third day' was not simply the day of the resurrection but also of the ascension and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit.

The destruction of 'this temple' when it refers to the supersession of the old order of religion of which the cleansing of the temple is the 'sign' is final. The destruction of 'this temple' when it refers to the death of Jesus is not final, for he will rise again from the dead and ascend to the Father. It is by being glorified in the cross, resurrection and ascension that Jesus, who is himself in his historical person the source of living water, continues to be the fountain of this living water, the Holy Spirit. So far from his death ending the new temple which has replaced the old, it is to be the way which is to lead to the ascension whereby his work is fulfilled, and is fulfilled when the risen and ascended Jesus comes to his disciples and 'breathes' on them saying: 'receive ye the Holy Spirit'.

This reference to the Holy Spirit is implicit in Jn. 2.22 which at first glance reads as if it were only after the resurrection that the disciples ἐμνήσθησαν this saying of Jesus (Jn. 2.17). The parallel saying in Jn. 12.16 speaks of the disciples 'remembering' that citations quoted at his entry into Jerusalem were in fact references to Jesus only after he was 'glorified'. But these references to the later 'remembering' by the disciples must be interpreted in the light of the pronouncement about the Paraclete in the farewell discourses. There we read: 'But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things, and ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ .' (Jn. 14.26). This 'remembering' by the disciples is consequent upon the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Thus this saying in reply to the demand for a sign points to Jesus himself as the new temple, and also to his death and resurrection and ascension by which his messianic work would be fulfilled in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the disciples. This teaching is no Johannine peculiarity. In Acts 2 it is only after the bestowal of the Holy Spirit that the disciples, in their spokesman Peter, understood the significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus and applied to Jesus citations of Old Testament prophecies with great confidence and boldness.

3. This saying: 'Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up' or in its Marcan form 'I will destroy this temple (made with hands) and in three days build another (not made with hands)' has also a third level of meaning.

1. Jn. 4.14; Jn. 7.38

2. Jn. 7.39

3. Jn. 20.22. For the same teaching in the synoptic tradition cf above pp.42ff.

4. On the meaning of 'remember' cf below pp.601ff.

One cannot but be struck by the strongly active verb in the second half of the saying. If the reference is only to the resurrection of Jesus, then this is the only place in the New Testament in which Jesus is made the agent of his own resurrection. The most probable explanation of the active form of the saying is that it is a cryptic reference not only to the resurrection of Jesus but to the community of believers who will be 'raised up' by him.

While there is no tradition of Jesus being the agent of his resurrection, it is a constantly recurring theme of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus is himself 'the resurrection and the life', that he has come to give life, and that he will raise up the believer 'at the last day'. Equally important is the fact that the events of the first Good Friday and Easter are not for Jesus alone. John sees the decision of the Sanhedrin spoken by the high priest ('It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people' J. 11.50) as highly significant, for in saying this he was unconsciously exercising the prophetic gift resident in the high priest. What he was declaring, John tells us, was that Christ was to die 'not only for the people, but to gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (Jn. 11.52). In the discourse about the Good Shepherd we are told that the Shepherd comes to give his life for his flock (Jn. 10.11) in order that the flock might possess life (Jn. 10.10) and to gather into one the scattered children of God so that they might become 'one flock, one shepherd' (Jn. 10.16). Similarly we are told that Jesus must be 'lifted up' on the cross and in the ascension in order to 'draw all men unto' himself (Jn. 12.32). Thus John sees the death and resurrection/ascension of

-
1. In Mark and Luke Jesus' resurrection is spoken of as 'He (or I) will rise again' without specifying the agent of this event (Mk. 8.31; 9.31; 10.34; Lk. 18.33; 24.7, 46). On one occasion we find a similar form in Matthew (Mat. 27.63) but usually he preserves these predictions in a passive form (Mat. 16.21; 17.23; 20.19; cf also Lk. 9.22). In the rest of the New Testament the most common form of reference to the resurrection is that God raised him from the dead (Acts 2.24,32; 3.15,26; 4.10; 5.30; 10.40; 13.30,33,34; 17.31; Rom. 4.24; 6.4; 8.11; 10.9; 1 Cor. 6.14; 15.15; 2 Cor. 4.14; Gal. 1.1; Eph. 1.20; Col. 2.12; 1 Thes. 1.10; Heb. 13.20; 1 Pet. 1.21) or it is used simply in the passive form, Christ was raised (Rom. 6.9; 8.34; 1 Cor. 15.4,13,14,16f,20). This is not the usual language used by John who prefers to speak of Jesus' 'glorification'. On the one hand Jesus is to glorify the Father in the events of the first Easter (Jn. 12.28; 13.31; 17.1,4; 21.19), but it is none the less true that it is the Father who glorifies the Son (Jn. 12.28; 13.32; 17.1,5) or of Jesus being glorified, i.e. using the passive voice, (Jn. 7.39; 12.16,23; 13.13; cf also 3.14). Thus John is true to the tradition in not making Jesus the agent of his resurrection. It is significant that Jn. 2.22 preserves the uncharacteristically Johannine saying about his being 'raised from the dead'. This is further evidence for John's dependence in his account on an early tradition. It also places the more usual passive form of reference to the resurrection together with this unique active form of Jn. 2.19.
 2. Jn. 11.25; 14.6
 3. e.g. Jn. 1.4; 3.15ff,36; 5.21,25,40; 6.33,40,47; 10.10 cf also the story of the raising of Lazarus Jn. 11.1ff and below pp. 473ff
 4. Jn. 6.39, 40, 44.55
 5. Cf below pp. 367ff.

Jesus to be to create the new purified Israel who would possess the Holy Spirit from himself (Jn. 7.37-39) and that this was fulfilled on the first Easter (Jn. 20.22).

Thus it is clear that the words in which Jesus answers the demand for a 'sign' at the cleansing of the temple 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up', refers not only to the death and resurrection of Jesus but also to his raising up of the new Israel, the purified and Spirit-endowed messianic community. Like Jesus himself this community is spoken of as the 'temple'.

It is surely in this way that we are to understand Mark's version of the saying; 'I will destroy this temple (made with hands), and in three days build another (not made with hands) (Mk. 14.58). It would be very odd if this 'other' temple referred to the resurrection body of Jesus; it surely refers to the community of the followers. If the tradition which links Mark with Peter is sound, and if Peter is the author of 1 Peter, then it is most significant that in 1 Peter we find worked out the idea that the Christian Church is the new temple of God, a spiritual house, where the new holy priesthood offers up spiritual sacrifices to God 'through Jesus Christ'. The thought is clearly modelled on Malachi 3 where we are told that the Lord who will 'suddenly appear in his temple' will purify the Levitical priesthood so that they may offer 'unto the Lord offerings in righteousness'. In 1 Peter this thought is closely associated with the death of Christ (1 Pet. 1.18ff).

This would suggest that Mk. 14.58 was linked in the tradition of the Church with Jesus' action in cleansing the temple for the parallelism of ideas between Mk. 14.58 and 1 Pet. 2.5f is so striking as to make this view most probable. The fact that it is so linked in Jn. 2 would confirm this.

A most informative parallel to Jn. 2.21 is found in 1 Cor. 6.19. In John we read: 'But he spoke $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ^{αὐτοῦ} \wedge .' In Corinthians Paul writes: 'Do you not know $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ (sing.) $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ (plural) $\nu\alpha\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\text{Α}}\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \Pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, which you have from God.' Both of these statements are found in documents which almost certainly have their origin in Ephesus, and this suggests that John has in mind the teaching found in 1 Corinthians and the

1. O. Cullmann, Worship, 1953, p.72.n.3, 73.
2. 1 Pet. 2.5

Epistle to the Ephesians that the Church is the ^{1.} ναὸς Θεοῦ, ^{2.} ναὸς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, and ^{3.} σῶμα Χριστοῦ (οὐ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ). That which Jesus will raise up is the ^{4.} ναὸς τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, the Church.

Summary of Conclusions and Interpretation of the Temptation

The saying of Jesus in reply to the demand for a messianic sign authenticating his messianic claims in cleansing the temple moves at a number of different levels. Firstly, the cleansing of the temple is a sign that the temple in Jerusalem will be destroyed, i.e. the old religious order is to be replaced and men will no longer worship God according to the old sacrificial system in the temple in Jerusalem. Secondly, it points to Jesus himself as the new temple which is to replace the old whose messianic 'cleansing' will be accomplished through the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, it points to the new community which he is to raise up. In the use of the same words to refer to himself and the Church as ^{5.} the new temple we see what we shall examine in greater detail below, the teaching of an 'identity' between Christ and the ^{6.} Church.

This teaching of John is clearly no Johannine peculiarity and reflects a wide-spread and primitive tradition in the Church. We have seen that the synoptics have preserved an account of the demand by the religious leaders for a 'sign' which proves that the action of cleansing the temple was understood to be a messianic claim being made by Jesus. In the synoptic account the reply of Jesus was to put another question about the 'origin' of the baptism of John. This reply would seem to have little in common with Jn. 2. But while the synoptics point to John the Baptist as the prophetic forerunner of the Messiah - Elijah redivivus, it is significant to note that this expectation was also based on Mal. 3. In the background of both accounts, therefore, lies Mal. 3. The synoptics have laid the emphasis on the prophetic herald of the Messiah who would cleanse the temple while John has placed it on the messianic action of cleansing the temple which is now superseded by Jesus himself and the Christian Church.

1. 1 Cor. 3.16 (cf 1 Cor. 6.19); Eph. 2.21f.

2. 1 Cor. 6.19 (cf 1 Cor. 3.13) Eph. 2.22)

3. 1 Cor. 12.27; Eph. 4.12.

4. Cf C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.302, C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.167f; O. Cullmann, Worship, 1953, p.72f.

5. Cf also Jn. 1.14 which asserts that in the Word made flesh ~~that~~ men behold the glory of God and Jn. 17.22 which asserts that this glory is in the Church.

6. Cf. pp. 393 n.2, 438ff, 482ff.

7. Cf above p. 88 n.5 (Mat. 21.23-27; Mk. 11.27-33; Lk. 20. 1-8)

We have seen also that the tradition of the supersession of the old temple in Jerusalem, and the raising up of the new temple, the Christian Church, was wide-spread in the primitive community. Teaching that Jesus himself is the new temple is found also in Mat. 28.17 when, after his resurrection the disciples saw him on the mountain in Galilee, Matthew adds the illuminating comment; ^{1.} ^{2.} καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν. He, and not the temple in Jerusalem is now the place of their worship, and he is 'with' them 'ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος'.^{3.}

This teaching is admirably summed up by Luke in Acts who sees the fulfilment of the messianic mission in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the disciples. This is the fruit of the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus; 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear.' (Acts. 2.33). In the old religious system cleansing was to be had in the priestly sacrifices of the temple. Now this cleansing from sin is declared to be by baptism 'in the name of Jesus Christ' (Acts 2.38) by which the Holy Spirit is given. The Spirit of God rests no longer in the old temple or the old nation. That for which Israel longed in the coming of the Messiah, their sharing in his possession of the Spirit, was now declared to be in the new community of Jesus the Messiah. In this blessing the convert could share through baptism in the name of Jesus the Messiah or, as Paul states it, by 'putting on Christ' (Gal. 3.27). This is the community born out of the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus, and his bestowal of the Holy Spirit.

It is against this background of the tradition of the Church which had its occasion in the action of Jesus in cleansing the temple that the temptation depicted on the roof of the temple is to be understood.

It can scarcely be doubted that Satan's transporting Jesus from the wilderness (so Matthew) or from the place of his vision of the kingdoms of the world (so Luke) to the pinnacle of the temple would suggest a sudden appearance. This sudden appearance is a feature of the Malachi prophecy (Mal. 3.1) and also of the Gospel record.^{4.}

While it is true that there was in Judaism no expectation that the Messiah would establish his messianic claims by jumping from the roof of the

1. Cf above p. 120 ff

2. Cf above p. 123 ff

3. Mat. 28.20

4. Cf above p. 118 f

temple, nor was there any expectation that he would turn stones into bread. Just as the bread miracle of the first temptation draws attention to the crudely materialistic nature of the 'manna' miracle, which is rejected as satanic by Jesus though he fulfils the true nature of that hope, so Jesus rejects the temptation to draw the attention of the world to himself as Messiah by such an act and to the temple in Jerusalem. Judaism most certainly did expect that in the restored kingdom of David Jerusalem would become the political centre of the world and its temple the religious focus. Such teaching is found also in Mal. 3, 1. 2. What Jesus the Messiah declares is that it is not the building in Jerusalem which is the true temple where men see the glory of God and worship him. Rather, he himself is God's true temple, and he has come to draw men to himself.

At the same time it must be remembered that Israel's hope in the Messiah was essentially for the Israelite community. They believed themselves to be the covenant people of God. When the Messiah came they would not only be this people of the true God but also be seen to be such by the world. Then the nations would want to join themselves to the Jews so that they might also worship in the temple ^{of} the God of the Jews. This community hope the early Church believed was fulfilled by Jesus when he raised up the new community. It is to give life to the world by raising up this new, purified, transformed community in which he - the new temple - is present that Jesus accepts the cross. But this messianic work of his is fulfilled when he is raised from the dead and exalted. Then is the new Israel raised up, which also is the temple, to participate in his messianic endowment with the Holy Spirit.

Thus the temptation to draw attention to himself and the temple in Jerusalem by a crude miracle is rejected as satanic. He is the Messiah, but he will fulfil his messianic mission in purifying the temple by dying and rising again to create the new Spirit-filled community.

(v) The Temptation of World dominion and Caesarea Phillipi.

In the third temptation we have the political counterpart to the religious aspect of the messianic hope of normative Judaism. Here Jesus is offered political dominion of the kingdoms of the world. It is this which Jesus rejects as satanic. As we have seen in the first two temptations, however, when we place the temptation in the context of its historical occasion we find that Jesus does not simply reject the Jewish hope; instead he transforms it.

1. Cf above pp. 71f; 73f; 79f.

2. Cf Mal. 3.4,12.

1.

Cullmann has convincingly shown that the political temptation was a constant feature of the ministry of Jesus and how in the question about paying taxes Jesus rejected both the zealot ideal of the fusion of Church and State and the Sadducean separation. In the saying about giving Caesar what is his but not what belongs to God, the final authority of Christ declares that the State has a legitimate function but cannot be identified with the kingdom of God.

This teaching must be borne in mind as we turn to that incident in the life of Jesus which most closely reflects the third temptation, Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah at Caesarea Phillipi. Its bearing on this narrative is

2.

that if Jesus did not reject the title Messiah but exercised a reserve in so designating himself, and if at the same time in his teaching of his followers about paying taxes he was at pains neither to confuse the State and the kingdom of God nor to make the State totally independent of the kingdom, then it follows that Jesus' acceptance of a transformed messianic status must imply a transformed concept of the messianic community in which the distinction between Church and State is applicable, i.e. an earthly community.

3.

In view of the extremely difficult exegetical problem occasioned by

4.

Matthew's record of Jesus' words of commendation to Peter, we shall begin our analysis of this narrative following Mark, and then return to the 'Rock' saying.

There are indications in the Markan story that it is the more original.

The first hint of this is given in the way in which Jesus addresses his question to the disciples: 'Who do men say that I am?' Luke preserves the simplicity of

5.

this question. Matthew, on the other hand, has anticipated the conclusion of

6.

the discourse by introducing the 'Son of man' concept into the question of Jesus

7.

which is clearly secondary. The second indication of this is the expansion of the simple form of Peter's reply in Mark 'You are the Messiah' (Mk. 8.29) by Luke ('You are the Messiah of God', Lk. 9.20) and Matthew ('You are the Messiah, the son of the living God', Mat. 16.16).

What all three synoptic Gospels record is that Peter declares Jesus to be the expected Messiah, and that in response to a direct question from Jesus himself. This is the first recorded incident in the synoptics in which Jesus

1. O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 1957, pp. 3-49

2. Mk. 8.27ff; Mat. 16.13ff; Lk. 9.18ff.

3. Cf below p. 130 n.1

4. Mat. 16. 17-19

5. Mk. 8.27

6. Lk. 9.18

7. Mat. 16.13. Cf. below pp 340 on this verse and the reasons for this alteration.

openly invites comment on his status, for which reason the reply of the disciples in their spokesman Peter and the attitude of Jesus to that reply is of paramount importance.

In Mark and Luke, though not in Matthew, the attitude of Jesus; 'And he charged them to tell no one about him' implies that Jesus neither affirmed nor denied Peter's messianic confession. Strangely enough he says nothing at all about it. He speaks rather of the Son of man who must suffer many things at the hands of the religious leaders of the Jews and be killed and rise again on the third day.

This would indeed be very strange if it were not an easy and natural transition from the idea of the Messiah to the Son of man. That it was so in Judaism of the period we have already seen, and we shall see in the next chapter,

1. That Jesus exercised a reserve about the title Messiah, probably because of its political connotations, and preferred the title Son of man is made clear by an examination of Mk. 14.61f and par. and Mk. 15.22ff and par.

During the trial of Jesus before Caiaphas the high priest asks him, 'Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?' According to the most natural interpretation of Mark, Jesus answers in the affirmative, $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$. The parallel texts read differently. In Mat. 26.64 Jesus says $\sigma\acute{\upsilon} \{\pi\alpha\varsigma\}$. At first glance this appears to imply an affirmative reply. But if we assume that the Aramaic ʿamarta lies behind this word, then semitists are agreed that this is not a clear affirmation but may even indicate a veiled denial. This suggests that Jesus avoided a direct reply as in Lk. 22.67f; 'If I tell you, you will not believe, and if I ask you, you will not answer.' It is clear that Matthew's version of the reply is the more original (cf below p.252f) and suggests that Jesus neither affirmed nor denied that he was the Messiah. Mark and Luke record Jesus as qualifying his answer with a reference to the Danielic Son of man which points plainly to the ascension (cf below p.253f), indicating that Jesus avoids a direct answer when asked about the Messiah for the fulfilment of his work lies in his ascension. In Matthew the sentence begins with $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$, 'But I tell you, hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.' The emphasized 'but' would suggest that the answer to the messianic question was negative and that the reference to the Son of man is intended as a contrast. However if that were the meaning of the reply then we should expect an emphasized $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ corresponding to the $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$. We should interpret the reply, therefore, as a refusal to give a direct answer whether he is the Messiah, for the real significance of his work is that he must ascend to the Father, like the Danielic Son of man, to fulfil his messianic task. Thus $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ is not intended to contrast Messiah and Son of man but is a rejection of the political connotations of the Messiah and an acceptance of his death and ascension as a part of his transformed concept of his messianic mission.

In Mk. 15.2f and par. Jesus stands before the Roman Pilate who addresses the messianic question in purely political terms, which would be the only ones of interest to him; 'Are you the king of the Jews?' Jesus answers Pilate, 'You say so ($\sigma\acute{\upsilon} \lambda\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$).' This is the form of the answer in the three synoptics and it certainly means 'Yes'. If, however, this unequivocal answer was what Jesus said, then the lack of reaction in Pilate and his later statement 'I find no crime in this man' (Lk. 23.4) is hard to understand. Probably the Fourth Gospel has preserved the more historically accurate reply; 'My kingdom is not of this world' (Jn. 18.33ff). In this event Jesus' answer is both an affirmation and a denial. He is the messianic king of the Jews but not in the sense that would make him a political threat to the Roman occupation.

The attitude of Jesus at his two 'trials' is precisely the same as at Caesarea Phillipi.

2. Cf above p. 80 .

despite the fact that in origin the Son of man may have been a pre-existent heavenly being and that he appears in writings which anticipate the eschaton to be other-worldly, when he appears in Judaism he is NOT consistently 'heavenly' and the eschatology associated with him often reverts to the more 'earthy' eschaton of the Messiah. The disciples certainly understood the reference to the Son of man to be a reference to the Messiah. That Jesus also contemplated the establishment of the messianic community in this world is made clear in teaching his disciples that they should 'Take up their cross and follow' and in the distinctions he draws between 'gaining the whole world' and 'forfeiting life'.

The messianic significance of the whole section, including the transfiguration narrative and the subsequent discourse of Jesus with his disciples, is proved by the repetition at the transfiguration of the words from heaven addressed to Jesus at his baptism, which we have seen to be messianic; the appearance of Moses and Elijah, the prophetic heralds of the Messiah, with Jesus on the mount of transfiguration; the question of the disciples about Elijah as the Messianic forerunner; and the identification of Elijah with John the Baptist by Jesus. The linking of the Elijah expectation with a Son of man saying proves that the Son of man was understood to be the Messiah. It is significant to note that when Jesus enjoins silence after the vision on the mountain, as he had done after the messianic declaration of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, he adds a limit to the silence; 'until the Son of man should be raised from the dead.' The implication is that then the disciples might declare him to be the Christ. According to Acts 2 it is after the death, resurrection, ascension, and bestowal of the Holy Spirit that Peter declares 'Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified'.

That Jesus did envisage raising up the messianic community through his (death and) ascension, in which the chief feature would be allegiance to himself, is proved by the Son of man saying with which the discourse at Caesarea Philippi closes and which introduces the transfiguration narrative as a prefigurement of

1. Mk. 8.34; Mat. 16.24; Lk. 9.23

2. Mk. 8.36; Mat. 16.26; Lk. 9.25

3. Mk. 9.7; Mat. 17.5; Lk. 10.35. Cf above pp. 94ff.

4. Mk. 9.4; Mat. 17.3; Lk. 10.30. Cf above p. 84

5. Mk. 9.11; Mat. 17.10.

6. Mk. 9.12f; Mat. 17.11f.

7. Mk. 9.12; Mat. 17.12. Even though this saying is probably secondary (cf below p229f) it is clear that in the primitive Palestinian community no radical distinction was drawn between the figure of the Messiah and that of the Son of man.

8. Mk. 8.30; Mat. 16.20; Lk. 9.21

9. Mk. 9.9; Mat. 17.9

10. Acts 2.36

1.
that promise.

We conclude, therefore, that both at Caesarea Philippi and after the transfiguration Jesus exercised a conscious reserve about the title Messiah. This is not because he did not conceive of himself as an earthly Messiah who would inaugurate a community in this world, but rather because the term Messiah carried not only an earthly connotation but was also strongly political; it carried connotations of his inaugurating a golden age for Israel. Further, the concept of a suffering and dying Messiah was foreign to Judaism, and this Jesus knew would be his lot.

It is this which neither Peter nor the other disciples at Caesarea Philippi could understand. When Jesus answers to the declaration that he is the Messiah; 'and he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again' Peter is understandably horrified. He has completely missed the reference to the resurrection. Mark records that when Jesus spoke about his rising from the dead after the transfiguration narrative the disciples were completely puzzled about what he could mean by it. This cannot be because they had no idea of a resurrection for they must have known of the resurrection at the 'Last Day', a general rising from the dead. They could not conceive that Jesus meant anything different when he spoke of his resurrection. Thus Jesus' reference to his resurrection could have had little significance for them for he, like themselves, would share in the general resurrection.

What does concern Peter is that Jesus teaches that he is going to suffer and to die. Such a thought is impossible for them to reconcile with their hopes for political deliverance connected with the Messiah. A dead Messiah was an impossibility. For themselves too, it was one thing to be the disciples of a political hero but quite another to be the disciples of a rejected, suffering and dying Son of man. Peter rebukes Jesus for propagating such a notion, and Jesus flings at him the terrible accusation, 'Get behind me Satan'. Mark adds that Jesus looked at his disciples when he said this to

-
1. Mk. 8.38 (on the interpretation of this cf below p226f); Lk. 9.26 (on the interpretation of this cf below p303f); Mat 16.27f (on the interpretation of this cf below p226f).
 2. Cf above p. 82
 3. Mk. 8.31; Mat. 16.21; Lk. 9.22. On the basic authenticity of this saying without the specific details provided by the passion narrative and the explicit reference to the 'three days' cf below pp.226f.
 4. Mk. 8.33; Mat. 16.23.

Peter. Not only Peter but all of them shared the political dreams which they associated with him. It is this which Jesus rejects as satanic. The extraordinary vehemence with which Jesus rebukes Peter and the disciples shows how urgent and pressing must have been the political temptation to him. But this is not his work and it is not his purpose for his disciples or the new community which he would raise up.

To understand the changed nature of Jesus' ideal for the messianic community we must turn to Jesus' promise to Peter in Mat. 16.17-19;

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed (it) unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.

I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt lose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Two problems confront us in this passage. The first concerns the authenticity of these words, and the second is whether they belong in this context.

The authenticity of Mat. 16.17-19

The arguments for and against the authenticity of these words are many and varied. In favour of attributing these words to Jesus we should note the following:

(a) The Palestinian origin of the section may today be considered beyond question. This is shown by its semitic linguistic character. On this even those scholars who contest the genuineness of the saying are all but agreed. Bultmann, for example, asserts that the saying must have emanated from the Palestinian Church.

As Cullmann has noted, the semitic character is confirmed by the designation of Peter as bar-Jonah; the expression 'flesh and blood' for 'men';

1. For the main arguments against the authenticity of H.J. Holtzmann, Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. 1, 1901, ad. loc; A. Loisy, Les evangiles Synoptiques, 1908; L'Evangile et L'Eglise, 1902, p.111; E. Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium, 1927, p.140; M. Dibelius, Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert, 1942; A. Harnack, 'Der Spruch über Petrus als den Felsen der Kirche' in SBA, 1918, pp. 637ff; R. Bultmann, 'Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mat. 16. 17-19' in TB, Vol. 20, 1941, pp. 265ff; W.G. Kümmel, Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus, 1933; B.S. Easton, Luke, 1926 ad. loc.
For the main arguments for the authenticity of Th. Zahn, Matthäus, 1922, ad loc.; A. Schweitzer, Quest, 1911, p. 369; K.L. Schmidt, 'Das Kirchenproblem im Urchristentum' in TB, Vol. 6, 1927, col. 293ff; also 'Die Kirche des Urchristentums' in Festgabe für A. Harnack, 1927, p.259f; and especially and Ἐκκλησία, in TWNT, Vol. 3. C.H. Turner, Catholic and Apostolic, 1931, pp. 193f, 283. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, pp. 184-201; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, pp. 89ff. Roman Catholic scholars naturally fall into this category.
2. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.185f.

the word pair 'bind and loose'; the strophic rhythm - three strophes of three lines each - which is found in other sayings of Jesus; the illustration of the rock as foundation, to which there is an exact parallel in the rabbinic literature; and that the word play on 'Peter' and 'rock' is more pronounced in Aramaic where precisely the same word Kepha would be found rather than the Greek change of gender, Πέτρος to Πέτρα.^{3.}

The argument of Bultmann and others that the saying arose out of the dispute between James and Peter, or as a result of debates about the Law can scarcely be considered as scientific. Our knowledge of such debates is far too scanty to base such a sweeping conclusion on them. The fact is that it is far more likely that the saying would have been an embarrassment at the time when Matthew wrote his Gospel and Peter was no longer at the head of the Jerusalem Church, having even been opposed by Paul. His inclusion of it therefore seems clearly to point to a strong and early tradition which did attribute the saying to Jesus.^{4.}

The early and Palestinian character of the saying does not even prove that it came from Jesus, but it is an important pointer to that conclusion.

(b) The chief objection to attributing the saying to Jesus is that he could not have spoken of the 'Church', since he proclaimed only the coming of the kingdom of God. It is true that the word ἐκκλησία occurs^{5.} only one other passage in the Gospels. This passage has also been vigorously contested. As Cullmann rightly notes, however, 'these statistics concerning the use of the words cannot be decisive. The issue is whether not only the word but also the thing that the word denotes is lacking. That is how we must put the question.'^{6.} We have already seen how the idea of a new community belonged to the concept of the Shehed and the Messiah, and that it was in the mind of Jesus in his teaching.

It is also to be noted that the word ἐκκλησία did belong to Hebrew thinking.^{7.} It is used in the LXX about 100 times to translate qahal, which usually

1. Cf Mat. 11.7-9, 25-30

2. Cf the rabbinical exegesis of Isa. 53 in Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 1 p.733; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p.93; 'When God looked upon Abraham who was to appear, he said: Behold, I have found a rock on which I can build and base the world. Therefore he called Abraham a rock.'

3. M. Goguel, L'Elise naissante, 1947, p.189 n.4 is one of the few scholars who today would reject the thesis that this word play is intended.

4. W. Michaelis, Matthäus, Part 2, 1949, p.350; K.L. Schmidt, art ἐκκλησία in TWNT, Vol. 3

5. Mat. 18.18

6. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.187

7. For what follows cf K.L. Schmidt, art ἐκκλησία TWNT, Vol. 3.

designates the congregation of Israel, and when connected with the Genitive Yahweh (gehal YHWH) designates the people of Israel with a reference to redemptive history. There are still other Hebrew and Aramaic words which could be rendered in Greek by ^{1.} ἑκκλησία. Schmidt has put forward the attractive thesis that the basic word is kenishta, the commonest rabbinic word for 'synagogue'. The Sinaitic Syriac version translates ἑκκλησία in Mat. 18.17 by ^{2.} kenushta. It is probably better to leave open the question of which Aramaic word should be considered most likely. The important point is that all of these words are essentially semitic and belong to the thought-world of the 'people of God'.

If we start then from the meaning 'people of God', and render the saying of Jesus; 'on this rock I will build my people of God', then the saying is closely parallel to Jn. 2.19 and Mk. 14.58 in which Jesus speaks of raising up the new temple, his body, the Church.

Consequently the fact that Matthew has translated some aramaic word which spoke of Jesus building his 'People of God' as building his ἑκκλησία, a word which is found on the lips of Jesus again only in Mat. 18.17 is insufficient to establish the secondary character of the saying.

(c) In these words of Jesus it is presupposed that the people of God will be built up in a time when there will still be some point in contrasting heaven and earth, i.e. before the final eschaton. This has led many scholars to deny that Jesus could have spoken these words, maintaining that he spoke only of the kingdom of God which breaks in at the end. While modern scholarship is indebted to A. Schweitzer for his rediscovery of the place eschatology in the teaching of Jesus, his one-sided emphasis on a 'future eschatology' lost sight of the teaching of Jesus that in himself the eschatological kingdom has already come. The true teaching of Jesus seems to lie in a tension between the 'already fulfilled' and the 'not yet fulfilled'. ^{3.} This tension is expressed in the characteristically Johannine phrase; "Every one who sees the Son, and believes on him has eternal ^{4.} life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

In the early Church and in Paul this tension really exists, but this is

1. In Hebrew kenesheth, cibbur, 'edhah, and in Aramaic qahala, cibbura, and most frequently kenishta.
 2. Mat. 16.18 is not preserved in this version.
 3. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, 1951, pp. 81ff.
 4. Jn. 6.40, 54. In the next chapter we shall see that the coming kingdom is not consistently viewed as either of 'this world' or 'the world to come', especially when related to the figure of the eschatological deliverer. Therefore this 'tension' may be nothing more than a lack of consistent eschatology. Both aspects are simply 'there'.

not, as the proponents of the purely future eschatology would have us believe, a falling away from the teaching of Jesus. As Cullmann has noted, while Jesus taught that the kingdom of God has come in his person, primitive Christianity saw the fulfilment of the Church. This is really no conflict for the early Church did not understand her existence apart from Christ. As a result the same tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet complete' is present in the Church.

Flew is right in part when he warns against the identification of the kingdom of God and the Church. He is wrong when he refuses to allow us to speak of the Church as the kingdom of God in any sense. The end is to fulfil what is already present in Christ in his Church. In him the end has already been anticipated even if its final fulfilment is still to come.

Although this Church in reality was only built up after his death and the events of Easter day, the foundation of this new people of God was laid during his life-time. The fact of his choice of the twelve, which seems to be an intentional type of the twelve tribes of Israel, points to a conviction in the mind of Jesus that he was building up the new Israel of God.

More important than the choice of the twelve is the mission which they received from him during his life. A comparison of Jesus' words to the disciples of John the Baptist (Mat. 11.4f) with his commission to his disciples (Mat. 10.7f) shows that the parallels are so striking that the conclusion cannot be avoided that Jesus saw the coming of the kingdom of God not only in his own person but also in the group of disciples he gathered around himself. His messianic conviction is closely coupled with the community of disciples which his coming brought into existence. It is they who are the foundation on which his $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ will be built after his death. As disciples of the Messiah they share in the realization of the kingdom of God already present in Jesus, and they anticipate the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of the risen and ascended Christ, which is itself an anticipation of the final kingdom which will be brought in at the end.

Unless all our textual criticism is based on an a priori assumption

-
1. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.194
 2. Cf below pp. 340f, 341ff, 352ff.
 3. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p.91
 4. Cf C.H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, 1944, pp.79-96; O.Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.95
 5. R. Bultmann, 'Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mat. 16.17-19' in TB, Vo.1.20 1941, denies that Jesus did this, and transfers the origin of the twelve to the primitive Church. It is impossible to see how this group could have arisen as late as this time. The picture we have suggests rather that pains were taken to reconstitute the twelve after the betrayal and death of Judas (Acts 1.15ff).

that only those passages which refer to a purely future eschatology are genuine, which does unnecessary violence to far too many sayings of Jesus, then we have no reason to reject this saying as spurious. Since there is no textual evidence to support the contention that Mat. 16.17-19 is a late addition to the text of Matthew, we conclude that this saying of Jesus is genuine, and that the ἐκκλησία¹ which he declared he would build falls into the time between the resurrection and the end.

The context of Mat. 16 17-19.

The second problem to which we must turn our attention is whether we can say with any confidence that this saying has been introduced by Matthew from another context. Most Protestant scholars who accept the genuineness of the saying are agreed in ascribing it to some other context. We need to take a closer look at the reasons advanced for this conclusion.

(a) We have noted above that there are indications that the Markan form¹ of the tradition, which does not contain these words, is the more primitive. This, however, does not mean that Matthew has deliberately included in the narrative this whole saying from another context. It is possible that Luke has not included these words because he was aware that Peter's primacy among the apostles belonged only to the early period of the Church.² Since 1 Pet. 2.4f describes Christ as the chief corner-stone of the Church in which each member is a 'living stone', it is possible that Mark, whom the tradition of Papias links with Peter,³ who may be the author of 1 Peter, has excluded these words because of the possibility of their being misunderstood.⁴ Thus while it is possible that Matthew may have included these words from another context it is equally possible that the other evangelists may have excluded them because they were problematical.

(b) Secondly, it has been pointed out that the naming of Simon as Cephas⁵ seems to occur for the first time at this point in Matthew. In Mark Jesus gives this name to him when he forms the group of the twelve, and John places it at the first meeting of Simon and Jesus.⁶ That Matthew was familiar with Mark cannot be doubted.⁷ He would therefore have been aware of the naming of Simon at an earlier

1. Cf above p. 129

2. W. Michaelis, *Matthäus*, Part 2, 1949, p.350

3. Cf also 1 Pet. 5.13

4. This assumes that all three evangelists were familiar with the tradition which Matthew alone records. In the present uncertain state of synoptic sources and priorities, this is not impossible.

5. O. Cullmann, *Peter*, 1958, p.177.

6. Mk. 3.16.

7. Jn. 1.42.

time. What is intended here may be to explain the significance of that name. This would help to remove the chronological conflict between Matthew and Mark. It is to be noted, however, that Matthew does not record the earlier naming. This fact has led Cullmann to conclude that the formal parallel between Peter's declaration 'You are the Messiah' and Jesus' declaration 'You are Peter' has helped to fuse together two independent traditions. While it is true that Matthew has grouped his material into homogenous sections of teaching, miracle stories, etc., there is no evidence that purely formal linguistic parallels, especially when they are as slight as this, has led Matthew to transpose sections of the tradition into different contexts. Matthew can hardly have been unaware that the significance of Caesarea Philippi was not a mutual naming ceremony, but messianic. It is surely easier to believe that Matthew has excluded reference to the earlier naming of Peter because of the theological significance it contained at Caesarea Philippi than that he has collated two independent traditions on the grounds of the formal parallel of the words used.

(c) It has been argued by Cullmann among others that Matthew has missed the point of the Markan narrative. In Mark, when Peter declares Jesus to be the Messiah Jesus immediately commands the disciples not to make this public. He then carries on to speak of the Son of man who must suffer, die, and rise again. Here he does not reject the concept of Messiah but exercised a careful reserve about the title because of its political connotations. For Peter and the disciples the political connotations are an essential aspect of their thinking about the Messiah with which the idea of a suffering and dying Messiah are incompatible.

3.

As we have noted it is this concept in the minds of the disciples which Jesus regards as satanic. This is indeed the point of the Markan narrative.

It is also the point of Matthew's account. In Matthew, however, it is not the political connotation of the Messiah only which is rejected but also of the messianic community. To have been told that the ἐκκλησία which he was to build would be victorious over Hades, would be the gateway to the kingdom of heaven, and would secure the heavenly binding and loosing of what was bound or loosed on earth, would hardly have been the summary of the political dreams of a people seething under a hated Roman domination. Thus when Jesus enjoins silence on the disciples and speaks of the fulfilment of his work in his death and

1. This has been stressed by Th. Zahn, *Matthäus*, 1922, ad. loc. He points to the fact that the Matthew passage lacks the formula customary in giving names. (Gen. 17.5,15; 32.28; Mat. 1.21,25; 2.23; Lk. 1.13,31,59-63; 2.21.)

2. O. Cullmann, *Peter*, 1958, pp.177, 180.

3. Cf above p. 132f

resurrection whereby the promise; 'I will build...' will be realized, Peter rebukes Jesus and, as in Mark, is rebuked in turn by Jesus; 'Get thee behind me Satan'. While the point of the narrative in Mark is that Jesus regards the political ideals of his messiahship as satanic, in Matthew it is both the political ideals of his messiahship and of the community which are repudiated. The Messiah and his community belong together. Surely this saying is wholly appropriate in this context in Matthew. Bultmann, Michaelis, and Zahn are right in describing the teaching in Mark which is thoroughly messianic as a torso without the words which Matthew has included. When Jesus presented a transformed understanding of his messiahship we should expect him to have spoken of a new understanding of the messianic community.

Against this it has been held that the climax of the narrative 'Get thee behind me Satan' is incompatible with the opening words of Jesus' reply to Peter in Matthew, 'Blessed are you Simon bar-Jonah'. For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven.¹ We have seen, however, that the transfiguration narrative is also thoroughly messianic in which the words from heaven contain a distinct echo of the messianic Psalm 2.7. After this heavenly revelation the disciples are again commanded to silence until after the resurrection. It can hardly be doubted that the disciples, despite this heavenly revelation, still could not free themselves from their political pre-conceptions of the Messiah. The satanic conception of a political Messiah remains with them until in the garden of Gethsemane they desert him when his death is inevitable. Thus it is not impossible that in the same narrative at Caesarea Philippi Jesus could call Peter blessed because he has received a revelation from God, and yet at the same time call his conception of it satanic.

(d) Cullmann has argued further that the fact that the demonstrative pronoun 'this' as the object of the verb ἀπεκάλυψέν in Mat. 16.17 is lacking in the Greek text might indicate that the saying is not original in this context.³ He notes that whether the saying is in context here or stood in a separate unit of tradition there must have been some object of the verb. He poses the question whether it is not possible that Matthew's omission of the object might not indicate that the original unit had another introduction. Like all things in New Testament textual criticism this is possible, but it is surely sounder to argue for

1. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.178f.
 2. Cf above p. 131.
 3. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.179.

misplacement on the basis of redundant words which do not suit the context, than on the basis of the omission of a word which is easily and naturally supplied by the context. If, however, there were sufficiently strong reasons for associating the saying with another context then the absence of the object of ἀπεκαλυφέν would be a strong supporting argument.

(e) Finally we must consider whether or not the arguments advanced for placing the saying in a different context are sufficiently compelling for us to be able to regard this saying in this context as secondary.

To assess the thesis of many scholars that these words to Peter have been transferred from a commission of the risen Christ to Peter, possibly reflected in Jn. 21, to the promise of Jesus to Peter at Caesarea Philippi, and the thesis of Cullmann that Lk. 22. 31ff may be the context from which Matthew has derived this promise to Peter, I shall put forward a thesis counter to both of these which retains the saying in the context in which Matthew records it. If this can be maintained then the reasons for looking for another context will be materially weakened.

That all three synoptic evangelists intended that the narratives and discourses of Caesarea Philippi and the subsequent transfiguration as a complex whole is shown in the important link-verse which connects the discussion of the conditions of discipleship given at Caesarea Philippi and the 'coming of the Son of man' with the transfiguration narrative which is surely a prefigurement of the promise contained in the link-verse. The discourse at Caesarea Philippi concludes with a reference to the 'coming of the Son of man'. Then we are told that Jesus promised that some of the disciples would not die until they see the 'kingdom of God'. This is followed immediately by the vision of the transfiguration to Peter, James and John. The connexion between the discourse, the promise, and the prefigurement of the fulfilment is unmistakable.

On this basis we may follow the thought of Jesus as it is unfolded by Matthew at Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration. We have, firstly, the momentous declaration by Peter that Jesus is the Messiah (Mat. 16.16). This is declared by Jesus to be a revelation of God (Mat. 16.17), but closely linked with this we have a declaration about the new people of God which Jesus is to build up. We are already given a hint that this messianic community in the mind of Jesus lacks the political connotations which predominated in the messianic hopes of

1. O. Cullmann, *Peter*, 1958, pp. 181-184

2. Mk. 9.1; Mat. 16.28; Lk. 9.27.

Judaism and were undoubtedly present in the minds of the disciples. To Peter as the spokesman and unofficial leader of the twelve, and thus through him to the twelve, the promise is made that on him Jesus will build his ^{1.} ἐκκλησία. Of this ^{2.} ἐκκλησία we are told that it will triumph over the power of Hades. As this ^{3.} ἐκκλησία is at least in part the realization of the kingdom of God and Peter and ten of the others will be the 'foundation members' of that ἐκκλησία-kingdom, to them - with Peter as their representative - are committed the 'keys' to the kingdom. If we may provisionally assume that 'binding and loosing' means authority to forgive sins, then to them is given authority to forgive sins in the coming ^{4.} ἐκκλησία. This is the nature of the messianic community in the mind of Jesus, and this is the place and authority which the disciples will have in it. Here the nature of the messianic community, the eschatological people of God, is radically transformed. Despite the fact that it is in this world it is not a political kingdom in which the disciples are promised the position of powerful lieutenants to a political hero.

This transformation of the nature of the messianic community is closely linked with a transformation of Jesus' concept of his messianic work. Accordingly he commands the disciples to be silent about Peter's confession, for in the prevailing atmosphere of longing for a political Messiah and kingdom this could lead only to a thorough misunderstanding of his concept of his work. It is not to be a political Messiah that Jesus has come. Rather he is the Son of man who must suffer, die, and rise again to complete his work and build his ἐκκλησία.

Following hard on Jesus' rebuke of Peter for his opposing what Jesus held to be the true nature of his God-given work, Jesus tells his disciples of the conditions of discipleship and promises that the disciples will 'see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' (Mat. 16.28). We shall see below that the primary reference of the Son of man saying in Mat. 16.27 is to the ascension, to which Matthew has added secondary eschatological features, and that the Matthaean peculiarity of referring to the 'kingdom of the Son of man' (Mat. 16.28) is a reference to the Church existing between the ascension and the parousia. The

-
1. Cf Mat. 18.18. Whether this saying is genuine or not, Matthew clearly understood the promise made to Peter in 16.19 to apply to the other disciples as well.
 2. The future tense used here would seem to refer to the building of the Church after the death and resurrection of Jesus to which reference is made in Verse 21.
 3. Cf above p. 135ff
 4. Cf below p. 226ff
 5. Cf below p. 341ff

transfiguration narrative which follows is consequently to be seen as a pre-^{1.}figurement of the fulfilment of the promise not simply in the parousia but also in the ascension.

On the mountain Jesus is transfigured before Peter, James and John, and this is a prefiguring of his ascension. There the voice from the cloud declares Jesus to be the 'son' which refers both to Jesus' role as the ^{2.}'ebhed and ^{3.}Messiah, precisely as at Caesarea Philippi. As they come down from the mountain Jesus tells his disciples to tell no one about the vision until he has fulfilled his mission in his death and resurrection. On the basis of Matthew's record of Caesarea Philippi this would mean that it is only after the resurrection and ascension (with which is closely coupled the gift of the Holy Spirit) that the disciples should proclaim that he is the Messiah, for then would be realized that ²ἐκκλησία -kingdom promised in Mat. 16.17-19.

It would have been utterly impossible for them to have been able to proclaim the dead but risen and ascended Jesus as the Messiah if at the same time the disciples did not have an equally radically transformed concept of the messianic community founded by him. The basis for this transformation is already laid in Mat. 16.17-19 in the teaching of Jesus. Matthew alone provides us with both essentials: a transformed concept of the Messiah and a transformed concept of the messianic community.

If we turn now to the concluding sections of John, Luke, and Matthew we see the fulfilment of this sequence of thought presented in Mat. 16 and 17.

In John, after the death, resurrection and ascension Jesus comes to the disciples and they receive the Holy Spirit (Jn. 20.19ff).^{4.} Then Jesus adds the significant words (whose soever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; and whose soever ye retain they are retained'. (Jn. 20.23). This is not a characteristically Johannine saying. The declaration of the forgiveness of sin is notably lacking from John's Gospel. John the Baptist does witness of Jesus; 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away (ὁ ἄρων) the sin of the world' (Jn. 1.29), but at no stage does John's Jesus declare the forgiveness of sin. Indeed this is the only occasion in which we have mention of forgiveness (ἀφεσις) of sin in the entire Gospel. The idea, though not the language, is undoubtedly present in

1. Cf G.H. Boobyer, St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, 1942; A.M. Ramsay, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, 1949.

2. Cf above p. 48f

3. Cf above p. 131

4. For the post-ascension character of this narrative cf above p. 42

1. Jesus' teaching about eternal life, the healing of the blind man, and the Son
 2. bringing freedom from the bondage of sin which Jesus sees fulfilled in the events
 3. of his 'glorification'. This fact would seem to indicate that John is dependent
 4. upon a tradition which saw the resurrection and ascension as the fulfilment of the
 teaching of Jesus in Mat. 16.13-17.13 and especially the promise contained in Mat.
 16 17-19. Despite the denial of Zahn of any connection between Jn. 20.23 and
 5. Mat. 16.19 it cannot be doubted that there is no other passage in the synoptic
 Gospels which really bears the same force as Jn. 20.23 where Jesus gives to the
 6. disciples the authority to forgive sins.

In a passage which we have seen to be associated with the ascension and
 7. the gift of the Holy Spirit Luke preserves the final saying of Jesus to the
 disciples in a form which is strongly reminiscent of Matthew's version of Caesarea
 Philippi; 'And he (Jesus) said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Messiah
 (Christ) should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that
 repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the
 nations, beginning from Jerusalem' (Lk. 24.46f). It is significant to note;
 (i) Whereas at Caesarea Philippi Peter's declaration that Jesus is the Messiah is
 followed by the prediction of the suffering and rising again of the Son of man,
 here Jesus teaches the suffering and rising again of the Messiah. Similarly in
 Acts 2 Luke records the sermon of Peter in which he speaks of the death, resur-
 rection, and ascension of Jesus and his bestowal of the Holy Spirit and moves to
 the conclusion, 'Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God has made
 him both Lord and Messiah (Christ), this Jesus who ye crucified' (Acts 2.36)
 This is precisely the fulfilment of the teaching of Jesus recorded in Mat. 16 and
 17. (ii) Together with this declaration of the crucified but risen Jesus as the
 Messiah goes the commission to the messianic community. They are those who are
 to herald repentance and the remission of sins 'in his name'. This commission

1. Jn. 6.26ff.

2. Jn. 9.1ff.

3. Jn. 8.34ff.

4. Jn. 12.28,31.

5. Th. Zahn, Matthäus, 1922, ad. loc.

6. While there is no exact linguistic parallel which, in view of the probable Aramaic origin of Mat. 16.17-19 (cf above p.133f), we should not expect to find, we are to note (i) the same use of word pairs 'binding and loosing' and 'forgiving and retaining': (ii) in the form of the commission Peter and the disciples are the agents of the action (Mat. 16.19 δέσσης - λύσης; Mat. 18.18 δέσσητε - λύσητε Jn. 20.23 ἀφῆτε - κρατήτε) but the effect of this action is described in the passive implying that through the action of the disciples God acts, (Mat. 16.19; 18.18 ἔσται δεδόμενον - λελυμένον (λελυμένα); Jn. 20.23 ἐὰν φέωvται - κεικράτηvται).

7. Cf above p.44f

to the disciples is clearly modelled on the teaching of John the Baptist and is fulfilled at the first Christian baptisms when Peter declares, 'Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (Acts 2.38). Thus when the new Messianic community is founded in the resurrection, ascension and bestowal of the Holy Spirit not only is Jesus declared to be the Messiah but also forgiveness of sins is declared to be by baptism into this new community of the Messiah. This we have seen to be the essential teaching of Mat. 16 and 17. It is also significant to note that in the early sections of Acts it is only Peter who declares or promises this forgiveness. In the later sections Paul also does so.

As with the Fourth Gospel the teaching of John the Baptist seems to lie in the background of this faith and declaration of the primitive Church. It is hard to believe, however, that the faith of the primitive Church rested on the authority of John. It is far more likely that the confident declaration of the forgiveness of sins is dependent on some actual teaching of Jesus. As Mk. 2.10 and par. is clearly secondary the only other recorded occasion of such teaching which has a strong claim to authenticity is Mat. 16 17-19. Further, bearing in mind the close parallel between Peter's declaration at Caesarea Philippi with Jesus' prediction of his passion and rising again, and the saying of the risen Jesus in Lk. 24.26, and also the fact that the Lukan accounts in Acts of the ascension and Pentecost are based upon their prefigurement in the transfiguration story - which is intimately connected with Caesarea Philippi the conclusion would seem to be that Lk. 24.47 (fulfilled by Peter in Acts 2.38) is dependent upon some actual teaching of Jesus given in the context of Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration narrative. It is in this context that Matthew has recorded the promise to Peter.

Consequently both John and Luke add independent testimony to the authenticity of the tradition of the teaching of Jesus preserved in Mat. 16 and 17 including the promise to Peter in Mat. 16.17-19.

Matthew too concludes his Gospel with the commission of Jesus to the disciples: 'All authority has been given unto me in heaven and earth, go ye

-
1. Acts 2.38; 5.31; 8.22; 10.43.
 2. Acts 13.38; 26.18.
 3. Cf below p. 218ff.
 4. Cf above p. 41f.

therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit¹. What the disciples are commissioned to do they do on the 'authority' which Jesus possesses. They are to baptize. As clearly as the commission in Luke to herald repentance and the remission of sins implies baptism, the command to baptize implies repentance and the remission of sins preached by John the Baptist. Matthew has, however, omitted any reference to John's baptism being for the remission of sins. We have seen that the reason for this was to avoid the difficulty of Jesus submitting to John's baptism². It was probably also because Matthew knew the remission of sins to be realised only in the shedding of the blood of the new covenant (Mat. 26.28) and thus to be declared in his name in the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ which he would build up by his death and rising again (Mat. 16 17-19).

If we are correct in assuming that this command of Jesus recorded in Matthew implies that the ascension and gift of the Holy Spirit has already taken place³, then this command to baptize stands clearly as the fulfilment of the promise to Peter and the disciples made in the context of Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration narrative. On the authority of Jesus they are to baptize into the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ -kingdom built up by Jesus in his death and rising again and their sharing in his messianic endowment with the Holy Spirit. But Jesus is present in his $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ on earth (Mat. 28.20) as the one with authority to forgive sins (Mat. 9.6; Mk. 2.10; Lk. 5.24). Thus the sins which he forgives by his working through his Church on earth are forgiven in heaven. In this way the teaching and commission of the ascended Christ is seen to be the fulfilment of the teaching of Jesus in Mat. 16 and 17.

Consequently Matthew, Luke, and John each in his own way understood the authority and nature of the Church as the realization of the promise made to Peter in the context of the Caesarea Philippi and transfiguration narrative. This may mean no more than that Matthew has converted the later understanding of the Church into a promise of Jesus during his earthly mission but, for the reasons

-
1. Mat. 28.18.19. Few competent scholars today regard these as *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. We must not lose sight, however, of the fact that for Matthew this is the climax of his Gospel and the fulfilment of the work of Jesus. Without understanding the link between the work of Jesus and the function of the disciples the Church could never have withstood the crisis of the death of Jesus her Messiah.
 2. Cf above p. 95
 3. Cf above p. 43

already advanced, this is improbable. We conclude, therefore, that the promise of Jesus to Peter is not only genuine but is also in context in Mat. 16.17-19.

Against this thesis it has been argued that these words were spoken by the risen Jesus to Peter and were later transferred back into the life of Jesus.¹ Many things favour this possibility, It is striking that nowhere in the New Testament is there any narrative of the first appearance of the risen Jesus which according to 1 Cor. 15.5 was to Peter. A trace of such a narrative could exist in Jn. 21. Though this is an appearance before several disciples, the dialogue from verse 13 onwards is essentially between the risen Lord and Peter. Therefore it may possibly be asked whether, although the missing appearance to Peter alone is not recorded, it may not be utilised here by John. It has been argued that the missing conclusion of Mark may have contained a record of such an appearance to Peter which John may have used in a different context and which Matthew has transferred back into the context of the Caesarea Philippi narrative.²

Against this it must be noted (i) While John does record a commission to Peter this is where the similarity between Jn. 21 and Mat. 16 17-19 ends. The command 'feed my lambs' can hardly be based upon the same tradition as Mat. 16 17-19 unless we can assume that either or both evangelists have distorted the tradition beyond recognition and recovery. (ii) While the thesis of Jn. 21 being dependent on the lost ending of Mark is attractive, it is a thesis which we have no means whatsoever of verifying in our present state of knowledge. It is a possibility but is no basis for a scientifically sound exegesis and textual criticism.

Cullmann has argued that both Jn. 21 and Mat. 16 17-19 are dependent on the words of Jesus to Peter in the context of the Passion story where Luke records that after the bold profession of constancy by Peter Jesus warns him of the satanic temptation but commissions him to strengthen his brethren after he has been 'converted'.³ It is true that this Lukan passage does bear a close similarity to Jn. 21, and the content of the commission 'strengthen your brethren' and 'feed my lambs' is similar. But surely neither the wording nor the content is sufficiently close for us to assume with any confidence that it is in this context

1. So chiefly R. Bultmann, *Theology*, Vol. 1, 1959, p. 45; C.H. Turner, *Catholic and Apostolic*, 1931, p. 193f; E. Stauffer, 'Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Primatus Petri' in *ZKG*, 1943-44, pp. 1ff.
2. So E. Stauffer, 'Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Primatus Petri' in *ZKG*, 1943-44, pp. 11ff; N. Hoffmann, 'Emmaus among the Resurrection Narratives' in *JBL* Vol. 64, 1945, pp. 205ff. On the other hand that the conclusion to Mark is missing is denied among others by K. L. Schmidt, *Kanonische und apokryphe Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten*, 1944, p. 27f; N.B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ*, 1944, pp. 86ff.
3. O. Cullmann, *Peter*, 1958, pp. 182-184. Lk. 22 31-34.

that Matthew found the tradition he has recorded in the context of Caesarea Philippi. Of this Cullmann himself says, 'the wording of the Lukan passage, to be sure, does not agree with Mat. 16.17ff; this is the only weak point in the theory here propounded. But as far as the wording is concerned, Matthew may well have had at his disposal here a special tradition which originally belonged in the same framework as the words of Lk. 22.31ff.¹' On such a principle of textual criticism it would seem possible to transfer almost any saying of Jesus to another context so long as there was the slightest of formal parallels between the two contexts. If Matthew was aware that the promise to Peter did belong to the context of his profession of loyalty and Jesus' prediction of his denial, then it is impossible to understand why Matthew has deliberately transferred this saying out of this context in Mat. 26.31-35 to Mat. 16.17ff. On the other hand we have seen that there are strong reasons to believe that the final commission of Jesus to the disciples recorded in Matthew, Luke and John is dependent on this saying of Jesus to Peter in the context of the Caesarea Philippi and transfiguration narratives.

We reach the conclusion therefore that the saying in Mat. 16.17-19 is genuine and belongs in the context in which Matthew has recorded it.

The Interpretation of Mat. 16.17-19

1. The 'rock' saying.

'I say unto you, that you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church....' Whom does Jesus mean when he says that upon the rock the new people of God will be built? This question is only relevant because the self-evident answer has been contested. The solution of the Reformers that the rock is the faith of Peter, and by implication the similar faith of later generations of Christians, does not satisfy. The text offers no genuine support for such an interpretation. 'You are kepha, and upon this kepha I will build....' shows that the second rock is not intended to express anything different from the first. Even in Greek, Πέτρος and πέτρα, the play on words is retained. Indeed if this saying had referred to the faith of Peter it would be difficult to discern the connexion between the naming of Simon and the explanation of that name. It is the person Simon who is named 'rock' and declared to be the 'rock' on which the new people of God is to be built.

1. O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.184

2. Cf Luther, Wider Das Papsttum vom Teufel gestiftet, Weimer edition p.54. Calvin, Commentary, ad. loc.; Zwingli, Hauptschriften, Vol. 2 p.195; Vol. 9, pp. 158ff; so also Th. Zahn, Matthäus, 1922, ad. loc. and many other Protestant scholars.

(2) 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it'

Of this ἐκκλησία which Jesus promises he will build on the person of Simon, and thus within history, we are told that 'the gates of Hades will not prevail against it'.¹ By Hades is meant the realm of the dead, and not chiefly the realm of sin and damnation.² The idea of gates of the realm of the dead is already found in Jewish writings, in which it is taught that these gates will close behind all men and they will not be opened to allow the dead to escape.³ If this is the thought behind Mat. 16.18 then our Lord is declaring that with the building of his Church these gates will have lost their power to hold it in their grip. His Church is included in Jesus' own victory over death by his death and resurrection. The task which Jesus gave to his disciples during his ministry as a messianic function, the conflict with death, whether in the form of healing the sick or raising the dead or the conquest of demonic powers (cf. Mat. 10.7ff and par.), is here promised to the entire Church. This Church will be built in the time when death still rules, but it will already share in the risen life of Christ which marks the Kingdom of God.

(3) The keys of the kingdom.

The second declaration; 'I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven' brings together again the two concepts of the ἐκκλησία and the βασιλεία. In the previous saying Jesus has spoken of building his ἐκκλησία which will share in his resurrection victory over death, which is a major characteristic of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ in Jewish thinking. Here we are told that to Peter, on whom the ἐκκλησία is to be built, is given the keys of the kingdom. It seems clear that we must assume a close connexion between this βασιλεία saying and the previous ἐκκλησία one. The so-called 'power of the keys' makes Peter the human agent of the resurrection. He is to lead the people of God into the resurrection βασιλεία.

This saying must not be taken to mean that Jesus has abdicated, passing his authority to Peter. The risen and ascended Christ is not thought of in the New Testament as the absent Christ. Rather, he is present in and with his Church. Therefore when the Apocalypse says that the Son of man has the keys of death and Hades (Rev. 1.8) or that he has the keys of David with which he irrevocably opens and closes (Rev. 3.7; cf. Isa. 22.22) he is not

1. So E. Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, 1927, ad. loc; S. Schlatter, Matthäus 1929; O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.201; J.C. Fenton, St. Matthew, 1963, p.269
 2. On the entire subject and differing interpretations cf. W. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesus Christ; 1949, pp. 43ff.
 3. Isa. 38.10; Ps. 9.13; 107.13; Job 38.17; Wis. Sol. 16.13, 3 Mac. 5.51; Ps. Sol. 16.2

contradicting Mat. 16.19 where the power of the keys is committed to Peter. It is through Peter that the living Christ acts to open the way into the resurrection kingdom established by his resurrection.

While this saying is addressed to Peter it is significant to note that Paul teaches that in baptism the Christian participates not only in the death of Christ but also in his resurrection.^{2.}

Thus for Paul the Christian shares here and now in the resurrection life of Jesus Christ by baptism. If this is so then in a sense the officiant at baptism exercises the power of the keys opening the door into the ²ἐκκλησία-Βασιλεία of the resurrection. In this sense also it is Peter who first exercises the power of the keys when he administers the first baptisms of Christian converts in Acts 2.

(4) Binding and loosing

The saying about 'binding' and 'loosing' must likewise be interpreted in context and not in isolation from the whole saying to Peter. What Peter does in the ἐκκλησία-Βασιλεία on earth is effective in heaven, for the Christ present in the Church is also the Christ who has ascended into heaven. It is he who possesses all authority in heaven and on earth (Mat. 28.18) and who acts through his Church. Thus what he binds through Peter on earth is bound also by him in heaven, and what he looses in his Church on earth is loosed by him in heaven.^{3.} This belief in the inseparable union of the ascended Christ and the Christ present in the community is the basis of the confidence in the Church which receives its classical expression in this promise of Jesus to Peter. The Church does not usurp the authority of Christ rather she is, as we shall see below, the inclusive individual who is Christ.^{4.}

1. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p.95, has argued that the power of the keys is the spiritual insight which will enable Peter to lead others through the door of revelation through which he himself has passed. Such an etherialised interpretation is only possible if we accept Flew's arbitrary decision to treat each of the sayings of Jesus to Peter independently of each other. If, on the other hand, we treat this saying as a developing whole, then the thought of Jesus is far more realistic than Flew allows.

2. Cf below p. 424f.

3. For this reason we cannot accept that this saying must be understood first of all in a temporal and not a spatial sense (so O. Cullmann, Peter, 1958, p.204) Indeed the temporal tension between the 'already fulfilled' and the 'not yet' is present in this passage, but the primary meaning is the oneness of Christ present with his Church and yet also ascended into heaven. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p.97, has argued that what is bound in the community is ratified by Christ in heaven. This interpretation is not acceptable as it implies a 'distance' and separation between the present and ascended Christ which is foreign to the New Testament.

4. Cf below p. 438ff, 482ff.

Two explanations of the expression 'bind and loose' are possible.

Firstly, according to rabbinic usage the phrase may mean 'forbidding' and 'allowing' practical questions of conduct, that is, establish rules in the community. The saying would therefore mean that the decisions of Jesus in and through his community would be binding in heaven whether this same Jesus is ascended. On account of the context in which Matthew has placed the parallel verses in Mat. 18.18 it has been argued that the binding and loosing have to do with exclusion from or admission to the community. As in the Council of Jerusalem the decisions taken about practical conduct imply who shall and who shall not be admitted. If, however, it is accepted that the saying deals with admission to the community the theological import lies deeper than the authority to establish rules. As in Acts 2 the 'binding' and 'loosing' would be the inevitable result of the preaching of the kerygma which was the word of judgement. As Jesus himself is the occasion of judgement into light (cf Jn. 3.16ff), so the proclamation of the kerygma is the occasion of judgement or salvation; 'He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth me'. (Lk. 10.16). The hearing and accepting would correspond to the loosing, and the rejecting to the binding.

Secondly, the saying 'bind and loose' may also mean 'put under the ban' and 'acquit', that is, the power to forgive or retain sins. Since this is what is effected by the shedding of the blood of the covenant (Mat. 26.28), is the commission of the living Christ to the disciples (Mat. 28.19; Lk. 24.47; Jn. 20.23), and is what is proclaimed in the ἐκκλησία (Cf Acts 2.38.5.31; 8.22; 13.8; 26.18) this is no doubt the primary significance of the phrase here.

It is unnecessary for us to decide between these two meanings as they are not contradictory. Since it is Christ who has power on earth to forgive sin (Mk. 2.10 and par.) who has realized this in the shedding of his blood, and who is now uniquely present in the ἐκκλησία-βασίλεια which he established by his death and rising again, forgiveness of sins by Christ in baptism is also entry into his Church.

It is necessary to note that this promise is given not only to Peter,

1. So G. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 1909, p.214; Th. Zahn, Matthäus, 1922, ad. loc. E. Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, 1927, ad. loc.; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p.96.
2. So Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 1 pp. 738-742.
3. So H.D. Wendland, Reich Gottes, 1931, pp. 179-181; A. Schlatter, Die Geschichte des Christus, 1923, p.387; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1943, p. 97.
4. So A. Schlatter, Matthäus, 1929, ad. loc.; J. Schiewind, Matthäus, 1937 ad. loc. ; J.C. Fenton, St. Matthew, ad. loc.

but in almost the same words to the disciples as well (Mat. 18.18; cf. Jn.20.23). Peter shares this authority with the other disciples, so there is no contradiction between 'thou' of Mat. 16.19 and 'ye' of Mat. 18.18. Because of the intimate union, between Christ and his Church it is in and through the ἐκκλησία that Christ brings forgiveness of sins and incorporates men into the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Further, because of the unity of Christ and his Church and the inseparable unity of the ascended and yet present Christ already that final kingdom when 'heaven and earth shall pass away' (Rev. 21.1) is anticipated in the Church.

Summary of conclusions and interpretations of the temptation.

The promise made to Peter and the disciples at Caesarea Philippi in which the nature of the messianic community is declared by Jesus and his prediction of his passion and vindication are to be seen as belonging inseparably together. They are but two sides of the same answer to Peter's declaration that Jesus is the Messiah. His mission as the Messiah, about which title he exercised a conscious reserve, is not to be a political hero who will vanquish Rome and the enemies of Israel and assume political dominion over the kingdoms of the world and so bring in Israel's dream that the community of the Messiah will, through him, be the political masters of the world. Both of these conceptions are repudiated by him as satanic. His task is rather to bring in the ἐκκλησία-βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ which, though in the world, is not of this world. To accomplish this he must die and rise again and ascend into heaven that he might build his Church in which men will share in his victory over death and the power of Satan and in which he will be present to bring forgiveness of sin.¹

Against this background we can return to interpret the third temptation. We need not concern ourselves with the differences in detail between Matthew's and Luke's versions as the main point in both is that Jesus is offered all the kingdoms of the world. To this is added the satanic condition 'If you will fall down and worship me (Mat. 4.9; Lk. 4.7). No reader of the Gospels at all familiar with the political character of the messianic hope could miss the barb

1. It is important to note here that as in orthodox Chalcedonian Christology we should neither confuse nor separate the Divine and the human in Jesus, so in the Church we should neither confuse nor separate Christ and his Church. We can only attribute the forgiveness of sin to men if we separate Christ from his Church, and we can only refuse to grant that it is really through men that the forgiveness of Christ is accomplished in men if we do the same thing. It is Christ who forgives, but he forgives through his Church with whom he is inseparably united.
2. e.g. Matthew omits the claim by Satan that the kingdoms of the world are his to give (Lk. 4.6) and Luke presents the temptation as a visionary experience (Lk. 4.5). While Matthew has this temptation on a very high mountain (Mat. 4.8), Luke simply says that the devil 'led him up' (Lk. 4.5).

hidden in that satanic condition. As we have seen, in Judaism the political dreams associated with the coming Messiah were regarded as an essential aspect of the Messiah's work in which he would make Jerusalem the political capital of the world and the Jewish people the world's masters. This dream was based on their religious faith in Yahweh. For them this was the will of God and in fulfilling this political dream the Jewish Messiah would be serving God. Here in the introduction to the Gospel even Satan is made to acknowledge that in fulfilling the role of a political hero Jesus will be falling down and worshipping not God but Satan. Jesus is thus made to rebuke Satan in precisely the same words as he rebukes Peter at Caesarea Philippi $\overset{1.}{\text{ὐπὲρ}} \text{ , } \xi\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha$. It is clear that in rejecting this political messianic role Jesus is also rejecting the political connotation of the messianic community. What Jesus has come to do is to worship and serve God. This, as we know from the incident at Caesarea Philippi, means that he must suffer and die and rise again; then will be born the true messianic community, the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\text{-}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$.

Like the first two temptations, this temptation is thoroughly messianic. What is repudiated is the crudely physical and earthly nature of the Jewish messianic hope. The hopes about both the Messiah and the messianic community are radically transformed and filled with a new meaning. This transformation itself is not provided in the temptation narrative for it stands simply as a summary of the teaching of Jesus, but it is to be noted that when at Caesarea Philippi Jesus does describe his concept of his work and its aim he does not lift it out of this world. The fulfilment of his work retains the essential community and earthly character of the Jewish hope. The $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\text{-}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, which is the fulfilment of his work, will exist in this world between the time of his ascension and the end. What is removed is the hope of a political golden age for the Jews and in its place comes the rich religious significance of the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\text{-}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ we have outlined above.

(vi) The Markan Temptation Narrative

In comparison with Matthew and Luke the Markan presentation of the temptation is surprisingly brief and bare. He preserves none of the details of the three specific temptations, but states simply that the Spirit drove Jesus into the wilderness where he was tempted by Satan for forty days, that he was with the wild beasts, and that the angels came and ministered to him (Mk. 1.12f).

1. Luke, of course, omits this rebuke of Satan both in the temptation narrative and at Caesarea Philippi, proving the link between the two narratives.

He makes no mention of the fast (Mat. 4.2; Lk. 4.2), the renunciation of Satan (Mat. 4.4,7,10; Lk. 4.4,8,12), or that after this period Satan left him (Mat. 4.11; Lk. 4.13). What Mark has recorded is simply the tradition of a satanic temptation of Jesus closely linked with his baptism.¹

One of the most outstanding features of Mark's temptation narrative is that it differs markedly in style from the preceding verses.² The subject in verses 12 and 13 stands at the beginning of the clauses and the verb follows; the historic present appears here for the first time; and there is a rhythmical structure which Lohmeyer represents as b/a b. This Lohmeyer holds points to this narrative being part of the liturgical tradition of the Church.

We shall see below that by the time that the Gospel of Mark came to be written a 'renunciation' of Satan, in some form, formed a part of the baptismal instruction. It is by no means impossible that this simple form of the tradition formed the rationale for it. As Rawlinson has noted, the story has catechetical value; 'The newly baptized Christian must be ready like his Lord, to face immediately the onset of the Tempter.'³ It is probable that it was this form of the tradition which was used in the instruction of those about to be baptized, for its significance for the candidate for baptism is not obscured by the renunciation of false messianic ideals by Jesus which appear in the fuller tradition.

This raises the question of whether this Markan tradition has been derived from the only person who could have had any knowledge of it - Jesus himself - or whether it was created by the early Church on the basis of the injunction to 'resist the devil' which, as we shall see, formed an integral part of the baptismal instruction in the primitive Church. The rhythmical structure of the saying would indicate that the form of the tradition is secondary. This, however, need not imply that the tradition itself is secondary. Since it is clear that Christian baptism was modelled on John's baptism of Jesus and not created ex nihilo by the early Church, it is also probable that the recurring theme of 'resisting Satan' was not a later creation by the Church which was then

1. A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1950, p.12 and J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium, 1903, p. 133f and Das Markusevangelium, 1917, p.75 have suggested that Mark knew the more detailed story of Q and could assume a knowledge of it on the part of his readers. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.163, holds that it is more probable that he did not know it. In any event Mark was certainly familiar with the Gospel incidents of which the Q narrative is an introductory summary (cf above p.100ff).
2. Cf E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, p.26f; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.
3. A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1942, p.12

read back into Jesus' baptism. It would appear more likely that this aspect of Christian baptism was also modelled on the baptism of Jesus which is coupled with the satanic temptation. As we have no reason to believe that John the Baptist taught anything about a conflict with Satan which he associated with his rite, we must assume that we have in Mark a secondary version of a genuine tradition derived from Jesus.

The baptismal renunciation of Satan

That such renunciations did form part of the primitive instruction has been made clear by Carrington and Selwyn. Arguing on the basis of the parallels between the Apostolic Decree of Acts 15, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and 1 Peter, Selwyn holds that these reflect a 'common substratum' of instruction from which all three have drawn. Certain key words stand out in the passages cited. On the negative side we have ἀπέχεσθαι⁴, which Carrington has characterised as the Abstinentes. The sins to be renounced are described as 'lusts' (ἐπιθυμία⁵) which are said to spring from the heathen's ignorance of God, and they are particularised above all in πορνεία⁶ or ἀκαθαρσία⁷ and πλεονεξία⁸. On the positive side, we have an emphatic call to holiness, the emphasis laid on brotherly love, and the maxim about 'not rendering evil for evil' which would be a fair paraphrase of Lev. 19.18. Thus the evidence of these passages points to a primitive nucleus of baptismal teaching whose chief points were a call to abstain from lusts and avarice, and to holiness embodying itself in benevolence towards fellow Christians and all men.

Selwyn notes further that in the baptismal teaching common to 1 Peter, Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, and James there emerges a stronger form of renunciation which he calls the Deponentes which gathers under the key word ἀποθέσθαι with its correlative ἐνδύσασθαι (not used in James and 1 Peter) the Induentes. The use of ἀποθέσθαι, usually with the resumptive particle

-
1. P. Carrington, Primitive Catechism, 1940.
 2. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, pp. 365-488. Against Selwyn's thesis that the 'renunciation of Satan' was part of a Persecution manual of instruction and not a baptismal manual we shall argue below.
 3. Cf Table of parallels ibid, pp. 370f.
 4. Acts 15.20; 1 Thess. 4.3; 5.22; 1 Peter 2.11.
 5. 1 Thess. 4.5; 1 Peter 1.14 cf. 4.2
 6. 1 Thess. 4.3; 1 Cor. 5.9
 7. 1 Thess. 4.7; Eph. 4.19; 5.5; cf 1 Pet. 2.11; 4.3,4.
 8. 1 Thess. 4.6; Eph. 5.5.
 9. 1 Thess. 4.7; 1 Pet. 1.15ff (this Petrine passage hangs upon a direct quotation from Lev. 19 which Selwyn holds lay behind the development of the primitive manual of baptismal teaching.)
 10. 1 Thess. 4.9; 1 Pet. 1.22; 2.17; 3.8, 4.8. Cf Lev. 19.18b quoted by Jesus in Mat. 5.43; 22.39.
 11. 1 Thess. 5.15; Rom. 12.17; 1 Pet. 3.9.

(διδό, οὖν, συνὲ δέ) and its association with κακία, covering in particular falsehood and bad temper, are 'such marked features of all three traditions that Carrington is surely right in regarding them as pointing to an underlying formula.'

In the earlier Pauline letters, 1 Thessalonians and Galatians, we find no use of the Deponentes. However the idea of 'putting on' the Christian armour is found. The baptismal reference in Gal. 3.27 suggests that the Induentes may have been an original feature of the common baptismal teaching, and was evidently a favourite word of Paul. While the actual use of ἐνδύσασθαι does not appear in 1 Peter, he has preserved the idea of the Christian armour which he introduces with the more military term ἐπιλίσασθαι (1 Peter 6.1ff). Outside this military metaphor he preserves the idea of 'putting on' in 1.13 (ἀναβυσάμενοι) and 5.5 (ἐγκομβώσασθε). This evidence points to the probability that the concept of 'putting on' belonged to a primitive common source of baptismal teaching.

A far more difficult, and for our purposes very important, problem is whether Selwyn is right in ascribing the metaphor of 'putting on' the Christian armour to Paul and the development of a later 'persecution torah', and not to the baptismal teaching. He notes in favour of the view that it did belong to the primitive baptismal teaching that the heavenly armour is associated with the armour of 'light' to which the baptized are admitted. Against this he notes that the metaphor always occurs in eschatological passages which seem to have marked the early teaching about persecution. He therefore concludes that the Primitive baptismal teaching about the armour of 'light' has attracted the heavenly armour passages from the persecution manual into the baptismal teaching and vice versa.

Selwyn has brilliantly outlined the evidence in the New Testament with which he supports his thesis of a common document containing teaching and encouragement for Christians as they faced persecution, which document he holds drew largely on verba Christi derived in the main from the eschatological passages in Q. There are certain features in his analysis, however, which would suggest

1. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, p.393.
2. 1 Thess. 5.8; Gal. 3.27.
3. 1 Thess. 5.8; Gal. 3.27; Rom. 12.12,14; Col. 3,10,12; Eph. 4.24; 6.11,14. cf also Lk. 24.49 which is the only place where ἐνδύσασθαι occurs in a metaphorical sense outside the Pauline letters in the New Testament.
4. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, pp. 398f, 439ff. The importance of this question is that in 1 Pet. 5.8; Eph. 6.11 (cf 4.27), James 4.7 and Heb. 2.14 we find associated the 'armour' metaphor and the 'renunciation of Satan' both of which Selwyn assigns to the 'persecution Torah'.
5. 1 Thess. 4.4-8; Rom. 12.12. It is clear that the light and darkness motif did belong to the primitive baptismal teaching. Cf Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, pp. 375ff.
6. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, pp. 439-458, and especially Table XIV pp.442-449

that the idea of arming for spiritual warfare was a part of baptismal instruction from the beginning.

The most interesting of these features for our purposes are the striking parallels in 1 Pet. 5.8, Eph. 6.11 (cf 4.27), James 4.7 and Heb.2.14, all of which contain the command to 'resist the devil' and which Selwyn assigns, together with the armour metaphor, to the 'persecution torah'.

1. 1 Peter 5.8

1 Peter has commonly been held to be addressed to a Church faced with impending or actual persecution, and is so treated by Selwyn. F.L. Cross,¹ however, has pointed out the difficulty inherent in this view. He is surely correct when he writes 'even if the persecution could be identified, there are still various obscurities. The civil power is viewed in a temper of calm submission which, however right and proper such respect might be, is hardly conceivable in a situation where persecution was threatened or existent.'² This attitude is certainly far removed from that of the Apocalypse where there can be little doubt that the Church was facing persecution.

The theme which runs through the whole of this work is that of the sufferings of Christ and the Christian.³ The author is at pains to introduce verbal references to suffering whenever he can, which references have been taken to point to some form of persecution. The result has been to present almost insuperable problems to exegetes. One such passage is 1 Pet. 4.1b,⁴ 'He that suffereth in the flesh hath ceased from sin.' Both Selwyn and Beare⁵ interpret this as pointing to some actual physical suffering of the Christian in imitation of Christ's suffering which will be the means of forgiveness and the beginning of a life of ethical goodness. But this is not the plain meaning of the text. While few commentators would agree with Cross that 1 Peter is Paschal Liturgy, few would deny that it is a baptismal homily. The immediately preceding verses (1 Peter 3.21, 22) are, in any event, undoubtedly baptismal. Bearing in mind this baptismal context Cross rightly says 'to have suffered in the flesh' means 'to have put on the Paschal Christ', i.e. in baptism the Christian puts on the Christ who suffered in the flesh for

1. F.L. Cross, 1 Peter as a Paschal Liturgy, 1954, p.13f.

2. ibid p.13.

3. Cross, ibid, holds that the semantic word pesah, Passover, is explained by the Greek πάσχω, suffer.

4. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, p.209

5. F.W. Beare, First Peter, 1958, p.153.

1. our redemption. When he continues to say that he who has thus put on Christ 'has ceased from sin', the meaning is more theologically realistic than that he begins a life of ethical goodness or patiently endures suffering. It means both that in baptism into Christ sin is forgiven and sin's power is broken.^{2.}

This concept is made even clearer in 1 Pet. 1.10f. This passage again is given a baptismal setting in 1 Pet. 1.3 which speaks of Christ having 'begotten us again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead'. This is clearly baptismal language, and it is significant to note that this association of the suffering of Christ, his resurrection and ascension reappears in expanded form in 1 Pet. 3.20, 22 which the author specifically connects with baptism. In 1 Pet. 1.10f we read that Christ's sufferings were the primary goal of the prophetic quest; 'Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently.... searching what time or manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα and the glories that should follow them.' Hort understood the phrase τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα as 'the sufferings destined for the Messiah'.^{3.} Selwyn is surely correct when he interprets this as the Christian's participation in the suffering of Christ.^{4.} But again the baptismal context of the whole book must be understood, and the reference is to the Christian's sacramental incorporation into Christ (εἰς Χριστὸν) which was to be followed by glory, which is that to which the prophets looked forward, i.e., that to which the prophets looked forward was the glory of the messianic community which is and will be established through incorporation into the suffering and glory of Jesus the Messiah, and not that they looked forward to a suffering Messiah.

The primary reference to the suffering of the Christians is not to a time of persecution, but to their sacramental union with Christ in his suffering and their participation with him in his glory. For this reason they are exhorted to endure in the face of unjust treatment (1 Pet. 2.19ff). For this reason also they are to rejoice in the trials which will herald the end and their inheritance of even greater joy (1 Pet. 4.1ff).

If this interpretation is correct it would indicate that the reference in 1 Pet. 4.1 to Christians 'arming' themselves with the mind of Christ belongs not

1. F.L. Cross, 1 Peter as a Paschal Liturgy, 1954, p.15. Cf 1 Pet. 1.18,19.

2. For the way in which 1 Peter sees the breaking of the power of sin in the Christian's baptismal incorporation into Christ cf. below p.163f.

3. Hort, The First Epistle of Peter 1.1 - 2.17, 1898, p.54.

4. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, p.137

5. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.16; Phil. 2.5.

to a persecution teaching but to a baptismal instruction. Such an interpretation throws a great deal of light on 1 Pet. 5:8.

This passage reads: 'Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom withstand in your faith, knowing that the same sufferings are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world.' The opening injunction to watchfulness and sobriety are gathered up from 1 Pet. 1:3, 4:7; and are found in similar form in 1 Thess. 5:6. Selwyn maintains that this points to a common source rather than a dependence of 1 Peter on 1 Thessalonians. The author then speaks of the satanic adversary who is ever threatening. ὁ ἀντίδικος expresses the hostility of ὁ διάβολος to every aspect of the Christian life, to which the response is steadfast faith, 'knowing that τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world.' The phrase τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων Selwyn holds indicates that persecutions are in mind. The strength of τὰ αὐτὰ, however, which E.H. Blakeney notes 'would be regarded as a noun-equivalent', would imply that the author held that precisely the same sufferings were taking place throughout the world. If we are to understand this as actual persecution such a supposition by our author would be absurd. It also makes the use of the genitive τῶν παθημάτων unintelligible. The phrase is much more naturally understood theologically in terms of the sufferings of Christ which is accomplished among Christians throughout the world. This interpretation would retain the force of τὰ αὐτὰ and the use of the genitive would be explained by its attraction to the sufferings τοῦ Χριστοῦ which must be understood here. It is this which is 'being completed' (ἐπιτελεῖσθαι) throughout the world, not simply as a world-wide persecution.

The fact that the command to 'resist the devil' occurs also in Eph. 6:11-13; Jas. 4:7; that ἀνιστῆναι is used by Paul, James and Peter in this figurative sense nowhere else but in these passages; and that Eph. 6 and 1 Pet. 5 have ἀνιστῆναι and στῆναι in that order and in this context points to the conclusion that the command to resist the devil was 'a familiar phrase in the catechetical literature of Greek Judaism, whence it passed early into the Christian Church.' We have seen, however, that there are strong grounds for maintaining that this was a part of the pre-baptismal instruction and did not belong to a persecution

1. Cf his arguments First Peter, 1946, pp. 452-456.

2. Quoted ibid p. 238

3. Even if this 'persecution' be not organised by the State but sporadic outbursts of persecutions possibly by the Jews.

4. ibid p. 238.

teaching, for the use both of this verse and the concept of suffering is thoroughly baptismal.

It is significant to note also that 1 Pet. 5.13 links the author with Mark. If this Mark is the author of the second Gospel then it is most significant that both Mark and 1 Peter associate baptism with the satanic temptation. This would lend strength to the statement of Rawlinson that Mark's account of the temptation has catechetical value: 'The newly baptized Christian must be ready like his Lord, to face immediately the onset of the tempter.'

2. Ephesians 4.27 and 6.11

This conclusion is borne out by an examination of the parallel passage to 1 Pet. 5.8 in Eph. 6.11 and 4.27.

A striking feature of these two letters is the similarity of words, theological concepts, and even structure of argument which exists between them. These parallels are obvious even on a casual reading. An examination of the detailed analysis must put the issue beyond all doubt. The difference, however, in wording, theological intention, and theological interpretation are as striking as the similarities which points to two independent variations on a common theme rather than to a dependence of one on the other.

We have seen that 1 Peter is baptismal and not persecution teaching. This is borne out by the fact that in Ephesians we have no hint of a wide-spread, continual, or even sporadic persecution of the Church. The only such persecutions we find are the author's 'tribulations' (Eph. 3.13; cf. 6.20). On the other hand baptismal teaching and symbolism is a constantly recurring theme in this letter.

It is significant to note that the author of Ephesians picks up the metaphor of 'arming' oneself with the 'same mind' as Christ, used by 1 Peter in a baptismal context, though he expresses it in an entirely different way. It is most natural to understand the context of this Ephesians passage as baptismal. Reference has been made by the author to a teaching with which he assumes his readers are familiar, that they should 'put away' their 'former manner of life,

-
1. Cf above p. 153.
 2. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, especially Tables I (p.370f); II (pp.376-378); IV (p.390); V (p.391); VI (p.394f); VII (p.403); VIIc (p.416); IX (p.420); X (p.423); XII (p.430); XII (p.432f); XIV (pp.442-449).
 3. Eph. 1.7-11; 2.1,5,13; 4.5,22-24; 5.8-11 (light and darkness symbolism); 5.26.
 4. Eph. 4.20-24; cf 1 Pet. 4.1 and above p.157.
 5. Eph. 4.20, 21.

1. the old man', and, their minds being renewed 'in the Spirit', put on the new man
 2. created by God. Selwyn and Carrington are agreed that this concept of 'putting
 3. off' and 'putting on' belonged to a primitive baptismal teaching. This is con-
 4. firmed by the use of τῷ πνεύματι, which is a characteristic of our author's
 5. baptismal teaching, and by the collation of the idea of a changed 'mind' in this
 passage and 1 Pet. 4.1.

It is therefore in a context which is unmistakably baptismal that we find the injunction to 'give no place to the devil' (Eph. 4.27).

The author of Ephesians, however, does not use the metaphor of 'arming' oneself with the spiritual armour in this context. This may suggest that this concept was not part of the common baptismal instruction, and support Selwyn's contention that it belonged to an independent form of 'persecution teaching'. This arming metaphor is used in the famous passage in Eph. 6.10-20, which can scarcely be taken to be a form of teaching developed in the face of persecution. The only possible reference to persecution is the author's reference to his being 'in chains' (Eph. 6.20) which need not be taken literally but may refer to his being in bondage to Christ and the Gospel (cf Eph. 6.19).

6. By 1 Peter's association of the 'arming' metaphor with baptism the implication is that we have here an extension of the baptismal metaphor of the Christians armour against the onslaughts of the devil. From this it would appear that the injunction to 'Put on the whole armour of God, that ye might stand against the wiles of the devil' (Eph. 6.11) is to be understood as a part of the primitive baptismal teaching. This is confirmed by the use of ἐνδύσασθαι both in Eph. 6.11 and Eph. 4.24, and the baptismal context of the command to give no place to the wiles of the devil in Eph. 4.27.

We conclude, therefore, that the call to 'resist the devil' did form part of the primitive baptismal instruction which lies behind both 1 Peter and Ephesians.

1. Eph. 4.22.
2. Eph. 4.23. I have translated τῷ πνεύματι as 'in the Spirit' with a capital 'S' implying that the reference is to the Holy Spirit. I have done so because our author does not use the concept of the Spirit in the loose way implied by the AV and RV (cf Eph. 1.13; 2.18,22; 3.16; 4.3, 4.30; 5.18; 6.18 - in none of these passages could we translate πνεῦμα as spirit in a general sense). Thus the translation of this would appear to be not the loose 'And that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind' (so RV) but the more theologically exact 'And to be renewed of your mind in the Spirit', i.e. the renewal of mind is the work of the Holy Spirit in whom they are 'sealed' in baptism (cf Eph. 1.13; 4.30). Cf also G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, 1951, pp. 3,5,6,7,28,57, /248,256.
3. Eph. 4.24.
4. Cf above p.154.
5. Cf. Eph. 1.13; 4.30 and above note 2 . on Eph. 4.23.
6. 1 Pet. 4.1f; cf above p.157.

3. James 4.7

Again in James we find such remarkable similarities of words, ideas, and structure of argument to 1 Peter, Ephesians, and other New Testament writings,^{1.} and yet such great differences in their application that the conclusion is irrestible^{is} that a common basis of teaching underlies them. Our problem is to attempt to determine whether this is related to persecution or baptismal teaching which contained the call to 'resist the devil'.

It is perhaps significant to note at the outset that the injunction to 'resist the devil' does not occur in the strongly eschatological section of the letter.^{2.} As the eschatological section, however, forms the climax to the epistle, as in 1 Peter, it may legitimately be claimed to colour the teaching of James. The question then is whether we have in this section a reference to the persecution of the Church.

Clearly Jas. 5.1-5 implies an oppression but the oppression is one of social injustice. It is this that he denounces in terms so reminiscent of the Old Testament prophets^{3.} and against those who do this he announces the woes of the 'coming miseries'. In verse 6 we read; 'Ye have condemned ye have killed the righteous, he doth not resist you' (ΚΑΤΕΔΙΚΑΣΑΤΕ, ΕΦΟΝΕΥΣΑΤΕ ΤΟΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ, ΟΥΚ ΑΝΤΙΤΑΣΣΕΤΑΙ ὑμῖν). In view of the context, the most natural interpretation of this is to be seen in the wicked scheming of men against the 'righteous poor' found in Wis. 2.10-20;

Let us oppress the righteous poor;

 With outrage and torture let us put him to the test,
 That we may learn his gentleness,
 And prove his patience under wrong.
 Let us condemn him to a shameful death. (4)

This is borne out by James' use of similar ideas in his admonition to the Christians not to have 'respect of persons' (Jas. 2.1) and dishonour the 'poor man' for 'Do not the rich oppress you, and themselves drag you before the judgement-seats?' (Jas. 2.6). The oppression is the oppression by the wealthy of the poor as poor and not as Christians, and the call is to equality in the Church and to 'patience' in the face of this social injustice, and not encouragement to 'endure' persecution.

-
1. Cf the tables in Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, to which attention has already been drawn above p.159 n.2.
 2. Jas. 5.1-11.
 3. Jas. 5.1 (cf Prov. 11.28; Amos 6.1); 5.2 (cf Job 13.28; Isa. 1.9); 5.4 (cf Job 24.10; Lev. 19.13; Deut. 24.15); 5.5 (cf Job 21.13; Jer. 12.3).
 4. Translation of R.H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vo. 1.

That this is the way in which the reference to 'condemning' and 'killing' 'the righteous' (Jas. 5.6) is to be interpreted and not as a reference to the suffering of Christ is made clear when James makes his call to 'patience'. He cites as examples not the suffering and death of Christ but the patience of the 'prophets' and Job in their sufferings (Jas. 5.10,11), which sufferings (κακοπαθεία) (Jas. 5.10,13) seem to imply illness and not persecution. Accordingly while social injustices play a large part in the teaching of James and physical illness is mentioned, it is stretching the normal use of the word 'persecution' too far to say that we have here evidence of persecution teaching.

At the same time it can scarcely be said that the teaching of James is baptismal, even though phrases reminiscent of baptismal teaching appear in the course of the argument. The most remarkable of these is ὁὶ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσεΐαν κακίας ἐν πρᾶυτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν (Jas. 1.21). This passage echoes 1 Pet. 3.21-4.1 and Eph. 4.22-24. We find the use of ἀποθέσθαι in all three passages. In James the object of ἀποθέσθαι is ῥυπαρίαν and in 1 Peter ῥύπον. In all three passages this idea of 'putting off' is balanced by a concept of 'putting on' expressed variously as ἐνδύσασθαι (Eph. 4.24), ὀπλίσασθαι (1 Pet. 4.1), or δέξασθαι (Jas. 1.21). In James that which is received is τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον, an agricultural rather than military metaphor, and found also in 1 Peter, 1.23 where we are told that Christians have been ἀναγεγεννημένο διὰ λόγου..... Θεοῦ as the 'living', 'abiding' and 'incorruptible' seed. In Ephesians we do not find this image of the implanted λόγος but of being ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (Eph. 4.23). This idea appears also in Jas. 4.5; 'He made the Spirit to dwell in us', and in 1 Pet. 3.18. The concept of δικαιοσύνη is found in Jas. 1.20 and also Eph. 4.24. Finally σῶσαι of Jas. 1.21 appears also in 1 Pet. 3.20, 21 where it is explicitly linked with baptism.

This evidence makes it clear that while Jas. 1.21 and 4.5 are not explicitly baptismal in their context in the letter, their parallels with baptismal teaching in 1 Pet. and Ephesians points to a common underlying teaching or document concerned with baptism. Further, the use of the metaphor of 'moth-eaten garments' (Jas. 5.2) to refer to the corrupt moral lives of the rich is using a baptismal concept.

1. Jas. 1.21; Eph. 4.22, 25; 1 Pet. 3.21.

2. Cf above p.160n.2

Like 1 Peter and Ephesians, James treats the Christian life as a warfare against temptation (πειρασμός) (Jas. 1.2). This concept of temptation is gradually developed through the course of the letter. In 1.2f the readers are enjoined to rejoice in temptation, knowing that faith 'worketh patience' and 'patience' 'perfection'. Such temptations are not of God, 'but each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed' (Jas. 1.13f). The worst of these passions is 'jealousy' (Jas. 3.14) which is not 'from heaven' but ἐπίγχιος, ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης (Jas. 3.15). This demoniacal jealousy lies at the root of 'confusion and every vile deed' (Jas. 3.16) and the temptation of lust is the cause of wars and fightings (Jas. 4.1f). Consequently he pleads 'be subject therefore unto God; but resist the devil (ὁ διάβολος) and he will flee from you' (Jas. 4.7).

1.

The context in which this call to 'resist the devil' appears in James, the fact that we have clear echoes of baptismal concepts in this non-baptismal letter, and the fact that it is highly doubtful whether we have reference to persecution, points again to James' use not of a persecution manual but of a common baptismal document which must have included the call to 'resist the devil'.

4. Acts 26.18

It is highly significant that in the third account of Paul's conversion given in Acts (Acts 26) the explicit reference to Baptism contained in the two earlier accounts (Acts 9.18; 22.16) is omitted and is replaced by theological teaching associated with baptism, particularly in the light-darkness motif and the forgiveness of sins. It is precisely in this context and embedded in this baptismal teaching that Paul speaks of turning from 'the power of Satan to God' (Acts 26.18).

The Interpretation of the Baptismal renunciation.

In all three epistles it is to be noted that Satan is remarkably subservient, and each author states the grounds of this subservience and the Christian's power to 'resist' him. James prefixes his call; 'God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble' therefore 'be subject to God; but resist the devil and he will flee from you'. In Ephesians and 1 Peter the

1. Cf above p.162 for the baptismal character of Jas. 4.5

2. Cf above p.102

3. Jas. 5.6 cited from Prov. 3.34 (LXX)

basis is that God has raised Christ and made him to 'sit at his right hand' and
 has subjected all things to him.^{1.} By the mercy of God the Christian has been
 'quickened together with Christ' to share his exaltation, and has received the^{2.}
 power of the Spirit so that Christ dwells in the believer's heart through faith.^{3.}
 This sharing in the power of the Spirit and the victory of Christ is the
 baptismal gift.^{4.} So the Christian is enjoined to 'give no place to the devil'
 (Eph. 4.27) and to put on the 'armour of God' to withstand the devil and^{5.}
 'quench all his fiery darts' with faith.^{6.} Thus the victory over Satan has
 already been won by God in the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. In
 this victory the Christian is made to share through his union with the suffering
 exalted Christ and his participation in the Holy Spirit. This teaching is
 summed up in Heb. 2.14-18; 'Since then the children are sharers in flesh and
 blood, he (Christ) also himself in like manner partook the same; that through
 death he might also bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is,
 the devil; And might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their
 lifetime subject to bondage... for in that he himself suffered being tempted,
 he is able to succour them that are tempted.'

Conclusion and interpretation of the Markan temptation narrative
 in the light of the defeat of Satan in the Gospel records.

We conclude, therefore, that these satanic temptations, which form
 a recurring theme in the New Testament epistles, were part of the primitive
 baptismal teaching. The Christian is to resist the devil in the heavenly
 armour of faith, and his victory is assured through his union with Christ
 (effected in Baptism) in whom, by his death, resurrection and ascension, God
 has already secured the victory. In this conflict of the Church with the
 satanic tempter, the Christian is assured of the powerful aid of the Holy Spirit
 (also the baptismal gift).

The Markan temptation narrative significantly follows immediately
 on the baptism of Jesus where he is endowed with the Spirit and declared to be
 God's ebhed-Messiah. He is now driven into the wilderness where he was

-
1. Eph. 1.19-23; 1 Pet. 1.21; 3.22.
 2. Eph. 2.4-6; 1 Pet. 1.21; 2.24; 5.10.
 3. Eph. 3.16,17; 1 Pet. 3.18; 4.14.
 4. Eph. 4.22-24; 2.1ff; 1 Pet. 3.20-22; 1.3.
 5. Eph. 6.11; 1 Pet. 4.1; 5.8.
 6. Eph. 6.16; 1 Pet. 5.9.

tempted by Satan ^{1.} τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας . Here we are not told that Jesus countered the satanic tempter or repudiated him. The significance, which no Jew could have missed, is that the declared Messiah is brought into immediate conflict with Satan which, it was believed, would herald the dawn of the Kingdom of God. It is highly significant, therefore, that immediately following on this reference to the satanic temptation we are told that Jesus came into Galilee and began to preach the 'good news of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is drawn near (^{2.} ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ^{3.}). Though the conflict with Satan is not yet described as the victory of Jesus, the fact that he immediately proclaims the advent of the kingdom would leave the hearer in no doubt what the issue of the conflict will be.

Of this issue we are told in the second recorded incident of Jesus' conflict with Satan.^{4.}

The messianic character of this incident is proved by the fact that the saying about the 'unforgivable sin' and blasphemy against the Son of man (Mk. 3.28f; Mat. 12.31f) is clearly secondary.^{5.} Luke's record of the demand for a 'sign' (Lk. 11.16) is further evidence. Manson is surely correct when he notes that this verse cannot be an editorial addition in view of the fact that this request is not dealt with until Lk. 11.29. 'Luke would hardly have inserted here introductory matter to something which was not going to be treated until 13 verses later.'^{6.} That Manson is not correct in treating this as simply the demand for a sign that Jesus was a prophet is proved by Matthew's version in which the people ask 'Can this be the Son of David?' (Mat. 12.23). Finally, the Q saying concludes 'He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scattereth' (Mat. 12.30; Lk.11.23). According to Ps. Sol 17.28 it is the Messiah who shall 'gather together a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness' while 'he (the wicked) never ceaseth to scatter and bereave'^{7.}

1. Mk. 1.13. This phrase recalls the experience of Moses (Ex. 34.28) and Elijah (1 Ki. 19.8) the two figures in Jewish history associated with the coming Messiah (cf above p.84). It is these same two who appear with Jesus on the mount of transfiguration (Mk. 9.4; Mat. 17.3; Lk. 10.30). These two facts confirm the messianic significance of the temptation narrative in Mark, and its link with Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration.

2. Cf above p. 78f.

3. Mk. 1.14,15; cf Mat. 4.12,17. Luke significantly reserves Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God to the risen Christ in Acts 1.3, where we also find a reference to the 'forty days' of the temptation narrative.

4. Mk. 3.22-27; Mat. 12.24-29; Lk. 11.15-22.

5. Cf the independent position of the saying in Lk.12.10, cf also below p. 279. For the originality of the Q 'Son of man' form of the saying against the Markan 'sons of men' cf below p. 279.

6. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.83

7. ibid. p.84.

(Ps. Sol. 4.13).

The occasion for the controversy in both Mark and Q is Jesus' authority over devils. The terms of the charge brought against Jesus are almost identical in the three synoptic Gospels, that Jesus is in league with Satan.¹

In Mark Jesus replies to the allegation in terms which would mean that if the charge were true, then Satan would be in civil war with himself, and as such his kingdom could not stand. The strength of the satanic kingdom, like that of any kingdom or household, is its unity. Matthew and Luke alone record Jesus turning defence into attack.² Jesus is not the only one who casts out demons. There were also Jewish exorcists.³ Is the accusation brought against Jesus the explanation of the exorcisms performed by members of their own party? Jesus does not stop to argue the point, but moves on to the true significance of his exorcisms. This is that they are a manifestation of the kingdom of God which has already come in him; 'If it is by the finger (Mat. Spirit) of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you' (ἀρα ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ).⁴

The kingdom of God is here described by Jesus as already come, and not simply as 'near' as it was after the temptation. The reason for this is that Jesus sees the house of the 'strong man' as able to be plundered because the 'strong man', i.e. Satan, is already bound (Mk. 3.27; Mat. 12.29). The stronger one who has come is Jesus himself who has overcome the strong man and taken away his armour (Lk. 11.21f) which represents the host of demons under Satan's rule.⁵

1. Mark has two distinct charges; the first 'He hath Beelzebul', i.e. possessed by an evil spirit, and the second is that his exorcisms are wrought in the power of the 'ruler of demons', i.e. Satan. Matthew and Luke combine the two charges identifying Beelzebul with Satan. Whether Beelzebul is to be treated as a particular evil spirit in the rule of Satan (so V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.238) or is another name given to the arch-fiend by the Jews, even though it is not found in Jewish literature (so T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.83) need not detain us here. It is possible that the separation of the Q charge in Mark has been occasioned by the narrative introduction that Jesus is insane (Mk. 8.21). Most scholars are agreed that this, though undoubtedly a genuine tradition, is secondary in this context (cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955 p.237). This is confirmed by the fact that this charge is not answered by Jesus, though Mark introduces an editorial comment at the end of the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit which makes this saying the reply to the charge (Mk. 3.30). This is certainly not an original part of the tradition. The form of the charge in Q is therefore to be considered as the more original.
2. Mat. 12.27f; Lk. 11.18b-20.
3. Cf Josephus Antiq VIII, 2.5; Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 4 p.533ff; Acts 19.3.
4. Mat. 12.28; Lk. 11.20. Though the saying is not preserved in Mark there is no reason to doubt its genuineness and its position in Q. The fact that there are a number of secondary features in Mark (cf above p.165 n.5 and 166 n.1) supports the greater reliability of the Q account. Further, the fact that when reference is made to the satanic opposition at the temptation and at Caesarea Philippi reference is also made to the 'kingdom of God' would indicate that Q has preserved a genuine tradition here.
5. So T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.86.

It is clear that in this saying the 'kingdom of God' cannot be identified with either the purely other-worldly or the political kingdom of Jewish expectation. It is highly significant that Mark reserves to Mk. 6.7-13 the fulfilment of the commission of Jesus to his disciples given immediately before this controversy (Mk. 3.15). If the sign of the advent of the kingdom of God is the casting out of demons because in the power of God Jesus has already bound Satan, then surely the disciples who now cast out demons 'in his name' (Lk. 10.17) are already sharers and co-workers in that kingdom.

Though Satan is conquered and bound this does not mean that the hostility between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan is at an end. The Q saying concludes 'He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters' (Mat. 12.30; Lk. 11.23). In view of the messianic character of this saying, the challenge is to share with Jesus in his messianic work in gathering a 'holy people', i.e. the people of God, in the conflict with Satan, or to oppose God's Messiah and scatter the people.

The third occasion of the messianic conflict with Satan at Caesarea Philippi we have already studied at length. We shall limit ourselves here to a summary of the conclusions previously reached and try to see how the theme of the satanic conflict is carried further.

Here the setting is Peter's historic declaration that Jesus is the Messiah. Jesus' reply to this declaration is twofold. Firstly, he points forward to the messianic people of God whom he will build on the foundation of the disciples who were sharers with him in his messianic work on earth. This people of God will be sharers with him in his triumph over the realm of death. Because it is he in whom the kingdom has already come and who is the reality of the existence of the ἑκκλησία, through them he will lead men into that kingdom and grant the forgiveness of sin. Secondly, he points forward to his suffering, death, and vindication on the 'third day' (which includes his resurrection, ascension, and bestowal of the Holy Spirit) as the means by which he will build the ἑκκλησία-βασιλεία.

Through Peter, as the representative of all the disciples, the satanic opposition to this understanding of the work of Jesus is expressed. But Satan is repudiated. Jesus will accept his suffering and death and will rise again

1. Cf above p. 165

2. Cf above pp.129-151

from the dead and ascend to the Father and by this means inaugurate the kingdom of God. By his death and resurrection Satan's power will be broken. In this sense the repudiation of Satan is precisely the same as the saying of the Johannine Christ who, referring to his coming 'glorification' (Jn. 14.28) says 'Now is the judgement of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out' (Jn. 14.31)

Coupled with the ἑκκλησία is the promise of the keys τῆς βασιλείας and the discourse closes with the promise of the coming kingdom. That which in the temptation narrative is declared to have drawn near and in the Beelzebul controversy to be a present reality in Jesus is here a promise of the coming reality. The fulfilment of this promise, prefigured in the transfiguration, comes with the presence by the Holy Spirit of the crucified but risen and ascended Christ in the ἑκκλησία-βασιλεία.

As the ἑκκλησία-βασιλεία is built by the crucified and exalted Messiah, which event is the 'judgement of the ruler of this world' or the 'defeat of Satan', who is present in and with his ἑκκλησία it would seem wholly legitimate to call this new people of God the Satan-defeating community. The New Testament epistles do not reveal that life in the Church is a life free from satanic temptation, but for the Christian this is no longer an unequal struggle. Through his union by sacrament and faith with the Christ who has subjected Satan he is to 'resist the devil' assured of his victory through Christ. The longer ending of Mark's Gospel represents the commission of the risen Christ to the disciples; 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name they shall cast out devils.....' (Mk. 16.15-17a). Though this saying can almost certainly not be ascribed to Jesus, and is only dubiously to be ascribed to Mark, it forms the most fitting climax to the development of the theme of the satanic conflict with Jesus and the kingdom of God which began at the baptism of Jesus.

Our study of Jesus the Messiah involved in the messianic conflict with Satan has revealed again that though Jesus transformed the Jewish concept of the Messiah he has preserved the essential community character of the messianic hope. Jesus entered into conflict with Satan and won the victory over Satan by his death and rising again not for his own sake but that his new people of God, built up by him in these events, might share with him in his messianic triumph over Satan. As he won the victory through his baptismal endowment with the Spirit,

so will they. The injunction to 'resist the devil' which formed part of the primitive baptismal rite is an integral part of the baptismal declaration that Jesus is the Messiah. The basis of this injunction is not simply that Jesus at his baptism also had to face the satanic tempter, but that Jesus has already won the victory over Satan. It is into this Spirit-filled, Satan-defeating community of the Spirit-endowed Messiah who has secured the victory over Satan that the Christian is incorporated in baptism. This, I believe, is the theological significance of the temptation narrative as it stands coupled with the baptism of Jesus the Sebhed-Messiah.

(c) Conclusion.

Our analysis of the baptismal and temptation narratives and their related passages in the Gospels has made it clear that while Jesus exercised a reserve about the title Messiah there can be little doubt that he did think of himself as the Messiah of the people of God. The concepts which he applied to himself, though radically transformed, can only be understood in terms of Jewish messianic expectations. This transformation was not entirely negative.

In Judaism the messianic hope was essentially a hope for the community which had its focus in the Messiah. He would be a triumphant political figure bringing in a political golden age for Israel which would be the kingdom of God. It is therefore not surprising that Jesus' concept of his messianic work included teaching about the messianic community which would be the fulfilment of his work. In the teaching of Jesus both his work as Messiah and the nature of the messianic community are stripped of political connotations.

He is the Spirit-endowed Messiah who by his life, death, and exaltation has inaugurated the messianic ἐκκλησία-βασιλεία, the new people of God. This community is not thought of as a 'successor' to Jesus, rather, as we shall see,

is understood not only as the community through which he continues to fulfil his messianic work but also is incorporated into his own person. As such this new people of God share in his endowment with the Spirit. They share also in his messianic blessings, his conquest of Satan, his resurrection triumph over death, his forgiveness of sin, his eternal life. It is through baptism into Christ and

1. The difficult saying of Mk. 12.35ff and par. cannot be taken to point to a contrary conclusion. Here Jesus cannot be taken to be denying his Davidic sonship as many scholars have concluded. If this were the intention of Jesus then it is hard to understand how Matthew and Luke could have included their Davidic genealogies in their Gospels. The tradition of such Davidic lineage is present in Rom. 1.3 and must have been very early. Such a tradition would have had the significance also for the family of Jesus, especially James, and would certainly have been repudiated had it been false. I am in complete agreement with Cullmann, (Christology, 1959, pp.130ff) that this saying of Jesus must be taken to point to the same reserve about the title Son of David as he exercised about the title Messiah. Jesus here repudiates the political connotations of the 'Son of David' and points to his heavenly origin - a concept more fully worked out in the Fourth Gospel - without denying the fact of his Davidic lineage.
2. Cf below pp.422ff.

into the messianic community that men share in this fruit of his mission. As he fed the disciples during his earthly ministry so he still feeds the faithful with the miraculous messianic food which brings eternal life - himself- in the eucharist.

This is certainly no fulfilment of the political dream, yet, as we shall see in greater detail below, its social implications are *tremendous*

In the early Church all other designations of Jesus recede into the background. The expression 'Jesus is the Messiah' is lifted to a confession. It alone became and has remained a proper name, Jesus Christ, though the New Testament epistles still retain the more original designation, Jesus the Christ. For Paul the dominant title of the Church was *σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and the closely related *ναὸς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος*. This is so despite Jesus' own reluctance to use the title of himself as the evangelists are aware. This would show that the early Church did understand the intense community nature of the messianic hope. For them this hope had at last been fulfilled but in a way that made the old political connotations fade into insignificance. In Jesus the prophetic quest had been fulfilled. His coming was the coming of the Kingdom of God. In that kingdom the new people of the Messiah, Christians, are sharers through their union with God's Messiah.

This understanding of the primitive Church was not a falling away from the teaching of Jesus. While he was reluctant to use the title Messiah they made it their chief declaration of their faith in him. This declaration was only possible because they rightly understood themselves to be the community which Jesus the Messiah had built by his death, resurrection and ascension, and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit.

It is not incidental or accidental that in our discussion of Jesus as the Messiah we have had to anticipate a great deal of our discussions on the nature of the Church and the sacraments. For the sacraments cannot be understood apart from the Church, the messianic community. Nor can that community be understood apart from the Messiah. The Messiah, his community, and its worship belong together in indissoluble union, a union which was already present in the Jewish messianic hope. It was therefore perfectly natural that Jesus' concept of his messianic office and work did involve a concept of the messianic community, its nature and worship. We cannot hope to gain an understanding of the Church

or the sacraments without giving full place to Jesus' understanding of his messianic work. This, as with the concept of the Sebhed Yahweh, is an essential part of the theological setting of the sacraments of the Church.

CHAPTER 3THE SON OF MAN.A. OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND(a) Introduction

No subject in New Testament scholarship has been more hotly debated than the Son of man. There have been three major problem areas.

(i) What material is to count as background material of the concept in the New Testament?

Scholars are virtually unanimous that it is only in the Book of Daniel that 'Son of man' is used as a technical soteriological title in the Old Testament. But its appearance here is so unexpected and new, and so little explanation of its meaning is given in Daniel, that some explanation of its origin is necessary. Kraeeling has argued that Daniel's figure is linked with the Anthropos of Iranian belief. Various scholars have tried to trace the 'one like a Son of man' to some form of the idea of a primal or heavenly man, widespread in Eastern religions. While Mowinckel has shown the clear parallels between the Urmensch mythology and the use of the 'Son of man' in 1 Enoch, suggesting that they both belong to the same mythological pattern of thought, too little is known about the date of these speculations and their extent to place any confidence in the theories that the author of Daniel 7 deliberately borrowed traits from a well-known figure. Evidence is too scant for us to assume that he either intended to convey the concept of a 'Heavenly man', or that his readers would have understood him in this way. It is more likely that the concern of both the author and his hearers was with the fortunes of Israel and not with a heavenly man. Since it is by no means necessary to interpret Daniel 7 in terms of the Urmensch concept it would be sounder to look within the Old Testament itself for the leading ideas employed in Daniel 7.

The problems of looking to Urmensch speculations and their parallels with the Son of man in 1 Enoch and then reading them back into Daniel 7, or of

1. C.H. Kraeeling, Anthropos and Son of man, 1927.
2. For a survey of the theories cf. W. Staerk, Erlöserwartung, 1938, pp. 422ff; S. Mowinckel, Review of Engnell's 'Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East', NIT, Vol. 45, 1944, pp.190ff; J.M. Creed, 'The Heavenly Man', JTS, Vol. 26, 1925, pp.113-136; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, pp.174-190; cf also the brief discussion and literature given by S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1959, p.422, n.1.
3. ibid, pp.421 ff.
4. So also M.D. Hooker, The Son of man in Mark, 1967, p.13.

making them valid background material to the New Testament use of the concept is made more complex by the problem of the date of 1 Enoch. New light has been shed on the question of the date by the discovery of the Qumran Texts. At Qumran the Enoch literature is represented fairly extensively, especially in the fragments from Cave 4, but as yet the Similitudes are conspicuous by their absence, and it may be that the sect did not have this part of the Book of Enoch in their library. In the light of this the question of the date of the Similitudes has been re-discussed. Rowley suggests a date in the Second Century B.C., Eissfeldt one in the first century B.C., Bousset places it in the Roman period, and Milik in the second century A.D. Consequently in English scholarship there has been a considerable reluctance to accept the derivation of the Son of man in the Gospels from the Book of Enoch. Dodd points to the difficulty in determining whether the Similitudes are pre-Christian, the actual meaning and precise reference of the various Ethiopic expressions translated 'Son of man', and he also points out that the Similitudes may represent an isolated and probably eccentric authority for the association of the title 'Son of man' with an apocalyptic Messiah.

These factors, together with the fact that while Jesus made reference to Daniel 7.13 he makes no direct reference to the Similitudes, suggest to us that the Urmensch mythology and the Book of Enoch alike are very doubtful authorities for our purpose.

(ii) The second major problem area, closely related to the first, is

the tenability of T.W. Manson's collective interpretation of the Son of man concept. (8)

Manson's collective interpretation has been extensively criticized,

1. A Dupont-Somer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, 1961, pp. 298-300 and G.H.P. Thomson, 'The Son of Man; Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls', Ext, Vol. 72, 1961, p.125, contend that this negative evidence cannot be regarded as decisive
2. H.H. Rowley, Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1957, p.9. (i.e. an early Maccabean dating.)
3. O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 1956, p.766; cf also S. Mowinckel He that Cometh, 1959, p.355.
4. W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, 1926 p.13; cf also E. Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946, pp.35-39 (during the reign of Herod); N. Messel, 'Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch' ZAW, Vol. 35, 1922, pp.78-85 (during a Roman procuratorship), M.D. Hooker, The Son of man in Mark, 1967, p.48 ('roughly contemporaneous with Jesus').
5. J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (ET), 1959, p.33
6. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1953, pp.116f.
7. Mt. 26.64, Mk. 14.62.
8. T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, pp.171ff; Sayings, 1957; 'The Son of man in Daniel Enoch and the Gospels', JRL, bulletin 32, 1949/50, pp.171-193; 'The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church' JEH, Vol.1, 1950, pp.1-11; The Servant Messiah, 1953, p.80f; 'Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret' in Studies in the Gospels, Essays in memory of R.H. Lightfoot, ed. D.E. Nineham, 1955, pp.209-222; 'The Life of Jesus: some Tendencies in Present-day Research' in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, 1956, pp.211-221.

1. especially by Sjöberg, and supported by Mowinckel. Both hold that the concept of the 'heavenly man' was already on Jewish soil before the Book of Daniel, and at the time of Christ. The main evidence for this is the use of the term in the Similitudes. We have already seen reason to believe that it is a highly dubious procedure to place such reliance on the Similitudes.

3.

On the other hand, Matthew Black has called attention to some evidence in the Qumran texts which does lend support to T.W. Manson's collective interpretation. He cites in particular 1 QS 8.1ff, where the sect, or an inner élite of it, are 'to maintain faithfulness in the land with a steadfast purpose and a broken spirit; and they shall expiate iniquity by upholding the righteous cause and bearing anguish of the refiner's furnace.' There follows a description of the group in verse:

As an eternal planting, and holy house for Israel,
 A conclave which is an holy of holies for Aaron,
 Witness of the truth concerning judgement, (5)
 And the chosen of grace to atone for the land, (6)
 And to render to the wicked their desert, (7)
 This is the tried wall, the precious corner stone,
 Whose foundation shall not be shaken,
 Nor dislodged from their place. (8)

In this passage two features are of particular importance. The first is the association of thought between the function of the remnant within the sect and the function of Isaiah's Ebhed Yahweh. The second is the phrase 'to render to the wicked their desert' which appears in Ps. 94.2, and CD 7.9, where it is used of God's activity. Here the community is the means of this aspect of the eschatological visitation. This combination of judgement and community brings us very close to the thought of Dan. 7.14, where the Son of man is given 'dominion and glory and a kingdom that all peoples...should serve him', and to that of Dan. 7.26f., where the dominion of the fourth beast is destroyed and the kingdom and dominion passes to 'the people of the saints of the Most High'.

This evidence indicates that the functions ascribed to the Ebhed Yahweh and to the Son of man were linked in the thought of Judaism at the time of Christ, and that both were given a collective interpretation. Therefore

-
1. E. Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946
 2. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1959, pp.346ff.
 3. M. Black, 'The Servant of the Lord and Son of Man', SJT, Vol. 6, 1953 pp.1-11.
 4. 1 QS 8.3f. Black's translation.
 5. Cf Isa. 32.10, 12.
 6. 'chosen by divine grace' cf Isa. 42.1 'my servant.... my chosen', and the parallels of thought between ('to atone for the earth' and Isa. 53.
 7. This phrase, 'to render to the wicked their desert' is a quotation from Ps. 94.2, which is also quoted in C.D. 7.9 (cf N. Perrin, The Kingdom of God, 1963, p.99 n.5)
 8. 1 QS 8.5-8. Black's translation.

1.
 Manson's interpretation cannot be described as 'strained', or be rejected on the grounds of the all-pervasive influence of the individual apocalyptic deliverer of 1 Enoch at the time of Jesus. 2.
 If the men of the Qumran could think of themselves as a community exercising the functions of the eschatological Son of man, then there is nothing inherently improbable about a communal interpretation of the figure in Daniel or the teaching of Jesus. Nor is it relevant to say with Flew that 'to any student today the confusion caused by applying the title, now in the sense of a community, now in the sense of an individual, is evident' and it is therefore 'unlikely that Jesus..... would clothe his thought in such ambiguity'. 3.
 Modern conceptions of the distinctions between the individual and the community are simply irrelevant in trying to understand the thought of first-century Judaism. As Vincent Taylor has shown 'community' and 'individual' are not mutually exclusive categories. 4.
 So that it is probable that, like the 'Messiah', the concept of the 'Son of man' stood primarily for a hope for Israel - a hope which would be realized by God through Israel itself, or a remnant in Israel, or a representative individual.

The important point to remember is that 'Son of man' is a soteriological concept, which means that it was a concept in terms of which the hope for the redemption of Israel was expressed. If the Urmensch mythology did in fact lie behind its use in Judaism, when it appears in Judaism it becomes a concept through which the vindication of Israel is to be achieved. 5.
 Because there is already this shift in the Urmensch mythology it is wrong to assume that individual users of this concept will be slavishly dependent on the precise connotations of it in other religions. How Israel's glory will be achieved through the work of the Son of man, and what the connotations of it are must be gained from a study of the thought of each particular user of the concept. But, as we shall see, whether a particular user uses the 'Son of man' in a collective or representative individual sense, the corporate is always built into his use of the concept in that it is through his work that Israel's victory and redemption will be achieved.

-
1. As it is by T.F. Glasson, *The Second Advent*, 1945, p.54, or as 'impossible' by S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 1959, p.355.
 2. Ibid, pp.346ff; J. Knox, *The Death of Christ*, 1958, p.61
 3. R.N. Flew, *Jesus and his Church*, 1943, p.54
 4. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, 1953, p.32
 5. This remains a possibility even though we have argued that there is no conclusive evidence that it does in fact lie behind the use of the concept in Daniel or the teaching of Jesus.

(iii) The third major problem area is

whether Jesus used the concept as a self-designation.

In the last few years there has been a steadily increasing number of scholars who maintain that Jesus did not speak of himself as the 'Son of man', but rather that he spoke of an eschatological figure, the 'Son of man', and that the early Church made the step of identifying Jesus himself with that figure and created non-eschatological 'Son of man' sayings. Still more radical conclusions are reached by Conzelmann and Vielhauer, who regard all 'Son of man' sayings in the gospels as creations of the Church.

One major exception to this trend is E. Schweizer. While Tödt and others contend that, since there can be no doubt that the early Church did identify Jesus and the Son of man, the retention in the Gospels of sayings (which refer to a coming eschatological deliverer) in which there appears to be a distinction between Jesus and the Son of man indicates that these are most probably the only logia we can claim with any confidence to be authentic, Schweizer notes that precisely because the early Church did believe that Jesus would be the coming eschatological Son of man, all eschatological logia must be regarded as unreliable. He holds that the balance of probable authenticity rests with those sayings which refer to the humble life of the Son of man on earth. He rejects the group of sayings which refer to the passion and the resurrection of the Son of man as vaticinia ex eventu on the grounds that the concept of a suffering Son of man did not belong to the tradition of the Son of man. Nevertheless, although these sayings have been elaborated he feels that the tradition of the Son of man being 'handed over' is very early, and concludes that 'it is probable that Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of man who was to be humiliated and rejected by men, yet exalted by God.'

1. cf R. Bultmann, Theology, 1, 1959, pp. 26-32; J. Knox, The Death of Christ, 1958, pp. 31-125; F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitslitel, 1963, pp. 13-53; H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965; A. J. B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964 (with which compare the contrary conclusions of his earlier work, 'The Son of Man-Forschung since "The Teaching of Jesus"' in New Testament Essays, ed. Higgins, 1959, pp. 119-135); R. H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, 1965 (with which compare the contrary conclusions of his earlier work, Mission and Achievement, 1954).
2. H. Conzelmann, 'Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition', ZTK Vol. 54, 1957, pp. 277-296.
3. P. Vielhauer, 'Jesus und der Menschensohn', ZTK, Vol. 60, 1963, pp. 135-177.
4. E. Schweizer, 'The Son of Man', JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, pp. 119-129 and 'The Son of Man Again', NTS, Vol. 9, 1963, pp. 256-261.
5. E. Schweizer, 'The Son of Man' JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, p. 120.

We have protagonists among most notable and competent New Testament scholars for the authenticity of none of the Son of man sayings, those sayings which retain a distinction between Jesus and the Son of man, the eschatological sayings, the sayings which refer to the humble life on earth of the Son of man,¹ and the sayings which refer to the passion and resurrection of the Son of man. Some hold that only one class of the sayings can be regarded as authentic, and others will admit, in differing degrees, combinations of the classes. In spite of recent support for Bultmann's position, therefore, there is no agreed solution to the problem, and it is doubtful whether the methods of form-criticism and source-criticism can solve it. Miss Hooker displays a healthy scepticism about the form-critical method when she asks: 'If we place a saying or tradition to the credit of the Church, are we necessarily obliged to debit it from our picture of Jesus?'² Clearly there are occasions when we are obliged to do so, but equally it must very often also be true that the understanding of the community was itself formed by the teaching of Jesus.

In relation to these three areas of debate our method in this chapter will be; (i) to look in some detail at the background material which was certainly familiar at the time of Jesus, and also to take note of the later developments which may reflect what was familiar to Jesus and at least some of the New Testament writers; and we shall confine our attention to the Jewish material. This is not to deny the possible importance of the Urmensch mythology but, assuming that it did influence the Jewish thinking, that influence will be seen in the differing conceptions of the Son of man and his work within Judaism; (ii) decisions on whether or not the concept must be understood in corporate or individual terms will be made by accepting what seems to be the most natural understanding of the way the concept is used by different writers and in different texts; (iii) questions of authenticity will be tackled only where interpretation is dependent on whether or not a saying is to be ascribed to Jesus. Our main concern will be with the concept of redemption that the various authors present through the concept of the Son of man.

1. cf C.F.D. Moule, 'From Defendant to Judge and Deliverer: an Enquiry into the use and Limitations of the Theme of Vindication in the New Testament', *Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Oxford, Bulletin 111, 1952, - p. 45.

2. M.D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 1967, p. 6.

1.

(b) The 'One Like a Son of man' in Daniel 7.(i) Who or what is the figure 'like a Son of man' in Daniel 7.13?

Mowinckel, among other scholars who hold that behind the use in Judaism of the Son of man lies the Urmensch myth, believes that the figure represents an angelic or heavenly being.

We can conclude from Dan. vii that about 200 B.C. or earlier there was in Judaism a conception of a heavenly being in human form ("one like a man"), who, at the turn of the age, the dawn of the eschatological era, would appear, and would receive from God delegated power and authority over all kingdoms and peoples. (2)

I have already suggested that while this may be true there is no incontrovertible evidence that the Urmensch speculation is part of the background of Daniel's thought.

3.

Noth reaches a similar conclusion. He contends that the term 'the holy ones' (= the saints of the Most High) is used almost invariably in the Old Testament to denote heavenly being, and that the phrase 'the saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7 should be given the same meaning. He finds further support for this interpretation in CD XX 8. He concludes, therefore, that the expression in Dan. 7.27, 'the people of the saints of the Most High', refers not to Israel but to the company of the holy ones, and that although Dan. 7.21f does appear to refer to the pious in Israel this is to be explained as a later interpolation.

4.

Noth's thesis has been examined by Dequeker who cites material from the Qumran in further support, and has been accepted with enthusiasm by Barr, but treated with caution by Porteous.

5.

6.

Although the majority of the occurrences of qedhoshim in the Old

7.

8.

Testament support Noth there are exceptions to this rule. Dequeker notes similar

1. Despite the fact that many scholars hold that Daniel 7 is not a unity, vv 15ff being a secondary insertion into the text, we shall treat the whole chapter as a unity. We shall do so because our concern is to discover what connotations the concept 'Son of man' would have had at the time of Jesus. There can be little doubt that both Jesus and his contemporaries would have accepted the Book of Daniel as a whole as a unity. The interpretation, therefore, would have been as important as the vision itself. This does not mean that the vision and the interpretation may not have belonged originally to different strata requiring different exegesis, but rather that in the period in which we are interested those different strata would have become synthesised by the form in which they appear in Dan. 7 itself.
2. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956. p.352 (*Italics mine*)
3. M. Noth, Die Heiligen des Höchsten, in Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, (ed. M. Noth), 1960, pp.274-290.
4. J. Coppens and L. Dequeker, Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très Haut en Daniel VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament, 1961, pp.33-54.
5. J. Barr, 'Daniel', in Peake's Commentary of the Bible (new edn.) ed M. Black and H.H. Rowley, 1962, p.598.
6. N. Porteous, Das Danielbuch, 1962, pp.90f.
7. e.g. Ps. 16.3; 89.6,8. Cf also S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.380; F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, The Blessing of Moses, JBL, Vol.67, 1948, p.199.
8. e.g. Ps. 34.10; Dan. 7.21f; 8.24.

1. exceptions in the Dead Sea scrolls, and the interpretation of other passages he
 2. lists in support of Noth are often debatable, or depend on textual emendation.
 3. As both Noth and Dequeker recognise, the idea of holiness is not confined to
 angels but is extended to the people of God who share in this holiness. In the
 4. Similitudes of Enoch, the term 'holy' is applied both to angels and the 'elect'.
 It is possible that this use is a later development, but we do find it in Dan.
 7.21f and 8.24. Again, this may be an editorial recension, but, since both these
 verses belong to the interpretation of the vision in Dan. 7 which certainly
 belonged together with the vision in the Scriptures at the time of Jesus, it is
 by no means impossible that the 'saints of the Most High' would have meant for
 Jesus and his disciples a group of people - Israel.

5. Various objections to Noth's thesis have been discussed recently by
 Coppens. He is able to deal with many of the difficulties, but the greatest
 stumbling-block is the paucity of evidence. CD XX.8 remains the only real
 parallel to the phrase 'the saints of the Most High', and its meaning is disputed.
 The evidence of the simple qedhoshim is inconclusive, and Coppens himself
 distinguishes between the expression 'saints of the Most High' and the simpler
 'saints' in Dan. 7.21,22,25b. He understands 'saints' to designate 'les
 6. 7. Israelites pieux, restés fidèles à Yahvé.' Elsewhere he traces in the Psalms a
 development from an earlier use of qedhoshim to denote supernatural beings to a
 later extension of the term to the faithful in Israel.

It still remains probable, therefore, that the 'saints of the Most High'
 refers to the righteous within Israel. Be that as it may, in its present form,
 Dan. 7 uses both 'the saints of the Most High' and the simpler 'saints' of the
 8. faithful remnant.

R.H. Charles combined the idea of a heavenly being and a group of people.
 He argued that 'in apocalyptic visions men are symbolized by beasts, angels and
 other supernatural beings are symbolized by men' and thus the expression must

1. 1QM IX 7f; X 9-11

2. e.g. CD XX 8; 1QSb 1.5; 1QM VI.6.

3. e.g. 1 QSb III.5f; IV 22-26.

4. e.g. 1 En. 39.4f

5. J. Coppens, Les Saints du Très-Haut sont-ils à identifier avec les Milices Célestes? ETL, Vol. 39, 1963, pp. 94-100 (cf also his remarks on the same subject in his discussion of Porteous' book in the same issue, pp. 91-93).

6. *ibid.* p. 94

7. J. Coppens, Les Saints dans le Psautier, ETL, Vol. 39, 1963, pp. 485-500

8. For a similar judgement of D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 1964, pp. 325f; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p. 13. n. 3; W. Baumgartner, Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung, in Theologische Rundschau, Neue Folge, 11, 1939, p. 216

represent 'a supernatural being or body of beings!' Since he accepted the explanation given in vv 18, 22, 25 and 27, that the figure represents the 'saints of the Most High', he concluded that 'the faithful remnant of Israel are to be transformed into heavenly or supernatural beings.'

While it is true that in later apocalyptic literature the convention of representing men as beasts and supernatural beings as men is employed, it is doubtful that this has become a fixed formula at the time of Daniel. There are traces of this in the later chapters of Daniel, but nowhere in Daniel is there the automatic symbolism one finds, for example, in 1 Enoch 83-90.

A more profitable line of inquiry is an examination of those passages in Daniel where human characteristics are attributed to figures in other respects said to be 'beasts'. Thus Dan. 7 itself tells us of the first beast who 'was lifted up from the earth and made to stand upon two feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it'. The same idea is to be found in Dan. 4, where an account is given of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its sequel. In spite of the confusion of the tree metaphor, the contrast is clear; The great Nebuchadnezzar ceases to be a man and behaves like a beast, and looks like one, when he refuses to recognise and acknowledge that 'the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will'. He becomes a man again, and his kingdom is restored to him when he acknowledges that dominion over men belongs of right only to God, and that in his sight 'all the inhabitants of the earth are accounted as nothing'.

Here the contrast between men and beasts is the contrast between the man who acknowledges God's sole rule and the man who by his self-glorification and rebellion against God's dominion reduces himself to the level of an animal. With this we should compare Dan. 2 where Daniel interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dream to mean that he is the head of gold of the visionary image because God has given to him 'the kingdom, the power, the might, and the glory', and has placed in his hand 'the sons of men, the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air, making him

-
1. R.H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1929, p.187.
 2. N. Schmidt, The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel, JBL, Vol. 19, 1900, held, on the analogy of the man-like figures in 8.15, 16 and 10.16, 18, that the 'one like a Son of man' must also be an angelic being - here Michael, the heavenly representative of Israel.
 3. Dan. 7.4
 4. Dan. 4.33
 5. Dan. 4.25
 6. Dan. 4.34-37
 7. Dan. 2.37f

1. rule over them all'. According to Dan. 4 it is when he forgets this that he is
 2. reduced to the level of a beast.

The same emphasis on self-magnification is found in the later visions of Daniel. Thus in Chapter 8 we read repeatedly of the animals and their horns that
 3. they magnified themselves. Similarly Chapter 11 speaks of men who exalt them-
 4. selves and seize kingship which is not theirs by right. As for the beasts in Dan. 7 it is self-evident that they - with the possible exception of the first -
 are in rebellion against God. This is particularly so of the 'little horn'
 5. which had a mouth 'speaking great things', and of whom it is said in the inter-
 pretation that 'he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the
 6. saints of the Most High: and he shall think to change the times and the law...'.
 6.

Because of the parallels between the first beast to whom a 'man's heart' was given, and the fate of Nebuchadrezzar, it would appear that the apocalyptic convention of depicting men as beasts and supernatural beings as men is not the correct interpretation of Dan. 7 since the author had no intention of suggesting that either Nebuchadrezzar or his kingdom ever possessed or gained supernatural status. Rather, those who are subservient to God are depicted as being men, while those who rebel against his authority are depicted as beasts. It may be that the apocalyptic convention grew out of the imagery of Daniel 7. To understand the imagery of Dan. 7, however, we must not assume the latter apocalyptic convention but rather look to its precursors in the Old Testament mythological background.

(ii) Old Testament mythological background

It is clear that while the author of Daniel is an apocalyptist he still
 7. stands very close to the prophetic tradition out of which apocalyptic grew. The ideas expressed in Dan. 7 are a re-interpretation of those found in the psalmists and in the later prophets, especially Deutero-Isaiah, depicting Yahweh's defeat of
 8. Israel's enemies and the nation's restoration in terms of creation mythology.

-
1. cf the vision of Dan. 4. where Nebuchadrezzar is the 'tree' in whose branches the birds nested and in whose shade the beasts rested.
 2. cf the use made of the same idea by Jesus in Lk. 15 11-32.
 3. Dan. 8.4 8, 11, 25
 4. Dan. 11.12, 18, 21, 36
 5. Dan. 7.8, 11.
 6. Dan. 7.25. This connexion between arrogant self-sufficiency before God is found also in the Psalms, cf Ps. 73.21f; Ps. 49.21 and 13f.
 7. cf S.R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, 1900, pplxvii f, commenting on Dan. 7 writes: 'This representation of the future kingdom of God, though it differs in details, and displays traits marking the later age to which it belongs, is, in all essential features the same as that which is found repeatedly in the earlier prophets.'
 8. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp. 138-143 argues that the connexion between Dan. 7 and Deutero-Isaiah is the result of the use of an enthronement festival ritual in Daniel.

Instead of prophetic imagery and symbolism Tiamat and Leviathan have once again taken on concrete shape.

Daniel's affinity with earlier Hebrew thought is illustrated by the character in which he portrays the beasts. They are still the forces of chaos revolting against God, but now they are portrayed as nations and not as natural forces. In depicting Israel's enemies as wild beasts Daniel is following the tradition of the Psalms and prophets. In Psalm 80 Israel - or probably the king as Israel's embodiment - is described as 'the man of thy right hand, the son of man whom thou has made strong for thyself'. This verse follows immediately after the description of Israel as a vine planted in a vineyard ravaged by a boar. The psalmist does not combine the images of Israel's enemies as a wild animal and Israel (or her King) as a man. They are two distinct metaphors which are not mixed, and the Psalmist does not draw out the obvious contrast. Similar ideas seem to lie behind Ezekiel 34.31. Throughout the chapter the prophet has described the people of Israel as sheep, their leaders as shepherds, and their enemies as wild beasts. The final verse reads: 'You are sheep, the sheep of my pasture; you are men, and I am your God'. Once again the representation of Israel's enemies as beasts and Israel as men are linked but not combined, and no contrast is clearly drawn. Thus it is not surprising to find in Dan. 7 the conception of Israel's enemies as wild animals and the complementary image of Israel as 'one like a Son of man'.

There is a second Old Testament theme interwoven with the conflict between the man (Israel) and the beasts (her enemies). This is the creation mythology of the defeat of chaos by Yahweh. It is seen in the close relationship between the fourth beast and the primeval dragon of mythology, slain by Marduk in Babylonian tradition and by Yahweh in the Hebrew counterpart. In Job 9.8, 13 and 26.12 Yahweh's defeat of the sea monster, Rahab, is interpreted in terms of creation. The same conception underlies the extension of the myth in Ps. 74.12-17 and 89.10f, and Isaiah 51.9f, where Yahweh's power in defeating the sea dragon,

1. e.g. Ps. 68.31; 74.18f; Ezek. 29.3; cf Ps. 57.5.

2. G.A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel, 1936, p.379 follows the LXX and drops the word for men, ʔadham, and thus avoids the awkwardness of the Hebrew. But the very difficulty of the word argues in favour of its genuineness (so M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.19). Miss Hooker argues that the prophet may have felt that while wild beasts adequately represented Israel's enemies, sheep did not convey Israel's true relationship with Yahweh.

3. Daniel does not describe the fourth beast in great detail, but what he does tell us is significant. In particular we are told that 'it had great iron teeth'. Cf with this the description of Leviathan in Job 41.6 (14) ff, and in the Babylonian epic of creation the strength and terror of the 'ferocious' dragons is depicted and they are said to be 'sharp of tooth' (cf enuma Elish, tablets 1, lines 133ff, 11, 20ff, 111, 24ff, and 82ff, and the translation in A. Heidel, The Babylonian Genesis, new edn. 1963).

Leviathan and Rahab, is used as an appeal for a similar show of strength in the contemporary crisis. The final stage in the development is the interpretation of the myth in terms of history, and the equation of the mythical with the historical. Therefore in Isaiah 27.1, Jeremiah 51. 34-37, and Ezekiel 29.3f, the battle between Yahweh and chaos is thrown into the future: Leviathan and Rahab have become Egypt and Babylon whose defeat is as certain as that of the monster in the myth. The parallel with Daniel's use of the fourth beast is exact.

The inter-dependence of the two themes is plain: Yahweh's struggle with the cosmic monster and the people's struggle with their enemies are one, and it is the certainty of God's victory that is the certainty of Israel's. Yahweh will certainly defeat the manifestation of the work of the chaos-creating dragon, which means that he will defeat Israel's enemies and save the nation from degradation.

The use that Daniel makes of these concepts and myths is that we have the initial victory of the hostile powers who have conquered and crushed Israel. Their triumph is temporary, however, and dominion over them is given to the Son of man representing the faithful remnant of Israel. As in other applications of the myth, whether cultic or historical, it is the people who suffer initial defeat, Yahweh who gains the victory, and Yahweh who restores the rule to the righteous. Daniel 1. makes it clear that this is Yahweh's gift, not the result of their own achievement.

It would appear therefore that the source of the imagery and mythology employed in Daniel is to be found within the ritual, myth, and symbolism of the Hebrew tradition and not in the later apocalyptic.

(iii) The suffering Son of man coming with the clouds to receive dominion

The recognition of creation mythology as part of the background of the vision in Daniel 7 may help to solve the problem of why it is that in the vision the 'one like a Son of man' does not make his appearance until after the judgement by the Ancient of Days and the destruction or subjugation of the beasts and yet in the interpretation the saints of the Most High are present throughout, suffering under the beasts until the judgement and the passing of dominion to them. This inconsistency is to be expected since the vision takes its terms from a mythology

1. cf Dan. 7.14: 'The saints of the Most High' have the same passive role as the 'Son of man' in the vision. The context of the ambiguous words wedhina' yehibh legaddishe 'elyonin in 7.22 suggests that they should be translated 'and judgement was given for the saints of the Most High'.

which speaks of man's creation as subsequent to the rule of the beast, while the interpretation speaks of 'historical' events in which man plays a part. As

Miss Hooker notes:

'Yahweh's ancient conquest of the dragon is re-enacted on the plane of history, just as it was re-enacted in the situation - whether cultic or historical - reflected in the Psalms. In neither case, however, can the re-enactment be an exact repetition of events; for while the original order was (1) The temporary triumph of chaos; (2) Yahweh's victory and enthronement; (3) The creation of man; any re-enactment of the primitive conflict must take man's existence into account. In the myth man's creation is the final event, but in history the primeval battle is reflected in the conflict between the nation and its enemies: thus man, whose existence is the outcome of Yahweh's victory, becomes, on the empirical level, one of the contestants in the preceding battle'. (2)

The vision, faithful to creation mythology, depicts the appearance of man as subsequent to the subjugation of the beast, while the interpretation, applying the vision very consciously to history, is aware that he existed all along through the dominion of the beasts. The problem is, of course, that the author is using creation mythology to speak of the restoration of man to his proper dominion over the earth - a dominion which is God-given.³

While a great deal of scholarly attention has been given to the absence of the Son of man from the earlier part of the vision, little notice has been taken of the fact that the beasts who, according to Dan. 7:12, are to be spared for a time do not appear in the later part of the vision. The explanation of this seems to be that the whole vision turns around the judgement in vv 9 and 10. It is this judgement that marks the complete transformation of the vision. Before it the picture is of the beasts having dominion. We are not told who their victims are, though that there are victims is made clear in v.7. After it the picture is of the Son of man having universal dominion, though no specific mention is made of the surviving beasts. The judgement marks the dividing line between the terrible but temporary dominion of the beasts and the eternal dominion of the Son of man.

Because the contrast is the contrast of who holds dominion, and not over whom dominion is held, too much must not be made of the fact that the Son of man does not make his appearance in the vision until after the judgement. In vv 17 and 18 the contrast is summed up in two statements; the one is that the four beasts are four kings who will rise up from the sea; the other is the assurance that the

1. A.M. Farrer, A Study in St. Mark, 1957, p.260 holds that the late appearance of the Son of man is owing to the author's dependence on Gen. 1. While this particular dependence may not be correct we have seen that he is dependent on some form of Eastern creation mythology which had become absorbed into the Hebrew tradition.

2. M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.24f.

3. cf. e.g. Gen. 1.26; Ps. 8.6-8

the saints will receive the kingdom for ever and ever. In this the heart of the contrast is summed up between the dominion which is not God-given and the dominion which is.

If this is the correct interpretation of the vision, then, while it is true that the phrase 'Son of man' is used to convey dignity and not in connexion with the preceding defeat, it is claiming too much to say that the Son of man does not suffer. In Daniel in some way the Son of man clearly represents the saints of the Most High, and they clearly suffered. The suffering of the saints of the Most High is made very plain in the interpretation. In the vision itself there is only a brief reference to suffering, but this was sufficient to make the author's meaning clear. There was no need for him to elaborate the theme or to emphasize the severity of their suffering, for they were only too much in evidence, and were very much the cause of the book's existence.

If we are right in seeing behind the imagery of the 'one like a Son of man' the older contrast between the 'beasts' - Israel's enemies who in their self-glorification do not recognize that dominion is a gift of God - and 'man' who has the God-given right to dominion, then the sufferers in verse 7 are 'men', whose right it is to rule, but the title 'Son of man' is reserved to symbolize their victory and glory and not their suffering.

In Daniel 7 it is clear that we have no 'epiphany' of the Son of man. Verse 13 makes it plain that he comes unto the Ancient of Days, and 'they brought him nearer'. He comes to receive the promise given to man in Genesis 1.26, and is seen coming with 'the clouds of heaven'.

1. as with W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, pp 7f; S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.410f; E. Sjöberg, 'Känner 1 Henok och 4 Ezra tanken på den ledande Människosonen?' in SEK, Vol. v. 1940 pp.163ff; and Menschensohn, 1946, pp. 116ff.
2. Dan. 7.7
3. The contrast with the 'watcher' and 'holy one' of Dan. 4.13, who 'came down from heaven' and ordered the cutting down of the tree, is clear. The Son of man of Dan. 7.13 comes to the Ancient of Days and is given the dominion, which, according to the interpretation at v.27, is given to the saints of the Most High.
4. There is controversy over both the meaning and reading of this phrase (cf H.H. Rowley, Darius the Mede and the Four world Empires in the Book of Daniel, 1935, p.62. n.2) Various attempts have been made to explain the presence of the clouds which in the Old Testament appear only as natural phenomena or in theophanies. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp. 352, 420-427, tracing the Son of man back to the Anthropos tradition and to his hiddenness, holds that they represent the coming of the heavenly figure to receive authority to carry out the Divine judgement. This may be so if the figure in Dan. 4.13 is to be linked with the Son of man in Dan. 7.13. But in view of the contrasts between the two figures noted in n.3 above this is unlikely, an improbability strengthened by the clear association between the Son of man and the saints of the Most High in the interpretation who are not heavenly beings. (cf for similar judgements T.W. Manson, The Son of man in Daniel, JRL, Vol. 32, 1950 p.174; E.W. Heaton, The Book of Daniel, 1956, ad. loc.; J.A.T. Robinson,

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE/.....

There is no justification for the claim that the saints become the Son¹ of man on being enthroned. There is no indication that any change has taken place between vv 7 and 13. It is worthwhile noting that it is not only after receiving the kingdom and rule over the nations that the Son of man is mentioned. He is mentioned in v.13 as coming to receive that rule. So it would seem that the Son of man represents the saints of the Most High before their glorification as well as after.² Therefore the 'saints' do not become 'Son of man' they rather assume their rightful authority which has temporarily been usurped by the beasts. So Yahweh's original purpose in creation is restored and 'man' again has sovereignty.

Conclusion

From this study we may conclude that 'Son of man' in Daniel 7 represents the saints in Israel. At present they are suffering under the beasts who have temporarily seized what, by God's decree, belongs to Israel. They are not destined to become Son of man, they are Son of man, and because they are they will be vindicated by God and from God receive the kingdom which is theirs. In this faith the author believes that God will intervene on behalf of his suffering people, end their suffering by destroying their enemies, and give them the kingdom.

Daniel's vision is not simply a fanciful and pictorial representation of a pious hope that everything will be all right in the end, rather, it is a revelation to Israel of what she is and of what God will enable her to become. It is a message of significance to a tortured and despairing people.

'Israel may thus fairly be described, not as Son of man futurus or designatus but rather as Son of man absconditus and even passurus. It is easy to understand, however, why, when the "one like the Son of man" ceased to be understood of Israel and became a distinct and separate figure, he was thought of in connexion 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 all the concepts of suffering and humiliation. Men failed to

4. continued from p.185:- Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.45; T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, pp.63-68). J.A. Emerton, The Origin of the Son of man imagery, JTS, Vol. 9, 1958, pp.225ff, sees the clouds as evidence that the figure of the Ancient of Days and of the one like a Son of man were, in the original myth, El Elyon and Baal-Yahweh. The evidence for this is too slight to be dependable. R.B.Y. Scott, 'Behold He Cometh with Clouds', NTS, Vol. 5 1959, pp. 127-132, holds that the phrase refers to the whole scene taking place in the presence of God, not simply to the Son of man. M.D. Hooker, Son of man, 1967 p.26. n.1, suggests that on the basis of Ps.8, and possibly Ex. 28.12-15, there is no real reason why the clouds should not be extended to 'man' in this context. But surely the locus of an apocalyptic vision is neither here nor there. What is indisputable is that it is a scene of vindication, and the Son of man is brought to God to receive it. Thus God and man are brought together, not indeed as a theophany, but this association of God and man makes the image of the clouds a natural Jewish one.

1. cf A.M. Farrer, A Study in St. Mark, 1951, p.260 (for (2) see next page....)

realize that in this vision of Daniel it is "written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt".' (1)

(c) The Son of man in the Similitudes of Enoch

Despite the fact that we have seen that too great a dependence cannot be placed on 1 Enoch for understanding and assessing Jesus' teaching about the Son of man, it remains probable that Urmensch speculations did make their way into late Judaism, and did affect both Messianic concepts and the concept of the Son of man which had come in through Daniel. If we can accept that 1 Enoch may be roughly contemporaneous with Jesus then, while Jesus may not have been dependent on the Similitudes we have here an indication of how at least one Jew in this period used the concept. Similar conceptions may underlie the teaching of Jesus.

(i) The eschatological role of the Son of man

The first thing to be said about the Son of man in the Similitudes of Enoch is that he is an eschatological figure. He has not yet appeared; but at the time appointed by God he will 'appear', be 'revealed', be enthroned, be 'named', or 'arise'. Then will come the 'Day of the Son of man'. Until this day dawns the Son of man has been hidden or preserved.

The dawn of this day heralds the eschatological transformation, which is the sole theme of the Similitudes. On the one hand this means the destruction of sinners, heathen powers, kingdoms, and kings, and also the cosmic powers of evil; the angels who have led men astray, and the chaos dragons of creation mythology

-
2. from previous page:- C.F.D. Moule, *From Defendant to Judge- and Deliverer: and Enquiry into the use and limitations of the theme of Vindication in the New Testament*, *SNTS, Bulletin* 111, 1952, p.45, 'The Son of man already means the representative of God's chosen people destined through suffering to be exalted.'
1. M.D. Hooker, *Son of man*, 1967, p.30
2. cf above p.172f.
3. S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 1956, p.358; E. Sjöberg, *Menschensohn*, 1946, pp. 61ff. Despite his dependence on Urmensch mythology in interpreting 1 Enoch, Mowinckel himself notes that the identification of the Messiah with the Son of man in 1 Enoch brought about many changes in the Urmensch concept in late Judaism. In particular his function as creator of the cosmos is almost completely removed, he is not regarded as the Primordial man, his role is a strangely passive one, and the essential feature that remains is his eschatological role. (*ibid*, pp. 435).
4. 1 En. 52.9 (of Elect One); 38.2 (of Righteous One); 69.29 (of Son of man).
5. 1 En. 62.7; 69.26 (Son of man) cf also 71.14 for controversial text in which Enoch is told that he is the Son of man. For argument against this identification of S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp.44ff.
6. 1 En. 45.3; 51.3; 55.4; 61.8; 62.2 (Elect One); 62.5; 69.27; 69.29 (Son of man)
7. 1 En. 48.2 (Son of man)
8. 1 En. 51.5a (Elect One)
9. 1 En. 61.5 cf 61.11; 39.6b (Day of Elect One).
10. 1 En. 39.7 (Elect One and cf 40.5); 62.7; 48.6 (Son of man).
11. 1 En. 38.3; 45.1f, 45.6; 53.2; 54.10; 60.5f; 62.2; 65.6ff; 68.5; 69.27.
12. 1 En. 38.4,5; 46.4; 48.8; 52.6ff; 53.5; 55.5; 62.3ff; 63.1f,11; 69.27.
13. 1 En. 64.1f; 67.4 cf 58.6 the destruction of darkness.

1. Azazel, Leviathan and Behemoth. On the other hand the Day heralds the establish-
 2. ment of the congregation of the righteous elect ones, who will be free from the
 3. oppression of sinners, obtain a victory over the enemies of the righteous, know
 4. peace and security on earth, receive wisdom, live and eat with the Son of man,
 5. 6. 7.
 8. enter into the Covenant, and have eternal life. 9.

1 And in those days a change shall take place for the holy and elect,
 and the light of days shall abide upon them,
 and the glory and honour shall turn to the holy,
 on the day of affliction on which evil shall have been treasured up
 against the sinners. (10)

This passage makes it evident that the change is to be both radical and sudden, and
 11. it ushers in a day when 'from henceforth there shall be nothing corruptible'. The
 day of the Son of man marks the transition from the old aeon under the dominion of
 the monsters with whom God warred at Creation, fallen angels, and kings who have
 12. usurped dominion, and ushers in the new aeon - a transformed heaven and earth -
 when every one who dwells on the earth will fall down before God and worship,
 13. praise, and extol the Lord of Spirits. It is for this purpose that the Son of man
 14. is who he is. All Enoch's visions are concerned with this change from one age to
 another.

Despite the obvious cruciality of the enthronement of the Son of man in
 1 Enoch, the Son of man is by no means the sole punisher of the sinful forces and
 bestower of blessing on the righteous and elect ones. In addition to the Son of
 15. 16. 17.
 man's role as judge, punisher, and bestower of blessing, each of these functions is

-
1. 1 En. 54.5 (Azazel): 55.3 - 56.4 (Azazel and his associates); 60.7-10 (Leviathan and Behemoth).
 2. 1 En. 38.1; 62.8; 53.6,7; 45.4; 71.16. (cf also 48.1; 61.4).
 3. 1 En. 38.1; 39.6b; 47.2; 62.8, 13.
 4. 1 En. 48.9, 50.1f
 5. 1 En. 51.8d; 45.31; 48.4; 58.4; 71.15, 17.
 6. 1 En. 48.1f
 7. 1 En. 62.14 (cf 61.4)
 8. 1 En. 606.
 9. 1 En. 40.9; 58.3,6; 62.14-16; 71.16,17.
 10. 1 En. 50.1 (Charles translation in Apoc. and Pseud., 1913).
 11. 1 En. 69.29.
 12. 1 En. 45.4,5.
 13. 1 En. 48.5
 14. 1 En. 48.6
 15. 1 En. 45.3; 49.4; 61.8
 16. 1 En. 46.4f; 62.2; 69.27.
 17. 1 En. 48.2; 53.6

1. also ascribed to the Lord of Spirits. Frequently the agent is indefinite, is the
 2. righteous and elect (only in punishment), or the angels (only in punishment and with
 3. one exception the punishment of the mythological monsters). How is this cruciality
 4. yet strange passivity of the Son of man to be explained?

(ii) The fusion of different traditions.

5. In answer to this question it would seem that Mowinckel is correct in
 6. seeing the fusion of the concepts of a heavenly, divine figure, borrowed from the
 7. Urmensch speculation in which he has^a a very active eschatological role, with the more
 8. mundane figure of the national Messiah in Judaism. In addition the passivity of
 9. the Son of man in Daniel 7, where he appears to be simply the inheritor of what
 10. rightly belongs to him after Yahweh's conquest of evil, played its part.

1. Messianism

2. That there is this dependence on Messianic concepts is evident in the
 3. common use of the title 'the Elect One' or 'My Elect One' in the Similitudes. This
 4. term is derived from Old Testament usage where it indicates that the person in question
 5. stands in a specially close relationship to Yahweh, partly as the special object of
 6. his care, and partly as his chosen instrument to fulfil some task or purpose to carry
 7. out his will. Like Deutero-Isaiah Enoch also calls Israel, or those in Israel who
 8. are destined for the blessing of Yahweh, 'the elect ones'. The leader or king of the
 9. 'elect ones' in the new age is 'the Elect One' par excellence. The word 'elect' (or
 10. chosen) is used specifically of the king as Yahweh's favourite and instrument,
 11. because he is the representative of Israel, the one who sums up Israel in himself.
 12. But what is true of kings and other chosen instruments of Yahweh is also true of the
 13. Messiah. It is, therefore, understandable that the Targums interpret Messianically
 14. both the passages which refer to the chosen servant and other passages which speak of
 15. Yahweh's chosen. It is, accordingly, overwhelmingly probable that the title 'the
 16. Elect One' was transferred from the Messiah to the Son of man who was himself

-
1. The Lord of Spirits as judge, 1 En. 50.1f; as punisher and destroyer, 1 En. 45.4.6; 60.2; 62.10; and as agent of blessing, 1 En. 38.4; 45.4; 62.16.
 2. 1 En. 39.6; 52.9; 61.8f; 62.7, 8, 13-15.
 3. 1 En. 38.5; 48.9f; 50.1f.
 4. 1 En. 53; 54; 55.3-56.4; 56.5; 62.11; 63.1
 5. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp. 360 ff.
 6. ibid. pp. 427ff.
 7. 1 En. 39.6; 40.5; 45.3f; 49.2ff; 51.3ff, 52.6, 9; 53.6; 55.4; 61.(4), 5, 8, 10.
 8. Isa. 43.20; 45.4; 48.12, 15; cf 65.9, 15, 22.
 9. 1 En 53.6; 62.12; 15; and many other passages.
 10. e.g. Isa. 42.1; 41.8f; 43.10 cf also S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956 pp. 283, 328f.

1.
regarded as the Messiah.

Beside 'the Elect One', the 'Righteous One' also occurs as a name of
2.
the eschatological figure. In one passage he is called 'the Elect One of righteous-
ness and faith', that is 'the righteous and faithful Elect One'. This title probably
derives from his being the leader of the righteous ones as the 'Elect One' is the
3.
leader of the 'elect ones', and also from his most conspicuous characteristic and task.
This task is principally to establish righteousness, and this is not only a moral
quality but it also includes the right conditions for the righteous, i.e. he esta-
4.
blishes the right of the righteous.

In two passages the title 'the Messiah' or 'the Anointed' is applied to
5. 6. 7.
the Son of man. Dalman and Messel assert that Messiah is here a secondary addition
8.
but the reasons they give are not convincing. In any event, whether it is a secondary
insertion or not is not particularly relevant, for its inclusion, or its appearance
as a gloss, would show that the tradition within the Enoch circles took the Son of
man to be the Messiah.

The application of these Messianic concepts to the Son of man should lead
us to expect to find traces in 1 Enoch of the eschaton being viewed in this-worldly
9.
concepts, of the defeat of the enemies of Israel by the messianic community, of the
10.
subservience of the hostile powers to the Messiah, and of the firm establishment of
11.
Israel on earth free from the threat of hostile powers.

1. so Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p.366. For evidence that the Son of man was regarded as the Messiah in some circles cf *ibid.*, pp. 360ff; E. Sjöberg, *Menschensohn*, 1946, pp. 140ff. The fact that there is this dependence on Deutero-Isaiah, and that the title 'the Elect One' may have been derived from his 'Servant', must not make us assume too readily that the ideas associated with the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah are taken over and applied to the Son of man. When 'the Elect One' is used in 1 Enoch the expression conveys the normal Messianic sense. He is leader of the elect ones, those who will share in the Messianic salvation.

2. 1 En. 38.2; cf 39.6; 53.6.

3. 1 En. 38.2, 39.5f; 46.3; 49.2; 53.7; 62.2f; etc.

4. cf S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 1956, pp.377f.

5. 1 En. 48.10; 52.4.

6. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 1909, p.221.

7. N. Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden de Henoch*, *ZAW*, Vo. 35, 1922 pp.31ff

8. Cf E. Sjöberg, *Menschensohn*, 1946, pp.140ff.

9. 1 En. 38.5; 48.9f; 50.1f (cf also the self-destruction by the kings 56.7)

10. cf 1 En. 52.4; 62.9.

11. 1 En. 38.1; 45.5; 50.2; 51.5; 53.6f; 56.7; 57.1ff; 60.6; 62.8f; 65.12; 48.5

1.
2. Urmensch Mythology

In addition to Messianism non-Jewish sources of the concept should also be expected to have left traces. Thus we should expect to find traces of his heavenly pre-existence, his connexion with the act of creation, his ideal manhood, and possession of all secrets and wisdom, his conflict with evil and Satan, his

-
1. For the main features of the Urmensch mythology and the Greek Anthropos concept cf. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp. 427ff; and C.H. Kraeling, Anthropos and the Son of man, 1927, pp.74ff.
 2. 1 En. 39.3-7; (40.5); 48.3; 48.6; (49.2); 62.7; (70.1). Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 11, p.334 maintain that 1 Enoch speaks only of an ideal pre-existence, or that the Son of man is one of the righteous dead. There is certainly nothing in the text to support the thesis of one of the ancient dead (for arguments against regarding Enoch as the Son of man cf. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp.457ff) M-J Lagrange, Le Judaisme avant Jésus-Christ, 1931, pp.224ff and N. Messel, Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch, ZAW, vol. 35, 1922, deny the pre-existence on the grounds that the texts which seem to imply it are later Christian interpolations. This thesis is decisively rejected by Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946, pp.17ff. G.F. Moore, Judaism, vol. 11, 1929, pp.343f, argues for an ideal pre-existence in the sense that the Son of man is part of the plan of Yahweh that will be revealed in the future. Despite the objections of Mowinckel, op.cit., p.370 n.2, that dogmatic assertions are made about the nature of the Son of man, Moore's interpretation is a possibility as dogmatic statements are also made about the nature of the coming Messiah without this implying his real pre-existence. The ideas of his being hidden 'under the wings of the Lord of Spirits' (39.7), of his being named 'before the stars of the heaven were made' (48.3), and of his being 'chosen and hidden before Him (the Lord of Spirits) before the creation of the world and for evermore' (48.6), do suggest, however, something more than ideal pre-existence. But it is significant that no pre-eschatological role is assigned to him (cf the role of the angels 40.9,10), except that he is regarded as king of the pre-eschatological community already in heaven. This suggests that the idea of pre-existence is taken from the Urmensch speculation but, when applied to the Messiah, it ceases to have its original significance, and simply gives to the figure something of a supernatural aura.
 3. 1 En. 49.3. Here we read:

In him dwells the spirit of wisdom,
 and the spirit which gives insight,
 and the spirit of understanding and of might,
 and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.

In its context this final sentence means that he is possessed of the same spirit as inspired the pious Israelites of former times. But, as Mowinckel, op.cit., p.377, notes, this may be the form in which the idea of the Primordial Soul, in whom all other souls have pre-existence, from which they derive their earthly existence, and to which they return at death, may have carried over into Judaism but with a completely changed meaning. Since God alone is creator, the idea of the Son of man as creator would have been unacceptable in Judaism, but Mowinckel may well be right in seeing some trace of this non-Jewish concept in 1 Enoch. cf. also 1 En. 39.12 where we have the strange assertion that the Lord of Spirits 'filled the earth with spirits'. This looks like a Jewish form of the myth, but ascribing the work of creating spirits to Yahweh.
 4. cf S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp. 383ff for argument that the Son of man in 1 Enoch has traces of the idea that he is the 'ideal man, the pre-existent, heavenly ideal and pattern'.
 5. e.g. 1 En. 41.3f; cf 52.1ff (which implies that he has authority over the ordering of the cosmos); 46.3 (he is the righteous one who 'revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden'); 49.3 (his endowment with the spirit of wisdom, insight, understanding, might and piety); 49.4 (his perfect knowledge of men); 51.3 (at the enthronement he will 'pour forth all the secrets of wisdom and counsel').
 6. In addition to the many references to the destruction of evil men and nations, which was part of what was hoped for in Messianic eschatology, cf. particularly 54.6 (the destruction of Azazel); 55.4 (the destruction of Azazel and his associates); and 60.2 (the punishment of Leviathan and Behemoth).

1. gathering to himself a people in heaven, his connexion with the resurrection, and
 2. his role in bringing in the totally incorruptible age.
 3.

3. Daniel 7.

In addition some of the key ideas which we noted in Daniel 7 are also to be found in the Similitudes. In our study of Daniel we noted that the contrast between the beasts and men was the contrast between those who in self-glorification usurped a dominion which was not theirs and those whose God-given right it was to have dominion.
 4. In the Similitudes we are repeatedly told that the sinners, kings and mighty are to be destroyed because they denied the Lord of Spirits, and we are told also of their self-glorification and their refusal to acknowledge that dominion is a gift bestowed by Yahweh.
 5. While the persecution of the righteous elect in Israel is very much in evidence there are only occasional hints that dominion belongs to
 7.

1. In addition to passages in which it is clearly implied, or stated, that the community of the elect, righteous and holy are on earth (1 En. 38.1f; 41.2; 43.4; 48.9; 50.2; 56.6; 62.11; 65.12) and that the eschatological community will be established on a transformed earth (1 En. 45.4; 51.5; 57.1-3; 62.8), there are also passages which imply that the heavenly Son of man has about him a heavenly community of elect, holy and righteous ones (1 En. 39.1-7; 47.2; 48.2; 58.5; 70.4) and that the eschatological kingdom will be in heaven (1 En. 51.1f; 58.5f; 61.4f; 8ff; 70.3; 71.1f; 71.14f-.) These two conceptions of an earthly and a heavenly community live side by side and often the one slips almost imperceptibly into the other. Thus, e.g. in 39.6 and 7 the author sees the dwellings of the holy and righteous with the angels and with the 'Elect One', whose dwelling place is 'under the wings of the Lord of Spirits'. This is clearly in heaven, and the 'Elect One' is their king. But later we are told how the sinners were being driven and dragged from the mansions of the holy (41.2). Now it is impossible to suppose that the author could imagine that sinners were in heaven, especially since there is no hint of a resurrection of sinners in the Similitudes, or at least of their being taken up to heaven for their punishment. Similarly of the future state after the enthronement of the Son of man. After being told of the resurrection we are told 'and the earth shall rejoice, and the righteous shall dwell upon it, and the elect shall walk thereon'. (51.5).

It may be that in the Similitudes the truly righteous within Israel appear already to have their counterparts in heaven, and that the two meet at the enthronement of the Son of man (so Mowinkel, *op.cit.*, p.378). But it may also be that the themes of the resurrection and the Anthropos myth sometimes make the author fix his attention on heaven and heavenly rewards, but that the theme of the Messiah causes him to focus on Israel on earth, and a hope for Israel's restoration and peace, and that the two run together at times in his thought. They can run together because basically the Similitudes are a vision of hope for the righteous within Israel which means, among other things, freedom from oppression. He has no single-minded interpretation of this hope for the community. Whether in heaven or on earth God will give his people eternal security and peace and freedom from the oppression of sinners on the day of the Son of man. This fact should caution us against trying to reduce the bewildering series of images to any theological hypothesis.

2. 1 En. 51.1f; 62.14f.

3. 1 En. 69.29; cf. 45.4f.

4. cf above p. 181ff.

5. 1 En. 38.2; 45.1f; 46.6f; 48.10; 60.6; 63.7; 67.8,11.

6. 1 En. 63.7 'Our hope was in the sceptre of our kingdom'.

7. 1 En. 46.5 the kings will be destroyed because they did not 'humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them'. cf. also 63.4; 68.4.

8. eg. 1 En 46.8; 47.1f; 53.6f; 62.11; etc.

1. Israel and the Son of man.

In all the many and varying accounts of the 'appearing' or 'enthronement' of the Son of man, there is only one which clearly echoes Dan. 7.13 in that the Elect One makes his appearance 'before the face of the Lord of Spirits'^{3.}

We have already seen grounds for accepting the communal interpretation of the Son of man in Daniel 7. It would seem that there are also certain clear traces of this in 1 Enoch. The 'corporate personality' inter-relationship of individual and community is brought out in three passages.

Firstly, while we read of the Son of man that he

.....hath righteousness,
with whom dwelleth righteousness,
and who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden (6)

we also read that

.....the Lord of Spirits...is long-suffering,
and all His works and all that He created
He has revealed to the righteous and elect
in the name of the Lord of Spirits. (7)

Here it appears that both to the Son of man and the righteous and elect God has revealed all the secret treasures of wisdom and knowledge. It is possible that here we have an indication of at least a conflation of thought about the Son of

-
1. In 1 En. 45.1 we are told of the fate of those who deny 'the dwelling of the holy ones'. While this is almost certainly a reference back to 39.3f, where we are told that their dwelling is with the Elect One under the wings of the Lord of Spirits, i.e. in heaven, we have already noted (cf above p.192n.1) the almost imperceptible shift from heaven to earth when in 41.2 sinners are dragged from their dwellings. Thus it is possible that as they deny the Lord of Spirits, whose gift dominion is, so also they deny that that gift belongs properly to the righteous elect in Israel. Similarly we are told that the sinful kings 'judge the stars of heaven' (46.7) which, we are informed, are the holy ones on earth (43.1,4). As R.H. Charles notes in his commentary on 1 Enoch in Apoc & Pseud. 1913, ad. loc., there is an echo in this verse of Dan. 8.10:
'and these are they who cast down the stars of heaven
and tread to the earth those who dwell upon it'.
2. 1 En. 49.2. It is said of the Elect One:
his glory is for ever and ever
and his might unto all generations,
which suggests that the mighty ones and kings have usurped what rightly belongs to the Son of man. cf 1 En. 62.6f.
3. 1 En. 52.9 but cf below p.194f.
4. cf above pp.178ff.
5. cf T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1943, p.228, and The Son of man in Daniel, JRL, Bulletin xxxii, 2, 1950. This view is strongly criticised by S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, and E. Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946. It would seem, however, that both sides are claiming too much. With Mowinckel and Sjöberg I would agree that the attention is fixed upon an apocalyptic individual who would redeem Israel and bring in the totally transformed new aeon. But with Manson I would agree that there are indications of an identification of the Son of man with the righteous élite in Israel. That this should be so is perfectly understandable if we remember that 'corporate personality' refers to the delicately balanced inter-relationship between an individual and the community. Thus properties and functions of the king, Messiah, Servant, etc. almost imperceptibly become the attributes and work of the community of which he is or is to be the head. Thus we should not be surprised to find the same thing of the Son of man in Enoch, even if the communal in Daniel 7 has tended to give way to the individual in Enoch.
6. 1 En. 46.3. 7. 1 En. 61.13.

man and the righteous within Israel.

Secondly, we are told of the Elect One that

glory is his for ever and ever,
and his might unto all generations (1)

But this 'glory and honour' of the Elect One is shared by the elect ones at the day of the great change.

And in those days a change shall take place for the holy and elect,
and the light of days shall abide upon them,
and the glory and honour shall turn to the holy,
on the day of affliction on which evil shall have been treasured up
against sinners. (2)

Thirdly we are given a description of the sin of the kings who are to be destroyed by the Son of man.³ This sin appears to be three-fold; (i) they do not praise the Lord of Spirits or acknowledge the source of their kingdom (vv 5 and 6); (ii) they do not praise the Son of man (v.5); (iii) they judge the righteous (v.7) and persecute the 'houses of His congregation and the faithful who hang upon the name of the Lord of Spirits' (v.8). Here thoughts about God, the Son of man, and the community shift easily and naturally from one to the other. While this may not constitute grounds for an identity between the Son of man and the community, it is evidence that the Son of man and the community belong inextricably together.

This point is borne out by the obvious associations between the titles of the Son of man as 'the Elect One' and 'the Righteous One' and the faithful community as 'the elect ones' and the 'righteous ones'. If he is the eschatological figure whose appearing heralds the end of darkness and evil and the dawn of the incorruptible aeon, they are the eschatological community who will appear with him at that time, free from persecution and suffering.

4. Conclusion

It is by taking into account this complex background that we can understand the inconsistency in 1 Enoch about the agent of blessing and destruction on the day of the Son of man. Concepts derived from Urmensch speculation would threaten strict monotheism in Judaism. It is understandable, therefore, for the author to transfer some of them from the Son of man to the Lord of Spirits and the angels, or to find them in that form within Judaism.⁴ Equally, acceptable ideas of the power and function of the Messiah and the messianic community are retained. It is probable also that the Danielic concept of the Son of man/saints of the Most

1. 1 En. 49.2

2. 1 En. 50.1

3. 1 En. 46.4-8.

4. For the spread of the idea in Judaism of S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956 p.415ff.

High as the inheritor of the victory gained by Yahweh played its part. With this complex of ideas being brought to focus on an apocalyptic deliverer under the strict monotheism of Judaism, it is understandable that the thought of the Similitudes cannot be brought within a closely inter-related system of ideas.

But when all has been said, the central theme of the Similitudes remains God's eternal preservation in blessing, peace, joy, and righteousness of the faithful within Israel - both the living and the dead. While the spotlight falls on the figure of the deliverer, the hope is for the faithful community.

(iii) The Epiphany of the Son of man?

1.
Mowinckel is undoubtedly correct in seeing the total impact of the various
2. images of the enthronement of the Son of man as a cosmic event when he is hailed
3. by all the living 'and the kings and mighty and all who possess the earth' and
4. 'all who dwell in heaven'. It is clearly an event visible not only in heaven but
5. also by the kings, mighty men, the nations of the earth, and the righteous ones.
6. 7.
But we need to be cautious of accepting his conclusion that the Son of man has
been brought from his hidden, heavenly, pre-existent place of waiting. That
there are traces of his heavenly pre-existence we have already seen cannot be
8. seriously questioned. The complexity of the ground from which Enoch has drawn
his images should caution us against allowing any one strain of thought so to
dominate the whole as to allow us to interpret every reference in the light of it.

In addition to the idea of what virtually amounts to a theophany of the heavenly Son of man to the righteous and the sinners, we find traces also of what may fairly be described as a translation of the Son of man from earth to heaven, derived probably from Daniel. Thus we are told:

And these things shall be (denied and) destroyed from the surface of the
earth
when the Elect One shall appear before the face of the Lord of Spirits (9).

1. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.338f.

2. cf above p. 187 nn 4-8

3. 1 En. 62.6f. cf also 61.7; 69.26 (cf the same idea in Matt. 24.27; Lk. 17.24).

4. 1 En. 47.5 cf 61.6ff.

5. 1 En. 61.8

6. 1 En. 38.2; 62.1ff (especially verse 5).

7. 1 En. 38.2

8. cf above p.191 n 2.

9. 1 En. 52.9. This idea of appearing before the face of the Lord of Spirits is clearly derived from a tradition different from the one which has already assigned him a place 'under the wings of the Lord of Spirits'

So also:

And at that hour that Son of man was named
in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
and his name before the Head of Days. (1)

Here especially in the use of the Danielic name for God, the Ancient of Days, we have a clear reference back to Dan. 7.13 where the translated Son of man is brought into the heavenly court to receive the authority and dominion which belongs to him.^{2.}

These two ideas of a theophany and a translation live side by side in 1 Enoch's vision of the glorious enthronement and appearance of the Son of man.

(iv) Community and the Son of man

When the Son of man appears he does not appear alone. When the Lord of Spirits places the Elect One on the throne of glory we are told;

And He will summon all the host of heaven, and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and the other powers on the earth and over the waters.^{3.}

As is made clear both in this passage and 1 Enoch 39.4-7 these are not simply angelic beings and cosmic powers but also the host of the elect who are now in heaven. In addition to this heavenly community that appears with the Son of man an earthly community also appears with him.

When the congregation of the righteous shall appear,
and sinners be judged for their sins,
and shall be driven from the face of the earth:
And when the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the righteous,
whose elect works hang upon the Lord of Spirits,
And light shall appear to the righteous and elect who dwell on the earth,
where then shall be the dwelling of the sinners? (4).

1. 1 En. 48.2

2. For the ancient kingship ideology which lies behind this imagery of E. Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946, pp. 62ff. That 1 Enoch like Daniel 7 sees this dominion as belonging by right to the Son of man is made clear in the verses that follow:

Yea, before the sun and the signs were created,
before the stars of heaven were made,
his name was named before the Lord of Spirits.

He shall be a light of the Gentiles (cf Isa. 42.6; 49.6)

and the hope of those who are troubled of heart (cf Isa. 61.1f)

And all who dwell upon the earth shall fall down and worship before him,
and will praise and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits.

And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before him,
before the creation of the world and for evermore.

The bringing together in this single passage of ideas derived from Dan. 7, Deuteroc Isaiah's 'ebhed Yahweh, and Antropos mythology, show us how wideranging is the background material from which 1 Enoch has taken his thought. Thus, despite the fact that v.7 makes clear reference to pre-existence, v.2 may still be said to preserve a strand of thought in which the enthronement of the Son of man is seen as a translation.

3. 1 En. 60.10 (cf the New Testament usage of the same idea that he will come 'with all his saints', 'with the angels of His power' 1 Thess. 3.13; 2 Thess. 1.7; Mat. 25.31.)

4. 1 En. 38.1.

The appearance of the 'congregation of the righteous' clearly parallels the appearance of the Righteous One. The difficulty in determining whether these 'righteous' who appear are in heaven or on earth is that in the parallel appearance of the Righteous One his appearance is to the 'righteous elect whose elect works hang upon the Lord of Spirits'. This phrase is used of the heavenly community in 40.6 ~~but 40.6~~ but of the earthly congregation in 46.8. It is not clear whether the Righteous One's appearance is a theophany or translation. The fact that light then dawns on the righteous on earth does not help us solve the question since the joys attending the Son of man's enthronement belong to both the earthly and the heavenly community. In view of this it is probable that 'the congregation of the righteous' who appear with the Righteous One is intended to convey the idea that the Son of man comes with both a heavenly and an earthly congregation.

In addition to appearing with his eschatological community, the epiphany of the Son of man marks the establishment of his community free from the oppression of both cosmic and human forces of evil. We are told; 'And after this the Righteous and Elect One shall cause the house of his congregation to appear: henceforth they shall no more be hindered in the name of the Lord of Spirits', and 'The congregation of the elect and holy ones shall be sown, and all the elect shall stand before him on that day'.

Where that community is established appears at times to reflect the ideas of Dan. 7 and the national Messianic hope seeing the community established inviolate and victorious on earth, and at other times to reflect more transcendental ideas of a heavenly community. These two conceptions are sometimes brought together with the dwelling of the eschatological community on a totally renewed earth. But the crucial point about that community is that it is with the Son of man in the

-
1. This lends further support to our contention (cf above p.192f.) that traces of a communal interpretation of the Son of man are to be found in 1 Enoch.
 2. Such an interpretation may help towards an understanding of 1 En. 61.4; that on the day of the Elect One 'the elect shall begin to dwell with the elect'. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.406 n.1, contends that the text does not make sense as it stands, and must have originally read 'the elect shall begin to dwell with the Elect One'. Since there is no textual evidence for this, it is more likely to mean that the day of the Elect One brings together the elect of heaven and earth.
 3. 1 En. 53.6
 4. 1 En. 62.8
 5. 1 En. 50.2; 51.5; 56.6; 62.8; 65.12;
 6. 1 En. 51.1f; 58.5f; 61.4f,8ff; 70.3; 71.1f; 71.4f.
 7. 1 En. 45.4f; 51.5. This dual conception of the kingdom of the Son of man is almost certainly to be explained in terms of the fusion of national Messianic concepts with the tradition of an altogether supernatural figure. Thus Enoch's Son of man is at times the national Messiah, to whom certain supernatural attributes have been added, and at other time the heavenly Anthropos, but robbed of some of his celestial splendours.
 8. 1 En. 45.4; 62.14.

1. 2.
presence of the Lord of Spirits giving praise to God and sharing in an everlasting joyous banquet.

and the Lord of Spirits will abide over them,
and with that Son of man shall they eat
and lie down and rise up for ever and ever. (3)

(v) A Suffering Son of man?

As in Daniel all attention in the Similitudes is focussed on the coming glorious rule of the Son of man. But the question remains whether there is any hint of his suffering and death in 1 Enoch.

4. 5.
Dalman and Klausner have shown that in the entire apocalyptic literature there is not a single passage which suggests that it is part of the vocation of the Son of man that he must suffer and die to atone for the sins of men. While this point must be taken to be as certain as any point can be in biblical study it does not dispense with T.W. Manson's collective interpretation of the Son of man in 1 Enoch.

We have already seen that while this collective interpretation is not true of all parts of the Similitudes, there are some indications of its presence. Similarly we have seen that there are indications that an earthly congregation appears with the Son of man at his enthronement. While this does not necessarily imply an identity of the Son of man and the righteous community, he is most certainly its leader. It is then significant that we are told of the persecution 'of the house of his congregation, and the faithful who hang upon the name of the Lord of Spirits'. Even if these must be taken with 40.6 to refer to the heavenly community 40.6 sees the Elect One to be together with the elect ones. There can be no doubt that the righteous and elect on earth are suffering persecution, and if 46.8 does refer to the heavenly community, they too are suffering. While we are never told specifically that the Son of man suffers, the implication is that the Son of man

1. 1 En. 45.6

2. 1 En. 48.5f; 61.9f.

3. 1 En. 62.14.

4. G. Dalman, Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert, 1888.

5. J. Klausner, Die messianischen Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten, 1903.

6. Only in 2 Esdras 7.28ff are we told of the death of the Messiah, but this is a relic of the older conception of a wholly this-worldly Messiah who is mortal. J. Jeremias, Erlöser und Erlösung, in Deutsche Theologie, ii, 1929, pp.106ff, has tried to revive the idea of atoning suffering by the Son of man based on ideas and themes taken from Deutero-Isaiah's Servant. His thesis has been examined by Sjöyberg, Menschensohn, 1946, pp.116ff, and decisively rejected. Sjöyberg is enthusiastically supported by Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, pp.410ff. In view of the weight of evidence against the idea of it being the vocation of the Son of man to suffer and die for man, such a concept can certainly not be supported.

7. cf above p. 192f

8. cf above p. 196ff

9. 1 En. 46.8

suffers together with his elect ones. If so it is equally clear that the suffering of neither is their vocation. On the contrary their vocation is their glorification and dominion not only of the earth but of the whole created order, and the message of the Similitudes is that their glorious vindication and victory is shortly to take place. The enthronement of the Son of man brings them to share in the eternal glory and dominion that belongs to him.

Accordingly, as in Daniel, while all the focus on the Son of man is on his coming enthronement which will bring suffering to an end for the elect, the theme of a suffering Son of man cannot be said to be entirely absent from the Similitudes.

(vi) The Equipment of the Son of man.

Apart from a 'numinous' endowment of the Son of man with Divine glory, a
 1. glory in which the elect are to share, he is also to be endowed with the spirit.
 2. In keeping with the Old Testament conceptions of the working of the spirit, this
 endowment is thought of in terms of miraculous power, working chiefly against the
 3. enemies of the Son of man. As the elect share in his endowment with divine glory
 4. so they also share this spirit of miraculous power. In accordance with the major
 interest of the apocalyptists particular stress is placed on the Son of man's
 5. endowment with the spirit of wisdom, shared also by the congregation of the elect
 6. and righteous ones.

7. Righteousness is the supreme element in the equipment of the Son of man.
 As in the Old Testament the word embraces the sum of religious and moral virtues.
 The Son of man is the Righteous One because he is the one who is 'right' par
 excellence. But the word has here the same double significance that it has in the
 Old Testament. It refers both to a personal moral quality and also to establishing
 a society of those who are righteous. When the social conditions are such that the
 rights of the righteous ones are being threatened then 'righteousness' means
 salvation from one's enemies, and the securing of eternal peace. It is this social
 8. aspect of the 'righteousness' of the Son of man that predominates in 1 Enoch. When
 9. we are told:

And righteousness shall prevail in his days,
 and the righteous and elect shall be without number before him for
 ever and ever (9)

-
1. 1 En. 50.1
 2. 1 En. 49.3
 3. e.g. 1 En. 62.2
 4. 1 En. 56.7
 5. 1 En. 41.3ff; 46.3; 49.1ff; 51.3
 6. 1 En. 61.13.
 7. 1 En. 38.2; 39.5f; 46.3; 49.2; 53.7; 62.2f; etc.
 8. 1 En. 38.3; 47.4; 48.1; 49.2; 58.5; 62.12; 71.16.
 9. 1 En. 39.6

the thought is of the bliss of the redeemed. So also the 'fountain of righteousness'^{1.} is the fountain of life from which the eschatological community will drink. He is the Righteous One because it is he who will gain for the oppressed ones their^{2.} right. The Son of man is God's guarantee that 'righteousness' will one day be realized in the world.^{3.}

Thus the very qualities of the Son of man are what constitutes the hope for the faithful within Israel because they will share in what belongs to him, which means that they will be established in everlasting peace and joy and freedom from oppression as the community of the Son of man.

Conclusion

Clearly the figure of the Son of man in 1 Enoch is not simply the nationalistic Messiah born of human parents. Equally he is not simply the Urmensch taken over into Judaism or a natural development of Daniel 7. Messiah and Son of man have been identified and each has influenced the other tradition. He emerges as a figure of irresistible might at his enthronement by God, and yet a strangely passive figure appearing before the Lord of Spirits. There is no dogmatically consistent teaching on who is to be judge, destroyer, and rewarder when the Son of man appears.

His enthronement, however, marks the dawn of the day when every power for evil and persecution of the elect is destroyed, heaven and earth are transformed, and the community of the elect and righteous ones (both in heaven and on earth) is established. It is his 'appearing' that creates that community. It is this coming glory that dominates everything, even the present suffering of the elect. Then will come the resurrection and the eternal fellowship of the elect ones with the Elect One, and the unceasing praise of the Lord of Spirits. It is to establish this that the Son of man appears, and it is established when God enthrones him.

(d) The Son of man in 2 Esdras (IV Ezra)

4.

2 Esdras is a comparatively late book written originally in Hebrew^{5.} during the reign of Domitian. Its importance for our study lies not in any possible influence on the New Testament, but in the evidence it offers of contemporary thought and interpretation.

-
1. 1 En. 48.1
 2. 1 En. 53.7
 3. E. Sjöberg, Menschensohn, 1946, pp.96ff; S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956 p.377ff.
 4. C.H. Box, IV Ezra, in Apoc and Pseud. 1913, p.547.
 5. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.356. C.C. Torrey, A Twice-buried Apocalypse Munera Studiosa, Studies presented to W.L.P. Hatch, 1946, pp.23ff, contends that 2 Esdras is a slightly revised version of an earlier Shealtiel Apocalypse written before the time of Nero.

(i) The doctrine of the two ages

In 2 Esdras the doctrine of the two ages predominates. The eschaton
 marks a 'parting of the times' when this corruptible age will give way to incor-
 ruption. Unlike 1 Enoch, where the coming glorious age is sometimes pictured as
 being on earth and sometimes in heaven, the new aeon in 2 Esdras is unmistakably
 in heaven, where the heavenly city has been 'hidden' until this time. Because the
 eschatology is viewed in transcendental and not Messianic terms the doctrine of a
 resurrection to judgement followed by a destruction of sinners and salvation for
 the righteous plays a large part.

An artificial attempt is made to harmonise this totally transcendent
 eschatology with Messianism by presenting us with the sudden appearance of the
 Messiah, who shall rule for 400 years then die with all other mortals.

(ii) Nationalism and Individualism

In 2 Esdras the sinners fall into two major categories; the nations
 hostile to Israel, and those Israelites who know but do not keep the law. Individualism and nationalism are blended.

The earlier portion of the book is concerned with the question of why
 Israel, the people whom God elected, for whose sake all things were created, and
 who rightfully should have dominion over the earth, is being crushed by nations
 hostile to Israel. It is freely acknowledged that all nations, including Israel,
 have descended from Adam and inherited Adam's sin. But Israel has been elected by
 God, alone of all the nations has known God, and has been chosen to inherit Adam's
 dominion over the earth. Thus the burning question is how God can let Israel
 suffer while her enemies are spared. The answer given is that 'the other nations,
 which are descended from Adam... are nothing... they are like unto spittle.

1. 2 Es. 7.50; 7.112f; 8.1

2. 2 Es. 6.7,20; 7.31

3. 2 Es. 7.31, 97, 114, 120, 123; 8.53

4. 2 Es. 4.30; 6.25; 7.26; 4.31, 32; 10.54. The only possible exception to this is to be found in 11.46, where we are told that the earth will be replenished. But this replenishment follows the destruction of the eagle (Rome) and not the cosmic punishment of all sinners which follows their being set alive for judgement and destruction (12.33) which marks the end before the appearing of the heavenly city. (10.54).

5. 2 Es. 7.26

6. 2 Es. 5.45; 7.13,31,66f,75f; 12.33.

7. 2 Es. 7.28-30 and cf 12.34

8. 2 Es. 6.56; 11.1-12.1; 12.3; 13.28-33

9. 2 Es. 7.20-25, 72, 79, 81; 9.11, 33, 36.

10. 2 Es. 3.14; 4.25; 5.23f; 6.54,58.

11. 2 Es. 6.56, 59; 9.13.

12. 2 Es. 6.57, 59.

13. 2 Es. 3.7, 4.30; 7.116f.

14. 2 Es. 3.33

15. 2 Es. 6.54

16. 2 Es. 3.32; 4.12, 23f; 5.28-30,33f.

17. 2 Es. 6.56

Consequently they stand no hope at all when the new, incorruptible aeon dawns.

1.
They will be destroyed.

The second portion of the book asks why all Israel will not be saved.

2.
That the new aeon is for Israel alone is clear; it is equally clear that only a few
3.
in Israel will be saved. The universality of sin is what makes the author despair
4.
of any hope when the day of punishment dawns. The final answer is that the fate of
every man is determined by his response to the claim of the Law;

then everyone shall bear his own righteousness or unrighteousness (5)

In this a strong individualism is seen, though it remains firmly embedded
within the context of nationalism. Punishment awaits all the nations regarded by
6.
God as spittle and who have persecuted his saints as surely as it awaits those
within Israel who have rejected the Law. As in 1 Enoch the author sees no hope of
salvation for sinners. Hope belongs to the righteous alone; sinners can expect
nothing other than the coming torments.

For the empty, empty things!
For the full, full things! (7)

Together with this theme of punishment goes the theme of the coming
8.
resurrection for the righteous to their eternal bliss and security. Apart from
the vision of the man from the sea in chapter 13, little stress is laid on the
aspect of community in the life of bliss; rather individual bliss is stressed,
probably under the impact of the strong individualism within nationalism in Ezra's
thought, an individualism which overcomes his own longing for the salvation of
9.
Israel and which becomes agony at the thought of the few who will be saved.

1. 2 Es. 11.1-12.1; 12.3; 13.28ff.

2. 2 Es. 7.120

3. 2 Es. 7.47, 51, 60, 116f; 8.1ff, 26, 41ff; 9.12, 16; 10.57. That this is a reference to a few in Israel and not a few of mankind is made clear, e.g. in the frequent reference to the punishment which is meted out to those who have received but rejected the Law (9.12). For a Jewish author this cannot include Gentiles, for Gentiles have not received the Law.

4. 2 Es. 7.46f; 8.35; etc.

5. 2 Es. 7.105, cf 7.103, 127f.

6. 2 Es. 8.57

7. 2 Es. 7.35.

8. 2 Es. 6.25; 7.14, 16, 34ff, 98; 8.37ff, 52ff; 9.8; etc.

9. Despite this emphasis on individualism something of a community concept of the eschaton might be seen when the seer, being impatient for the day of final redemption is rebuked;

Thy haste may not exceed that of the Most High; for thou art hastening for thine own self, but the Exalted one on behalf of many. (2 Es. 4.34)

This passage is, at least superficially, reminiscent of Isa. 53.11

My righteous servant shall justify many.

Box, IV Ezra, Apoc and Pseud, 1913, ad. loc. is certainly wrong when he interprets this passage, 'The Most High is no less ready to "haste" than himself, but determines his action in accordance with the interests of all (many)'. The many in this passage, as the context makes plain, is the full number of the righteous, which has to be made up before the end will come (cf. 2 Es. 4.36f). Thus, while Deutero-Isaiah's Servant is suffering in order that through his suffering 'the many' i.e. Israel (cf above p.11ff), may be made righteous, here the Most High delays the day of salvation until 'the many', i.e. the righteous within Israel, have been prepared to receive their heavenly reward. In Deutero-Isaiah the 'many' are to be created (or redeemed) through the work of the Servant. In 2 Esdras the 'many' are to inherit their eternal reward when their full complement is made up by their own choice of piety and adherence. Despite this radical difference in theology, the concept of the righteous community is inherent in both. Salvation belongs to the community, not simply to individuals.

(iii) The Eschatological Deliverer

While both the Similitudes and the Ezra apocalypse are concerned with the coming day of judgement, cosmic destruction, and the ushering in of the age to come, the spotlight in 1 Enoch falls on the figure of the eschatological deliverer. This, however, is not so in 2 Esdras. Apart from the vision and interpretation of chapter 13 there are only two references to him, and in both of these he appears as the Messiah.

1. The Messiah

The Messiah in 2 Baruch appears as a mortal man in David's line who inaugurates the interim kingdom of the Messiah before the day of judgement when even he dies as the earth returns to pre-creation 'silence'.

1.

For my Servant the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him, and he shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years. And it shall be, after these years, that my Servant the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. Then shall the world be turned into the primeval silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings; so that no man is left. (2)

And as for the lion whom thou didst see roused from the wood and roaring, and speaking to the eagle and reproving him for his unrighteousness and all his deeds, as thou hast heard: This is the Messiah⁽³⁾ whom the Most High hath kept unto the end (of the days, who shall spring from the seed of David and shall come and speak unto them); he shall reprove them for their ungodliness, rebuke them for their unrighteousness, reproach them to their faces with their treacheries. For at first he shall set them alive for judgement; and when he hath rebuked them he shall destroy them. (But my people who survive he shall deliver with mercy, even those who have been saved throughout my borders, and he shall make them joyful until the End come, even the Day of Judgement, of which I have spoken unto thee from the beginning) (4)

1. The Latin text here reads filius meus, and is translated by Box as 'my Son the Messiah'. But since the expression stands quite alone it is most probable that the Christian translator used it to render the Greek word παῖς, which may mean either son or servant. In later usage it most frequently means servant. It would then correspond here to the Hebrew 'abhdī (cf S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.294, S. Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, 1877, pp.285ff) The word 'son' or servant, however, does not appear in the Arabic, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions. Thus it may be assumed that it is a Christian interpolation in some manuscripts of the Greek version, and that the original had only 'My Anointed'. On this ground this text cannot be appealed to to show any indication of a suffering Son of man. Even if 'abhdī did stand in the original, it is applied here to the Messiah, of whom it is explicitly stated that his task is not one of redemptive suffering. He is rather the conquering hero who inaugurates the Messianic interim-kingdom. At the end of this he dies. But this death is no part of his 'work'. It marks the end of that redemptive work before the great eschatological day of the resurrection, judgement, and salvation to eternal life.
2. 2 Es. 7.28-30.
3. In the Arabic and Ethiopic versions there is nothing to correspond with the word Unctus (Messiah) of the Latin version, and so may be a Christian interpolation (cf S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.360). In this passage, however, we have the fusion of the two sources or two ideas. In the one the figure appears to be the eschatological deliverer himself (even though he is of David's line) connected with the resurrection and the eschatological punishment. In the other he appears as the Messiah inaugurating the interim-kingdom and making his people happy and secure until the end comes. This identification of the lion with the seed of David (i.e. the Messiah) is found again in Revelation 5.5, but that this identification belongs to the Ezra apocalypse (so Mowinckel, ibid, p.360) is doubtful. It is more probable that we have an interpolation into the text at this point of the Messiah of David's line who inaugurates the millenium. The original probably spoke only of the eschatological deliverer at whose coming the eagle (Rome) would be utterly destroyed.
4. 2 Es. 12.31-35.

The eschatological deliverer of this second passage appears to be more like the Son of man of 1 Enoch. If we exclude the passages marked by brackets and the word 'Messiah' then we are left with the figure of one who appears at the time appointed by God to judge the godless, raise the godless dead, and then destroy them all. Until this day he has been kept by the Most High. This may suggest his heavenly pre-existence.¹ It is, however, not obvious that this is the meaning the seer himself would wish his readers to derive from the image of his being 'kept unto the end' by the Most High. Since such frequent reference is made throughout the book to the appointing of a day by God, if we were not aware of the idea of the appearing of a heavenly man in other traditions, the most natural interpretation of this passage would be that this figure begins his work at the time appointed by God; a time and an event which has been in the eternal purpose of God. It may also be that if the word 'Messiah' did stand in the original, the this-worldly character of the Messianic figure has helped to play down the more transcendental features of the Son of man in the Urmensch speculation. If this is so, it follows that although the tradition from which this image is taken may have had underlying it the idea of a real heavenly pre-existence, in Ezra it becomes an ideal pre-existence as being part of God's eternal purpose.²

Both of these interpretations would help to explain why in 2 Esdras the heavenly traits of the eschatological deliverer are not prominent in contrast to the heavenly pre-existence of the hidden city in due course to be revealed.

2. The one having the 'form of a man' in 2 Esdras 13.1-13.

In the vision of chapter 13 we are told of the violent winds that arose from the sea which caused the one having 'the form of a man' to come up out of the heart of the sea. This man then flew with the 'clouds of heaven'. Everything that he saw trembled, and everything that heard his voice 'melted away'. Then from the four corners of the earth an innumerable multitude gathered together to make war with the man, but he carved out for himself a great mountain and flew upon it. The seer was unable to see the material out of which the man had carved the mountain. Despite their fear the army gathered against him still waged war and were killed by the fiery stream that came out of his mouth. Then the man came down

1. So S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p. 386. It is to be noted, however, that in the vision of which this is the interpretation the lion appears from the forest, and there is nothing to suggest that the forest stands for heaven. (2 Es. 11.37). Too much must not be made of this since the image of the lion roaring, which is a wholly appropriate metaphor for what the lion does, leads to an association with the natural habitat of the lion.

2. 2 Es. 4.27,34ff; 5.49; 6.1-6,52; 7.74; 9.18; 12.39; 13.53.

from his mountain and gathered together a peacable army, and they came; some glad, some sorrowful, some in chains, and some bringing human sacrifices.

1.

In the interpretation of this vision we are told that the man coming up from the sea 'is he whom the Most High is keeping many ages (and through whom he will deliver his creation) and the same shall order the survivors'. This is a much clearer indication of pre-existence than the more general 'whom the Most High hath kept unto the end of the days' in 2 Es. 12.52. But how does this pre-existence square with his coming out of the sea?

The interpretation given by the seer of this is:

Just as one can neither seek out nor know what is in the deep of the sea, even so can no one upon earth see my Servant (or those that are with him), but in the time of his day. (2)

While this accords with what is said elsewhere in the book it is clearly an artificial interpretation. Mowinkel contends that it is connected with the concept of his pre-existent hiddenness originating from the myth of the primordial man.

3.

4.

It is possible, however, that we have here some form of a translation myth such as we found in Daniel 7. It is significant that in the vision of the eagle (Rome) we are told:

and lo! there came up from the sea an eagle.....(5)

and in the interpretation:

The eagle which thou sawest come up from the sea is the fourth kingdom which appeared in vision to thy brother Daniel. (6)

In neither 2 Esdras nor Daniel 7 can this be interpreted to convey anything of a heavenly origin. Rather, here as in Daniel we seem to have the dual connexion of the beasts and the sea with the chaos monsters of creation mythology and with those who in their pride have become as beasts in usurping the dominion which does not belong to them. In view of this the meaning of the eagle's appearing from the sea seems to be that he brings chaos and suffering to the world.

7.

8.

1. 2 Esdras 13.25-53. Despite the inconsistencies between the vision and the interpretation it would seem that the interpretation is an important and integral part of the book. As M.D. Hooker, *Son of Man*, 1967, p.51, notes, the seer himself may not have understood the traditional material he has used to compose his vision. But if this is so the interpretation is of great importance in that it shows how the traditional material is interpreted by this Jew. Consequently our understanding of the use of the Son of man in 2 Esdras must take into account the interpretation and cannot be based simply on the vision itself.
2. 2 Es. 13.52.
3. So Mowinkel, *He That Cometh*, 1956, p.390.
4. *ibid.* pp. 391f. J. Jeremias, *Erlösung und Erlöser*, in *Deutsche Theologie*, ii, 1929 p.110 and H. Gressmann, *Der Messias*, FRL, vol. 43, 1914, p.372, have suggested that the sea is a symbol indicating the underworld. E. Sjöberg, *Verborgene Menschensohn*, 1955, p.47, n.4 rightly objects that in 2 Esdras the Son of man is preserved in heaven not Hades.
5. 2 Es. 11.1
6. 2 Es. 12.11
7. cf 2 Es. 6.51 where Leviathan is consigned to the 'moist places'.
8. cf 2 Es. 11.42f.

On this interpretation of the sea the appearance of the one having the 'form of man' from the heart of the sea would mean that he appears from out of the chaos and suffering of the world and, like the 'one like a Son of man' in Daniel 7.13, he flies with the 'clouds of heaven'.^{1.}

That we have here a translation myth is borne out by the fact that there is no mention of his manifestation to the elect, and that the place to which the man flies is the great mountain which, in the interpretation is identified as Zion. The rest of the book leaves us in no doubt whatever that this is the hidden heavenly city which will miraculously appear at the end. Thus it would appear that he is translated out of the midst of chaos to reign in the 'world to come'. Here he enters upon his rightful dominion of all creation and by the miraculous power of his voice all the evil-doers are burned up.^{2.}

In the interpretation the miraculous power of the Son of man is the Law which is compared unto fire. (3)

This is in harmony with centrality of the Law in the seers view of things.

(iv) Community and the Son of man.

As in 1 Enoch the eschatological deliverer is not to appear alone but together with a community. In 2 Esdras the character of this community is ambiguous. We are told:

And the men who have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth, shall appear. (4)

Here the reference is clearly to those men, like Enoch, who have been translated and are in heaven. But we are also told:

For my Servant the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him. (5)

Since this appears in a context which speaks of the mortal Messiah who establishes the interim-kingdom, the community here is more likely to be the earthly Israel.

In the vision of chapter 13 the man from the sea does not come with a community. Once he has settled on the 'great mountain' and destroyed the army

1. The other parallels between 2 Esdras and Daniel would support this interpretation; thus the 'great mountain' in 2 Es. 13.6f, cf. Dan. 2.34f, 45; the 'wind out of the heart of the sea' in 2 Es. 13.3, cf. Dan. 7.2; the fire, flame and sparks of 2 Es. 13.10, cf. Dan. 7.9f; the enemy destroyed by fire in 3 Es. 13.11, cf. Dan. 7.11; and only the dust left in 2 Es. 31.11 cf. Dan. 2.35.

2. so also E. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 1955, p.47. cf. 2 Es. 13.52 'no one upon earth can see my Servant or those that are with him, but in the time of his day'.

3. 2 Es. 13.39.

4. 2 Es. 6.26.

5. 2 Es. 7.28 (on this cf above p. 203 n.1)

arrayed against him he 'comes down' and gathers the great army of joyful, sorrowful,^{1.} those carrying chains, and those bearing human sacrifices. This reference to human sacrifices echoes Isaiah 66.20 where the meaning is stated to be 'brethren out of all the nations', i.e. the diaspora. This same meaning is given in the interpretation of the peacable army:

the ten tribes which were led away captive out of their own land in the days of Josiah the king, which (tribes) Sálmanasser the king of the Assyrians led away captive; he carried them across the River, and they were transported into another land. (2)

This passage goes on to say that the land of the diaspora can only be reached by travelling underground for one-and-a-half years. The seer thought that this tunnel is to be found in the Tigris-tunnel at Bylkalein where the river goes underground for some distance at the narrow passage of the Euphrates.^{3.} Mowinckel is probably correct in seeing this to be the interpretation given by the seer to an original form of the myth in which the reference is to the eschatological remnant in paradise.

But whether the community that appears with the man is heavenly or earthly the result of his work, after the destruction of evil, is the gathering together of the righteous community to be with himself translated from earth to the place prepared for the elect.

(v) Son of man individual or community in 2 Esdras?

In the vision of the one having the 'form of man' we are told that he 'came down' from the great mountain to gather his peacable army. What this could mean in the context of the book is not clear since we are left in no doubt at all that the coming 'bliss' is to be in heaven. The interpretation makes no reference to this 'coming down' before gathering the diaspora. Even if the background to the interpretation is a myth which referred to a community in Paradise, the dispersed tribes in chapter 13 are not thought of as being in heaven.^{4.}

It may be that Daniel's identification of the 'one like a Son of man' with the 'saints of the Most High' has influenced the vision at this point. If this is so despite the strongly transcendental eschatology of the book as a whole, the seer may have preserved an element which suggested that after the enthronement of the Son of man and the destruction of sinners, the Son of man (= Israel) was

1. cf above p. 204f.

3. cf H. Gressmann, *Der Messias*, FRL, vol. 43, 1914, p.382

2. 2 Es. 13.40.

4. cf. above .

1.

gathered together to exercise due lordship over creation.

In support of this notion is an earlier prayer of the seer:

O Lord above us, if thou wouldst but suffer thy servant to pray before thee; and wouldst give unto us seed of a new heart and culture to our understanding, whence fruit may come, whereby every corruptible one may be able to live, who bears the form of man. (2)

Oesterly describes this as a prayer 'for humanity in general, a universalistic note
3.

which is by no means always found in our book'. This can be interpreted as a universalism, however, only if we forget that the author has already dismissed the other nations as 'spittle' in 2 Es. 6.56. That the author is thinking of Israel as those having the 'form of man' is made plain in the succeeding verses of the prayer:

Thou sustainest it (him) in thy mercy
and nourishest it (him) in thy righteousness;
Thou disciplinest it (him) through thy Law,
and reprovest it (him) in thy wisdom.....
..... Concerning man in general, thou knowest best, but
concerning thy people on whose account I grieve,
and thine inheritance for which I mourn,
and Israel for whom I am sad,
and Jacob's seed for whom I am dismayed -
Therefore would I fain pray before thee for myself and for them. (4)

Here it is made quite explicit that the prayer is not for man in general but for Israel.

If the original text was in Hebrew then the strange phrase 'form of man' may have intended a reference to Adam. This is made more likely since the next
5.
verses refer to creation. Now Israel's connexion with Adam is a constantly
6.
recurring theme of 2 Esdras in which it is asserted that Israel alone has inherited
7.
Adam's dominion over the earth. The other nations are dismissed as being of no consequence. Yet it is they who have usurped Israel's right in the earth. These ideas are those we found also in Daniel 7.

8.

Another most interesting point appears in 8.44. The author expresses indignation at the idea that a vast proportion of the seed sown by the husbandmen is doomed to perish. The following verse indicates that the reference is not to mankind in general but to the chosen people, Israel: the Son of man, (or man) 'who

-
1. cf M. D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp. 49ff, who presents a very cogent argument that in 2 Esdras the ideas underlying Daniel's human figure are perfectly understood and applied to Israel.
 2. 2 Esdras 8.6. The Latin version has locum hominis which is evidently due to a confusion between τόπον and τύπον. The Syrian version understood τύπον. This is precisely the same phrase as is used of the man in the vision of Chapter 13.
 3. W. O. E. Oesterly, 11 Esdras, 1933, ad. loc.
 4. 2 Es. 8.12-16.
 5. 2 Es. 8.7ff.
 6. cf above p. 201
 7. 2 Es. 6.54
 8. Unfortunately the text of the existing versions of this passage is not certain. Most Latin MSS read hic pater et filius, though one has sic pat et filius. Editors restore either hic perit or sic patitur.

has been fashioned with thine own hands, and is made in thine own image, for whose sake thou has fashioned all things'. Since it is made clear that all things were created for Israel it follows that the Son of man (or man) in this passage refers to 'thy people' of 8.26, i.e. Israel.

It is accordingly possible that the one having the 'form of man' in the vision of Chapter 13 carries echoes of Daniel's 'saints of the Most High'. Admittedly not all aspects of the vision or its interpretation could fit into this picture notably among them the man's pre-existence in the interpretation, his carving out the 'great mountain' interpreted as the heavenly Zion, and his miraculous power by which he slays the hostile hosts. All of these tend to reflect the influence of the more transcendental Urmensch, an influence which is furthered by the author's own concept of a transcendental eschaton. But equally, not all the features of Chapter 13 can be fitted into the picture of a theophany of a heavenly Son of man; notably his ascent from the sea, his flying with the clouds of heaven to the heavenly Zion, and the gathering of the peacable army. What we have appears to be the conflation of the less Jewish theophany of a semi-divine figure with the more Jewish ascension of an individual or community (the faithful remnant in Israel) to receive rightful dominion. Rather artificially blended with both of these is the more traditional figure of the national Messiah.

(vi) A Suffering Son of man

If the possibility of a collective interpretation of the Son of man in 2 Esdras is accepted, then, since he is to be identified or associated with Israel, it is clear that he is suffering. In the author's view this suffering must be because the world is evil, and will continue until the world is destroyed. There is nothing moral, propitiatory, or vicarious about these sufferings. They are simply the unfortunate result of evil which came with Adam's fall and must be endured by those who would inherit eternal life until the incorruptible new order comes. The theology of suffering presented by the seer is that it is an evil which is to be conquered when the eschatological day dawns. Unlike Deutero-Isaiah 2 Esdras attached no redemptive significance to suffering itself.

Conclusion

2 Esdras presents us with a strange conflation of many traditions. In the main his thinking has left the traditional Messianic conception of the coming glory

1. 2 Es. 6.56, 59; 9.13.

2. 2 Es. 3.32; 4.12, 23f; 5.28-30, 33ff; 6.56-59; 9.13; 10.7f, 21ff, 43.

3. 2 Es. 4.28-30

4. 2 Es. 7.2ff.

for Israel on earth. Here the picture is of a cosmic destruction before the righteous within Israel enter their heavenly reward.

Despite the transcendentalism and individualism the author has not left the firm ground of Jewish particularism.

The figure of the eschatological deliverer is a strange enigma in the Ezra apocalypse. The influence of Urmensch speculation has undoubtedly individualised him and clothed him with supernatural powers and origins. Yet at the same time there appear traces of an older concept of the translation of a human figure to receive dominion, a figure closely associated with Israel. It would be false to say that the author consciously identifies him with Israel, but it is significant that even in so late a composition these traces are still to be found suggesting that while the myth of the primordial man has individualised the man and, to some extent, set him over against Israel as its deliverer, yet his intimate links with the people of God are never really lost and he is thought of in the same terms as are applied to Israel.

As in Daniel 7 and 1 Enoch the Son of man is not presented in terms of suffering but of glory, though his connexion with Israel is suggestive of a suffering that is never mentioned. Be that as it may, this suffering is not conceived of as redemptive but inevitable.

While the individualism of 2 Esdras has helped to present us with a picture of salvation in terms of individual bliss, there are still strong traces that salvation means the establishment of a community in fellowship with God and the Son of man. There is, however, no indication that sinners are to be included in that community by redeeming them from their sins. The election of Israel excludes the Gentiles from any hope, and the disobedience of many Jews to the Law has marked them also for destruction.

(e) The Son of man in 2 Baruch

The final work to which we need to give some attention is the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, originally written in Hebrew and usually considered to be a little later than the Ezra Apocalypse. It is clearly either dependent on 2 Esdras, or both of them are dependent on a common source. The arguments of Torrey that both are dependent on the Shealtiel Apocalypse seem decisive.

-
1. cf S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p. 356; R.H. Charles, Apoc and Pseud, 1913, p. 472.
 2. C.C. Torrey, A Twice-Buried Apocalypse, in Munera Studiosa, Studies presented to W.L.P. Hatch, 1946, pp. 23ff.

All the major themes of 2 Esdras are present in 2 Baruch, some in a slightly modified form and some exaggerated. We shall, therefore, confine our attention to the concept of eschatology and the figure of the eschatological deliverer in 2 Baruch.

(i) The Concept of eschatology

The concept of the 'world to come' is presented in the same radically transcendental term as in 2 Esdras. The day prepared by and known to God will mark 'a consummation of the times'¹. Here the doctrine of the 'two ages' is most clearly marked and is spoken of as 'two worlds'². The seer delights to draw out contrasts between the hopelessness, suffering, and corruptibility of this life,³ and the delights of immortality and incorruption of the life which is to come. Thus there is a cosmic destruction at the end not only of sinners but also of the angel of death and Hades,⁴ and the mythological creation-monsters Leviathan and Behemoth.⁵ 'Everything that is shall become the prey of corruption'.⁶ At the same time the righteous are to be raised and leave this world for a world⁷ promised by God.⁸

This 'new world' is conceived of as the 'New Jerusalem' which has been preserved by God until the end and belongs to that new, transcendental world that is to be revealed.⁹

The Gentile nations, as in 2 Esdras, are regarded as 'spittle' and for them all, with the exception of those who have not known Israel, there will be everlasting death and destruction.¹⁰ On the other hand salvation is only for those Jews who have kept the Law faithfully. Those Jews who have rejected the Law or who have been disobedient can only expect the same fate as awaits the Gentiles - they will be destroyed.¹¹

-
1. 2 Bar. 13.3; 19.5; 21.8,17; 27.15; 30.3; 54.21; 56.2; 59.4,8; 69.5; 82.2; 83.7.
 2. 2 Bar. 83.8
 3. e.g. 2 Bar. 21.12f, 19, 23; 44.8ff; 48.48-50; 51.11ff.
 4. 2 Bar. 21.23.
 5. 2 Bar. 29.4
 6. 2 Bar. 31.5.
 7. 2 Bar. 21.23; 23.5; 30.2f; 42.8; 49.1-50.4.
 8. 2 Bar. 14.13; 15.8; 21.12,25.
 9. 2 Bar. 4.3; 32.5; 51.8, 11.
 10. 2 Bar. 82.5
 11. 2 Bar. 72.4ff
 12. 2 Bar. 12.1ff; 13.5,11ff; 14.1f.
 13. 2 Bar. 32.1; 41.4; 44.7, 14; 46.4ff; 51.3,7; 83.7.
 14. 2 Bar. 15.6; 17.1-9; 41.1f; 42.7; 44.14f; 48.38ff, 47; 51.4; 54.14; 84.3.

(ii) The Figure of the eschatological deliverer

Into this transcendental eschatology the figure of the apocalyptic deliverer fits very awkwardly. For Baruch he is the Messiah.¹

And it shall come to pass when all is accomplished that was come to pass in those parts (i.e. at the end of the signs of the end - the twelve cosmic woes which precede this section) that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed. And Behemoth shall be revealed from his place and Leviathan shall ascend from the sea, those two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation, and shall have kept until that time; and then they shall be for food for all that are left. The earth also shall yield its fruit ten thousandfold and on each (?) vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice; moreover, also, they shall behold marvels every day. For winds shall go forth from Me to being every morning the fragrance of aromatic fruits, and at the close of the self-same time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time. And it shall come to pass after these things, when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, that he shall return in glory. (2)

The fact that the Messiah appears at the end of the signs which will precede the end makes him appear to be the apocalyptic Son of man. But, apart from the destruction of the creation monsters, his appearance heralds not heavenly bliss but fantastic earthly pleasures; increased productivity, health, and the restoration of the Mosaic manna. There is no hint here of heavenly origins or appearing with a heavenly community.

The strange conclusion to the section suggests that we are dealing with the same conception of an interim-kingdom as we found in 2 Esdras.³ The text itself gives us no clue about the meaning of his 'return in glory', whether this is to heaven or to earth. What we are told is that the 'return' heralds the resurrection of the righteous and their being gathered together in joy, a joy which springs from knowing that the consummation of time has come.⁴ Behind this may lie a translation myth and a return from heaven to gather the righteous for their translation to the 'new world' prepared for them. On the other hand the 'return' might be to a pre-existent heavenly glory, gathering together into one kingdom the righteous living and dead. A third possibility is that the 'return' of the Messiah is the same as the 'return' of the righteous dead, i.e. his resurrection, which heralds the resurrection of the righteous.

It seems fruitless to attempt to decide between these various possible interpretations, as supporting texts for each can be found within the Baruch

-
1. On one occasion he is called 'My servant Messiah' (2 Bar, 70.9) but R.H. Charles, Apoc and Pseud, ad loc., suggests that this is an interpolation.
 2. 2 Bar. 29.3-30.1
 3. So S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 1956, p.404, 419f.
 4. 2 Bar. 30.2f.

apocalypse itself. What is clear is that we have a fusion of two theological concepts - a this-worldly Messiah associated with a miraculous restoration of the earth, and a more transcendental Son of man associated with the resurrection and an other-worldly eschatology. In this passage both ideas are present with a hint of a time difference between the two eschatologies, but are both associated with the same eschatological figure, the Messiah.

The second passage referring to the Messiah is found in the interpretation of the vision of the forest and the vine.

2.

And it shall come to pass when the time of its consummation that it should fall has approached, then the principate of My Messiah will be revealed, which is like the fountain and the vine, and when it is revealed it will root out the multitude of its host. And as touching that which thou hast seen, the lofty cedar, which was left of the forest, and the fact that the vine spoke these words with it which thou didst hear, this is the word.

The last leader of the timewill be left alive, when the multitude of his hosts will be put to the sword, and he will be bound, and they will take him up to Mount Zion, and My Messiah will convict him of all his impieties, and will gather and set before him all the works of his host. And afterwards he will put him to death, and protect the rest of my people which shall be found in the place which I have chosen. And his principate will stand for ever, until the world of corruption is at an end, and until the times aforesaid are fulfilled. (3)

In this passage the 'revelation of the principate of My Messiah' does not require the question to be asked whether this is a revelation which has its origin in heaven or on earth. The rule of the Messiah appears to be a surprising revelation to the heathen powers which need mean nothing more than the entry of Israel into her rightful world dominion at the coming of the Messiah. The role of the Messiah is more active here than in the previous passage we have examined. It is he who judges and destroys the world ruler, and protects the people of God.

While we are told that his rule is to be 'for ever' this is immediately qualified by 'until the world of corruption is at an end'. This would indicate that we have here the same identification we found in chapter 29f of the figure of the earthly Messiah, establishing an unending kingdom on earth, and the more transcendental Son of man, bringing in the 'new world'.

The third reference to the Messiah is in the interpretation of the vision of the cloud with the black and white waters. In the vision we are told of the lightning which was 'on the summit of the cloud' which destroyed the black waters mingled with fire, healed the areas devastated by the waters, and took

1. 2 Bar. 36.1ff.

2. This is a reference to the fourth world empire, obviously Rome, cf R.H. Charles Apoc and Pseud, comment on 2 Bar. 39.3-5.

3. 2 Bar. 39.7-40.3

4. 2 Bar. 72.4ff cf 11.1f

5. 2 Bar. 53ff.

dominion of the whole earth. In the interpretation we are told that the alternating white and black waters are the alternating areas of the reign of goodness and wickedness, and of the lightning we are told:

regarding the bright lightning which is to come at the consummation after these black (waters): this is the word. After the signs have come, of which thou was told before, when the nations become turbulent, and the time of My Messiah is come, he shall summon all the nations, and some of them he shall spare, and some he shall slay. These things therefore shall come upon the nations which are to be spared by him. Every nation which knows not Israel and has not trodden down the seed of Jacob, shall indeed be spared. And this because some out of every nation shall be subjected to thy People. But all who have ruled over you, or have known you, shall be given up to the sword.

And it shall come to pass, when he has brought low everything that is in the world,
and has sat down for peace on the throne of his kingdom,
that joy shall then be revealed,
and rest shall appear.

And then shall healing descend in dew,
and disease shall withdraw,
and anxiety and anguish and lamentation pass from amongst men,
and gladness proceed through the whole earth.

And no one shall die again untimely,
nor shall any adversity suddenly befall.

And judgements and revilings and contentions and revenges,
and blood, and passions, and envy, and hatred,
and whatsoever things are like these shall go into condemnation when they are removed.

For it is these things which have filled this world with evils,
and on account of these the life of man has been greatly troubled.

And wild beasts shall come from the forest and minister unto men,
and asps and dragons shall come forth from their holes to submit themselves to a little child,

And women shall no longer have pain when they bear,
nor shall they suffer torment when they yield the fruit of the womb.

And it shall come to pass in those days that the reapers shall not grow weary,
Nor those that build be toil-worn;
For the works of themselves speedily advance
together with those who do them in much tranquillity.

For that is the time of the consummation of that which is corruptible,
and the beginning of that which is not corruptible.

Therefore those things which are predicted shall belong to it;
Therefore it is far away from evils, and near to those things which die not. (1)

Two features of this passage suggest that behind this Messiah stands the figure of the Son of man. The first is his association with the sea and the cloud. The second is the reference to his enthronement which was such a prominent feature of 1 Enoch and the only feature which Daniel mentions. His active punitive role supports the view that the Son of man has coloured Baruch's eschatological Messiah. But his Jewish nationalism also colours the figure of the deliverer making him see

1. 2 Bar. 72.1-74.3

2. so S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 1956, p.390. Mowinckel suggests that we have here the same figure as in 2 Es. 13, of the one having the 'form of man' flying with the clouds. We have already suggested that whatever the myth that lies behind this vision may have contained, when Jewish apocalyptists used it the figure is one who arises out of the same world as chaos and wickedness to defeat that wickedness (cf. above p.204f). In Baruch he is closely associated with the cloud that rains alternating goodness and evil, suggesting the same idea. In Daniel the cloud represented a translation. All of this confirms the view that however 'heavenly' in origin may have been the Son of man outside Judaism, within Judaism there is a strong tendency to regard him as human and a representative of Israel.

hope for Israel alone (with the exception of nations totally ignorant of Israel). Thereafter comes the universal dominion of Israel as we saw in Daniel 7 and the other writers we have studied.

Despite the transcendental character of the eschaton in 2 Baruch in passages not connected with the figure of the eschatological deliverer, in this passage the 'transformation' is not the radical break between 'this world' and the 'new world'. It is again the picture of a miraculously restored earth and a reversal of the curse placed upon mankind at the fall of Adam. It would appear that when the figure of the eschatological deliverer is brought into focus there is an irresistible tendency to picture the eschaton in terms borrowed from the traditional national Messiah.

Of particular interest to the thesis that salvation is a community and not individual idea, or that it is to be understood as community creating, is Baruch's clear presentation that everything which destroys the community of men will be destroyed. This means, as Baruch himself says, that peace is established because the eschatological Messiah establishes true community on the earth. For him this community is only for Jews who have been faithful to the Law. There is no hope of salvation for the rest of mankind.

Summary

What precisely the thought concerning the Son of man was in Judaism at the time of Jesus is hard to say. In the writings in which this figure is mentioned we have seen the tendency to picture the eschaton as a radical break between this aeon of corruption and the coming aeon of immortality and perfection. This corruptible age is destined for complete annihilation, an annihilation in which particular emphasis is placed on the destruction of the nations hostile to Israel. Where this nationalism is modified, it is modified not by including non-Jews but by excluding those Jews who have chosen to disregard the Law.

This annihilation awaits not only human sinners but also the cosmic creatures of evil; Satan, the mythological creation monsters, and every mortal and corruptible thing.

Since this destruction is to be so complete the coming world is the appearance of something that has never been seen before. Most often it is the appearance of a city that God has kept in hiding only to be revealed at this time. The entrance into this city is therefore of necessity via a resurrection.

The figure of the eschatological deliverer, however, is a strange enigma. At times there can be no doubting his heavenly origin and pre-existence. At times also nationalistic Messianism has brought this non-Jewish figure within traditional bounds. This is done by attempting to span the two eschatologies by the introduction of an interim-kingdom on earth. At other times the figure is clearly like the Messiah, a human and representative individual. In Daniel he appears to be a symbol for Israel. So we find that the 'appearance' of the figure is presented sometimes as a theophany and sometimes as a translation. The favourite imagery used to depict this 'appearing' is the 'enthronement' of the Son of man.

The kingdom established at the Son of man's enthronement is sometimes thought of as his glorious reign over the faithful of Israel who have been gathered into their eternal inheritance after the annihilation of the earth and evil. At other times this appears to be a figure describing the establishment of the sovereign community of Israel in peace on the earth.

If our communal interpretation of the Son of man in Daniel is correct, the figure becomes more individualised in the later writings, standing over against Israel bringing her salvation. But in the main the Son of man, like the Messiah, appears as a representative individual. Seen against the back-drop of corporate personality in Israel's thought this means that Israel (or a remnant) is to share in the endowment with spirit, wisdom, glory, and universal dominion of the Son of man. Consequently the thought often shifts in a confusing way from an individual figure over against Israel to an individual appearing with a community, to a figure closely identified with Israel, or to a figure who appears to be a symbol for Israel.

This shift is to be explained by the fact that what concerns the apocalyptists is not primarily the figure of the eschatological deliverer but rather what is going to happen to Israel - an Israel who is suffering in subjection to the rule of hostile powers, but who believes herself to be elected by God to inherit Adam's dominion of the world. Their unanimous verdict is that Israel (or a remnant) will receive that dominion in God's good time, whether it be on earth, in heaven, or both. It is to achieve Israel's glory and never the salvation of sinners that the Son of man is enthroned, which means Israel's enthronement to her rightful dominion. Every mention of the coming glory of the Son of man has locked within it a reference to the coming glory of Israel. If he is an individual, he

is to bring Israel to glory. If he is a representative individual he comes to his glory together with Israel. If he is a symbol for Israel his coming to dominion is Israel's coming to due honour. Consequently whatever we may say of the Son of man himself and who is the agent of destruction the result is the same - the true community (i.e. a good Jewish community) is established in peace and splendour and sometimes heavenly glory; a community in unbroken fellowship with the Son of man given to praising God.

Where the Son of man appears as a symbol for the people of God there is justification in saying that he suffers, because in all the works we have studied the suffering of Israel is everywhere in evidence. But there is no justification in saying that suffering is part of the redemptive work of the Son of man. With the exception of 2 Baruch suffering is throughout presented as a tragic inevitability in a world that is evil. The consummation marks salvation from this suffering by destroying the cause of it; and this cause is seen to be the nations hostile to Israel and the cosmic powers of evil. When they are destroyed then only the good will be left to enjoy eternal peace and well-being. Even if the Son of man does suffer, therefore, it is not vicarious but shared. The title 'Son of man' however, is never applied to his suffering. It is reserved entirely for the eschatological day and its triumphant glory for the community.

Because we find this easy transition from individual to community in the background material, we should expect to find that the Son of man in the New Testament is used with the same 'inconsistency'. This will be seen as an inconsistency only if we forget that the 'Son of man' represents in all its various forms a hope for the people of God.

Similarly with the inter-acting of concepts derived from Adam and creation mythology in Judaism, Urmensch speculations, national Messianism, and Daniel 7, it is not at all surprising that the material we have studied is not unambiguous in ascribing heavenly or earthly origins and attributes to the Son of man. And, despite the increasingly consistent transcendentalism of the 'age to come' it is not surprising that the eschatology associated with the figure of the apocalyptic deliverer often reverts to the more traditional, this-worldly view of the eschatological community. There is no good reason why we should expect the thought of the New Testament writers to be any more consistent.

For these reasons there can be no grounds for approaching the New

Testament material with the pre-supposition that any one strand in the developing and changing concept of the Son of man must be given pre-eminence. The way any one writer understood it through his own particular background and applied it to Jesus need not be the same as any other New Testament writer. If the thought of 1 Enoch cannot be reduced to a single integrated system, the same may well be true of Matthew, Mark, Luke, 'Q', and Paul. Since Jesus is presented to us through the understanding of others, and since all men interpret what they hear in terms of their own understanding of the words used - an understanding which is largely shaped by the background traditions - it is only to be expected if we shall find that the Son of man theology presented in the New Testament cannot be reduced to a neat single-minded system.

The most that we can expect to find is that if Jesus did in fact use the title 'Son of man' his teaching has coloured and shaped the thinking of his interpreters to us as much as, if not more than, their own thinking has interpreted what they heard from him. But it would be strange indeed if the work of the Son of man and its result were not thought of in terms of the creation of the community of the Son of man.

B. NEW TESTAMENT.

(a) Method of Study

Since the chief purpose of this chapter is to take us further along the road in discovering the theological setting of the sacraments in the Church's understanding of herself in the New Testament, what will concern us chiefly is how the early Church's presentation of Jesus as the Son of man bears on the doctrine of the Church.

In our study of the Jewish background to the Son of man in the New Testament we have seen how the teaching of the defeat of Satan plays a prominent role. Because there is a conflation in late Judaism of the figures of the Son of man and the Messiah it is not always possible to treat them independently. Consequently we have chosen to deal with the concept of the defeat of Satan in our study of the Messiah. This has been done mainly for the sake of convenience.

We shall confine our attention in this chapter to passages where the title is specifically used or where the concept of the Son of man appears to lie behind the teaching. But we have seen that it is to be expected that the New Testament writers will use the concept in differing ways which cannot be reduced to one single meaning. Acting on this assumption we shall deal with each New Testament author separately to gain an understanding of how each viewed the work of Jesus as the Son of man.

Our aim will not be to get behind the New Testament faith to the words of Jesus, so we shall concern ourselves with the question of authenticity only when this is an important basis for interpretation.

(b) The Son of man in Mark

(i) Mark 2.10

But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority ($\xi\lambda\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$)
on earth to forgive sins, he saith to the sick of the palsy.....
cf Matt. 9.6; Lk. 5.24.

From the welter of learned writing on Mk. 2.1-12 one conclusion is reached by most; that the section is a compilation of two distinct pre-Markan sources, consisting of vv 1-4, 10b-12 (the story of the healing of the paralytic let through the roof by his four friends) and vv 5-10a (the conflict about

1. 'forgiving sins'). Less unanimous is the conclusion that the account is
 2. historical. The majority opinion appears to be that the debate about forgiveness is an expansion of an original healing miracle, reflecting a controversy between the early Church and the Jewish authorities. In this saying it is held that the Christian leaders expressed their belief about the authority given to Jesus and
 3. sought to justify their own claim to forgive sins in the name of their master.

If those who contend that this saying is a product of Gemeindetheologie
 4. are correct, and if the words 'Son of man' were intended to convey the eschatological title and are not a mistranslation of something else,^{5.} then the first important

1. cf R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, pp.14-16. In support he cites Wrede, Völter, Fridrichsen, Loisy, and Klöstermann. Also V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, pp 191f; A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1940, ad. loc.; M.D. Hooker, Son of man, 1967, pp. 86ff. M. Dibelius, Tradition, 1934, pp. 66f.
 The chief grounds for this are (i) the vividness of 3-5a and 11f in contrast to the conflict section 5b-10a; (ii) The phrase 'he saith to the paralytic' in 5a and 10b have the appearance of editorial links; (iii) The sudden introduction of the scribes in v.6 who most certainly would not have been among the 'all' who rejoice in v.12; (iv) Although 5b-10a would lack an introduction if 3 and 4 are not the original introduction, it has a strong resemblance to the pronouncement stories in Mk. 2.16f, 18-20; 23-26; 3.1-6.
2. Among the scholars who accept the historicity of the saying as given in Mark are V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, 82ff; B.H. Branscomb, Mark, 1937, 44f.
3. e.g. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, 14-16; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, 126-130; E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, ad. loc; A. Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptiques Vol 1, 1907, 470-481; C.J. Cadoux, The Historical Mission of Jesus, 1941, p.75; J. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, 40ff; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, 26-28; M. Dibelius, Tradition, 1934, 66f.
4. V. Taylor's argument against such a conclusion is most odd (Mark, 1955, 192). He agrees that the problem for the primitive Church is to establish grounds for the practice of forgiving sins, but says 'It seems reasonable to suggest that historical testimony would be preferred to creative invention at a time when eye-witnesses still lived'. On his own admission, however, eye-witnesses would have known that this saying about the authority of the Son of man did not belong in this context. If it were historical it is hard to understand how it is not mentioned among the charges brought against Jesus by the Jews at his trial. This saying looks like a later and more precise form of the commission to 'bind and loose' made to Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 17.19), which is omitted in Mark. In the commission at Caesarea Philippi and in Jn.20.23, which we have suggested may well be historical (cf above 134ff), it is noteworthy that it is not claimed that Jesus has the right to forgive sins. This is the gift of the ascended Lord to his Church, and belongs to the fulfilment of his work - or rather is the work of the ascended Lord in and through his Church which is born out of his finished work. Thus the Church 'binds' and 'Loosens' because it was so commissioned, but she does so because by his ascension Jesus has entered into his 'glory' and 'dominion', a dominion which she shares with him by her obedient response to his presence. On this interpretation Miss Hooker's argument (Son of man, 1967, 82, cf. also B.H. Branscomb, Mark, 1937, 44f) that the Church would not have claimed for herself what Jesus had not claimed for himself is invalid, we have here what appears to be a reading back into his earthly life what belonged to the completed work of Jesus. Matthew's conclusion to our story: 'They glorified God who had given such authority to men' offers strong support to this interpretation.
5. Many hold that Jesus was thinking of man in general. Cf E. Klostermann, Markus-evangelium, 1926, 27; Jackson & Lake, Vol. 1, 1920, p.379; B.H. Branscomb, Mark, 1937, 43f. That man in general has the authority to forgive sins would have been impossible both in Judaism, as v.7 shows, and in Christianity. Another possibility is that Jesus was referring to himself, without claiming any eschatological title, using the indeterminate bar nash = כִּי = 'a certain man', 'one', 'I who speak'. Cf R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, 15f. But against this and, in my opinion, decisively cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, 127. The majority opinion is that this is intended to be a title used to express the full authority of Jesus. Cf. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, 15ff; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, 127; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, 26ff.

conclusion we can draw is that the 'Son of man' is linked with the community: the authority of Jesus the Son of man is extended to his followers.

The problem remains, however, why the community or Mark chose the title Son of man to express the idea of his authority to forgive sins. We have^{1.} already seen that we have here a reading back into the earthly life of Jesus what is seen in other parts of the New Testament to belong to his ascension, whereby he enters into his dominion and, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit creates the community which shares his authority. It is probably this concept^{2.} of the ascension, seen by Mark to be the fulfilment of Daniel 7, which has attracted the title Son of man to this teaching about the 'authority' of Jesus to forgive sins.

Such an interpretation would account for what has been noted by so many scholars that there is not the slightest evidence in Judaism that the Son of man or the Messiah was ever thought of as forgiving sins. It is not the forgiveness of sins which has attracted the title, but rather the thought of the ascension and the $\xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ ^{3.} coupled with it, for it is precisely this 'dominion and glory and rule' which the Son of man receives from the Ancient of Days when he comes to Him with the clouds in Daniel 7. In Daniel the exaltation of the Son of man is the exaltation of the 'Saints of the Most High'. But in the New Testament it is through the exaltation of Jesus^{and his} presence with the new community through the Spirit that the commission of Jesus to his disciples to 'bind' and 'loosen' is fulfilled. Despite this, the ideas are so closely parallel that the title 'Son of man' is most natural in this context.

According to our text the sphere of this $\xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ is $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ τῆς γῆς^{4.} That $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ τῆς γῆς qualifies $\xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ and not $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ should be obvious since sins are committed on earth and not in heaven. But these words also contain some form of contrast, and the contrast is surely with the authority^{5.} of the Son of man in heaven. Miss Hooker notes that according to Daniel it is

1. cf above p.219 n 4.

2. cf below pp.242 , 252 for the use of the imagery derived from Daniel in Mark.

3. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p.15f; H.E. Tuck Son of Man, 1965, p.127 and M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp. 82ff, among others, note that it is the $\xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ of Jesus that is the subject of discussion.

4. There is some uncertainty about the position of these words in the Markan text. In some manuscripts they appear before the words $\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (as in Mt. and Lk.), or between them $\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ τῆς γῆς $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$, or they are omitted altogether. This uncertainty could be taken as evidence that the words are a later addition, reflecting the extension of the $\xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ from heaven to earth.

5. M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp.90f.

precisely on earth that the Son of man exercises his dominion. Her argument that this constitutes grounds for attributing the saying to Jesus fails to take note of the fact that it is only after the exaltation of the Son of man, according to Daniel, that he does exercise this authority. This dominion over the earth may be his right, but the exercise of this right is subsequent to his enthronement before the Ancient of Days. This suggests, therefore, that the contrast is intended to be between the heavenly and earthly authority of the Son of man. From this it does not follow that Mark believed in the heavenly pre-existence of the Son of man coming to earth to exercise authority. Of this, as we shall see, there is no hint in Mark.

This helps us to extend our first conclusion that the community is linked with the Son of man whose authority is extended to them. They have this authority through the exaltation of Jesus the Son of man, but who is present with them ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς sharing with them his gift of dominion.

What the phrase ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας means is not immediately clear. In its context it is closely parallel to, if not identified with, the act of healing. Loisy rightly warns against supplying modern psychological details to the story to explain it. However helpful these might be for us they do not help to understand the concepts with which Mark is working. It is sufficient to note that popular opinion at that time did consider misfortune to be evidence of sin. The sacrificial system in Judaism was not primarily to deal with sin; rather it was to remove the taboos and bans from the sinner (whose sin was manifested in social or physical disorders) after the signs had disappeared. The person who was now no longer under the rod of God was restored to the community in fellowship with God. The forgiveness of sins entailed this restoration to physical and social 'wholeness'.

When Jesus is said to identify the forgiveness of sins and the restoration of the paralytic to full health these same conceptions seem to underlie the thought of Mark whether or not Jesus himself saw the relationship in the same way.

What Mark sees this ἐξουσία to be, then, is the lordship of Jesus over all creation but, at this point at any rate, it is a lordship which issues

1. A. Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, Vol. 1, 1907, 475ff.

2. A remark in the Talmud, 'No one gets up from his sick-bed until all his sins are forgiven' (B. Ned. 41a) is relevant here as an indication of Jewish teaching on this subject.

3. Cf above p. 28f.

in restoration rather than destruction - a restoration to community both with man and with God.

(ii) Mark 2.28

So the Son of man is lord even of the Sabbath.
Cf Mt. 12.8; Lk. 6.5

This verse presents us with two important textual problems which help us to interpret it. The first is whether vv. 27 and 28 are an integral part of the preceding conflict story about the disciples plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath. On this commentators are virtually unanimous that the typical and, in this context, redundant connecting formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* 'shows clearly^{1.} that the saying which was originally isolated has been added in Mk. 2.27f'. The second is whether vv. 27 and 28 were originally intended as a unit. 'It seems best to conclude that Mark found 27 (the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath) supplemented by a Christian comment expressing the conviction that Jesus is lord of all ~~that~~^{2.} belongs to man, including the Sabbath'^{3.} is the virtually unanimous conclusion of modern commentators.

If we accept these textual conclusions then the question remains what is the use that the early Church is making of the Son of man concept in this particular setting; i.e. why have they added this teaching about the Son of man to the story of the Sabbath controversy, and what is the significance of the inclusion of v. 27 in the non-Western texts?

Taylor is undoubtedly correct in saying that this story was preserved in the early Christian community because it dealt with the burning issue of the^{4.} Sabbath. From an early date the first day of the week was observed in the^{5.} Christian community, and for this reason it is natural that the conflict stories on the question of Sabbath observance were remembered and told. As in Mk.2.10 it appears that it is the practice of the early Church which occasions the saying, and as in Mk. 2.10 the justification of the practice is found in the

1. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, 14ff. Cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, 218 and the list of authorities he cites in support; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, 130; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, 28f; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, 97f.
2. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, 220 and the authorities he cites in support; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, 130f; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, 28f. Against this conclusion of M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, 94ff.
3. The chief grounds for this conclusion are (i) the omission of v.27 in Matthew and Luke; (ii) and from the Western family of texts (cf E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, 65 n.4 and V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, 218).
4. ibid, p.214; and The Names of Jesus, 1954, 28
5. cf. Rev. 1.10; Ignatius Ad Magn, 9.1; The Gospel of Peter 9; Didache 14.1.

1. lordship of Jesus; the Son of man is lord of the Sabbath'

2. The consistency of the argument in Matthew adds weight to the consensus
3. that Mk. 2.27 did not belong together with Mk. 2.28, but this still leaves unanswered the question concerning the belief in the early community that led to its inclusion together with 2.28 in so many manuscripts.

4. A consideration of T.W. Manson's reversal of his earlier position may help to explain why v.27 was included with v.28 as the conclusion to the conflict story. He argues that 'man' in v.27 is a misunderstanding for 'Son of man'. In support he notes that the Sabbath was made not for 'man' but for Israel, and, according to Daniel 7 it is Israel who is given the title 'Son of man'. Thus Manson suggests that these verses are a Christian re-interpretation of this Jewish teaching. It is for the Son of man, i.e. Jesus and his disciples, that the Sabbath was made, so it is the Son of man, i.e. Jesus and his disciples, who is lord of the Sabbath.

Because it is unlikely that vv. 27 and 28 originally belonged together as a unit this interpretation is not completely satisfactory, but it is surely some such thought as this that has led to the inclusion of 27 with 28. By his ascension Jesus, the Son of man, has received lordship over all creation, including the Sabbath. By this the community of the Son of man shares his ἐξουσία. In the

1. A comparison with the parallel section in Matthew supports this conclusion. To the justification by referring to David's behaviour Matthew adds a further justification (Mt.12.5); the priests in the Temple must actually profane the Sabbath in order to carry out Temple rituals. The conclusion is 'But I tell you, here is more than the Temple' (Mt.12.6). According to Mt.12.41 it is Jesus himself who is more than the Temple. The argument of vv. 3-7 is that it is the Law itself which is a witness for Jesus. Accordingly v.8 states that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. (So G. Bornkamm, End-Expectation and Church in Matthew, in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H.J. Held, 1963, 15ff.) Thus it is by no means intended to proclaim that 'man', i.e. the disciples, is lord over the Sabbath (cf W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, 116). Their behaviour is traced back to the behaviour of Jesus. In this Mk.2.28 fully agrees with Mk. 2.10. Since we saw that Mk.2.10 is probably a reading back into the earthly life of Jesus what belonged more properly to the ascension, and through the ascension to the community, this is probably also to be understood here.
2. cf above n.1.
3. cf above p.222 nn.2 and 3.
4. T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, 214. Here he holds that the 'Son of man' in v.28 is a mistranslation of an original Aramaic phrase meaning 'man', and thus is a logical continuation of v.27. His later view, presented in 'Mark ii.27f' in Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen, 1947, 138-146, is that 'man' in v.27 is a misunderstanding for 'Son of man' in v.28.
5. cf ibid., and support of this view M.D. Hooker, Son of man, 1967, 95f. Miss Hooker presents argument to show that the Sabbath was associated with the theme of eschatological restoration. Her own argument concerning the importance of ideas derived from Daniel 7 in Mark should show that this restoration to lordship over creation followed the translation enthronement of the Son of man. While he certainly exercised this authority 'on earth' it is a post- and not a pre-ascension lordship. Thus her argument would support the conclusion that we have here a reading back into the life of Jesus what was believed by the Church to be his present lordship over all things.

situation of the early Church this means an authority to break the Sabbath laws¹ and keep the 'day of the Lord', which is the day of the resurrection.

Here, as in Mk. 2.10, while the community is not thought of as a community with the Son of man in heaven, the community is seen in the closest possible relation to the Son of man.

(iii) Mark 8.31

And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.

Cf. Mt. 16.21. Lk. 9.22

In Mark 2.10 and 2.28 interpretation is closely coupled with settling the question of authenticity. Before deciding whether it is necessary to turn to the vexed question of the authenticity of Mk. 8.31 we shall attempt to see what role this verse played in Mark's developing narrative.

While Mark 2.10 and 2.28 may be a reading back into the earthly ministry of Jesus an authority which was held to belong to his ascension, in their present form and position in the Gospel they do stress that Jesus is the one to whom God has given the authority and lordship of the Son of man, and that this authority belonged to him in his earthly life. It is this legitimate authority of Jesus which is rejected by the religious leaders at the conclusion of the conflict stories;

And the Pharisees went out and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him. (2)

According to Mark's scheme it was immediately after his rejection by the authorities that Jesus 'withdrew with his disciples'³ and 'appointed twelve, that they might be with him and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils'⁴. It is with this theme that Mark is concerned in the intervening Chapters, and carries over the theme of the disciples sharing in the ἐξουσία of their master. This topical layout of the material has helped to obscure the relationship between the conflict-stories in Mk. 2 1-3.6 and the narrative of Caesarea Philippi. The return of the use of the title 'Son of man', however, at Caesarea Philippi, which is the climax of the Gospel before the Passion story, clearly indicates the link between the events at

-
1. However we interpret Mk. 2.27 as an isolated unit, in its context and situation this seems to be the most natural interpretation of the faith of the early Christian community which it reflects.
 2. Mk. 3.6
 3. Mk. 3.7
 4. Mk. 3.14f.

1.
Caesarea Philippi and Mk. 3.6.

The developing theme is therefore, the authority of Jesus, an authority shared by the disciples but totally rejected by the Jewish leaders. According to our analysis of Daniel 7 the suffering of Israel, the Son of man, is a necessary corollary to the rejection of God's gift of authority to Israel.

It is interesting and informative to note that Mark's Jesus makes no reference to his coming sufferings until the disciples, through Peter, acknowledge the authority of Jesus. They acknowledge it in the form of a Messianic declaration which probably had for them all the political overtones of the national conquering hero. But since Messianism at this period was influenced by Son of man concepts so that the two cannot be held in sharp distinction, it is probable that this was also a declaration of faith in the rightful ἐξουσία and lordship of Jesus.

It is the recognition of this authority of Jesus by the disciples that evokes the teaching that the Son of man must (δέι) suffer many things and be rejected by the Jewish leaders (a rejection which has already taken place) and be killed and rise again. If we are correct in seeing that the authority of Jesus is coupled with the term 'Son of man' and that rejection of that authority inevitably issues in suffering, then the use of the term 'Son of man' is wholly apposite. This is particularly so since the transfiguration narrative which immediately follows pre-figures the glorious issue of the suffering in the ascension and parousia.

It is highly significant that this theme of the authority of Jesus, which is rejected and so leads to suffering but which issues in the final glorious enthronement of Jesus, is closely paralleled with the authority of the disciples which is rejected and which calls forth from Jesus a prediction of their suffering; 'If any man would come after me let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it'. But this suffering also will issue in their sharing in the final victory of the Son of man.

-
1. I am indebted to M.D. Hooker, Son of man, 1967, 109ff, for this interpretation.
 2. Cf above p.183f. Mark's use of Dan. 7 in Mk. 13.26 and 14.62 shows that he was familiar with Daniel 7, and thus makes this reference to Daniel legitimate.
 3. Mk. 3.6
 4. on the necessity of taking the transfiguration story together with the narrative of Caesarea Philippi of above p. 39ff, 128 ff.
 5. Cf above p. 39ff, 128ff for the interpretation of the transfiguration narrative as a prefiguration of the ascension especially in Luke and Mark. Cf also our discussion below on Mk. 13.26.
 6. Mk. 3.15
 7. cf our discussion above on Mk. 2.10,28.
 8. Mk. 8.34f.
 9. Mk. 8.38. On this see below pp.226ff.

The picture of the Son of man is of the one who has the gift of authority in which gift the disciples share. It is the rejection of this authority that will bring suffering to both Jesus and his disciples. The outcome is, however, certain. They shall share his glory if they are never 'ashamed' of him in their discipleship.

Whether this faith is to be attributed to the early Church or to Jesus^{1.} is a question on which scholars are sharply divided. Even the most conservative scholars are agreed that Mk. 8.31 reflects the influence of the passion and resurrection stories in its detailed reference to the 'elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes' and the dating of the rising again 'after three days'. On the question whether Jesus could have predicted his passion Dodd is surely correct when he writes; 'It needed not supernatural prescience, but the ordinary insight of an intelligent person, to see whither things were tending, at least during the latter stages of the ministry'.^{2.} But whether Jesus himself used the term 'Son of man' to refer to his suffering is difficult to say. It is possible that Jesus did use some other term.^{3.} If so, then the theme of the authority of Jesus which Mark links with the Son of man has led him to include it here.

The use of the title 'Son of man' in Mk. 8.31, coupled with the teaching on his suffering and the conditions of discipleship, may reflect the belief of the early Church which knew her existence to be born out of the work of Jesus, her authority to be dependent on his, and her destiny to be inextricably bound up with him.^{4.} In this faith the strong community connotations of the title 'Son of man' are evident.

(iv) Mark 8.38

For whosoever 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.

Cf Mt. 16.27; Lk. 9.26.

This saying is reproduced substantially by Luke. The Matthaean parallel

-
1. Those who attribute it to the early Church, M. Dibelius, *Tradition*, 1934, 115; R. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 1963, 277ff; H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, 141ff; A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, 31ff. Those who attribute it to Jesus, V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, 374; M.D. Hooker, *Son of Man*, 1967, 103ff; E. Schweizer, *The Son of Man*, JBL, Vol. 79, 1960.
 2. C.H. Dodd, *Parables*, 1956, 57.
 3. cf A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, 32.
 4. That the teaching on the conditions of discipleship was probably originally an isolated unit is seen in the unexpected introduction of the 'multitude' into the scene at Caesarea Philippi in Mk. 8.34; 'And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples'. This looks like a connecting clause for an originally isolated saying (so V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, ad loc. and the supporting authorities he cites). If this is so then Mark's faith that Jesus is the Son of man has led him to include a saying about the conditions of discipleship which parallel the lot of Jesus himself. This confirms the conclusion that faith in Jesus as the authoritative Son of man entails the Church's self-understanding that she is the authority-endowed community of the Son of man, born out of his suffering and exaltation to share in his suffering and glory.

is not nearly so close. The changes in Matthew appear to be the evangelist's
1.
heightening of the apocalyptic allusions in Mark.

But this saying appears also in a slightly modified form in Q (Lk. 12.8f and Mt. 10.32f). Lk. 12.8f reads:

Everyone who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man confess before the angels of God:
But he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God.

Matthew 10.32f reads:

Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my father which is in heaven.
But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.

The use of 'Son of man' in both Luke and Mark against 'I' in Matthew, and the
2.
reference to 'angels' in Luke and Mark, omitted in Matthew, indicates that the Markan and Lukan form is more original.

A comparison of the Markan and Q saying makes it at once apparent that Mark 8.38 has preserved only the negative aspect of the Q saying, possibly because the positive element has already been supplied in the saying in Mk. 8.35; 'whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it'. Secondly, in the Q saying it is the attachment to the person of Jesus himself which ensures being acknowledged as a member of the community of the Son of man. Mark adds 'and of my words'. Tödt claims that this is a reference to the post-Easter situation, and is therefore not
3.
original. Manson, noting that certain manuscripts omit *λόγους*, favours the inter-
4.
pretation 'and mine', i.e. my followers. Whichever interpretation is favoured, it appears certain that these words have been added by Mark, and at least some manuscripts understand that not only a rejection of Jesus but also of his followers will result in condemnation. Thirdly, Mark expands the simple Lucan form of denying Jesus 'in the presence of men' to 'in this adulterous and sinful generation'. As Tödt rightly remarks, 'this basically expresses the same thing... The tension exists between belonging to Jesus and belonging to this generation. Prerequisite

1. Cf V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, pp.382ff.

2. The originality of the reference to the angels is supported by Rev. 3.5; 'And I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels', but it reflects also the clear Matthaean conviction that Jesus is the Son of man. 2 Tim. 2.12 is another form of the Q saying; 'If we endure we shall also reign with him: if we shall deny him, he also will deny us'.

3. H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p.45.

4. T.W. Manson, *Sayings*, 1957, p.109. So also C.H. Turner, *JTS*, Vol. 29, 1928; A.T. Cadoux, *The Sources of the Second Gospel*, 1935, p.78. For details of manuscripts which omit *λόγους* cf V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, ad loc.

for the tension is that Jesus and the sinful generation are separated from each other. "Confessing" the one side actually involves renouncing the other side. Fourthly, The Q saying has nothing apocalyptic about it. For this reason it is commonly taken that the second part of Mark 8.38 is a secondary version of Q. The parallel in Luke 9.26 plays down the apocalyptic, and certainly the parousia implications, by having Jesus come 'in his glory, and of the Father, and of the holy angels'. The meaning in Luke 9.26 is different from the Q saying in Luke 12.8. In 12.8, it appears that the angels are part of the heavenly court before whom the Son of man acts as guarantor for those who confess Jesus or a periphrasis for God. In Luke 9.26 the Son of man is said to have the $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ of his Father and the angels. But in Mark we are told that the angels come with him. Here the reference to Dan. 7.13f or to the apocalyptic tradition is obvious, and possibly expresses the parousia expectations of the early Church.

It is possible that a non-parousia interpretation ought to be given to this angel entourage. It may refer to the Son of man taking up his place in the presence of God, as in Daniel 7. This would be supported by Luke's reproduction of the essentials of Mark 8.38, for Luke has no pre-dilection for parousia ideas, as his omission in 22.69 of the second part of Mark 14.62 clearly shows. Undoubtedly the concept of the parousia is present in Mark. Probably both the concepts of the heavenly enthronement = the ascension, and the parousia are to be seen in this saying, and Luke has interpreted it in its ascension sense but Matthew as a reference to the parousia.

Whether Mark has preserved in this saying an original distinction in the teaching of Jesus between himself and the Son of man, is really rather irrelevant for our purposes. No reader of the Gospel of Mark would be in any doubt that Mark understood that Jesus is the Son of man. Thus what we learn from this section on the conditions of discipleship is that Jesus is making an absolute claim on his followers, a claim which overrules every claim of this evil generation. To be a disciple means to give allegiance to Jesus openly, even if this entails the

-
1. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 43.
 2. e.g. T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, pp.74f; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.384; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.59.
 3. so H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.44
 4. so A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.59. G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, 1909, pp.209f.
 5. cf 1 Thess. 4.15-17; 2 Thess. 1.7.
 6. As e.g. R. Bultmann, Theology, 1952, Vol. 1 pp. 28-30; J. Knox, The Death of Christ, 1959, pp. 93-97; G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, 1960, pp.175-178, 228-231; B.H. Branscomb, Mark, 1937 pp. 146-149; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp. 57-60; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.40f.

disciple losing his life. It is precisely this allegiance which will bring 'life' when the Son of man comes in his glory. Thus in this saying, whether expressed negatively or positively, we are concerned with a statement primarily soteriological: a break in the unswerving allegiance to Jesus, no matter how great the odds, will be followed by the loss of a place in the community of the Son of man. Clearly here allegiance to Jesus has taken the place of allegiance to the Law which so predominates 2 Esdras and 2 Baruch. Even if we accept that in the original words of Jesus he was referring to the Son of man as a figure other than himself, and that Mark is referring to the parousia, the concept of salvation belongs to the community. Jesus creates the community on earth who will finally be brought to their rightful glory by the Son of man. What marks men out for this inheritance is their allegiance to Jesus. For Mark the reason is obvious: Jesus himself is the Son of man. He will recognise those who are truly his.

To what we have already learned; that the disciples share in the ἐξουσία of Jesus the Son of man, and in his suffering, is now added the idea that their 'hope' of final deliverance from their suffering is inextricably bound up with him. Allegiance to him will mean sharing with him in his exaltation and kingdom. The Son of man may here be a more individual figure than in Daniel 7, but built into it is the concept of the community created by the life and teaching of Jesus. It is those who by their own decision accept the lordship of Jesus, the Son of man, who share his authority and who will share in his final glory.

(v) Mark 9.9 and 9.12

And as they were coming down from the mountain he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen from the dead.

And he said unto them Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how it is written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought. (cf Mt. 17.9, 12.)

These two verses add little to our understanding of the Son of man in Mark, though their setting in both Mark and Matthew add weight to what we have already discovered. They occur in the context of the declaration of the Messiahship of Jesus at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus' teaching about the inevitable suffering of the Son of man, the conditions for discipleship which will enable

1. Luke omits this conversation between Jesus and his disciples after the Transfiguration. This fact, together with the differences we have already noted in his account (cf above pp 41f) may lend weight to the suggestion that Luke is using a different tradition.

the disciples to share in his triumph at his 'coming', and the Transfiguration, which is clearly seen by the evangelist's to be a foretaste of the vindication of Jesus. What they see is the glory which he will wear when he has passed through his suffering. The concept of the Son of man inevitably pushes on beyond suffering to entering into Glory and dominion.

1. 2.
If Ramsey and Boobyer are correct in linking the Transfiguration story with the parousia, then it is significant that the disciples are ordered to keep silent 'until the Son of man is risen from the dead'.^{3.} Miss Hooker suggests that the original tradition may have referred more vaguely to the vindication of Jesus,^{4.} which Mark has interpreted in terms of the resurrection. If so it is strange that the vindication is spoken of in terms of resurrection and not 'coming', whether in ascension or parousia. That he does present the saying in this form strengthens what we said earlier that Mark probably did not draw a sharp distinction between the ascension and the parousia, possibly because like Paul he believed the parousia to be so imminent that he understood them to be part of the same action.

The subsequent questioning of the three disciples among themselves, whether we accept the reading in most manuscripts τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι (what the rising again from the dead should mean (RV) or ὅταν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ^{5.} (the meaning of 'when he shall rise again from the dead') the thought in the minds of the disciples is probably of the Messiah, whose rising again would herald the general resurrection and the entry of the elect into the heavenly kingdom of the Son of man.^{6.} This verse may then preserve a very primitive Christian tradition in which the followers of Jesus are perplexed that the resurrection of Jesus did not include their resurrection. Matthew may have omitted this verse because he was aware of the tradition that the general resurrection would be at the parousia.^{7.}

If this is correct, then the ensuing reference to the Messianic forerunner, Elijah in the disciple's question is most natural. The reply of Jesus is that he has come, and they have 'done unto him whatsoever they listed' (v.13).^{8.} Matthew makes it explicit that the reference is to John the Baptist. The impli-^{9.}

-
1. A.M. Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, 1949, Chs. 10 and 11.
 2. G.H. Boobyer, St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, 1942, p.87, but cf. below pp.241ff.
 3. J. Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus, Göttingen, 1960 in loc. links the Transfiguration with the resurrection.
 4. M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.129
 5. for manuscript evidence cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.394.
 6. cf. 2 Baruch 30.1 (above p.211)
 7. cf 1 Cor. 15.52.
 8. For Elijah as a Messianic forerunner cf above p.84
 9. Matthew 17.13.

ation is that Jesus, who was heralded by John the Baptist, accepts the designation that he is the Messiah. But just as John suffered, so must the Son of man. Again we see the tendency of Mark, (or Jesus?), to use the term Son of man to refer to the messianic authority of Jesus. The parallels of this section with the tacit acceptance of the messianic declaration of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, and the subsequent teaching about the necessary suffering of the Son of man make it probable that the thought here is an echo of what we saw in 8.31, that the suffering of Jesus is the tragic accompaniment of the rejection of his authority. On the other hand the lack of reference to the Jewish authorities and to the death of Jesus may suggest that 8.31 is an expanded form of 9.12. In either event nothing significant is added to what we have already learned.

(vi) Mark 9.31 and 10.33f.

For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again.

Cf Matthew 17.22f; Luke 9.44.

Behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again.

Cf Matthew 20.18f; Luke 18.31ff.

The initial prophecy of the passion found in 8.31 is repeated in slightly different forms in 9.31 and 10.33. All three sayings might be traced to one original, or the threefold prophecy may be the result of different traditions about the words, which according to the evangelists were not understood by the disciples. If this is so, then the lack of detail in 9.31 commends it for consideration as the more original form. The Lukan form preserves only the idea of being 'delivered into the hands of men', which E. Schweizer holds to have been the most primitive tradition.

What is most interesting is that both Mark and Luke follow the prediction in 9.31 with the discussion among the disciples who would be the greatest. (Matthew inserts the debate about the half-shekel), and Matthew follows Mark in placing the request of James and John for positions on the right and left hand of Jesus in his glory (Mark) and kingdom (Matthew) after the second passion prediction (Luke omits this story, probably because he saw apocalyptic details here which are not so obvious in Mk. 9.33ff). Since we cannot rely on the connexion between the

1. Cf A.T. Cadoux, The Sources of the Second Gospel. 1935, pp.25f, 167-169.

2. E. Schweizer, The Son of Man, JBL, Vol. 79, 1960.

passion predictions and the controversies of the disciples being part of the pre-Markan tradition, it is clear that Mark sees an intimate connexion between the entry into glory of Jesus and the entry into that same glory of the disciples.

Mark 9.31 is followed by reference to the dispute of the disciples about who was to be the greatest. Jesus then immediately warns the disciples 'If any man would be first, he shall be least of all, and minister of all'. This looks like a variant form of Mark 10.45.

'For the Son of man came not to be served but to serve', which, as we shall see below, states a radically new concept of greatness and what the lordship of the Son of man means. What is significant is that the teaching about discipleship, which follows all three passion predictions, is in precisely the same terms as the teaching about the way of the Son of man.

The prediction in Mark 10.33 leads into a discussion again on the theme of greatness and priority very similar to that which followed the prediction of 9.31. The reference to Jesus being 'in thy glory' certainly conveys a more transcendental image than the previous discussion, but it also clearly enunciates that Jesus does not enter his glory alone but together with his followers. In reply to their request Jesus says,

'Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?' (3)

In its context this saying probably means, in its simplest interpretation,

'Are you able to suffer and die for my sake'.

This is the theme of the whole passage. Matthew and Luke both follow Mark in prefixing this section with the encounter of the rich man with Jesus and the ensuing conversation between Jesus and his disciples. The rich man, though anxious to inherit eternal life, is unwilling to pay the price of selling everything to follow Jesus. The disciples, on the other hand, have left everything and followed him. They will receive the eternal life; 'many that are first will be last, and the last first.' They are promised also a hundred-fold return on what they have left - "with persecutions", an ominous reminder of what their absolute allegiance to Jesus will mean.

-
1. For the arguments against the unity of both passages cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad loc.
 2. The relevance of vv. 36-37, about setting a child in the midst, and saying that to receive a child is to receive Jesus himself, and to receive Jesus is to receive God who sent him, is not immediately apparent.
 3. Mark 10.38. cf also above pp. 43-45
 4. Matthew inserts here the story of the labourers in the vineyard, Mt.20.1-15, which he considers an illustration of the point about the first and last - a point which he repeats at the end of the parable, in v. 16.

Mark continues,

'And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid'. (1)

2.

E. Schweizer is certainly right in seeing in this more than a description of how the company were organised in their walk to the capital. Jesus is going before his disciples on a road which will bring him to suffering and death, and those who follow may expect the same fate. Miss Hooker surmises that this may explain why the subject of ἔθαμβοῦντο is indefinite, while it is οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες who ἐφοβοῦντο. This fear is given point when Jesus, who has already warned them of persecutions, predicts the suffering, death, and rising again of the Son of man. When Mark follows this prediction of the rising again with the disciples' quarrel about greatness in the coming glory the implication is, as Manson has argued, that the disciples thought that they would share with him both in his suffering and death in Jerusalem and his entry into glory. For the sake of the glory they are prepared to suffer and die with him; drink his cup and be baptized with his baptism.

Whether Manson is correct in saying that the disciples did not in fact die and rise with him is because they were not found worthy, the reference to drinking the cup and being baptized, with its obvious sacramental overtones looks like the influence of the later sacramental practice of the Church on the text. It is their way of retaining the essentially corporate character of the Son of man and the soteriology associated with it. As we have seen, the theology of Baptism in the New Testament epistles is the disciples' incorporation into the suffering and death of Jesus, and, according to Romans 6.4 and 5 it is also sharing in his rising again from the dead. Baptism is seen as the fulfilment of the redemptive work of Jesus until the parousia. John 6 applies the same concepts to the Eucharist. Both are the means by which the disciples are incorporated into the Son of man, and as such are a closely-knit community.

While the sacramental references betray the lateness of the composition, they show that the thinking of the early Church is of a corporate rather than an individual soteriology. Thus Jesus can go on to say that John and James will indeed share his cup and be baptized with his baptism and be with him in his

1. Mark 10.32.

2. E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, 1960, pp.14-16.

3. T.W. Manson, *Teaching*, 1959, pp.231f.

4. cf above pp. 156ff

5. cf above pp. 107ff

glory, but he is not free to elect his own heavenly cabinet.

When the disciples show jealous anger, Jesus again turns to teaching about the conditions of discipleship. He contrasts the authority exercised by the "great" among the Gentiles with the behaviour he expects from his followers. The contrast is clearly not between the 'authority' of the Gentiles and the lack of authority among the disciples. It is rather in the way in which this authority is exercised. The Gentiles exercise authority by lording it over others, as do the 'beasts' in Daniel 7. The disciples are not simply to replace this kind of lordship with another in which the only difference will be those who exercise the lordship. Rather the greatness and authority of the disciples will be seen in service of others; 'For the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister'¹.

In all of the sayings about the Son of man, which contain references either to his ascension glory and authority or suffering because he is rejected or both, Jesus and his followers are bound inextricably together. What is true of him is true of them. This does not mean that in Mark as in Daniel the 'Son of man' is a community term. It is more truly community-creating. It is Jesus who leads, and from him that they derive their ἐξουσία, it is in his suffering, death, and resurrection that they must participate to share in his glory, the pattern of their discipleship is given in the pattern of his life and the existence² and continuing life of the community is dependent on him.

(vii) Mark 10.45

For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

Matthew 20.28; cf Luke 22.27.

For exegetical purposes it is necessary to treat 10.45a and 10.45b separately. The case for regarding 45b as a Markan addition to the saying about

-
1. Here, as in Matthew 16.17-19, a change in the idea of Jesus as Messiah and Son of man entails a change in the concept of the community created in him cf above pp.148ff
 2. If we are correct in giving a collective interpretation to the term Son of man in Daniel, meaning the righteous within Israel, then that collective term has come to refer in the New Testament to one Israelite only, Jesus. But, it is also clear from the passages we have examined, that after the death, resurrection and ascension, the term is both individualistic and collective. It still refers to Jesus, but also to the community. It is probably true that the community of the ascended Jesus is seen, as in Paul, to be Jesus himself. Consequently the authority of the community is the authority of the ascended Son of man for no radical distinction between Jesus and the Christian community is contemplated. During his earthly ministry the Son of man is an exclusive Christological concept. Of the ^{ascended} Son of man it is inclusive, and in this sense it is a basic soteriological concept. Those 'in him' participate in his triumph and authority.

the Son of man having come to serve and not to be served seems to me to be established beyond reasonable doubt.^{1.}

- The chief grounds for this are twofold:
- (i) In none of the Synoptic Son of man sayings is the implication of 'giving life' (dying?) for the salvation of many expressed. We have the necessity of suffering and death, which is according to Scripture, but nothing more. Thus a new concept is introduced when we read of giving his life as a $\lambdaύτρον$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$. Apart from Mark 10.45 and its parallel in Matthew 20.28 this concept is nowhere associated with the Son of man. It is highly improbable that a connexion as distinct and meaningful as this, if it had come from Jesus or was a part of the early tradition, would have left no impression on the rest of the Son of man sayings.
- (ii) The concept of serving is the logical climax to the development of the preceding verses in both Mark and Luke. The development is of a strict correspondence between the behaviour of the disciples and that of the Son of man. But this correspondence disappears when we come to Mark 10.45b. The view of the New Testament is that Jesus has given his life once for all, and this cannot be repeated. The disciple may give his life in allegiance to Jesus,^{2.} but he does not give it $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$. As Lohse^{2.} has pointed out, the conceptual parallels and yet sharp linguistic differences between Mark 10.42-45a and Luke 22.24-27 indicate not a dependence of either on the other but independent traditions springing from a common source. This material obviously contained the theme of strict correspondence which is common to both texts but which could not have included the $\lambdaύτρον$ saying which Luke,^{3.} being faithful to his source, omits.

Mark 10.45a introduces a radically new concept into the teaching about how the Son of man exercises his authority. This is demonstrated by the use of $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\dots \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ ^{4.} which, as Barrett has shown, brings out a contrast between what might be expected of the Son of man and of Jesus' concept of his work. The expectation in Daniel and Enoch points in exactly the opposite direction, the Son of man would in fact come to be served.

And to him was given dominion
and glory and kingdom,
that all peoples, nations and languages
should serve him. (5)

But Mark 10.45a stands not only in sharp contrast to expectations derived from the Old Testament and apocalyptic speculations, it contrasts also with

1. Cf for example H.E. Tödt, Son of Man 1965, pp. 206 ff.

2. E. Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, 1955, p. 118.

3. Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 207.

4. C.K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10.45" in New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, 1959, p. 9.

5. Dan. 7.14, cf 1 En. 48.5; 62.9

what we have already learned in Mark, where the rejected authority of the Son of man issues in suffering and death, a suffering and death to which the followers of Jesus will also be exposed. But this suffering is not seen to be his mission. The Q saying in Matthew 8.20 and parallel speaks of the humbleness of the Son of man, who is without a home. He is denied what is given to the animals. But this is precisely because his authority is rejected; this generation refuses to take him in. This is again not seen to be the mission of the Son of man, but a humiliation which is imposed on him, a tragic consequence of his being rejected.

Against this background of the sovereignty of the Son of man, the saying about service stands out in sharp contrast. Yet the sovereignty is inherent in this Son of man saying, even in its 'I' form in Luke 22.27. Not only does he reverse the expectations about the exercise of his authority, he makes the same claim on his disciples. They are to serve precisely because he is the one who is among them whose sovereign mission it is to serve. They are not merely summoned to follow an example. The behaviour of Jesus, or the Son of man, provides the authoritative basis for this reversal of expectations. Yet, according to Matthew and Luke, this reversal is temporary; the disciples will yet sit on thrones^{1.} judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

It is probably the concept of 'to serve' which has attracted 'and to give his life as a $\lambdaύτρον \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\upsilon$ ' to this saying. As Beyer notes, in the New Testament $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ primarily means "to wait at table"^{2.} It is noteworthy that Luke, in contrast to Mark, incorporates the saying about serving into the conversation at table during the Last Supper.^{3.} This was surely not chance. The situation at the table is incorporated into the saying about serving in Luke 22.27, "For who is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is it not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth"^{4.} This is picked up again in Luke 22.30a where Jesus promises the disciples to share in his kingdom 'that ye may eat and drink at my table', an idea which probably reflects the same tradition as in 1 Enoch 62.14.

1. Matthew 19.28, Luke 22.30.

2. Beyer in TWNT, Vol. 2, p.83 lines 34f.

3. cf M. Dibelius, Tradition, 1924, pp.200f; K.G. Kuhn, 'Die Abendmahlsworte' in Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1950, col. 399f.

4. R. Bultmann, Johannes, 1950, p.352. n2 argues that 'the saying of the Lord in Luke 22.27 or a variant of it 'underlies the narrative of the foot-washing in John 13.1-30, which forms a part of the account of Jesus' last meal with his disciples.'

This evidence indicates that the original tradition of the saying about 'serving' was in the context of the Last Supper. It is not surprising therefore to find in Mark 10.45b a saying which is closely parallel to his saying in Mark 14.24 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ πολλῶν' which is set in the context of the Last Supper. This parallel with 14.24 makes it unlikely that the $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\nu$ saying is a secondary reflection on the saying about ^{1.} serving. It is more probably an incorporation of the Eucharistic saying into Mark 10.45a.

Our interpretation of this saying is to some extent dependent on whether the background is Isaiah 53. This association with Isaiah 53 is contested by ^{2.} C.K. Barrett and ^{3.} Miss Hooker among others. This argument is based on the fact 'asham in Is. 53.10 is nowhere translated in the LXX as $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\nu$. Against this it has been convincingly argued that Mark 10.42-45 reflects a Palestinian tradition and relies upon the Hebrew Scriptures and not the ^{4.} LXX. Miss Hooker's argument against the background of Isaiah 53 is that Son of man's giving of his life $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ πολλῶν is achieved through his exaltation and glorification, an idea which she sees associated with the Son of man but not the Servant. But it is precisely this idea which we have seen associated with the Servant both in Isaiah and the New Testament.

If we are correct in seeing the incorporation of Mark 10.45b from 14.24b both through the word $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and the association of the original tradition with the Last Supper, then this may throw some light on the interpretation of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\nu$ $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ πολλῶν.

At the Last Supper Mark tells us that 'he gave (the cup) to them' ($\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ αὐτοῖς) and said 'This is my blood' ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου). In Mark 10.45b we are told that the mission of the Son of man is $\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. It is a commonplace in interpretation of 'blood' to note its association with 'life' in Hebrew thinking. The use of 'give' in both contexts re-inforces this parallel, together with the oddly poetic phrase 'to give his life' rather than the simpler 'to die'.

Both the references to 'blood' and to 'giving his life' carry at least a reference to the death of Jesus. But both also have a deeper connotation,

1. J. Jeremias, *Das Lösegeld für Viele* (Mk. 10.45), *Judaica* 3, 1947, p.262.
2. C.K. Barrett, *The Background of Mark 10.45*, *New Testament Essays*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, 1959, 85ff.
3. M.D. Hooker, *Jesus the Servant*, 1959, pp.74-79; and *Son of Man*, 1967, pp.144f.
4. cf J. Jeremias, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in *TWNT* Vol. V pp.663ff; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, *FRL*, Vol. 64, 1963, pp.117ff; H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, pp. 203ff and above pp.53ff

pointing beyond death to the present risen 'life' in glory of the Son of man. It is this complex of suffering, death, and vindication which is ἀντὶ πολλῶν and clearly means, as in Isaiah 53, that he creates the community which will share in God's glorious vindication of him. As we saw in our examination of Isaiah 53,^{1.} it is the Servant himself who is the ʿasham, i.e. the one who is the true Israel into which the 'we' of the poem are to be incorporated. The same idea is present here. Jesus himself, in giving his life is the one into whom the 'many' are to be incorporated and, granting the eucharistic setting of these words, to be incorporated through their eucharistic participation.

At a second level of interpretation Mark's addition of 10.45b may not be so far distant from the thought in Luke 22.30 'That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom'. Luke's thought may here be transcendental, but Mark's is the sacramental foretaste of it. He gives himself in the Eucharist where the disciples now eat and drink with him at his table in his kingdom.

It is both the suffering, death, and vindication of Jesus and the giving of himself to the disciples as they share with him at his Eucharistic table which is the λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, or the means by which the Son of man will come to have a collective reference.

2.
Miss Hooker is undoubtedly correct in seeing that the word λύτρον and its cognate verb λυτρόω are used in the LXX of God's acts of deliverance which freed his people both at the Exodus and at the long-awaited return from exile;^{3.} events which also established Israel, the people of God. It may well be Mark's familiarity with this which led him to translate ʿasham as λύτρον. If this is so then λύτρον carries ideas both of deliverance and creation of the people of God.^{4.}

In its context in Mark this deliverance is from 'bondage' to this generation by allegiance to Jesus who has authority over it, and from 'lording it over others' because Jesus, by his authority as the Son of man, has changed their expectation of what their dominion will mean by his coming to serve. The creation of the new people of God by his passion and glorification, in which glorification they share in the feast of the kingdom, even if this is only an anticipation of the glorious eschatological feast with Jesus. This creative deliverance ἀντὶ πολλῶν which is via the Cross, resurrection, and ascension is continued in the ^{friendship} meal with Jesus the Son of man.

1. cf above pp. 25ff

2. M. D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p. 144.

4. e.g. Isa. 52.3; 62.12; Mic. 4.10; Jer. 15.21; 38.11.

3. e.g. Ex. 6.6; 15.16; Deut. 7.8; 9.26; Isa. 43.1; Mic. 6.4.

But who are the 'many'? In 10.45a no limits are set for whom the Son of man serves, just as in the background expectations no limits are set for who will serve the Son of man. Clearly the service of both the Son of man and his disciples is the service of all men. Since 10.45b belongs to a different strand of tradition, with a different background of thought, we cannot assume that $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ should be interpreted in the same universalistic way to mean 'all men'.

In Isaiah 53.11b f.

My servant will stand forth as righteous before the many,
because he bore their iniquities
Therefore will I divide him a portion among the great
and he will divide the spoil with the mighty.

1.

We have seen that 'the many' is Israel. The idea being that in the servant's amazing vindication he will be shown to be righteous to Israel who regards his suffering as the result of his sin. It is those who make him their ²asham, i.e. acknowledge their guilt and join themselves to him, who will constitute the new, purified Israel.

We have already seen that Jesus demands of his disciples an absolute allegiance to himself. Those who give this allegiance are promised a hundredfold of what they have given up for him in this life, and eternal life in the world to come. Jesus is the guarantor of salvation; prosperity and a wide family circle, but 'with persecutions' in this life and eternal life in the world to come. The 'many' in 10.45b has the same meaning as we found in Isaiah 53 and Mark 10.29f. They are those who have given allegiance to the person of Jesus. It is their $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\nu$ which is guaranteed in the 'giving of his life'. Allegiance to Jesus does not of itself constitute the community of the Son of man as Manson supposed. Those who give their allegiance to him are made the people of God in the vindication of Jesus. By it they become the new, purified Israel when the thought is of the Servant, or the community of the Son of man who share in his eschatological fellowship meal. This is the decisive act of God for the 'many'.

The use of the same phrase in the context of the Last Supper supports this conclusion. The blood which is 'poured out' for the 'many' is clearly for those who have given allegiance to Jesus. In its Eucharistic practice the Church

1. cf above pp.30ff.

2. Mark 10.29f.

3. Cf T.W. Manson, Teaching; G. Dalman, Words, 1909, and N. Perrin, Kingdom of God, 1963, pp. 24-27, 160-178, 95-97; have shown that the thought of the kingdom is not simply the thought of allegiance, but of the decisive eschatological intervention by God in the affairs of men. It is an event under the agency of God, not simply a decision on the part of men.

reflects that this is the meaning in that the table fellowship is for those who are the followers of Jesus, and it is these followers who 'eat and drink' at the table of Jesus in his kingdom in Luke 22.30.

While no man is specifically excluded from giving this allegiance to Jesus, the Son of man, it is clear that it is for those who do give it that the kingdom breaks in. By the act of God in raising and exalting Jesus the followers are made members of the community who share in the meal and for whom the glories to come are reserved.

Even if the term 'Son of man' belonged originally to neither the saying about 'serving' (which is made probable by its absence from Luke 22.27) nor to the ^{1.} λύτρον saying (which is probable because of its absence from Mark 14.24), Mark's use of it here is not inappropriate. While it introduces two new and remarkable ideas into its meaning, it retains the ideas of authority, exaltation, and the community concept of soteriology. It is probably these parallel ideas which have led Mark to include it at this point.

This conclusion hears out what we have seen already; that the title Son of man is not primarily Christological but soteriological. An interest in the attributes of the person of Christ is present in the implied assertion of his absolute authority over all men, but what concerns Mark is an understanding of the Church as the community whose creation, continued existence, way of life, authority and hope is dependent on Jesus. This salvation is understood in terms of community, whether it be in this life as service and the fellowship of 'the many' with Jesus, or, in the life to come.

(viii) Mark 13.26f

And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send forth the angels and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

Cf Matthew 24.30f; Luke 21.27

2. 3.

Since the time of Colani and Weiffenbach the hypothesis that a small apocalypse lies behind Mk. 13 has been widely accepted. The majority of scholars regard the chapter as an artificial composition consisting of a high proportion of non-dominical sayings. However much the various reconstructions may disagree

1. So H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.208

2. T. Colani, Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps, 1864, pp. 201f.

3. W. Weiffenbach, Der Wiederkunfts-gedanke Jesu, 1873, pp. 69f., 135f.

4. For a full survey of G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, 1954,; also V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, pp.498ff.

among themselves, there is virtual unanimity that if there is a later composition in Mk. 13, it is in the paragraph in which these words occur (vv. 24-27). As
 1. 2.
 Robinson and Glasson, among others, have shown, the section is a "pastiche of Old Testament illusions" dependent on the LXX, a fatal objection to the view that Jesus himself is speaking.

That vv. 24-27 are an extraneous introduction is shown by the fact that the disciples' question about the destruction of the Temple is answered by Jesus in terms of the end of the world and his own advent - a discrepancy of which
 3.
 Matthew was aware and so altered the initial question to suit the Markan answer. Moreover, whereas the discourse before and after 24-27 is addressed to the disciples in the second person, this paragraph alone is marked by an unexplained transition to the third person plural.
 4.

Without this paragraph vv. 5-20 stand as a perfectly consistent reply to
 5.
 the disciples' question about the fall of the Temple and, of course, the city. 5-8 tells the disciples not to be alarmed by those who will try to lead them astray nor by the wars and rumours of wars; "these things are the beginning of travail". 9-13 tells of the coming trials of the disciples, who are to be bold in their witness, but who have much to endure before the end, "but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved". 14-20 says "But when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand) then let them that are in Judaea flee unto the mountains....." In the independent and probably more original Lukan tradition we read "But when you see Jerusalem
 6.
 compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand". This suggests that the document behind Mark probably referred to the destruction of Jerusalem which has been influenced by secondary apocalyptic motifs. It is clear from the instructions in vv. 14-18 that what is in mind is the destruction of Jerusalem and the collapse of Judaea not the annihilation of the earth.

If this is so then 'the end' in verses 7 and 13, if not Markan redactions, probably referred originally to the end of the nation and not, as they must in

-
1. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.56f.
 2. T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, p.187
 3. Matt. 24.3. 'Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?' Here we see the typical Matthaean tendency to heighten parousia teaching.
 4. Cf Mk. 13.14 'But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not....' but Mk. 13.26 'And then shall they see the Son of man....'
 5. Mk. 13.21-23 appear to be a variant form of v.6f (cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955 p.499)
 6. Luke 21.20. Cf C.H. Dodd, 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'', Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 37 (1947) pp.47-54; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955 p.512; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.329f.

1.
 their present context, to the end of the world. Similarly Taylor argues that v.10; 'And the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations' is wholly and distinctively Markan.

2.
 The parallel passage in Luke 21, though manifestly an independent tradition shows a clear dependence on Mark 13. But if these Markan verses are omitted from Luke a coherent discourse of the same sort as Mark 13 can be identified. 3.
 The discourse is apocalyptic in neither. It is rather a solemn warning in the manner of the Prophets of the historical consequences of God's rejection of Israel and of the attitude which the faithful must adopt to them.

If we exclude vv. 24-27 and its parallel in Luke, then the concluding verses in both concerning watchfulness would refer quite naturally to the fall of Jerusalem, not to the parousia of the Son of man. Without this paragraph the whole section looks like a document, comprising the teaching of Jesus, which was circulated to provide guidance, instruction, and warning to the Christians living in Palestine as the political situation approached its crisis. Robinson argues that the document circulated widely in a number of different forms, evidence of which he sees in Mark 13, Luke 17, Luke 21 and possibly also Luke 12.1-4. 4.

This evidence makes it imperative that Mark 13.26 be interpreted independently of its context. In its context in Mk. 13 the 'they' who see the Son of man coming would appear to refer to the disciples, kings, and the men on earth already referred to in the previous verses. The implication is therefore of the parousia. Without this context, we read only of the darkening of the sun and moon, the fall of the stars from heaven, 'and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken. And they shall see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory.' 5.
 Now it is no longer self-evident that the reference is to the parousia, for it appears that it is 'the powers that are in heaven' who see the Son of man 'coming', the implication being, as in Daniel 7 on which the saying is undoubtedly modelled, that it is a 'coming' to heaven. 6.

That the 'they' who see the Son of man 'coming' are the powers in

-
1. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.
 2. Cf V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, 1926, pp. 109-125; A.M. Perry, The Sources of St. Luke's Passion Narrative, 1919, pp.35-38; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.323-337; G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, 1954 pp.226f.
 3. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p. 123f.
 4. ibid pp. 126ff.
 5. Mark 13.25b, 26.
 6. For the dependence on Daniel 7 cf. for example, C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1953, pp.67-69; E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, p. 279, nn. 1-4; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.35.

1.
 heaven (whoever or whatever they might be) which implies an ascension is made evident by a comparison with Matthew 24.29b.f.

and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

Matthew has significantly added *πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*. He also adds the negative side to the judgement which is absent both in Daniel and Mark. He has not only changed the question of the disciples from one about the destruction of the Temple to one about the end of the world, but he has also recast Mark's answer to an indubitable allusion to the parousia, probably because he was aware that Mark 13.26 suggested a Daniel-like heavenly enthronement rather than a parousia accompanied by the destruction of wicked men. If this is so, then Miss Hooker is certainly correct in seeing behind Mark 13.24-27 a tradition in which the coming of the Son of man was understood as in Daniel of a judgement scene before God rather than of a parousia to earth.
 2.

Undoubtedly the whole saying has become coloured with apocalyptic details and descriptions, and the Markan redactions show that the author knew that by including 24-27 in this context the whole gained parousia implications which were lacking in the original Son of man saying and the original context. Despite this and unlike Matthew, Mark has not removed the ascension imagery of vv. 24-27 in favour of clear parousia teaching. The two ideas are in confusion here.
 3. 4.

One important conclusion of this is that we cannot so easily assume with Boobyer and Ramsey that the Transfiguration in Mark is a pre-figuration of the parousia, rather it is a 'parousia' viewed primarily in terms not of visitation but of vindication, just as in II Peter 1.16-18, the guarantee of 'the power and parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ' is provided by the moment on the mountain 'when he received honour and glory from God the Father'. As Robinson notes; 'the evidence Dr. Boobyer assembles points even more strongly to a conclusion which he does not draw, namely, that the Parousia vision was originally conceived in terms of exaltation and ascent.'
 5. 6. 7.

1. cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p. 518

2. M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp.158f. The argument by which she arrives at this conclusion is, however, very different from ours.

3. Cf Mk. 13.24, 25 with Isa. 13.10; 34.4; Ezek. 32.7f; Amos 8.9; Joel 2.10; 1 Enoch 80. 4-7; 4 Ezra 5.4; Ass. Moses 10.5; Rev. 6.12-14; 2 Peter 3.12.

4. Cf above p. 241f.

5. G.H. Boobyer, St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, 1942.

6. A.M. Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, 1949.

7. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.133.

Mark works, but it never remains entirely unaffected by thinking of a descent parousia, a concept which Matthew picks up, makes more explicit, and develops at every available opportunity. This means that we must be careful of assuming that Mark 13.26 is indubitably parousia doctrine, in the sense of descent, and of interpreting similar passages in the light of this. It more clearly ascension theology, influenced by the emerging doctrine of the parousia, but never overshadowed by it.

Together with this Ascension/Parousia of the Son of man goes what might be expected by now, the gathering of the elect;

And then shall he send forth the angels and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven. (2)

Luke, with his anti-eschatological tendencies, omits this verse, whereas in contrast Matthew heightens the effect;

And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet (3) and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds from one end of heaven to the other. (4)

Matthew's additions are again interesting. His clear parousia teaching in the previous verse makes it natural to interpret the reference to the trumpet as in 1 Thessalonians 4.16;

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first.

Thus the idea is of the Son of man descending and sending out his angels to gather his elect. In Mark it is simply the angels who are sent out to gather together the elect.

The idea of gathering the elect from the four winds is taken from Zechariah 2.6, where it means from the four points of the compass. This conception of gathering together the people of God is a familiar one in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha, and is carried over into the New Testament,

It is not immediately apparent what is meant by the phrase ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ γῆς ἕως ἀκροῦ οὐρανοῦ. There is a parallel to this in a variant reading of 1 Enoch 57.2. But the more common phrases are (i) ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ τῆς γῆς ἕως ἀκροῦ τῆς γῆς.

1. Cf the more detailed support for this conclusion J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming 1957, pp. 128ff.
2. Mark 13.27.
3. Cf 1 Cor. 15.52; 1 Thess. 4.16.
4. Matthew 24.31.
5. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad loc.
6. Cf Deut. 30.4 Isa. 11.11,16; 27.12; Ezek. 39.27; Zech. 2.6-11; Ps.105.47,146.2.
7. Tobit 13.13, 14.7; Bar. 5.5-9; 2 Macc. 2.7;
8. 1 En. 57; Ps. Sol. 11.3, 17.26.
9. Cf 1 Thess. 4.15-17, 2 Thess. 2.1.
10. E. Lohmeyer, Marius, 1951, p.279 cites as a possible parallel Philo, Cherub, 99.

This occurs in Deut. 13.7 and Jeremiah 12.12. In both instances the reference is to people spread over the face of the earth; (ii) ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως ἀκροῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. This appears in Psalm 19.6, where it describes the path of the sun across the sky, and in Deuteronomy 30.4, where there is an implied contrast between the gathering of Israel from among the nations and 'if any of thine outcasts be in the uttermost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee'. Whatever the original meaning of this in Deuteronomy, we have seen in 1 Enoch the idea is of the Son of man appearing with the righteous community in heaven. It is possible therefore that Matthew may have altered his Markan source to express the idea of the parousia of the Son of man together with the elect heavenly community. On the other hand, since it was believed that the limits of heaven and earth were the same, the reference may simply be to the gathering together of the faithful across the face of the earth.

Since the phrase in Mark is unique, apart from the variant reading in Enoch and the doubtful parallel in Philo, it is more difficult to know what he means. Taylor suggests that he may be thinking of the land to the east of Palestine and the sea to the west. This seems to me to be unlikely since the use of the phrase ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ τῆς γῆς ἕως ἀκροῦ τῆς γῆς does not parallel the phrase ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως ἀκροῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in the Old Testament. The conflation of the two does not seem to be simply a variant form of ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων. Rather, it conveys the idea of gathering together into one final community the righteous living (ἀπὸ ἀκροῦ γῆς) and the faithful dead (ἕως ἀκροῦ οὐρανοῦ).

Mark does not make explicit where this community is to be established. If the parousia aspect of his thinking is pressed, then the implication would be that this community is with the Son of man in the 'world which is to come'. If, on the other hand, the thought is of the exaltation of the Son of man then the implication is of the fellowship of the heavenly and earthly community with each other and with the Son of man, or of the intimate union of the faithful on earth with the ascended Son of man.

Support for this latter argument may be found in Robinson's suggestion that the conclusion to Matthew's Gospel may well have been the lost climax to Mark's Gospel. He points out that the insertion of the command to baptize in

1. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.519; Cf also H.J. Holtzmann, Die Synoptiker (Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament), 1901, p.169; A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1949, pp.190f.
2. Matt. 28.18...20 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me;... and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age'.
3. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp.131ff.

the name of the Trinity has led scholars to regard the whole passage as a late editorial insertion. But the climax is so out of keeping with Matthew's eschatology that it is hard to believe that Matthew would have created it. It is precisely the sort of ending one would expect to find in Mark, and, for this reason, it is highly likely that it is from the lost ending of Mark that Matthew has derived it.

If Robinson is correct then 13.26 would point forward to the exaltation of Jesus to supreme authority, an authority which, as in Daniel 7, is given him by God. It is this exaltation of the Son of man which gathers the community of the faithful into the congregation of the Son of man, who share his authority through his abiding presence. Such a conclusion would be in line with what we have found elsewhere in Mark, and particularly in our analysis of Mark 10.45b.

There is no doubt that parousia ideas are present, but these look like attempts to cast the original tradition into the later parousia mould. It appears also that Mark is not prepared to do the radical re-casting we find in Matthew.

(ix) Mark 14.21 and 14.41

For the Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him:
but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is
betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had not been born.

Cf Matthew 26.24; Luke 22.22.

And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on
now, and take your rest: it is enough; the hour is come;
behold the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.

Cf Matthew 26.45; (Luke no parallel).

2.

Whether or not 14.21 is an authentic saying of Jesus, there can be little doubt that the tradition is very early. Its Palestinian origin is reflected in the Aramaisms in the text.

3.

It is significant that this saying is included by all the Gospels in the context of the Last Supper. More significant are the striking parallels between

-
1. Cf also C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.440.
 2. For argument that it is not cf. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.50-52; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.152; C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. I, 1927, p.325; J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci, 1903, ad. loc. For argument that it is cf. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad loc. M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp. 159f.
 3. Cf M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1954, pp. 86, 237f. The argument rests chiefly on the verb ὑπάγω, found only here (and its parallels) and the Fourth Gospel, but which may represent the Aramaic 'zl which occasionally bears this meaning, and on the Semitic use of קאל'ֹוֹן for the comparative.

Mark 14.17-21 and John 13.12-33. Both passages connect the Scriptural necessity with Psalm 41.9:

Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted,
which did eat
of my bread,
Hath lifted up his heel against me (1)

Most significantly this passage continues:

But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon me, and raise me up,
That I may requite them.
By this I know that thou delightest in me,
Because mine enemy doth not triumph over me.
And as for me, thou upholdest me in mine integrity,
And settest me before thy face forever. (2)

It unmistakably speaks of the vindication of the one betrayed by his friend who shared his table. Whatever 'settest me before thy face forever' may have meant to the Psalmist is irrelevant, for it is clear that when Jesus says 'I go' in John's Gospel, the primary meaning is not 'Going to die', though that is implied, but 'going to the Father'.³ The use of the citation from Ps. 41.9; the unique use of ὑπάγει outside of John's Gospel having a sense other than 'go' meaning a movement from one point in space to another; the fact that ὑπάγω in John uniformly refers to a 'going to the Father' and is used by Jesus in the first person singular only in the context of the Last Supper; and the Palestinian origin of Mark 14.21 points to a very early tradition in which Jesus spoke of the 'going' of the Son of man ('I' in John) in the sense of exaltation, and in the context of the Last Supper.⁴

This verse resembles Mark 8.31 in its reference to Scriptural necessity. There the passion of the Son of man was stated, but moved on beyond the passion to the resurrection and exaltation in the Transfiguration narrative. This suggests that ὑπάγειω here also refers to the coming passion, but supports our argument that it must be interpreted in its Johannine sense. The similar reference to Scripture in Mark 9.12 connected with the suffering of the Son of man, together with the fact that Mark 14.21 is indubitably Palestinian in origin, supports our conclusion that the tradition which linked the Son of man with the passion is very primitive.⁵

A comparison between Mark 9.13 and Mark 14.21 brings out again Mark's concept of the sovereignty of the Son of man. In 9.13 we are told that everything

1. Cf. Mk. 14.18; Jn. 13.18.

2. Ps. 41.10-12.

3. Jn. 7.33, 8.14, 21, (22); 13.33, 36; 14.4, 28; 16.5, 10, 17 (cf. 13.3; 14.5).

4. Apart from Chapters 7 and 8, where they are anticipations in very similar language of what Jesus says to the disciples in 13.33 about their inability to follow him.

5. Cf. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp. 198f.

has happened to Elijah 'καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν'. But of the Son of man we are told that he goes 'καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ'. If John the Baptist's suffering is a passive and unwitting fulfilment of Scripture, the Son of man chooses to go in the full knowledge of what this entails. Although the authority of Jesus is coupled with the authority of Scripture, the contrast between John and Jesus is plain. Jesus is the master of the situation.

In the second part of the verse the Son of man is linked as in Mark 9.31 and 10.33 with παραδίδωμι. Here it is given special point by its reference to the traitor Judas, who has already been named in 14.10f. The authority of the Son of man is further stressed in that Jesus goes on his way knowing that he is to be betrayed. This is his sovereign foreknowledge. But this sovereign authority is not expressed in terms of the destroyer of evil. Rather, by it he enters into the opposition of this generation, which results in his suffering, only to emerge triumphant over it. It is the assurance of this triumph which wrings from Jesus the 'woe' of deep sorrow for the one who must bear the responsibility of the rejection of his authority; 'Good were it for that man if he had not been born', presumably because he shall not share the glory and hope of the community of the son of man.

Mark 14.41 brings us to the climax before the passion narrative begins. In its context two features stand out. On the one hand the steadfastness of Jesus, despite his very human cry of anguish, stands out in contrast to the failure of the disciples. On the other hand if the Son of man ever was a collective term referring to Jesus and his disciples, here Jesus is separated to a sublime aloneness. First he separates himself from the larger circle of his disciples to be with Peter, James and John (Mk. 14.36, 37). Then he leaves these three as well and is alone (Mk. 14.38). But they cannot even 'watch' with him. In impressive repetition Jesus' readiness to respond to God is contrasted with the three disciples' falling asleep. He stands alone. All the initiative rests with him; 'The Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going,'³ The community of the Son of man belongs to the future, and rests on his authority, obedience, initiative and exaltation.

-
1. So V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.
 2. Here there is a play on the words 'Son of man' and 'that man'. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.199 suggests that 'that man' may be regarded as an exponent and representative of those who reject the authority of the Son of man. Matthew's inclusion of the reference to Judas is clearly secondary (Matt.26.25)
 3. Mk. 14.41c, 42a.

(x) Mark 14.62

And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.

Cf Matthew 26.64; Luke 22.69.

Scholarly opinion on the authenticity of this important saying is sharply divided, and not only on the saying itself but also on its context in the trial before Caiaphas. It is argued that the entire account of the trial is suspect, since it is unlikely that any of the followers of Jesus were present to observe what happened, and that the account is based upon later beliefs regarding the person of Jesus. On the other hand it is claimed that the early Church would have sought information concerning the trial, and while secondary material is acknowledged to exist, the reliability and logic of the events have been vigorously defended. Without entering into a detailed discussion on this point, let it suffice to note that the case for the unreliability of Mark's account of the trial is by no means proven.

The backbone of the narrative is formed by the sayings in v.58 and 62.

Verse 58 records the chief evidence brought against Jesus;

We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands.

The major exegetical problem connected with this verse is Mark's insistence that this witness is false. Not only are we told twice in the immediately preceding two verses that the witnesses are false, but the following verse insists that

And not even so did their witness agree together

If there was a widespread tradition that the accusation that Jesus would destroy the temple and raise up another was false, it is hard to understand how John could have ascribed very similar words to Jesus in his account of the cleansing of the temple.

John's ascription of these words to Jesus, despite Mark's insistence that the witnesses were 'false', supports our conclusion of the authenticity of the saying in John.

There is, however, a significant difference between Mark 14.58 and John 2.19. According to John 2.19 it is not Jesus who will destroy the

1. H. Lietzmann, Der Prozess Jesu, (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1930, pp. 313-322; M. Dibelius, Tradition, 1934, pp. 192ff; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, pp. 269ff; H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 36f; D. E. Nineham, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 1963, pp. 398ff.
2. G. D. Kilpatrick, The Trial of Jesus, 1953, A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 1963, pp. 24ff; A. J. B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 67; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.; M. D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p. 164f; W. G. Kimmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p. 50.
3. John 2.19.
4. Cf above p. 118. (esp. n.1.)

temple. Rather, the implication is that it is the 'Jews' who will do so. Mark also knows of a tradition in which Jesus is reported to have predicted the destruction of the temple (Mk. 13.2), but here the agent of the destruction is God.^{1.} In both, while Jesus is not himself made the agent of the destruction of the temple, its destruction is intimately linked with the mission of Jesus. In our analysis of John 2.19 we saw that while the saying carried an unmistakable allusion to the death of Jesus, at a second and deeper level it pointed to the destruction and replacement of the old religious order of which the temple is the symbol and centre.^{2.} This is certainly also the meaning of Mark 13, and Taylor argues for the same^{3.} conclusion in Mark 14.58.

The reason why the old order is to be brought to an end is because the Jews have refused to acknowledge that Jesus is the Messiah. They will therefore cease to be the people of God. In their place the new people of God is to be raised up, which will be the new temple, ἀχειροποιήτων^{4.}. It is this messianic claim to establish the new temple which makes the direct messianic question of the high priest immediately intelligible.^{5.}

It is possible that Mark insists that the testimony is false because in the accusation of Mark 14.58 Jesus is said to be the one who will destroy the Temple, though Taylor holds that it is more probable that Mark reflects the uneasiness of primitive Christianity regarding the saying on the part of those who continued to observe the Temple worship.^{6.} If this is correct it would confirm the authenticity of the tradition, and would suggest that the high priest asked Jesus 'Are you the Messiah?' in the context of the allegation that he would not only destroy the temple, but also raise up the new people of God.

An exegesis of the reply of Jesus demands that we should attempt to arrive at some conclusion on the most probable text.

-
1. It seems that not only were the 'false witnesses' confused about what Jesus actually said, but so also were the New Testament writers!
 2. Cf above pp.120ff.
 3. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.
 4. Cf above pp.122f. Also V. Taylor, ibid.
 5. Cf 1 Enoch 90.29; 4 Ezra 9.38-10.27, and the Targum on Isa. 53.5. Also V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.; A.E.J. Rawlinson, Mark, 1940, p.221; J.V. Bartlett, St. Mark, 1922, 406; Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 1, p.1004f. W. Bousset, revised H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter, 3rd ed. 1926, pp. 238ff; Y.M.-J. Congar, The Mystery of the Temple (E. Tr.) 1962, p.131; B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, 1965, p.17.
 6. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.

According to Mark, Jesus replied 'Ἐγώ εἰμι'.^{1.} E. Stauffer argues that the expression 'I am' in Mark 14.62 corresponds to 'the most sacred formula of the divine self-revelation', the name of God 'ani hu'.^{2.} The argument rests on the subsequent charge of blasphemy. According to the strict interpretation of the rabbis the charge of blasphemy would have to rest on the abuse of the divine name.^{3.} But, as has been shown by Lohmeyer, the concept of blasphemy was broadened and made more inclusive.^{4.} Further, there is no evidence to suggest that 'I am' in Mark 14.62 bears the same meaning as in the Fourth Gospel.^{5.}

In any event it is highly unlikely that this unequivocal affirmative is the original text. For Ἐγώ εἰμι Matthew 26.64 has οὐ ξῖπας and Luke 22.70 ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι.^{6.} There is good reason to suppose that Mark originally wrote οὐ ξῖπας ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι,^{7.} for not only is this reading well attested, but it would also account for the text of Matthew and Luke. It is hard to believe that the evangelists would have altered such a clear acceptance of Messiahship by Jesus to a more equivocal one where, nevertheless, an acceptance of Messiahship is implied.^{8.}

The second textual problem is that both Matthew and Luke have inserted qualifying phrases in the second half of the text. Matthew reads;

ἀπ' ἄρτι ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven.

Luke says;

ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.

8. Glasson argues in detail for the inclusion of ἀπ' ἄρτι,^{9.} which is supported by variant textual readings. Since Luke is probably using a different source

1. E. Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, 1960, pp.102f, 142ff (especially 150-192).
2. Cf Lev. 24.10-23.
3. E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1937, p.329. This view has been strongly supported by J. Blinzler, The Trial of Jesus (E.Tr), 1959, pp.105-107; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.68 (especially n.6) M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.172; Strack and Billerbeck, Vol. 1 pp.1008-1019, especially 1017.
4. Especially Jn. 8.24, 58; 18.6. On this meaning cf below p. 477ff.
5. Cf οὐ λέγεις in reply to Pilate Mk.15.2 = Mat. 27.11 = Lk. 23.3
6. In the Θ family, 13, 472, 543, 565, 700, 1071, geo. arm. Or.
7. For similar judgment cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc.; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp. 47f.; E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1937, p.328; B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, 1924, p.322; M. Smith, 'Notes on Goodspeed's "Problems of New Testament Translation"', JBL, Vol. 64, 1945, pp.506-510;
8. T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, pp.66-68. He is strongly supported among others by J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp. 47ff; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.167. Against this view cf A.J.B. Higgins, The Son of Man, 1964, p.69; E. Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, 1960, pp.142ff.
9. Sy sin, and by one manu script of the Sahidic version.

for the passion narrative, the agreement in meaning between Matthew and Luke is significant, though the Greek phrase used is different. That Matthew, who has spent the two previous chapters arguing that the coming on the clouds would happen 'at the consummation of the age', and whose tendency is towards a futurist apocalyptic, would have altered his Markan source by deliberately inserting $\alpha\pi\tau\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\alpha\pi\tau\iota$, suggesting that the 'coming on the clouds' is 'henceforth', seems impossible. Though the textual evidence is slight, when it is taken together with the (possibly) independent support in Luke and against the tendency in Matthew, it is easier to assume that Matthew found this phrase in Mark.

With some degree of confidence, therefore, we suggest that the original text may have been:

'You have said that I am; but henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.'

The sense then becomes: 'Are you the Christ?' 'That is your term, but, beginning as of now you will see the vindication of the Son of man'.

Scholars are virtually unanimous that the citation from Psalm 110.1, referring to the session at the right hand of power, is to be understood as the vindication of the Son of man, and the imagery is unmistakably that of the ascension. The paradox of the situation is that those who now sit in judgement over Jesus, are those who themselves will be judged by him. The one whom they have rejected is the one whom God will exalt. Like the Son of man in Daniel, Jesus the Son of man will receive dominion from God. In this passage there is an unmistakable reference again to the authority of Jesus.

Opinion on the meaning of the 'coming with the clouds of heaven' is deeply divided between those who regard this 'coming' as subsequent to the 'session' and so understand it as a reference to the parousia, and those who regard it as a coming to God in vindication as in Daniel 7.13. Clearly a

1. G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, 1954, p.259; and A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, 1957, p.91; J.E. Fison, The Christian Hope, 1954, pp.191ff; O. Cullmann, Peter, 1953, p.201; C.E.B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 1959, ad. loc.; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, pp.50f; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.70ff; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.38ff.
2. J.A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp.13ff, 130f; also 'Expository Problems: The Second Coming in Mark 14.62' in ET, Vol. 67, 1956, pp.336-340; T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, pp.63ff; also 'The Reply to Caiaphas (Mk. 14.62)' in NTS, Vol. 7, 1960, pp.88-93; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc. D.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, 1948, p.176; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, pp.166ff; M.-J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Marc, 1929, p.403; also Evangile selon Saint Matthieu, 1923, ad. loc.

decision for either of these alternatives is governed by the decision on the most probable text of Mark 14.62, and we have argued for the originality of the Matthaean text. Glasson's claim that 'two participles governed by the same verb describe simultaneous action' ^{1.} is surely only partly true. I can quite easily say 'you will see me coming in and going out' without this being 'simultaneous action'. In any event it is hard to imagine how 'sitting' and 'coming' could be 'simultaneous action'. Governed by the same verb they are, however, closely related actions. Glasson is correct, however, especially since he argues that what the Sanhedrin will see will be ἀπὸ ἄρτι ^{2.} (from this point on), in rejecting that while the 'session' will be 'from now on' the 'coming' will be at a later time and a distinct event. When both participles are governed by the same verb which is qualified by ἀπὸ ἄρτι, it is clear that both the 'session' and the 'coming' will be 'from now on'.

Now it is difficult to understand how the coming, whether it be understood in the sense of the later parousia doctrine or in the sense of exaltation will be ἀπὸ ἄρτι. The same difficulty is not present in the idea of a continuing 'session' in power and dominion. It may be this difficulty which has led commentators to postulate that the 'coming' refers to a future parousia. But such a postulation does not remove the difficulty of ἀπὸ ἄρτι. Nor is it removed by the suggestion that the 'coming' and the 'session' were originally in the reverse order, which would be the logical order if the 'coming' referred to the 'coming' to God in exaltation. ^{3.} Apart from this suggestion being pure conjecture with no evidence at all to substantiate it, it cannot remove the impossibility of it being qualified by ἀπὸ ἄρτι.

The most natural interpretation of the 'coming with the clouds of heaven' with its clear dependence on Dan. 7.13 is that it is a coming to his own, which the early Church most certainly did understand to be a continuing action ἀπὸ ἄρτι. This is not to deny that the phrase did mean the coming to God in exaltation; the Son of man coming into his own, but in this context the primary meaning must be the coming of the Son of man to the temple ἀχειροποιήτων -

1. T.F. Glasson. The Second Advent, 1945, p.89, and quoted with approval by M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.169.
2. With A. Oepke, in TWNT, Vol. V. p.865, I cannot accept the thesis of A. Debrunner, (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, Vol. XI, p.48, that ἀπὸ ἄρτι (sic!) here and elsewhere means 'assuredly', though granting that it may be the correct interpretation of Rev. 14.13.
3. So. E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, 1960, p.39, also 'Son of Man' in JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, p.120; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.45 n.2; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.170.

the new people of God, who would share his authority precisely because he is the one who is seated at the 'right hand of power'. Thus the saying about raising up the new temple (made without hands) and the saying about the 'coming' are intimately linked together. We have already argued in some detail for such a

1.
conclusion earlier.

Here again we see what we have seen in so many other Son of man sayings in Mark that the concepts of the authority of the Son of man, and the creation of the community in fellowship with the Son of man is by the act of God in exalting him to dominion and power.

Whether $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$ $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$ was an addition to an original saying of Jesus which modified its meaning from a reference either to the exaltation or to the parousia, and whether the 'blasphemy' allegation was made against Jesus for making these claims about himself or arose out of the conflict situation of the early Church with the Jews as a result of its claim to be the 'new temple' with the authority of the Son of man, the meaning of Mark 14.62 (according to its most probable reading) is clearly that those who now judge Jesus will themselves be judged in God's raising up for himself a new people by the exaltation of Jesus to God's right hand and his coming to them. Such a conclusion is precisely in line with what we found in Mark 13.26, and would support the suggestion that Mark's Gospel may have ended with the words found so unfittingly as the climax to Matthew's Gospel;

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me;.....
and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age. (3)

This distinction between the 'session' and 'coming' should not be seen as two events separated in time, but rather as two theological ideas belonging inextricably together. The Church exists because it is created by God as a result of the rejection of Jesus by the 'old order' people of God, and it is created because there are those who have accepted that Jesus is God's Messiah. To them, the rejected Jesus comes in exalted glory, for he has been vindicated by God and given dominion over all things. Not only is the Church's existence dependent upon God's vindication of Jesus, and the bestowal of all authority and power upon him, but also the theological character of the Church itself is dependent on this. In fellowship with the vindicated Jesus, the Church understands herself to share in his authority and in his special relation to God.

1. Cf above pp.120ff especially pp.125ff

2. Cf 1 Cor. 6.19 and 1 Peter 2.5.

3. Matt. 28.18...20 (Cf above pp. 245f.)

In this participation in and with him the Son of man has become a collective term. As such this one concept is both Christological and soteriological and as soteriological it is also ecclesiological. While the concept of 'session' conveys the conviction of the authority of Jesus, the concept of 'coming' conveys the conviction of being included into the community of the one who has received authority. It is noteworthy that it is on this note of exaltation and fellowship that both Matthew and Luke conclude their Gospels. We have already seen this in Matthew 28.18 and 20, and have urged that Luke's Gospel concluded with an account of the ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit, seen in the great joy of the disciples, which, according to Luke in Acts, is the characteristic of the disciples after Pentecost.

Summary.

From this study of the Son of man in Mark the following are the chief points which emerge:

1. His teaching on the 'coming' of the Son of man cannot be equated easily and consistently with either a 'coming' to God in exaltation and vindication or a 'coming' from God at the parousia. Both conceptions are present, often in confusion rather than a clearly formulated 'tension'. In addition we have argued for a third strand of thought, that the 'coming' is the fellowship of the exalted Son of man with the community.
2. One of the notes present in most, if not all, of the sayings in Mark is the authority and lordship of the Son of man. We have seen that in many of the sayings there are good grounds for regarding this concept of lordship as a reading back into the earthly life of Jesus what was understood to belong essentially to his exaltation. But this reading back into the earthly life stresses the faith of the Church that whatever authority she possesses is dependent on him. But it is also truly her authority in her union with the ascended Son of man.
3. Mark presents us with a unique view of what the lordship of the Son of man entails. It is serving rather than being served.
4. The rejection of this authority leads tragically and inevitably to the suffering and death of the Son of man, as Scripture has foretold. But Jesus by no means unwittingly fulfils what has been prophesied. He is the master

1. Cf above p.40.

of the situation, knowing that he will be betrayed, yet choosing to walk this road in obedience to God, even if he walks it in supreme aloneness. In this 'aloneness' the Son of man in an exclusive term. Apart from Mk. 10.45b, however, this suffering is not seen to be part of his mission.

5. The suffering of the Son of man is also his via to glory. It issues in his exaltation when he receives and exercises his dominion over all things.
6. From his session at the right hand of power, the Son of man 'comes' to the faithful community. We have seen that a significant proportion of the sayings have a direct or indirect connexion with the Last Supper, reflecting the faith of the Church that the Eucharist is the fellowship meal of the community with the Son of man, and a foretaste (according to Luke) of the final eschatological meal.
7. The soteriology associated with the Son of man is essentially corporate. Because Jesus is the Son of man the Church, the new people of God, is raised up by him in God's act of exalting him and by his coming to them. In this fellowship union of the community with the Son of man they share his authority. As the rejection of his authority issues in his suffering, so the rejection of the new community will issue in their suffering. In union with him they not only share his right to forgive sins and exercise lordship over the Sabbath, but they also are to exercise his radically transformed concept of what lordship means, i.e. service. Thus the Church not only is but also is what it is because Jesus is the exalted but present Son of man. In this are combined the three elements of the Son of man. As a Christological /the unique authority of Jesus himself. As a soteriological title it refers to a title it refers to the means by which his followers will participate in his suffering, death, exaltation and authority. As an ecclesiological title it is the Christological title but now made an inclusive concept through the saying work of the Son of man. In this is implicit what is explicit in 1. Paul and John that the Church has the identity of Jesus himself.
8. Even if we conclude that Mark 13.26 does refer to the parousia, then Mark 13.27 still retains the essentially corporate character of soteriology in the gathering together of the living and the dead to be with the Son of man in the world to come. If it is to be interpreted in terms of exaltation, then the soteriology of 13.27 points to the gathering together into one community

both the living and the dead to be in fellowship with the Son of man, i.e. the Church's identity with and yet dependence on the Son of man is not individualistic but corporate or communal.

9. It is most noticeable that the negative and punitive aspects of the judgement of the Son of man, so common in the apocalyptic literature are virtually absent from Mark. Where this element is present, as in Mark 8.38, it is significant that rejection by the Son of man at his coming is, in some manuscripts, the result of men's rejection of Jesus and his followers. In this again the corporateness of the concept is seen.
10. The close parallel between the Son of man and the community in authority, rejection, suffering, and vindication, and the similarity of the fate of those who reject Jesus and his followers points to the essentially corporate character of the Son of man in Mark. But at the same time what belongs to Jesus, belongs to him by right, and to the community only in dependence on and fellowship with him. Thus it is more appropriate to speak of the Son of man as the one who creates the community, through God's vindication of him, than as a collective term. He is the one who raises up the new temple 'made without hands'. The followers are not that temple simply by virtue of their allegiance. The creation of the community is seen as a decisive and continuing act within history. The decisive act is in the exaltation to the right hand of God and Jesus' coming to the faithful. The continuing act is his coming ἀπ' ἄρτι and in the disciples being baptized with his baptism and drinking the blood of the Covenant which is shed ἀντὶ πολλῶν in the Eucharistic meal, and which is interpreted as the Son of man giving his life as αὐτότρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Yet there are unmistakable signs that Mark looked beyond history to the breaking in of the 'world to come' at the parousia.
11. This points to an understanding of the Church in Mark as already the authority-endowed community of the Son of man, which means that through the ministry, death, resurrection and exaltation of the Son of man the new aeon has already broken in. It is through being baptized with his baptism that the disciples enter with him into his kingdom (Mark 10.38ff). While baptism here may be being used as a metaphorical allusion to the suffering of Jesus which the disciples also share, the use of the sacramental term

points to the Church's belief that in baptism the disciple does participate in the sufferings of Christ, and not only his sufferings and death but also in his resurrection, his victory over Satan, and his exaltation. Similarly in the Eucharist the community already eats and drinks at the table fellowship of the Son of man. Here also they drink his cup of death, which means that they participate also in his exaltation. It is through drinking the cup that they enter into his kingdom. So the Eucharist is seen both as the means of creating the community of the Son of man and as the fellowship-meal of the community with him.

1.

Alongside of this 'realised eschatology' stands also the concept of a future parousia when all that is already present in the Church will be perfectly fulfilled, but this aspect is not emphasised or made perfectly explicit in Mark.

(c) The Son of Man in Q

Without entering into discussion on the full contents and limits of the hypothetical source document 'Q' we shall assume that sayings which are paralleled in Luke and Matthew, but which are clearly not derived from Mark, were derived from a source common to both Luke and Matthew, and we shall follow ^{1.} Streeter's reconstruction. Without assuming that the order followed by Luke is more faithful to Q, we shall follow Luke, noting that the order in Matthew is not significantly different. One further pre-supposition which we shall make is ^{2.} that Bornkamm is correct in tracing Q to the Palestinian community.

(i) Luke 6.22, 23.

Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you (from their company), and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of Man's sake. Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy: for behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

Matthew 5.11, 12.

Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

There can be little doubt that Matthew has conflated his Q and M sources in his construction of the sermon on the mount and that, despite the differences in language, Luke 6.22, 23 and Matthew 5.11, 12 are derived from the same source. It is not so clear, however, whether Luke's 'for the Son of man's sake' or Matthew's 'for my sake' represents the original form of the saying in Q. A comparison of Mark 10.29 with Luke 18.29 shows that the Markan $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon$ has been altered in Luke to $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. It is possible, therefore, that here too we have a Lukan revision, and that the form in Matthew 5.11 is the more original. If this is so, then Luke's changing of 'for my sake' to 'for the Son of man's sake' reflects not only his belief that Jesus is the Son of man but also a soteriological and Christological heightening

1. B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, 1924.

2. G. Bornkamm, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (3rd Edn) Vol. I, col. 758. O. Cullmann's argument that the Son of man tradition is derived from 'Hellenists' a term used to denote syncretistic Hellenistic Judaism, who may have been associated with those esoteric circles in Judaism with which we become acquainted in Enoch and the Qumran texts, and that they preserved Jesus' self-designation as the Son of man (Christology, 1959, pp.164ff) is decisively refuted by H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.323ff. Tödt follows Bornkamm in arguing for a Palestinian and Aramaic origin of Q. Cf also M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1954: J. Jeremias, The Sermon on the Mount, 1961, p.18; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.119.

of the original 'I' saying! On the other hand Luke 12.8 is nearer to the Markan form of the same saying in Mark 8.38, while Matthew 10.32 shows traces of editorial revision, particularly in the phrase 'before my Father in heaven'.^{1.} This would support the originality of the Lukan version.^{2.} If this is so, then Matthew's change of the original Son of man saying to an 'I' saying reflects his belief that Jesus is the Son of man.

The judgement of Bultmann that the saying is 'a new piece of tradition composed by the community'^{3.} is widely accepted by scholars. If this is so, and the evidence in support of this contention seems to be decisive, then the situation which has given rise to the saying is the conflict of the primitive Palestinian community with the Jewish authorities and stands very close to the tradition in Mark 2.10 and 2.28. As such the whole passage reflects the self-understanding of the community.

We are now in a position to say with some measure of confidence what that self-understanding of the community is. In all of these passages the community has no hesitation whatever in ascribing to Jesus a saying concerning the Son of man which expresses his supreme authority. This suggests very strongly that the community understood itself to be the corporate identity of the exalted Son of man. This corporate identity as the authoritative Son of man is undoubtedly wholly and utterly dependent on Jesus, the exalted Son of man. But in his death and exaltation he has created a community in such intense union with himself and, in him, with one another, that the community participates in his vindication, glory and authority. Consequently to make the sweeping claims of Mk. 2.10, 28; Lk. 6.22, 23 and Matt. 5.11, 12 is not so much a reading back into the life of Jesus a saying which purports to be the ground of their practice, rather it reflects their self-understanding as participating through dependence in the authority of Christ. To place the words into the mouth of Jesus reflects the conviction of their dependence on his authority. To attribute a saying to him which almost certainly did not come from him reflects their understanding of their corporate character as sharing in his authority. It is this profound theological conviction rather than a desire to falsify the historical records which accounts for these later assertions being attributed to Jesus.

1. For argument for the secondary nature of this phrase in Matthew cf. T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, p.96
2. So also B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, 1924; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.48; P. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu' Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.52. W. Manson, Luke, 1945, p.64.
3. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1965, p.110, cf also H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.123,125,274; W. Manson, Luke, p.64; A.J.B.Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.120; T.W. Manson, Sayings, p.49 assigns it to the post-Caesarea Philippi period of the ministry of Jesus.

According to the simpler Lukan version, which is probably the more original, Jesus addresses his disciples as 'ye poor' to whom the Kingdom of God belongs. The meaning of the word 'Poor' is given by such passages as Psalm 69.29-36. In Judaism of the last two centuries B.C. the term was practically a synonym for chased, i. e. 'saintly' or 'pious'. So, for example, Psalm of Solomon 10,7:

The saints also shall give thanks in the assembly of the people:
and God will have mercy on the poor in the (day of) gladness in Israel.

Here the 'saints' and the 'poor' stand in synonymous parallelism, and 'the poor' are the eschatological community. In the Talmud the 'saints' and the 'poor' are also treated as synonymous. In the days of the Seleucid rule in Palestine the 'poor' were pre-eminently those who remained faithful to the Law and their religion. Thus when the Christian community understands itself to be 'the poor' it reflects the conviction that they have remained faithful to the essentials of the Jewish religion, they are the saints, the eschatological community and the true inheritors of the Kingdom of God.

The second beatitude draws this out further:

Blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled (Luke 6.21)
Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness;
for they shall be filled (Matt. 5.6)

In both Jewish and Christian imagery the good time coming is likened to a feast. The Matthaean form of the saying reflects the influence of Amos 8.11 ff;

a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water,
but of hearing the words of the Lord.

For the rabbis the Law is bread and wine. Matthew expands the simpler form of Luke to 'hunger and thirst after righteousness'. Righteousness is not simply the conformity of human conduct to the divine will, but also - and primarily - the fulfilment by God of his own purposes. Thus the probable meaning of the saying in both Luke and Matthew is that the disciples are those who wait expectantly, and can wait confidently, for the fulfilment of the purposes of God. They are those who will share in the eschatological banquet.

The third beatitude contrasts the present weeping of the disciples with their coming laughter. The sentiments and wording reflect very strongly those of Psalms 137.1ff and 126.1ff. In them the weeping of the exile community

1. Ber. 6b.

2. Cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.47

3. Cf Isa. 49.10-12; Ps. 107.1-9; Mt. 8.11f and Par. Mt. 22.1-10 and par; Lk. 22.30

4. Cf C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.12.

1.
is exchanged for laughter when 'Yahweh turned again the captivity of Zion'.
So also the Christian community can weep now, for they are those who will be
blessed and their weeping exchanged for laughter when God acts to deliver them.

All of these beatitudes, therefore, reflect the self-understanding of
the primitive Christian community that they are the true Israel, the saints,
the community elected for the final blessing of God. If in contemporary
Judaism it was allegiance to the Law that was the distinguishing characteristic
of those who would inherit the blessing to come, the fourth beatitude makes it
plain that for the Christian it is absolute and unswerving allegiance to Jesus.

According to Matthew a heavenly reward is assured to those who are
'reproached', 'persecuted', and 'slandered' for the sake of their allegiance to
Jesus. If 'for my sake' is the original form of the saying in Q, then it
conceals a high Christology which is brought out in the comparison with the
persecution of the prophets. Matthew does not compare the persecution of
Christ with that of the prophets, but the persecution of the disciples. The
persecution of the prophets was the result of the opposition to the word of
God which they proclaimed, and their allegiance to that word. This comparison,
therefore, implies a comparison between the authority of the word of God
proclaimed by the prophets and the authority of Jesus himself. It is because
Jesus has this full authority, those who give him unswerving and absolute
allegiance in the face of persecution, are those who constitute the community
2.
of the elect.

Luke's form of the saying is that the heavenly reward is the possession
of those who are 'hated', 'separated', 'reproached', and 'slandered' for the
sake of the Son of man. His assertion that it is 'their fathers' who persecuted
3.
the prophets, makes it clear that the persecutors of the Christian community are
the Jews. It has been suggested that 'separation' may refer to some synagogue
discipline, but it may refer more generally to the exclusion of the Jewish Christ
4.
ians from the Jewish society. If Matthew concealed his Christology in the 'I'

1. Ps. 126.1

2. It is irrelevant for our purposes whether this fourth beatitude, unlike the
first three, belongs to a later period in the ministry of Jesus (so T.W.Manson
Sayings, 1957, p.49) or was a separate piece of Church tradition which has
become conflated with the first three beatitudes in Q. It is significant to
note that when it is conflated in this way it reflects the community's self-
understanding as the new people of God based on the supreme authority of
Jesus, an authority which can be compared with the authority of a word of God.

3. The differences between the present sufferings of the disciples in Luke and
Matthew are most probably to be explained by accepting an Aramaic original
of the saying. (cf M.Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts,
1954, ad.loc.; T.W.Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.48.

4. Cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol IV, p 331.

form of the saying, Luke has revealed it in his use of the Son of man title, but the comparison with the persecution of the prophets makes it plain that the primary connotation of the title is the supreme authority of Jesus. It is because he is the authority-endowed Son of man that the disciples are the community of the Son of man who share his authority, and will share his heavenly glory.¹ It is by this authority that the claims of the primitive community are justified against their Jewish persecutors, and it is this allegiance to Jesus the Son of man which guarantees that as the new 'elect' people of God they will inherit his heavenly reward.

As we saw so frequently in Mark, the title Son of man combines the concepts of sovereignty and community. As this saying must be judged to be a creation of the post-Easter community, it reflects the faith of the Church that it is by the ascension of Jesus that he has entered into his full authority as the Son of man, and created the new community. This authority is now manifested on earth, and through the community's fellowship with and allegiance to the Son of man her claims to authority and election are justified. Because this is an authority on earth, the form of the saying representing Jesus as having this authority during his earthly ministry is wholly appropriate. And more than 'appropriate'; it reflects the corporate identity of the Son of man and his community on earth.

It must be stressed that this understanding of Jesus as the Son of man contains within it the self-understanding of the community. Because of his authority and her allegiance she is the community who is the inheritor of the Kingdom; she does and shall share the eschatological banquet; her weeping shall be turned to laughter when she is finally delivered; and those who persecute and exclude her now shall themselves be excluded because in rejecting them they have rejected the supreme authority of Jesus. That they are the 'saints' who are the new sovereign people of God is dependent on Jesus' authority as the Son of man, and their allegiance to him. They are a community because of Jesus, and the community is what it is because Jesus is the Son of man. He is the one who both creates the community and gives it its character.

1. Cf also H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.123, 255, 266.

(ii) Luke 7.34

The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!

And wisdom is justified of all her children.

Matthew 11.19

The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! And wisdom is justified by her works.

On the authenticity of the parable of Jesus about the children in the market place who would not join in the games of dancing and funerals (Lk. 7.31,32 = Mt. 11.16,17) and the comment on it referring to the unreasonable pretexts by which 'this generation' evades the message of John and Jesus, there is little scholarly doubt. This is established beyond reasonable doubt by the fact that the point of the parable is not to draw a contrast or comparison between Jesus and John. The message of both is discredited by the simple and common device of discrediting the man. The ascetic behaviour of John exposes him to the charge of being insane, and the freer behaviour of Jesus draws out the charge that he is a gluttonous drunkard who keeps illicit company. If the saying were a creation of the community we would expect to find some hint of a subordination of Jesus to John, as is present in Lk. 7.28 = Mt. 11.11. But as Jeremias has noted, in this saying there is an apparent equality between Jesus and John. The theme of the contrast between the austerity of John and the freer relationships of Jesus is supported by Mark 2.18 and its parallels in Luke 5.33 and Matthew 2.16, and Mark 2.16.

There is, however, nothing like this support for the use of the title 'Son of man' in the saying. Manson argues for the authenticity of the saying as a whole by treating ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a mistranslation of bar nash which could be treated as a periphrasis for the first person pronoun. If this is so the saying would then read:

'For John the Baptist is come eating no bread.....
A certain man (I) is come eating and drinking.....'

Against this it must be noted that both evangelists make precisely the same mistranslation which would indicate strongly that either the title did stand in the original Q document, or that both evangelists felt that the title was appropriate

1. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.122; J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.121 and n.75; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.70 and Teaching, 1959, p.217.
2. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.121, n.75. This judgement is supported by Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.122 and E. Schweizer, Son of Man in JBL, Vol. 79, 1960.
3. T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, pp.217f and Sayings, 1957, p.70. So also R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.155

in this context. If the title is original, it remains probable that it was inserted by the community into an authentic saying. This raises the question of what connotations the title has in this saying.

This generation's objection to the behaviour of the Son of man is the dominant point in this parable and comment. The particular features to which exception are taken can be inferred. We shall begin with the second part of the reproach: 'a friend of tax collectors and sinners'. In Mark 2.15-17 it is stated that Jesus sat at table in the house of Levi with many tax collectors and sinners, and he is reproached for this by the Pharisees. He answered this reproach by saying that he is come to call tax collectors and sinners. This section must be interpreted in exactly the same way. The Son of man offers fellowship to tax collectors and sinners, which is expressed in a common meal. This establishing of a fellowship with sinners which, for a devout Jew who faithfully follows the Law, means a serious defilement is designated by Jesus in Mark 2.17 as his specific mission. He goes beyond the limits of the Law in the fulfilment of his mission. To a Jew this is unprecedented, shocking and totally unexpected. Nothing of this sort of behaviour formed part of the messianic hope, and nothing of this could be deduced from the picture of the Son of man in Daniel or the later apocalyptic writing. When Jesus offers this table-fellowship to sinners, he is either falling foul of the Law or he is acting with an authority superior to the Law. Clearly the conviction of the primitive community is that he has this authority. As Tödt rightly notes 'the name designates Jesus in his specific sovereign activity by means of his mission, i.e. Jesus in his specific supreme authority.⁽¹⁾

However there is more to this table-fellowship than this. As L. Koehler notes the etymological derivation of the term berith was a communion effected by having a meal in common, more particularly 'table-fellowship, which a healthy person offers to a sick person, one therefore who because of his sickness is socially and religiously suspect'. It is a fellowship between two unequal partners. Jeremias elucidates this. 'Orientals, to whom symbolic actions mean more than to us, immediately understood that the admission of the outcasts to table-fellowship with Jesus meant an offer of salvation to the guilty sinners and

1. So. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.117; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.123; J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.121 n.75; E. Schweizer, 'Son of Man' in JBL, Vol 79, 1960.
2. For what follows cf. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.115 and 308f.
3. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.117.
4. L. Köhler, Old Testament Theology, 1957 p.62, also Lexicon in veteris testamenti libros, 1953, p.152

1.

the assurance of forgiveness'. Thus the offer of table-fellowship to the tax collectors and sinners was at the same time the offer of a new berith and a new status before God. In this the ideas of Lk. 7.34 closely approximate Mk. 2.10.

As Bornkamm has rightly said 'Jesus' parables show that fellowship of the table is, as it has been from ancient times, a symbol of the closest fellowship with God, and a picture of that joyful age brought in by the Messiah (Mt. 8.11; Mk. 2.15ff; Lk. 14.16ff; Mt. 22.1ff)²'. But this meal also has an eschatological aspect. It exists already related to the meal in heaven.³

It is further to be noted that 'the tax collectors and sinners with whom Jesus sits at meat are not asked first about the state of their moral improvement, any more ^{than} is the prodigal when he returns home'⁴. It is not a right that is earned it is rather a privilege that is accepted, and it is a privilege that is offered by Jesus independently and sovereignly.

The situation which has given rise to the insertion of the title Son of man into the saying of Jesus is the situation in the primitive community which, following the practice of Jesus opened its doors to the tax collectors and sinners, to those who were lost.⁵ This brought them into the same opposition as their Master. Since the primitive community understood themselves to be created as a community by the risen, ascended, and yet present one, they knew that their activity depended not simply on the example but on the authority of Jesus.⁶ This community was created out of the followers of Jesus by his 'glorification' and presence with them. Thus their character, action and authority is seen to be directly dependent on him. It is his own. This combination of authority and community again makes the title Son of man wholly appropriate in this context.

In the first part of the reproach Jesus is accused of being a glutton and a drunkard. This is caused by the fact that Jesus expresses his fellowship with tax collectors and sinners by bestowing on them table-fellowship, which means

1. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.136 n.2.

2. G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, 1960, p.81. Cf for the concept of a messianic meal Isa. 25.6; 1 En. 60.7f; 62.14; IV Ezra 6.52; 2 Bar. 29.4; Rev. 3.20; 19.9; Mt. 8.11; Lk. 22.69f; Also E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, pp. 304ff; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.109, n.1; Strack and Billerbeck, Vol. IV, pp.1154-1165.

3. Cf Lk. 22.16, 18; Mk. 14.25 and Par.

4. G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, 1960, p.83

5. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1964, p.310

6. Cf. W. Kümmel, 'Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus' in Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis 1, 1943, pp.30-45; N.A. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums, 1941, esp. p.166.

1.
 a place at the bridegroom's table, includes them in the berith, and is seen to be his specific mission. This messianic feasting is sharply contrasted with the
 2.
 fasting practised by the Pharisees and may have been the reason for the reproach
 3.
 that he was a glutton and a drunkard. The two charges are thus really one; that
 4.
 Jesus eats and drinks with sinners in the supper of God's reign.

Thus, as in Daniel, we see again that the concept Son of man belongs inextricably to the ascension and carries the connotation of an authority which occasions opposition, and inherent in it also is the concept of a community which shares both this authority and opposition. Unlike Daniel, the Son of man is not a collective term (at least not in his earthly life) for here the existence and nature of the community is understood to be directly dependent on Jesus, the Son of man. The disciples are not a corporate entity who become the Son of man, as
 5.
 Manson holds, rather they become a community by the offer of table-fellowship with the exalted and sovereign Jesus. And they become a community whose doors are open to the sinners because Jesus is the sovereign Son of man whose earthly example and continuing life completely determines the attitudes of and relationships
 6.
 within the community. Because there is this intimate relation between the example of Jesus and his exalted sovereignty, the primitive community showed a great theological astuteness in applying the title Son of man to the earthly Jesus in this context and in understanding what that title meant for the nature of the Church.

(iii) Luke 9.58

And Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.

Matthew 8.20

And Jesus saith unto him, the foxes have holes, and the birds of heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. (7)

The authenticity of this saying has been hotly debated by scholars, but

-
1. Cf Lk. 5.34
 2. Mk. 2.18ff.
 3. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1964. p.115
 4. So Zahn, quoted by E. Klosterman, Das Markusevangelium, 1936, p.27.
 5. T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1957, p.233.
 6. Cf also H.E. Tödt, Son of Man 1969, p.310
 7. The Gospel of Thomas preserves the saying (No. 86) in a slightly different form '(The foxes have their holes) and the birds have their nest; but the Son of man has no place to lay his head and to rest'. The reference to rest may be a gnostic addition, expressing the thought of rest as the state of blessedness (cf R.M. Grant and D.N. Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus according to the Gospel of Thomas, 1960, p.172; R. McL. Wilson, Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, 1960, p.59. B. Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas, (1961, pp.60ff). This saying is of interest only in that it is the sole example of a Son of man saying in the Gospel of Thomas.

1.
it must be admitted that neither the evidence for nor against is decisive. As such it is risky to base interpretation exclusively on either the situation of Jesus or the early Church.

2.
Equally hotly debated is the interpretation of the saying. Bultmann,
3.
followed by Grundmann, suggests that the saying is based on a Jewish proverbial saying in which the happy lot of the birds and foxes is contrasted with the
4. 5.
unhappy lot of man. This has been rejected by numerous scholars, and most decisively by Manson who writes:

'The view that v.58 is a popular proverb put into the mouth of Jesus may be dismissed. Proverbs, in order to survive, must contain some element of truth: and this proverb is required to say that man, in contrast to foxes and birds, has no home; which is plain nonsense. For man, of all living creatures, has provided himself with the most elaborate and permanent lodgings.' (6)

Manson's own interpretation is based on the felt need to take into account not only the 'Son of man' but also 'the strange conjunction of foxes and birds'. The foxes are 'the Edomite interlopers' (Jesus calls Herod 'that fox', Luke 13.32) and the birds are the Romans, so that the effect of the saying is 'everybody is at home in Israel's land except the true Israel'. This is an ingenious suggestion but is unlikely in view of (i) the possibility that 'foxes and birds' without the contrast with 'man' may have been associated in popular
7.
Palestinian speech, much as we associate 'cats and dogs' (ii) the fact that none of the synoptic Son of man sayings support Manson's 'collective' interpretation. Though they carry the concept of the community within them this community is entirely dependent on Jesus the Son of man and belongs essentially to the ascended, vindicated Lord.

8. 9.
A third line of approach, supported by Cullmann and Dibelius, is that the saying reflects Jesus' belief that he is the pre-existent heavenly Son of man

1. Cf in support of authenticity M. Dibelius, Jesus, 1949, p.91; O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.162. R.H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, 1954, pp.104f; T. Preiss, Le fils de l'homme, 1951, p.30. Cf against authenticity H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.125; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of man, 1964, p.126.
2. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, pp. 27,102, Cf also Jesus and the Word. 1958, pp. 42ff.
3. W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 1961, p.168
4. It is suggested that 'Son of man' here is not the apocalyptic title, but rather a reference to man in general.
5. J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.142; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, pp.59f; G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, 1960, p.230, A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 124.
6. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.72
7. So H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.122, A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.124
8. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.162,
9. M. Dibelius, Jesus, 1949, pp.89, 91.

1.
who leads a life of humility and humiliation on earth. However, this cannot be supported. There is no idea of concealment or heavenly origins in this Q saying.

2.
The idea is homelessness. It is illegitimate to transfer ideas found in 1 Enoch or Philippians 2 to the Synoptic sayings unless they themselves demand this interpretation, and pre-existence and concealment is not intimated in any Synoptic Son of man saying.

3. 4.
A fourth interpretation is given by Fuller and Preiss. They argue that the saying is a figurative allusion to the final rejection and passion of Jesus, and thus a Q parallel to the passion predictions in Mark. Whether Q has any reference to the passion, and if not why not, is open to debate, but it is hard indeed to maintain that this saying is a parallel to the Markan passion predictions, and the argument is considerably weakened by the lack of any other Q sayings referring to the suffering and death of the Son of man.

6.
Fifthly, E. Schweizer holds that the saying must be taken literally, meaning that Jesus had no home. He supports his argument for the authenticity of this saying by noting that there are no other sayings of this sort which were created by the primitive community. As Higgins rightly says, 'The plausibility of this approach, however, vanishes when it is recalled that in fact Jesus did often receive lodging (Cf Mark 1.29-35; 11.11; and in Luke 8.3 the mention of the women who provided maintenance for Jesus and the Twelve). If Jesus did receive lodgings then the saying cannot be taken literally to mean that he did not.'

8.
The most plausible interpretation is reached if we take more seriously the immediate context of the saying. In Luke 'a certain man', identified in Matthew as a scribe, declares his intention to follow Jesus wherever he goes. The reply of Jesus concerns the conditions of discipleship, which is a severance of all ties with this generation. This is made clear when Jesus calls two others to follow him, and they reply, Yes, but first let me go and bury my father, but first let me bid farewell to my family. In reply Jesus says

Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God. (9)

1. Cullmann supports his argument by reference to the Christological hymn in Phil. 2.6ff and Dibelius by reference to the ideas of heavenly concealment of the Son of man in 1 Enoch.
2. Cf H.E. Todt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p.121
3. R.H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, 1954, pp.104f.
4. T. Preiss, *Le fils de l'homme*, 1951, p.30
5. But cf below p.275 and n.1 on Lk. 11.30 and Matt. 12.40. In this passage on the 'sign of Jonah' the emphasis is not on suffering and death, as in the Markan passion predictions, but on deliverance from death.
6. E. Schweizer, *The Son of Man*, JBL, Vol. 79, 1960.
7. A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.125.
8. For what follows A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, pp.126f; H.E. Todt, *Son of Man*, 1965, pp.122f.
9. Lk. 9.60 = Matt. 8.22.

No man having put his hand to the plough and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God. (1)

It is therefore highly probable that it is in this sense that homelessness needs to be taken in this saying, and not literally. If the disciple wishes to follow Jesus then he must sever all other ties for the sake of Jesus and the Kingdom, and Jesus is himself the example of this lack of attachment to this generation. But he is more than example. He is the one with the authority to make this claim on his disciples even if, as in Lk. 6.22 and Matt. 5.11, it brings persecution.

It must be emphasised that there is no immediate allusion to suffering or persecution in this saying. If in Luke 6.22 the followers are cut off from the community by the Jews, here the initiative for severance lies with Jesus. It is his example and his demand that is to be followed by the aspirant disciple. The reason for this is that Jesus is the Son of man, the one who has been invested by God with supreme authority, and therefore inheritance in the Kingdom is intimately bound up with following him. (2)

This saying takes us a step further than Lk. 7.34 and Matt. 11.19. There we saw that it was the sovereign initiative of Jesus the Son of man which called even tax collectors and sinners to his table-fellowship. Here we see what acceptance of that invitation entails. There the sovereignty of Jesus was seen in that he went beyond both Jewish expectations and the Law. Here the sovereignty is seen in the radical claim which Jesus makes on his followers. It is this link between it and the community and its attitudes which is the significance of the title 'Son of man' in this Q saying. When Jesus grants fellowship ultimate decisions come with it. Such seriousness, even to enduring persecutions, is inherent in it because it has an intimate link with the kingdom of God, and the link is that Jesus is the Son of man in whom the Kingdom is established. This 'in whom' has a dual significance: firstly, it is in the person of Jesus himself that the kingdom has come, he is the kingdom: secondly it is by being incorporated into him that we are incorporated into the kingdom. It is this which is the link between Jesus and the kingdom, and also the link between Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology.

-
1. Lk. 9.62 (no parallel in Matthew, indicating that this may not have been in Q).
 2. What this saying indicates is a dualism between the Church and the world as in John and Paul (cf below pp.450,451) which dualism is a continuation in the Church of the radical 'break' between Jesus as the authoritative Son of man and 'this evil generation'.
 3. Cf below p.293f for the evidence that in the person of Jesus the kingdom has come.

(iv) Luke 11.30

For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall the Son of man be to this generation.

Matthew 12.40

For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

The differences between these two sayings are so great - the only point of similarity being a comparison between Jonah and the Son of man - that one is compelled to accept the originality of either the Lukan or Matthaean form, or to treat both as independent attempts to explain the enigmatic 'sign of Jonah'. The mere fact that both authors follow up the reference to the 'sign of Jonah' with some form of a comparison between Jonah and the Son of man, seems to indicate that such a comparison was present in this context in Q. This being so the fact that Luke does not carry the obvious allusion to the death and resurrection of Jesus together with the reference to the time prediction, and that his identification of the Son of man with Jesus is left indeterminate, must be accepted as strong grounds for supporting the originality of the Lukan version of the saying. In view of this and the probable authenticity of the saying in Luke, Luke's version cannot be interpreted in the light of Matthew 12.40.

According to Luke Jesus addresses the crowds, denouncing 'this generation' as 'evil'. The reason for this characterisation is that they seek

1. R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.124; E. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 1955, p.179 n.1, 238 n.1; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.211f; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.135; J. Jeremias, TWNT, Vol.III, pp.412f; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1957, p.68. The main argument here is that Matt. 12.40 bears all the marks of secondary formation.
2. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p. 62 (who inclines to this view but leaves the question open); V. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 1961, p.168; A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus, 1948, p.416; C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, 1947, p.90; J.Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, 1956, p.162.
3. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.83; J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.163; T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, p.219 (Manson holds that while the saying was not present in this context in Q, it is not an independent creation and that the form of the saying in Luke is closer to the original).
4. Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.52; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.136; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p.68.
5. In the announcement of the suffering Matthew uses without exception the phrase 'on the third day' (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ). The incongruity of Matthew 12.40, τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, while obviously disagreeing with the primitive tradition (Cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.89f) is to be explained by the text of Jonah 1.17 (Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.214). Matthew obviously wished to support his argument by an exact citation from Scripture, and in this text the phrase 'on the third day' would not have made sense.
6. Cf E. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 1955, p.180 n.1; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.134 (On this ground Higgins argues for the authenticity of the saying cf. p.138f; also H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.60, 65.)

'signs', but the only sign they will receive is that of Jonah. We are then told that 'as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so shall the Son of man be to this generation'. We are not told here in what way Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, thus the point of the comparison with the way in which the Son of man will be a sign to this generation is lost. Clearly the comparison is between Jonah who was a sign to his generation, and the Son of man who will be a sign to this one.

Luke 11.32 attempts to explicate the meaning of this 'sign'. It is the 'teaching' of Jonah. So the contrast in verse 30 appears to be between the 'teaching' of Jonah, at which his generation repented, and the 'teaching' of Jesus, which calls forth not repentance but the demand for 'signs'. It is not self-evident, however, that verse 30 should be interpreted in the light of verse 32. In verse 32 Jonah is clearly subordinated to Jesus, a subordination of which there is no hint in verse 30. Further, Jeremias has rightly said that the description of Jesus' teaching as a sign would be 'ganz ungewöhnlich'. There is also the problem of the future tenses in Luke 11.29f. 'no sign shall be given (δοθήσεται).....' could be understood to mean that no further sign will be given than that already given, the sign of Jonah - that is Jesus as the preacher of judgement. But full weight must also be given to the second future tense 'so will the Son of man be (ἔσται).....' Here some future event is implied, which cannot be the 'teaching' of Jesus which is already both past and present. This would seem to indicate that verse 32 is secondary in this context. That Luke found it in this context in Q is rendered probable by the fact that Matthew has also preserved it in this context. Its attraction to this context is to be explained by the use of the words 'Jonah' and 'Ninevites' in both verses 30 and 32.

If this is correct, then while the teaching of Jesus in both Q and Luke is seen to be linked with the coming event which is spoken of as the coming 'sign' of the Son of man, that event itself cannot be 'the teaching' of Jesus.

-
1. In the text in Luke the threatening prediction that the men of Nineveh will arise at the judgement with this generation does not immediately follow after the saying about the sign of Jonah. Thus we must consider that the prediction in Lk. 11.32 stood originally by itself. (Cf E. Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium, 1927, p.112; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.212)
 2. J. Jeremias, TWNT, Vol. III, p.412.
 3. W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, pp.68f.
 4. This does not mean that this saying is not an authentic word of Jesus. (For argument for its authenticity of T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.187; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.118, A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.137 and n.l.) It only means that its original context is unknown.

Tödt claims that this sign is to be 'the Son of man who comes in judgement'¹. His appearance will satisfy their demand for a sign from heaven, but only in the manner described by Matthew 24.30; 'Then the sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.'² 'For a number of reasons it is highly improbable that this 'sign of the Son of man' in Luke 11.30 should be interpreted as a reference to the parousia of the Son of man in annihilatory judgement.

- (i) Although the 'sign of the Son of man' in Matthew 24.30 is identical in form with 'the sign of Jonah' in Luke 11.30, the 'signs in heaven' of Matthew 24.30 are signs which precede the advent of the Son of man, and does not mean that the Son of man himself is a sign. In Luke 11.30 the comparison is between Jonah himself, who became a sign to his generation, and the Son of man, who will be a sign to this generation.
- (ii) If the coming event is the parousia of the Son of man, any point of comparison with Jonah is lost. If Bultmann's argument that the comparison is between Jonah, who came from a distant land, and the Son of man, who will come from his heavenly pre-existence, must be rejected as far too subtle,³ so must this one be.⁴ Higgins' claim that the comparison is not exact, is a masterly understatement, and his assertion that it could not be exact because Jonah was a prophet and not an eschatological figure does not help at all, for he himself has to revert to a comparison between the teaching of Jonah and Jesus, which he has said is not the point of the comparison. Because this generation has rejected the teaching they will get an unexpected and unpleasant sign, the advent of the Son of man who will authenticate the teaching of Jesus. **While this interpretation** establishes a link between the teaching of Jesus and the parousia of the Son of man, it has to appeal to verse 32 to supply the comparison between Jonah and the Son of man. This self-contradiction in Higgins hardly encourages acceptance of his interpretation.

Further, Manson's objection to this view is decisive:

1. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.53. So also A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.138.
 2. B. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.124.
 3. Cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.90.
 4. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.138.

'For Jonah came preaching repentance; the Son of man comes to execute judgement. The sign of Jonah was of some use to the Ninevites: it gave them opportunity to repent. The sign of the Son of man will be of no use to this generation; for when it comes it will be too late to repent. Such a sign is hardly worthy of the name of sign.' (1)

- (iii) If verse 32 is taken into account in interpreting verse 30, then it is noteworthy that it is the Ninevites who condemn the men of this generation at the judgement for their refusal to repent at the teaching of the one greater than Jonah. This condemnation is not assigned either to Jesus or to the Son of man.^{2.}
- (iv) If the saying in verse 30 is to be understood in terms of the parousia then it is strange indeed that Matthew, with his strong predilection for parousia teaching, should have so misunderstood the saying that he has removed all traces of the parousia from his version and interpreted it unmistakeably in terms of the resurrection.^{3.}

This being so, the interpretation given by Jeremias seems to me to be the most probable.^{4.} Although he agrees that Matthew 12.40 is secondary, and therefore should not be used as a basis for interpreting Luke 11.30, he suggests that the meaning of the two versions is basically identical, but with a change of emphasis. He holds that the meaning is that as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites as one who appeared to them after having been rescued from the belly of the whale, so Jesus will appear to this generation after being rescued from death. The claims of Jesus, as of Jonah, will be established by deliverance from death. In the secondary version in Matthew the emphasis has shifted from this central theme to the length of time involved - three days and three nights.

5.

Manson's argument against such an interpretation is not convincing. It is certainly true that historically the Ninevites knew nothing of the 'submarine adventures' of Jonah, and that they repented at his preaching not at the miraculous deliverance. But it is equally true that the Ninevites are not the audience here. Whether this saying emanates from Jesus or the primitive community

1. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.90.

2. This would constitute further grounds against the originality of v.32 in this context, but the link between the concepts of judgement and the Son of man would have further facilitated its attraction to this context. In this context however, if v.30 is to be understood in terms of the parousia of the Son of man in judgement, when it is strange indeed that neither Matthew nor Luke have linked the Ninevites with the Son of man in condemnation. This would seem to indicate that Luke, like Matthew, did not understand the sign which the Son of man will be to this generation as condemnatory judgement.

3. Cf above pp.109f.

4. J. Jeremias, TWNT, Vol. III, p.412f.

5. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.89f.

they would most certainly have been familiar with the miraculous deliverance of Jonah which authenticated the preaching of Jonah to the Ninevites as a word from God. Thus the comparison between Jonah and the Son of man would be unforced if it was the deliverance from death, authenticating the message, that is in mind here. Such an interpretation would make it plain why the comparison in verse 30 is between Jonah himself - and not his teaching, as in verse 32 - and the Son of man himself - and not the teaching of the one greater than Jonah, as in verse 32.^{1.}

However, it is inherently probable that the title 'Son of man' is used here to convey more than simply deliverance from death. If the saying did emanate from the lips of Jesus, who was certainly familiar with Dan. 7.13, then it is probable that the reference is to the ascension; to the Son of man's coming to the Ancient of days to be invested with full and supreme authority and dominion. If this is so, then this saying is precisely parallel in meaning to what we have found in Mark 14.62, where Jesus warns his judges that they will see the Son of man 'sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven'. In this sense the Son of man will certainly be a 'sign' to this generation, authenticating the teaching of Jesus and legitimising the claim that men should repent at the teaching of the one who is greater than Jonah. But since the 'sign' is the Son of man himself and not his teaching, the call is for attachment to him as the one to whom full authority belongs.

In Matthew 12.40 the primary reference is clearly not to the ascension but to the resurrection. In verse 41 the comparison is between the preaching of Jonah and the one greater than Jonah, but in verse 40 the well-known story of the sojourn of Jonah in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights has probably been brought out by the fact that in the stereotyped announcements of the passion the Son of man is connected with the phrase about rising after three days, or on the third day.^{2.} This provides for him a ready-made and Scripturally supported point of comparison between Jonah and the Son of man. In the process while the idea of deliverance from death is still obviously present, the concept

1. The argument of Higgins (Son of Man, 1964, p.135) and Tödt (Son of Man, 1965, p.212) against this interpretation on the grounds that there are no sayings in Q which parallel the Markan predictions of the (passion and) resurrection (and ascension) is unconvincing, for this saying could well be the one exception! It appears as if their interpretation of this saying is pre-judged by their interpretation of other sayings, and that the only authentic sayings of Jesus are those which refer to the parousia of the Son of man.
2. On the use of the phrase τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας rather than Matthew's τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ cf above p.271 n.5

1.

of the ascension has been somewhat obscured. So the point of the title 'Son of man' with its allusions to the appearance of the Son of man before the heavenly court to be invested with full authority is also obscured. Nevertheless the fact that Matthew has interpreted the Q saying in this way, despite his fondness for the parousia and apocalyptic details, supports our conclusion that Luke 11.30 is to be interpreted in terms of deliverance from death and not of the parousia.

This saying takes us further along the road of understanding the use of the title Son of man in Q. It is because of the act of deliverance from death and ascension that Jesus has been invested with supreme authority. It is worthwhile, therefore, to endure persecutions for his sake, because attachment to him ensures participation in the Kingdom (Luke 6.22f = Matthew 5.11f). Because of it he has the right to go beyond the Law in inviting sinners to the banquet of God's reign (Luke 7.34 = Matthew 11.19). And because he is who he is, the one with whom salvation is bound up, he has the right to make ultimate claims on his followers. Accordingly the nature, authority, and attitudes of the Christian community are bound up not simply with the example of Jesus and attachment to him during his earthly ministry, but supremely with the ascension and the fellowship of the ascended sovereign Son of man with the community. As we have seen so often before, the historical ministry, deliverance from death and the ascension, and the continued fellowship, is what creates the community which can be termed 'the Church', and the role of the title 'Son of man' in this total process is to stress the sovereign authority of the ascended Jesus and the link with the Kingdom of God. In stressing the person of the Son of man rather than his teaching the concept of the Church as the 'corporate personality' of the ascended Son of man is also made clear. The Church consists not simply of those who obey his teaching, but who are 'in him' to use the Pauline phrase.

(v) Luke 12.8f

And I say unto you, Every one who shall confess me before men,
him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God:
But he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied
in the presence of the angels of God.

Matthew 10.32f

Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will
I also confess before my Father which is in heaven.
But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny
before my Father which is in heaven. (2)

-
1. Unless our argument above pp 39ff is correct, that for Matthew as much as John and Luke, the day of the resurrection was also the day of the ascension and bestowal of the Holy Spirit.
 2. For the Aramaisms in this passage of T.W. Manson, Teaching, 1959, p.263 n.2.

1.

We have already examined the Markan parallel of this saying in 8.38, and noted the secondary character of the form of the saying in Matthew. We have also seen that the possible apocalyptic interpretation of Mk. 8.38 might support the originality of Luke 12.8f, where the apocalyptic element is absent. If we are right, however, in seeing the primary imagery in Mark as being derived from Dan. 7.13 and that the root meaning in Mark is the ascension of the Son of man, which has become confused with the parousia, then it is possible that the dynamic 'coming' of the Son of man has been altered to the more static imagery in Luke to express the idea of the continuing acknowledgement by the Son of man in the heavenly court of those who 'confess' Jesus in the presence of men (so Luke) or in this generation (so Mark). This would not be an argument for the originality of all of the Markan text, but simply for the 'coming' of the Son of man.

3.

If Luke, or Q, has altered the original authentic saying in Mark with its reference to the ascension, then the argument that a distinction is implied between Jesus and the Son of man is defeated, for the 'coming' will refer not to a distinct figure but the 'coming' of Jesus into his glory and the exercise of his rightful dominion. This interpretation is supported by Matthew's version who has made the identification between Jesus and the Son of man so complete that any reference to the title has disappeared, and has given the saying neither ascension nor apocalyptic connotations, but who has preserved the Q concept of the continuing confession of the faithful Christian community by Jesus in his glory. Therefore while Matthew's version must be accepted as secondary, he has interpreted the saying, which was wide-spread in the early Church, most accurately. This can only be denied if it can be maintained that the original form of the saying did imply a distinction between Jesus and the Son of man. Argument for such an interpretation must fail on the grounds that the Q version of the saying gives us no hint at all of either a translation or epiphany of the Son of man. Such a hint might be present in Mark, but there it refers primarily to a Daniel-like ascension of the Son of man.

The Q form of the saying appears to reflect a slight alteration of an authentic saying expressing by this alteration, the faith of the community that

-
1. Cf above pp. 226ff.
 2. The originality of Luke 12.8f is supported by T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, p.75; J.A.T. Robinson, The Second Coming - Mark XIV 62, ET, Vol. 67, 1956, pp.336f; V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.383; M.D. Hooker, Son of Man, 1967, p.119; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.109; Teaching, 1959, p.263; A.J.B. Higgins Son of Man, 1964, pp.58ff.
 3. For the authenticity of the saying cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.40ff; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.60
 4. Cf above p. 226.

adherence to or denial of Jesus is of ultimate significance, because Jesus, in his ascended glory, is the one whose testimony either includes in or excludes from the people of God, and what that testimony will be is dependent upon a man's attitude to Jesus. As such this saying is closely parallel to Luke 6.22f, where those who endure suffering and persecution for the sake of the Son of man are to rejoice for their reward 'is great in heaven'. In 6.22f this 'heavenly reward' may mean that the faithful disciple, like his master, will be translated to share the life of bliss with the Son of man in the heavenly community. Here the disciples are assured of acceptance by God as a result of their faithfulness because, in heaven, Jesus the Son of man acknowledges them as members of his community. The ascension of the Son of man is, therefore, the sign to this generation (Lk. 11.30 and par.), establishing the supreme authority of Jesus to include sinners in the redeemed community (Lk. 7.34 and par.) and to make ultimate demands on men (Lk. 9.58 and Matt.8.20). Because he is the sovereign ascended Son of man suffering is inevitable when this authority is rejected (Lk. 6.22f and Matt. 5.11f) but it is both worthwhile and necessary to endure this suffering because it brings with it inclusion in the community of the Son of man, the elect people of God, who are now accepted by God (Lk. 12.8 and Matt. 10.32) and who will share his heavenly inheritance (Lk. 6.22 and Matt. 5.12). Here we see again that faith in Jesus as the Son of man contains within it both the Christian community's self-understanding and hope, but it is a self-understanding and hope which is utterly dependent upon Jesus and their attitude to him in the light of the ascension. It is his testimony concerning them in the heavenly court which makes them the eschatological people of God.

(vi) Luke 12.10

And everyone who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven.

Matthew 12.32

And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.

There is a parallel to this saying in Mark where, significantly, the title 'Son of man' does not appear but rather τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,¹ an over-literal rendering of 'the Aramaic original'.

1. So V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.242.

Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme.

But whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin:

Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit. (1)

The Markan form of the saying appears to mean that any blasphemy of man will be forgiven except the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and this exception is clearly linked intimately with Jesus whose works of exorcism were performed in the power of the Holy Spirit. There is no forgiveness for the man who is unable to see the power of the divine Spirit in the work of Jesus.² Despite the similarity of this Markan saying to the version in Q, its meaning is manifestly different.

3.

Since the work of Wellhausen most scholars have followed him in assuming the originality of the Markan form of the saying.⁴ Hence it is argued that the saying originally contrasted a railing against men with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,⁵ or alternatively that Jesus used 'a son of man' in the singular referring to himself, but not in a Messianic sense.⁶ This Mark has generalised,⁷ Lohmeyer has, however, shown convincingly the impossibility of this.⁷ In Mark, **as** it stands, every sin and blasphemy of man will be forgiven - 'a monstrous saying from which it would follow that all discernment of sin and all final judgement would be eliminated'.⁸

One of the major grounds for holding the originality of the Markan form of the saying has been the impossibility of making sense of the saying in Luke 12.10, which contradicts Luke 12.8f. But this fact should be strong grounds for the originality of the Q form. It is quite easy to understand that Mark would have been unable to accept that blasphemy against the Son of man would be forgiven, especially in view of Mk. 8.38, and has therefore altered the saying to one that is virtually meaningless. On the other hand it is impossible to assume that Luke, finding a saying which referred to men generally, would have altered it to the apocalyptic title, especially since he chose to insert it along with the saying

1. Mark 3.27-29.

2. So M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 1929, p.76.

3. J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, 1904, pp.62f.

4. Cf T.W. Manson, *Teaching*, 1959, p.217; *Sayings*, 1957, p.109f; V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955, p.242; R. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 1963, p.138; A.T. Cadoux, *The Sources of the Second Gospel*, 1935, p.96; G. Dalman, *Words*, 1909, p.254.

5. A.H. McNeile, *Matthew*, 1910, p.178.

6. A.E.J. Rawlinson, *Mark*, 1940, pp. 44f.

7. E. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 1937, p.80; supported by H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p.120; A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.129.

8. E. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 1940, p.80 (quoted by H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p.120 n.3.)

about confessing or denying Jesus which results in confession or denial of men before God by the Son of man.

Consequently the trend in recent discussion has rightly been to support
 1. 2.
 the originality of the Q form of the saying, and thus of the title 'Son of man'.

What then is the point of the contrast between blasphemy against the Son of man, which will be forgiven, and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, for which there is no forgiveness? Without pre-judging the authenticity of the
 3.
 saying the fact that it is specifically blasphemy against the Son of man establishes beyond reasonable doubt that the saying was preserved in the Palestinian community. As such the situation which would have encouraged the preservation or creation of the saying would have been the rejection by Jews of the Church's offer of salvation - an all too common factor in their experience.

There are three intelligible ways of interpreting the contrast.

4.
 Barrett calls attention to the normal patristic exegesis, according to which blasphemy against the Son of man is a sin of the heathen, but is forgivable in baptism for those who are converted, whereas post-baptismal sins are unforgivable because they are committed against the Holy Spirit who had been received in baptism, and the most heinous of such sins is blasphemy against the Spirit. This approach does justice to the New Testament church's vivid consciousness of the Spirit as
 5.
 'the absolutely constitutive factor' of its life, so that blasphemy against him was
 6.
 the unforgivable sin of apostacy. To deny Jesus, the Son of man, is forgivable in conversion. But to choose to place one's self outside the community of the

1. Cf R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.138, who cites A. Fridrichsen and M. Goguel; B.S. Easton, Luke, 1926, p.199; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.119f; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.129f.

2. If this is so, then the original context of the saying cannot have been the Lukan one. Tödt argues that the more original context is that of Matthew and Mark (H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.118) who place it at the climax of the Beelzebul controversy. More probably the saying was originally independent of this pericope, for it is clearly an editorial insertion at this point in Mark. (Cf. V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, p.241). Matthew has probably inserted it after his version of the similar saying in Mark (Mk. 3.28f and Mt. 12.31) because of its obvious parallels to that saying. If this were an independent saying it would explain why Luke has not included it in his record of the Beelzebul controversy. (Lk. 11.14ff. For a similar conclusion, Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 130f.)

3. Accepting the originality of the Markan form, R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.110 and V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, ad. loc. accept also its authenticity. Accepting the originality of the Q form, B.H. Branscomb, Mark, 1929, p.74; C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, 1947, pp.105-107, E. Schweizer, 'Spirit of God', 1960, p.25 n.6; TWNT, Vol vi, p.395, n.407; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.125; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.130, accept the post-Easter formulation of the saying.

4. C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, 1947, p.106f.

5. *ibid*, p.106.

6. Cf. Heb. 6.4-6; 1 Jn. 5.16f; Acts 7.51; Eph. 4.30; 1 Thess. 4.8.

Holy Spirit, the Church, meant exclusion from forgiveness and salvation.

1.
Tödt holds that the saying reflects two periods in the history of salvation, the period of the activity of the Son of man on earth and the subsequent period of the Holy Spirit.¹ Those who turned against the Son of man in his activity on earth can be forgiven. There is no forgiveness, however, in the post-Easter situation for the one who sets himself in opposition to the manifest activity of the Holy Spirit. 'The meaning of this distinction is quite intelligible. In the Spirit the exalted Lord reveals himself. He who did not follow the earthly Jesus may nevertheless find forgiveness following the exalted Lord, i.e. if he does not blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. (For the statement that opposition to Jesus' claim to full authority can be forgiven, cf Acts 3.17ff; 13.27ff; Lk. 23.34)'.²

3.
Higgins, holding to the creation of the saying by the Palestinian community interprets it as follows: 'The attitude of the church would have been that blasphemy against its Lord, serious though it was, could be forgiven those Jews who were converted and came in baptism to confess Jesus as the exalted Son of man.' His meaning would seem to be that those who repent of their blasphemy against the Son of man will find forgiveness, but those who refuse to do so and to submit to baptism will never find forgiveness.

Whichever specific interpretation is favoured, the meaning appears to be that for men who deny Jesus the Son of man there is the ever open possibility of forgiveness. But this forgiveness entails becoming members of the community of the ascended Son of man created by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit - and becoming a member entails confession of the Lordship of Jesus and submission to baptism to receive the Holy Spirit.⁴ The contrast would then appear to be between those who are outside the community, for whom there is the opportunity of repentance and forgiveness, and those who remain permanently outside of it, for whom there is none; 'neither in this world nor in that which is to come' as Matthew adds. The reason is obvious. The community understood itself to be created by their participation in the Spirit of the 'Ehbed Yahweh, The Messiah, and the Son

1. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 119.

2. H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 119.

3. A. J. B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 130f.

4. This baptismal inference is rendered highly probable by the fact that Mark and Matthew (Matthew either independently of Mark or following him) have attached this saying to the Beelzebul pericope in which Jesus' conquest of the 'strong man' is asserted and by the fact that in the New Testament baptismal faith it is frequently asserted that through baptism a man is made a member of the Satan-defeating community (cf above pp 154ff) of him who defeated Satan. It is not unlikely that this baptismal faith attracted this saying to this context as well as the aspect of Jewish opposition to both Jesus and the community.

of man, and in every case this is seen to be consequent upon the ascension. By this participation in the Spirit of Jesus they know themselves, beyond any shadow of doubt, to be the New Israel, the elect people of God, the eschatological community, sharing in his redeeming nature.

(vii) Luke 12.40

Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.

Matthew 24.44

Therefore be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.

It is possible, though not probable, that this saying did not stand in Q as the interpretative conclusion to the parable of the thief. Harnack argued that since Luke 12.40 is omitted from some MSS in family I it is a Matthaean editorial addition which has become assimilated to the text in Luke. Such a conclusion would be supported by the fact that 'have watched and' in Luke 12.39 is omitted in several early and important MSS. This would be a second instance in which words which have been added as an editorial gloss by Matthew have crept into the text of Luke in the space of two verses. Further, Matthew concludes his two other similes in this context with a reference to the unexpected 'coming' of the Son of man (v.39, which repeats what has already been said in V.37) or 'your Lord' (v.42, which has been taken from Mark 13.35). The fact that 24.42 is appended to verses 40f from a different context in Mark, and that it repeats what has already been said in verses 37 and 39, would support the conclusion that the saying is not original in Q.

This uncertainty alone should caution against accepting its authenticity, even without the general principle that interpretations of parables must be regarded as suspect. Thus we accept that the saying is a subsequent allegorization by the Church of an authentic parable of Jesus whereby Jesus becomes identified with the figure in the parable. This conclusion must stand whether or not

1. A. Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus, 1908, pp.31, 34. So also T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, p.95; Blass and Debrunner, Sect. 284(5) p.154.
2. Cf J.M. Creed, Luke, 1950, p.176 who gives the MSS as X D e i syr rt arm sah^{codd} Tert.
3. Against this conclusion, cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.54; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.140 n.3.
4. The non-authenticity of the saying is widely accepted by scholars. Cf J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, pp.39ff; C.H. Dodd, Parables, 1956, pp.154ff; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.79; Ph. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu', in Festestschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.71; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.141. This conclusion is rejected by H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.54,60,65,329ff. He holds that the saying emanates from the ministry of Jesus.

1.
the saying was in Q.

There can be little doubt that the parable itself is authentic. The fact that the metaphor of the thief in the night 'is foreign to the eschatological imagery of late Jewish literature' but is echoed in other New Testament passages suggests that it belongs to a very primitive and authentic tradition. If the interpretation is a Christological composition of the early Church, to what does the 'coming of the Son of man' refer? It is noteworthy that no heavenly or apocalyptic details of the saying are furnished at all. This might support the argument of Jeremias that the parable was addressed by Jesus to his contemporaries as a warning of the approaching 'eschatological catastrophe', the day of the Lord, and that the 'Son of man' was substituted for the 'day of the Lord' by the Church when it applied the parable to the delay of the parousia, and changed it into an admonition to the post-Easter community to be ever watchful for the parousia.

This tendency to interpret the parable in terms of the parousia is clearly present in 1 Thessalonians 5.1-11. For Paul the thief comes 'in the night', and upon this detail he elaborates not very consistently. The point is of significance for him because Christians are the children of light, and therefore should not be overtaken by a thief or drunkenness, both of which are states belonging to the night. 'But as a result of his allegorization the metaphor breaks in his hands, and what begins as a symbol of darkness ends inconsequentially as a figure for "the Day": "You are not in darkness, brethren, that the day should overtake you like a thief"'. If the metaphor breaks at this point it may be, as Robinson suggests, that the tradition and context of John 12.35f is to be counted as authentic. Here the contrast is between the sons of light and those who walk in darkness which concludes with the injunction; "Walk while you have the light, that darkness may not overtake you", and in John the reference is

1. Cf the arguments of J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, pp. 40f; Ph. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu' in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.66A. J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.140f.

2. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.40.

3. 1 Thess. 5.2,4; 2 Pet. 3.10; Rev. 3.3; 6.5. None of these make reference to the Son of man. In 1 Thess. and 2 Peter the comparison is between the thief and the 'day' or 'the day of the Lord'. In Rev. it is Jesus who comes as a thief.

4. Ph. Vielhauer's argument that the parable is a Gemeindebildung, which was directed to the problem of the delayed parousia and was always Christological (op. cit. p.66 and his criticism of Jeremias' view of the parable as an adapted 'crisis-parable' in n.79) fails to convince.

5. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, pp. 39-41.

6. Cf Lk. 21.34f.

7. If this is so then a still later stage is reflected in Rev. 3.3; 16.5, where Christ says 'I will come as a thief'.

8. There is nothing to suggest this in Luke 12.39. It is implied by the words 'he would have kept awake' which, as we have seen (above p.282) is a Matthaean editorial addition, probably to provide a link with the $\chi\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ of the previous verse.

9. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.115 and n.3

not to the parousia, but to the imminent climax of the ministry of Jesus in the lifting up of the Son of man and the judgement which that must bring (Jn. 12.31-34). The injunction in John would certainly make better sense than the reference to 'the day' in 1 Thessalonians 5.4.

On the other hand the break down of the metaphor by the incongruous reference to 'the Day' when Paul has made such play on the night and darkness would support Jeremias' conclusion that the parable of the thief in the mouth of Jesus did have a reference to the 'day of the Lord'. If so, Paul is here being faithful to the tradition which compared the unexpected breaking in of the thief with the unexpected 'Day' even at the expense of consistency.

It is probable that both John 12.31ff, where both judgement and the lifting up of the Son of man is said to be imminent - a judgement which will be in favour of those who walk in the light while the light is still among them, i.e. the followers of Jesus - and Luke 12.39f = Matt. 24.43f, where the unexpected breaking in of the thief is compared with the unexpected breaking in of the 'Day of the Lord', are to be considered as the sources of Paul's composition in 1 Thessalonians 5.1-7.

We conclude, therefore, that the tradition behind the Q saying referred to the eschatological Day of judgement. In this form the parable and its comparison with the sudden advent of the 'day' may well be authentic. It is clear, however, that the alteration of 'the day' to 'the Son of man' is to bring the saying into line with the parousia expectations of the early Church.

This could be the most natural interpretation of the saying in Luke, where it appears as the climax to a variant form of the parable of the ten virgins which follows shortly after in Matthew 25. 1-13. In Matthew's parable the virgins are waiting for the arrival of the bridegroom for the marriage feast. When he arrives the five wise virgins go into the feast with him, but the five foolish ones are excluded. The climax is the call to watchfulness because neither the hour nor day is known. In its context this is clearly the hour of the arrival of the bridegroom and the commencement of the marriage feast. The most natural interpretation of this is not in terms of the parousia, but rather in terms of the entry of Jesus on the heavenly banquet. Since it is not known when this will be, the disciples are warned to be watchful at the risk of

1. If 'the Son of man' did stand in Q and is an authentic word of Jesus, as H. E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, pp. 54, 60, 65, 329ff, contends, then it is not easy to understand why Paul and Peter have retained the comparison of the thief with the 'day' and not with 'the Lord', which would have made equally good sense in 2 Pet. 3.10 and better sense in 1 Thess. 5.4.
2. The complete lack of apocalyptic details from the parable supports this conclusion.

exclusion from that banquet. The most natural application of this parable in the situation of the early church would be the inclusion of the faithful disciple at the Eucharistic banquet of the bridegroom, and the exclusion of those who are not known by the bridegroom because of their casual discipleship.

In Luke, however, the bridegroom is 'returning' from the marriage feast¹ to the waiting servants and with those he finds watching for his return he sits down to meat, girds himself, and serves them. It is strange indeed that here the faithful disciples are not included in the bridegroom's feast but rather share in a meal which is subsequent to it.² The reference to the 'Lord's' girding himself, however, carries clear allusions to John's record of what Jesus did for his disciples at the Last Supper, and the reference to his 'serving them' to the discussion of the disciples at the Last Supper about greatness and the reply of Jesus that his greatness is to be seen in the fact that he 'serves those who sit at meat'.³ This supports the Eucharistic interpretation we have given to Matthew 25.1ff, and suggests that the primary meaning of the 'return' of the bridegroom may not be the Parousia, but his coming from his heavenly banquet to the disciples in the Eucharistic fellowship, which is intimately connected with that heavenly feast.⁴

This interpretation receives support from Luke's reference to the 'going' of the Son of man at the Last Supper, which is followed immediately by the discussion at the table among the disciples about who would be the greatest and the reply of Jesus that greatness is to be measured in terms of servicing those who 'sit at meat' and the saying about eating and drinking with him in his Kingdom.⁵ If this eating and drinking in the Kingdom is thought of in transcendental terms, the Eucharist is clearly the anticipation of that eschatological banquet in its fellowship with Jesus, the ascended Son of man.⁶

We conclude that the coming of the Son of man in Lk. 12.40, for which the disciples are to be constantly prepared, is primarily the coming of the Son of man to serve his faithful followers in the fellowship of the Eucharistic banquet. This does not exclude the possibility that at a second level of interpretation the

1. Lk. 12.36

2. Cf Lk. 5.34; 14.16ff.

3. Cf. Jn. 13.4

4. Cf. Lk. 22.24-27 and above pp.236 ff. The fact that 'girding himself', 'sitting at meat' and 'serving' are all to be found in the contexts of the Last Supper, makes it most probable that the 'return' of the bridegroom is Eucharistic in meaning.

5. Lk. 22.22 cf our discussion of this above pp.246 ff.

6. Lk. 22.24-27. Cf our discussion of this above pp.236 ff. It is noteworthy that both 'serving' and 'sitting at meat' are key ideas in Lk.22.27 and Lk. 12.37. For Luke the Eucharistic implications of 12.37 would have been obvious.

7. Lk. 22.30a.

reference is to the parousia of the Son of man, which is to be the fulfilment of his 'coming' to them in the Eucharist.

A Eucharistic interpretation of the saying in Matthew cannot be supported. In its context in Matthew the primary reference of the saying must be to the sudden parousia of the Son of man.

The history of this saying is probably a very early, and possibly authentic comparison between the sudden breaking in of the thief and the unexpected coming of the 'day', supported by the evidence of 1 Thessalonians 5.4 and 11 Peter 3.10. In Q 'the Son of man' has replaced the 'day of the Lord', but what preceded the saying can no longer be ascertained.

It is not possible to decide whether Luke's or Matthew's context should be ascribed to Q. Matthew's predilection for the parousia may have led him to cast it in a parousia mould. But by the same token Luke's concern with the ascension and the creation of the community by the outpouring of the Spirit and the table-fellowship with the ascended Lord may have led him to place the saying in a context with clear references to the Eucharist.

(viii) Luke 17.22

And he said unto the disciples
The days will come, when ye shall
desire to see one of the days of
the Son of man, and ye shall not
see it.

No parallel (1).

Luke 17.23f

And they shall say to you Lo,
there! Lo, here! go not away, nor
follow after them:
For as lightning, when it lighte-
neth out of one part under heaven
shineth unto the other part of
heaven; so shall the Son of man
be in his day.

Matthew 24.26f.

If therefore they shall say unto you,
Behold, he is in the wilderness; go
forth: Behold he is in the inner
chambers; believe it not. For as
Lightning cometh forth from the east,
and is seen in the west; so shall be
the coming of the Son of Man.

Luke 17.26f

And as it came to pass in the
days of Noah, even so shall it be
also in the days of the Son of
man.
They ate, they drank, they
married, they were given in mar-
riage, until the day that Noah
entered into the ark, and the
flood came, and destroyed them
all.

Matthew 24.37ff

And as were the days of Noah, so
shall be the coming (Gr. presence)
of the Son of man. For as in those
days which were before the flood
they were eating and drinking, mar-
rying and giving in marriage, until
the day that Noah entered into the
Ark,
And they knew not until the flood
came and took them all away; so
shall be the coming (Gr. presence)
of the Son of man.

Luke 17.28ff

Likewise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;
 But in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all: After the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed. No. Parallel (1).

We shall attempt to deal with this complex series of inter-related Son of man sayings in the following way: Firstly, we shall attempt to show what may have stood in the original Q source, and what interpretation we can place on them with reasonable certainty. Secondly we shall consider the interpretation which Matthew put on these sayings by the context in which he included them, and the theological interest he shows in the alterations he makes to the probable Q text. Finally we shall deal with Luke in the same way.

Matthew has obviously inserted Q material, Matt. 24. 26-28, into material derived from Mark 13. After v. 28 he reverts to his Mark source for verses 29-31; 32f; 34-36. This is followed by another saying from Q, 37-39a, with 39b an editorial repetition of 37b. The sayings which are thus kept apart in Matthew (24.27 and 24.37) by the material from Mark (24.29 - 24.36) are brought close together in Luke (17.24 and 17.26). Only verse 25 separates the sayings in Luke, and this must be regarded as a Lukan editorial addition modelled on the Markan passion predictions. In Matthew the simile of the vultures and carcase (24.28) follows immediately on the Son of man saying (24.26f). In Luke it is separated from it by v. 31, probably derived from Mark 13.15, 16, v.32, probably a Lukan editorial addition, v.33, which may be derived from Mark 8.35, or be a Q saying which is preserved in a different non-Markan context in Matt. 10.39, and vv. 34 and 35, which appears to be derived from Q and in this context.

4.

If Luke 17. 28-30 did stand in Q, it is difficult to understand why it

1. (and previous page):-

-
- Although there is no parallel in Matthew to verses 22 and 30 in Luke 17, they cannot be treated in isolation from the whole section Lk. 17.22-37. Matthew inserts these Q sayings into the discourse on Mount Olivet which he has taken from Mark 13. Luke, on the other hand reserves the Olivet discourses to Chapter 21.5ff. Thus it is certain that these Q sayings are not in their original context in Matthew.
2. Cf. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.78f; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp. 105ff. Against this cf. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.142; .G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p.70.
 3. Cf also A. Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus, 1968, p.145; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp. 141ff.
 4. Cf E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium, 1929, p.175; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.141ff.

was omitted by Matthew. It is possible that Luke derived it from an edition of Q not known to Matthew, but this would be strange if Matthew was written later than Luke, which would make it more probable that there would be editorial additions in Matthew's Gospel than Luke's. In any event, these verses do not appear to belong to a common source.

Opinion is equally sharply divided on whether Lk. 17.22 belonged to Q. If it was in Q in some form it is understandable that Matthew would have omitted it for the sake of style since he has just taken from his Markan source a very similar saying about the Christ not the Son of man. (Matt. 24.23). Thus the grounds for including Lk. 17.22f must be regarded as stronger than those for Lk. 17.28-30.

From these considerations the following arrangement of the probable text of Q results:

Lk. 17.22,23 = ?
 Lk. 17.23f, 28 = Matt. 24. 26-28
 Lk. 17. 26,27 = Matt 24. 37-39
 Lk. 17. 28-30 = ?
 Lk. 17. 34,35 = Matt. 24. 40,41.

Concerning the text of Q itself, one of the immediate problems is that in the two Son of man texts for which we have parallels Luke makes reference to the 'day of the Son of man' (17.24) and the 'days of the Son of man.' In the two references to which there is no parallel in Matthew Luke has both forms; 'the days of the Son of man' in the verse which possibly comes from Q (Lk. 17.23) and 'the day that the Son of man is revealed' in the verse which is more probably Lukan (Lk. 17.30).

It must be taken as virtually certain that Matthew's *ἡ παρουσία* is secondary and owes its presence to his recasting of the original question of the disciples about when the destruction of the temple will take place (Mk. 13.4) to a question about Jesus' *ἡ παρουσία* and the end of the world (Matt. 24.3). The reference to the *ἡ παρουσία* of the Son of man is clearly intended to be a direct answer to the original question as it is formulated by Matthew.

But is the singular or plural form of the expression found in Luke

-
1. Cf R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, pp. 117, 123; Ph. Vielhauer, Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.66; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.51.
 2. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.85.
 3. It is included by T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.141f; and strongly supported by A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.89. It is regarded as a secondary Lukan formulation by H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.51,105; Ph. Vielhauer, op.cit. pp. 56ff.
 4. Cf also A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.86; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p. 49; and above pp.240ff; E. Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, 1927, p.175. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.141ff. W.G. Kümmel, Promise and fulfilment, 1961, p.38 n.63.

the original belonging to Q? On verse 22 Manson accepted Torrey's explanation that the Aramaic adverb lahda, meaning 'very much', has been misunderstood as the numeral 'one' with the sign of the accusative, and that the original meaning was 'you will greatly desire to see the day of the Son of Man'¹. Alternatively, Higgins has suggested that the plural here may be due to its occurrence in v. 26, thus reflecting Luke's belief that the final era has arrived, and is bound to end with the coming of the Son of man.² If this is correct then it is clearly stated that the disciples will not see that 'day', which implies a tradition that the parousia will be delayed beyond the lifetime of the disciples. Whether parousia teaching stemmed from Jesus or the primitive church, this assertion that it is not imminent would reflect a very late tradition, an attempt to deal with the problem of the delay of the parousia. If so, it is unlikely that Higgins' judgement that this is an authentic saying is correct,³ neither is it likely that it was in Q nor written originally in Aramaic. It is far more likely to be Luke's composition, and that the 'days of the Son of man' which the disciples will not see is to be ascribed to him in this form.

From this two conclusions follow. The first is that Lk. 17.22 cannot be used to interpret the Q saying, and the second that whatever Luke may have meant by the expression 'the days of the Son of man' in v.22 it is possible that he is responsible for this form of words in v.26.⁴ Thus the balance of probability is that the expression in Q was 'the day of the Son of man'.

The remaining textual differences between Luke and Matthew do not constitute vital exegetical points. The simpler Lukan form of Luke 17.23, multiply attested,⁵ is probably to be preferred as both original and authentic.⁶ The fact that Matthew has just reproduced the same phrase from Mark (Matt. 24.23) suggests that Matthew has altered the expression for stylistic reasons. In the simile of the lightning Luke's 'shineth' and Matthew's 'is seen' may simply be variant translations of the original Aramaic, though it is possible that since Luke has just said that the disciples will not 'see' one of the days of the Son of man he has shifted the sense of the visibility out of the simile. Whether Matthew's

1. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.142; C.C. Torrey, The Four Gospels, 1933, p.312

2. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.89

3. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.89. This conclusion is supported by J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.218

4. Cf below p. 292.

5. Mk. 13.21 and par. Lk. 17.21.

6. Cf. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.141f; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.72. A.J.B. Higgins suggests that Luke has re-shaped the original saying in Matthew 24.26, Son of Man, 1964, p.83.

factually false assertion about lightning coming from the East, or Luke's more accurate description of the phenomenon of lightning is to be preferred is irrelevant for our purposes. The point is the same. The disciples need not set off on any false trails which are whispered to them, the 'day of the Son of man' will be immediately apparent to all. The parable of the 'vultures' is probably to be preferred in its cruder form in Matthew. Apart from the editorial repetition of Matt. 24.37a in 39b, there are no significant differences between Lk. 17.26f and Matt. 24.37ff.

On this reconstruction the Q section may have read something as follows:

1. If they shall say to you, Lo, there! Lo, here! go not away, nor follow after them:
2. For as lightning, when it lighteneth out of one part under heaven is seen unto the other part under heaven; so shall the day of the Son of man be.
3. Wheresoever the corpse is, there will the vultures be gathered together.
4. And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the day of the Son of man.
5. They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.
6. Then shall two men be in the field (or in bed) and one shall be taken and the other left.
7. Two women shall be grinding; one is taken and the other is left.

There are two possible interpretations of the first three verses of this attempted reconstruction. The first is to focus attention upon the 'Son of man', and so read in verse 2 'so shall the Son of man be in his day'. If this is so then the disciples are warned against those who will bring the glad tidings of where the Son of man is. The disciples are to pay no attention to them, because just as lightning is universally apparent so will the Son of man be 'in his day'. Like the vulture who sees his prey from a great distance so that no corpse is hidden from him, so will the Son of man be hidden from none.

The second possible interpretation is to focus attention upon the event of the 'day', and so read in verse 2 'so shall be the day of the Son of man'. If this is so then the disciples are warned against those tale bearers who bring the news of where 'the day' is breaking in. As lightning strikes suddenly right across the sky, and as the vulture moves with lightning speed upon its prey, so the day of the Son of man will dawn unheralded and unexpected.

In view of the facts that Matthew 24.26 is secondary, that the swiftness

1. This is clearly the intention of Matthew who has the false tale bearers saying 'Behold, he is in the wilderness.... Behold, he is in the inner chambers'. (Matt. 24.26).

1.

of the vulture on his prey is a popular theme of the Old Testament, and that suddenness is the chief idea in the section that follows, the second interpretation is to be preferred.

In verses 4 and 5 the comparison is drawn between the days of Noah and the day of the Son of man. During the days before the flood men were carrying on their normal affairs. All of this came to a terrifying end on the day that Noah entered the ark. Here again is the imagery of unexpected suddenness. But more than suddenness is implied. It is when Noah, who had been living among the wicked men, went into the ark that the flood gates were released. Although Q does not mention this detail, it would have been well known both to the Palestinian audience of Jesus - if the saying is to be counted as authentic - and the Palestinian readers of Q. So, although Jesus is nowhere identified with the Son of man in this Q passage, the implication is unavoidable. Some event comparable to the entry of Noah into the ark is about to take place in the life of Jesus, which will open the flood-gates of judgement.

Before we can decide on the nature of that event, we need to decide on the nature of the judgement. In describing it Luke has borrowed material from Mark 13, and Matthew embedded his Q material in the context of Mark 13. And Mark 13, as we have seen, refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. If it is the destruction of Jerusalem that is in mind here, and Luke appears to think that it is, then the meaning of verses 6 and 7 could be that those who are alert and watchful and understand the significance of the coming event in the life of Jesus, will be spared. If it is dubious to interpret these verses by their Markan context, the use of 'left' in both verses, corresponding so closely to the phrase in Genesis 7.23, where it is Noah and those that were with him in the ark who were spared, then the meaning of verses 6 and 7 is clearly that those who are 'with' Jesus in the coming event, i.e. the faithful followers, will be spared in the judgement.

If we follow this second interpretation, which is preferable since it does not depend on deriving its meaning from Mark, then this Q passage is entirely lacking in apocalyptic details and imagery. It seems highly probable that the

1. Cf Job 9.26; Hab. 1.8; 2 Sam 1.23; Jer. 4.13; Lam. 4.19.

2. Cf above pp.240ff.

3. If he thought the saying referred to the universal holocaust, then what would be the point of the warning to those on the housetop not to go into the house to collect their belonging, nor those in the fields? (Lk. 17.31) Like Lot's wife none are to look back, nor try to save their lives, presumably by returning to the city. (cf J.A.T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, 1957, pp. 74f; T.F. Glasson, *The Second Advent*, 1945, pp.83ff.) Cf below p.296

4. i.e. 'spared' not 'abandoned'. Cf Gen. 7.23 'Only Noah was left, and those that were with him in the ark'.

5. A fact which has been noted by H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p.52, but not taken

thought lying behind the concept of the 'day of the Son of man' is that depicted in Da. 7.13, and that the event in the life of Jesus which will usher in the judgement is the coming suffering, death, resurrection and ascension, not the parousia. Those who attach themselves to the ascended glorified Son of man are those, who like Noah's sons and their families, will be spared in the judgement that event implies.

Such an interpretation makes the Q passage internally consistent. Jesus warns his disciples against going off after false Messiahs, because before they know it the 'day of the Son of man' will be upon them, as suddenly as a flash of lightning or the vulture upon its prey. As men carried on with their normal occupations in the days of Noah and were caught in the floods of judgement when Noah went into the ark, and those that were with him were 'left', so it will be in the life of Jesus Son of man, and judgement - not depicted in terms of destruction - will come upon them suddenly when his 'day' comes. Those who understand his significance and are 'with him' will then be saved. Their allegiance to him will mark them out as the community of the Son of man, the redeemed community.

If this is the meaning that is to be given to the Q passage, then Matthew has entirely transformed its meaning, and made it refer to the *παρουσία*. He shows his hand in the opening question of the disciples on the Mount of Olives;

Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the signs *τῆς σῆς παρουσίας*, and of the end of the world? (Matt. 24.3)

Here not only is the term *παρουσία* used, but it is the *παρουσία* of Jesus. Everything that follows is the reply to that question. When we come to the Q sections this apocalyptic element dominates. The warning to the disciples in 24.26 is that they are not to follow those who come bearing reports of where the Son of man, i.e. the returning Jesus, is. His *παρουσία* will be as universally visible as the lightning, which, coming from the East is seen even in the West, as visible as a dead carcass is to the circling vultures. His *παρουσία* will bring the same sudden and complete destruction as followed Noah's entry into the ark. With dramatic suddenness one of two men in the field will be gathered into the community of the elect and one destroyed; one of two women at their grinding mills will be gathered in and the other overtaken by the judgement.

1. The record of the Gospels makes it quite plain that the disciples never really believed that Jesus would allow himself to be crucified, and that his arrest took them so much by surprise, and so shattered their hopes, that they fled.
2. Cf. Matt. 24.31. 'they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other'.

Here Matthew's alterations of both his Markan and Q sources betrays his interest in the *παρουσία* of Jesus and its consequences. Yet it is significant that the corporate character of this eschatological salvation is strongly preserved. It is at the *παρουσία* that the elect community will be gathered together, it is then that the community of the Son of man will be created. For Matthew the *παρουσία* is essentially a community hope. When that event for which the community longs will take place is a secret known only to the Father.^{1.}

Luke's use of Q is quite different from this and, as we shall see, far closer to the original.

We have already seen that Lk. 17.22 is to be ascribed to Luke and not to a mistranslation of a supposed Aramaic original. What then does he mean when he puts in the mouth of Jesus 'The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it'? Tödt supposes that it refers to the parousia, not as a single event but as a situation which lasts for a long time.^{2.} But it is an event which belongs to the future, even for the post-Easter community. He is aware that this contradicts the situation implied in Luke 21.28 and 21.31, but ascribes it to Luke's new theology which arises from the delayed parousia. He is aware also that this creates problems in the light of what Luke has just mentioned in the preceding verse; 'Behold, the kingdom of God is (already) in the midst of you'.^{3.} Following Conzelmann he argues that in Jesus' presence the kingdom is in the midst of the disciples. After his departure the disciples long for the return of Jesus and of the kingdom, for the kingdom does not remain with the disciples in the days of the Church. Since Jesus is already at the right hand of God, they not only look forward to his return but also back to the days when the kingdom was in the midst in Jesus' person.

If we are prepared to allow that Lk. 17.22 is not a contradiction of 21.28 and 21.31, and that it does not refer to the parousia, then we are not driven to this yo-yo interpretation of the kingdom.^{4.} Since Luke most clearly shared the primitive community's identification of the earthly Jesus with the Son of man, then it is possible to interpret this verse to mean 'the days are coming when you will long to see again one of my days (i.e. see again one of the days when I, the Son of man, was amongst you) but you will not see it.'^{5.} Such an

-
1. Matt. 24.36
 2. H. B. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p. 105.
 3. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 1960, pp.125ff.
 4. This interpretation can only be supported if we maintain a steadfast fascination for the physical presence of Jesus and the parousia. But surely, even so, if the kingdom is directly related to the presence of Jesus, it cannot be seriously maintained that Luke thought there was no continuing fellowship of the Church with the risen and ascended Jesus.
 5. This is the interpretation given rightly by J.A.T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, 1957, p.74 and n.1.

interpretation would not contradict Lk. 21.28 and 21.31, and would carry precisely
1.
the same sense as the previous verse.

This being so, Higgins' judgement that Lk. 17.24 ('so shall the Son of man be in his day') refers to the parousia, 'as it is explicitly stated in Matt. 24.27',² ~~is false~~ We have seen that the original Q passage did not refer to the parousia, and such an interpretation is even less likely in Luke. As Glasson has pointed out,³ in Luke we have three parallel situations in which a period of 'days' is followed in each case by a decisive 'day' which brings the period to a close. The first is the 'days of the Son of man', which the disciples will in vain long to re-call, which is to be followed by 'the day'; then the days of Noah followed by 'the day' and the days of Lot followed by 'the day'; and each of these is compared with the Son of man. The days of Noah and Lot are the days when men carried on their normal business apparently unaware of the impending judgement. Each period of days is brought to a sudden climactic close on 'the day' when Noah went into the ark and Lot went out of the city of Sodom.

We have seen that 'the days of the Son of man' in Lk. 17.22 bears precisely the same meaning as the days of Noah and Lot in verses 26 and 28. Lk. 17.23 may refer to the time when those days are at an end and cannot be re-called. It is then that the disciples are not to follow after those who bring reports of the return of the Son of man. Alternatively, in its Lukan context the saying may be a warning to the disciples to remain faithful to him despite rumours of other Messiahs and the advent of another who might claim to be the Son of man. The alternative explanation is to be preferred because it leads most easily into what follows. The disciples are to remain faithful because 'the day of the Son of man' is coming, a day which will come as suddenly as lightning, and the vulture on its prey.

What that 'day' will be is made clear in verse 25; 'But first he must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation'. This saying may be an echo of a genuine word of Jesus which contained no reference to the resurrection,⁴ or an echo of the Markan passion predictions of the Son of man.⁵ The balance of probability rests with those who assert that it is a Lukan composition based on the Markan passion predictions but, and most significantly, excluding the

-
1. For the interpretation of Lk. 17.21 cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp. 303ff.
 2. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.86.
 3. T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, pp.83-88.
 4. Cf W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, pp.70ff; E. Schweizer, 'The Son of Man' JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, pp.120ff.
 5. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.106ff; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p 78f.

reference to the resurrection. Tödt's claim that 'to point to Jesus' resurrection would be neither necessary nor appropriate at this point' can only be valid if Luke intended the 'day of the Son of man' in verse 24 to be a reference to the parousia, which would indeed imply the resurrection for Luke who has identified Jesus with the Son of man. If we do not assume that verse 24 refers to the parousia, then this unique combination of a saying about the 'day of the Son of man' with a saying about his prior sufferings which does not refer to his resurrection makes it highly probable that the 'day of the Son of man' implied in verse 24 is a reference to the omitted resurrection and ascension in verse 25. On this interpretation v.25 would mean 'first, before the day of the Son of man comes, he must be rejected by this generation and suffer many things as a result of that rejection. But this will not be the end. That he is the Son of man will be known 'in his day', as certainly as lightning is known as it spreads across the sky'. This 'day' is clearly his resurrection and ascension to 'the right hand of the power of God'.

This conclusion is strongly supported by the most natural interpretation of the ensuing comparisons between Noah and Lot. The days of Noah reached their climax on 'the day' when Noah entered the ark, so shall the 'days of the Son of man'. The period of Jesus' rejection by this generation, mentioned in the previous verse, will reach its climax on the day when Jesus rises victorious over death and receives the kingdom from the Father, then will be the judgement as it was on the day of Noah. Similarly, the days of Lot reached their climax on 'the day' when he left the city of Sodom, and judgement followed. So also will it be when the days of the rejection of the Son of man are over and he is enthroned in power, then judgement will follow.

Consistently, therefore, throughout this passage in Luke, the 'days of the Son of man' refer to the days of the Son of man's earthly but rejected ministry, and 'the day of the Son of man' to his entry into a full authority which will issue in the sudden and climactic judgement. This 'day' is his

1. H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, p. 107 and N.2.

2. Here we see again what we saw in both Daniel and Mark; the combinations of the ideas of authority with the title Son of man, but an authority whose rejection brings the inevitability of suffering.

3. Cf Lk. 22.69 and our discussion of that verse below pp. 327ff. It is perhaps significant that Lk. 17.24 has removed the idea of the visibility of lightning found in Matt. 24.27, and also the visibility of the session at the right hand in Lk. 22.69 which are retained in Mk. 14.41 and Matt. 26.64. If so, this may reflect Luke's conviction that the 'day of the Son of man' is the day when, through the ascension, he takes up his seat 'at the right hand', an event with universal consequences, but not of universal visibility. This would strengthen our claim that it is the vision of Dan. 7.13 which has informed Luke's concept of the day of the Son of man and not the doctrine of the parousia.

ascension and heavenly session.

How does Luke visualise the ensuing judgement? Robinson may be correct in saying that it is the destruction of Jerusalem that is in the mind of Luke, and that the saying about the 'vultures' may be a rather enigmatic reference to the city.^{1.} This would be supported by the injunction to 'remember Lot's wife'^{2.} of whom it would be remembered that she looked back at the burning city of Sodom and was turned into a pillar of salt. On the other hand the passage may be interpreted in a less physical way than this. The chief idea may be the call to allegiance to Jesus in the days that would follow his 'departure'. Then the warning of v.31 would be against putting false store in their possessions.

In that day, he which shall be on the housetop, and his goods in the house, let him not go down to take them away: and let him that is in the field likewise not return back.

Unlike Lot's wife who, through curiosity or fondness for the doomed city she had left behind, took a fatal glance back, the disciple is to remain unfaltering in his allegiance to Jesus over against 'this generation'^{3.} (v.32). The man who would try to save his life by giving up his allegiance would surely lose his place among those who have 'life' with the Son of man, but he who is prepared to lose his life 'for my sake',^{4.} will have 'life' in the community of the Son of man.^{5.} (17.33) When this 'glorification' of the Son of man takes place then^{6.} will take place the separation of those who are 'with' him and those who are not. As Noah and those who were with him were 'left' so will those be who are 'with' the Son of man. But those who take their place with 'this generation' will be judged, as the wicked generation was 'taken' in the day of Noah.^{7.} As Lk. 17.34 and 35 give no description of physical violence being done to those 'taken', or

1. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp.74ff.

2. Lk. 17.32

3. Cf Lk. 17.25.

4. Cf. Lk. 9.24.

5. This verse creates real difficulties for those who wish to maintain that it is the destruction of Jerusalem which is in Luke's mind. It is significant that Robinson omits this verse on the ground that it does not belong to Luke's source (op. cit. pp. 73f). But it is equally probable that Luke has also inserted verses 31 and 32 into his source (cf above p.288), verses which could support a 'destruction of Jerusalem' story.

6. Lk. 17.34 reads $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\iota\ \tau\grave{\eta}\ \nu\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\ \delta\epsilon$. This strange reference to 'that night' when the whole passage has been referring to 'the day' of the Son of man may be explained as a natural alteration to fit in with the reference to the two being $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\varsigma$. It may also support our conviction that the 'day of the Son of man' refers to the ascension in that Luke's Gospel concludes with an account of the ascension on the evening of the resurrection, though this point must not be pressed.

7. Cf Matt. 24.39 'And they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away'.

'heavenly bliss' for those 'left', the probable meaning is that those who are 'with' the Son of man are 'left' in that they constitute the new Israel, the true people of God, a privilege from which the others are excluded. On this interpretation the final reference to the vultures gathering together on the dead bodies (Lk. 17.37) would be that as surely will judgement of God fall on the now dead body of the old Israel who has rejected the Son of man.¹

We conclude that Luke conceptualised the judgement that would follow upon the ascension of the Son of man to his heavenly session at the right hand of the power of God not primarily in terms of the destruction of Jerusalem, but in terms of the constituting of the community of the Son of man, the true Israel. As such the historical fact of the destruction of Jerusalem, which may be implied in Lk. 17.31 and 32, stands as a symbol of God's rejection of the Israel which has rejected the Son of man. While Luke has embellished his Q source his thought is essentially in line with it, and makes clearer the conception of the enthronement of the Son of man, an enthronement which brings with it the judgement of rejection by God of those who have rejected Jesus, and the creation of his new people - those who have maintained a steadfast faithfulness to him.²

Summary

From this study of the Son of man in Q the following are the chief points which emerge.

- (i) We have seen that there is little in Q which supports a teaching about a future parousia of the Son of man. The only text which may support this is Luke 12.40 = Matt. 24.44. But we saw that Luke interpreted this saying in terms of a Eucharistic 'coming' and Matthew in terms of the parousia. Since it is impossible to recover the context of the saying in Q it is also impossible to be dogmatic about which interpretation is to be given to Q. It is clear, however, that the predominant conception is the deliverance from death (Lk. 11.30 = Matt. 12.40) and the ascension to the heavenly session in glory and power (Lk. 11.30; Lk. 12.8f; Lk. 17.24 = Matt. 24.27 and Lk. 17.26 = Matt. 24.37,39b).³ ^{4.} ^{5.}

In this early Palestinian source, therefore, we find a close conformity to what we saw in Mark, but probably without Mark's confusion of 'ascension' and 'parousia' teaching. This suggests that the earliest strand of the tradition

1. Lk. 17.25.

2. Though Lk. 17.31, 32, suggest that such a thought may have been in his mind.

3. Cf above p.274f

4. Cf. above p.277

5. Cf above p.290

did not refer to a parousia of the Son of man but was more akin to Dan. 7.13 in referring to the Son of man's translation enthronement in glory, dominion, power and sovereignty. Entirely lacking from Q is any teaching of his heavenly pre-existence.

(ii) The conception of the sovereignty of the Son of man, as in Mark, is present in most, if not all, of the sayings. This is a sovereignty which the Son of man possesses on earth to call the disciples to endure suffering (Lk. 6.22 = Matt. 5.11), to include sinners and publicans at his table-fellowship^{1.} (Lk. 7.34 = Matt. 11.19), and to make radical claims on his followers which imply a decisive 'break' with 'this generation' (Lk. 9.58)

These sayings, as in Mark, are most probably a reading back into the earthly life of Jesus an authority which was seen to belong to him in his ascension, and are creations of the early church to justify the practice of the community in the face of attacks from the Jewish authorities. But their practice was based solidly on the example of Jesus, an example which becomes an authoritative command in the light of his ascension and enthronement. This is not to imply that the earthly Jesus is the 'Son of man' designatus who becomes the Son of man on his enthronement but rather that then he is 'revealed' as the Son of man, as Luke says.^{3.} Because of the ascension the acts of Jesus take on a new significance for the disciples. They are now seen to be the authoritative acts of the Son of man on earth.

(iii) While Q is silent on the question of the suffering of the Son of man, all stress being laid on his victory over death, glory and authority, the rejection of the authority of the community carries with it an inevitable suffering (Lk. 6.22 = Matt. 5.11), but endurance of this suffering guarantees a heavenly reward, which may mean sharing in the Son of man's translation to his heavenly kingdom or his confession of them before God (Lk. 12.8f = Matt. 10.32f).^{4.}

(iv) The evidence of Q cannot support Manson's thesis that the Son of man is a collective term meaning 'Jesus and his disciples'. But it is equally certain that the Son of man in Q entails a community; a community which is created supremely in the resurrection and ascension of the Son of man and which, on his authoritative example, has a mission to include tax-collectors and sinners (Lk. 7.34 = Matt 11.19), and to be in tension with 'this generation'^{5.}

1. Cf above p.264

2. Cf above p.263

3. Lk. 17.30; a questionable Q saying.

4. Cf above p.266

5. Cf above p.266

1.
 (Lk. 9.58 = Matt.8.20). Through him and by their faithful allegiance to him
 their acceptance by God is guaranteed (Lk. 12.8f = Matt. 10.32f).^{2.} Though the
 community is created on the supreme initiative of the Son of man (Lk. 7.34 =
 Matt. 11.19), and is dependent on the faithful allegiance of his followers,
 it is not a loose collection of individuals where this allegiance is the common
 denominator. Rather, it is essentially corporate so that fellowship with the
 Son of man entails fellowship with the community.^{3.}

This community is born out of the ascension of the Son of man and
 their endowment with his spirit, which is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit
 upon them (Lk. 12.10 = Mat. 12.52).^{4.} In the judgement which follows the
 ascension the community which is 'with' Jesus is 'left', while the rest of this
 generation is 'taken' (Lk. 17.34f = Mat. 24.40f). Since Q is a Palestinian
 document and apocalyptic details of annihilation are absent, this is probably to
 be interpreted as the rejection of the old Israel by God and the creation of his
 new people. (cf Lk. 6.22f = Matt. 5.11f).^{5.}

(vi) If we follow Matthew's interpretation of the 'day of the Son of man'
 as referring not to the ascension but the parousia (Matt. 24.27, 37, .
 39b) the essentially corporate character of the soteriology is retained in the
 gathering together of the elect to be with the Son of man at his coming.

(vii) The relation between the Son of man and the community is depicted in
 terms of a table-fellowship (Lk. 7.34 = Matt. 11.19), which Luke sees
 to be a foretaste of the continuing fellowship with the Son of man in the
 Eucharist (Lk. 12.40). In the Eucharist as in the earthly ministry the offer
 of table-fellowship constitutes the new covenant which implies forgiveness and
 acceptance by God.

(viii) We have seen also that baptism is into the community of the Holy
 Spirit; the community of which the Son of man is lord (Lk. 12.10 =
 Matt. 12.52.)^{6.}

(ix) All of this points to an understanding of the church in Q as already
 the authority-endowed community of the Son of man, which means that
 through the Son of man's victory over death and his exaltation the new age has
 broken in, and the new Israel has been created. Through baptism into the

1. Cf above p. 269
 2. Cf above p. 276
 3. Cf above p. 305

4. Cf above pp. 304ff
 5. Cf above pp. 301ff
 6. Cf above pp. 304ff

community of the Holy Spirit there is forgiveness, but for those who refuse to share in that community and to confess the lordship of Jesus the Son of man there is no forgiveness. In the Eucharist the community shares in the covenant-making meal of the Son of man.

Quite central to the community is its allegiance to and dependence on Jesus the Son of man. This entails, on the one hand, acceptance by God because it is the mission of the Son of man to invite tax-collectors and sinners to the meal of God's reign and because of the heavenly testimony with which he confesses those who confess him, and on the other hand fellowship with each other in the community - even fellowship with tax-collectors and sinners.

This 'realized eschatology' is not indubitably balanced by a doctrine of a future parousia, as we saw it to be in Mark.

It would appear that because of the close parallels drawn between the authority, suffering and actions of Jesus the Son of man and the Church, we can reasonably conclude that the community of the ascended Son of man is his 'corporate personality'. While the relationship is given in terms of 'Like Master, so disciple' the relationship is clearly at a level of union rather than imitation. This is supported by the fact that while John can state the demands on the Church in terms of imitation, his thought is clearly that of the Church as one single living organism in which the nature of Christ is communicated to those in union with him.

(d) The Son of Man in Luke

The vast majority of the Son of man sayings in Luke are derived from Mark and Q. In dealing with these Lukan sayings, therefore, we shall summarise our previous conclusions briefly in order to have Luke's development of the theme of the Son of man and his emphasis before us.

(i) Luke 5.24 (1)

But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith unto him that was palsied), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house.

There are no notable differences in this saying from the saying in Mark. It is a product of the primitive community, and expresses the conviction that the authority of Jesus the Son of man is shared by his followers. It is a reading back into the earthly ministry of what belongs to the ascension whereby he enters into his dominion and, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, creates the community which shares his authority to forgive sins.

(ii) Luke 6.5 (2)

And he said unto them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

This saying arose in the primitive Christian community to justify its practice in keeping the first day of the week. The disciples' behaviour is traced back to the authoritative example of Jesus. Because Jesus is the glorified, ascended Son of man who has received the kingdom and supreme authority from God the post-Easter community has the authority to break sabbath laws and keep 'the day of the Lord', which is the day of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. Thus a clear link is established between Jesus, the exalted and sovereign Son of man, and the post-Easter Christian community. Jesus, and his example, has taken the place of the law in the new Israel.

(iii) Luke 6.22f (3)

Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you (from their company), and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy: for behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

This saying probably represents its form in Q, and is a 'new piece of tradition'. The conflict situation with the Jewish authorities has

-
1. Cf under Mk. 2.10 above pp. 218ff
 2. Cf under Mk. 2.23 above pp. 222ff
 3. Cf under Q (= Matt. 5.11) above pp.259ff

engendered it. The context stresses that the community clearly understands itself to be the new people of God. In this community allegiance to Jesus has taken the place of the Law in the old Israel because Jesus himself bears the same authority as the 'word of Yahweh' which the prophets proclaimed, and for which they suffered. Allegiance to Jesus, the authoritative word of God, will bring with it the same sufferings from the sons of those who persecuted the prophets.

(iv) Luke 7.34 (1)

The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!

While the saying may be regarded as an authentic word of Jesus, the title was probably not in Q but is a product of the Palestinian Christian community. On the sovereign initiative the Son of man offers table-fellowship to tax collectors and sinners. In this behaviour he transgresses the Law which, for a Jew, meant defilement but, for Jesus, was his specific mission. His action is legitimate in that he has the authority which surpasses that of the Law, and establishes a new covenant and 'brings salvation to guilty sinners and the assurance of forgiveness' and fellowship with God.

(v) Luke 9.22 (2)

The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up.

This saying plays the same role in the unfolding narrative of Luke as it does in Mark. The previous Son of man sayings have developed the theme of the legitimate authority of the Son of man in his earthly ministry. At the same time this authority has been rejected by the Jewish leaders. Now, by Peter, Jesus predicts that the rejection of his messianic authority following the acknowledgement of this authority³ will lead to his suffering and death, but this will issue in his victory over death and his ascension to the 'right hand' of the power of God. This theme is close/paralleled in the lives of the disciples. To them Jesus has given authority and power (Lk. 9.1), but this authority of the followers of Jesus is rejected as strongly as the authority of Jesus himself. Consequently Jesus follows up the prediction of his sufferings with a prediction of the suffering of his followers (Lk. 9.23f); a suffering which will have its reward in that, at his coming, the Son of man will not be 'ashamed' of them (Lk. 9.26; 12.8f) and they will finally share

1. Cf under Q (= Matt. 11.19) above pp. 264 ff.

2. Cf under Mark 8.31 above pp. 224ff

3. Implied in all the sayings in Luke, and specifically stated in Lk. 4.24ff; 6.11; 7.34.

in his heavenly kingdom (Lk. 22.28-30). This close parallel between the Son of man and the community does not support a 'collective' interpretation of the Son of man in Luke for throughout his Gospel the existence, nature, and fate of the community is wholly dependent on the Son of man. For Luke, however, whose account of the transfiguration is a conscious prefigurement of the ascension,¹ the community is a post-Easter phenomenon in that it is only when the disciples are endowed with the Spirit of the glorified, ascended, sovereign Son of man that they become the corporate body, the new Israel, the authority-endowed eschatological community of the Son of man.

(vi) Luke 9.26 (2)

For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory and (the glory) of the Father, and of the holy angels.

Luke 12.8f (3)

And I say unto you, Everyone who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: But he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God.

Following on the prediction of the passion and victory over death of the Son of man and the sufferings which the disciples are to endure for the sake of Jesus (which emphasises yet again that in the new Israel Jesus has assumed the authoritative place of the law in the old Israel) Luke follows Mark in inserting the saying about the absolute claim of Jesus over against this generation such that those who are ashamed of him the Son of man will be ashamed of them when he 'comes'.⁴ Luke removes the possible parousia interpretation of Mark 8.38, where the Son of man comes 'with the holy angels', to the coming 'with his own glory and the glory of the Father and the angels', and by his use of the immediately following narrative of the transfiguration which is, for him, a prefigurement of the ascension. In this context the promise that some of the disciples will not die before they see the kingdom of God means that the kingdom comes, and will be seen to come, in the ascension of the Son of man and his enthronement in sovereign dominion.

That enthronement (Lk. 9.26) and the continuing rule of the Son of man in the heavenly court (Lk. 12.8f) will bring with it the inclusion in the kingdom of those who are not ashamed to confess Jesus before men and the

1. Cf above p. 39ff

2. Cf under Mark 8.38 above pp. 276ff

3. Cf under Q (= Matt. 12.40) above pp. 271ff

4. Here we see again the dualism between the Church and 'this generation' precisely paralleling the dualism between Christ and it.

exclusion of those who are ashamed, which entails acceptance or rejection by God. Inclusion in the kingdom is seen to be wholly dependent on Jesus, the sovereign Son of man. On the one hand it is dependent on the testimony he bears in the heavenly court, and on the other hand on the allegiance of the disciples to Jesus.

(vii) Luke 9.58 (1)

And Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.

This saying reflects the sovereign demand that Jesus makes on those who would follow him, for following him entails the 'homelessness' which comes from severing attachments to 'this generation'. This sovereign demand is based on the example of Jesus which becomes authoritative for the disciples in the light of his ascension/enthronement which reveals him as the Son of man. As such, we have here the other side of the coin of the gracious initiative of the Son of man to include even tax collectors and sinners in his table-fellowship (Lk. 7.34). Acceptance of that invitation entails ultimate seriousness in discipleship for discipleship and the kingdom are intimately linked together. And they are linked because Jesus is himself the Kingdom of God in their midst. (Lk. 17.21)

(viii) Luke 11.30 (2)

For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so also shall the Son of man be to this generation.

The comparison of the Son of man with Jonah suggests that the comparison may be between the preaching of Jonah and the Son of man, or between their deliverance from death. We have seen that there are good reasons for believing that the 'sign of the Son of man' is his deliverance from death and enthronement, which will then authenticate the teaching of Jesus (Lk. 11.32) as the sovereign word to this generation.

(ix) Luke 12.10 (3)

And every one who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven.

This saying reflects the conviction of Luke that no matter how serious it is to speak against the Son of man there is always forgiveness for those who repent and are baptized into the community of the Holy Spirit.

1. Cf under Q (= Matt. 8.20) above pp.267ff
2. Cf under Q (= Matt. 12.40) above pp.271ff
3. Cf under Q (= Matt. 12.32) above pp.278ff

For the apostates or those who refuse a place in that community there is no forgiveness.

(x) Luke 12.40 (1)

Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.

Whatever may have been the meaning of this saying in Q the context in which Luke has placed it is significant. It follows his version of the parable of the ten virgins in which 'their lord's' return is awaited from the wedding banquet (Lk. 12.36). Those who are found waiting on his return are invited to 'sit at meat' and are 'served' by him after he has 'girded himself' (Lk. 12.36). With the first two underlined phrases being taken from Lk. 22.37, which is in the context of the Last Supper, and the third carrying clear allusions to John's account of that meal (Jn. 13.4), the meal with the waiting disciples on the lord's return from the wedding feast is most naturally interpreted as the Eucharist to which the Lord comes from his heavenly enthronement banquet. In this context, therefore, the parable of the thief with its injunction to readiness for the coming of the Son of man, would most naturally be understood as a call to continual readiness for his coming in covenant-creating and salvation-bringing table-fellowship at the Eucharistic meal.

(xi) Luke 17.22-30 (2)

And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man and ye shall not see it.

And they shall say unto you, Lo, there! Lo, here! go not away nor follow after them:

For as lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day.

But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.

And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.

They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.

Likewise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; But in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all:

After the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed.

This pericope follows on the saying of Jesus to the Pharisees that in his presence the kingdom of God is in their midst and although the audience is changed to the disciples the theme is continued. The days are coming when the

1. Cf under Q (= Matt. 24.44) above pp. 282ff

2. Cf under Q (= Matt. 24.27,37) above pp. 286 ff. For the specific interpretation of Luke 17.22ff cf especially pp. 293-296.

disciples will long to recall one of the days when Jesus the Son of man was with them, but they will not be able to recall it. In the meantime the disciples are not to follow after false clues about the arrival of the 'day' of the Son of man, for that day will be as universally plain as lightning. Before it comes the Son of man will suffer many things as a result of his rejection by 'this generation'. The omission of any reference to the resurrection in 17.25 makes it clear that the 'day of the Son of man' which will terminate his 'days' is the victory over death and his coming into his heavenly kingdom. This interpretation is supported by the comparisons between the 'days' of Noah and Lot, during which the men of their generation carried on with their normal activities oblivious of the impending judgement. But the judgement came suddenly and unexpectedly on the day when Noah entered the ark and Lot left Sodom. So will the judgement come on this generation on the 'day of the Son of man', when he ascends to receive the kingdom from God, i.e. the day of his revelation as the Son of man.

In depicting the ensuing judgement two themes seem to be woven together; the destruction of Jerusalem (Lk. 17.31f) and the gathering together of the faithful (Lk. 17.34f). The destruction of Jerusalem is probably intended as an historical metaphor expressing the rejection of Israel and the creation of the new Israel in which allegiance to Jesus has taken the place of the Law in the old Israel.

(xii) Luke 18.8b

Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?

While Easton was prepared to accept this saying as an authentic word of Jesus, the vast majority of scholars regard it as a secondary explanatory comment appended to the parable of the unjust judge. The fact that the parable is complete at Lk. 18.8a and that the transition to 18.8b is not clear

1. B. S. Easton, Luke, 1926, p. 268. Cf W.L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Vol. ii, 1957, p.114, who regards it as an isolated saying of Jesus whose meaning is no longer understood.
2. Cf J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Lucae, 1904, ad loc.; J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.222; J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.84; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and his coming, 1957, pp.80f; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p. 175; Ph. Vielhauer, Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.57; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1957, p.59 n. 126; E. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 1955, p.237.n (Sjöberg is doubtful of the authenticity); H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.99; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.92 (he doubts whether the saying can be attributed to Luke rather than to his source).

supports this scholarly consensus. In fact it is difficult to understand what the relation is between the parable and the Son of man saying. This has led Hirsch to conclude that it probably belonged originally to Lk. 17.37.^{1.} Though there is no textual evidence to support this conjecture, Higgins is doubtless correct in seeing this saying as a conclusion to the whole previous section beginning at Lk. 17.22.^{2.} It is probable that both the Son of man sayings in Lk. 17.22f and the reference to the speedy avenging of the elect in Lk. 18.7, 8a has attracted the saying to this context, if it was in the source material at Luke's disposal and not a composition of his own.

This being so Luke 18.8b is to be interpreted in the light of 17.22ff.^{3.} Since we have seen that the previous section does not refer to the parousia, this saying cannot bear a parousia interpretation. If, with Robinson we take our clue from the sayings which refer to the 'days' of the Son of man, meaning the days of the visitation of the Son of man on earth, then the saying could reflect the longing of Jesus to find faith on the earth, and would reflect a conception similar to Lk. 7.9.^{4.} Such an interpretation is improbable on two major grounds: (i) Creed rightly holds that the use of the definite article in 18.8b, τὴν πίστιν, as opposed to πίστιν in 7.9, refers specifically to the Christian faith, and that it is being used here in its Pauline sense.^{5.} (ii) Robinson's argument that the references to the earthly ministry of the Son of man and his coming were originally to his coming from God in visitation is not supported by the evidence which points in the direction of a reading back into his earthly life an authority which was 'revealed' in his ascension/enthronement. Thus we conclude that the 'coming' of the Son of man in Lk. 18.8b bears the same meaning as the 'day' of the Son of man in the previous section, and refers to his 'coming' to his heavenly enthronement.

On this interpretation 'the faith' here means allegiance to Jesus which, as we have seen in Lk. 9.26 and 12.8f, is of such significance because on the basis of it the Son of man bears testimony in heaven. On this testimony depends inclusion in or exclusion from the kingdom of God, the new Israel.

1. E. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums, ii : Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus, 1941, p.159.
2. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.92 n.4.
3. On the claim that Lk. 17.22 does refer to the parousia the following are some scholars who, consistently with this, interpret Lk. 18.8b as referring to the parousia - W. Manson, Luke, 1945, p.201; J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.224 H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.100f, 283; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.91f
4. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.81; J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930 ad, loc
5. Cf J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954 p.84; E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium, 1929, p.179.

It is this sense that we saw Lk. 17.34f bears. Those who remain faithful to Jesus will be left, i.e. included in the new Israel, while the rest will be taken. Lk. 18.8b reflects the uneasiness of Luke concerning the faithfulness of the Christian community, and could be paraphrased 'will the Son of man find faithfulness among those who are on earth when he is enthroned in glory and bears testimony before the heavenly court'.

The real test of this interpretation is whether it can make better sense of the saying in this context especially if, as Jeremias holds, it is a Lukan composition. It is surely legitimate to expect an editorial comment to have some point!

Luke's introduction to the parable of the unjust judge (Lk. 18.1) indicates that he saw the point of the parable as a call not to 'get fed up with praying or be sick of praying'. An examination of the parable itself shows that the duty of praying is not its main point, rather it is that God will answer the prayers of His servants. 'It is thus a word of hope and encouragement to the victims of oppression and injustice.' As Creed asserts, it expresses the hopes of the early Christian community for vindication against their Jewish persecutors. Verse 8a carries the promise that the cries of the faithful will be answered with a speedy vindication. If we do not assume that this is a vindication which will come at the parousia, and there is nothing in the context from Lk. 17.22ff to suggest this, then it is inherently probable that 18.8 should be interpreted in the light of 17.31ff. In our examination of this passage we saw that 17.31f referred to the fall of Jerusalem as a sign of God's rejection of the old Israel. Similarly Lk. 18.8a may be a 'prophecy' of that event, which would be God's vindication of the suffering Christian community against their Jewish persecutors. Lk. 17.33ff does not continue this theme of the destruction of Jerusalem, but rather points to the creation of the new Israel whose distinguishing characteristic would be allegiance to Jesus. It is those who have this 'faith' and who maintain it despite all opposition who will be acknowledged by the Son of man (Lk. 9.26; 12.8f). Now in 18.8b a

1. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.84 (As Higgins points out, Son of Man, 1964, p. 91f. the Lukan peculiarities may be the result of his translation of the Aramaic original).

2. So. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.306

3. *ibid* p.305

4. Cf Lk. 6.22

question mark seems to appear in the mind of Luke whether in fact the disciples will take their discipleship with sufficient seriousness so that the Son of man will find 'the faith' on earth when he comes into his glory. The parable itself provides the answer. The disciple must never lose heart. His voice will be heard. God is longsuffering with them (Lk. 18.7).

There is no doubt that this interpretation does violence to the original intention of the parable, but all this means is that Luke has taken a parable which is not wholly suitable to his purposes and made it fit his developing theme with his anomalous introduction in Lk. 18.1 and its unfitting conclusion about the coming of the Son of man. It is these Lukan editorial additions which determine the use to which he is putting the parable, not the parable which interprets the meaning of the additions. This does not mean, however, that the parable is irrelevant but that Luke has used it for some of the points which it made to his mind.

We conclude that Lk. 18.8b refers to the heavenly enthronement of the Son of man, an event which will bring the speedy vindication of the Christian community suffering at the hands of their Jewish persecutors. This vindication refers to the same judgement event as in Lk. 17.31f; the fall of Jerusalem, a sign of God's rejection of Israel as his people. But the question remains whether there will be any whose allegiance to Jesus ('the faith') is strong enough to be included in the new Israel in the face of the persecutions. The answer is a call to prayer trusting in God's longsuffering with the righteous.

(xiii) Luke 9.44 (2)

Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men.

Luke 18.31ff (3)

And he took unto him the twelve, and said, Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. For he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully **extreated**, and spit upon: And they shall scourge and kill him: and the third day he shall rise again.

Luke 9.44 is significantly different from its parallel in Mark 9.31 in that it contains no reference to the death of the Son of man or his resurrection. This may support Schweizer's argument that this is the original

1. cf. T.w. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.307f for the interpretation of 'long-suffering'; also W. Manson, Luke, 1945, p.201.
 2. Cf Mk. 10.33ff above pp.231ff
 3. Cf under Mark 9.31 above pp.231ff

1.
and authentic form of the sayings predicting the passion of the Son of man.
If Luke has preserved authentic history in this saying, then it may be that
Lk. 9.45, which refers to the disciples' inability to understand it, shows that
their thought is still of the national Messiah of Peter's declaration at Caesarea
Philippi (Lk. 9.20). As such they cannot believe that he will suffer and die.
In this nationalistic Messianic sense the disciples' argument about who would
be greatest is to be understood. They ignore the passion predictions in Lk.
9.22 and Lk. 9.44, and continue to think of Jesus as the one who would set up
the Messianic kingdom.

While this interpretation cannot be dismissed, and may indeed accurately
reflect genuine history, it has a number of difficulties. We cannot be certain
that Luke is not following Mark who does have a reference both to the death and
the resurrection in his version of the saying. If he did not have at his
disposal what he believed to be a more reliable tradition at this point, then
it remains strange that he followed Mark in including the resurrection in Lk.9.22
and Lk 18.31ff. The closeness of the language of Lk. 9.44 to Mark 9.31, however
suggests very strongly that he is not following an independent tradition, but
that he has intentionally dropped the reference to the resurrection. We saw a
similar omission of any reference to the resurrection in Luke's composition in
Lk. 17.25, where the Greek used is vastly different.^{3.} It is reasonable to
assume, therefore, that Luke is following Mark in 9.44, and that he has dropped
the reference to the resurrection from the saying.

In Lk. 17.25 we saw that his reason for doing so was that he had just
spoken of the ascension of the Son of man (his 'day') in Lk. 17.24. 'First',
before that day of victory and enthronement, the Son of man must suffer. In
Lk. 9.44 instead of πρῶτον Luke inserts μέλλει, i.e., the Son of man is
about to suffer as a result of his rejection. The context of Lk. 9.44
indicates that the significance of the omission of the reference to the victory
over death is precisely the same as in Lk. 17.25. It follows hard on his

1. Cf also E. Lohmeyer, Markus, 1951, pp. 164f; W. Michaelis, TWNT, Vol. V. p.
914, H.E. Tödt, 1965, pp.152 (Tödt does not support the authenticity of the
saying).

2. Mk. 9.31 ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδονται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων.
Lk. 9.44 ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας
ἀνθρώπων

3. Cf. Lk.17.25 πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ
ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

pre-figuration of the ascension in the transfiguration narrative and the subsequent healing of the paralytic boy. Whereas Mark indicates a new context for the saying in the Galilean ministry, Luke includes it in the same context. The meaning is plainly; while all are marvelling at his authority over 'unclean spirits' it must not be forgotten that this authority is rejected by the Jewish leaders, and this rejection will bring suffering and death at the hands of 'men'. The issue of that rejection is not simply resurrection, it is already given in the vision of the mountain of transfiguration; his acceptance by God and glorious enthronement. This interpretation of the intention of Luke is borne out by his introduction to the next section of his narrative;

And when it came to pass, when the days were well nigh come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem. (3)

The questioning of the disciples in Lk. 9.46ff about who will be the greatest in Luke's mind, even if this does not reflect the historical situation accurately, is that they will share in his heavenly kingdom. As a result of his ascension and enthronement in glory and power they will be the authority-endowed community of the Son of man sharing in his universal dominion, for Luke knows that the enthronement and dominion of the Son of man in Dan. 7.13 brings with it the dominion of the saints of the most high in Dan. 7.27.

Like Lk. 9.44, Lk. 18.31 is significantly different from the Markan text. The omission of the reference to the Jewish authorities who condemn Jesus to death is to be explained by his version of the legal proceedings in which there is no reference, such as we find in Mk. 14.64 and Matt. 26.66, to the 'condemnation to death' in the court of the High Priest. He is simply bringing the Markan saying into line with his view of what actually did happen.

More significant and revealing is his insertion 'and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man'. This is significant in that it makes it perfectly plain that the 'necessity' of the suffering is based on Scripture. It is revealing when we compare this with Luke's introduction to the events which led finally to his going to

1. Mk. 9.30 'And they went forth from thence through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it'.
2. Lk. 9.43 'And they were all astonished at the majesty of God. But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said to his disciples....'.
3. Lk. 9.51 Cf Mk. 16.19 'So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God'. , which is certainly the meaning of the phrase in Luke.
4. What is different from Daniel is that for Luke 'Son of man' is not a collective title during the earthly ministry. It refers to Jesus alone who, through death and exaltation is to create the community which will be with him and share his nature.

Jerusalem where he would be 'received up' (Lk. 9.51). In 18.31 that time has now come, 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem'. It is even more revealing when we compare it with Lk. 24.26f.

Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.

What the prophets foretold was, for Luke, not simply the suffering but also the entry into ^{1.} 'his glory'. While Lk. 24.26 uses the title 'the Christ' rather than 'the Son of man', we have seen that this is the predominant Lukan conception of the vindication of the Son of man. The combination of what Luke saw to be the ultimate issue of the going to Jerusalem and what the prophets had written makes it clear that Lk. 18.31ff, like Lk. 9.44, sees the suffering of the Son of man to be the inevitable result of the rejection of his authority by the Jewish leaders, but that this rejection would be nullified by God who would receive him up and enthrone him in glory and power.

Although Luke does not follow Mark, as Matthew does, in recording the request of James and John for positions of authority in the coming Kingdom, possibly because he saw apocalyptic details which were not so obvious in ^{2.} Mk. 9.33f, this does not mean that Luke has dropped the idea that the enthronement of the Son of man has consequences for the community. This, as we shall see, is brought out again in Lk. 22.24ff.

Thus the key ideas in both of these passages are the authority of the Son of man on earth, which authority, when it is rejected, brings the inevitable consequence of suffering. In obedience to the word of God the Son of man deliberately takes the road to Jerusalem which will lead to suffering, but beyond it to his being 'lifted up' to universal dominion. This ascension/enthronement of the Son of man brings with it the gift of dominion to the new ^{3.} 'saints of the Most High', the faithful followers of Jesus.

1. Cf Lk. 9.26 'the Son of man cometh in his own glory'.

2. Or because of his general tendency to pass over incidents which reflect badly on the character of the Apostles (so J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p.228)

3. Dan. 7.27

(xiv) Luke 19.10 (1)

For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.

The authenticity of this saying is ruled out by its obvious secondary nature. This is indicated by the fact that in 19.9a Jesus addresses Zacchaeus, saying; 'Today is salvation come to this house'. 19.9b appears to be an explanatory comment on this in which Zacchaeus is referred to in the third person 'forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham'. Verse 10 appears to be another explanatory comment; that salvation is come to the house of Zacchaeus, not in terms of Zacchaeus' qualifications in terms of his being an actual or 'spiritual' 'son of Abraham' but because of the mission of Jesus the Son of man.

It is probable that this saying has been appended to the story of Zacchaeus on the basis of the conclusion to the parallel story of the call of the tax collector Levi; 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners' to which Luke adds 'to repentance'. The fact that this saying has been added to a story which did not originally contain it does not mean that it was added by Luke (6), though it is possible that he has modelled this conclusion on Mk. 2.17 substituting a Son of man saying for the 'I' saying, clearly identifying the earthly Jesus with the Son of man.

Two facts about Zacchaeus in the story are significant. They are that he is a tax collector (Lk. 19.2) and that he is regarded as a sinner (Lk. 19.7). This recalls immediately the reproach, 'friend of tax collectors and sinners' in the Q saying (Lk. 7.34 = Matt. 11.19), and stresses the sovereignty of the Son of man whose mission is 'to seek and to save that which is lost'. Although it is not specifically stated that Jesus had a meal in the home of Zacchaeus, as we are told of Levi, this is implied in 'abide at thy house'. In examining the Q saying we saw the conclusion of Jeremias that

1. Although this saying is peculiar to Luke, cf also our discussion of the Q saying under Lk. 7.34 = Matt. 11.19 above pp.264 ff.
2. Cf R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.34; E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium, 1929, p.184; E. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangelium, ii, Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus, 1941, pp.281ff; B.S. Easton, Luke, 1926, p.279; H.E. Tödt, Son of man, 1965, p.134; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.77.
3. Mk. 2.14-17 = Lk. 5.27-32.
4. Mk. 2.17
5. Lk. 5.32
6. Cf E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium, 1929, p.184 who holds that 'in spite of its late form' it may belong to the basic text. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.133, suggests that this conclusion is supported by the fact that Luke adds only 'to repentance' to the Markan conclusion of the call of Levi.
7. Mk. 2.15; Lk. 5.29.

'Orientals, to whom symbolic actions mean more than to us, immediately understood that the admission of the outcasts to table-fellowship meant an offer of salvation to the guilty sinners and the assurance of forgiveness'. This is made explicit in the story of Zacchaeus; 'Today is salvation come to this house'. The sovereign authority of the Son of man is seen in this redemptive mission, to include social and religious outcasts in the table-fellowship of the Son of man, and to be included in that table-fellowship is to be a 'son of Abraham', a member of the new Israel. There is nothing said here about the conditions of discipleship, for discipleship is consequent and dependent upon the sovereign initiative of the Son of man to include sinners in the new people of God. Discipleship is always a response to this supreme initiative and never a condition of inclusion in the community of the Son of man. When faithfulness to the Son of man fails it brings with it the inevitable rejection (Lk. 12.8f and par.)

Thus this saying belongs to that strand of tradition which emphasises the authority of the Son of man to transcend the barriers of the Law and social prejudice to include men within his new community, which means that the Christian community is bound to keep its doors wide open to the religiously and socially suspect. This tradition is balanced by that which speaks of the authority of the Son of man to make claims of absolute allegiance to those who respond.

1. Cf above p. 266f

2. Lk. 19.9a.

3. This saying appears to have provided textual variants of Lk. 9.56 and Mat. 18.11. (Cf H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, ^{p. 134 on 2nd ed.} for the textual evidence). The variant Lk. 9.56: 'For the Son of man has not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them', gives the reason for Jesus' rebuke of James and John for wanting to call down fire from heaven to destroy a Samaritan village which would not receive Jesus. According to the original text, Jesus rejects their proposal without giving any reason. Apparently the need for some reason existed. This need led to the interpolation of the variant in 9.56 which expresses Jesus' mission both negatively and positively by reference to the designation Son of man. Matthew 18.10-14 appeals to the hearers to have regard for the 'little ones' who are as near to the heart of God as the lost sheep is to the shepherd. 18.10b gives the reason that their angels in heaven always behold the face of the Father in heaven. 18.11, probably under the influence of both Lk. 19.10 and the lost sheep in the parable, 18.12f, gives the reason in terms of the mission of the Son of man 'to save that which was lost'. These textual insertions on the basis of Lk. 19.10 indicate clearly that once it is
(continued

(xv) Luke 21.27 (1)

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with great power and great glory.

In our study of Lk. 17.22ff we saw that the themes of the Son of man were: the 'days' of his earthly ministry which would end in his rejection by 'this generation' and passion; then would come 'the day' of the Son of man's enthronement in heaven in glory, dominion and power. This 'day' would set in motion the judgement which is seen both as the destruction of Jerusalem - the sign of God's rejection of Israel -, and the gathering together of the new Israel.
2.

Our examination of the 'little apocalypse' in Mark 13 showed that an original document dealing with the destruction of Jerusalem has had apocalyptic motifs worked into it, and that the Son of man saying in Mk. 13.26, while originally referring to the ascension of the Son of man and the gathering together of the elect, introduces the notions of the eschaton and parousia. As the same time we saw that Luke consistently played down the apocalyptic elements, and kept the attention focused on the impending fall of Jerusalem. This is seen particularly in his 'But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand' instead of Mark's 'But when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not!'. This theme of the desolation of Jerusalem is maintained until the end of Verse 24. In verses 25-27, however, the upheavals are more cosmic.

3. continued from previous page:-asserted that the mission of the Son of man is to 'lost' sinners, the Christian community understood this to be their mission on his authority and therefore understood the completeness and intimacy of their union with him - a union so intimate that his concern for the 'lost' is their concern.

1. Cf under Mark 13.26 above pp.240 ff. Though cf p. 242 n.2 for the authorities cited supporting that Lk.21 is an independent tradition from Mk.13, yet with a clear dependence on Mk. 13. In the verse under discussion the linguistic parallels are very marked; Mk. 13.26 reads; και τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης and Lk. 21.27; και τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

In a passage where the parallels are not close, they are so close here - the changes being apparently made for better style - as to make it certain that Luke has taken his saying from Mk. 13.26.

2. Cf above pp.286ff and 305ff.

Lk. 21.25-27 may be a very free re-casting of Mark 13.24-26.

Luke retains Mark's shift from the second person plural to the third person plural; we are told 'And then they shall see the Son of man coming in a cloud^{1.} with power and great glory'.

The shift of person in Mark 13.24ff, we saw was to be explained by the fact that he has conflated originally distinct traditional material, in which the 'they' who see the 'coming' of the Son of man, are the 'powers in heaven', making it clear that the original reference was to the ascension. In Luke the shift is to be explained by his reproducing Mark and conflating it with his source. The effect of the shift in Luke, where the previous verses have referred to both 'powers in heaven' and 'men', is that 'they' who see the 'coming' of the Son of man 'In a cloud' are both beings on earth and in heaven.

In view of the fact that in Lk. 17.22ff the 'day of the Son of man' precedes the fall of Jerusalem, but in Lk. 21.27 it not only follows that event but is also a more cosmic upheaval, the most natural interpretation to be placed on the text as it stands is that it refers to the parousia of the Son of man. If this is so we have the first instance in Luke where a saying which originally referred to the ascension 'coming' of the Son of man has been made to refer to the parousia 'coming' of the Son of man.

2.

As Manson has pointed out, however, this interpretation makes nonsense of the next verse; 'But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh' (Lk. 21.28). A parousia interpretation of Lk. 21.27 would surely imply that the redemption of the faithful has already come, even more strongly than would an ascension interpretation of it. The 'these things' which begin to happen, in its present context, refers not simply to the fall of Jerusalem, and the universal distress, but also to the coming of the Son of man. If we remove the Markan insertion of vv. 26b and 27 it makes perfectly good sense. The disciples need not fear when Jerusalem falls, or even when the distress of the nations begins. This is simply the end of the old order, and the ushering in of the new. Then, as in Lk. 17.34f God will create his new people, those who give their allegiance to Jesus the Son of man. These things will simply vindicate their faith, and establish beyond any doubt the new election.

1. Lk. 21.27. Luke's retention of this unexplained shift is further evidence that Luke is here directly dependent on Mk. 13 and not his independent source.
2. F.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.331.

What this indicates beyond any shadow of doubt is that Luke's source contained no reference to the parousia, but it leaves unanswered the question of why Luke has inserted this material from Mark at this point, and by so doing has ^{altered} the original meaning of both his own source and that of his Markan material. The answer may be that Luke, the companion of Paul, did believe in the parousia of the Son of man as another event which would take place after the ascension/enthronement of the Son of man, an event which would bring redemption to the faithful disciples. If so, it played a very minor and secondary role in his thought and, as we have seen, he certainly did not restrict the concept of 'redemption' to that event.

More probably too great stress should not be placed on Luke's slavish copying of Mark. His own source provided him with the concept of the destruction of Jerusalem and the distress of the nations which were to be the judgement events following the Son of man's heavenly session. But it did not provide him with any teaching linking those events with the 'day' of the Son of man. He, therefore, inserts teaching derived from Mark immediately before the climax of hope in his source to stress that this hope is not based on the fall of Jerusalem but on the Son of man with whom both the fall of Jerusalem and their salvation is bound up. As such, being faithful to both his sources, he has imposed an unnatural link on his material and probably changed the sense which he himself intended the finished product to convey. If we can imagine his situation, having in mind the process of thought he has developed in Lk. 17.22f, and before him a document referring to the fall of Jerusalem and the distress of the nations, and a document referring to the heavenly disturbances which accompany the image derived from Dan. 7.13 of the Son of man coming on the cloud to his dominion in Mk. 13.24ff., then it is possible to imagine that he has tried to link both conceptions. In his faithfulness to his sources he has simply taken over their language and in the process imposed a time-sequence on his finished work which accords with neither his theology nor his intention.

If this conjecture is accepted as possible, then the interpretation of Lk. 21.28 would be that because Jesus, the one to whom the disciples have given their allegiance, is the Son of man seated in great glory and power in heavenly dominion, the community has nothing to fear in the coming trying times. They are simply the events which will vindicate them as God's new

Israel, the saints of the Most High to whom 'the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven' has been given.^{1.}

While this interpretation is not supported by the text as it stands in Luke, the facts that it accords most closely with his theology, that he has conflated two sources which, when separately examined, support his theology, and that he has consistently played down apocalyptic imagery, give our conjecture a credence which it would not otherwise have.

We conclude, therefore, that while at its face value Lk. 21.27 refers to the parousia, it is **probable** that Luke understood it to refer to the ascension enthronement and has retained the community-hope which was associated with that event.

(xvi) Luke 21.36

But watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.

This whole section Lk. 21.34-36 is a late composition and therefore ^{2.} not an authentic saying of Jesus. The evidence of Kümmel and Tödt that it must be ascribed to Luke is very convincing. Yet as ^{3.} Bultmann and Jeremias have shown Luke is no total innovator in this section.

The common interpretation of this section is that it is composed by Luke to face the problem of the delayed parousia, reflecting a shift from the most primitive teaching of an imminent parousia to the later call to watchfulness at all times for none but God knows when it will be. ^{4.} We have seen, however, that in the primitive tradition in Q and Mark and even more markedly in Luke, the reference is not to an imminent parousia of the Son of man followed by a judgement, but rather to his ascension/enthronement

1. Dan. 7.27.

2. Cf the evidence presented by T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp. 335f; R. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 1963, p.119 (who hold that the terminology is so characteristic of Paul that it might be conjectured that Luke has used a lost letter of Paul) J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.62. n.76 (who holds that it is a late composition but a revision of old material) cf also J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, pp.113ff, ^{W.G. Kümmel} Promise and Fulfilment, 1967, p.36 and especially note 56 (where he collects Lukan phrases and words, and concludes that the whole is a Lukan composition); H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.97 (who supports the conclusion of Kümmel, and adds further evidence of a Lukan composition).

3. Cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, pp.335ff; J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, pp.114ff; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.93.

4. Cf E. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, 1960, pp.125-132; H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.97.

which will be accompanied by the destruction of Jerusalem and the creation of the new people of God. If this passage is occasioned by the problem of the delay of the parousia, then it appears that between the primitive tradition and it there is a stage in the history of the doctrine in which ascension teaching is understood as imminent parousia teaching, a stage which is clearly represented in Matthew. The most natural explanation of this shift is that instant glory did not descend on the Church with the ascension and outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Rather, persecutions and hardships not only continued but they also increased. Thus sayings which referred to the ascension and heavenly rule came to be interpreted as sayings referring to the parousia. Then glory and triumph and dominion would burst upon the new people of God. Similarly sayings which originally referred to the Son of Man's continual 'coming' in fellowship to his gathered community, which would be 'from now on', came to be given the meaning of 'another' specific 'coming' from heaven, which would usher in the final deliverance of the Christian community and their being gathered together in his kingdom.

There appear, therefore, to be three distinct stages in the history of the tradition; (i) Ascension of the Son of man to dominion in heaven, accompanied by the rejection of the old Israel (symbolised in the destruction of Jerusalem) and the creation of the new people of God; (ii) With instant glory not accompanying the ascension, sayings which referred to it came to be interpreted as an imminent parousia of the Son of man which would bring about the destruction of the persecutors of the church and its redemption;

1. Cf Mk. 14.62 and par. above pp.249 ff; and Lk. 12.40 (=Matt.24.44) above pp. 282 ff and 305.

2. Support for this is to be found, significantly, in 1 Thessalonians 5.3-7, a passage which is undoubtedly apocalyptic and deals with the question of the delayed parousia quite explicitly. This support is found in his use of the image of a woman's pains in child-birth, which he uses to express the idea of suddenness but which, in the tradition from which the image is derived, referred to anguish and not to suddenness or unexpectedness. This indicates that Paul has used the imagery of the coming anguish of Jerusalem, which is present in the Q, Markan, and Lukan traditions and is linked with the ascension of the Son of man and consequent rejection by God of those who have rejected him. But Paul uses the image not in this sense, which is probably its original sense, but rather to express the idea of the unexpectedness of the Parousia.

(iii) With the delay of the parousia, sayings were composed to account for this and to call the church to watchfulness, for the parousia will come suddenly and unexpectedly.

Is this section Lk. 21.34-36 to be interpreted as belonging to this third stage in the history of the development of the concept? If we accept that Luke has inserted the section from Mark in Lk. 21.26b f intending to alter his source, which spoke primarily of the destruction of Jerusalem, to make that event a sign of the coming parousia of the Son of man, even though such an interpretation renders Lk. 21.28 unintelligible, ~~then the logical interpretation renders Lk. 21.28 unintelligible~~, then the logical interpretation both of the pericope on the fig tree (Lk. 21.29-33) and the Lukan conclusion (Lk. 21.34-36) must be in terms of the parousia. If, on the other hand, Luke's intention in inserting the Markan material in Lk. 21.26bf was to link the destruction of Jerusalem with the 'day of the Son of man' as in Lk. 17.22ff as a sign of God's rejection of Israel and the creation of his new people, then both the pericope on the fig tree and Luke's conclusion are open to the same interpretation.

If, as is probable, Luke has derived his parable of the fig tree from his special source and has not adapted it from Mark 13.28ff, then it is also true that the 'these things' which indicate that the 'kingdom of God is nigh' (Lk. 21.31) would not have included any reference at all to the 'coming' of the Son of man. The meaning then would be that the kingdom of God comes with the final rejection of Israel symbolised in the fall of Jerusalem, and would be wholly in keeping with what we saw in Lk. 17.30ff. On the other hand, if we accept that Lk. 21.27 is a reference to the parousia of the Son of man and include ^{it} among the 'things' indicating the nearness of the kingdom, then v.31 becomes as unintelligible as v.28. Surely the parousia of the Son of man is not simply one of the signs indicating the nearness of the kingdom, but is the advent of the kingdom itself. This parousia interpretation of v.27 requires us to accept that in both these verses Luke, in faithfulness to his text, sees both redemption and the kingdom as only 'nigh' despite the parousia.

If, however, we allow that Luke has inserted Lk.21.27 from Mark in order to stress the link between the rejection of Israel and the enthronement of the Son of man in power and great glory, then both Lk. 17.27 and 28 bear the same meaning as in Lk. 17.30ff. The disciples, who are discouraged by the

persecutions, will witness not only God's vindication of the Son of man but also the historical outworkings of his rejection of Israel. When they see these things begin to happen, then know 'your redemption draweth nigh' (Lk. 21.28) 'the Kingdom of God is nigh' (Lk. 21.31), i.e. the persecutions will not go on for ever, for the 'saints of the Most High' will receive the gift of the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole of heaven'.^{1.}

Following this second interpretation 'the day' in Lk. 21.34 bears the same meaning as in Lk. 17.22ff, referring to the ascension/enthronement. While the activities which are warned against in 21.34 carry a note of moral and religious censure which is not implied in the activities ascribed to the men of Noah's and Lot's generation in Lk. 17.27 and 28, the idea is the same. Men must take their discipleship with ultimate seriousness so that they are not caught unawares by the 'day' of the Son of man's enthronement. They are called to constant vigilance and prayer in order that they might 'stand before the Son of man'. This 'standing before the Son of man' carries distinct echoes of Lk. 12.8f and Lk. 18.8b, neither of which refer to the parousia, but rather to the enthronement of the Son of man where he is both the judge and advocate of men in the heavenly court. To 'stand' before him means to be accepted by him, and 'confessed' by him, which means acceptance by God. Consequently the faithful and vigilant disciple need not fear in 'all these things that shall come to pass', they are merely the signs that the old order is passing away and the new order is dawning. In that new order Jesus, the Son of man, is absolutely central, and faithful allegiance to him of ultimate significance.^{2.}

On it depends inclusion in or exclusion from the kingdom of God.^{3.}

We conclude that the interpretation of Lk. 21.20ff centres on whether Luke's insertion of the Son of man saying from Mark 13.26 in Lk. 21.36 is intended by him to describe the future parousia of the Son of man, of which the destruction of Jerusalem and distress of the nations are intended to be signs, or whether this insertion is intended, on the basis of Lk. 17.22ff, to link

1. Dan. 7.27

2. Cf Lk. 18.1

3. Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.94, who argues that the conception is that the Son of man is depicted here acting as judge.

4. Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.98, who holds that the imagery is that of the Son of man as advocate. I doubt whether Luke's conception is either that the Son of man is judge in the final sense, but equally that Luke conceives of him merely as an advocate. That final judgement belongs to God cannot be doubted, but Luke gives no hint that acceptance by the Son of man could or would possibly be open to rejection by God. To 'stand before the Son of man' does not mean to appear in the court of the Son of man for judgement, but to be accepted by him, and thus also by God, but the Son of man is not God, nor has he assumed the ultimate role of God's judgement.^{4.}

these judgement events with the enthronement of the Son of man. If we accept the former, we have to accept that this intention has rendered vv. 28 and 31 unintelligible. If we accept the latter, we have to accept that he has buried his intention through his slavish adherence to the text of his sources. Since these are real difficulties in both interpretations it may be that his thought hovered between both conceptions.

(xvii) Luke 22.22 (1)

For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined:
but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed.
significant

The only difference of this Lukan saying from its parallel in Mark is that Luke has omitted the harsh conclusion 'good were it for that man if he had not been born', which appears to have been motivated more by compassion than theology. While he has retained the saying in the setting of the Last Supper, he has shifted it from before the words of institution to immediately after them. The significance of this shift is that it brings the reference to the traitor Judas into sharp contrast with the new Covenant which is established in that meal and in the events to which it points forward. The contrast is brought out in the strong $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$, stressing that although the new Covenant is established in that table fellowship of the Son of man with his disciples and will be continued in the Eucharistic meals after the passion and exaltation of the Son of man, that Covenant is not automatic. It entails the responsibility of faithful discipleship. But if one who shares in that Covenant-making meal is also one who betrays the Son of man, 'woe' to that man. Here the sovereign freedom and grace of the Son of man to include not only tax collectors and sinners but also his betrayer in his table-fellowship is stressed. But this is balanced by the sovereign demand of allegiance which is always the other side of the new Covenant.

As we saw in our study of the parallel saying in Mark, not only does the rejection of the authority of the Son of man entail exclusion from the new Covenant it also entails inevitable suffering. But this is not something which happens to him 'as it has been determined', rather in complete command of the situation and in full knowledge of what it entails 'the Son of man goes'. Thus the whole section throbs with the concept of the sovereignty of the Son of man.

1. Cf under Mk. 14.21 above pp. 246ff.

2. Lk. 7.34

The reference to the Son of man's 'going' following on the allusion to Psalm 41,9 and its clear echo of John's use of the phrase, makes it plain that the reference is not simply a 'going' to death on the Cross, though that is implied, but to a 'going' to the Father in glorification and exaltation.

(xviii) Luke 22.28-30

But ye are they which have continued in my temptations;
And I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed me,
That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Cf Matthew 19.28

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

The first problem which confronts us in this saying is whether Matthew and Luke have derived it from the common source, Q. The fact that the linguistic parallels between the two versions are restricted to the 'ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' makes this unlikely. This being so, the fact that the ideas contained in the two versions are so closely akin, ^{suggests} that both are dependent on a more primitive common tradition, which was wide-spread in the early Church.

This raises the question of whether Matthew 19.28 or Luke 22.28-30 represents the more primitive tradition. Manson's argument for the authenticity of Matt. 19.28 is very strong; 'It is hard to see how the primitive Church could have invented a saying which promises a throne, amongst others, to Judas Iscariot'. Equally strong, however, is the fact that the Greek phrase $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ is untranslatable in Hebrew and Aramaic, which suggests both that the saying is not authentic and belongs to the Hellenistic Church. If Matthew's saying were authentic we should expect to find some such phrase as 'the new aeon' or 'the age to come'. This being so the fact that there are twelve tribes of Israel has probably attracted the number twelve to the thrones, and expresses Matthew's view of the supremacy of the Twelve in

1. Cf B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, 1924, p.228; T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.216 (who ascribes the versions to L and M respectively); Ph. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu' in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957 p.61.
2. Cf Rev. 3.21; 20.4; 2 Tim. 2.11f.
3. T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.217. The originality of Matthew is supported also by W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p.47; Ph. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung' in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957.
4. Cf Ph. Vielhauer, ibid, p.61; G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, 1969, pp.209f; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.107

the Church. However, since Matthew's tendency is not to create 'Son of man' out of 'I' sayings¹ sayings² but rather the reverse, it would appear that the title was present in the tradition behind M and L.

The secondariness of Matt. 19.28 is also seen in his use of the phrase 'the throne of his glory', a phrase which occurs again in Matt. 25.31, and is close to the idea represented in 1 Enoch.² Although Matthew 19.28 differs from 1 Enoch in not identifying the throne of the Son of man with God's throne his dependence on this late apocalyptic material betrays the lateness of his form of the saying.³

If we strip^{away} these secondary features in the saying, the original form may have run; 'I say unto you who have followed me, in the coming age when the Son of man shall sit on his throne in glory, you also shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'. As such the conception is that the new aeon is associated with the heavenly enthronement of the Son of man, which will mean that the faithful disciples will then share in his dominion, as in Dan. 7.13&27. It is probable that the meaning of 'judging the twelve tribes of Israel' did not refer to the rule of the twelve over the spiritual Israel, though Matthew's insertion of twelve thrones does give this sense to the saying, but to the rejection of Israel as the people of God thus linking them with the nations over whom the saints of the Most High have dominion in Dan. 7.27.⁴

The originality of Lk. 21.28-30 has been strongly supported by Schweizer.⁵ This is supported by the fact that the Lukan form is closer to what we have argued is the original sense of Matt. 19.28, and expresses essentially the same idea as Rev. 3.21 and 2 Tim. 2.11f. It also stresses the conception of Dan. 7.14, rather than 1 Enoch, that the dominion of the Son of man is God's gift, and of Dan. 7.27 that the dominion of the 'saints' is also a gift. The essential difference between this passage in Luke and that in Dan. 7 is that the gift of dominion to the Son of man in Dan. 7.14 and the saints in Dan. 7.27 is so closely paralleled that we are driven to the conclusion that the Son of man is a collective term there. In Lk. on the other

1. Cf Mt. 5.11 (=Lk. 6.22); 10.32 (=Lk. 12.8)

2. Cf 1 En. 45.3, 51.3, 55.4; 61.8; 62.2ff; 69.27. The idea of the thrones of the faithful is also paralleled in 1 En. 108.12b.

3. Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of man, 1965, p.62.

4. Cf T.W. Manson, Sayings, 1957, p.217 (on the basis of a comparison with Mt. 25.31; 1 Cor. 6.3); J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.55

5. E. Schweizer, 'Son of Man' in JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, p.204 (who holds also that this Lukan form of the saying is an authentic word of Jesus); Cf. also J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 1957, p.53.

hand the dominion bestowed on those who have remained faithful to Jesus is the gift of Jesus, i.e. their dominion is wholly dependent on him. This we have seen is a very primitive and authentic emphasis in the New Testament tradition.

Secondary features are, however, also present in Luke's version of the saying. We have seen that the saying probably contained the title Son of man which either Luke or his source L has replaced making it an 'I' saying, thus identifying Jesus unmistakably with the Son of man. Further the concept of eating and drinking with the Son of man appears to be derived from 1 Enoch 1.62.14, and derives its point from its context in the Last Supper which is a pre-figuration of the continuing table-fellowship with the Son of man in the church's Eucharist and a fore-taste of the final eschatological meal with the Son of man in heaven.

If we remove these secondary features, then the original form of the saying may have been; 'But you are those who have remained with me through my trials; thus I will give you a kingdom, even as the Father will give to the Son of man, and ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'. The meaning then is basically the same as in 2 Timothy 2.12a; 'If we endure, we shall also reign with him'. That Luke conceives of this enthronement of the Son of man in terms of the ascension is made clear by his retention of the phrase 'the Son of man goeth' in Lk.22.22. It is this ascension/enthronement of the Son of man which will create the community of the Son of man who will share in his eschatological banquet and universal dominion. That dominion will not be the dominion of the twelve tribes of Israel, but over them, signifying that those who remain faithful to Jesus are those who constitute the new people of God, the eschatological community. Thus every Eucharist is a meal of the kingdom, a glorious messianic banquet, for it is 'eating and drinking' with the Son of man in his kingdom.

We conclude that the tradition behind both Matt. 19.28 and Lk. 22.28-30 referred to the ascension/enthronement of the Son of man which entailed that the faithful community would share in his dominion as the true people of God to whom dominion is the gift of God.

1. Cf also 1 En. 61.4

2. It is probably this sort of teaching, which seemed to be denied by the facts of the situation in which the post-Easter community found themselves, that led to the emergence of the doctrine of the parousia. Then would this promise be fulfilled, then would come freedom from persecution. Since, in the most primitive tradition, this promise is linked with the ascension which is built into the structure of the passion sayings, it is natural that when ascension teaching came to be read as parousia teaching the parousia was seen to be just around the corner. When that did not happen either, the problem of the delay of the parousia became a problem for the early Christians.

(xix). Luke 22.48

But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss.

In Luke this saying appears to play the same role as Mk. 14.41, 'the hour is come, behold the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.' It marks the climax of the 'handing over' (παράδιδόμαι) of the Son of man in the passion predictions (Mk. 9.31 = Lk. 9.44; Mk. 10.33 = Lk. 18.32). In Mk. 14.41, presented in a stylistically improved form in Lk. 22.22, the theme of 'handing over' is replaced by the theme of betrayal by one of the twelve who sit at table with the Son of man. Both Gospel writers have already linked the themes of 'handing over' and 'betrayal' in the identification of Judas as the one of the twelve who went to the chief priests in order to find a way to 'hand him over to them'.¹ For Mark the whole development reaches its climax in the saying of Jesus immediately after the scene with the disciples in Gethsemane and before the arrival of the traitor Judas; 'the hour is come, behold the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners'. For Luke the climax is in the saying of Jesus after the arrival of Judas; 'betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?'

It must be admitted that even without taking into consideration John's use of 'the hour' to denote the destined moment in time for the triumphant exaltation of Jesus via the Cross,² Mark's climax has a ring of authority and triumph about it which is absent from Luke's more factual account of Jesus' identification before others of who is to betray the Son of man. It is precisely this note of triumph we should expect to find in view of Luke's development of the theme of the Son of man, not simply the climax of the theme of 'handing over' in the open identification of the betrayer. Thus it is hard to believe that Lk. 22.48 is an editorial modification of Mk. 14.41.³

Hirsch holds that Lk. 22.48 has been modelled on Matt. 26.50 where Jesus says to Judas: ἔταίρε, ἐφ' ὃ πᾶρσι which may be translated as a question 'Friend, why are you here?' (RSV, cf NEB margin) or as a command 'Do that for which you have come' (NEB, cf RSV margin). He supposes that Luke has constructed his saying understanding Matthew as meaning 'Do you kiss

1. Mk. 14.10f = Lk. 22.3f.

2. Cf Jn. 2.4; 4.21,23; 5.25,28; 7.30; 8.20; 12.23,27; 13.1; 16.32; 17.1. Mark's use of the concept of the hour in 14.41 appears to reflect the same tradition as Jn. 12.27 'Father save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour'.

3. Cf H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp.152ff.

1.

me for the purpose for which you have come?' If this is so, then it is difficult to understand why apart from the kiss the linguistic parallels are so slight. It is surely easier to assume that the 'Judas kiss' was a part of the early tradition, and that Luke has constructed the saying on the basis of Lk. 22.22 or, less probably, Mk. 14.41, where both the title 'Son of man' and the word 'betray' are found.

2.

A third possible source of the saying is from Luke's special source.

Whether the saying is composed by Luke on the basis of Lk. 21.3f and 22 and the primitive tradition of the kiss of betrayal, or derived from his special source, the point of the saying is to bring the Son of man face to face with his betrayer, an event which brings to a head the rejection of the Son of man by his generation which entails his passion. The use of the title Son of man in this context by Luke stresses both the idea of his authority and also that beyond the passion lies the 'day of the Son of man', his exaltation.

(.xx) Luke 22.69 (3)

But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.

Not only are the details of this saying markedly different from its parallel in Mk. 14.62, even in what we have argued is its more original form⁴ in Matt. 26.64, but so also are crucial details of Mark's version of the trial⁵ before the high priest. All of this suggests very strongly that Luke is here following an independent source. If this is so then Luke bears independent testimony to the fact that Jesus is faced by the direct question 'Are you the Christ?' that Jesus replied in a veiled affirmative, and that he followed this⁶ up immediately with a saying about the Son of man.

The only detail Luke gives about the Son of man is that from this point on will begin the heavenly session of the Son of man. It is not easy to

1. E. Hirsch, Frügeschichte des Evangeliums, ii: Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus, 1941, p.243.
2. Cf R. Rehkopf, Die Lukanische Sonderquelle, 1959, pp.50ff.
3. Cf under Mk. 14.62 above pp.249 ff.
4. Particularly in the absence of the idea of 'seeing' the Son of man, and the lack of reference to his 'coming on the clouds'.
5. Cf (i) the timing of the trial on the day after the arrest in Lk. 22.66, while both Mark and Matthew imply that it took place on the same night; (ii) the lack of the presence of 'false witnesses' found in Mk. 14.56ff=Matt. 26.59ff; (iii) no mention of the charge about destroying the temple and to build it again in Mk. 14.58 = Matt. 26.61; (iv) no concluding charge of blasphemy and condemnation to death as in Mk. 14.64 = Mat. 26.65; (v) The question about his Messianism is not put to him specifically by the high priest, as in Mk. 14.61 = Matt. 26.63.
6. Lk. 22.67bf. 'If I tell you, ye will not believe: And if I ask, ye will not answer' implies 'yes'.

decide whether the reaction of the assembly of the elders, chief priests, and scribes ('What further need have we of witnesses? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth') is to his claim to be the Christ, or the implication that he is the Son of man whose being 'seated at the right hand of power' is to begin from now on. Certainly they base their charge before Pilate on the grounds that he claimed to be the Christ.¹ A political ruler like Pilate would have been aware of the political implications of a Messianic claim, but is scarcely likely to be aware of the implications of a claim to be the Son of man. A Son of man charge would, therefore, have been a pointless accusation to lay before Pilate. It is more probable that the 'Christ-charge' provided the religious leaders with a political pretext for getting rid of Jesus on the basis of the religious implications of the Son of man claim.

Any Jew at all familiar with the concept of the Son of man, as this august body must have been, would have known that a claim to be the Son of man whose enthronement was to be 'from now on' entailed that the followers of this man would constitute the new Israel, the eschatological community. Since they were not his followers and had no intention of becoming such, they knew also that this claim implied a rejection of themselves as the people of God. It was the harshest judgement on themselves conceivable by the man whom they assumed they were judging. This being so Mark's account of the high priest tearing his clothes,² a detail not present in Luke's account, is perfectly understandable.

If, however, this claim either escaped the Sanhedrin or was of little interest to them (because they were looking for a charge on which to secure his crucifixion) this is plainly the significance of the saying to Luke, and marks the climax of his development of his theme of the Son of man pointing beyond what men could do to him to what God would do for him. That exaltation would mark the rejection of those who rejected him and imply the creation of the new Israel whose distinguishing characteristic would be their allegiance to him.

(xxj) Luke 24.6f.

Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

This saying, which is peculiar to Luke, has been regarded as an

1. Lk. 23.2

2. Mk. 14.63 = Matt. 26.65.

editorial combination of Lk. 9.22 and Lk. 9.44, or as a remodelling of Mark 16.7 necessitated by Luke's omission of Jesus' prediction in Mark 14.28 that after being raised up he would precede his disciples into Galilee. However, as Rengstorf has shown, Luke's contact with Mark ceases at Mark 16.8, with the result that Lk. 24.1-11 must be accepted as coming from another tradition.

The really crucial difference in this saying is the use of the term 'crucify' (σταυρωθῆναι) in place of 'kill' in Lk. 9.22 and par., Lk. 18.33 and par., and Mk. 9.33 = Matt. 17.23. In only two other predictions of the Son of man's passion is the word 'crucify' used; Matt. 20.19, where it replaces 'kill' in Mark 10.34; and Matt. 26.2, which introduces a saying of Jesus into a Markan context. Therefore it would appear that σταυρωθῆναι is late.

However, if we may assume an Aramaic original of this saying which has been translated as σταυρωθῆναι by Luke or his source, then it is possible that it is a translation of the Aramaic verb 'izdeqeph. This is the word which it is widely assumed stood behind John's translation of the similar Son of man saying in John 3.14 'so must the Son of man be lifted up (ὑψωθῆναι)' where being 'lifted up' carries the two-fold meaning of being lifted up on the Cross and also being exalted to the right hand of God, and thus bears essentially the same sense as the Synoptic prediction of the passion and resurrection of the Son of man and his exaltation, and the belief that this is accomplished in accordance with the divine decree and scripture (δέι). Undoubtedly in the primitive tradition 'izdeqeph bore the primary meaning, as in John, of the Son of man's exaltation, but it included the idea of the Cross. In its reference to the passion ὑψωθῆναι is the exact equivalent of σταυρωθῆναι, and both are probably variant translations of the same Aramaic verb. However, σταυρωθῆναι does not contain within it the idea of ὑψωθῆναι, and, as we have seen, is a later tendency.

-
1. B.S. Easton, Luke, 1926, p. 356; W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p. 72, n. 175; J.M. Creed, Luke, 1930, p. 293
 2. E. Sjöberg, Verborgene Menschensohn, 1955, p. 236 n; E. Schweizer, 'Son of Man' in JBL, Vol. 79, 1960, p. 238f.
 3. K.H. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 1958, pp. 278f.
 4. Cf H. E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, pp. 153, 175ff, 184f.
 5. Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp. 163f.
 6. G. Kittel, in ZNW, Vol. 35, 1936, pp. 282ff; M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1954, p. 103; C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p. 9.
 7. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 164.

We conclude that behind Lk. 24.7 stood an Aramaic original which spoke of the necessity of the death/exaltation of the Son of man. Since Luke, or his source, has translated 'izdegeph as ἀναστῆναι, thus omitting any reference to the exaltation he has supplemented the saying both with 'be delivered up into the hands of men', from Lk. 9.22, and more particularly 'and the third day rise again', from Lk. 18.33¹, which we have seen contained the idea of the exaltation for Luke and not simply deliverance from death. As such the Lukan saying in 24.26 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory', expresses the essential meaning of 24.7 and Jn. 3.14, and is probably the sense of the original saying without its Lukan additions from Lk. 9.22 and Lk. 18.33. This is consistent with the most primitive strand of the tradition, and there are no good grounds for not regarding it as an authentic saying of Jesus.

(xxii) Summary

From this study of the Son of man in Luke, the following are the chief points which emerge:-

- (i) There is nothing at all in Luke to suggest that he thought of the Son of man as a pre-existent heavenly being who has 'visited' earth in the person of Jesus.
- (ii) Despite the most natural interpretation of Lk. 21.27 and Lk. 21.36 in terms of the parousia, there is no Son of man saying in Luke which shows beyond any shadow of doubt that he thought of a 'future'coming' in power and glory of the Son of man to establish the kingdom of God. Rather, the imminent 'day' of the Son of man (Lk. 17.24,30; 21.34(?)) and his 'coming' (9.26; 12.8f; 18.8b; 21.27(?)) refer to his ascension enthronement. This, at any rate, is the explicit intention of Lk. 22.22, 28-30, 69 (Cf also 9.44 (with 9.51); 18.31 (with 24.26f); and 24.7 (with 24.26)). This conception of the heavenly enthronement dominates all the Son of man sayings in Luke, with the possible exception of Lk. 21.27, 36.
- (iii) Those sayings in the primitive tradition which ascribe this authority to the earthly Jesus (Lk. 5.24; 6.5; 7.34; 19.10; 22.22) are based on this concept. This authority is seen both as the sovereign grace to

1. This is the only other saying where 'on the third day' is used with ἀναστῆναι, betraying Luke's hand.

include sinners in the fellowship of the Son of man, thereby transcending the authority of the Law, (7.34, 19.10), and also as the sovereign demand to an absolute allegiance (5.24, 6.5, 6.22; 9.58). Both sovereign grace and sovereign demand are linked in Lk. 22.21, 22. Because Jesus is the ascended, sovereign Son of man his earthly example ceases to be mere example and becomes the authoritative demand on his followers.

(iv) This earthly sovereignty is linked also with the sayings which refer to the Suffering of the Son of man, for that suffering is the inevitable result of the rejection of Jesus by 'this generation' (Lk. 9.22, 9.44; 17.25; 18.31; 22.22; 22.48; 24.7). But since this passion issues in the vindication by God in the victory over death and enthronement on the 'right hand of God', it entails also the rejection by God of those who have rejected Jesus (Lk. 9.26; 12.8f; 18.8b) which is also a rejection of the old Israel as the people of God (Lk. 17.31ff; 21.20ff; 22.28-30; 22.69) and the creation of the new people of God whose primary characteristic would be allegiance to Jesus (Lk. 6.22; 9.22ff; 12.8f; 17.34f; 18.8b; 21.27f (?)).

(v) Although there are clear parallels between the community and the Son of man in authority (Lk. 5.24; 6.5; 7.34; 19.10; 22.28-30) and suffering (Lk. 6.22; 9.22ff), the community is wholly dependent on the Son of man for its existence, authority, and way of life (cf especially 9.26; 12.8f; 12.10; 18.8b; 22.28-30) and, theologically speaking, this dependence is directly related to the heavenly enthronement of the Son of man. Therefore the community is distinctly a post-Easter creation, which is said to be the community of the Holy Spirit (Lk. 12.10), i.e. they are endowed corporately with the 'Spirit' of the Son of man.

(vi) The ideas both of the judgement of the old Israel and of the creation of the new people of God are linked with the enthronement 'day' of the Son of man (Lk. 17.22ff; 21.20ff(?)).

(vii) Being in this community entails:

- (a) being accepted by God, before whom the Son of man appears as advocate of the faithful (Lk. 9.26; 12.8f; 18.8b; 21.36f(?));
- (b) sharing in the redemptive, covenant-making table-fellowship of the Son of man (Lk. 7.34f; 12.40; 22.21f; 22.28-30);
- (c) being forgiven (Lk. 7.34; 12.10; 19.10);

(d) being in the Kingdom (Lk. 22.28-30; 21.31(?))

In this we see that Luke has preserved the primitive teaching we found in Mark and Q where the Son of man is conceived of primarily in terms of the heavenly session in sovereign authority and power. With this figure Jesus is identified and thus the issue of his passion is in his ascension/enthronement. His earthly ministry carries within it the sovereignty of the glorified Son of man, and those who are with Jesus - the faithful disciples - are the authority-endowed community of the Son of man since the Spirit of Jesus is poured out upon them. For Luke, therefore, 'the Son of man' is both a Christological and soteriological title, and points to the community-creating character of the atonement, which community is marked by its dependence on and allegiance to Jesus the Son of man. If Lk. 21.27 and 36 are to be interpreted in terms of the parousia and not the ascension, it would appear that the process by which this doctrine has entered into his thinking is through the fact that the longed-for deliverance from persecutions and frustrations did not in fact come with either the ascension or the rejection of Israel manifested in the fall of Jerusalem. Consequently that hope was again deferred to a time when the Son of man would come again. It is only in Matthew, however, that this concept receives clear and unequivocal expression along with the more primitive teaching.

(v) The Son of Man in Matthew

In dealing with the Son of man sayings in Matthew we shall group them, for the sake of convenience, under the following headings:

- (i) Saying in which Matthew has made no changes or minor changes to the text or context of the sayings he has derived from Mark and Q, so preserving the original sense of the saying in his source. These are: Mt. 8.20 (=Q Lk. 9.58); 9.6 (= Mk. 2.10); 11.19 (=Q Lk. 7.34); 17.9, 12 (= Mk. 9.9-13)= 17.22 (= Mk. 9.31); 20.18f (= Mk. 10.33f); 20.28 (= Mk. 10.45); 26.24 (= Mk. 14.21); 26.45 (= Mk. 14.41); 26.64 (= Mk. 14.62; probable original text).
- (ii) Sayings in which Matthew's alterations to his text, or the contexts in which he has placed the sayings, have altered the original meaning. These are: Mt. 12.8 (= Mk. 2.28); 12.31f (=Q Lk.12.10); 12.40 (=Q Lk. 11.30).
- (iii) Sayings in which Matthew has removed the title Son of man and replaced it by 'I' or 'he'. These are: Mat. 5.11 (=Q Lk. 6.22) 10.32f (Q Lk. 12.8f); 16.21 (= Mk. 8.31).
- (iv) Sayings in which Matthew's emendations of his sources give the sayings a clear eschatological and/or parousia interpretation. These are: Mt. 12.31f(?) (=Q Lk. 12.10); 16.27f (= Mk. 8.38f); 24.27, 37, 39 (= Q Lk. 17.24, 26); 24.30f (= Mk.13.26f); 24.44 (= Q Lk. 12.40).
- (v) Sayings which are peculiar to Matthew. These are: Mt. 10.23; 13.37, 41; 16.13; (cf Mk. 8.27); 19.28 (cf Lk. 22.28-30); 25.31; 26.2.

(i) The sayings in this group fall naturally into two groups; (1) those sayings which stress the authority of the Son of man on earth; Mt. 8.20; 9.6; 11.19; 20.28a and (2) those which are connected with the rejection of the authority of the Son of man which issues in his passion or passion and resurrection; Mt. 17.9, 12; 17.22; 20.18f; 26.24; 26.45; 20.28b. Mt. 20.28

-
1. Cf for detailed discussions of Matt. 8.20, under Q above pp. 267 ff; 9.6, under Mk. 2.10 above pp.218ff; 11.19 under Q above pp.264 ff; 20.28a under Mk. 10.45a above 234 ff.
2. Cf for detailed discussion of Matt. 17.9,12 under Mk. 9.9,12 above p.229 ff; 17.22 under Mk. 9.31 above pp.231 ff; 20.18 under Mk. 10.33 above pp. 231 26.24 under Mk. 14.21 above pp.246 ff; 26.45 under Mk. 14.41 above pp.246ff; 20.28b under Mk. 10.45b above pp.234 ff.

a and b combine the two conceptions of the Son of man. The only exception to this grouping is, significantly, Mt. 26.64, which refers to the session and coming of the Son of man.

1. In our analysis of the sayings in this group, we have seen that the following are the key ideas; (a) The example of Jesus who is homeless in this generation (Mt. 8.20), who heals the sick thus implying that he forgives sins (Mt. 9.6), who includes tax-collectors in his covenant-making table-fellowship (Mt. 11.19), and who serves rather than is served (Mt. 20.28a); (b) In the light of the ascension to sovereign lordship all of these activities are seen to express the inherent sovereignty of the Son of man during his earthly ministry, it is this supreme authority which places him in tension with this generation (8.20), by which he forgives sins (9.6) transcends the Jewish law in eating and drinking with sinners (11.19), and reverses the expectations about the Son of man (20.28a); (c) This sovereign example and person becomes the crucial factor in the life of the new people of God. An absolute allegiance to him is demanded which will set them in tension with this generation (8.20); On his authority the practice of those who are 'with him' is justified (9.6; 11.19; 20.28a), and not only justified, it is their specific mission to forgive sins, to include tax collectors and sinners in their fellowship with the Son of man, and to serve rather than be served. Inherent in all these sayings, therefore, is the concept of the community; a community whose existence and character is wholly dependent on Jesus the Son of man.
2. The sayings in this group develop the theme of the rejection of the authority-endowed Son of man, which will issue in his suffering. But they point beyond his suffering to his victory over death and enthronement. It is both the concepts of authority and vindication by God which makes the title Son of man appropriate in the context of these passion sayings. Matt. 20.28b combines the theme of the Son of man and the ʿebhed Yahweh in asserting that it is the mission of the Son of man to 'give his life' and that the purpose of this is to create the new community (his giving his life is a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν) an action, which we have argued, is continued in the covenant-making meal with the Son of man in the Eucharist. These sayings reflect the conviction of the early church
 1. Cf for detailed discussion under Mk. 14.62 above pp.249 ff.
 2. Cf above pp.236 ff.

that they were created as the new covenant community out of the passion and exaltation of Jesus the Son of man, and that this creation and covenant is renewed in the Eucharistic meal.

The only saying which Matthew has taken over unaltered from his sources which does not refer either to the earthly activity or passion of the Son of man is Matt. 26.64. This refers to the heavenly 'session' and 'coming' of the Son of man. Apart from Matt. 10.32, this is the only saying which refers to the heavenly activity of the Son of man or his 'coming' which Matthew has not given a clear parousia interpretation. This makes it probable that Matthew understood the 'coming' of the Son of man which accompanies his 'sitting at the right hand' to refer to the parousia. However, since καθήμενον and ἐρχόμενον both express continuous action rather than either past or future, Matthew has retained the sense of the continual coming of the Son of man to his own. This continuous sense of the 'coming' which the Jewish rulers will see is reinforced by the qualifying ἀπ' ἄρτι.

(ii) The sayings in this group, in which Matthew has altered the text or context of his source, again refer to the authority of the Son of man on earth (Matt. 12.8; 12.31f) or to the passion and resurrection (Matt. 12.40).¹²

In Matt. 12.8 (For the Son of man is lord of the Sabbath) Matthew has not altered the essential meaning of either the text or context of Mark. What he has done is develop a much clearer and more explicit argument. After quoting the example of David who broke the law to feed his disciples he inserts

Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here. (3)

The force of this argument is that for the sake of the temple the temple priests break the law and are guiltless before the law. Now, for the sake of the one who is greater than the temple, his disciples break the law and are guiltless. That this insertion is secondary is obvious. In the story of how the disciples break the sabbath laws in the corn fields it is not 'for the sake of Jesus', but because they are hungry.⁴ But since, as we have seen, the saying was probably created by the primitive community to justify their keeping of the day of triumph

1. Cf for detailed discussion of Matt. 12.8 under Mk. 2.28 above pp. 222 ff;

Matt. 12.31f under Q above pp.282 ff.

2. Cf for detailed discussion of Matt. 12.40 under Q above pp.271 ff.

3. Matt. 12.5, 6.

4. Matt. 12.1

of Jesus, the first day of the week, the argument is wholly in place. Allegiance to Jesus the ascended, sovereign Son of man, is the new 'Law' of the new Israel, for his sake they keep this new day, and on his authority they are liberated from the sabbath laws of the old Israel. Again we see how the primitive church saw its life to stem from and be grounded in the events of Easter and the exaltation of Jesus.

Matthew's placing of the independent Q saying ('And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him') at the close of the Beelzebul pericope (Matt. 12.32) has altered the meaning of the saying. In this context, and especially when taken together with Matt. 12.33, the meaning of the saying is patently that it is in the power of the Holy Spirit that Jesus has cast out devils. To call this the work of Beelzebul is both stupid (for it implies that Satan is 'divided against himself') and blasphemous (for it implies that the Jewish leaders are not prepared to acknowledge the work of the Spirit of God when they see it). As such, the meaning of the saying is close to John 10.37; 'If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know that the Father is in me, and I in the Father'. While it is not essential to acknowledge that Jesus is indeed the Son of man, it is essential to acknowledge that it is 'by the Spirit of God' that Jesus casts out devils and thus that 'the kingdom of God is come upon you'. To refuse to acknowledge this, is to refuse to be a part of the Kingdom of God which is come in the work of Jesus. Consequently there is no forgiveness for such.

Matthew's uneasiness about this realized eschatology is seen in his 'eschatological' addition to the Q saying that there is no forgiveness for those who blaspheme 'neither in this age nor in that which is to come'. While the 'age to come' is not linked with a future 'coming' of the Son of man in this saying, Matthew has opened his text to a future eschatology. Although the kingdom of God is already come in the works of the Spirit which have been manifested in Jesus Matthew's association of the advent of the kingdom with the parousia of the Son of man has led him to draw a distinction between 'this age' and 'the age to come'. It is his introduction of the Son of man saying from Q into the Markan context which has brought with it a change in the concept of the kingdom which he found

1. 'Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by its fruit.'

2. Matt. 12.28.

3. Matt. 12.28.

in Mark.

In our examination of the Q saying about the 'sign of Jonah' we have seen that the essential meaning is deliverance from death and, in Luke, exaltation. In Matt. 12.40 Matthew has drawn together the details of the length of period Jonah was in the belly of the whale and the formal predictions of the death and resurrection of the Son of man. In so doing he has shifted the emphasis slightly from the fact of deliverance from death to the length of time involved.

(iii) The most significant change in this group of sayings is that Matthew has so completely identified Jesus with the Son of man that the title ^{1.} has disappeared and is replaced by an 'I' saying (Matt. 5.11; 10.32f; 16.21).

Matt. 5.11 is a saying whose chief point is to express the authority of Jesus which demands an absolute allegiance on the part of his followers. They are to endure persecutions 'for my sake' just as the prophets endured persecutions for the sake of the alien word of the Lord addressed to them. It is allegiance to him because he is the authoritative word of God that guarantees the disciples their reward in heaven.

Matt. 10.32f is significant in that it is the only saying, if Matt. ^{2.} 26.64 is not held to represent the original form of the saying in Mk. 14.62, in which a reference to the heavenly activity of the Son of man or his coming is not given a parousia interpretation. It is probably because Matthew has so identified the heavenly Son of man with the parousia that he has removed the title in Matt. 10.32f. Without the title the saying contains no hint of the parousia, and probably links up with Matt. 5.11f. The 'reward in heaven' which is the inheritance of those who endure persecution 'for my sake' is that 'I will confess them before my Father which is in heaven'. While this saying has preserved the ascension imagery of the original saying in Q, Matthew's 'parousia title', the Son of man, has been removed. It would seem that it is for this reason, and not simply to identify Jesus with the Son of man, that Matthew has made this alteration in this text.

While Matthew removes the title 'Son of man' from the passion prediction in Matt. 16.21, he has inserted it into the original question of Jesus to the ^{3.} disciples at Caesarea Philippi; 'Who do men say that the Son of man is?'

-
1. Cf for detailed discussion of Matt. 5.11 under Q above pp.259 ff; Matt. 10.32f. under Q above pp.276 ff; Matt. 16.21 under Mk. 8.31 above pp.224 ff.
 2. In any event Matthew probably did interpret the 'coming' of the Son of man 'on the clouds of heaven' in Matt. 26.64 in terms of the parousia.
 3. Matt. 16.13 = Mk. 8.27 'Who do men say that I am'.

The point of this omission in Matthew is that he, unlike the other evangelists,^{1.} records Jesus' approval of the Messianic declaration of Peter and promises that on him he will build his ἐκκλησία. Now the way in which that ἐκκλησία will be built is through the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. The work of the Son of man is reserved for a later coming in judgement (Matt. 16.27).

And so Matthew, who restricts the use of the title 'Son of man' to the earthly ministry and passion and to the parousia, and who links the advent of the kingdom of heaven with the parousia, when his context deals unmistakably with the Messiah and the ἐκκλησία, which exists in fellowship with and allegiance to the ascended Jesus in the period between Easter and the parousia, has dropped the title 'Son of man'. By this Matthew indicates clearly that he draws a distinction between the ἐκκλησία and the Kingdom. He certainly does not think of the Son of man as other than Jesus. His intention is rather to separate the concepts of the Church and the Kingdom, for the Church and the Kingdom will be identified only at the parousia.

It is for these reasons that Matthew has removed the title from Matt. 16.21 and put it into the original question of the earthly Jesus in Matt. 16.13, and given the Son of man saying in Matt. 16.27 a 'future eschatology' and parousia interpretation. In both 16.13 and 27 the title is in keeping with his theology and eschatology. But in the ἐκκλησία context of 16.21 it would not have been.

(iv) In addition to Matt. 12.32, 10.32 and 16.21, the sayings which are changed by Matthew to fit into his concept of the parousia of the Son of man are Matt. 16.27f; 24.27,37,39; 24.30f; 24.44^{2.} all reflect secondary insertions by Matthew into his sources and impose a parousia interpretation upon them.

All of the sayings in Matt. 24 are brought under the influence of Matthew's alteration of his Markan source making the initial question of the disciples to Jesus 'τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος?'^{3.} Since the disciples asked about the parousia of Jesus, the secondary alteration by Matthew of his Q source in Matt. 24.27,37, 39 to the

1. On the authenticity of Matt. 16.17-19 cf above pp.133ff

2. Cf for detailed discussion of Matt. 16.27f under Mk. 8.38f above pp.226 ff; Matt. 24.27,37,39 under Q above pp. 286 ff; Matt. 24.30f under Mk. 13.26f above pp.240 ff; Matt. 24.44 under Q above pp.282 ff.

3. Matt. 24.3

παρουσία of the Son of man makes it self-evident that Matthew thought that the coming Son of man would be none other than the ascended Jesus. This is so also in Matt. 24.30, where Matthew has altered Mk. 13.26f to suit the question about the 'sign' of the parousia of Jesus by introducing the saying about the 'sign of the Son of man' which will appear in heaven. So ~~as~~ the whole passage is given^a consistent parousia interpretation which we saw was present in confusion in Mk. 13. He has removed all traces of the independent nature of Mk. 13.24-27. After the 'tribulations of those days', during which men are not to follow any false reports about the 'parousia of the Son of man' for that will be universally seen, there will follow disturbances in heaven. Then the 'sign of the Son of man' will be seen in heaven. This final sign marks the beginning of crisis for 'the tribes of earth' who will see him coming 'on the clouds with power and great glory', and the gatheringⁱⁿ of the 'elect', i.e. those who have remained faithful to Jesus (cf Matt. 10.32f). While Matthew has inserted the apocalyptic idea of the 'mourning' of the tribes of the earth, reminiscent of the lament of the kings in I Enoch, and suggesting that sudden terror and destruction is to overtake them, he has retained the essential concept of the community associated with the Son of man. At his coming they will be gathered together into the final kingdom.

This consistent parousia interpretation of the coming of the Son of man in Matthew 24, linked with the 'end of the age', the destruction of sinners, and the gathering in of the faithful community, makes it self-evident that for Matthew the unexpected 'coming' of the Son of man like a thief refers to this same future event.

The same parousia and eschatological interest is evident in Matt. 16.27f. Matthew has carefully removed the Son of man from his role as advocate, even if only in a negative sense, in Mk. 8.38. Now, following hard on the saying about being prepared to lose one's life for the sake of Jesus, and thus finding it, comes the saying which reveals what 'saving one's life' means; 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deserts', i.e. gather in the elect who have been prepared to lose their lives for the sake of Jesus, and destroy the sinners. No longer is it possible to interpret this saying as referring to the heavenly intercession of the ascended Son of man.

1. Matt. 24.29, referring back to the fall of Jerusalem and the general unrest described in 24.4ff.
 2. Matt. 24.27
 3. Matt. 24.44.

His role is that of eschatological judge, and with his 'coming' as eschatological judge the 'kingdom' of the Son of man also comes.^{1.}

It is self-evident, therefore, that for Matthew the ἐκκλησία of Matt. 16.18 is not the final kingdom of God which comes only with the return in final triumph and power of the Son of man, Matt. 16.27ff.

Since we have seen that all of these textual changes are clearly secondary in Matthew, they reflect the later interest which sees the 'Kingdom of God' not as belonging to the ascension/enthronement of Jesus, but to a future parousia of the ascended Lord. Jesus is still the authoritative Son of man with whom salvation inextricably bound up, but that salvation for the new people of God belongs to a future period in the history of salvation.

(v) To complete the picture of the Son of man in Matthew we need to look at the Son of man sayings peculiar to him. These are Matt. 16.13, 19.28, 13.37, 41; 10.23; 25.31; 26.2

(1) Matt. 16.13

Who do men say that the Son of man is?

2.

We have already seen that Matthew has derived this title from the passion prediction of Mk. 8.31, which he has removed from the parallel in Matt. 16.21. In the ἐκκλησία context of Matt. 16.21, the title would not have accorded with his use of it, but in Matt. 16.13 it represents his conviction that already in his earthly ministry Jesus was the Son of man who, in the events of the first Easter, would establish his ἐκκλησία. This post-Easter community would be characterised by a continuing allegiance to Jesus who would be their advocate before the Father. Thus they would constitute the new 'elect' people of God who have nothing to fear when the Son of man returns in judgement and brings in the longed-for Kingdom of God.

(2) Matt. 19.28 (3)

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

We have seen that the tradition which lay behind both Matt. 19.28 and Lk. 22.28-30 referred to the ascension/enthronement of the Son of man which entailed that the faithful community would share in his dominion as the true

1. Matt. 16.28

2. Cf above p. 338

3. Cf for detailed discussion under Lk. 22.28-30 above pp. 323ff.

people of God. However, since 'the throne of his glory' is a Matthaean phrase, probably derived from 1 Enoch or the same milieu of thought as 1 Enoch, and is used again in Matt. 25.31 where it is undoubtedly related to the parousia, the saying most probably had an eschatological meaning for Matthew. Accordingly the Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, when the Son of man shall sit on his throne, probably refers to the Kingdom of the Son of man in Matt. 16.28 which is established at the parousia. In this final kingdom the twelve will also sit on thrones 'judging the twelve tribes of Israel', i.e. the faithful apostles will share in his judgement of the old Israel or in his rule over the new Israel. On either interpretation, as judging or ruling, the parousia-coming of the Son of man to his final eschatological enthronement creates at the same time the eschatological community.

3. Matt. 13.37-43

He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man;
 And the field is the world; and the good seed, these are the sons of the kingdom; and the tares are the sons of the evil one. And the enemy that sowed them is the devil: and the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are angels. As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world.
The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity,
 And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.
 Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

The careful linguistic analysis by Jeremias of Matt. 13.36ff has shown¹ beyond any shadow of doubt that it is to be ascribed to Matthew. This conclusion is supported by the fact that two conceptions found in Matt. 13.41 are peculiar to Matthew in the New Testament. These are the angels of the Son of man (cf² Matt. 16.27; 24.31) and the kingdom of the Son of man (cf Matt.16.28).

These two Son of man sayings represent Matthew's twin conceptions of the Son of man's work. The first is that he is the authoritative figure on earth, and the second is that he is judge at the 'consummation of the age'.

As the authoritative Son of man on earth, Jesus is the one who 'sows the good seed, the sons of the kingdom'. The process by which he does this is by preaching the λόγος τῆς βασιλείας³. It would appear that he understands

1. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, pp. 64-67.

2. Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.97. In 16.28, derived from Mk. 9.1, the kingdom of the Son of man still bears the meaning of the final kingdom of God.

3. Matt. 13.19, Cf H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.71.

this 'good seed' to be the true sons of the kingdom of the Father. They are the 'righteous' who will 'shine forth' in the Kingdom of the Father after the judgement of the Son of man carried out by his angels (Matt. 13.41,43). In that judgement we are told that the sons of the evil one will be rooted out from the kingdom of the Son of man, (verse 41). We see, therefore, a clear distinction implied between the kingdom of the Son of man, which contains both good seed and tares, and the final kingdom of God, which will contain only good seed. Although Matthew tells us that the field in which both good seed and tares are sown is the world (verse 38), the kingdom of the Son of man must almost certainly be interpreted as the church.¹ In this provisional and temporary kingdom, two processes are at work; the effective power of the Son of man who places his own in the kingdom, and the 'evil one' who sows the tares amongst them. The intense interest of Matthew's interpretation, after allegorising on the various elements in the original parable, is with the final separation of those who are at present found together in the kingdom of the Son of man. This will take place 'at the consummation of the age'. Verses 41 onwards describe the judgement by means of traditional apocalyptic elements - not without dwelling at some length on the pitiable fate of the sons of the evil one (v.42) and the inheritance of the final kingdom of the Father by the 'good seed' sown by the Son of man.

As we saw when dealing with Matt. 16.13, 21 and 27, Matthew restricts the concept of the Son of man as lord of the Church to his creation and judgement of it. 'He is not seen as the one who rules over the Church during its existence on earth; he is not seen as the exalted one. He is not the Lord acting in the Church.'² In the interim Matthew speaks of allegiance to Jesus (Matt. 10.32f) rather than to the Son of man. But they are the 'good seed' who are promised that they will be included in the 'kingdom of the Father' when the Son of man 'comes' in judgement (cf Matt. 16.27; 24.30f.).³

4. Matt. 25.31

But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.

This saying enjoys the dubious distinction of being the only Son of man saying in a Gospel parable, a fact which immediately arouses suspicion.

1. G. Bornkamm, End-Expectation and Church in Matthew, in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H.J. Held 'Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, 1963, p.44; H.E. Tödt Son of Man, 1965, p. 71; A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.98.
2. H.E. Tödt, Son of Man, 1965, p.73. Cf also G. Bornkamm, op. cit. p.44 who also argues that the Church is seen in the same way in Matt. 16.17-19.
3. It is significant that both of these passages contain the Matthaean peculiarities of the angels of the Son of man and the kingdom of the Son of man showing beyond question that this theology is Matthaean and not primitive.

This suspicion is confirmed by the fact that 'shall sit on the throne of his glory' reproduces exactly the same phrase ^{1.} as in Matt. 19.28, where we saw it to be secondary and Matthaean in origin. Matthew's hand is also seen in this verse in the fact that the title Son of man does not recur in the parable. Rather, there is a sudden and unexplained transition to 'the King' in verses 34 and 40, and the one who does the separating of the sheep from the goats is addressed as 'Lord' in verses 37 and 44. ^{2.} Jeremias suggests, therefore, that this opening verse is a 'stylization of the introduction by Matthew' and Schweizer and Vielhauer that the evangelist has transformed a parable about God as the judge to ^{3.} represent Jesus, the Son of man, as the eschatological judge.

Little of the parable itself can be ascribed to authentic teaching of Jesus. In fact Dodd finds the only truly parabolic element in the 'simile of ^{4.} the shepherd separating the sheep and the goats'. Higgins sees authentic ^{5.} elements in the 'two amen-pronouncements in verses 40 and 45'. His conclusion ^{6.} that the parable is 'the deposit of early Christian ethical instruction' is certainly correct. Nevertheless, Matthew's introduction has turned the whole parable into a parable of the parousia and final judgement in which the Son of ^{7.} man (despite the references to the King and Lord) is the judge who separates the sheep from the goats as he separates the good seed from the tares in Matt. 13.41.

Here the basis of the separation is allegiance to Jesus which expresses ^{8.} itself in acts of mercy to 'one of these, my brethren, even the least'.

In this saying, therefore, we see again how Matthew's secondary amendments to his sources has introduced the concept of the parousia and final judgement, not sparing the terrifying details of the fate which awaits the 'goats' (verses 41 and 46) and introducing his concept that at the parousia the 'sheep' will inherit the final kingdom of God (verse 34). This final judgement is linked for him with the return of Jesus, the Son of man.

1. Cf above pp.323 ff.

2. J. Jeremias, Parables, 1954, p.142

3. E. Schweizer, 'Son of Man' in JBL Vol. 79, 1960, p.200; Ph. Vielhauer, Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, 1957, p.58.

4. C.H. Dodd, Parables, 1956, p.85, n.1.

5. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.116.

6. ibid p.117

7. Nowhere in the synoptic gospels is the Son of man called either King or Lord.

8. Matt. 25.40,45. If E. Schweizer and Ph. Vielhauer (cf p. 349 n.5) are right in seeing that the original parable referred to the judgement by God, then it is significant to note that it is God who is identified with these hungry, etc. and not Jesus. On the other hand, by making it a Son of man parable, Matthew reflects the universal faith of the N.T. in implying an identity between Jesus and his brethren, i.e. between Jesus and the Church, an identity which is so close that what is done to one of his brethren is done to him.

5. Matt. 26.2

Ye know that after two days the passover cometh, and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified.

This is the only saying concerning the suffering of the Son of man which Matthew has not taken from Mark.

Verse 2a is a modification of Mk. 14.1 which follows the apocalyptic chapter Mark 13, expanded by Matthew to the dimension of chapters 24 and 25. In Matthew Mark's reminder about the proximity of the passover becomes a saying on the lips of Jesus, who continues 'and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified'.

1.
The theme of 'delivering up' is familiar, though no mention of to whom the Son of man is delivered is unique.^{2.} $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ is only found elsewhere in Matt. 20.19, where it replaces 'kill' in Mark 10.34, and Luke 24.7, where it is a variant translation of the Aramaic verb ^{3.} 'izdeqeph.

All of this points to the fact that the saying is a late insertion into the Markan context by Matthew who formulated the saying. It is possible that the second half of the saying was intended by Matthew to be a heading for the passion^{4.} lection, reflecting that everything that follows is the issue of the rejection of the Son of man by 'this generation'.

6. Matt. 10.23

But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.

5.
This saying has given rise to a wide range of interpretations, and the question of its authenticity as a saying of Jesus has been hotly debated.^{6.}

7.
In his famous study Albert Schweitzer concluded, on the ground that Matt. 10 is 'historical as a whole and down to the smallest detail', that the saying is not only a word of Jesus himself but marked the turning point in his ministry. 'The parousia of the Son of man, which is logically and temporally

-
1. Mk. 9.31; 10.33; 14.21, 41; Lk. 22.48; 24.7.
 2. Only those passages which speak of the 'going' of the Son of man contain no references to the agents of the passion, making reference only to the betrayal by 'that man' Mk. 14.21 and par.
 3. Cf above p. 329.
 4. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of man, 1964, p.100
 5. For a useful summary of the major interpretations cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.100f.
 6. For references on the controversy whether the saying originated with Jesus cf W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 1961, p.63 n.137.
 7. A. Schweitzer, Quest, 1911, p.361

identical with the dawn of the Kingdom, will take place before they (the twelve)^{1.} shall have completed a hasty journey through the cities of Israel to announce it. When they return and the parousia had not happened, we get the first postponement of the parousia. From now on Jesus sets himself on the road of suffering which he sees will be the necessary preliminary to the kingdom's advent.

The fatal weakness of this interpretation is that it fails to notice the composite character of this Matthaean discourse, and especially Matt. 10.17-23^{2.} Matt. 10.17-22 is taken from Mark 13.9-13, which is not reproduced in Matt. 24, the chapter corresponding to Mark 13, except that Mk. 13.13 is found both in Matt. 24.9a 13b and 10.22. Thus while Matt. 10.17-22 is not the work of the evangelist the setting of it in this context is. A comparison of Mark 13.14 with Matt. 10.23a is also instructive. Mark refers to the 'abomination of desolation standing where it ought not', which in Luke 21.20 refers to the armies which encompass Jerusalem heralding her desolation, and the advice to those who are in Judaea to flee. Similarly Matt. 10.23a advises flight from persecution. The reason given is that they will not have gone far before the Son of man comes. In contrast Mark 13.13b in Matt. 24.13 is followed by 'And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall come the end.' This fact, at first sight, appears to indicate the originality of Matt. 10.23. But this cannot be as the restriction of the mission to Israel both here and in Matt. 10.5f and 15.24 is incompatible with Matt. 10.18; 'Yea and before governors and kings shall ye be brought for my sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles'.

We conclude that at least Matt. 10.23b is an isolated saying which^{3.} has been incorporated by Matthew into this context. But is Tödt right in rejecting the argument of Kümmel, that 10.23a and 10.23b were originally separated and have^{4.} been combined by Matthew, and thus treating the whole of v.23 as an isolated

-
1. A. Schweitzer, *Quest*, 1911, p.357.
 2. Cf Lk. 21.12-19.
 3. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, 1958, pp. 20ff has shown that the Aramaisms of Matt. 10.23 exclude the possibility of attributing it to the evangelist. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, 1954, p.29 holds that Matthew has re-interpreted an older saying in the light of the controversy regarding the Gentile mission, but H.E. Tödt, *Son of man*, 1965, p.61 n.1 rightly says against this 'we cannot very well ascribe to Matthew, however, the 're-interpretation' in 10.23, since the saying had become quite inappropriate to the situation of Matthew's day.'
 4. W.G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 1961, pp.61f.

1. logion? While Kümmel's argument for the original isolation of this saying both from verse 22 and 24 is decisive, his linguistic argument for the original isolation of 23a from 23b is not conclusive in itself. When, however, this is taken together with the fact of the parallel ideas in Mark, 13.14 and Matt. 10.23a, which appears to be Matthew's recasting of the Markan apocalyptic image to suit the situation of the missionary charge to the twelve, the argument for the independence of Matt. 10.23b is convincing.

When Matt. 10.23b is interpreted together with Matt. 10.23a, the meaning of the saying can only be: in your flight you will not reach all the cities of Israel before the Son of man appears in glory. As such it is a message of hope and consolation to a persecuted missionary church. But when Matt. 10.23b is interpreted in isolation the meaning appears to be; the Son of man will come before the disciples have finished proclaiming the advent of the kingdom of God in Israel. As such no persecution situation is implied. And since there is no evidence to prove that the saying belonged originally to the mission charge to the twelve, this does not mean that the Son of man would 'come' before the time span of that particular mission had run out. It is probably a more general statement.

To what does the 'coming of the Son of man' refer in Matt. 10.23b? Kümmel confidently asserts that it is to the parousia.³ While agreeing that there are few good grounds for doubting the authenticity of the logion when separated from Matt. 10.23a., it is hard to support his parousia interpretation. We have seen that few, if any, of the most primitive Son of man sayings which refer to his 'coming' did refer to the parousia 'coming'. More particularly no 'coming' saying, which could be given a parousia interpretation, does contain a time prediction. On the other hand if the reference is to the 'coming' of the Son of man into his ascension kingdom, then we know from very primitive tradition that this coming was to be via the passion, which did in fact come before the proclamation of the imminent advent of the Kingdom of Heaven had been completed in Israel.⁴

-
1. H.E. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 1965, pp.60f. By treating the whole of verse 23 as an isolated logion, Tödt holds that the saying comes from a situation of persecution in the midst of a post-Easter mission to the Jews, and is a prophetic message of hope; 'they will not have to endure the persecution for long because the Son of man will come soon'. This is supported by A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.104 who notes that 'nowhere else is Jesus reported to have expected the coming of the Son of man as soon as this saying suggests.'
 2. The peculiar reference to fleeing from 'this city' to the 'next', instead of the more usual 'from one city to another' suggests that, as in Luke 21.20, it is the destruction of Jerusalem which is in mind here.
 3. W.G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 1961, p.63.
 4. Matt. 10.7.

We conclude that behind the saying in Matthew 10.23b was an independent logion which belonged to a general missionary context, and which promised that with the heavenly enthronement of the Son of man in glory the kingdom of God would come. It is probably this missionary context and the reference to Israel which has attracted the saying to this context in Matthew which, despite the reference to the Gentiles in Matt. 10.18, is specifically stated to be the mission of the Twelve to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel'.¹

It is doubtful that even Matthew understood this to be a parousia saying, since it is he who has incorporated both the material from Mark 13.9-13 into this charge relating to the mission to Israel and 10.23b from some other source. The resultant merger of the sources gives the impression of a teaching concerning the parousia before that mission is completed, and Matthew would have known that his created prediction was inappropriate in his situation where the parousia is still seen to belong to the future. Precisely the same is true even if Tödt is right in seeing the whole of verse 23 as a creation of the primitive community in a post-Easter persecution situation, containing a message of hope concerning the imminent parousia. Matthew has still embedded it in past, unfulfilled history whose character he has created. It is probable, therefore, that even Matthew understood this saying to refer to the ascension, which would be the necessary preliminary of the final advent of the Kingdom of God in the parousia of the Son of man. The only other possibility, and an unlikely one at that, is that at this stage in the conflation of his sources Matthew has lost track of his developing narrative and, completely out of his theological context, has referred to the final parousia of the Son of man which will bring in the kingdom and end the persecutions of the Church.

If we may assume that Matthew is a more consistent theologian than this last suggestion implies, then it is probable that this saying carries the same significance as Matt. 13.37 and 41. It implies that in the preaching of the kingdom and the death and resurrection and ascension of the Son of man the 'kingdom of the Son of man' is created, a kingdom which will be the sphere of his judgement at the parousia when the 'good seed' or the 'sheep' (Matt. 25.34) will inherit the final kingdom of God.

Summary.

Matthew restricts his conception of the Son of man to three distinct periods in the history of salvation; (i) the period when the Son of man acts
1. Matt. 10.6

with authority on earth, (ii) the period when this due authority is rejected issuing in the passion, resurrection and ascension of the Son of man, and (iii) the time, still in the future, when, with the parousia of the Son of man the final judgement will take place (which is the work of the Son of man) and the advent of the kingdom of God. Of the activity of the Son of man in the period between Easter and the parousia we are told nothing. This is the period of the Church, which is also spoken of as the kingdom of the Son of man, Matt. 13.41, and is characterised by a continued faithful allegiance to Jesus, Matt. 10.32f. While this period is also spoken of as a kingdom, it is a provisional kingdom not to be identified with the kingdom of God which belongs to the parousia.

For Matthew, all three periods are related to the creation of a community. In the period of the earthly ministry this is most strongly stated in Matthew's own saying in Matt. 13.37, where it is the Son of man who sows the 'good seed' who are the 'sons of the kingdom', i.e. he not only places them in the interim church kingdom, where they are joined by the tares of the devil's sowing, but also by the fact that he is the sower in the final kingdom of God.

He has also retained the teaching of Mark that in the passion and exaltation of the Son of man the new community of the Son of man is created which community is the provisional βασιλεία, as is made plain in Matt. 16.13-28. The concept of the gathering of the 'elect' community at the parousia, which is sometimes ascribed to his angels (Matt. 13.41; 24.31), is a favourite one in Matthew (cf also Matt. 16.27, 19.28, 25.34). Consequently despite the shift in meaning of the 'coming of the Son of man' from its primitive reference to the ascension/enthronement to the later parousia doctrine, and with it the shift of the concept of the Kingdom of God from the presence of Jesus with his disciples in the earthly ministry and heavenly 'session' to the future parousia of the Son of man, Matthew has retained the strong sense of the community inherent in the title. Salvation is still thought of as the creation of the new people of God by Jesus in his life, passion, ascension, and future parousia. The creation, character, mission, and hope of the community is all tied up with Jesus the Son of man. In the Son of man parable of the sheep and the goats (Mt. 25.31ff) Matthew expounds the corporate identity of the Son of man and the Church. The Son of man is himself the Church so that it is he who is given help or refused it when this is done to any one of his brethren (Mt. 25.40,45). This suggests very strongly that to be included into the ἐκκλησία or the βασιλεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is to be included in the Son of man himself.

(vi) The Son of Man in John's Gospel

In John's ^{Gospel} three themes of the Son of man predominate. The first is the heavenly pre-existence of the Son of man, Jn. 3.13, 5.27 and 6.62. In addition to these sayings, John frequently refers to Jesus as 'the man', but only two of the instances appear to have any Christological significance. In 10.33, 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God', the point is that the Jews do not accept that Jesus is more than a mere man, whereas he is 'man from heaven'. Barrett sees here a clear trace of the myth of the heavenly Man behind the Johannine Son of man. The same applies to 19.5 'Behold the man'. The context of Jn. 6.27 (cf 6.33, 35) and 6.53 (cf 6.58) also provides an incarnational motif to the Son of man sayings.

The second theme is that of the suffering and glory of the Son of man, Jn. 3.14f; 8.28; 12.23; 12.34; 13.31. Unlike Luke 9.22 and 17.25 the Fourth Gospel has no sayings at all which refer simply and solely to the passion. The passion and glorification of the Son of man are one and the same thing. If the passion is the road to glory, it is the exaltation which is the underlying meaning of both ὑψοῦν and δοξάζειν. In this John reflects what we have seen to be the most primitive strand of teaching in the Synoptic Gospels.

The third theme relates to the heavenly glory of the Son of man (without any reference to the passion) Jn. 1.51; 5.27; or to his giving himself to the faithful in the Eucharist, J. 6.27, 53.

As with Mark, Q and L, John has no sayings which refer to the parousia of the Son of man. Whatever meaning must be given to πάλιν ἔρχομαι in Jn. 14.3, ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς in Jn. 14.18, 28, ἕως ἔρχομαι 21.22f, and 'I will see you again' in Jn. 16.22, none of these are in Son of man sayings. This does not mean, however, that John has no teaching on 'the last days' or on a final consummation in the general resurrection.

Since all of these themes are so intricately interwoven in the Fourth Gospel we shall not deal with the sayings in thematic blocks, but rather take them independently.

1. Cf E.M. Sidebottom, The Christ of the Fourth Gospel, 1961, p.96
 2. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.450.
 3. Cf Jn. 6.39f, 44, 54; 12.48.
 4. Cf Jn. 5.24; 5.28ff.

(i) John 1.51

And he said unto him, Verily, verily I say unto you, Ye shall see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

The crucial problem in the interpretation of this saying is the conception of the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of man. It is widely held that there is some connection with the exegesis of Genesis 28.12 found in the Midrash Bereshith Rabba 68.18.^{1.} According to this two interpretations, by R. Hiya and R. Yannai, are given to the ambiguous 'olim weyoredhim bo, where bo could refer to the ladder (şullam, which is masculine in Hebrew) or Jacob. While the LXX has come down on former meaning, rendering ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ in agreement with the feminine κλίμαξ and is supported by R. Hiya, R. Yannai supports 'ascending and descending upon Jacob'. R. Yannai is quoted as continuing 'The explanation' "Ascending and descending upon Jacob" implies that they were taking up and bringing down upon him. They were leaping and skipping over him and rallying him, as it is said 'Israel in whom I glory' (Is. 49.3), 'Thou art he whose εἰκὼν (ʿegon) is engraved on high'. They were ascending on high and looking at his εἰκων (ʿegonin = εἰκόνιον),^{2.} and then descending below and finding him sleeping'.

Using this Midrash, although he urges caution, Barrett suggests that John has replaced Jacob with the Son of man and has combined the earlier speculations about a heavenly man and the Christian conception of the Incarnation. Thus the ascending and descending angels express 'an eternal contact between heaven and earth, God, and man'.^{3.} While the concepts of contact between men and God through Jesus (Jn. 14.6) of his descent from the Father (Jn. 3.13) and ascending (Jn. 3.13, 6.53) are certainly Johannine emphases, it is doubtful whether this third century Midrash can be used to draw this interpretation from Jn. 1.51.

The interpretation of Burney, which is followed by Dodd is more acceptable. He says 'Jacob, as the ancestor of the nation of Israel, summarizes in his person the ideal Israel in posse, just as our Lord, at the other end of

1. Cf for Hebrew text and translation C.F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1922, p.116. That this midrashic interpretation stands also behind Jn. 1.51 is accepted also by H. Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in its relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World, 1929, pp.33f; C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.156 C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp.245f. W. Michaelis, 'John 1.51, Gen. 28.12 und das Menschensohn-Problem' in Theologische Literaturzeitung Vol. 85, 1960, pp. 56-578, tries to show that Gen. 28.12 has not influenced Jn. 1.51 at all.
2. C.F. Burney's translation, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1922 p.116.
3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.156; H. Odeberg, op cit. p.40.

1.
the line, summarizes it in esse as the Son of man'. The problem with this interpretation is that it derives its Platonism of the 'ideal' and the 'real' from the $\xi\kappa\omega\nu$ conception of R. Yannai. While it is certainly probable that bo was interpreted in John's day of Jacob as well as of the ladder, there is nothing in Gen. 28.12 to suggest the later, possibly post-Johannine, conception of the angels contemplating the ideal image of Jacob in heaven and the sleeping Jacob on earth.

Black has adduced evidence for the Aramaic 'al (rendered by $\epsilon\pi\iota$ in Jn. 1.51) meaning 'towards', as the equivalent of the Hebrew 'el. This suggests that the picture is that 'of the heavens opened and angels from above and beneath converging on the Son of man, the central Figure'. This is supported by Torrey, who translates Jn. 1.51 'in the service of the Son of man', and Higgins who notes that this is precisely the role of the angels in the Synoptic Son of man sayings. Further support for this is found in the assertion 'Ye shall see the heavens opened'. It is a promised heavenly vision of the Son of man in glory attended by the angels, and thus looks forward to the ascension.

There is textual support for the claim that behind this saying lay an allusion to the heavenly session of the Son of man and to the angelic traffic either between a heavenly and an earthly Son of man or an ideal figure and the 'inhistorization' of that ideal. Barret cites $\Theta\omega\lambda\epsilon$ pesh Chrysostom Augustine prefixing $\delta\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{o}\varphi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\psi\chi\acute{o}\tau\alpha$ with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ which appears to have been imported from Matt. 26.64, which continues to refer to the heavenly session of the Son of man. Further $\delta\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, 'you(plural) shall see', is used here as in Matt. 26.64, despite the fact that it is Nathanael alone who is addressed; $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \xi\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$. Another parallel between John's account and the Synoptic trial before Caiaphas is that when Jesus hears Nathanael's confession that he is the Son of God, the king of Israel (Jn. 1.49), as in the Synoptic account he admits that he is the Messiah, and points to the still greater reality about himself that he is the Son of man who will be enthroned in heavenly glory. Thus Jn. 1.51 is a Johannine equivalent to Mark 14.62

1. C.F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1922, p.115.

2. M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1946, p.85.

3. C.C. Torrey, The Four Gospels, 1933, pp.186, 318.

4. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.159.

5. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.155.

6. Cf also Acts 7.56.

and parallels pointing to the heavenly glory of the ascended Son of man.^{1.}

Despite this the ascending and descending of the angels does require an explanation since there is no reference to the angels in Mk. 14.62 and par. The most obvious explanation is that John has incorporated this concept from Gen. 28.12. This supposition is strengthened by the reference to Nathanael as an 'Israelite in whom is no guile',^{2.} in which Barrett sees a reference 'to the cunning of Jacob (later called Israel) in robbing Esau of his blessing (cf Gen. 27.35)'.^{3.} If this is so, the reference to Jacob via the angels suggests very strongly the comparison between Jacob as the father of the nation Israel, and indeed the inclusive representative of Israel, and the Son of man as the creator of the new Israel, and indeed their inclusive representative for they are 'in him' and he 'in them'. But for John this new people is constituted in the post-ascension gift of the Holy Spirit (Jn. 7.39; 20.19-23) in whom Jesus 'comes' to his disciples (Jn. 14.16-18). It is wholly appropriate, therefore, that Nathanael's confession that Jesus is the king of Israel should be followed by the prediction of Jesus which referred to his ascension glory, for in this event would his kingship be established and 'Israel' created.^{4.}

(ii) John 3.13

And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.

Although it is true that the Son of man in the Fourth Gospel has features resembling the heavenly Man in Hellenistic thought, Higgins is certainly correct in his conclusion that 'the main source is early Christian usage'.^{5.} Parallel concepts of 'ascent' and 'descent', though not of the Son of man, are found in Eph. 4.8-10 and Rom. 10.6, but the really striking parallels to Jn. 3.13f are found in Acts 2.33ff, where we find the Johannine ἀναβαίνειν, used to refer to the ascent, and ὑψοῦν to refer to the exaltation, i.e. both passages use the same words to describe the act of ascent, ἀναβαίνειν, and its theological implications, ὑψοῦν. Further, although John ascribes this saying to the earthly Jesus his ἀναβέβηκεν, as much as ἀνέβη^{7.} in

1. Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, pp.160f.

2. Jn. 1.47.

3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.154.

4. Cf below pp.482f on the corporate character of the new community in John.

5. Particularly in Philo and the Hermetica. C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 241ff discusses these similarities in detail and stresses especially the archetypal Man in Poimandres.

6. A.J.B. Higgins, son of Man, 1964, pp.171f.

7. In Acts 2.34 we are told that it was not David who ascended into heaven, but, it is implied, Jesus the one who was exalted (ὑψωθεῖς) to the right hand of God (Acts 2.33).

Acts 2.34, implies that this ascension has already taken place. Thus it is clear that this saying belongs to the post-Easter community and not to Jesus.¹ It would appear also that the saying cannot be ascribed to John, for one would then expect a reference to the ascension in the future tense. The most probable explanation of the form of the saying is that John has derived it from a primitive but post-Easter tradition from which Acts 2.33ff has also been derived.²

This post-Easter situation is seen also in the phrase $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega$ which is added by $\Theta \omega$ it vg (cur has 'who was in heaven' which points back to the descent of the Son of man from heaven, and is clearly an attempt to make the saying fit the context of a word by the earthly Jesus. A similar addition, $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \omega \sigma \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \omega \upsilon$, is made by sin and a few Greek MSS.) The strong textual support for this phrase suggests that it was written by John. Its omission by χ , B, W, among others, is probably a variant attempt to avoid the difficulty of ascribing a saying to the earthly Jesus which implies that he has already ascended. If the words are to be ascribed to John they indicate very clearly that it is the ascension and heavenly session of the Son of man which is the main point of the saying in the development of the discourse with Nicodemus.

While the phrase 'he that descended out of heaven' is undoubtedly Johannine and represents his strongly incarnational theology, implying the heavenly pre-existence of the Son of man who has already come in the person of Jesus, it is not this conception which is the main point of the saying. True, only he who has descended from heaven has ascended to heaven, but it is the ascent to heavenly glory which is the point of the saying in its context.

Two main themes are presented in the context. The first is the encounter of Jesus with Nicodemus. In the passage Nicodemus is described variously as $\epsilon \kappa \tau \omega \nu \phi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \alpha \iota \omega \nu$ (3.1) $\alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \iota \sigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$ (3.1) and $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \omicron \varsigma \wedge$ (3.10). Although it is possible that the one man might have been all three things, it is probable that John is here collecting titles to portray Nicodemus as a representative Jew.³ It is also possible that when John tells us that Nicodemus came 'by night' he is doing nothing more than relating a fact, but since we are never told the purpose of the visit (which appears to be little

1. Cf also C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p. 178.

2. It is significant that this Acts passage like Jn. 3.13ff is in a baptismal context.

3. Cf C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.170.

more than the frame for the subsequent discourse); ^{1.} $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\xi$ is used elsewhere in John with more than literal significance; ^{2.} and the theme of Jesus as the true Light is developed in Jn. 3.19-21, it is probable that it is intended to indicate the darkness of the Jews who come into but reject the true Light of Jesus the Son of man.

That this is the correct interpretation of the role of Nicodemus and $\nu\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is born out by the theme of being born $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ which is developed in Jn. 3.3-8. As has frequently been noted by scholars $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ can mean both 'afresh' and 'from above', and probably bears this dual meaning for John.

^{3.} Barrett points out also that $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ refers more frequently to the father's act of 'begetting' than the mother's of 'giving birth'. Thus the concept is of a radical new beginning whose origin is 'from above'. Without this, Nicodemus is told, a man will not see the kingdom of God.

What this radical regeneration is is made clear when Nicodemus interprets $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ as again, and takes it in a physical sense, 'How can a man be born when he is old?' In reply we are told that without the birth $\xi\acute{\varsigma}$ $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ^{4.} $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ no man can $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. ^{5.} If there was any doubt that the birth $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ referred to baptism the juxtaposition of water and Spirit calls to mind the Baptist's prediction (Jn. 1.26 cf 1.33) and also Jn. 3.29-34 (the relation and contrast between John and Jesus) drives home the baptismal significance of this earlier part of the chapter.

There appears to be no significant distinction implied between 'seeing' the kingdom of God in Jn. 3.3 and entering into the kingdom in Jn. 3.5. Thus the plain meaning is that a man enters the kingdom of God through the regeneration by the Holy Spirit in the Christian rite of Baptism.

Barrett rightly notes that this conception of regeneration 'from above' ^{6.} plays no part in Judaism. The novelty of John's thought when compared with Judaism is not accidental, since the point of the paragraph is to bring out the

1. Cf the sudden change to the plural in vv. 7. ff.

2. Jn. 9.4; 11.10; 13.30.

3. C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p.172

4. There is no textual ground whatsoever for the omission of $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as an interpolation; they are undoubtedly the work of the author who wrote the Gospel and must be interpreted as part of the text.

5. Cf C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p.172 for references to the same concept in the New Testament and early fathers where the rebirth refers to baptism, also O. Cullmann, *Worship*, 1953, p.75 n.2

6. C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p.172.

fact that Judaism, which Nicodemus represents, is inadequate, and that being a Jew does not in itself ensure entry into the Kingdom of God. Between that entry and Judaism stands a break as radical as re-birth, and a re-birth which is to be ascribed to the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit who is beyond the control of men (Jn. 3.8). This concept of the invasion of present human life by the power of God was reserved in Judaism for the age which is to come. When this is associated now with the post-Baptismal life in the Spirit in the Christian community there is an open declaration that that new age has come in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Nicodemus, the representative of the old Israel, who doubts and questions these things is himself a parable of the gulf between the old Israel and the new. He most probably represents the conflict situation of the early church with the Jewish leaders, and declares on the authority of Jesus - the Son of man who has descended from heaven - that it is only through baptismal incorporation into the Christian community/community of the Holy Spirit that a man may enter into the Kingdom of God.

To this theme of Judaism vs. the Kingdom of God is added the theme of the role of Jesus. When Nicodemus questions how these things can be (Jn. 3.9) the reply of Jesus is that as a 'teacher of Israel' he ought to understand. But more than this. The reference to the 'descent' of the Son of man from heaven in the incarnation establishes the authority of Jesus, and thus his ability to reveal heavenly things (Jn. 3.12).¹ These things are fulfilled in the ascension of the Son of man. The baptismal regeneration - incorporation-into-the-Kingdom is ἐκ πνεύματος². It is the miraculous work of the Spirit, but the gift of the Spirit is quite categorically consequent upon the 'glorification' of Jesus.² Thus the answer of Jesus to the question of Nicodemus contains two aspects; the first is that 'these things will be' because they are declared by the Son of man who has descended out of heaven; the second tells how they will be accomplished through his ascension and bestowal of the Spirit. In this we see yet again how the Son of man in the predominant New Testament tradition is linked with the creation of the new community through the ascension and sharing in his spirit.

While the ascension of the Son of man is the appropriate climax to the theme that has been developed in Jn. 3.1-12, the theme of the 'descent' being

1. This aspect of the saying resembles the Synoptic Son of man sayings which refer to the authority of the Son of man on earth, though it differs from them in establishing the ground of this authority in the heavenly pre-existence of the Son of man.
2. Jn. 7.39; 14.16; 16.7; cf 20.19-23.

used to establish the authority and supernatural knowledge of Jesus, it is the concept of the 'descent' which provides the introduction to what follows, especially in verses 16-21; Jesus is the one who has come from God so that judgement is entailed in the response of men to him. Thus judgement, which in Matthew is seen to belong to the parousia of the Son of man, is seen here to belong to Jesus in his incarnation. This earthly ministry and the ascension are, for John, the two distinct periods in the history of salvation. As we have seen, however, since John is writing from the standpoint of the post-Easter community in this passage the 'belief' to which it refers is probably a reading back into the earthly situation of the 'belief' in the ascended Jesus which lies at the centre of the new Israel.

(iii) John 3.14f (1)

And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life.

In the Fourth Gospel the verb ὑψοῦν is used only in connexion with the Son of man (3.28; 12.34).^{2.} In both of these the primary meaning is the crucifixion. In 3.28, speaking to the Jews (cf 8.22) Jesus says 'When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he'. Since the verb is used in the active *voice* in which the agents are Jews, it is clear that the basic reference is to being lifted up on the cross. 12.34 repeats the expression of 3.14, δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and *refers* back to 12.32; 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto *my*-self.' But the meaning given to this utterance is 'He said this signifying by what manner of death he should die'.

Is the primary reference in Jn. 3.14 also to the cross? The fact that this is the meaning of the other instances of the phrase suggests that the cross is certainly implied for John. However, the fact that John uses this verb only in association with the Son of man points to his dependence on a pre-Johannine source. This is born out by its use in the non-Johannine kerygma.

Acts 2.33, 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted (ὑψωθείς); Acts 5.31, 'Him did God exalt (ὑψωθεν) at his right hand to be a Prince and Saviour'. It is probable that behind both of these sayings stood the Aramaic verb ʾizdeqeph. We find a similar use in Phil. 2.9, 'Wherefore also God highly
2. Jn. 12.32 is a special case, cf above p.329f

1. Cf also under Luke 24.7 above pp.323f.

exalted (ὑπερῴψωσεν) him'. If this is an adaptation of an earlier Aramaic Christological hymn, and if as Lohmeyer suggests,¹ ὡς ἄνθρωπος in verse 7 represents the Aramaic kebhar nasa', it would be a remarkable parallel to Jn. 3.14. In view of this uniform use of ὑψοῦν in the primitive kerygma to denote the exaltation to the right hand of God, the pre-Johannine saying in 3.14 must have had this original meaning.

The use of δεῖν, with its clear echo of the Synoptic usage, indicates that the crucifixion is also contained in ὑψωθῆναι in Jn. 3.14. While the Aramaic 'izdeqeph probably stood behind ὑψωθῆναι here and in the non-Johannine kerygma, in this non-Johannine tradition ὑψοῦν did not carry the double reference to the cross and exaltation which it does in 3.14. Consequently it would appear certain that Jn. 3.14 is dependent on an Aramaic tradition which is common to that found in Lk. 24.7, where Luke, in conformity with later tradition, has translated 'izdeqeph as σταυρωθῆναι, while John is more faithful to the primitive tradition in translating it as ὑψωθῆναι thus retaining its primary reference to the ascension to the right hand of God.

This being so it is probable that the reference to the 'lifting up' of the serpent in the wilderness by Moses also carries this root meaning.² The point of the comparison is that as the uplifted serpent brought 'life' to those dying from the snake-bites when they saw it, so the Son of man must be lifted up³ in order that believers may have eternal life in him. It is the Son of man, enthroned in heavenly glory, who brings eternal life to the believers, and he brings it by their being incorporated 'in him' in baptism.

The adjective αἰώνιος is used in John only in the expression ζωὴ αἰώνιος⁴, and most probably derives from the phrase hayey ha'olam

-
1. E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper, 1954, p. 95.
 2. The LXX translates Num. 21.8 as ἔστησεν αὐτὸν (the serpent) ἐπὶ σημεῖου. On the basis of this and the familiar Johannine allusiveness T. F. Glasson, Moses in the Fourth Gospel, 1963, pp. 36-39 tries to import into Jn. 3.14 the idea of the σημεῖον in the sense of a standard, i. e. the Cross. However σημεῖον is such a favourite concept with the Fourth Evangelist that it is inconceivable that he would not have used it if he had intended this. It is equally unlikely that the later use of the story of the serpent as a type of Christ is what is intended here (cf. Barn 12.5; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1.60; Trypho 94, 112.; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iii.18). The Fourth Gospel preserves the earliest Christian use of the story. On its antiquity, Palestinian origin, and rival Jewish exegeses cf. T. W. Manson, *JTS*, Vol. 46, 1945, pp. 129ff.
 3. The fact that it is only in Jn. 3.15 that we find ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ used with ἔν suggests that ἔν αὐτῷ belongs together with ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. (Cf. 6.47; 20.31 where ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ is used absolutely as the ground of eternal life; and 1.4, ἔν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.)
 4. Jn. 3.15, 16, 36; 4.14, 36; 5.24, 39; 6.27, 40, 47, 54, 68; 12.25, 50; 17.2, 3.

in Dan. 12.2, which is translated in the LXX and Theodotion, ζῶν διώνιος.
 Barrett suggests that its meaning is made clearer by the more common rabbinic
 formula hayey ha'olam habho', or life of the age to come.¹ In this sense the
 phrase appears in the Synoptic Gospels.² It is significant that the phrase appears
 in John only after the only references in the Gospel to the Kingdom of God (3.3,5),
 and thus is probably the Johannine equivalent of the Kingdom of God. In any
 event the phrase here bears the same meaning as the kingdom of God in Jn. 3.3 and
 5. In them we saw that entry into the kingdom of God was to come about through
 the baptismal regeneration by the Spirit, which is the gift of the ascended Jesus.
 Here we are told that the Son of man is 'lifted up' in order that men might have
 eternal life 'in him'. The parallelism of ideas is striking.

If this interpretation is correct then being 'in the kingdom' entails
 being 'in' the ascended Son of man. Here we see most clearly the 'corporate
 personality' of the Son of man, in which the crucial central figure with whom the
 life and hope of the community is bound up is the risen and ascended Jesus.
 Baptism into the Kingdom of God is therefore also baptism into the community which
 is 'in' Jesus. It is to draw all men to himself that the Son of man is lifted up
 (cf Jn. 12.32), and to 'gather together into one the children of God that are
 scattered abroad'.³

John makes explicit what is implicit in the Synoptics that the community
 is the ascended Jesus and therefore exists as the kingdom of God, the new
 Israel, having 'eternal life' only by being 'in him', i.e. a part of his ascended
 being.

To this objective aspect of salvation in creating the new eschatological
 community through God's exalting of the Son of man and giving the regenerating
 Spirit in baptism is added the more subjective side of 'believing', which means
 the total response of acceptance to the Person of Christ present to the Church in
 the sacraments through which the eschatological community is created 'in him'.⁴
 In this we have the Johannine counterpart to the Synoptic concept that it is
 allegiance to the exalted Son of man which is the distinguishing characteristic
 of the eschatological community created through his ascension and bestowal of the
 Spirit.

1. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.179

2. e.g. Mk. 10.30.

3. Jn. 11.52.

4. Cf O. Cullmann, worship, 1953, p.78.

(iv) John 5.27

And he gave him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of man.

The major problem which surrounds this text is the unique form of the Greek reference to 'Son of man' - υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. The only other comparable New Testament use of this form is Heb. 2.6 where the author is not using Dan. 7.13f but Psalm 8 and uses the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου both to express the humanity of Jesus and to illustrate his theme of humiliation and exaltation.

Because of the lack of the definite article in the expression there is a wide-spread scholarly opinion that the reference is not to the apocalyptic title but to the humanity of Jesus. Accordingly it is suggested that Jesus judges by virtue of his manhood.¹ Against this the argument of Barrett is decisive; 'it seems wholly improbable that precisely at this place where judgement - the characteristic function of the apocalyptic Son of man - is in mind, John would turn his back on the common Christian (and his own) usage'.² Equally decisive is the argument of Higgins for the antiquity and Semitic origin of the saying.³

The saying bears remarkable parallels to Dan. 7.13f,⁴ where the conception is of the bestowal of authority, and to 1 Enoch 69.27, 'the sum of judgement was given unto the Son of man'.⁵ As we have seen the concepts of authority and judgement are common themes in the Synoptic Son of man sayings, though this saying differs from all the Synoptic sayings in its categorical claim that it is precisely because Jesus is the Son of man that he is the judge. However, Jn. 5.27 simply makes perfectly explicit what is implicit in the Synoptics.⁶

We conclude, therefore, that this is a pre-Johannine saying of great antiquity and Semitic origin which, in view of its dependence on Dan. 7.13f, probably referred originally to the ascension of the Son of man and the bestowal of authority and the right to judge upon him. John has, however, completely adapted the saying to his context, where the theme is that of the judgement which has been given to the Son (cf Jn. 5.22). Thus, for John, the meaning is that

1. Cf. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.167 n.1 for a list of authors supporting this exegesis.

2. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.218

3. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.166ff.

4. Dan. 7.14 in the LXX is translated καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία and in Jn. 5.27 we have καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ.

5. Cf also 1 En. 61.8-63.12, where the Elect One or Son of man is judge.

6. Cf. O. Cullman, Christology, 1957, p.158.

the Son is judge in his incarnation precisely because he is the Son of man, which clearly implies the pre-existence of the Son of man who in the ministry of Jesus is already the apocalyptic judge, and will be at the general resurrection (v. 28,29) when the righteous will be rewarded with the 'resurrection of life' and those who have not escaped the judgement through their lack of belief (v.24) will then have to face the final judgement. The original theme of the ascension/enthronement and bestowal of authority and judgement on the Son of man has here been expanded in two directions, firstly into the earthly ministry of Jesus as the one in whom the judgement has already come and secondly to the 'last days' when those who have already been quickened and escaped judgement will be raised to 'life' and the rest to judgement. Although nothing is said of the interval between cross and the final 'hour' this does not mean that judgement and 'giving life' are limited to the incarnation and general resurrection. For John this is a continuing process which begins in the incarnation and culminates in the general resurrection. There is nothing in John which is comparable to Matthew's conception of an interim-kingdom of the Son of man. The kingdom is already present in the ministry of Jesus. Believers enter the kingdom of God in baptism, and finally share in the resurrection life of the kingdom.

(v) John 6.27

Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you:

John 6.53

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.

John 6.62

What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?

-
1. The post-Easter situation of the whole passage is seen in verse 24 where those who have passed out of judgement are not those who believe in Jesus himself (as e.g. in Jn. 14.1) but who τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πνεύματι (cf also Jn. 2.22; 4.50; 7.40; 8.43, 51f, 55; 14.23f; 17.6). Cf also, among other passages, 12.48, where it is the word of Jesus that judges a man who rejects it. To hear the word of Jesus is to have eternal life (i.e. be in the Kingdom of God), since his ῥήματα are the words of eternal life (6.68); that is they are Spirit and life (6.63). This word of Jesus is seen to be an active thing which judges, gives life, and cleanses (5.24; 15.3). Thus in the word of the one who has been sent by God judgement, life and cleansing are present in the Church just as they were present in the Person of Jesus. Just as the word of God in the Old Testament meant God present and accomplishing things on earth, so the word of Jesus is the ascended Lord present in giving life and judging. So it can be said that it is the word of Jesus which judges at the last day (12.48) expressing the eternal continuity of the Jesus of the incarnation, ascension, and 'last day'. There is, therefore, no difference between the life giving and judging word of the Jesus of history, of the Church and of the 'last day', nor is there any difference between the 'word' which judges at the last day (12.48) and hearing his voice in the coming hour which brings the resurrection of life and judgement (5.28f)

In our study of the Messiah we have already analysed the developing
 1. argument of John 6 and seen that it is Eucharistic throughout. It remains for us to see the source and role of the Son of man concept.

We have seen that none of the Son of man sayings in John which we have studied can be attributed to the evangelist, but that he is dependent on a pre-Johannine and probably Semitic source. It is probable, therefore, that John is using an already existing tradition about the Son of man here. Verses 27 and 53, however, are so radically different - in that in 6.27 the Son of man is the dispenser of the food which brings 'eternal life' while in 6.53 the Son of man is himself that food - that many scholars have concluded that verses 51c (and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world) - 58 are a
 2. redactional eucharistic addition to the discourse on the bread of life.

Against this we have seen the clear eucharistic allusions in verses 4,
 3. 11, 12, 33, 34 and 35. Further Gärtner points out the close connection between verses 51c-58 and the preceding section of the discourse in the resemblances between the whole discourse and the Jewish Passover Haggadah, and especially the occurrence of the four questions, 28, 30f., 42 and 52. This last question falls into the disputed section (51c-58) and corresponds to questions of a similar type in the Haggadah. Consequently it is probable that verses 27 and 53 were part of a pre-Johannine eucharistic homily which had been constructed on the pattern of the Jewish passover Haggadah.

So far from verses 27 and 53 being incompatible with one another, the two sayings form the framework of the whole discourse, and the transition between them is made quite clear by the evangelist.

In verse 27 it is the Son of man who gives τὴν βρωσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Verse 33 is open to the intended double translation as 'the bread of God is that bread which descends from heaven' and 'the bread of God is
 4. he who descends from heaven'. This allows the identification of Jesus with the bread of life in verses 35 and 48. Further, ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in v. 33 is very reminiscent of ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς in Jn. 3.13 where the
 5. reference is to the Son of man. Therefore, as Higgins suggests, the transition is

1. Cf above pp. 112ff

2. Cf above pp. 114f for the argument that this is the Johannine equivalent of the words of institution.

3. B. Gärtner, 'John 6 and the Jewish Passover' in Coniectanea Neotestamentica xvii, 1959, p. 24n, 26-29.

4. Cf above p. 113

5. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p. 174.

- 3.13 The Son of man descended from heaven. (cf 6.33)
 6.27 the Son of man gives the food of eternal life (the kingdom)
 6.53 the Son of man himself is this food (cf 6.33,35,48)

Because Jesus is the Son of man who has come from heaven, he is himself the food which brings eternal life, i.e. he himself is the eschatological banquet which implies that in him the kingdom has already come, a kingdom which will be consummated in the general resurrection at the 'last day' (6.39,40,44,54).

The transition from this incarnational theme to the eucharistic discourse is marked by the repetition that Jesus is the bread which is come down from heaven, which, if any man should eat it, he will live forever. In the incarnational theme the idea of 'eating' the bread from heaven is not present, rather it is of 'coming to me' and 'believing' (cf 6.35,37,40,47). The continuity between the incarnation and the eucharist is emphasised, however, in that it is the 'bread from heaven' who gives life to those who 'come' to him in the incarnation, and that same 'bread from heaven' who gives life to those who eat it. Therefore the eucharistic theme, which really begins at verse 50, is woven inextricably into the whole discourse and the parallelism of ideas between the incarnational and eucharistic themes is most striking. Certainly the effect of eucharistic participation is precisely the same as the effect of the incarnation, which is to give eternal life which, we have argued, is the Johannine equivalent of the life of the age to come, i.e. the Kingdom of God.^{1.}

The corporate significance of 6.53 is seen most strikingly in the phrase ἔχετε βρωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, which carries a different significance from ἔχει βρωὴν δι' ἑαυτὸν in 6.54. It is precisely this, we are told in 5.26, the verse immediately preceding the Son of man saying in 5.27, which the Father has and has given to the Son (ὡςπερ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἔχει βρωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ οὕτως ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ υἱῷ βρωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ). It is striking that this phrase, which is found nowhere else in the New Testament, is used only in the context of the Son of man.^{2.} In Jn. 5 the idea of the Son 'having life in himself' as a gift from the Father who has 'life in himself' probably refers back to 5.21 just as the idea of the bestowal of authority to judge/refers back to 5.22. In verse 21 we are told that both the Father and the Son ζωοποιεῖ, i.e. make alive. The ground of this is established in verse 26. The Father is able to 'make alive'

1. Cf above p. 358

2. The closest parallels to this concept are in Jn. 1.4, ἐν αὐτῷ βρωὴ ἦν and 1 Jn. 5.12 'He that hath the Son ἔχει τὴν βρωὴν'. This suggests that the phrase is not a Johannine creation, but belonged to his Son of man source.

because he has this life in himself, and the Son is also able to 'make alive' because the Father has bestowed this inherent life-giving power on the Son. Now in 6.53 we are told that eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking his blood bestows 'life in themselves' upon the communicants, i.e. they share in the unique gift of the Father to the Son of man. Since this is not a gift given for the recipient himself, but in order that the Son may share in the Father's work of 'making alive', so we must assume that it is for this purpose that the faithful receive this gift in the eucharist. This being so the thought is that in the eucharist the faithful are made those who share in the gift to the Son of man and thus share in his redemptive work. This corporate incorporation into the Father through the Son for the sake of mission is stated in more specifically Johannine concepts in Jn. 17,18,21 (As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world....(I pray) That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me.)

Jn. 6.62 belongs to the explanation of the discourse which is introduced by the disciples query about the 'hard saying' (6.60). This hard saying points especially, though not exclusively, to the climax of the discourse (verses 51c, 53-58), to the initial statement of which the Jews have already objected (verse 52). The explanation Jesus gives is in two parts. Verse 62, referring back to Jn. 3.13, speaks of the ascent of the Son of man 'where he was before'. Unlike 3.13 this ascension is still in the future. The implication of this is that 'eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking his blood' is a post-ascension experience. Verse 63 speaks of the Spirit (It is the Spirit that makes alive (ἐσθωποιοῦν); the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life. But there are some of you that believe not, for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.) As Higgins has suggested this inclusion of the reference to the Spirit given after the ascension is another version of Jn. 7.39. His further suggestion that 'It is a spiritual eating that is meant' is far too

1. Cf W. Thüsing, Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, 1960, pp. 261f.

2. This reference to the betrayer in the context of a Son of man saying which refers to the ascension and also in the context of the Eucharist is very reminiscent of Mk. 14.21 = Matt. 26.64, Lk. 22.22. So striking is the reference to the betrayer in a context which does not really call for it that it is hard to believe that this is purely a Johannine creation (cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.176, who classes it with his sayings of a non-Synoptic type).

While admitting the dependence of 6.62f on 3.13, it seems certain that this is a Johannine re-casting of Mk. 14.21 and par. in which John has made explicit what is implicit in the Synoptic saying and added the specific reference to the Spirit.

3. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp. 176f.

4. *ibid* p.176

imprecise. What John tells us is that in eating the flesh of the Son of man, which gives 'life in themselves' to those who eat, it is the Spirit which gives life, the Spirit which is breathed on the disciples by the ascended Jesus and which he had promised would be his ascension gift. Yet it is clear that in the Spirit it is Jesus himself who comes to the disciples. Thus the meaning is that in eating and drinking the sacramental elements it is the ascended Son of man who comes to 'make alive' and to bestow the gift of 'having life in themselves', but this presence is spoken of as the presence of the life-giving Spirit.

In this we see at work the concept of the 'corporate personality' of Judaism which was spoken of as being endowed with the Spirit of the ebhed, Messiah, and Son of man. In the predominant Jewish tradition this did not mean that the community was the ebhed, Messiah or Son of man, but rather that in him the hope for the community was centred and their glory was dependent on him. He is both the focus and creator of the new community. It is precisely in this way that John is to be understood here. In the life-giving presence of the Son of man in the eucharist the eschatological community is created, and the use of the concept of the Spirit makes it plain that this is a corporate body.

Higgins regards all these three sayings as 'Un-synoptic'; 'The intrusion of the Son of man concept into a eucharistic context in the homiletical tradition reflected in them is a radical departure'. We have seen that this is plainly not true of 6.62ff, and we have also seen the application of the Son of man concept to the eucharist in Mk. 10.45 = Matt. 20.28, Lk. 22.28-30, Lk. 7.34 = Matt. 11.19, and Lk. 12.40. What is unique is the concept of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man which appears to be the influence of the words of Institution on the earlier concept of the covenant-making meal with the Son of man. As such 6.53 is to be regarded as a later extension of the primitive association of the Son of man with the eschatological meal of the Kingdom. Jn. 6.27 has striking conceptual if not linguistic parallels to Mk. 10.45, where the eucharistic allusions are made explicit in the Lukan parallel (Lk. 22.27) in his placing of the saying in the context of the Last Supper.

We conclude, therefore, that while these sayings are comparatively late - though pre-Johannine - they faithfully reflect a very primitive Son of man tradition.

1. Jn. 20, 22.

2. Jn. 14.16 etc.

3. Jn. 14.18.

4. Yet, as we shall see below pp.422ff, the union between Christ and the disciple is so intense that they not only share his nature (in dependence on him) but 'in him' constitute one single living thing which is Christ himself.

5. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.175.

6. Cf above p.363n.2. 7. cf above pp.237ff. 8. cf above pp.324 ff. 9. cf above p.264ff.

10. cf above pp.282 ff, 305.

(vi) John 8.28

When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he.

John 12.34

How do you say that the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man? (1)

Both of these verses appear to be derived from Jn. 3.14 and only in this sense derived from a pre-Johannine source. They both differ from 3.14 in that the primary meaning of the 'lifting up' is not the ascension but the lifting up on the Cross. In 8.28 the use of the verb in the active *voice* (ὑψώσητε) in which the Jews (verse 22) are the agents makes this plain. 12.34 has been woven into the context of 12.32ff, and the statement by Jesus in verse 32, 'if I be lifted up', is taken from 3.14 which is repeated in 12.34. But the explanation of this 'lifting up' in verse 33 is a reference to the crucifixion ('this he said, signifying by what manner of death he was to die')

In 8.28 the words 'then shall ye know that I am' suggests that the idea of the ascension is also present. The meaning appears to be that the Jews will know who he is when they 'lift him up', for though they are the perpetrators of the crucifixion God will 'lift him up', i.e. exalt him to heavenly glory. Thüsing has shown that the words 'you will know' cannot mean 'you will know to your cost'.² In John γινώσκειν is used only in a positive sense. The opposite is expressed in verse 24, 'for except you believe that I am, ye shall die in your sins'. Thus 'ye shall know that I am' implies a promise of salvation to those Jews who will believe as a result of the 'lifting up' of the Son of man and enter into life-giving union with him. The sense is therefore the same as in 11.52f. 'Now this he said (referring to the death of Jesus) not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (cf also 12.32) i.e. this death at the hands of the Jews and exaltation at the hand of God will bring salvation to those who believe by gathering them into 'one' in himself.

One remaining problem in 8.28 is whether Ἐγώ εἰμι² has the same meaning as in 8.24. If so then Ἐγώ εἰμι², as so often in John, is a 'theophanic formula'

1. The omission of the words τίς ἐστίν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in P⁷⁵ does not appear to be a genuine textual variant, but rather the result of haplography. P.75 also omits ὅτι before εἶπεν in this verse.

2. W. Thüsing, Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, 1960, pp. 15.- 22.

corresponding to 'ani hu' implying that God has given his own name to Jesus.^{1.}
 Since this is such a characteristic formula in John it is impossible to believe that he has used it without this implication. But, as Higgins suggests, it may equally well mean 'I am the Son of man', and answer the question 'Who art thou?'^{2.}
 in verse 25. This being so the saying corresponds closely to 1.51 and 3.14f where the concept is of the revelatory exaltation which evokes belief.

In 12.34 the reference by the 'multitude' to the Son of man is strange in that Jesus has not spoken of the lifting up of the Son of man. For this reason Bultmann has proposed transposing this verse to follow 8.28f.^{3.} This is unnecessary. Although the Son of man is not mentioned in 12.32, this saying is clearly modelled on 3.14f, and thus is present in his source when the question of the multitude repeats this assertion in 12.34.

While the reference to the Cross is the primary intention in both 12.32 and 12.34, as is made explicit in 12.33, the deeper significance of this is retained in the being 'lifted up from the earth'. It is this exaltation which will 'draw all men unto himself, and thus bring them to share in his glory (cf Jn. 17.22 'And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one') However, the immediate concern of the passage is with the death which evokes the query of how Jesus can say that the Son of man will be lifted up when the law says that the Messiah 'abideth forever'. The Messiah and Son of man are here equivalent terms. Beneath this surface reference to the death lurks the meaning, which would have been clear to the readers of the Gospel, that in this 'lifting up' the Messiah/Son of man does indeed abide forever. This is made explicit in the great Spirit discourse when Jesus promises^{4.} 'I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you'.

It is doubtful that the question 'who is this Son of man?' is to be interpreted as 'what sort of a Son of man is this?'^{5.} Rather it serves as an introduction to the reply of Jesus about the 'light' being present with them and a call to believe on the light 'that ye might become sons of light'.^{6.} The reader would already be familiar with the claim of Jesus 'I am the light of the world'^{7.}

1. E. Stauffer, *Jesus and His Story*, 1960, 142ff, 154ff; C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955 pp. 282f; C.H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, 1960, pp.93ff, 349f. On this formula cf. below pp. 477ff.

2. A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.169.

3. R. Bultmann, *Johannes*, 1950, p.269, n.7

4. Jn. 14.18

5. So. A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.170.

6. Jn. 12.35f.

7. Jn. 8.12.

1.
 who has come from God into the world. The clear implication is that Jesus is the Son of man who, like the light, has come from a heavenly pre-existence into the world.
 2.

The expression 'sons of light' is most interesting here, and resembles very closely the phrase τέκνα φωτός of Ephesians 5.8 where it occurs also with περιπατῶν . As Selwyn has shown, this Filii Lucis was an element of primitive Christian baptismal instruction.
 3. Since the Son of man has been woven into a baptismal discourse in Jn. 3.13f, it is significant to see this baptismal allusion here again. In 3.13f we saw that both incarnational and ascension themes were present in the Son of man concept, but that the 'how' of baptismal regeneration was associated particularly with the ascension and gift of the Spirit. Here the incarnational theme is introduced by the concept of 'light' in reply to the question 'Who is this Son of man?' The 'how' to become children of light is by believing in the light in their midst but also by the ascended Son of man 'drawing' them (verse 32), and the inference is that this is the baptismal gift to those who believe. Thus baptism is seen as incorporation into the corporate personality of the Son of man. Baptism, for John, therefore has the same community creating significance as the incarnation and 'lifting up' of the Son of man, and the eucharist, for the Christ-event, baptism, and the eucharist all serve to create the eschatological community which is incorporated into the Son and so into the Son's unity with the Father (cf Jn. 17.21). Because of this John is able to shift easily
 4. from incarnational to sacramental themes.

(vii) John 12.23

The hour is coming that the Son of man should be glorified.

5.
 This saying is classified by Higgins as a non-synoptic type. It would appear, however, that under the verb 'glorify' (δοξάζειν) John has combined the passion prediction of the Son of man in Mk. 8.31, and the 'hour' when the Son of man is betrayed in Mk. 14.41. This is strongly supported by the fact that the synoptic saying in Mk. 8.35 is found again in Jn. 12.25 and Mk. 8.34 in
 6. Jn. 12.26. Jn. 12.27 also bears remarkable similarities to

1. Jn. 1.4, 9 (cf also 12.46).

2. Jn. 3.13; 6.62.

3. E.G. Selwyn, First Peter, 1946, pp. 375-382.

4. As is shown by O. Cullmann, Worship, 1955.

5. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of man, 1964, pp. 177ff.

6. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.353, also argues that John has Mk. 8.31ff in mind here.

1. Mk. 14.34ff. But the saying itself bears remarkable linguistic parallels to
 2. Mk. 14.41. The really striking difference between the two is that *παραδίδονται* in Mark is replaced with the Johannine *δοξασθῆ*.

δοξάζειν is a thoroughly Johannine word which, unlike *ὑψοῦν*
 3. he uses in contexts other than the Son of man. His use of the word, however, shows that it bears the same double meaning as *ὑψοῦν*. Dodd, following Odeberg, suggests that John's use of *δοξάζειν* has been suggested by the citation of
 4. Isaiah 49.3 in the Midrash on Genesis 28.12. But we have seen that it is highly dubious to base such a derivation on a third century document. While he is undoubtedly correct in seeing the influence of the Isaianic Servant on the Johannine Christology and soteriology, none of the examples he cites are in Son of man sayings.

While *δοξάζειν* is a favourite Johannine concept it, like *ὑψοῦν* belonged to the primitive kerygma. 'The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified his servant Jesus' (Acts 3.13).
 5. 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory' (Lk. 24.26). 'So Christ also glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but that he spake unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee' (Heb. 5.5). Thus while the primitive kerygma did associate *δοξάζειν* with the *ἐβhed*, it applied it also to the Messiah and the high priest, and in them all the primary reference is to the exaltation as an act of God.

It would appear, therefore, that like *ὑψοῦν* John has derived *δοξάζειν* from the primitive kerygma. In the kerygma both words referred essentially to the ascension to the right hand of God to be crowned with glory and John has retained this primitive meaning but read into it also the death,

1. ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρακται Jn. 12.27 cf Mk. 14.34 περίλυπτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου John has perhaps gone independently to Ps. 42(41) 6f, 12, ἵνα τί περίλυπτος εἶ, ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ ἵνα τί συνταράσσεις με; .. πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἑταράχθη (Lk.) τί εἶπώ Jn. 12.27. Here the synoptic petition in Mk. 14.36, qualified by 'howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt', is introduced with hesitation. Further, while 'Father' as Jesus' term for God is very common in John; it is possible that in verse 27 and 28 it may be a recollection of the striking use of Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ in Mk. 14.36 (C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p. 354.)
2. Jn. 12.23 ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Mk. 14.41 ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
3. Jesus says that the Father is glorified (14.13; 15.8); that the Father (8.54) or the Spirit of truth (16.14) glorifies him; and that the Son of God is glorified through the sickness of Lazarus (11.4). This is also the favourite way in which he refers to the death of Jesus (7.39; 12.16; 17.1), in which both he and the Father are glorified (17.1). So close knit have the ideas of death and glorification become that the prophecy of the death of Peter is described in this same way. 'Now this he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God'. (21.19).
4. C.H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, 1960, p. 246.
5. Cf also Heb. 5.5f, where 'glorify' is related to Christ assuming his high-priestly office; and Luke 24.26 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?'

making the Cross and the ascension one inseparable act in which Jesus is glorified.

But in this act not only is Jesus glorified but so also are his followers. 'And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one.' (17.22). As a result they are not ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (Jn. 17.14, 16). The meaning of this appears to be the same as in 12.25 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ which is the Johannine equivalent of the Hebrew ha'olam hazeh, i.e. this present age. Through the ascension the disciple is already in the 'age to come', though spatially located in the world (17.11), sharing in the heavenly glory of the Son of man and his union with the Father, i.e. the disciple is already a member of the Kingdom of God.

This concept of death, resurrection, ascension and gathering the community is expressed in 12.24, the verse immediately following the Son of man saying, in the imagery of sowing seeds which is found both in the Synoptics and Paul. The parallelism of Jn. 12.24 and 1 Cor. 15.36 is especially close. The concern of Paul, however, is to expound the nature of the resurrection body (though doubtless the idea of the Church as the body of Christ is present), while the concern of John is not simply with the future body of the seed but the fruit it will bear. This 'fruit' is the drawing of all men to the uplifted Christ (12.32) and gathering them together into one (11.52).

We see here again how the Christological title 'the Son of man' is also a soteriological concept which is tied inextricably to the (passion and) ascension of the Son of man, in which act the new community is created which is both 'one' and shares in the 'glory' of the Son of man.

(viii) John 13.31f

Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him; and God shall glorify him in himself, and straightway shall he glorify him.

The omission of 13.31-32 from the text would cause no break in the sense, and it has therefore been suggested that they are an intrusion of a pre-Johannine

1. Mk. 4.3-9; 4.26-29; 4.31f; Matt. 13.24-30, 37ff. (It is significant that Matthew also uses the Son of man title in connection with this imagery)

2. 1 Cor. 15.36ff.

3. J. A. T. Robinson, Body, 1963, pp. 17, 81.

1.
hymn concerning the Son of man. Their rhythmical structure has often been noted, which is particularly marked if the phrase $\xi\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \xi\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ is original.² Barrett supports the originality of the shorter text, but it is difficult to understand what would have motivated their addition.⁴

Higgins has pointed out the close linguistic and conceptual parallels between Jn. 13.31f and Jn. 17.1 and 4, and argues that 13.31f is a Johannine composition based on 17.1,4, cast in a quasi-poetical form as a solemn introduction to the farewell discourse. It is more likely, however, that 17.1ff is a Johannine composition based on the Son of man hymn in 13.31f. We have seen that no Son of man saying in John is entirely his own composition, and in every instance a Son of man source stands behind it. It is unlikely, therefore, that John has created a Son of man saying out of the Son saying in 17.1ff.

The difficulty of interpretation of these verses lies in the use of $\nu\upsilon\nu$ and the aorist in verse 31 ($\xi\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$) and future tense in verse 32 ($\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota$). Since the aorist in 13.31 implies that the glorification is already past, and in the primitive kerygma this was applied to the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of power, it is probable that the pre-Johannine hymn referred to the exaltation in this verse. The future tenses in verse 32, which refer to a glorification which will occur immediately ($\xi\upsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) may very well hint at the emerging parousia doctrine in the early church. Be this as it may in John the hymn appears to be used as an introduction to the farewell discourse in which the theme of Christ's departure to be with the Father, the gift of the Spirit, and his abiding presence with the disciples is worked out.⁵ As such it appears to be a variant on 12.32, not that it is derived from that saying, which refers to the coming glorification of the Son of man by God in the death and exaltation, and the glorification of God which will be the other side of the coin in that event.

That John has the ascension in mind in his use of the Son of man hymn is made plain in verse 33; 'whither I go, ye cannot come'. Like all the other Son of man sayings this one is followed by a reference to the community in the 'new commandment that ye love one another as I have loved you....by this shall men

-
1. Cf. S. Schulz, Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium, 1957, who sees it as a Jewish Christian adaptation of the glorification of the Elect One (= the Son of man) by the Lord of Spirits in 1 En. 51.3.
 2. It is omitted by P⁶⁶ & BDW it sys, and present in $\Theta\omega$ vg and Origen.
 3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.375f.
 4. Cf M-J Lagrange, Evangile selon saint Jean, 1948, pp.365f, who holds that the omission is due to homoioteleuton. So also W. Thüsing, Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, 1960, p.235. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.180, n.1. suggests that it is an insertion to provide a link between the aorist in verse 31 and the future tense in verse 32. This is possible but unlikely. An editor who was bothered about the tenses would be more likely to change the offending tense than to make an insertion the effect of which is to enhance the poetic quality of the whole saying.
 5. Cf C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, pp.376ff.

know that ye are my disciples' (13.34f). Like Matthew 25.31ff this makes explicit what is meant by allegiance to Jesus. It also shows that the 'oneness' of the community consists not simply in their unity 'in Christ', nor simply in their sharing in Christ's 'glory', but in their love; a love which is drawn from Christ's love for them and which therefore proclaims their discipleship.

(ix) John 9.35

Dost thou believe on the Son of man? (1)

This is the only saying to be found in the Gospels in which the earthly Jesus calls for belief in the Son of man. Higgins is certainly correct when he says 'Here the church is speaking through the earthly Jesus who, in accordance with Johannine anachronism, is at the same time the Christ of glory, the exalted and vindicated Son of man, the Lord'. The reply of the man born blind, 'Lord, I believe' (9.38) reflects the primitive Christian confession, 'Jesus is Lord'.

It is significant that this whole story, even in the early fathers, is regularly interpreted as Baptismal. Cullmann has drawn attention to the details in the preceding narrative which indicate conclusively the baptismal significance of the narrative for the evangelist, and to the fact that the dialogue between Jesus and the healed man in vv. 35-38 is so constructed as to call immediately the liturgical questions and answers of the oldest baptismal ritual. Since the narrative and discourse is concerned with the response of the Jews to this event, who finally excommunicated the healed man ($\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\delta\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ v. 38) which was the fate of the baptised Jewish Christian, and since the title 'Son of man' is probably original in V.35, it is virtually certain that John is here dependent on a pre-Johannine Palestinian baptismal homily and liturgy.

This being so, it appears that John has taken a call to belief in the glorified lord of the church, the Son of man, in a primitive baptismal confession,

-
1. This reading is so strongly attested ($P^{66} P^{75} XBDW pc sys sa ac^2 f^m$) as to be almost certainly correct, over against 'the Son of God' ($\Theta\omega\iota\tau$ vg). Cf C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, p.302 who holds that it is improbable that 'the Son of God' would have been changed into 'the Son of man'. Cf also A.J.B. Higgins, *Son of Man*, 1964, p.155 n.2.
 2. *ibid.*
 3. Acts 2.36; Rom. 10.9; 1 Cor. 12.3; Phil. 2.11.
 4. Cf O. Cullmann, *Worship*, 1953, p.102 for citations from the early fathers, and also recent exegetes. Cf especially E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. F.N. Davey, 1947, pp.363ff. who directs attention particularly to the ancient Christian lectionaries, according to which this pericope and also the story of the healing at Bethesda and that of the Samaritan woman were used especially for the Baptismal liturgy.
 5. *ibid* pp. 103ff.
 6. The title 'Son of God' in some versions is probably to be explained by the fact that 'Son of man' was not used in the Hellenistic baptismal liturgy.

and applied it to the earthly Jesus. The meaning would then be that it is the ascended Son of man who gives sight, at a deeper level of meaning than physical, in the baptismal miracle, just as Jesus gave sight to the man born blind when he anointed his eyes with clay and sent him to wash in the pool Siloam. But as in 3.14f this objective side of the baptismal miracle is balanced by the demand for belief in the Son of man.

(x) Summary

The most significant feature of the Son of man sayings in John is that of the 12, 4 are found in undeniably baptismal contexts (3.13; 3.14f; 12.34; 9.35), and 3 in a eucharistic setting (6.27; 6.53; 6.62). Of the remaining 5, we have seen that 8.28 is derived from the baptismal saying 3.14f, and 13.31f is a pre-Johannine Son of man hymn. This, together with the fact that strong liturgical traces are to be found in 6.27, 53; 9.35; 13.31f, suggests very strongly that behind most, if not all, the Son of man sayings in John was a Palestinian sacramental source, which was homiletical and liturgical. This would indicate that the sacramental Son of man tradition in the synoptics is very primitive. But what is distinctive in the Johannine tradition is the link of the Son of man with baptism. How the Son of man came to be linked with baptism is probably through the teaching contained in the primitive kerygma of the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, whence he has poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit. We have seen that this exaltation of the Son of man is the most prominent and authentic feature of the Gospel tradition, and that the reception of the Spirit for the forgiveness of sin upon confession of Christ is the most persistent feature of the primitive teaching concerning baptism. These two factors plus the fact that the soteriology associated with the Son of man is that of creating the community who share in his glory, his union with the Father, and thus inherit the Kingdom of God, and that in baptism a man is made a member of that eschatological community, would have provided the Palestinian community with ready-made points of association.

Despite the lateness of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, and the association of the Son of man theme with baptism, John has retained the very

1. For references cf above p.364nn 6-10.

2. Cf Acts 2.33, 5.31.

3. Cf Acts 2.38

4. We have seen precisely the same process of thought in the Hellenistic church where the titles 'Ebhed, Messiah, and Lord have completely superseded the title Son of man.

primitive, and probably authentic, tradition of the death and exaltation of the Son of man, and its association with the judgement-rejection of the old Israel and the creation of the new eschatological community of the Kingdom of God. Unlike the synoptic tradition John quite explicitly derives the earthly authority of the Son of man from his heavenly pre-existence (Jn.3.13; 5.27; 6.62). But because the incarnation of Jesus is such a clearly worked out theme in the Gospel, we find the most remarkable soteriological parallels between the incarnation, the death-and-ascension 'lifting up' or 'glorification', and the Son of man present to his Church in the sacraments. The effect of each act in the drama of salvation as presented by John is to give 'eternal life' which is the Johannine equivalent of bringing in the Kingdom of God. Consequently the eschatological community is created beginning in the incarnation, brought to fulfilment in the ascension, continued in the sacraments and the life-giving word of Jesus, and brought to its glorious climax in the general resurrection. Against the backdrop of the 'corporate personality' of Judaism this community is included in the Person of Jesus, sharing in his endowment with life, Spirit, glory, and union with the Father. Apart from the predominant concept of the community being 'in me' and thus 'in us' (Jn.17.21ff) and 'I in them' (Jn.17.26), the community is also characterised by its being 'one' (Jn.11.52; 17.21ff) and by its 'love' (Jn.13.34; 17.26), and both are seen to be the gifts of God to the community in the total Christ-event. In this sense John's soteriology is most decidedly corporate and ethical, and cannot be reduced to a Christ-mysticism, nor can his conception of the community created in the atonement be regarded as a loose collection of individuals who believe the same things. They are 'one' in the corporate personality of the Son of man, and this corporateness is achieved as much in the sacraments as in the incarnation, 'glorification', or general resurrection to 'life'.

(g) The Son of Man in the Rest of the New Testament(i) Acts 7.56

Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.

This is the sole example of the Son of man saying on the lips of another than Jesus outside the Gospels.

The semitic origin of this saying is indicated in the use of 'heavens' here as opposed to 'heaven' in verse 55, thus probably representing an exact Greek equivalent of the Hebrew shemayyim (σὐρανοῦς). The concept of the vision of heaven opening to reveal the Son of man is found also in Jn. 1.51, and his being at the 'right hand of God' reflects the same thought as Lk. 22.69 'But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God', which we have seen may either be a Lukan version of Mk. 14.62 with the possible parousia implication of the 'coming on the clouds of heaven' removed, or may have been derived from Luke's special passion source.

The unique aspect of this saying is that the Son of man is seen to be 'standing' and not sitting at the right hand of God. This has led to a wide variety of interpretations. A parousia interpretation has been given to the saying by Owen who suggests that the Son of man is standing because Christ is about to return. This is putting a weight of meaning on the text which it cannot bear. Higgins has argued that the idea of heavenly intercession is implicit in the saying. Unlike the interceding angels who stand before God the Son of man, who has superceded them, stands on the right hand in accordance with the testimonium of Psalm 110.1. Thus he sees present in this saying the synoptic concept of the heavenly intercession of the Son of man conflated with the immediately preceding citation from Psalm 110.1.

In its context this appears to be the most acceptable interpretation. What has preceded is the accusation that the Jews have 'betrayed' and 'murdered' the 'Righteous One' (verse 52). Verse 55 recounts the vision in which Stephen sees Jesus standing on the right hand of God, which vision he immediately declares to his persecutors in terms of the Son of man. The implication appears to be two-fold, For the Jews it is a declaration of God's exaltation of the

-
1. Cf A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp. 145f for summary of major interpretations.
 2. H.P. Owen, 'Stephen's Vision in Acts VII. 55-6' NIS, Vol. 1 (New Series) 1955, pp. 224-226.
 3. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.144 n.1; 145.
 4. 1 En. 89.76; 99.3; 104.1.
 5. Cf Lk. 12.8f etc.

Jesus whom they 'murdered' to his right hand as 'Son of man'. It is presumably for this that the Jews cast him out of the city and stone him (verses 57f). For Stephen himself it is the assurance that the heavenly Son of man will be the advocate on high of those who have confessed him on earth, as he has done. While the concept of 'sitting', which implies the role of judge, would have been appropriate in the situation of the Jews, it would not have been appropriate as a living, hope-filled Christology for Stephen. Despite this the notion of 'standing' certainly also conveys the idea of judgement on those who have denied and rejected the coming 'Righteous One', which in 1 Enoch is a variant title of the Son of man.¹ Thus both the positive and negative elements of the Q saying in Lk. 12.8f are present here, as is also the idea of exaltation found in Lk. 22.69, and Jn. 1.51.

(ii) Hebrews 2.6

What is man that thou art mindful of him?
or the son of man, that thou visitest him?

Although this is a quotation from Psalm 8 where the reference is to man, and this psalm was used messianically in later Judaism, it is clear from the interpretation the author has given to it that he is familiar with the Son of man Christology.²

'For in that he subjected all things unto him, he hath left nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see not yet all things subjected to him. (v.8)
But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man (v.9). For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of salvation perfect through sufferings. (v.10)
For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, (v.11)
Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. (v.17)

In the underlined passages we see most of the major themes of the Son of man in the Gospels.³ Verse 8 suggests the 'second appearance' of the Son of man when all things will finally be subjected to him. The first section of v.9 suggests the Johannine theme of the heavenly pre-existence of the Son of man, which continues into the common Gospel theme of the passion and exaltation to glory of the Son of man. In verse 17 the Son of man's role as the heavenly

1. 1 En. 38.2; cf 39.6; 53.6 also p.190 above.

2. Cf S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 1956, p.357.

3. O. Michel, *Der Brief an der Hebräer*, 1957, p.71.

.. Heb. 9.28.

advocate is expressed in the concept of the high priestly intercession (cf Heb. 7.25). Verse 10 stresses the community-creating character of the ascension which brings 'many sons' to share the *δόξα* with which he is crowned. In verse 11 we find the most unambiguous statement of the corporate personality of the ascended Son of man. Here is not the Johannine plea 'That they may be one, even as we are'¹. Rather we are told of the 'oneness' of both sanctifier and sanctified. But here is no 'communal' interpretation of the Son of man. By the act of crowning Jesus with 'glory' in the ascension, many sons are also glorified and 'incorporated' into him. This glorified community is therefore wholly dependent on Jesus and God's glorification of him.

2.

We have already seen the baptismal significance of this passage in that it echoes concepts which appear to be derived from a primitive baptismal instruction. This is seen particularly in the concept of the defeat of the devil. It would appear that here as in John we have the link of the Son of man with baptism, and presumably that it is through baptism that a man enters into the Satan-defeating community of the Son of man, and shares in his glory.

(iii) Revelation 1.13; 14.14

One like a son of man. (*ὄμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου*)

Torrey has explained the form of the expression in these two passages as an exact reproduction of the Aramaic title, retaining the distinctive apocalyptic form 'like a Son of man' of Dan. 7.13.³ As in Acts 7.56 the expression in Rev. 1.13 belongs to a vision, and therefore depicts the Son of man as reigning in heavenly glory. It is significant that this is a vision 'on the Lord's day' (Rev. 1.10) suggesting again a liturgical source of the expression in primitive Christian worship. The primitive association of the Son of man with both the passion and the exaltation is found here again in the words spoken by him in verse 18, 'I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades'. Revelation 14.14 contains clear allusions to Dan 7.13 particularly in the reference to the cloud, but the use to which it is put is that this Son of man is he who reaps the earth in judgement.

1. Jn. 17.22.

2. Cf above pp. 164 It is possible also that the reference to 'flesh and blood' in verse 14, particularly in the form 'since the children are sharers in flesh and blood', may indicate a eucharistic as well as incarnational meaning. If this is so then this passage would give strong support to our conclusion that a primitive Son of man liturgical source lay behind the Son of man sayings in John.

3. C.C. Torrey, The Apocalypse of John, 1958, p.96. For agreement in essential details with the Son of man in Jewish apocalyptic cf S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, 1956, p.353.

(iv) The Son of Man in Paul

1.

That Paul has a thorough-going Son of man Christology is widely held, although the title does not appear in his writing.

(1) 1 Cor. 15. 45-47

So also it is written, The first man became a living soul. The last Adam (became) a life-giving spirit. Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven.

Cullmann holds that Paul is here contradicting a Jewish doctrine of the two Adams in some form similar to that known to us from Philo. According to Philo there are two Adams. The Adam in Genesis 1.27 is the heavenly man, made in God's image, the Adam in Genesis 2.7 is the historical first member of the human race, who is of the earth as distinct from the Adam who has a heavenly origin. It is possible, though improbable as Cullmann concedes, that Paul had read one of Philo's tracts. It is also possible that the concept was viable in rabbinic circles, but for this there is no evidence. It is possibly significant also that while there may be an allusion to Gen. 2.7 in 1 Cor. 15.47, there is nothing comparable with Gen. 1.27. While it is true that 'it does not occur to Paul to contrast this (Gen. 2.7) with Gen. 1.27, which says that man is created in the image of God, there can be no contradiction between the two because the Adam in Gen. 1.27 is not the "Heavenly man" who later became incarnate in Jesus, but the Adam who is created in God's image and sins immediately thereafter' it is strange that it does not 'occur to him' to make this contrast if the Philonic doctrine of the two Adams is what Paul is busy contradicting, a doctrine which was based on the two verses in Genesis.

A more profitable approach is to note that the contrast between the first Adam and the Last Adam in 1 Cor. 15.45 is between a 'living soul' and the

1. Cf especially O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, pp. 166-181, whose order in treating the passages we shall follow; J. Weiss, Earliest Christianity (= The History of Primitive Christianity) Vol. ii, 1959, pp. 485ff, who contends that "the Man" in Paul is a Hellenization of the 'Son of man'; A.M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, 1961, p.86f. A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, pp.149ff.
2. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, pp. 167ff. So also A.J.B. Higgins, Son of Man, 1964, p.150. For chief references in Philo of Legum allegoria 1.31f.; De opificio mundi, 134ff.
3. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. III, pp.477f.
4. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, p.169.
5. i.e. 'a living being' as contrasted with a 'Spirit-filled being'. Its meaning parallels $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ in verse 44 which is contrasted with $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$. Cf also H. Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, 1956, p.70 'It is quite misleading to translate the phrase nephesh hayyah by 'a living soul', as our English versions do, so putting the emphasis where a Greek, but not a Hebrew, would have done'.

πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν . It is a contrast between 'natural man' and 'the Man' who becomes the life-giving Spirit. Without the contrast with 'natural man' this is precisely the same thought as we found in the Son of man saying in John 6.62f, where we are told of the ascension of the Son of man and the πνεῦμα¹ ζωοποιῶν. More significant is the fact that ζωοποιῶν is used elsewhere in John only in 5.21 which, we have argued, is derived from the idea of having 'life in himself' in v.25 which is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in the Son of man saying in Jn. 6.53. Thus Paul's 'Last Adam' appears to be his equivalent of the Johannine Son of man who, as a result of the ascension bestows the 'life-giving Spirit'.

Like verse 45 verse 47, 'the second man is of heaven' appears also to be dependent on the tradition behind Jn. 6.62, and more particularly Jn. 3.13, in the reference to the heavenly origins of the Son of man. We have seen that Jn. 3.13 belonged to a pre-Johannine baptismal instruction. This being so it is instructive to compare 1 Cor. 15.45 with Col. 2.12f,

Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, did he quicken together (συνεζωποίησεν) with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses. (2)

Here the baptismal context is made explicit; the notion of baptism for the forgiveness of sins is reminiscent of Acts 2.38 which is also baptism for the reception of the Spirit; and the corporate concept of the baptised with Christ is remarkably similar to that found in Heb. 2.11 which follows the reference to the Son of man in verse 6.

A remarkably similar contrast is drawn in Rom. 8.11 between 'mortal man' and the one who is quickened (ζωοποιήσεται) by God who raised up Jesus from the dead through his Spirit (πνεῦμα) dwelling in him. While this passage is not explicitly baptismal the association of the resurrection, πνεῦμα, and ζωοποιῶν³ makes it evident that Paul is drawing on a primitive baptismal instruction.

We find a similar comparison between the natural and the spiritual again in a baptismal context in 1 Pet. 3.18:

Because Christ also suffered for our sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh (σάρκι), but quickened in the spirit (ζωοποίηθεις δὲ τῷ πνεύματι)

Here again we find the concepts of ζωοποιῶν and πνεῦμα combined, although

1. Cf above pp. 362 ff.

2. Cf also Eph. 2.1, 5.

3. Cf 2 Cor. 3.6. τὸ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.

here it is not the baptised person who is 'quickened' by the 'Spirit' but Christ himself. In verse 22 the reference to Christ's being on the 'right hand of God' is very reminiscent of the Son of man saying in Mk. 14.62 and par.

Apart from Rom. 4.17 and 1 Tim. 5.13, where we are told that God quickens, the word $\xi\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$ is found again in the New Testament only in 1 Cor. 15.36 which closely parallels John 12.24. The significance of this is that John 12.23 is a Son of man saying.

The link of $\xi\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$ with the Son of man and the Spirit in John and with the 'Last' or 'Second' Adam and the Spirit in 1 Cor. 15.45-47 can hardly be co-incidental, especially in view of the rareness of $\xi\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$ in the New Testament. The same is true of the link between $\xi\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in baptismal teaching, and the contrast between man who is and man who is not quickened by the Spirit. We conclude, therefore, that behind 1 Cor. 15.45-47 lies a primitive baptismal teaching which probably referred to the Son of man seated in heavenly glory who pours forth the spirit to incorporate the baptised into himself and his unique relationship with God. While each author uses the source or sources in different ways, the parallelism not only of ideas but also of language suggests an ultimate common tradition. In this tradition Paul would have found the contrast between natural man and the Man who bestows the life-giving Spirit, and thus also the contrast between the 'natural body' (v.44) or 'the natural' (v.46) and the 'spiritual body' (v. 44) and 'the spiritual' (v.46).

In this Pauline passage, therefore, we find the same baptismal, incarnation¹, and ascension/Spirit themes as we found in Jn. 3.1-15. Having drawn the contrast between the 'natural body' and the 'spiritual body' in verse 43, Paul continues to draw a distinction between the first man, Adam, who is simply a living being, and the eschatological Adam, who became a life-giving spirit. The meaning clearly is that as Adam's descendants we are all natural men belonging to the 'natural body' of humanity. But because of the incarnation (verse 47 and 'the second man is of heaven') and the ascension² gift of the Spirit, those who are 'with Christ' are 'born again' from above and thus made members of the 'spiritual body'. As such they are no longer simply 'flesh and blood' and thus unable to inherit the Kingdom of God (verse 50). By their baptismal incorporation into the 'spiritual body' they are 'translated into the kingdom of the

1. The link with Jn. 3 is strengthened by 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God' in 1 Cor. 15.50. Cf Jn. 3.3,5 and by the fact that in none of the other non-Johannine parallels is the concept of the incarnation found except possibly Heb. 2.6ff. . 2. Please see over.../

1.
Son of his love'.

This Son of man Christology, linked as it was in the pre-Pauline tradition with incarnational and baptismal soteriology is set by Paul in the context of his discourse on the nature of the resurrection body. Because of this Robinson rightly remarks 'The resurrection of the body starts at baptism, (cf the direct connection between baptism and the eschatological glory in Eph. 5.26f) when a Christian becomes 'one Spirit' (i.e. one spiritual body) with the Lord (1 Cor. 6.17), and 'put on (the body of) Christ' (Gal. 3.27), 'the new man' which 'hath been created' (Eph. 4.24) and 'is being renewed.... after the image of him that created him' (Col. 3.10).^{2.} For Paul, unlike John and the primitive tradition, the completion of this transformation must wait upon the day of the parousia,^{3.} but for Paul, as for Matthew and John, the completion retains its essentially corporate character in the concept of the general resurrection.^{4.}

2. Rom. 5.12ff

Cullmann has suggested that behind this passage is a Son of man^{5.} Christology but the grounds on which he supports this claim are not convincing. He points to Paul's concept of Adam as a 'type of him that was to come', and suggests that this is a type of the first or second Adam in 1 Cor. 15.45ff. While we have seen that 1 Cor. 15.45ff does go back to a Son of man concept, it is noteworthy that 'he that cometh' is used elsewhere in the New Testament to refer to the Messiah (with the exception of Heb. 10.37 - where the reference is to the parousia).^{6.} Taylor's suggestion that the origin of the title is to be found in the proclamation of John the Baptist, 'There cometh after me he that is mightier than I'^{7.} is probably correct.^{8.} Thus it would appear that τοῦ μέλλοντος in Rom. 5.14 is derived from this Messianic concept and not from the Hellenised form of the Son of man in 1 Cor. 15.45ff.

Nygren's claim that this whole passage reflects the distinction between the two aeons and that in the reference to δ μέλλοντος the idea of Christ as the

2. from previous page... It is significant to note that here as in Heb. 2.14 there is a reference to 'flesh and blood' strengthening the claim that a common tradition lies behind both this Pauline and the Hebrews passages.

1. Col. 1.13.

2. J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.79

3. 1 Cor. 15.52, Rom. 8.19, Phil. 3.20.

4. 1 Thess. 5.17; 1 Cor. 15.52, etc.

5. O. Cullmann, Christology, 1959, pp. 170ff.

6. The phrase is used in connection with John the Baptist in Lk. 7.19f = Matt. 11.3; Jn. 1.15, 27; Acts 19.4; in connection with the messianic entry into Jerusalem in Lk. 13.35 = Matt. 23.39; Mk. 11.9; and specifically referring to the Christ in Jn. 6.14, 27. In Heb. 10.37 the title is somewhat of an artificial literary construct. The writer follows the LXX version of Hab. 2.3, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἴξει but inserts the article before ἐρχόμενος.

7. Mk. 1.7. 8. V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, 1953, p.79.

head of $\overset{1.}{\text{ὁ ἀὶὼν ὁ μέλλων}}$ is entailed, would provide stronger support for a Son of man Christology since the Jewish apocalyptic Son of man was associated with the decisive break between the two aeons. However, while verse 17 refers to the 'reign of death' through Adam and the 'reign in life' through Jesus Christ, no reference is made to the two aeons in this passage.

Dodd is surely more correct when he says that this passage in Paul is based on the current rabbinic doctrine, that, through the Fall of Adam, all men fell into sin,^{2.} and stresses the Hebrew concept that the moral unit was the community rather than the individual. 'Adam is a name which stands for the "corporate personality" of mankind, and a new "corporate personality" is created in Christ (cf Rom 12.5; 1 Cor. 12.12; Eph. 2.10, 4.4-16)^{3.}' While it is true, as Cullmann points out, that the Hellenistic myth of the primal man represented all men, it is equally true that the universalism of the 'new corporate personality' would have been suggested by the Genesis myth of the fall of Adam with whom 'Jesus Christ' is contrasted.^{4.}

It is significant that none of the characteristic themes of the Son of man in the New Testament are found in the passage; his authority on earth; his passion and exaltation to the right hand of God; his outpouring of the Spirit. Despite the allusion to Philipians 2.8 in the contrast between the disobedience of Adam and the obedience of Christ, the theme of the exaltation in Phil. 2.9 is not referred to. The whole passage is concerned with the contrast between the cosmic effects of Adam's sin, and the cosmic redemption wrought in Christ. For the essential corporateness of the concept of the salvation implied in this passage it is not necessary to presuppose a Son of man Christology. This is already given in the comparison with Adam, and, as we have seen, is inherent also in the titles ʿebhed Yahweh and Messiah

(3) Phil. 2. 5-11

Into the variety of views concerning the Christological hymn in Phil. 2.5-11 it is ^{un} necessary to enter here.^{5.} If we accept Lohmeyer's thesis

-
1. A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, 1955, pp.16ff, 206ff.
 2. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.100. He cites 2 Esd. 3.21-22; 4.30.
 3. ibid p.101.
 4. Cf M.D. Hooker, in NTS, Vol. 6, 1960, pp.297 - 306; C.K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last, 1962, p.17.
 5. Cf R.P. Martin, Carmen Christi, Philippians ii.5-11 in recent interpretations and in the setting of Early Christian worship, 1967. Cf also the discussion and bibliography in F.W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philipians, 1959, pp. 40ff, 73-88, C.K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last, 1962, pp. 69ff.

that the hymn is basically a translation from an Aramaic original, in which the words 'as a man' in v.8 render the Aramaic kebhar ^{1.} 'enash 'asa Son of man', then it is significant that the themes of the servant and the Son of man are brought together as in Mark 10.45 and par.

As a Son of man hymn the major themes are pre-existence (v.6); incarnation (v.7); humility and obedience unto death (v.8); exaltation (v.9); and universal sovereignty (v.10). The baptismal significance of the hymn may be seen in the primitive baptismal confession 'Jesus Christ is Lord' in v.10 which is the hymn's logical climax. The hymn itself is the ground of Paul's call on the Philippians for unity through love and fellowship of the Spirit (κοινωνία πνεύματος) as opposed to self-seeking and self-aggrandisement. The implication is therefore that the exalted Son of man has poured out the Spirit thus creating the κοινωνία πνεύματος of whom Jesus, the Son of man, is Lord. Thus the pattern of his earthly life is to be the pattern of the life of those who confess him. This, as we have seen, is a common theme related to the Son of man in the Synoptics.

(h) Conclusion

All this would seem to show that the Son of man Christology persisted for some time as an influential concept through the New Testament period. Outside the Synoptic Gospels it persisted chiefly in primitive liturgical material and sacramental, especially baptismal, instruction. The persistence of the Christology in relation to baptism indicates clearly the community-creating soteriology which was associated with the Christology. In the earliest tradition we have seen how, probably derived from Dan. 7.13ff the exaltation/enthronement of the Son of man to glory and dominion is the central feature. This ascension was associated with the outpouring of the Spirit and the dawn of the Kingdom of God. A man entered this kingdom through the baptismal miracle of incorporation into the exalted Lord through the Spirit. The Son of man's 'work' is not finished in the historic ministry or the Cross. Nor is it completed in the ascension. Rather it is from now on that it truly begins as he comes in the Spirit and includes men

1. E. Lohmeyer, 'Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2.5-11' in SHA, 1928, pp. 39f., 58; Der Brief an die Philipper, 1956, pp. 90ff. This view and the dependence of the hymn on Dan. 7.13 is strongly supported by C.F.D. Moule, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin 3, 1952, p.49.

into the new community, the 'new corporate personality' of which he is the focus. It is understandable, therefore, that we should find the clearest traces of a living Son of man Christology outside the Gospels in the primitive baptismal teaching. For, if it is true that in baptism a man is included in the community which understands itself to be the 'corporate personality' of the Son of man (or 'ebhed or Messiah), and that he is understood to be in a unique relation to God, then it is also true that 'no man can come unto the Father but by me' (Jn. 14.6). This does not imply that Jesus is God, but rather that it is only in this corporate body in union with the ascended Lord that a man can know fellowship with God - just as in Judaism it was taught that only in being a member of the people of God can one be a son of God. In baptism, therefore, through the Spirit the exalted Son of man continues to create the new community which is the kingdom of God, the dawn in history of the age to come. Within this community the distinguishing characteristic is allegiance to the glorified Lord, which expresses itself in inter-personal relationships modelled on the example of Jesus. As such the community is not simply a mystical 'unit' but a moral and inter-personal community.

The association of the Son of man with baptism, which is an event which makes a man who is not a member of the community an integral part of it, preserves also the Synoptic teaching of the Son of man who included in his table-fellowship both the social and religious outcasts, in that it stresses the missionary character of the community. It is not a self-enclosed unit, for its doors must always be open, and more than having its doors open it must actively seek to include others into the unity of the baptized and their unity with the ascended sovereign Son of man.

What we see here then is what can only be described as baptismal (and Eucharistic) salvation, dependent on God's exaltation of Jesus to lordship and the bestowal of the Spirit. While Protestant theology may shy away from such a concept stressing, with biblical justification, the need for faith in and allegiance to the sovereign Son of man, this objection can only be sustained when 'faith' and 'allegiance' is identified with a psychological experience, usually adult. But the scriptural concept is more realistic than this. 'Salvation' is not an individual experience or state, but a communal

reality. No man is ever entirely an individual. There is a continual two-way relationship between every man and his community. What he does which is good or evil has its influence, however great or small, on others, and his own judgements, beliefs, ideals, actions, and commitments are to a large measure fashioned in the society in which he lives. This is as true of the Christian faith as of any other aspect of our lives. No man becomes a Christian without some contact with the Christian community, and the deeper and longer his contact the greater the chances of a deepening faith and commitment. For the primitive community life in the fellowship of the Spirit began in baptism and demanded a continuing and growing allegiance to Jesus. To cut oneself off from this community was to place oneself outside the realm of redemption (Cf Heb. 6.1ff). To be within it was to be included among the 'forgiven' through the miracle of the exaltation and the miracle of baptism, and the continuing covenant- and community-making eucharistic meal. But to be within it also placed one under the obligation to maintain the unity of the community through love, following the example of Christ, and by resisting the human temptation to self-seeking which brings division.

With this two-fold conception of salvation as being 'in Christ' and 'in one another', baptismal incorporation into the eschatological community was seen to be community-creating in both respects. On the one hand we are 'quickened together with him (Christ/the Son of man)' (Col. 2.13, Heb. 2.11). On the other we are received into the inter-personal community of love, making moral demands on both the baptizing community and the newly baptized. The doctrine of baptism thus stresses both the missionary and corporate character of the community of the Son of man, and both have their roots in the community-creating soteriology of the Son of man Christology of the New Testament.

PART II - THE CHURCH

INTRODUCTION

Our study of the three major soteriological titles of Jesus has shown the cruciality of the concept of the creation of a new community, the Church, through the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and the outpouring of the Spirit. We have seen that the creation of this community is the key to understanding the New Testament concept of atonement. But this essay is designed to discover the theological setting of the sacraments in the New Testament, which setting provides the basis for the interpretation of the sacraments, and since this setting is in the Christian community it is necessary to examine further the theological self-understanding of the community in the New Testament. In this self-understanding, we shall see, lies the clue to the theological understanding of the sacraments.

As the corporate character of the community is a vital element of New Testament ecclesiology, our method of study will be to explore first of all the semitic background to this concept (Chapter 1). We shall then turn to a more detailed analysis of the Pauline and Johannine ecclesiology (Chapters 2 and 3). In them we shall attempt to see what is involved in speaking of the Church as a corporate body 'in Christ', paying particular attention to her relationship with Christ; her relationship with God through Christ; the ethical inter-personal relationships within the body and the Church's relationship with 'the world'.

- SEMITIC BACKGROUND.

That we can legitimately speak of a 'biblical theology' can be argued from the fact that, although there is a great variety of theological emphasis in scripture, and concepts derived from various 'thought worlds' have shaped the thinking of the authors, there are certain distinctive ideas that run through the whole varied pattern. The concept of the living God whose very essence is his effectiveness, i.e. his power to act, is one such and is essentially semitic. Another, equally distinctively semitic, is the unitive or corporate notion of human personality.

Throughout this essay we have had occasion to refer to the Hebrew concept of corporate personality. If ever we are to understand this 'corporate personality' it has to be set in its context of the semitic unitive and dynamic conception of all reality, which in turn has its roots in what can best be described as a feeling-relation apprehension of reality.

(a) Life as 'felt'

As Boman has noted; 'For the Hebrew, the decisive reality of the world of experience was the word; for the Greek it was the thing.' But, as has been pointed out so often, the Hebrew dabhar connotes much more than a sound or definable meaning. It is charged with power, movement, and effect. Thus, for example, when Abraham's servant returned with Rebekah he told Isaac 'all the debarim he had made', it means all he had said, done, heard, and experienced, but most of all it means all that he had achieved. It is used also of perfectly concrete 'things'. When Yahweh killed the cattle of the

1. This concept has been extensively studied; cf W.R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites, 1927; W.O.E. Oesterly and T.H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, 1930; H. Wheeler Robinson, 'Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology' in Mansfield College Essays, 1909; Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, 1913; 'Hebrew Psychology' in The People and the Book, ed. A.S. Peake, 1925; Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (Ch. 5) 1946; A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many, 1961; Vitality of the Individual, 1949. (English Scholars); W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, 1951; The Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. 11, 1967; L. Köhler, Hebrew Man, 1954; J. Pedersen, Israel, Vol. 1-11, 111-1V, 1926; T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960 (esp. pp 69ff)
2. This has been shown by all the scholars mentioned above, but most forcefully and with a wealth of illustrative material taken from the Old Testament by Pedersen.
3. T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, p.206.
4. Cf, e.g. ibid pp. 58-66; W. Eichrodt, The Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. 1, pp. 69-79; J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p.168.
5. Gen. 24.66.
6. Cf also Gen. 15.1; 20.10; 22.16, 20; 44.7, etc.

1. Egyptians, not a dabhar of the Israelites' was killed. Because dabhar is primarily an event which is effective, and yet is applied also to what we would call 'things', objects of perception, it is understandable that for the Israelite what constitutes a 'thing' is neither matter nor form but characteristic activity and its effect. 2. Consequently while 'hearing' is the most important of all the senses for the Hebrew, he 'perceives' with every part of his body in so far as he is alive to the awakening of every possible mood or feeling through his involvement in the dynamic process of 'reality'.

When one considers the importance of the heart (lebh) in the Old Testament as a 'vital organ', this is not simply because of its biological importance, but because the Israelite felt his responses in the pounding of the heart. In addition to the wide range of emotions associated with the heart it can also be said that the heart 'knows', 'thinks', 'discovers', 'imagines', 'experiences', and 'understands'. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. The idea is that a man 'perceives' the truth about an event, life, or God in the emotional response which brings about a change in the beating of his heart. Like us the Hebrews also knew that stirring in the pit of the stomach (bowels) whether in terror, anxiety, pity, anger or love. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. Consequently they are also the seat of his thinking and planning. 16. The same is true also of the kidneys, liver, and bones. And life is 'perceived' not only through the inner organs but also in the whole carriage of the body, limbs, head, eyes, face. In them all he senses his relationship with his environment and in this sensing knows it as terrifying, shameful, encouraging, hopeful, joyful.

(b) Reality as dynamic

With this basic concept of perception and knowledge as a felt relationship it is natural that for the Hebrew all reality should be possessed of life or power. We have already seen this when 'things' such as cattle can be

-
1. Ex. 9.4
 2. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p.167f; T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp.58ff; J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.13.
 3. e.g. Josh. 23.14; Pr. 14.10; Eccl. 7.25; 8.9, 16.
 4. e.g. Job 17.11; Ps. 33.11; Jer. 23.20
 5. Pr. 18.2
 6. Deut. 29.19
 7. Eccl. 1.16
 8. Isa. 6.10.
 9. Is. 16.11.
 10. Jer. 4.19
 11. Jer. 31.20
 12. Is. 16.11
 13. Cant. 5.4
 14. Is. 19.3
 15. Ps. 5.10
 16. Cf J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp.172ff; W. Eichrodt, The Theology of the Old Testament, 1967, Vol. II, pp. 131ff. *esp.* 145 f

spoken of as debarim, but this dynamic power belongs also to stones, land, and
 3. even time. In a thorough and detailed analysis Boman has shown that the Hebrew
 language possesses no truly stative verbs or verbs of condition or quality, for
 4. they all contain within them an idea of movement or action or becoming. Similarly
 the verb 'to be' (hayah) means essentially 'becoming' or 'effecting' according
 5. to its context, and in its ostensibly static usage it expresses a characteris-
 tic which is intimately related to action, for the 'being' of anything is what
 6. it does and effects.

With rich illustration Pedersen has shown that the Hebrew words most
 commonly used to designate thinking (hashabh, dimma', zaman, hagha', siah) all
 contain the dual meaning of being impressed upon and planning for action. His
 thinking is not theoretical but contextual. Being in a dynamic relation with a
 dynamic context he knows himself to be shaped by his environment and able to
 shape it. Thinking is thus the active response of man to those things which
 impose themselves upon him.

(c) Unitive conceptualisation

Closely related to these two aspects of the 'felt' apprehension of a
 7. dynamic reality is the semitic tendency to unify through characterization.
 Since a 'thing' is what it does in so far as it produces an effect in the
 perceiver, and since similar events are likely to produce similar effects, it is
 natural that the Hebrew perceives things not as isolated units but as part of
 a totality bearing the same stamp. The nearest Greek thought comes to Hebrew
 is in the Platonic Ideal which is made real in particular, or in the later
 'substance philosophy' in which a particular is a particular thing in so far as
 it is a manifestation of the underlying substance. In both of these philoso-
 phical conceptions there is 'something' 'beyond' every particular'. For the
 Hebrew, on the other hand, the whole is in every particular not just a mani-
 8. festation of it. The reason for this distinction is that while Greek thinking
 is spatially oriented Hebrew thinking is event-oriented. For the Greek the
 problem is how spatially distinct entities can be designated by the same word.

1. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp. 99ff; 178, 483.

2. ibid, pp. 474, 479

3. ibid, pp. 155, 488.

4. T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 27-34.

5. ibid, pp. 38-42.

6. T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 42-46.

7. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p. 112.

8. ibid, p. 55 n1; T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 74ff

There is no evidence that such a problem ever occurred to the Hebrews. For them a stone is a stone because of what it does.

In this way the dynamic and totality concepts are fused. The land can be said to have a 'soul' because of its dynamic characteristics and the experienced relation to it. When one's response to any part is basically the same as one's response to any other part, then it follows that the whole dynamic character of the land is 'felt' in every part.

(d) The Hebrew concept of Time

The frequently noted distinctions between Greek and Hebrew concepts of time must **not** be pressed to the point where they are regarded as absolute or mutually exclusive. They are, rather, distinctions in emphasis.

Boman has drawn the valid and important distinction within the Hebrew concept of time between time determined in relation to the 'heavenly luminaries', the 'rhythms' of the day and night, week, month, harvest and seed-time, etc, and what he calls 'psychic time'.¹ Consequently the Hebrews as much as the Greeks had a concept of time as a temporal continuum. Equally the Greeks would have been able to characterise times or periods.

The really fundamental distinction is in Greek and Hebrew language. Built into the very structure of the Greek verb is a reference to the past, present, or future. Hebrew verbs contain no such time reference. They indicate whether the speaker thinks of the action as complete (Perfect) or incomplete (Imperfect).² Thus in his very language the Hebrew is given neither the sense that an event happened in the past nor the tools with which to conceive of it as such. He is consequently unable to say 'In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw the Lord', he says, rather, 'In-year-of-death the-king Uzziah in-this-context-see-I the-Lord'.³ The use of the | of context indicates not simply a desire to date his 'seeing the Lord', but rather that Isaiah felt a living relation between casting his gaze upon the Lord and Uzziah's death. We might therefore translate Is. 6.1 as 'because of king Uzziah's death that year I cast my gaze upon the Lord'.⁴ Such a translation, while not robbing the sentence of a time reference indicates that this time reference is not of primary

1. T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 129-153.

2. Cf J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11 pp. 114f for use as dependent on speaker's attitude (similarly T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, p.145)

3. for the interpretation of the | consecutive as the | of context cf J. Pedersen Israel, 1-11 pp. 116ff.

4. a more accurate rendering of wa'er'eh eth-'adonay

importance to Isaiah. What is important is the impact of the king's death had upon him motivating his action. In this sense the Hebrew concept of time is event-and-impact-oriented rather than 'dating'-oriented.^{1.}

The Hebrew consequently apprehended time in events and his concept of time is immediate rather than either linear or circular. For him time is characterised by content rather than distance, and history is not considered as a long chain divided into periods. It is true that one reckons with what we might call periods, but such a 'period' is experienced as the gathering round a special feature which pervades the whole, such as a significant event or man.

One such period is dor, usually translated as 'generation'. Noah's dor is that period characterised by the living impress of his personality. Every dor bears its own characteristic stamp; one is good, another is evil. Those who seek God together form a dor; the dor of the righteous is characterised by the blessing which makes the wicked gnash their teeth in fury.^{2.}

The strong personalities are naturally those who create a dor, because it is their actions and influence which gives content to what follows them. A dor is particularly strong while its creator is living. The man, therefore, who has committed man-slaughter may return in peace from a refuge city on the death of the high-priest. Actions done during his period of office are so closely associated with him that his death marks the end of the man's punishment in the beginning of a new dor.^{3.}

History consists of doroth, each with its special character, but all the generations are fused into a great whole, wherein experiences are condensed as commonly felt. This concentrated yet 'filled' time is called olam, commonly translated as 'eternity'. This is not 'timelessness' nor the sum of all the parts. It is 'timefullness'. When it is said that the throne of David will stand for ever, it means that it will pervade every changing period stamping it with the ongoing impact of that ideal king. Thus olam is history experienced

1. This is confirmed by the expression for the shortest perception of time, regha', which means a beat. Clearly in this word time is conceived of as 'felt' rather than 'seen'. Similarly the word petha' coming from the verb pathah = 'open', is used to designate abruptness or suddenness, and Boman suggests that it is derived not simply from the idea of opening the eyes, but also from the mouth opening in surprise (T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960. p.137)

2. Ps. 24.6

3. Ps. 112.2, 10.

5. To use the word coined by M. E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, 1962, p.65.

4. Num. 35.25-28; Josh. 20.6.

and responded to as a compact unit, which springs from those great men who have stamped their character on history; David, Moses, the patriarchs, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham. As such these men are not 'felt' to be lost in the mists of antiquity but are experienced as contemporaries in that the contemporary context of the Israelite is that which has been given in the 'blessing' of these men. Thus, what we might call the past is for the Hebrew packed into the living experience of the present which is the cradle of the future. ‘olam is history experienced as a unity in the present.

It is in this sense that zakar, usually translated as 'remember' is to be understood. To remember does not mean that an objective image of something or event is held 'in the mind' to be examined. The peculiarity about the Israelite is that he cannot imagine memory unless at the same time it has a dynamic effect upon him. To remember God is to come under the dynamic and felt impact of him. But since memory is directly related to thinking and thinking to action, memory is an immediate experience to which the man who remembers responds in action. Thus zakar like the other Hebrew words for thinking has the dual connotation of being impressed upon resulting in an appropriate action response. In this sense the Hebrew idea of memory and history are the same. Any moment of time is filled with the past (and the future) so that history and memory are immediate experiences making past and present contemporaneous. When we are told that at the creation of the new heavens and the new earth the Israelites will no longer remember the former, and it shall not rise in their hearts, then it means that the new will have so displaced the old that the old will no longer have the power to stir any response and thus shape the future.

(e) The Ancestors and Corporate Personality

The Hebrew concept of 'corporate personality' can best be expressed as a 'sensed' and 'expressed' belongingness. To know a man is to know his context and history and vice versa. 'If they meet a man whom they do not know they ask who he is, in order to know to what totality they must refer the impression which they receive of him. If he answers: I am Saul, the son of Kish, then they have the totality image. They know Kish, the rich peasant; they are aware of his importance in Benjamin; they are familiar with the history of his kindred, and thus the essential character of Saul is defined; they know

1. On this concept of contemporaneity cf especially T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 147ff.

2. Is. 65.17; Jer. 3.16.

3. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp. 106f.

1. ,
 his soul. As a moment of time is not an isolated unit in the time continuum,
 but is the whole history compacted into that moment and experienced, so also a
 man is not an isolated unit experienced as an isolated personality, rather, the
 whole is entirely in the individual because he derives his character from his
 involvement in the whole (both environment and history) which stamps him with
 2.
 its specific character.

It is important to remember that this corporate totality is not simply
 environmental but also historical. Here lies the key which unlocks the cruci-
 ality of the ancestors in the Hebrew concept of corporate personality. In
 Israel the basic unit is the father's house, i.e. kinship³. Unity stems from
 the strength of his personality, his ability to stamp his family with his
 characteristics, which is his 'blessing'⁴. The common life stems from strong
 personalities who are able to plan and counsel and so create a family (or nation)
 bearing the stamp of their character and the impress of their personality, and
 the direction is always from the strong to the weak. The idea is not simply
 total inter-dependence in which all involved stand as equals. The whole is
 constituted in those decisive events and personalities which have the power in
 themselves to constitute the unity.

Lesser totalities (i.e. smaller units) are constituted in the father
 who passes on his 'blessing' into the family
 of the family. His house persists as long as his impact is felt, which means
 5.
 as long as the unity constituted in him is felt. But the family extends as far

1. J. Pedersen, *Israel*, 1-11, p.101.

2. Cf H. Wheeler Robinson, 'Hebrew Psychology' in *The People and the Book*, ed. A.S. Peake, 1925, pp. 353-382; 'The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality' *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, ed. J. Hempel, 1936. J. Pedersen, *Israel*, 1-11, pp.100ff.

3. *ibid* pp. 48ff

4. *ibid* pp. 182ff.

5. *ibid* pp. 48, 55, 173f, 284. The tragedy of the story of Jonathan is that he is a man caught between the immense personalities of his father, Saul, and his friend, David. As the son of Saul the 'blessing' of the throne of Israel will pass to him, and he knows that in him resides the only hope of leaving Saul's living impress on succeeding generations. Without him Saul is dead, i.e. powerless, and his house is dead. Thus every Israelitic instinct must have made him tend towards his father - that is every Israelitic instinct save one, the impact of a stronger personality. In David a new 'soul' is created in Jonathan as he becomes the centre from which his acts spring. As long as harmony persists between Saul and David, Jonathan had two centres of inspiration in his life. When the harmony was broken Jonathan's 'felt' kinship, and thus the only kind of kinship that has any reality, is with David who now becomes his 'brother' (2 Sam.1.26). Jonathan's tragedy lies in the break between Saul and David. Normally the harmony between the father and the stronger personalities would have been maintained, and thus the father's house would have constituted a lesser totality in the more inclusive totality of the stronger man.

Thus a tribe, bearing the impress of the father of the tribe, which becomes his house, is a dynamic whole interwoven into the lesser family units. To know a man's tribe and his father is therefore to know him. Conversely to be a man at all is to be in a dynamic relation with one's historical and environmental context, sensing and expressing one's belongingness.

as the sense of belonging is felt, a belonging with its roots in history, which history is felt by and in all souls bearing the stamp of that history. In kinship 'there is no external definition of any kind, the chief feature being whether one has the common stamp in oneself'.^{1.}

Over-arching the totalities of family and tribe is the greater 'house of Israel'. It is by no means accidental that Israel is the name of a man, a nation, and a geographical area.

As a man Israel (Jacob) is he who has received the blessing (i.e. position of honour, land, strength of personality) from his father Isaac, who in turn received it from Abraham. It is he, therefore, who has stamped history with the impress of the common personality of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the sense that it is this personality which is sensed and expressed in every son. Since the Israelites derive their 'soul', i.e. their common characteristics, from their fathers they re-tell the patriarchal legends as living contemporary history. When these become filled out with elements which modern historians would say belong to later periods, the Hebrew feels no sense of inappropriateness for those events receive their character and dynamic from the ancestors.

There is a definite sense in which the man Israel is distinct from the nation Israel, for the nation is in a relation of dependence on the man. Yet there is also a sense in which the nation is the man for in the nation the individual senses the dynamic power of the man and thus as an experience of a certain kind the man and the nation are identical.^{2.}

Similarly there is a vital inter-relationship between the man, the nation, and the land.^{3.} For the Israelite land and property is not simply a thing possessed, rather there is a dynamic inter-relationship in that the land leaves its impress on the people as much as the people are able to shape the character of the land. Here we see the realistic psychic observation of the Israelites. A hard, dry land with sparse growth creates a hard, hard-working, and rugged people. A fertile and rich land creates a man of leisure and ease. At the same time man is able to transform the character of the land either by abuse or right use.

1. ibid p.49.

2. When, in the following chapters we suggest that there is a sense in the New Testament in which there is an 'identity' between Christ and the church this semitic background must be born in mind, for the 'identity' is not an identity of being in a Greek sense, but of experience in a Hebrew sense. Thus when on the Damascus road Paul hears Christ say 'Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me' (Acts 9.4) and when it is clear that Paul knows that it is the Christian Church that he is persecuting, it is hard to imagine that he is postulating an identity of 'being' between Christ and the church. It would be more true to say that his experience of Christ comes through the church, and he is not able to hold in separation his experience of Christ and his experience of

In this sense the Israelite perceived the ancestors, the nation, and the land as a psychic community, and the common expression to be 'in Israel' means not simply to be resident in a particular geographical area but to bear the impress of ancestor, people, and land in themselves - which arises from a sense of belonging to ancestor, people and land and to express this totality in themselves.

In the Old Testament we do not find what we could call different conceptions of history, since for all the writers history is bound up in the strength and character of some personality who becomes the very heart of the totality, in that he is the source of blessing and thus characterisation. However, different authors do perceive the character of the people in different ancestors, the patriarchs, Moses, Aaron, David. When, for example, David is seen as constituting the very essence of the people, then the people are 'in David', which means that all future history is already present in David just as much as David is present as the unifying and driving force in subsequent history, and David is the fixed point in every sensed belongingness between those who are 'in David'; for David characterises not simply an abstract whole but every particular individual. In other words the ancestor, the people, and the individual constitute a sensed unity in which the whole history is present at any given point passing on the contents of its 'soul'. As a result for the Hebrew another man is not someone who stands over against him as a distinct individual, unless he be a man with a totally different 'context'. Rather he is, whether he be ancestor, contemporary, or descendent, a vital part of himself. I can find no better phrase in which to express this than 'sensed belongingness'.

Closely related with this dynamic totality concept is the concept of 'knowing' (yadha'), which so far from being able to be characterised as a 'mental activity' has the primary meaning of sexual intercourse. It is the act in which two lives become so bound up with each other and belong so completely to each other that the two become 'one flesh'. Yadha' is used also in non-sexual contexts, but never loses this sense of inter-involvement and sensed belonging which tends towards sharing and unity. For the Hebrew 'life consists in the ^{constant} meeting of souls which must share their contents with each other'.

2. continued from previous page.....the church. As such Paul's thought is essentially semitic.

3. For the generalisations stated here of J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp.474ff.

1. Deut. 12.16; ^{11sq}19.43; 20.1.11.

2. Gen. 2.24.

3. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p.193.

Corporate personality in Israel's thinking must consequently be understood as a sense of unity and belonging which has both environmental and historical dimensions, and in which outstanding personalities play a crucial role. The basic concept which lies behind it is of relations rather than being.

(f) Yahweh the source of all life, unity, and blessing

So far we have made little reference to the role of Yahweh. This has been intentional, for while Yahweh is the source of all life, unity and blessing, this in no way diminishes the vitality of all that is not God.

When Yahweh's Mal'akh (messenger?) came to Gideon, he greeted him with the following words

'The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. And Gideon said unto him, Oh my Lord, if the Lord be with me, why then is all this befallen us? and where be all his wondrous works which our fathers told us of, saying, Did not the Lord bring us up from Egypt? but now the Lord has cast us off, and delivered us into the hand of Midian. and the Lord looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might and save Israel from the hand of Midian: have not I sent thee?' (1)

The greeting: "Yahweh is with thee!" is a homage and acknowledgment² of the strength of Gideon; and when Gideon rejects it by pointing to the weakness of his people against the enemy, Yahweh confirms his saying; Go in this thy might. There is no distinction entailed in the two expressions 'Yahweh is with thee, and 'Go in thy might'. Gideon's strength is his own because it is Yahweh's blessing to and covenant with him. There is here no conception of a powerful God behind a weak Gideon making him strong, rather he is sent to use the strength he has. There can be no denying that Gideon's strength is Yahweh's gift to him, but as gift it is truly Gideon's strength which Yahweh wishes to use in the service of Israel.

What this illustration makes clear is that the Hebrew belief in the dependence on Yahweh for all things in no way diminishes the vitality of either 'things' or men. The relation of all things with God is not that of powerless pawns in the hands of an omnipotent God, but that of Covenant. A Covenant always entails a relationship, but a relationship of weaker and stronger in which the stronger imparts his character to the fellowship. 'For the stronger it is a question of making covenants in order to carry through one's aims; . . .³ for the weaker to make a covenant with the strong in order to enjoy his strength!'

1. Judg. 6.12-14.

2. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p.195.

3. Cf ibid, p.286.

This is true not only of covenants made between weaker and stronger individuals e.g. David and Jonathan, and weaker and stronger nations, but also between ^{the} mighty God and everything else which is inherently weaker. But this emphasis on making covenants with God and God making covenants with man stresses the inherent vitality of men, although it is emphasised that the ultimate source of this power is God.

This point might be made more sharply by a brief analysis of the Hebrew work kabhad, usually translated as 'honour' or 'glory' but whose root meaning is 'to be heavy', and means essentially the natural characteristic and power of anything. Thus to change one kabhad into another means to change one's nature and power; and power and glory can be used as synonyms. When Paul refers to the different 'glories' of the various celestial and terrestrial bodies, the meaning is that each bears its own characteristics and powers, which is not in the slightest bit decreased by the assertion that it is God who gives everything its 'body'.

Thus for the Hebrew everything bears its God-given 'life' or characteristic or kabhad or power as its own, but this must continually be refreshed or renewed through the covenant relationship with Yahweh. But because of this quasi-independent or 'secular' view of nature and man it is always possible for covenants to be broken which means the draining of the vitality of the weak whose source of strength is in covenant with the strong and above all with Yahweh.

We have seen that the vitality of the individual in Hebrew thinking is essentially the strength of the outstanding personalities who leave their impress on their environment and history. From them strength and character and 'identity' is drawn. With their fundamental thought-forms which enable them to compact the past into the corporate present, this means that the power of these individuals is felt and experienced in the present in and with their experience of every individual who bears their impress. But the strength of these individuals is in their covenant with Yahweh, which is therefore at the same time the source of the strength of the people. With our conception of history we might regard this as a mediated covenant. Such a conception

1. ibid p. 228; F. Brown, S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1906, p.934.

2. Cf Ps. 106.20; Jer. 2.11; Hos. 4.7.

3. Dan. 2.37; 7.14; 1 Cor. 15.43.

4. 1 Cor. 15.39f.

5. 1 Cor. 15.38.

would not have occurred to the Hebrew who is included in his ancestor as much as the ancestor is included in the experienced corporate personality of the present people. A covenant with an ancestor is a covenant with themselves without this minimising the cruciality of the ancestor. The ancestor is unique in the sense that it is with him that the covenant is made enabling him to receive the strength of Yahweh in the covenant relationship, yet at the same time he is not an individual apart, for what he becomes flows into the life of the people so shaping its character that the character of the people is the character of the ancestor. He becomes one with them and they with him so much so that to experience Israel the nation or an Israelite is to experience Israel the ancestor, and thus to be in his covenant with Yahweh.

Corporate personality (with its historical dimensions) and covenant are but two sides of the same coin of the Israelite conception of life, which is an experience entailing a response to a dynamic totality whose source of life and power is always Yahweh in the corporate covenant.

(g) An attempted interpretation

If ever we are to understand the New Testament, and particularly the Pauline, concept of the church an attempt must be made to think ourselves into their thought-forms and try to appreciate in ourselves the significance of their concept of corporate personality. Since, as we shall see in greater detail below, their thought-forms were fundamentally semitic, this means that we must try to discover whether their psychological understanding rather than logical reasoning awakens any echoes within us.

we have argued that the Hebrew concept is dominated by a sensed 'belongingness'. Some illustrations may help to appreciate the point. We are all familiar with the sense of moral indignation which is aroused in us when we are reminded of the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis against the Jews. How is it possible, we ask ourselves, that a civilised people could have led countless men, women and children to their death in the notorious gas chambers? Similarly many South Africans are morally incensed when blatant injustices are done to the non-white population. In both instances we are able to state the moral rules in terms of which we justify our objections and censures. Yet it remains true, generally speaking, that these immoral acts do not touch us to

l. To use the phrase of T. Boman, Hebrew Thought, 1960, pp. 193ff.

the point where it leads to significant response actions until a member of our family or a close friend or associate is the victim. When this happens, the closer the felt bonds the more we feel their tragedy as ours. We are hurt or humiliated with them and in them. The changed intensity both of feeling and response cannot be explained in terms of general or abstract moral rules, for these remain the same. The change is to be explained, rather, in the deeply felt 'belongingness' which can sometimes be so intense that an injury done to someone very close and important to us is 'felt' more passionately than if it had been done to us.

And if this felt belongingness is what makes us 'feel with' another, it is also at the same time the emotional springboard for our response actions. A father who loves his son strongly and deeply will usually enter without hesitation into a situation of danger to himself in order to save his son from harm. The father who would not behave in that way is the exception rather than the rule. On the other hand the man who would behave in the same way for a stranger is the exception. Those who feel the bonds of parenthood deeply find it impossible to understand how a parent could abuse or ill-treat his child. They feel that such behaviour by parents towards their own children is more immoral than if precisely the same things were done by strangers.

Here in these common examples we sense something of the distinction between psychological understanding and logical reasoning. For philosophical ethics a moral rule is a moral rule in so far as it applies to all men, but such an abstraction is seldom able to motivate men who do not feel the inter-personal relationships in themselves. Since what we do springs so largely from our felt motivations it follows that for the vast majority of men abstract moral rules play a very minor role in the way they live their lives.

It is far more difficult, because of our means of communication and thought forms, to sense our belongingness to history and its great men who have left their personalities and abilities indelibly stamped on the present, and thus to feel their 'contemporaneity' with us. We are far more likely to think of a great man A, whose influence has brought about B (a whole complex of situations), which in turn has developed into C (a further complex of situations whose history can be traced via B to A), etc., until the present. Many people do have a far more passionate conception of their history and

their forefathers than this coldly analytic one, e.g. the Afrikaans-speaking people of South Africa. However, revelling in ideas as we do rather than in the people who have framed and embodied the ideas we tend to abstractions rather than a feeling for history.

Without the highly developed sense of history of the Hebrews, and having a language communication into the very structure of which is built a concept of past, present and future, one tends to pay little attention to the sources of one's values, ideals and ways of thinking, behaving, and feeling. But a little reflection and more scientific investigation shows it to be true that 'even strong personalities are sixty to eighty per cent the result of environment, about twenty to forty per cent representing their personal contribution. Feeble personalities - the masses - are ninety to ninety-nine per cent their environment.' We absorb our ways of thinking with our mothers' milk, our fathers' bed-time tales, our friends' chatter, our school masters' chalk, the books and newspapers we read, and radio programmes. Under the impact of them all we learn to respond and develop our own personalities. It is true that a great deal of what is me is my father and a host of others whose names have been forgotten, and behind them stand countless others spreading back in time.

The advent of the motion picture has sometimes given us an immediately felt sense of history and its personalities which is more Semitic than this obviously true but 'cold' analysis. In some senses they have filled the gap of the ancient story teller, and in their tendency to glamorise their heroes they are not so different from their less technically ingenious forbears. Using all the techniques of psychological communication, which are as modern as they are ancient, a film such as 'A Man for All Seasons' is able to make its audience feel the passions, agonies, ideals, and tragedy of Sir Thomas More. The more closely one feels his situation to parallel one's own in many respects, the more one feels him as a contemporary whose powerful personality produces a powerful and formative impact on oneself. The more perceptive viewer, especially if he allows himself to be an emotional participant in the tale while bearing in mind his own situation, may 'feel' that history to be compacted into the present and 'feel' the impress of his personality in contemporary history. In such an experience one is able to catch a fleeting glimpse of what the Hebrew meant when he thought of himself, his people, his history, and

his faith being 'in' and stemming from the powerful personalities of his ancestors. For us such tales are not told often or widely enough, as they were in Israel, for them to be an essential and living aspect of our common experience, but it is easy to imagine how a sense of intervening centuries could become obliterated.

Nationalism too, while not always morally respectable, is a sufficiently common phenomenon in the modern world for us to be able to grasp the Hebrew sense of belonging to a people and a country. In South Africa, for example, there is built into this sense of a common identity, a sense of history which is closely akin to the Hebrew sense of a common personality which is rootedⁱⁿ history and its great figures and decisive events.

When we think in these sorts of ways with our 'hearts' rather than our 'heads', or 'emotionally' rather than logically, we too are able to 'feel' our bonds with family, friends, history and formative personalities which is the essence of the concept of corporate personality, and it is a sense of belonging which can become so strong that our awareness of ourselves becomes almost indistinguishable from our awareness of those others with whom we feel the bonds. In this way a man may be^{un}able to think of himself as a person at all without at the same time thinking of his father, mother, wife, children, or friends who are of the very substance of his own life. He may also feel the bonds which make him a person and the person he is in the wider, less intimate, though not less real, context of his history and environment.

If this experienced and motivating sense of belongingness has any basis in reality, i.e. in our own experiencing, then it is possible also to understand how the Hebrew could think of a covenant of God with their ancestors as a covenant with themselves. Reverting to the film on Sir Thomas More it is possible for a man who participates emotionally in the tale as it is told to sense that he has derived his faith from More and yet at the same time to feel that it is his own relationship with God which has been born. Logically this does not make sense, for it implies that his sense of God is both mediated and immediate. As experience no contradiction is apparent. His sense of God is both in the man and in himself.

with this brief attempt at a re-interpretation of semitic thought-forms, it should be clear that when we speak of the atonement as 'community

creating' what is meant is a community with a strong sense of belonging to one another and to Christ who is its point of origin, centre of unity, and source of character and power. In the same way 'corporate personality' is understood. In the same way the twin Pauline conceptions of being 'in Christ' and of the church as the 'body of Christ' are to be understood. It is to these that we must now turn our attention.

CHAPTER IITHE PAULINE CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH
AS A CORPORATE BODY 'IN CHRIST'

While admitting the difference in details of language, and even fundamental differences in the concept of salvation, between Colossians/Ephesians, and the rest of the Pauline corpus (omitting the Pastoral epistles and Hebrews), the similarities of thought are so striking that if Colossians and Ephesians were not written by Paul they were written by someone who was profoundly influenced by him. If we take Paul's assertion seriously 'I am become^{1.} all things to all men, that I may by all means save some', then it is possible that the differences in language and soteriology are to be explained as the result of the situation to which he is addressing himself, or to a later development of Pauline thought. This is not the place to debate questions of^{2.} authorship, but since it can be shown that the understanding of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ generally and particularly of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is essentially continuous in Colossians and Ephesians with the rest of Paul's usage we shall treat them as belonging to the Pauline corpus. On the other hand the omission of the word from the Pastorals seems a decisive argument against their Pauline authorship, at least in their present form.

(a) Paul's soteriology

While granting the validity of Stewart's warning against trying to^{3.} systematise Paul's religion, it remains true that Paul's conception of man, i.e. mankind, is that he is in bondage and the work of Christ is to release man from that bondage by including him in a new solidarity. That new 'solidarity' has its beginning and continuing existence 'in Christ'. As the forms of bondage are differently conceived, so the nature of Christ and of his work are differently conceived. But the end product is always that man has been liberated from bondage by Christ (with freedom did Christ set us free.... be not entangled^{4.} again in a yoke of bondage) and 'in Christ' is become a 'new man'.^{5.} Consequently we shall begin our analysis with Paul's different conceptions of man's 'solidarity in bondage'.

1. 1 Cor. 9.22

2. Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1965, pp. 17ff.

3. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, 1954, p.3.

4. Gal. 5.1.

5. Cf 2 Cor. 5.17; Gal. 6,15; Eph. 4.23f; Col. 3.10; Rom. 6.4.

(i) Man's Bondage1. Man's solidarity 'in Adam' and thus his bondage to sin and death

Paul's conception of man's solidarity 'in Adam' and thus his bondage to death, and of man's redeemed solidarity 'in Christ' which means liberation from death is stated most succinctly in 1 Cor. 15.21f 'For since by man came death, by man also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive'. In Romans 5.12ff, Paul makes more explicit man's bondage in Adam to death. 'As through one man (i.e. Adam) sin entered the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned.' This verse expresses firstly that Adam sinned, i.e. Adam broke from the source of his continuing life by the fact of his sin (or disobedience v. 19), and the inevitable outcome was death. The second inevitable outcome was that all became sinners, and were consequently in an inescapable bondage to death. A superficial interpretation may see Paul's reasoning in more individual terms; that every man, by his own free choice, sinned and therefore shared the same necessity of Adam's fate of death. Such an interpretation might accord more easily with our own tendency to individualism, but Paul's meaning is made quite explicit in verse 19; 'For as through the one man's disobedience the many were caused to become (κατεστάθησαν) sinners'. The closest we can come to understanding Paul's meaning is that, believing Adam to be the

-
1. It is important to remember that for Paul death is not simply a biological fact. It is rather a judgement. While man is σάρξ, 'of the earth' (1 Cor. 15.48), he is created to live in a unique relationship with his Creator, and is intended not for annihilation but 'for the Lord'. For animals to die is natural. For man it is a punishment for sin (Rom. 1.32 etc.) which has an inner necessity; 'If ye live after the flesh ye must die' (Rom. 8.13); He that soweth to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption' (Gal.6.8), 'the mind of the flesh is death' (Rom. 8.6). The idea here is that for man to live κατὰ σάρκα is to change his very nature, because the nature of man is not to be self-sufficient or out of the life-giving Covenant relationship with God. If that covenant is broken so that man becomes flesh by itself, then its end must quite inevitably be death, for it has no source of life. For Paul the old Mosaic covenant is not covenant of life or spirit, it is purely formal (of the letter), and as such it is powerless to give life (cf 2 Cor. 3.6ff). It is a διακονία τοῦ Θανάτου. The life-giving covenant is broken by sin which therefore must bring death in its train.
 2. For this translation of κατεστάθησαν cf Arndt and Gingrich, 1957, p.391. This translation is confirmed in the use of the same verb (κατασταθήσονται) of Christ's ^{work} His obedience, we are told, 'caused the many to become righteous'. It is impossible to believe that Paul, whose watchword is 'being in Christ', believed that a man achieved 'righteousness' independently of Christ. The implication is that the fact that a man is a sinner is as dependent on Adam's act of disobedience as the fact of being 'righteous' is dependent on Christ's obedience. This can only be explained by Paul's concept of man's solidarity in history so that the past has inescapable consequences for every man in the present.

1.
 historical first man, when Adam became a sinner he created a community which was so shaped by him that no man was able to break completely free. Every man born into the community of man is born into a community whose character is stamped by the sin of Adam which will therefore stamp his own. Man is simply unable to remain impervious to his history and his society, and history and society are not too distinct and isolateable entities. When scientific history calls into question the historicity of the Adam story necessitating that we 'demythologise' Paul's use of it, then the direction of that demythologising must be to locate the fountain-head of human behaviour not in contemporary individuals but in history and society, for Paul does not conceive of man's solidarity in Adam as either mythical or metaphorical but as historical and social.

This is borne out by an analysis of Romans 7.14ff. While Paul is prepared to acknowledge 'intellectually' that the law is good and spiritual, he is unable to break free from a different 'law', the 'law of sin in my members'² (Rom. 7.23). As 'carnal', living in the 'body of death' (Rom. 7.24), sin has taken such a hold on him that it is no longer he who does what he does, but sin (Rom. 7.17), - that sin which has passed into all human society in its solidarity 'in Adam'. Paul tells us that he is totally powerless to do not only what he knows he ought to do but also what he would like to do, and the reason he gives for his powerlessness is not the greater power of Satan.³ It is not because of Satan, but because of Adam's sin that a man will be a sinner whether he likes it or not. While we might, with greater sophistication, state Paul's thought in terms of a long series of cause and effect but be unable to give the series a definite historical first member Adam, Paul sees ordinary men living in history either before Christ or without Christ as being inescapably 'in Adam',⁴ which means that they will be 'caused to become sinners' and they will die.

Consequently man's state 'in Adam' is that of bondage to sin. 'In

-
1. There is nothing in Paul's writing to suggest otherwise, nor to suppose that he thought that the truth of the 'Adam Myth' lay in the fact his story is the story of every man (cf D. Bonhoeffer, Creation and Fall, 1959.) For Paul Adam is the beginning in history of all human history, and the story of Adam must be repeated in every individual until a new beginning is made.
 2. The meaning of this phrase is clearly the human solidarity in Adam's sin which carries the inevitable consequence of death. Cf C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.125; A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, 1955, p.301.
 3. We have already seen, above pp.159ff that Paul does make use of the pre-Pauline baptismal instruction with its renunciation of Satan. However, in his developing argument in Romans it is nowhere stated that the bondage to sin is the result of a bondage to Satan.
 4. That Paul is using his real experience at the beginning of his Christian career, and has built it into his argument as expressive of the general
- /continued next page...

essence, indeed, sin is an act of human freedom, whose prime nature is disobedience (Rom. 5.19). But it is something which has long since got out of man's control. It is a symbol now not of freedom, but of determinism.... it has become an alien power residing within the individual, denying him command of his own actions.¹ Sin has man under its lordship (ἀμαρτία ὑμῶν κυριεύσει²)

Because of man's bondage to sin which issues inevitably in death, man is also in bondage to death. 'Sin reigned in death' (Rom. 5.21), which, as the context shows, means that when Adam sinned it issued in his death, and when Adam's sin caused all man to become sinners, so death 'passed unto all men' (Rom. 5.12), so sin's power and dominion is its ability to rob men of life. Θάνατος is the end term of that separation from God which Paul uses to characterise man's condition in other phrases; ἔχθρα, which means the distortion of the life-communicating 'togetherness' both between man and God and man and man into a life-draining opposition and hostility,³ and ὀργή, or wrath which leads to the abandonment (παρέδωκεν) of society by God issuing in a change in the true nature of man which reveals itself in unnatural and anti-social behaviour (Rom. 1.18-32). Death is that which most completely robs a man of his place in human society, and thus expresses the complete separation between man and God. It is consequently man's most complete enemy (1 Cor. 15.26) and at the same time sinful man's slave-master (Rom. 6.16) and lord (Rom. 6.9). It achieves its victory through sin (1 Cor. 15.54f) which no man is able to escape.

Anderson Scott suggests that 'death employed sin to stab for itself an opening into human nature'.⁴ This suggests that, for Paul, death was a mythological being with an independent existence. But Paul says that if we are the bond-servants of sin, then the issue of that servitude is death (e.g. Rom. 6.16), for sin is the breaking of that covenant relationship with God in which alone there is the possibility of life (2 Cor. 3.6). To be a sinner is already to be dead (Eph. 2.1), so the act of dying is the outward and final symbol of man's servitude to sin. Death does not give sin its victory, rather the final victory of sin is death. This distinction is important for if we

4. continued from previous page.....truth about man's bondage to sin is conclusively shown by C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, pp. 123f.

1. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.36.

2. Rom. 6.14.

3. Arndt and Gingrich, p.331.

4. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, 1961, p.51.

accept Scott's interpretation then it means that death, for Paul, is a supra-historical force. But, as we have seen, death is closely related to sin as its inevitable outcome, and sin has its origin in history, not from 'beyond' it. Consequently death is as firmly rooted in history and society as is sin. For Paul it would be true to say, If there were no sin there would be no death, but it would not be true to say, If there were no death there would be no sin.

2. Man's bondage to the Law

Paul's attitude to the Law is to some extent ambiguous. In Romans the Law both is and is not universal in its scope. It is not universal in that 'whatsoever things the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law' (Rom. 3.19), and here lies the tragedy of the Jews. While acknowledging the goodness of the law, and teaching it to others, they do not themselves keep it (Rom. 2.17ff) and consequently have no hope of being justified (Rom. 2.13). The thought here is the same as in Galatians 5.3 that the man who submits to the Law's demand for circumcision places himself under an obligation to keep the whole Law. It is just this keeping of the Law which the Law itself is powerless to effect. 'For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God' (Rom. 2.28f). Since the Law is 'of the letter' and not of the Spirit, it is powerless against sin and death (2 Cor. 3.6). When the Law is placed alongside sin, its effect is not to combat sin but to act as its powerful ally. It becomes the ¹ἀφ' ὧν, the 'base of operations' for sin to take hold of human nature (Rom. 7.8.11). It is the law, despite its goodness and spirituality (Rom. 7.14), which gives knowledge of sin (Rom. 7.7) which, as Paul makes clear, does not mean that it is the Law which informs us that to covet is a sin, but rather makes us do the very things the Law forbids.

The Law achieves this both because it is weak, 'of the letter', and because man 'in the flesh' is weak. When these two weaknesses are placed alongside sin's mastery over man through his solidarity 'in Adam', then the conclusion is that the Law is powerless 'through the flesh' and man can only be delivered from this twin bondage not by defeating the Law, but by defeating sin (Rom. 8.3). It is this inter-relationship between sin and Law, whatever the

1. Cf Arndt and Gingrich, p.127

2. For argument that $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in Paul's thought connotes weakness and not evilness or sinfulness cf J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, pp. 17ff.

psychological mechanism (vide Rom. 7.7ff), which makes the Law a power for sin which it is not in itself (Rom. 7.7).

At the same time the Law is universal in its scope. Apart from the fact that it is the Law itself which points to a righteousness apart from the Law (e.g. Rom. 3.21; Gal. 4.21ff), the righteous Gentile is he who, not having the Law, yet obeys its demands by nature (Rom. 2.14ff). There is nothing to suggest that the Gentile's 'natural law' is anything different from the Jewish Law. This is made clear when Paul says 'And shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law?' (Rom. 2.27). Here it is obviously the same Law which is kept by Gentiles but broken by Jews. Consequently both Jews and Gentiles are under the same Law, whether it be given in the Torah or not.

It is in this sense that Paul's enigmatic statement in Rom. 5.13f is to be understood; 'For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come!' Dodd is right when he holds that in the developing argument Paul draws a careful distinction between sin, in the sense of an act for which a person is not necessarily guiltily responsible, and transgression, which is a voluntary, responsible, guilty infraction of a known command. In the absence of the Law, making clear the distinction between right and wrong, a man cannot be held guilty for his actions. But Adam transgressed, knowingly doing what he was forbidden to do. In the generations that followed men were unable to avoid sinning, but their sins were not like Adam's transgression in so far as they were not consciously contravening

1. a known command. The Law, in the sense of Torah came with Moses. It is possible that when Paul describes Adam as the 'figure of him that was to come',

2. the reference is to Moses. It is Moses who codified the will of God for man, which was known by Adam, in the Jewish Torah, but what he codified was also that

1. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, pp. 102f.

2. It is equally possible that the reference may be to Christ, cf. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.35 n1. If the reference is to Christ, then it is probable that Adam is the 'figure' (τύπος) of Christ in the sense that both Adam and the second Adam or last Adam (1 Cor. 15.45) stand at the head of a history characterised by their action causing those who are 'in Adam' to become sinners, and those who are 'in Christ' to become righteous. It is probable that we ought not to make a choice between either Moses or Christ as being the one of whom Adam is a type. The reference can be both to Moses and Christ and though meaning different things be consistent with Paul's thought.

Law known by the Gentiles in their hearts and consciences. Adam is therefore a type of both Jew, represented by Moses, and Gentile, less obviously represented by Moses. He is therefore the fons et origo of both the Law, which is universal, and sin, which is equally universal, and also the type of the powerlessness of the Law.

Since Jew as well as Gentile is under sin's dominion because of Adam's sin, the Law for both Jew and Gentile is sin's accomplice. The outcome is that ^{not} man, and simply the Jewish nation, is in a state of bondage equally to the Law as he is to sin (Gal. 4.5). He is 'holden' by it and under its charge (Rom. 7.6), and subject to its curse (Gal. 3.13).

In Galatians there is a different conception of the Law (Gal. 3.15ff). Here Paul's argument is that the Abrahamic covenant was a covenant of promise, not of law, made with Abraham 'and his seed', which Paul, taking strictly in the singular, interprets not as a reference to many, i.e. the Jews, but to Christ. (Gal. 3.16). Now the Law came 430 years after the covenant of promise and even though it be confirmed by God, it is not able to nullify the earlier covenant of promise (Gal. 3.17) in which is the inheritance of the promises (Gal. 3.18). The Law was given until Christ should come (Gal. 3.19), to be man's 'tutor' εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. 3.24). Here the Law is seen as a useful but quite definitely temporary measure, which lacks the power to give life (ζωοποιῆσαι). At the same time the Law is by no means unambiguously a good thing for, as in Romans, it is the Law (ἡ ^{1.} γραφή) which 'shuts up all things under sin' (Gal. 3.22), i.e. it is sin's accomplice in bringing all things under its (sin's) dominion. If ever man is to fulfil the Law, he needs something new and more powerful in history, a something which will put a decisive stop to the flow of sin. Until then, though man is the heir of all the promises made to Abraham, he is nothing short of the Law's bondservant and ward (Gal. 4.1f). He is 'under the Law' (Gal. 4.5).

In Ephesians the Law is again differently conceived. Here it is the enmity (ἔχθραν), the point of opposition and conflict, between Jew and Gentile, an enmity from which there is no escape until the Law itself has been abolished. (Eph. 2.15).

1. The variant reading in LITRA, ἐκ νόμου ἐν ἡμῶν, which while not having a strong claim to authenticity certainly makes more explicit what is undoubtedly Paul's thought here.

In all of this is seen Paul's concept of man without or before Christ as being in a triple enslavement to the Law, sin and death, of which three sin is the pivotal point. It has its root in Adam's sin and continuing dominion in man's solidarity 'in Adam'. Its dominion brings death as its unavoidable consequence, and makes the weak and temporary, yet essentially good Law a power for evil. This inter-relationship is summed up in Rom. 7.11; 'For sin, finding occasion through the commandment, beguiled me, and through it slew me' - man's solidarity in Adam's sin, finding the law to be a powerful ally, was able to take root resulting in death.

3. Man's solidarity in bondage under the rudiments (στοιχεῖα) of the world.

In addition to man's solidarity in bondage to sin, Law, and death, which bondage has its origin firmly located in history and society, there is an element in Paul's thought which speaks of man's bondage to super-human forces. We meet this more mythical concept of man's bondage first in Galatians 4.3ff, where we are told:

'So we also, when we were children, were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου)... at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods. But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God, how turn ye back to the weak and beggarly rudiments, wherein unto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years.'

There are three possible interpretations of these 'rudiments' in Galatians, all of which have had and continue to have their champions among New Testament scholars, (i) the elementary forms of religion both Jewish (the Torah in particular) and Gentile; (ii) the elemental spirits which the syncretistic religious tendencies of later antiquity associated with the physical elements, and which determined the fate of men; (iii) the heavenly bodies which were associated with these powers of fate. As a decision between these three

1. For a survey of the literature of E.D. Burton, Galatians (International Crit. Commentary), 1921 pp. 510-518; E.J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translation, 1945; Arndt and Gingrich, 1957, pp. 776f.
2. Cf. e.g. E.D. Burton, op. cit., pp. 510ff; R.M. Grant, in The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 39, 1946, pp. 71-73; W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, 1939, pp. 108f.
3. Cf. e.g. M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. H. Lietzmann, 1909, pp. 78ff; E. Lohmeyer, Colossians, 1930, pp. 4-8, 103-105; E. Pfister, Die στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in den Briefen des Apostel Paulus in Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertum, vol. 69, 1910, pp. 411-427; A.W. Blunt, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, 1955, pp. 108ff.
4. cf. e.g. J. van Wageningen, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, in Theologische Studien, Vol. 35, 1917, pp. 1-6; B.L. Easton, The Pauline Theology and Hellenism, in The American Journal of Theology, Vol. 21, 1917, pp. 358-382

alternatives is bound up with a decision on the authorship of Colossians, and to a lesser extent Ephesians, a decision which we have left in abeyance, we shall treat the concept of bondage to these powers in each letter independently. In any event, even if all three letters are genuinely Pauline, it remains possible that Paul's use in one letter may ^{be} determined by the situational significance of the phrase which may have varied from place to place.

The passage which we have quoted from Galatians occurs embedded in his argument about the temporary and tutoring function of the Law which is unable to supercede the Covenant made with Abraham and Christ (Gal. 3.15ff). The argument reaches its conclusion in the assertion that the Galatians are 'one man in Christ' and thus Abraham's seed and heirs of the promises (Gal. 3.28f). The argument then proceeds that before Christ came (Gal. 4.4) we were children, and therefore nothing less than bondservants of the Law, despite the fact that according to the promises we were to be lords of all things (Gal. 4.1). In this context of being in temporary bondage to the Law the reference to being in bondage to the rudiments bears most naturally the meaning of bondage to the rudimentary but provisional religion of the Law. This is supported by the fact that the reference to the desire of the Galatians to be in bondage again to the 'weak and beggarly elements' (Gal. 4.9), is paralleled almost immediately afterwards by 'Tell me, ye that desire to be under the Law?' (Gal. 4.21). 'Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years' (Gal. 4.10) is not particularly distinctively Hellenistic or pagan, nor is it distinctively and unquestionably Jewish, but since Paul's whole concern in the argument is with the Jewish Law it is probably the Jewish festivals which are uppermost in his mind, which does not rule out the possibility that he is also thinking of the Gentile bondage to their religious laws and practices. The same ambiguity is present in the statement 'ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods' (Gal. 4.8). Here the meaning could be that the elemental spirits are not gods at all, but it could also be another way of saying 'our sufficiency is from God who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life' (2 Cor. 3.6), and mean that the Law, not being God's life-giving covenant with man, does not bear the stamp of God's life-giving power in its nature and is consequently 'weak and beggarly'.

If Paul's thought is of those blind and impersonal forces which control man's destiny, he has certainly tied these up in his own thinking with the futility and yet bondage of the Law. At best there is here a glimpse of other forces which hold man in bondage. But, in Galatians, this is a very minor conception so that his Christology and soteriology, unlike that in Colossians and Ephesians, is not related to these powers and their conquest.

In Colossians Paul speaks of being 'delivered out of the power of darkness' (Col. 1.13) by God since 'it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him (Christ) should all the fullness dwell' (Col. 1.19). In the Old Testament the belief is that it is God who 'fills the heaven and earth'.¹ In both the later Jewish and contemporary pagan world it was believed that God 'filled',² i.e. acted in, the world by the agency of a host of intermediary powers. The probable meaning here is that all the powers by which God acts in the world now reside fully and wholly in Christ.³ It is, however, by no means clear that it is these powers which hold men in their power and are the origin of man's state of 'darkness', i.e. 'Alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works' (Col. 1.21). As Whitely has shown at this point Paul does not make it plain whether the fall of Adam or the activities of the powers of evil are to be blamed for man's condition.⁴ In fact while the power in Col. 1.13 is undoubtedly a power of evil, it is not at all certain that the powers in Col. 1.19 are. While Col. 1.19 almost certainly comes from a pre-Pauline traditional hymn of the Colossians, the same idea of Christ being filled with the fullness of the godhead bodily (σωματικῶς) occurs in Col. 2.9, which follows immediately after a reference to the 'rudiments' (στοιχεῖα) (Col. 2.8). It is possible that these στοιχεῖα have no reality at all, being simply the false beliefs of men,⁶ though it is equally possible that they represent the intermediary powers between God and the world. If that is so then the fact that all these powers reside in the risen and ascended Christ suggests that they are not regarded by Paul as being evil powers. The meaning would then appear to be 'in Christ' there is no longer any need for the host of subsidiary powers through whom the fullness

1. Jer. 23.24, Cf Isa. 6.3; Ps. 72.19.

2. Cf W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, 1939, pp.163ff.

3. ibid p. 163; J.A.P. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.68; L.S. Thornton, Common Life, 1950, pp. 293ff.

4. D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, 1964, pp. 23, 26, 30. The same is true also of Gal. 1.4.

5. This is widely recognised by scholars, Cf E. Schweizer, The Church as the Body of Christ, 1965, pp. 65f; also NTS Vol. 8, 1961/2 pp. 6ff.

6. D.E.H. Whiteley, op. cit. p. 26 n.26.

of the godhead is mediated and dispersed. At the same time, however, if the στοιχεῖα are the same as the 'principalities and powers' (τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας) of Col. 2.15, then it is over them that Christ triumphed in the Cross. Again we are told that when in baptism (Col. 2.12) a man has 'died with Christ', he has died from the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Col. 2.20) and both the 'principalities and powers' and the 'rudiments of the world' are connected with 'ordinances' (χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν Col. 2.14, δογματίξασθε Col. 2.20). When we are told that through the Cross these 'written ordinances which are against us' have been blotted out through Christ's triumph over the 'principalities and powers' Paul's conclusion is 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's. (Col. 2.16-17). The list of the things to which the Colossians are no longer to be in subjection is here, in the reference to the sabbath, more particularly Jewish than in Gal. 4.10, and the idea that these 'ordinances' are a 'shadow' expresses essentially the same idea as in Gal. 3.15ff of the Law's temporary and tutoring function.

When we are told that in baptism we have died to the 'rudiments' of the world Paul's question is -

'why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), after the precepts and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh' (Col. 2.20-23).

Here the ordinances could be either Jewish or Hellenistic and, as we have seen, the concept of the total ineffectualness of the Law for sinful men is undoubtedly Pauline.

The argument of the whole passage appears to be that Paul, granting reality to the Jewish and Hellenistic beliefs in the 'elemental spirits' as the agents of God's action in the world asserts that all of God's action is in Christ, in which case the thought is the same as in 2 Cor. 5.19; 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself'. At the same time in the Cross and resurrection Christ is said to have triumphed over these powers, and the implication is that it is these powers who are responsible for the religious (both Jewish and Greek) 'ordinances' which, while good, are totally ineffectual

1. Cf also Phil. 3.14 'God in Christ Jesus'; 1 Thess. 5.18 'the will of God in Christ Jesus'; Eph. 4.32 'as God in Christ forgave you'.

to deliver men from the 'power of darkness'. Consequently the man who lives 'in the world' (Col. 2.20), as opposed to the man who has died with Christ (Col. 2.20) and risen with him (Col. 3.1), is subject to the 'powers' through the Law because of the 'power of darkness' (Col. 1.13). While the origin of this 'power of darkness' is not explained, there is nothing to suggest that its origin lies with the 'principalities and powers' or the 'rudiments of this world'. They appear to be connected with the religious 'ordinances' which 'are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh'. If Paul does not quite explicitly keep his feet in history and society to explain the bondage to sin, he does not 'explain' it as the effect of some supra-personal satanic force. Yet the Christology and soteriology of Colossians, unlike that of the Galatians, is related to these cosmic powers which, because of sin are powerless to redeem and because of Christ are redundant.

In Ephesians these 'celestial powers' are seen to have a more active role of evil, and yet at the same time Paul does not appear to have left the firm ground of history that we saw in Romans. He says -

'And you being dead in trespasses and sins in which you once walked under the power of the aeon, or controlling spirit, of this world, under the rule of the power of the air that now worketh in the sons of disobedience (1); among whom we also once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest' (Eph. 2.2-3)

Whether this 'evil power' be taken as a supra-personal and independent existent or as a personification, Paul says that it operates in the 'sons of the disobedience' (ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας) in whom (ἐν οἷς) we all had our conduct (ἀνεστράφημεν) once.^{2.} While the phrase υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας^{3.} is found only in Ephesians and Colossians in the New Testament, it is hard to believe that there is not an implied reference here to Adam's act of disobedience

1. J.A.T. Robinson, *The Body*, 1963, p. 22 n.1 and W.L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, 1939, p.187, both rightly interpret the unique combination in this verse of αἰῶν and ὁ κόσμος οὗτος with 'this world' in the genitive (κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) as representing a personification of 'the age' as the controlling force of 'this world'. It would then be translated as 'κατὰ the power of the aeon, or controlling spirit, of this world'. Robinson translates κατὰ as 'in obedience to', but its force is more that of control than willing obedience. Translated as such it is an exact parallel to κατὰ τὸν ἀρχοντα τῆς ἰσχυρίας τοῦ αἵρος, under the rule of the power of the air. This may be, as Robinson and Knox suggest, a personification of 'evil', or it may be as Whiteley suggests (op. cit. p. 26 and n. 25) a 'real' power.
2. There is no justification for the AV and RV translation of ἐν οἷς as 'in which' as if it was a reference back to τῆς ἀπειθείας. Paul is not so poor a linguist as to qualify a feminine noun in the singular with a masculine relative pronoun in the plural. The reference is clearly to the 'sons'.
3. Eph. 2.2; 5.6; Col. 3.6, but cf also Rom. 11.30, 32; Heb. 4.6,11.

which 'caused the many to become sinners' (Rom. 5.19). Because our conduct is in these 'sons of the disobedience' to this historical and social inevitability of sin is added the dominion of the spirit of this world and of the air.

A similar conception is found in 2 Cor. 4.4; 'the god of this age' is said to have 'blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them'. The concept of Christ as the 'image of God', immediately recalls the first man created in the image of God (Gen. 1.26) suggesting the contrast Paul draws in Romans 5.12ff between Adam and Christ. The implication would then be that man is unbelieving in and because of Adam's disobedience, and the 'god of this age' has come in alongside the sin to blind man's eyes to the Gospel.

That Paul believes that these are real forces with which man has to reckon is made plain in Eph. 6.12; 'Our wrestling is not with flesh and blood, but against the principalities (τὰς ἀρχάς) and powers (τὰς ἐξουσίας), against the world-rulers of this darkness (τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) against the spiritual powers in heavenly places (τὰ πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἑπαουρανίοις). Similarly in 1 Cor. 2.8 it is 'the rulers of this age' who 'crucified the Lord of glory', which 'rulers', as Thornton has convincingly demonstrated, are 'angelic powers' opposed to the will of God.

We conclude that for Paul 'the power of darkness' which holds mankind in its thrall is conceived of as man's bondage to the 'elemental spirits' which are real powers for evil. Yet at the same time Paul never breaks free from his historical and social realism. It would be more true to say that they gain their power to work evil in men because 'in Adam' men are disobedient, unbelieving sinners. Where they are conceived of as the givers of religious laws, customs, and doctrines, which may be good in themselves, their 'ordinances' are powerless to achieve good because of man's solidarity in Adam's sin, and become a force of evil and division. In bondage to sin, man is brought also into the inter-related bondage to death, the Law, and the supra-human 'rulers of this age'.

(ii) Christ's complete self-identification with man in his bondage

It is then into this situation of an inter-related four-fold bondage that Christ comes to bring freedom from the yoke of bondage (Gal. 5.1). It is possible to show that Paul considered Christ's identification with man to be L. L.S. Thornton Common Life, 1950, pp.106ff.

complete in relation to each of the four inter-related bondages, and yet, as we shall see, the language in which Paul states this identification in bondage is always very carefully chosen. Having seen Paul's historical and social realism in relation to sin, it is obvious that any concept of deliverance from sin's bondage demands an equal realism, i.e. Christ must really be a man like other men. At the same time if Christ were simply to be like other men in their bondage, then he could be no redeemer at all. He would simply be swallowed up in the continuing bondage of all men. Here lies the heart of the Christological problem; How are we to state that Christ is both 'one of us' and yet the possibility of a new beginning? Our intention is not to examine the different attempts to solve this problem, but to examine the terms in which Paul states Christ's self-identification with man in bondage and yet how he effected man's deliverance. For the sake of clarity we shall examine this in three 'stages', firstly Christ's self-identification with man in bondage; secondly Christ's triumph over this bondage; and lastly how men are able to triumph because of Christ, and we shall attempt to relate each stage to the four-fold bondage, although this must clearly be artificial to a large extent.

1. In relation to sin (1)

Paul's counterpart to the assertion in Hebrews that Christ, our high priest, 'hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb. 4.15) is even more astonishing; 'Him who knew no sin he (God) made to be sin ($\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \dot{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$) on our behalf ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$)' (2 Cor. 5.21). Christ's not 'knowing sin' is exactly the same as Paul's 'knowing sin' in Rom. 7.7. For Paul it meant that he actually sinned through the psychological mechanism that the Law evoked. For Christ it means that he did not sin. What precisely Paul meant when he asserted that God 'made Christ to be sin' is not so easy to determine. Romans 8.3, however, does provide a pointer; 'God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh' ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\iota\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\tau\iota \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$). That 'likeness' does not qualify 'flesh' but 'sinful' is self-evident (cf Eph. 2.16). What Paul means is made a little clearer when we remember that he could speak of Israel, his fellow-Jews, as 'my flesh' (Rom. 4.11), i.e. being a Jew his flesh and theirs is one flesh. In a broader sense all mankind is 'one flesh' (1 Cor. 15.39), which flesh, because of Adam's disobedience is caused to become sinful flesh. As man, therefore, Christ is 'one flesh' with all mankind

1. In what follows I am indebted very largely to J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1953, pp. 38ff.

At one level Christ's 'likeness of sinful flesh' expresses his solidarity with man. Yet at the same time Paul cannot forget that the 'one flesh', i.e. the human solidarity, is sinful because of Adam's disobedience and that Christ runs counter to Adam and his inevitable subsequent history in that he is obedient (Rom. 5.19). Consequently, 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' or to be 'made to be sin' expresses Christ's fundamental solidarity with man and yet 'knowing no sin' expresses, because of that solidarity, a new possibility, a new beginning for man.

2. In relation to death

Because of Christ's solidarity with sinful man and despite his sinlessness Christ shares in man's solidarity in bondage to death. Paul tells us; 'Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him ('Θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει')(Rom. 6.9). The assertion that, because of Christ's resurrection from the dead, death no longer is able to be his 'lord' implies that before this he was under the rule and power of death. Paul's totality thinking is so realistic for him that even when he can assert the paradox that a man can take 'sinful flesh' (Rom. 8.3) and yet 'know no sin' (2 Cor. 5.21), his historical 'sinlessness' is not able to save him from the consequences of his solidarity, death. Because Christ voluntarily entered into solidarity with man, he took on himself the 'form of a slave' (Phil. 2.7) which, as Ramsey has demonstrated, does not mean that he simply appeared to be a slave, but that it is what he was in reality, as a man among men, in contrast with mere outward appearance. Consequently it is not the historical 'sinlessness' of Christ which makes him the new possibility for man, it is rather the nature of Christ's death and the fact of his resurrection. As both Romans 6.6ff and Phil. 2.8 make plain 'the obedience of the one' which 'shall make the many righteous' refers not to the historical life of Christ, but to his death and exaltation. For Paul it is here, and not in the incarnation, that the possibility of a new 'solidarity' resides. Here is the

1. A.M. Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, 1949, p.54. He instances Rom. 12.2: 'Be ye not outwardly fashioned (συνασχηματισθεσθε) according to this world; but be ye changed in real being (μεταμορφωθεσθε) by the renewing of your mind!'

2. However true it may be that the historical details of Christ's life were given to his readers in the 'traditions' repeated in the churches, the oft-noted fact that Paul pays almost no attention to the life of Christ is to be explained by the fact that he did not believe that that life by itself was able to redeem. Thus he can say 'If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable' (1 Cor. 15.19), and this is not simply because if Christ was ^{not} raised we have no hope of a resurrection (1 Cor. 15.8) but also because 'ye are then still in your sins' (1 Cor. 15.17)

starting point of the 'new creation' (2 Cor. 5.14ff) 'because one dies, therefore all die... wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet we know him so no more. wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature...'. It is not knowing Christ 'after the flesh', i.e. as a man in history in solidarity with men, that makes us 'new creatures', but knowing him who in death divested himself of 'flesh'.

It is obvious, therefore, that Christ's 'bondage to death' expresses the same paradox as his 'bondage to sin', because the very nature of Christ's death, which issues in the resurrection, is his 'victory over death'. We shall see later how Paul conceives of Christ's victory over sin and death in dying.

3. In relation to the 'powers'

If Christ's solidarity with 'sinful flesh' places him in bondage to death, it also places him in bondage to the 'powers'. We are told that it is the 'rulers of this age' who 'crucified the Lord of glory' because of their ignorance of the 'wisdom of God' (1 Cor. 2.7f). There is nothing in Paul's thought to suggest that Christ committed suicide, i.e. that he only seemed to be in subjection to these powers, or that he simply allowed them to do this to him. They are really responsible, but, as we shall see, it is what Christ does in the act of dying which renders these powers powerless over him and gives him the victory.

4. In relation to the Law

Being born of a woman Christ is also born 'under the law' (Gal. 4.4) and thus 'under its curse' (Gal. 3.10), a curse issuing in death. When Robinson says 'Christ, therefore, accepted this too, "having become a curse for us", even to its end of "hanging on a tree"¹' (Gal. 3.13) it is possible to assume that Paul thought that Christ was playing a very serious game, accepting what he could have avoided. On the contrary for Paul Christ's bondage to the law was as real as his bondage to death and the powers. In his human solidarity he is under the Law, and as such must die, but it is in that event and its nature that the dominion of the Law over him, and thus those 'in him', is broken.

1. J.A.P. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.38.

(ii) Christ's triumph over his bondage

For all the incarnational character of Paul's Christology (cf e.g. Rom. 8.3; 1 Cor. 15.47; Gal. 4.4; Phil. 2.6) his soteriology is related not to this incarnation but to Christ's death, resurrection and exaltation. But for Paul, in his life in solidarity with men Christ is one with them in their bondage to death, the powers, and the Law, even though he is not a sinner. It is when the inevitable point of death is reached that Christ dies radically differently, and it is this 'difference' which gives him the victory over his bondage. However incomprehensible Paul's language may be to us the absolute cruciality of Christ's death and resurrection for Paul's soteriology cannot be seriously questioned (cf e.g. 1 Cor. 2.2).

1. In relation to sin

When Christ is conceived as being in complete solidarity with 'sinful flesh' then, as we have seen, its inevitable outcome is death despite the fact of his sinlessness. But whereas all men die through, or because of sin ($\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) (Rom. 5.12) Christ dies 'unto sin, once' ($\tau\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu,\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\acute{\xi}$) (Rom. 6.10). In baptism we are told that we also 'die to sin' ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$) (Rom. 6.2). What this means is made clear in another baptismal passage; 'Ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ' (Col. 2.11). $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\omicron\mu\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, could be interpreted as 'in the circumcision which Christ gives', but such an interpretation is unable to do justice to the crucial opening assertion that this is 'in Christ' ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \hat{\omega}$). While the concern of the passage is with the baptismal 'death' of the disciple, this 'death' of the disciple is Christ's death because in baptism the man is baptised 'into Christ Jesus, into his death' (Rom. 6.3), he is 'crucified with Christ' (Gal. 2.20), and dies 'with Christ' (Col. 2.20, cf. Rom. 6.4). Similarly the Gospels describe Christ's death as his baptism (Lk. 10.38f., Lk. 12.50). One can therefore only conclude that the Christian's baptismal 'death' is co-extensive and contemporaneous with the death of Christ, he dies 'with Christ', and 'in Christ'. It is perfectly legitimate, therefore, to take a reference to the character of the Christian's

1. and the vast amount of literature asking 'how is the Cross able to save us?' bears witness to the difficulty modern man has in making sense, in his own thought forms, of what Paul is saying. The difference between our thinking and Paul's is that for us death is either something that happens to us or is brought on by ourselves. For Paul death 'happens to' Christ, and yet he does something unique in the process of dying; he divests himself of his 'flesh body' and is raised a new reality, a 'spiritual body'. We shall have to try to interpret this later, our immediate task is to examine the

baptismal death to expound how Paul conceived of Christ's death.

For Paul, Christ dies 'unto sin' in that he 'put off the body of flesh', i.e. he strips off that which makes a man 'weak' against his inheritance of sin 'in Adam' and also weak to keep the Law (Rom. 8.3). This act, whatever we may think it means, is for Paul the act by which sin lost its hold over Christ for it no longer had a 'foothold'. When he is raised a 'spiritual body' (1 Cor. 15.44) he is free from the possibility of sin's dominion. This is surely the meaning of 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor. 15.50). By its very nature, because of Adam (1 Cor. 15.22), 'flesh and blood' must inherit corruption and death (1 Cor. 15.22, Rom. 8.21). Only that which is 'changed' (1 Cor. 15.51ff), which has become 'a spiritual body' (1 Cor. 15.46), is not subject to death and corruption (1 Cor. 15.53). Consequently, when in death Christ 'puts off the body of flesh' and is raised (by God) a 'spiritual body', he has 'died to sin', which does not mean that he ceases to be a sinner - which he never was - but that sin has no possibility of power over him.

2. In relation to death

The paradox of Christ's death is stated most completely in the Christological hymn of Phil. 2.6ff, where we are told; 'And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, the death of the cross' (Phil. 2.8). As we have seen, for Paul, death is not thought of as a biological necessity, but rather is the inevitable result of sin and disobedience¹ which breaks the life-giving Covenant with God. Death is therefore the ultimate victory of sin. What the hymn asserts, however, is that Christ's death was the death of obedience. In his solidarity with man he shares death, but his death is of a totally different kind. Consequently his death carries within it the possibility not of annihilation but resurrection; 'Wherefore God also highly exalted him' (Phil. 2.9); 'being raised from the dead Christ dieth no more, death no more hath dominion over him, for the death that he dies, he died unto sin once'. (Rom. 6.9f).

We have already seen that his dying 'unto sin' means that he divests himself of his 'natural body' and is clothed with a 'spiritual body' so that the 'last Adam' becomes a 'life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. 15.44f). Consequently

1. continued from previous page... language in which Paul himself states how, in death, Christ achieved his victory over bondage.

1. Cf above p.403 and n.1.

in his death sin has not triumphed but has, through his act, lost its power to triumph over him, and with its impotence death itself has become impotent and he is raised by God.

3. In relation to the powers

As sin and death lose their power over him through the 'putting off of the body of flesh' (Col. 2.11), so also do the powers lose their dominion over him. If it is the 'rulers of this aeon' (1 Cor. 2.8) who crucify Christ, by his 'putting off of the body of flesh' they too lose their power. It is in this way that Anderson Scott takes Col. 2.15, which in the R.V. runs: 'Having put off from himself the principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (i.e. the cross)^{1.}' He suggests, rightly in view of Col. 2.11, that this not only can but ought to be translated as; 'Having put off from himself (his body of flesh), he made a show of the principalities and powers openly, triumphing over them in it (the Cross)'. The use of ἀπεκδυσάμενος in verse 15, repeating ἀπεκδύσει of verse 11, suggests that it should take the same object, τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός. If this is so then the meaning would be that in death Christ divested himself of his 'body of flesh', thus rendering the principalities and powers impotent against him. They are not his victors when he dies, rather is he theirs.

2.

Anderson Scott thinks that Eph. 4.21ff contains a similar allusion. He connects the phrase καθὼς ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ with the words ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς... τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον... καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον and, noting the use of ἀλήθεια in 2 Cor. 7.14, translates it; 'That, as was actually the case with Jesus, ye put off the old man and put on the new'.

Through his death the powers have been robbed of their hold over him, he has 'triumphed over them'. In his resurrection and exaltation they have been subjected to him (Eph. 1.22). As much as he died 'unto sin' rather than because of it, so also he died 'from the rudiments of the world' (ἀπεθένατε σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου) (Col. 2.20) rather than simply because of them (1 Cor. 2.8).

It must be emphasised that it is not simply the death of Jesus which

1. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, 1961, pp. 26ff. This interpretation is followed by J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p. 41.

2. ibid pp. 36f.

3. 'Our glorying.... was found to be truth (i.e. it was actual fact).

gives him victory, but the nature of the death both as a death of obedience and as an act in which he broke the power of the forces arrayed against him in stripping himself of his point of weakness, his flesh.¹

4. In relation to the Law

While Paul sees Christ as the 'seed of Abraham' and thus the inheritor of the promises of the Abrahamic covenant (Gal. 2.16), he is nonetheless born 'under the law' (Gal. 4.4) which came 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant which it was not able to disannul (Gal. 2.17). His victory over the dominion of the law is not in his incarnation as the Son of God (Gal. 4.4) or Abraham's seed. Rather he is born 'under the law', that he might redeem them which were under the law' (Gal. 4.4-5). Redemption is achieved through his death (and resurrection).

The argument of Rom. 7.1ff is that a law has dominion over a man only so long as he lives. While a wife lives the law binds the husband to her, but when she dies the obligation dies with her. Although Paul's argument is forced, his meaning is quite clear when he says 'wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead (Rom. 7.4). Paul's reference to the 'body of Christ' here undoubtedly bears the dual meaning of the body of the Cross and the Church. Our concern is with the former meaning at this point. As such the meaning is that while 'in the flesh' both Christ and all men were under the Law's dominion. But when he died the Law lost its dominion, and when he was raised he became the new 'legal husband' of those who were joined to him and the Law has no longer any claim to be husband or lord over men.

His argument goes deeper than this legal one. In Eph. 2.15, Paul speaks of Christ 'having rendered inoperative (καταργήσας) in his flesh ... the law of commandments contained in ordinances'. I.e. when Jesus stripped off his flesh in death the Law became ineffective, because the Law was given 'because of transgressions' (Gal. 2.19) whose point of triumph is the weak flesh.

1. In consequence of this the Church could never be spoken of as the 'flesh of Christ', nor could Paul ever think of the Eucharistic bread (contra Jn. 6.53) as the 'flesh' of Christ. At the same time, as the whole argument of 1 Cor. 15.35ff makes abundantly plain (cf. also M.E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, 1962, pp. 74ff) Paul does not think now of Christ as a 'disembodied spirit', rather he is a 'spiritual body' which, as we shall see, cannot be understood as a thing in itself but must be understood in the most intimate relation to the Church, the body of Christ.

It is the power of the Law to destroy any man 'in the flesh' and thus 'in sin' because of Adam, which has been destroyed by Christ on the cross. This is made plain in Col. 2.14f, which in the R.V. reads; 'Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross'. This is, however, an unsatisfactory translation of ἔξαιέψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν. As Moulton and Milligan¹ have shown the meaning of χειρόγραφον is a written agreement to keep a contract, a certificate of indebtedness. The fact that τοῖς δόγμασιν is in the dative suggests that what has been 'blotted out' is our contract 'to the ordinances' not the ordinances themselves. The whole verse could therefore be paraphrased: 'Christ wiped out the agreement, which was not in our favour and in fact ~~was~~ hostile towards us, to be in subjection to the Law, and he nailed it to the Cross'. Paul's meaning is that it is the hostile power of the Law, and not the Law itself, which has been blotted out. This is confirmed by Rom. 8.3f. 'For what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and....condemned sin (not the Law) in the flesh; so that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit'. The hostile power of the Law, because of 'sin in the flesh' is destroyed when Christ condemned sin in the flesh, and therefore made it possible for man to fulfil the Law.

Paul's soteriology is absolutely rooted and grounded in the death of Christ, in which he put off his body of flesh and so triumphed over every power ranged against man, and the resurrection, in which he was given a new body. 'For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified' (1 Cor. 2.2) and 'If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins' (1 Cor. 15.17) are the two foundations on which the whole of Paul's concept of salvation are built.

(iv) How Christ's triumph is for many

Whatever else 'putting off of the body of flesh' (Col. 2.11,15) may have meant, it certainly means that in death Christ makes a radical break with what has gone before, his solidarity with man 'in Adam' is broken, and for a moment he stands alone just as Adam stood alone in the beginning. This break

1. J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of New Testament Greek, illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources, 1952; cf. also Arndt and Gingrich, p. 839.

with his 'solidarity', for Paul, occurs when Christ dies. If Christ's death had 'happened to him' then that death would have been expressive of his solidarity with man 'in Adam', even though he 'knew no sin'. Such a death would have been the triumph of all the forces arrayed against 'man'. While there is a sense in which death 'happened to' Christ, there is also the more predominant sense in which the death of Christ was voluntary, an act of obedience to God (Rom. 5.19; Phil. 2.8). This means that his death was quite unlike the death of any other man. That he was able to die in this way is undoubtedly due to the fact that he was sinless, but, for Paul, it is not the sinlessness but the death which makes Christ unique and 'alone'.

This uniqueness and aloneness does not lead in itself to the resurrection. Paul does not say 'Christ rose' as if he were the agent of his resurrection, but rather that he was raised by God. It is true that if his death was not of the kind it was his 'end' would have been 'corruption' (Rom. 8.21), but it is also true that his the resurrection is the work of God. Consequently since his death is unique and in his death Christ is alone, so also his resurrection is unique and in his risen life Christ is, for a while, alone.

But no man is created to be alone nor would Paul's semitic totality thinking allow him to conceive of this as a possibility. The man who stands alone creates a new solidarity characterised by him in his uniqueness so that any man born into this solidarity is born also into a solidarity which bears the stamp of his uniqueness. When Adam sinned, men were born 'in Adam' and were 'caused to become sinners' who with Adam and like Adam must die. (cf Rom. 5.12, 1 Cor. 15.21f). Equally when Christ died in obedience and in the way he did, he did this 'for many', so that any man who is born 'into Christ' is 'caused to become righteous' (Rom. 5.19). He becomes the creator of a new humanity, or better, as it is expressed in Eph. 2.15f; 'Having abolished in his flesh, the law of commandments in ordinances; that he might create in himself of the twain one new man..... and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross.' Quite clearly 'in one body' here means both the church, the body of Christ, and also Christ himself on the Cross, and risen again. The phrase 'in himself' places the emphasis on Christ and 'in one body' on the Church but, as we shall see, these are emphases rather than distinctions.

Romans 6.3-8, like Galatians 3.27f, places this new beginning for man at baptism, not at natural human birth, emphasising the death and resurrection rather than the incarnation of Christ. We have already seen how Paul argues in Gal. 3.16 that God's promise is made to Abraham's seed, and takes this quite strictly in the singular and therefore as referring to 'one man'. That 'one man' is Christ. Now in the baptismal passage in v.27f we are told that those who have been baptised have 'put on Christ', so that they have become one man' in Christ, i.e. Christ and those baptised constitute 'one man'. This is made quite clear, when, remembering the stress on the singular in verse 16, Paul continues 'if ye are Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed (note the same phrase as in v.16) heirs according to the promises' (Gal. 3.29).

In Romans 6.3-8 the point is made more explicitly. The man who is baptised is 'baptised into his death'. Baptism is seen as actual participation in death, burial and resurrection with Christ. The baptismal death and resurrection is seen as contemporaneous with the events in the messianic life-story. In this passage there is however an apparent contrast between the participation in the death and the participation in the resurrection. The union with Christ's death is seen as already effected, but of the union with the risen life it is said 'if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall ^{1.} be also by the likeness of his resurrection'. On the other hand in Colossians ^{2.} and Ephesians we are already risen and ascended with Christ. As Thornton notes ^{3.} the difference of emphasis must not be unduly pressed. Even in Romans, where the future tense of 5.5 is repeated in verse 8, it can also be said;

'Even so reckon yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God' (Rom. 6.11) and 'Present yourselves unto God as alive from the dead' (Rom. 6.13). These future tenses in Romans, and yet the assumption that the Christian who has died is already made alive in his baptismal union stem from the dual implications in verse 4; 'we were buried with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life'. The point is that when we have died with Christ, then, in union with the risen Christ, we have a new possibility in life,

1. Cf also 1 Cor. 15.22,23 and also v.49. We shall bear the image of the heavenly man when we possess a spiritual body. Despite this we need to note that for Paul the Christian is already spiritual, even in the earlier epistles (Cf. 1 Cor. 2.14; 3.1; Gal. 6.1 etc.)

2. Col. 2.11-13; 3.1-4; Eph. 2.5,6.

3. L.S. Thornton, Common Life, 1950, p.60.

we can lead a new life - a life whose possibilities stem from Christ and being 'in Christ' instead of the old life whose possibilities stemmed from Adam and being 'in Adam'. Baptism marks the beginning of a new life whose limits and character have been set by the death and resurrection of Jesus, i.e. it is a life without limit in that it is a life of victory over every force which holds man in its sway. Therefore life 'in Christ' is 'eternal life' or, if we accept that Paul has the Hebrew sense of ^{1.} olam in mind, life to the full (Rom. 6.23, cf Rom. 5.21), which means essentially 'freedom from the yoke of bondage' (Gal. 5.1) Baptism marks this beginning just as natural birth marks the beginning of natural life, life in the flesh, whose limits (death) and character (sin) have been set by Adam's disobedience. I.e. Christ's death and resurrection is the beginning point of a new solidarity and we are included in that solidarity when, in the baptismal death and resurrection with Christ, we, with him, constitute 'one man'. (Gal. 3.27).

The new beginning is expressed in the grafting metaphor of Romans 6.5. Literally translated this verse reads 'If we have become united by growth with the likeness of his death, then we shall also be united by growth with the like-^{2.} ness of his resurrection.' The statement that 'we have become united by growth with the likeness of his death' (Rom. 6.5a) refers, as the context shows, to baptism, but to baptism regarded as the starting-point of a process. If in verse 4a Paul was using the metaphor of death and burial, of which baptismal immersion is a most appropriate symbol ('a burying together with him into his death'^{3.}) the change of metaphor to that of grafting suggests that this dying is a continuing organic process. This process of dying is expressed in Col. 3.5 'Mortify your members' which, as the R.V. margin reminds us, means that we are to make dead what has already died. Similarly the emergence from the waters marks our baptismal union with his risen life which, in the grafting metaphor, is again a process which is expressed in Col. 3.1f 'If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated on the right hand of God'.

That we 'have died' with Christ asserts the beginning of the process of continually dying 'in Christ'. That we 'have been raised with Christ' similarly asserts the beginning of a process of life in union with Christ which

1. Cf above p. 390f

2. Cf L.S. Thornton, op cit. - p.61 Thornton's analysis of the grafting metaphor is most penetrating.

3. So W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Romans (International Critical Commentaries) 1902, ad loc.

is the possibility of our walking in newness of life (Rom. 6.4) and which can also be expressed as 'we shall live with him', and, as Romans 6.11, 13 makes quite explicit, this is not simply a reference to the future general resurrection. Because of this the Christian life is a life 'in Christ' or 'in the Spirit'.¹

If ever we are to understand the complexity of meaning in the phrase 'in Christ', it must be remembered that Paul is unable to make any radical distinction between Christ and the church. In the account of Paul's conversion on the Damascus road we find stressed that the heart of the revelation which came to him was the fact that the Church he was trying to stamp out was no other than the risen Jesus himself:² 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I said, who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest' (Acts 9.4f; 22.7f; 26.14f). The foundation of Paul's whole faith, and his claim to apostleship, was based on an experience of the risen Lord not as an individual, but intimately related to the Christian community. When in 1 Cor. 15.8 Paul tells of the appearance of Christ to himself (with no evidence in any of Paul's writings to the contrary) it must be assumed that it is to that experience on the Damascus road that he is referring.

That this experience 'of Christ' intimately related to the Christian community left a lasting impression on Paul is widely evidenced in his letters. We find a clear echo of it in Phil. 3.6 and 12. More strongly, Paul says to the Corinthians; 'And thus, sinning against the brethren and wounding their conscience when it is weak, ye sin against Christ' (Cor. 8.12). Similarly to the Galatians he says: 'ye received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus' (Gal. 4.14), and, in dealing with the question of sexual promiscuity among the Corinthians he writes; 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ (implying that Christ is the whole body of which the individuals are members) shall I then take away the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot? God forbid. Or know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for the twain, saith he, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord (i.e. Christ) is one spirit'. (1 Cor. 6.15ff). The implication here is that just as when a man and woman are joined together in the sex act they

1. For Paul, for whom the last Adam 'became a life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. 15.45), these two expressions mean essentially the same thing. Cf W.Sanday and A.C. Headlam, *op. cit.*, in loc.; L.S. Thornton, *Common Life*, 1950, pp. 66-95.

2. Σαούλ, Σαούλ. The lapse into a Greek transliteration of the Aramaic of Paul's name, found nowhere else in the New Testament but in all three accounts of that experience, is some evidence that we have an indelible personal reminiscence.

become 'one body', so the members who are joined to Christ are 'one body' or 'one spirit'. In that intimate joining Christ and his 'members' are one indistinguishable whole. Because of this Paul can say 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal. 2.20), and mean this just as seriously as 'So it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me' (Rom. 7.17). Just as Paul knew himself, in Adam, to be inextricably caught up in the onward sweep of sin so that his every action was sin's, so now, 'in Christ' Christ is manifested in his every action.

Possibly the most significant expression of this idea is found in the Eucharistic discussion of 1 Cor. 11.17-34. Apparently the Eucharist, for the Corinthians, was something like a sacramental meal of a mystery religion, imparting immortality. Fellowship, therefore, was totally unimportant, the sacrament being an individual feeding with divine food nourishing the individual soul. In opposition to that Paul insists on the fact that they actually destroyed the sacrament by having destroyed the fellowship meal (1 Cor. 11.20). There is nothing at all to suggest that the Corinthians were not reverent towards the sacrament. This whole passage contains but one reproach; they celebrated the Lord's supper without waiting for the latecomers (1 Cor. 11.21, 23), and these latecomers were those who had nothing (1 Cor. 11.22) while the rest ate and drank their fill (1 Cor. 11.21). Paul is sober enough to understand that it is hard to be hungry and sit at a full table waiting, so he admonishes them, if they are hungry, to eat before they come.

It is the reasons which Paul gives for this censure and admonition of the Corinthians which are most illuminating. He begins by quoting the words of institution with which he is familiar; 'This is my body, which is for you' (1 Cor. 11.24). Schweizer, believing that Paul's concept of the church as the Body of Christ¹ was derived from the Eucharist, suggests that if the Aramaic equivalent for 'body' and not 'flesh' was used, it meant that the bread was a token ~~of the token~~ of the presence of Christ since the Aramaic term 'includes² both meanings, that of "body" as well as that of "self, ego"'. From this he concludes that the Church, hearing this phrase repeatedly in their Eucharists would have had indelibly impressed on their minds that as Jesus is the one

1. E. Schweizer, The Church as The Body of Christ, 1965, Cf also A.E.J. Rawlinson, Corpus Christi in Mysterium Christi, ed. G.K.A. Ball and A. Deissmann, 1930.

2. ibid p.25.

'for others' so the Church must be united in service of others. Self-seeking and self-indulgence in the Eucharistic meal, since it so directly contradicts 'my body for you', must destroy the very essence of the Eucharist, which is giving expression to being for others. 'A Lord's Supper without a church supper is perhaps not quite, but almost, as bad as a church supper without a Lord's Supper!' Such a moralistic interpretation is not able to do justice to the whole of Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 11.

Having quoted the words of institution, Paul continues 'wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' (verse 27). We have already seen how Paul's indictment of the Corinthians is not their lack of reverence towards the sacrament, but their self-indulgence at the expense of their less privileged brethren when they meet to celebrate the Lord's Supper. To 'eat and drink unworthily' here must be a reference to the fact that they do not wait for each other. We have also seen how Paul has just told his Corinthian readers that to 'sin against a brother is to sin against Christ' (1 Cor. 8.12), consequently their behaviour towards their brethren not their attitude to the Eucharistic food is what makes them 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord'. This is made even more explicit in what follows; 'For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if he discern (διακρίνων = recognise) not the body. For this cause many among you (ἐν ὑμῖν = in you) are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep. But if we discerned (διακρίνομεν = recognised) ourselves, we should not be judged.' (verses 29-31). Whatever the explanation of why it is that some of the Corinthians are suffering physically, and the suggestion that it is because they do not care for each other is surely credible,⁴ Paul's use of διακρίνω both of 'the body' and 'ourselves' and both in the context of judgement suggests very strongly that 'the body' and 'ourselves' mean the same thing. At the same time 'the body' repeats what has just been said of the Eucharistic bread, i.e. Christ himself. It would seem, therefore, that to recognise Christ is not simply to recognise Christ in his

1. ibid. p.37.

2. Paul's argument in this passage is not that the Church, the body of Christ, should be 'for others', i.e. those outside the Church. His whole concern is with the relations within the body. Thus it is not so much the body 'for others' which constitutes the basis of his argument, but rather the inter-relationships of the 'members' (or 'organs' cf below p.439) in the new organism which is Christ himself.

3. Cf Arndt and Gingrich, p.184.

4. E. Schweizer, The Church as the Body of Christ, 1965, p.36f.

act of giving himself 'for you' in the Eucharistic bread, but it is also to recognise Christ in the brother and fellow-communicant. To 'receive Christ' is therefore not simply to receive the bread but also to receive the brother. To despise the brother is to despise Christ, and no amount of sacramental piety or reverence will enable them to eat a Lord's Supper which is truly the Lord's Supper (verse 20).

Schweizer is right in his recognition that the unity and very existence of the Church is dependent on Christ. Paul himself makes this quite clear in the earlier eucharistic reference in his letter: 'Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for (γὰρ) we all partake of the one bread' (1 Cor. 10.17). Being 'one bread, one body' is entirely dependent on 'partaking of the one bread, which means Christ. But this passage itself has the same ambiguity about the 'one bread' (εἰς ἄρτος) as we found in Chapter II. Here the 'one bread' and 'one body' are used both of Christ and the communicants. This suggests that becoming 'one bread' means partaking both of Christ and one another, or better, that we 'partake of Christ' both when we partake of the eucharistic bread and when we partake of one another.

This being so it is this theme which is taken up and developed by Paul in Chapter II. The Corinthians appear to be saying 'The sacrament is the thing'. Paul would not have disagreed that it is important, but points to what to him is the more important, or at least equally important, way in which to 'partake of Christ' and that is to 'partake of each other', which is precisely what the Corinthians were refusing to allow to the 'have-not' latecomers in relation to themselves, and to themselves in relation to them. Equally Paul is saying 'If Christ, through the eucharist; creates you to be one body in himself, then your actions are denying the reality of the sacrament'. For Paul, therefore unity with Christ means unity with one another, and being 'in Christ' means being 'in one another' (cf Eph. 4.25 'We are members one of another' and 1 Cor. 6.15 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ').

This solidarity of Christ and the Christians as 'one body', so that

1. This being so (and confirmed as being so, as we shall see, in 1 Cor. 10.14ff) classical theology's attempt to locate the real presence of Christ in the eucharist primarily in the eucharistic elements of bread and wine, represents but half of Paul's thinking. That 'real presence' is also in the brother. A sacramental piety, for Paul, which seeks a union with Christ through the elements but not at the same time through the brother is no Lord's Supper (1. Cor. 11.20).

any individual is the whole, must not lead us to assume that, for Paul, there is an identity without remainder of Christ and the Church, or that Christ is simply one among many. While Paul can say that when any member of the body suffers the whole body suffers (1 Cor. 12.26) his leading concept is that the whole body is Christ not any other member, so that the whole (which is Christ) may be manifested in any part. We have seen that for the Hebrews the outstanding individual was crucial in the concept of corporate personality, in that he constitutes the 'personality' of the corporate body of which he is the dynamic heart. Thus, while the **individual** is not swallowed up in the community nor identical with it, nor is he separable from the community. Precisely the same duality is to be found in Paul's thought.

The cruciality of Christ - the individual Jesus - is everywhere in evidence in Paul's letters. The watch-word 'in Christ' is sufficient proof of this; e.g.

'One died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again. Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet we know him so no more. Wherefore if any man is in Christ he is a new creature: the old things have passed away; behold they have become new' (2 Cor. 5.14ff).

Nothing could be more explicit. Whatever can be said of the Christian has one basis and one basis only, what Christ has done (or better what God has done through Christ). The old things have passed away for the Christian because the old things pass away when Christ died and rose. All things have become new in that same event.

At the same time that event cannot stand isolated from a new solidarity of which he is the fons et origo (or rather it is God/or through him). In many metaphors Paul attempts to describe that new 'solidarity'; in baptism we are become 'grafted into the likeness of his death and resurrection' (Rom. 6.5); 'buried with him and raised with him' (e.g. Rom. 6.4, Col. 2.11-13; 3.1-4; Eph. 2.5,6); we 'put on Christ' and were 'baptised into Christ' (εἰς Χριστὸν) (Gal. 3.27); and were 'created in Christ Jesus' (Eph. 2.10).

What this 'putting on Christ' means is putting on a 'new humanity' or 'the new man' (Eph. 2.24, cf. 2 Cor. 5.17; Gal. 6.15) or even that they no longer live 'in this world' (Col. 2.20; cf. Col. 1.13, we are 'translated into
 1. both in the historical sense of doing something in history and in the sense of the ongoing impact of that event making it contemporaneous with and effective in 'later' events.

the kingdom of the Son of His love'). As soon as Paul says that we have been joined to Christ in this way, which means being joined 'in Christ' to the new humanity, the inevitable consequence is that every old division between men falls away. Therefore, because of our baptismal union with Christ 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3.24). Similarly when in baptism a man 'puts on the new man' (Eph. 4.24) 'we are members one of another' (Eph. 3.25).

All of this indicates that, for Paul, Christ not only creates the 'new humanity' but so completely pervades the whole of it that Paul can speak of the Church as 'the body of Christ'; that in persecuting the Church Paul knows that he is persecuting Christ; that to sin against a brother is to sin against Christ; that his own life is Christ's. Consequently life 'in Christ' is not primarily a mystical relationship with the crucified and risen Christ, it is primarily a life rooted and created in the 'new thing' that happened when Christ died and was raised and also rooted in every other man who is created anew in that creative event. Being 'in Christ' is having such a sense of belonging to that event in history that I am changed by it, and such a sense of belonging to every man 'in Christ' as to Christ that I am continually being changed by him and he by me. But Christ, my neighbour and I form such a compact whole, with Christ as its sole ground, that to attempt to make neat and clear-cut individual distinctions between us is doomed to failure unless we choose to ignore the dynamic and 'felt' inter-relationships which constitute the whole. As individuals who can be 'dated' and 'placed' we are, of course, distinct. But this is an abstraction from life which is experienced as the impact and inter-change of persons as they relate to one another under the impact of a past which is never really gone. Because Paul, with his Hebraic background, understands life in this way the essential significance of Christ is that, in history, he died and was raised and in that event constituted a new beginning. The heart of Paul's Gospel is not that the risen and ascended Christ is now continually available to set men free, it is rather that 'with freedom Christ did set us free' (ἡλευθέρωσεν) (Gal. 5.1). Our redemption has its roots completely and absolutely in history, and specifically in the death and resurrection. It is Paul's sense of history coupled with his acceptance of man's solidarity in history which makes Paul focus all his attention

1. Note Paul's deliberate use of the aorist rather than present, stressing thereby the 'once-for-allness' of that event in history.

on that decisive event rather than any morbid fascination with the Cross which some believe almost reduces the resurrection in the thought of Paul to an after-thought. For Paul the resurrection is crucial (cf 1 Cor. 15.17) but as an event in history more than as a present reality of the risen Christ.^{1.}

With this general introduction in mind we can turn to see how Paul applies Christ's victory over his bondage to man's deliverance from his four-fold bondage.

1. In relation to sin.

'Our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, so that we should no longer be in bondage to sin' (Rom. 6.6); 'they that are of Jesus Christ have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof' (Gal. 5.24). Of these two assertions Robinson says 'Christians are those who have repeated in their flesh the process of the Cross'.^{2.} Everything that we have said so far makes it plain that the idea is not that of 'repetition', it is rather that of 'identification'. When the Christian 'dies' in baptism he is there 'with' or 'in' Christ on the Cross.

It is only when we appreciate the literalness with which Paul conceived of being 'in Christ' that we can appreciate how it is that Christ's death 'to sin' can be our death 'to sin' (Rom. 6.2). When Paul says that the baptised are 'all one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3.28), the thought is not that Christ is 'one man' and we are all united to him by our allegiance as quasi-separate units. Rather having 'put on Christ' (Gal. 3.27) we are 'one man', Abraham's seed (Gal. 3.29), which seed is Christ (Gal. 3.16) Similarly Paul can describe Christians as 'members of Christ' (1 Cor. 6.15) (1 Cor. 6.15) and understand that just as any organ of the human body constitutes an organic unit, so Christ and the Christians form an 'organic unit'. Again, when Paul says; 'that he might create in himself of the twain (Jews and Gentiles) one new man... and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross' (Eph. 2.15f cf Rom. 7.4) it is facile to ask whether Paul is referring to Jesus or the Church. It is even confusing to say that he is referring to both for this might imply that he conceived of Christ and the Church as distinct entities. So close knit is the solidarity between Christ and the Christian that the past of Christ and the present of the Christian are contemporaneous and Christ encloses the Christian in himself as

1. Note again the use of the Pluperfect (ἐξηγήσατο), 'If Christ had not been raised' (1 Cor. 15.14,17).
 2. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.44, an assertion which he himself recognises as inadequate and misleading, cf. pp.45ff.

one new being as the yolk of an egg is enclosed in its shell (if the farm-yard metaphor is any more helpful than Paul's 'body' preference). Because Christ and the baptized form one body or one new man, the divisions among the Corinthians lead Paul to ask them the strange question 'Is Christ divided?' (1 Cor. 1.13). If Christ were 'divided' it would be possible to be 'in Christ' and yet divided into conflicting parties. Since, however, Christ is 'one body' so are the Christians as 'organs' of that body.

When we are told, therefore, that 'he died unto sin, once' (Rom. 6.10) and that in baptism we died with Christ (Rom. 6.3f), the conclusion is that we also have 'died to sin' (Rom. 6.2) and as a result 'sin shall not have dominion over you' (Rom. 6.14) because we have been 'made free from sin' (Rom. 6.12, 22; 8.2). The reason for this is that in baptism we have 'put off the body of flesh' (Col. 2.11) and been 'quickened together with him' (Col. 2.13), or 'put off the old man' (Eph. 4.22) and 'put on the new man' (Eph. 4.24), i.e. the Christian in baptism, participates in Christ's 'break' with the old solidarity 'in Adam' in which a man is 'caused to become a sinner' (Rom. 5.19), and participates also in the new solidarity which has come through the 'obedience' of Christ (Rom. 5.19, Phil. 2.8) and his resurrection. It is this death and resurrection of Christ and our participation 'in' it which liberates us from the dominion of sin (1 Cor. 15.17). In the old solidarity 'in Adam' men are 'caused to become sinners' and must die (Rom. 5.12,19; 1 Cor. 15.21). By breaking with this old solidarity in being baptized 'into Christ' (Gal. 3.27) in his death and resurrection, the Christian is 'made alive' (1 Cor. 15.22), 'walks in newness of life' (Rom. 6.4), or is 'quickened together with him' (Col. 2.13).

This does not mean that the man 'in Christ' is sinless. If that were so the injunction, 'Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body that ye should obey the lusts thereof' (Rom. 6.12), would be meaningless as would be all Paul's ethical injunctions. Paul's thought appears rather to be that because of the new thing that has happened in Christ man has the real possibility of breaking free from the historical and social strangle-hold of sin. Consequently he prefers to speak of 'being set free' (Gal. 2.4; 5.1,13; Rom. 6.18, 22; 8.2), 'created anew' (2 Cor. 5.17; Gal. 6.15; Eph. 4.23,24; Col. 3.10), being 'caused to become righteous' (Rom. 5.19), or 'walking in newness of life' rather than being

1. 'forgiven'. Paul's use of ἀπολύτρωσις², as Dodd has shown, means essentially an act of God in history by which the 'slave' is set free from his slavery. All of this points to the historical and social dynamic which Paul perceived in the death and resurrection of Christ. It is an event with profound consequences in history rather than a transaction between Christ and God on our behalf. It is an event which is 'for us' in the dynamic of human solidarity. While it is true that for Paul our righteousness is 'by faith' (e.g. Rom. 1.17) it is also true that 'through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous' (Rom. 5.19), i.e. Paul does not conceive of the righteousness-creating 'faith' as distinct from the righteousness-creating 'event'. Faith is faith in him who has transformed and is transforming history, and is itself a response and a gift (Eph. 2.8).

Consequently a man is set free from sin by being incorporated 'into Christ', which means being incorporated into that 'body' of men who are 'in Christ', and being transformed by that new history whose possibility and character is derived from the death and resurrection of Christ - i.e. his 'break' from the old solidarity 'in Adam' through his 'putting off of the body of flesh'. In this new solidarity 'in Christ' a man is enabled to break free from sin's dominion.

2. In relation to death.

When Paul says 'Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him' (Rom. 6.9), the inevitable consequence is that those who are 'in Christ' possess 'life' (Rom. 6.11, 23; 8.2), and are 'made alive' (1 Cor. 15.22). It is 'with Christ' that they have been raised (Col. 2.12; 3.1; Eph. 2.6), quickened (Col. 2.13; Eph. 2.5), exalted (Eph. 2.6), and trust to be glorified (Rom. 8.17). He is delivered from the 'body of death' (Rom. 7.24) and made 'free from the law of sin and death' (Rom. 8.2)

Again the basis for these assertions appears to be that in baptism the Christians 'put off the body of the flesh' (Col. 2.11), or 'Put off the old man' (Col. 3.9, Eph. 4.22), just as Christ 'put off his flesh' (Col. 2.15, Eph. 4.21)

1. Paul's use of 'forgive' (χαρίζομαι, ἀφίημι) where God or Christ is the agent is confined to Colossians and Ephesians (Col. 1.14; 2.13; 3.13; Eph. 1.7; 4.32), and in Col. 1.14 and Eph. 1.7, where ἀφίημι (whose root meaning is to go away or leave) used together with ἀπολύτρωσις (whose root meaning is liberate) the idea is not so much that of a legal acquittal as a liberating event.

2. Rom. 3.24; 8.23; 1 Cor. 1.30; Eph. 1.7; Col. 1.14.

3. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.77; Cf also Arndt and Gingrich, p.95.

Having also 'put on the new man' (Col. 3.10, Eph. 4.24) which is Christ (Gal. 3.27) the Christian is made so completely one with Christ that Christ's liberation from death's lordship is his also. He is already 'alive from the dead' (Rom. 6.13), a 'new creature' (2 Cor. 5.17). Because of the corporate identity of the Church with Christ, for Paul the risen body of Christ is the Church. While Paul knows perfectly well that it is the 'Church of God' that he persecuted (1 Cor. 15.9; Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.6) he knows also that it is Jesus whom he is persecuting (Acts 9.4f, 22.7f; 26.14f). It would be true to say that Christ is encountered both 'in' the Church and 'as' the Church. The Church as the body of Christ, or 'in Christ' (1 Thess. 2.14), or Christ 'in' it (e.g. Gal. 4.19; Col. 3.11.) is that new reality which has triumphed over death's dominion through sin.

3. In relation to the powers

As Christ triumphed over the principalities and powers when he stripped himself of his flesh (Col. 2.15) so those who have 'died with Christ' have died ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου (Col. 2.20), which Robinson renders 'out from under the elements of the world', when in baptism they 'put off the body of the flesh' (Col. 2.11). In consequence they live no longer 'in this world' (Col. 2.20), the sphere in which these powers exercise their dominion, but have been 'translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love' (Col. 1.13).

It would appear also that the Christians have not simply been removed from the sphere of the dominion of the powers, but also participate in Christ's subjection of them. In Col. 2.8ff the reference to the 'rudiments of the world' is followed immediately by the assertion that 'in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily' (verse 9 cf. Col. 1.19) and 'in him, who is the head of all principality and power, ye are made full'. The probable meaning here is that in the risen and ascended Christ all the fullness of God's action in the world is concentrated, which means at the same time that those who are 'in him' are 'made full' by virtue of their being 'in him'. This fullness resides in him who in 'putting off the body of the flesh' triumphed over the principalities and powers (verse 15) and has become their 'head' (verse 10). In baptism the Christian too 'puts off the body of the flesh', is buried with Christ and raised with him (verses 11-13), and 'in him' is filled with his fullness (verse 10). The implication can only be that in this baptismal death and resurrection the Christian participates in Christ's triumph over the powers and his 'headship'.

of them.

A similar trend of thought, expressing even more forcefully the 'solidarity' of Christ and the Church, is found in the exceedingly difficult and much-debated passage Eph. 1.22f.

'He (the Father) put all things in subjection under his (Christ's) feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who all in all is being filled'. (2)

As in Colossians this assertion occurs in the context of a description of how in the ascension Christ has been exalted above 'all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, . . . ' and the assertion that 'all things have been put in subjection under his feet' means the same as that Christ is 'head of all principality and power' (Col. 2.10). It is this subjecting 'head' whom God has given 'to the Church', which church, we are told is the 'fullness of him who all in all is being filled'. As Knox, Thornton, and Robinson point out it is God who is 'filling' Christ.³ The meaning is then that as God 'fills' Christ, that which bears the fullness is not Christ alone but 'the church which is his body'. With Paul's conception of the relationship between Christ and the church it would have been impossible for him to conceive of Christ being filled without in that same event the church being filled. Consequently, the church bearing the same fullness it is the church also which participates in Christ's subjection of all things. And 'in Christ' we are raised and 'made to sit with him in the heavenly places' (Eph. 2.6) which, as Eph. 1.21 makes plain, is the source of Christ's dominion.

Again it must be noted that Paul's thought is not so much that because Christ has gained the victory over the powers, we can reap the subsequent benefits of that victory. The truth is that we are 'quickened together with Christ', raised up 'with him' and share his heavenly session 'in him'. (Eph. 2.5, 6). When we with the atomistic and individualistic pre-suppositions of our thought try to interpret Paul, we tend to think that because Christ defeated the powers they are now vanquished for us just as because Hitler was defeated in the Second World War we can now live in a world free from his threat. But Paul, with his

1. For discussions on these verses cf. J. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, 1904. pp. 42-45, 152, 255-259. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, 1939, p.186f; L.S. Thornton, Common Life, 1950, pp. 288-319; C.F.D. Moule, "'Fullness" and "Fill" in the New Testament, SJT, March, 1951, pp. 79-86.

2. There is no justification whatever in the translation of the passive (or middle) πληρουμένου as 'who filleth', as in the A.V. and R.V.

3. W.L. Knox, op. cit. p.186; L.S. Thornton, op. cit. p.297; J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.69. But cf. J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit. ad loc., who maintains that Christ is being filled by Christians, the members of his body.

totality thinking which enables him to speak of the past and present as contemporaneous, says that 'in Christ' we are actually participating in his death, resurrection, and ascension victory. Consequently the battle against the 'powers' is not over for us (cf Eph. 6.12, 'our wrestling is not against flesh and blood but against the principalities and powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places'). Rather, we are there with Christ facing precisely the same enemies of sin, death, and the powers, and triumphing with him. The battle is not over, but 'in him' the victory is secure because it is his victory. It is this conception that enables Paul to say both that we have died from the rudiments of this world (Col. 2.20), and yet that the battle against the powers continues (Eph. 6.12), both that we have died to sin (Rom. 6.2) and 'let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies' (Rom. 6.12); we have died and yet are to 'mortify your members which are upon the earth' (Col. 2.20; 3.5); we have been raised together with Christ, and yet are to 'seek the things that are above' (Col. 3.1f).

However difficult it may be for us to conceive of participating in a battle which has already been won, there can be no doubt that this is what Paul means by dying and rising with Christ or being in Christ.

4. In relation to the Law

'Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead' (Rom. 7.4). Here the words underlined mean both 'through the fact that Christ in his flesh-body died to the law' and 'through the fact that you are now joined and are part of that body'. The use of 'both...and' here is, as we have seen, somewhat misleading. These are two emphases rather than two senses. 'All attempts to distinguish in the relevant passages between the personal and the mystical body of Christ are inevitably doomed to failure. The obscurity was intended by Paul. The body of Christ is no longer thought of by him as an isolated entity, but as the point from which the dying and rising again, which began with Christ, passes over to the Elect who are united with him'. Consequently Paul can say 'I.....died unto the law.....I have been crucified with Christ' (Gal. 2.19f).

1. The closest I can get to this concept is to revert to the film analogy. When the film producer with all his psychological techniques is able to identify me with his hero, I am there with him, fighting his battle, sharing his agonies and fears, but also gaining his victory and knowing his relations in myself.
2. Cf above p.432f
3. A. Schweitzer, The mysticism of the Apostle Paul, 1931, p.118

The logic rests on the principle 'that the law hath dominion over a man for so long time as he liveth (Rom. 7.1) and the Christian is the man who has died with and in Christ. Consequently he is not 'under the law' (Gal. 5.18); he is free from the law which issues in sin and death (Rom. 8.2). Yet because of the literalness with which Paul takes the concept of dying 'with' Christ, i.e. facing and defeating the same dominion of the law, Paul can ask 'if ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why.... do ye subject yourselves to ordinances?' (Col. 2.20).

(b) Paul's Ecclesiology

In dealing with Paul's soteriology we have already had to deal at some length with Paul's ecclesiology, for both rest finally on his concept of the solidarity of man, a solidarity which has both historical and social dimensions. The link between Paul's soteriology and his ecclesiology is expressed most clearly in the passage in Rom. 7.4 which we have just examined; 'Wherefore my brethren, ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead'. In this assertion there is an equal emphasis on the body on the Cross and the Church, which is one with Christ's crucified and risen body. In Col. 1.21 ('you.... hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death'), the emphasis is placed on the body on the Cross, and its doublet in Eph. 2.15f ('that he.... might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the Cross'), places the emphasis on the church.

If we remember how realistically Paul conceived of the Christian being baptised 'into Christ' and dying and rising 'with' him, so that the Christian's baptismal death and resurrection is so contemporaneous with Christ's that he conceives of it as being involved in the same struggle against the hostile forces and participating in Christ's triumph, then it should be clear that the Church cannot be spoken of simply as the 'body of the resurrection'. It is rather Christ and the Christian going together through the whole process of redemption without this in any way implying that there could be salvation if Christ had not first in his death and resurrection broken the old solidarity which held men in bondage and created the new solidarity. While Eph. 2.15 might place the emphasis on the church, it cannot be denied that the phrase 'in one body.... through the cross' refers to the church intimately united with the ^{1.} As does J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p. 49.

body on the Cross. At the same time 'that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead' (Rom. 7.4) implies a close organic link with the risen Christ. Paul's conception of the Church is rooted and grounded in his concept of its contemporaneity and solidarity with Christ in the process of redemption in the Cross, resurrection, and exaltation.

From this it follows that the whole of Paul's doctrine of the Church is an extension, or better, a parallel of his Christology. Although there is some evidence of a group of people being referred to as a 'body' at the beginning^{1.} of the Christian era Paul does not speak of a 'body of Christians', but of the 'body of Christ'. This distinction is important. We have become so familiar with calling a collection of people or a society a 'body', that it is difficult always to appreciate what violence Paul has done to language when he speaks of the Church as the body of a single historical individual. 'To call the Church τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ was to draw attention to it not primarily as a^{2.} collection of men, but primarily as Christ Himself in His own being and life'.

We have also become so familiar with the concept of being members of a^{3.} corporate body that the materialism and crudity of Paul's conception 'Ye are the body of Christ and severally members thereof' (1 Cor. 12.27) is best expressed^{4.} in Dodd's paraphrase 'Ye are the body of Christ and severally organs thereof'. Just as my body as a single organic unit is made up of a number of inter-related tissues and organs, so the Church is made up of a number of inter-related tissues and organs, but the organic unit that is the body is none other than the Carpenter of Nazareth. As the crucified, risen, ascended and glorified Christ he has no 'body' other than this one, the Church.

So close and so physical is the relation between Christ and the Church that Paul does not hesitate to use the most physical and most intimate union between persons to express it, the sexual union, the act in which a man and a woman become 'one flesh'. He writes: 'Know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for, The twain, saith he, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined (κολλησθαι, the LXX word for the sexual union, cf. Gen. 2.24),

1. Most notably that cited by T.W. Manson, *JTS*, Vol. 37, 1936, p.385, from a fragment in the year 7/6 B.C., where it is used of a 'body' of Greeks. Cf also G.C. Richards, *JTS*. Vol. 38, 1937, p.165. W.L. Knox also instances the Stoic concept of the universe as a body, *JTS*, Vol. 39, 1938, pp.243-246, cf also E. Schweizer, *The Church as the Body of Christ*, 1965, pp. 9ff. It is hardly likely that Paul derived his usage from this Stoic conception for apart from the assertion that Christ is the 'head of all things' (Eph. 1.22) or the 'head of all principality and power' (Col. 2.10), Paul does not use body metaphors to express Christ's lordship over all things. His usage is limited to the Church.
2. A.M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 1956, p.35
3. So A.J.T. Robinson, *The Body*, 1963, p.51.
4. C.H. Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, 1956, p.154.

to the Lord is one spirit' (1 Cor. 6.16f). The idea here is that the Christians have become 'joined' to the last Adam, who has become a 'life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. 15.45) and are thus already a 'spiritual body'. The concept of a 'spiritual body' in no way suggests that the Christians are joined to Christ as 'spirits' rather than as $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, for the opposite of 'spiritual body' is 'natural body', i.e. that totality which has its foundation in Adam (1 Cor. 15.44ff). In 1 Cor. 6.15 it is explicitly stated that it is our 'bodies' which are 'organs' of Christ.

Just how intimate is the 'union' Paul conceives to be achieved through sex is seen when he can write -

'If any brother hath an unbelieving wife, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not leave her. And the woman which hath an unbelieving husband, let her not leave her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean; but now they are holy'. (1 Cor. 7.12-14).

The idea here is that in the physical contact and intimacies of marriage the one is so included in the other that he or she shares in the other's being 'in Christ'. Without either their willingness or faith they share in the believing partner's death and resurrection with Christ. Similarly the children of such a marriage share, through the believing parent, in that attachment to Christ which makes them also 'organs' of Christ.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find Paul working out in some detail Christ's relation with the Church in terms of the marriage union. In Eph. 5.28-32 he says that a husband ought to love his wife as his own body for, in reality, 'he that loveth his own wife loveth himself'. The man who does not love his own wife is being as unnatural as the man who does not care for his own body; 'even as Christ also the church'. The implication here is that in loving the church Christ is by no means loving another, but in fact loving and caring for himself, his own body.

When this is remembered, it should be obvious that Paul, taking for granted that Christ is one (cf 1 Cor. 12.12) also takes it for granted that the church is one. Where the disunity of Christians arises this is seen as the most monstrous thing imaginable, for it implies that Christ himself is divided (1 Cor. 1.13). His problem, as Robinson so ably points out, is not how many individual persons can be united, but how Jesus can be many persons.¹ In

1. J.A.T. Robinson, *The Body*, 1963, p.58.

1 Cor. 12.12ff the presupposition is the being-one-thing of Christ and the body, and then Paul proceeds to show that no body can consist of any one single organ, but to be a body at all it must consist of a number of inter-related and inter-dependent 'organs'. 'The corporal unity of the glorified Lord is axiomatic:
 1.
 it is never a conclusion from diversity.' Thus also: 'The members of the body, being many, are one body' (1 Cor. 12.12); 'Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body' (1 Cor. 10.17); 'So we, who are many, are one body in Christ' (Rom. 12.5); 'All you are one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3.28). Whatever diversity there is in the operations of the body arises out of and does not lead to the fact of this unity (cf. 1 Cor. 12.4-31; Rom. 12.3-8; Eph. 4.1-16). Whatever, therefore, disrupts this unity destroys, in that act, the body of Christ, such as the behaviour of the Corinthians at the Eucharist towards their fellow-'organs' (1 Cor. 11.17ff).

Robinson argues that the principle with which Paul is working is the
 2.
 Old Testament doctrine of the remnant and election. While it is true that under the old covenant Paul sees a gradual process of exclusion: Out of all mankind God chose Abraham to found, on behalf of 'many nations' (Rom. 4.17f), his people, Israel. Yet Abraham's line is continued through Isaac, the child of promise, and Ishmael was rejected (Rom. 9.7-9; Gal. 4.30), then through Jacob, and Esau is excluded (Rom. 9.10f.). The same principle was at work in the case of the remnant under Elijah (Rom. 11.2-4) and Isaiah (Rom. 9.27-29). Robinson concludes that 'finally, the true seed of Abraham had been narrowed down to one man, Jesus Christ (Gal. 3.16).... But now, Paul proclaims that the principle of exclusion has been set in reverse. Henceforward it is not the one who
 3.
 represents the many.... Rather, it is the many who represent the one.' A more careful analysis of the passage in Gal. 3.16 to which Robinson points, however, indicates that Paul believed that all along Abraham's 'seed' was a single individual, Christ. When he concludes that those who have 'put on' Christ have all become 'one man in Jesus Christ', so literally does he take this 'one man' that they are Abraham's seed, i.e. that single individual, Christ, referred to in verse 16 (Gal. 3.27ff). Consequently it would be more true to say that the many are the one rather than that they 'represent' him. Because they are the one who 'died' for all' (2 Cor. 5.14; and we must note carefully that Paul says

1. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.60

2. ibid p.60. Cf also C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.187; A.M. Ramsay, The Gospel and the Catholic Church, 1956, Chs. 11 and 111, among others.

3. ibid p.61.

'one died for all therefore all died') there can no longer be any exclusion from being 'in him', their identity is so completely Christ's that other identities such as being a Jew or a Gentile, a bondman or a servant, a male or a female have become irrelevant (Gal. 3.28; Eph. 2.14ff). This does not at all mean that every man does possess this Christ-identity or that there is no longer any exclusion from the covenant promises. Rather, there are only two sorts of identity, being 'in Adam' and being 'in Christ', we are either grafted into the stock of Christ (σύμθοτοι) (Rom. 6.5); συγκαινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης (fellow-partakers of the root) (Rom. 11.17) or χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, cut off from Christ (Eph. 2.12f); κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, severed from Christ (Gal. 5.4); ἔξεκλάσθησαν, broken off from the root (Rom. 11.20).

All of Paul's descriptions of the Church are designed to express this organic, spatial, and temporal 'oneness' with Christ. The organic oneness is expressed both in the grafting metaphors and in the concept of Christians as being the very 'organs' or 'tissues' or 'limbs' which compose Christ as his body. In Colossians and Ephesians Christ is no longer spoken of as that body of which we are the organs, but as the head of the body of which we are the limbs. As we have seen, this is closely connected with the doctrine of the 'fulness' of Christ. When Christ the head is filled with all the fullness of God, then the whole body is filled with that same fullness. The idea here is the same as in 1 Cor. 12.26; 'Whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it'.

It is this organic concept which must govern the interpretation of the phrase 'putting on the new man' (Eph. 4.24, Col. 3.10). This does not mean that each person puts on a new and better self individually. Rather it means 'putting on Christ' (Gal. 3.27), and that the whole body of Christ. Thus Eph. 4.24f; 'Put on the new man....Wherefore...speak ye truth...for we are members one of another' Col. 3.10: 'Ye have put on the new man...where there cannot be Greek or Jew', and Gal. 3.27f; 'you....did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek...for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus'.

The spatial 'oneness' is expressed in the being 'in Christ' and Christ 'in us'. The fact that Paul can use both expressions shows just how organically this spatial metaphor is conceived. One can say that a pebble is 'in' a box, one could not say that the same box is in the same pebble at the

1. Cf above p. 435 f.

same time. Biologically it is quite proper to speak of the flower being in the genes and the genes in the flower, and one's choice of the variants would depend on the direction in which the relationship is being conceived at the particular moment. Having Christ or the Spirit 'in us', expresses the direction of the organic relationship from the source of the life of the body. Being 'in Christ' or 'in the Spirit', like the grafting metaphor, expresses how we can be in a position to be fed by the source.

The temporal 'oneness' is expressed in being 'with Christ'; 'we were buried with him' (συνετάφημεν . . . αὐτῷ) (Rom. 6.4; Col. 2.12); 'crucified with him' (συνεσταυρώθη) (Rom. 6.6, Gal. 2.20); 'died with Christ' (ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ) (Rom. 6.8; Col. 2.20); 'raised with him' (συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ) (Col. 3.1; 2.12; cf Eph. 2.6); 'quicken together with him' (συνεζωποίησεν σὺν αὐτῷ) (Col. 2.13); 'suffer with him' (συνπάσχομεν) (Rom. 8.17); 'glorified with him' (συνδοξασθῶμεν) (Rom. 8.17); 'made to sit with him (συνεκάθεισεν) in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2.5f;). This 'withness', coupled so often with baptism, or being 'in Christ' or having Christ 'in me', quite clearly does not represent an external association. It is rather contemporary oneness.

When Paul switches from these organic and marriage union metaphors to describe the Church in its Christ-identity to his other important metaphor, that of a building or a temple it is significant to note that it is used always to express the relationship with God or the Spirit of God, not the relationship with Christ. Thus: 'We are God's building' (1 Cor. 3.9); 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? . . . The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are' (1 Cor. 3.16f); 'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have from God? (1 Cor. 6.19); 'we are a temple of the living God' (2 Cor. 6.16). In that building or temple Christ is not the indwelling deity, but the 'foundation' (1 Cor. 3.11) or 'the chief corner stone' (Eph. 2.20). But immediately Christ is spoken of as this corner stone, it becomes apparent that this whole building is 'in' the corner stone; In whom, each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; In whom ye are also builded together

1. Since Paul can say 'The last Adam became a life-giving spirit' it is clear that he does not conceive of a radical distinction between the risen Christ and the Spirit (1 Cor. 15.45). Thus Rom. 8, where 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit' appear to mean precisely the same thing, must present insuperable exegetical problems to those who approach the chapter with Nicene Trinitarian pre-suppositions.

for a habitation of God in the Spirit' (Eph. 2.21f).

Similarly when Paul speaks of the ἐκκλησία it is the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ (cf. 1 Cor. 1.2; 10.32; 11.16 22; 15.9; Gal. 1.13; 1 Thess. 2.14). Where the Church's relation to Christ is expressed it is the Church of God which is 'in Christ Jesus' (1 Thess. 2.14). Gal. 1.22 has only 'in Christ' omitting 'of God'. Rom. 16.16 is unique in speaking of the churches 'of Christ' (τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Schmidt, following Deissmann, notes that the Genitive here has the same meaning as the formula 'in Christ' for Paul does interchange^{1.} between the 'in'-formula and the Genitive in many other passages. The ἐκκλησία is essentially God's gathering 'in Christ', and, as Schmidt notes 'Christ is the ἐκκλησία itself' although at the same time he is lord and head^{2.} of the Church which is his body.

Because Paul conceives of the Church as a Christ-organism with a Christ-identity, it follows that his ecclesiology is his Christology. If Jesus is the Christ, then the Church 'in Christ' is the 'body of Christ'. If^{3.} Jesus is the Son of God then we are 'sons of God', called to participate in the Son of God (1 Cor. 1.9) and as children of God 'joint-heirs' with Christ (literally, of: συνκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ) (Rom. 8.17)^{4.}. Our 'adoption' (υἱοθεσία) is wholly 'through Christ' (διὰ...Χριστοῦ) (Eph. 1.5). If Jesus is the 'seed of Abraham' (Gal. 3.16) then those who are Christ's are Abraham's seed (Gal. 3.29), and joint-heirs with Christ of the promises (Rom. 8.17, cf Rom. 4.13). If Christ is being filled then the Church is the fullness (Eph. 1.23, Col. 2.9f). If Christ is 'of heaven', (1 Cor. 15.47) then we shall bear the image of the heavenly (1 Cor. 15.49).

(c) God Christ and the Church

We are now in a better position to consider the relationship between the Church and God, and the first thing to be noted in this regard is that God's redeeming relationship with men is 'through' or 'in' Christ. The instances of this are too frequent to quote in full, so we shall confine our attention to the clearest expressions of this. Thus 2 Cor. 5.14-19; 'For the

1. K.L. Schmidt, ἐκκλησία, TWNT, Vol. 11. For evidence of the interchange of the 'in'-formula and the genitive in Paul, cf M. Deissmann, Paulus, 1925, pp. 126f.

2. K.L.Schmidt, op.cit., p 345.

3. Cf Rom. 1.4,9; 5.10; 8.3,29,32; 1 Cor. 1.9; 2 Cor. 1.19; Gal. 1.16; 2.20; 4.4,6; Eph. 4.13; Col. 1.13; 1 Thess. 1.10.

4. Cf also Rom. 8.14,19; (υἱοὶ Θεοῦ); Phil 2.15 (τέκνα Θεοῦ).

love of God constraineth us; because we thus judge that one died for all therefore all died and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again.... Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation. To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself¹; Rom. 3.24, 'Being justified freely by his (God's) grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus'; 2 Cor. 1.21, 'now he that stablishes us with you in Christ, and anointed us, is God'; 1 Cor. 15.57, 'Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ'; Gal. 3.14 'Upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; Col. 1.14, 'Who (i.e. God) delivered us out of the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins'. , Col. 1.20 'And through him (Christ) to reconcile all things unto himself, (God) having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens'; Eph. 1.5, 'Having fore-ordained us unto the adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself' (God).

How this redemption is achieved 'through' Christ is expressed most fully in Rom. 3.21-26, which needs to be taken together with what we have already said about the manner of Christ's death and his resurrection and our incorporation into that event. 'But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested....even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ.... being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a mercy seat² (ἰλαστήριον), through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness.... that he might be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus'.

The interpretation of this passage depends on the interpretation given to its various key words; δικαιοσύνη and its cognates; ἰλαστήριον, blood and faith.

Dodd quite rightly sees behind Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος, δίκαιός the Hebrew background so that as adjective or verb it describes

1. Cf also Phil. 3.14; Col. 2.9; Eph. 4.32; 1 Thess 5.18, for the concept of God being 'in Christ', and Rom. 7.24f, 1 Cor. 15.57, for the concept of God's redemption working 'through Christ'.

2. For this translation cf below p 446.

not so much an abstract quality but an act of God 'vindicating the right, redressing wrong, and delivering men from the power of evil'.^{1.} Consequently what Paul is describing throughout is not a quality of God or men, but rather an act of God in which he liberates men from their bondage. Thus 'righteousness' and 'redemption' (ἀπολύτρωσις) mean essentially the same thing. When 'righteousness' is applied to God it means his establishing our rightful place against the forces arrayed against us. When it is applied to Christians, it refers to them as liberated, vindicated by God. The event in which God has shown his power to liberate and redeem is 'in Christ'.

The difficulty with the second key word in this passage is that it is used only here in Paul's epistles, and outside of them only in Heb. 9.5. In the LXX the word is the technical term for the cover of the ark of the covenant behind the veil in the Holy of Holies.^{2.} As Nygren has convincingly shown it is this meaning, rather than either 'propitiation' or 'expiation' which most closely fits the context.^{3.} That 'mercy seat' in the Holy of Holies was the place of reconciliation between God and Israel in the ceremonies of the Day of the Atonement. The twin ideas of the ἀπολύτρωσις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ and of Christ as the 'place of reconciliation' expresses again the organic and spatial terms in which Paul conceives of our relationship with Christ. Now in this passage he is saying that it is God, showing his power to deliver, who has set Christ forth to be the one 'in whom' - in fact the place where - deliverance and reconciliation can take place.

Dodd has attempted to argue that behind the concept of this redemption and reconciliation taking place 'by his blood' there is the old Hebrew idea of 'the blood is the life'.^{4.} However, having seen the cruciality of the death of Christ for Paul, it is clear that 'by his blood' means 'by the manner of his death', that death of obedience, in which he broke the old solidarity, i.e. the meaning of the whole is that God has shown his righteousness (his power to liberate) by setting forth Christ who in and by his death has become the event in which we have our deliverance (are justified).

This being so, the righteousness which has been revealed apart from the law, and which is attained through 'faith in Jesus', means that this righteousness

1. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, pp 10f, 75f.

2. Cf Arndt and Gingrich, p.376

3. A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, 1955, pp. 156ff.

4. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959. p.79

or liberation from the power of the law is attained through being 'in Christ'. It is false to assume that 'faith in Christ' means anything less than 'being in Christ'. It cannot mean anything as weak as intellectual assent, or even an acceptance that Christ is this liberating act of God. It expresses rather that sense of belonging to that event which is so intense that we are contemporaries of it, 'in it', and involved in the process of being liberated by it. 'Faith' is the intellectual and emotional counterpart to all the organic and spatial concepts of our 'oneness' with Christ.

If God's relationship with the Church is 'through' and 'in' Christ, so also is the Church's relationship with God. Again this language is so characteristic of Paul that a few illustrations of it will suffice. Thus Rom. 5.1, 'Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ'. Rom. 5.10 expresses most clearly that both the God/man and the man/God relationship has its locus in Christ, 'For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled shall we be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation'. Consequently we are 'alive to God in Christ Jesus' (Rom. 6.11), and whatever confidence we have in relation to God is 'through Christ' (2 Cor. 3.4). The difficult saying in 1 Cor. 8.6 obviously expresses the same concept 'To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through him', i.e. we are 'unto' God 'through' Christ. Again our access (προσαγωγή) to God and unity is 'through Christ' (Eph. 2.18, 3.12). Even giving thanks to God is 'through him' (Col. 3.17).

When Paul describes the Church's relationship to God in terms of the temple of which Christ is the 'chief corner stone' he quickly shatters any possibility of our being able to form any mental image of what the building would look like when he says that the whole building is 'in' the 'corner stone' and therefore 'in him' 'ye are also builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit' (Eph. 2.21f).

Despite this strongly emphasised 'throughness' Paul is also able to speak of our relationship with God as unmediated. 'Present yourselves to God' as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God'

(Rom. 6.13); 'each one of us shall give account of himself to God' (Rom. 14.12); 'we received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God' (1 Cor. 2.12); 'If any man loveth God, the same is known of him' (1 Cor. 8.3); 'He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God' (1 Cor. 14.2, cf v.28); 'We are a temple of the living God: even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God and they shall be my people' (2 Cor. 6.16); 'By prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God' (Phil. 4.6).

How is this essential 'throughness' and yet 'immediacy' to be explained? One thing is certain. It is not to be explained in terms of classical Trinitarian theology. There is nothing at all in Paul's letters which could support the claim that Paul thought that Christ was God, or even the Second Person of the Trinity. In fact all the evidence points in the opposite direction. For Paul God is supremely 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' he is the 'head of Christ' (1 Cor. 11.3), and as we are Christ's so 'Christ is God's' (1 Cor. 3.23). Paul can even describe Christ as our 'brother'; 'For whom he foreknew, he also fore-ordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren' (Rom. 8.29) We have already seen how Paul's thinking about the 'first' is determined by the Hebrew concept of the first as the one in whom the whole is present and consecrated. Consequently the assertion that Christ is the 'firstborn among many brethren' expresses the same idea as Paul has just expressed in verse 17 that we are 'joint-heirs with Christ', i.e. joint-heirs with him of the promises made by God to Israel through Abraham. Being 'conformed to the image of Christ' taken together with the idea of being 'joint-heirs with him' expresses the same idea as in Gal. 3.16, 27ff that Christ is Abraham's seed and 'in Christ' we become that single seed of Abraham which is Christ. The whole idea is that of ourselves as 'one man in Christ' in relation to God. This complex of ideas is succinctly expressed in Phil. 1.11, 'Being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.'

1. Cf 2 Cor. 1.3; 3.11; Col. 1.3; Eph. 1.3,17.

2. Cf also Heb. 2.11; 'For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren'. As the context makes plain, he who is one with the 'sanctified' and calls them 'brethren' is Christ.

3. Cf above pp. 47f.

If more convincing proof were necessary that Paul did not conceive of our relationship with Christ as identical with our relationship with God, we need point only to 1 Cor. 15.24; 'Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and authority and power'. But more pervasive evidence is in the fact that Paul's soteriology, as we have seen, is not incarnational but focussed wholly on the Cross and resurrection. What the incarnation expresses for Paul is Christ's solidarity with us, a solidarity which brings him also into our bondage. The deliverance from that bondage is achieved in the nature of his death and his being raised by God so giving man the possibility of a new solidarity 'in him' which means 'freedom'.

How Paul can conceive of our relationship with God as both 'through' or 'in' Christ and yet immediate is to be explained in terms of Christ's relationship with God, which is focussed supremely in his death and resurrection (cf Phil. 2.6-11), and our 'oneness' with Christ which is so intensely and realistically conceived that to be 'in Christ' is to be in his relationship with God. When we remember both the cruciality of Christ and yet that Christ and the Church constitute one living organism, it is easy to see why Paul found it appropriate to say both 'reckon ye also yourselves to be alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (Rom. 6.11) and 'present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead' (Rom. 6.13). Paul's concept of our participation in Christ is so complete that it includes our participation in his relationship with God without this in any way necessitating his equation of God and Christ or minimising the absolute cruciality of Christ for him, for cut off from Christ a man is 'without God in the world' (Eph. 1.12).

For Paul, therefore, a man's experience of God is as little the experience of an individual in isolation as his experience of Christ for the heart of his doctrine of the atonement is our incorporation into Christ. If the atonement is a community-creating event so also our experience of Christ is an experience of that community and in that community. However, for Paul, that community is so intensely conceived and thought of as being included in Christ himself that our word 'community' is hardly able to express at all adequately what Paul is saying. It might be better to speak of the atonement as a 'oneness' creating event where the event always flows from God but the one is always and only Christ himself, 'in whom' we are 'organs'.

(d) Ethics

So far in this analysis of Paul's thought we have been concerned to point to his conception of the total oneness of Christ in his death and resurrection and the Christian, which oneness is expressed particularly in our being 'in Christ', 'in the Spirit', 'the body of Christ', 'one man', 'one spirit'. While it is true that being 'in Christ' or organs of Christ dominates Paul's soteriology and ecclesiology, he never forgets that the many who compose the body of Christ are by virtue of this parts of each other. 'So we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members of one another' (Rom. 12.5, cf. Eph. 4.25). So intensely does he think of this organic inter-relationship of the various organs of Christ that he can say 'Whether one organ suffereth, all the organs suffer with it; or one organ is honoured, all the organs rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ and severally organs thereof' (1 Cor. 12.26-27). It is on this theological premise that Paul builds his ethic of the inter-relationship within the body.

Paul's ethic of the body, in distinction from his ethic of the body's relation to those outside it, is best summarised as 'being knit together in love' (Col. 2.2 cf. 1 Cor. 13.1ff). Since 'love' is such an abused word it is perhaps better to point to those passages in Paul's letters in which this 'love' is expressed as an intense sense of belonging to one another, caring for one another, and sharing with one another.

We have already seen how Paul's thought of Christians being 'organs of one another' all of which suffer when any one suffers expresses his deep and profound sense of the way in which Christians belong to one another in Christ. The same idea is present when he says 'Receive ye one another, even as Christ also received you' (Rom. 15.7) When we remember that for Paul Christ received us into his very being then it becomes clear that to 'receive one another' does not mean anything as weak as 'welcome each other', but rather that we are to take the other so much into our lives that his suffering becomes ours and his joys ours, or as Paul himself says to the Corinthians 'ye are in our hearts to die together and live together' (2 Cor. 7.3). So great is Paul's concern for his Thessalonian converts that to them he says 'now we live, if ye stand fast in the Lord' (1 Thess. 3.8).

It is this 'belonging' to one another which is to express itself in a

profound caring for one another. When Paul is dealing with the question of meat offered to idols (Rom. 14.1ff; 1 Cor. 8.1ff) what concerns him is not whether or not the meat is 'clean' but the effect that either eating or not eating will have on the 'weaker brethren'. The reason he gives for this is a passionate 'Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died' (Rom. 14.15), for to do this is to sin against Christ himself (1 Cor. 8.12). What constitutes the kingdom of God is not a list of regulations concerning what we might eat and drink, but those human relationships of 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit' (Rom. 14.17). Of the very essence of the life in Christ is to 'bear one another's burdens' (Gal. 6.2), which means to 'seek the other's good rather than one's own' (1 Cor. 10.24) and 'through love to be servants one to another' (Gal. 5.13). As Col. 3.10ff makes plain this life of passionate caring for and belonging to one another is what a man 'puts on' in the very act of 'putting on the new man (Christ)'. In this act distinctions between Greek, Jew, circumcision, uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman all fall away for 'Christ is all, and in all'. In this same act, therefore a man 'puts on' 'a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, longsuffering.... and above all these things love, which is the bond of perfectness'. In this passage is expressed the ethical or human relationship aspect of being 'in Christ' for being bound to Christ is being bound to one another (Christ is all and in all Col. 3.11).

To be 'in Christ' is to be in a new life characterised by sharing, a sharing both of faith (Rom. 1.11-12, 'I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end that ye may be established. That is, that I with you may be comforted in you, each of us by the other's faith, both yours and mine) and possessions (e.g. 2 Cor. 8.12-14, referring to the collection for the poor in Jerusalem 'For I say not this, that others may be eased, and ye distressed; but by equality; your abundance being a supply at this present time for their want, equality.) that their abundance also may become a supply for your want; that there may be

This ethics of the body is for Paul never simply a caring for men or belonging to men simply because they are human beings. It stems from one conviction alone; that 'in Christ' the other is Christ himself to me, and to sever myself from him, to be careless of him, to sin against him, or to disregard him is to do this to Christ himself. It is this conviction, as we have seen, that lies behind Paul's censure of the Corinthians who would partake of the 'body of Christ'

in the Eucharist, without being prepared to partake of each other, i.e. without^{1.} waiting for the poor late-comers (1 Cor. 11.17ff). To behave in this fashion so destroys the unity of Christ and his body that their 'Lord's Supper' is no 'Lord's Supper at all' (1 Cor. 11.20), and so separates some from Christ, the source of life, who is present to them as the other, that some are sick and some have died (1 Cor. 11.30). Paul's concern is that the body should give expression to its unity, 'giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. 4.3). As Robinson points out $\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ^{2.} means to preserve an independently established unity, not to create one. That this is so is seen in the profound shock Paul registers when he learns of the dissensions and disunity among the Corinthians. To be divided in this way means that Christ himself is divided, or that they were baptized into someone else (1 Cor. 1.13), both of which are impossible. The alternative is that the Corinthians are not 'spiritual' but still in the flesh (1 Cor. 3.3, 'ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk after the manner of men?'). One senses similar shock when Paul hears that the Corinthians are going to the secular courts against each other, 'Nay, it is already a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take the wrong? why not rather be defrauded? Nay, but ye yourselves do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren' (1 Cor. 6.7-8).

While Paul's ethics of the body is dominated by this uniting belonging to one another in Christ, it is by no means 'unity at all costs.' Christ is holy and so his body is holy. Therefore whatever makes that body impure must be put out. His reasoning depends on his concept of the church as a living organic unit so that the whole is infected by a rottenness in any part or, as he puts it 'know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump even as ye are unleavened. For our passover hath been sacrificed, even Christ' (1 Cor. 5.6-7). Therefore, the Corinthians are exhorted to 'put away the wicked man from among yourselves' (1 Cor. 5.13), i.e. the brother who has been living with his father's wife (1 Cor. 5.1).

In a previous letter Paul had written 'have no company with fornicators' (1 Cor. 5.9). If something of this letter is preserved in 2 Cor. 6.14ff, which does indeed sound like a general prohibition, Paul now writes saying that it was not his intention that the Christian should have no company at all with fornica-

1. Cf above pp. 426 ff.

2. A.J.T. Robinson, The Body, 1963, p.60 n.2

tors, covetous men, extortioners and idolaters 'for then must ye needs go out of the world' (1 Cor. 5.10), but 'not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat'. (1 Cor. 5.11).

This demand for severance from those who either do evil or cause divisions is repeated many times by Paul; 'Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which are causing division and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them' (Rom. 15.17f); 'Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly (as the context shows this means those who will not work) and not after the tradition which they received of us' (2 Thess. 3.6); 'If any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him' (2 Thess 3.14).

While this 'harshness' towards the sinning brother is a recurring theme in Paul's ethics, it has its basis not only in the necessity to keep the unity and purity of the body but also has a redemptive purpose (cf. 2 Thess. 3.14). But more than this, such exclusions place an obligation on the body of understanding, care, and forgiveness; 2 Thess. 3.15 'and yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother'; Gal. 6.1 'Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any temptation, ye which are spiritual, restore such a man in a spirit of meekness, looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted'. Similarly Paul's last word on the brother whose severance he had demanded in 1 Cor. 5.1-13 appears to be given in 2 Cor. 2.5-11, 'If any hath caused sorrow, he hath caused sorrow not to me, but in part.... to you all. Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many; so that contrariwise ye should forgive him and comfort him, lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you to confirm your love toward him.... to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also.... in the person of Christ, that no advantage may be gained over us by Satan'.

In his harshest judgments on the behaviour of those who comprise the body Paul is caught in the twin theological tensions between giving expression to the bonds of love which unite all those who are in Christ, even those brothers who fall, and to keep the 'lump unleavened' and united. To keep the lump unleavened demands the exclusion of those who make it leavened, but to uphold the

bonds of love which unite us in Christ means that that exclusion can never be complete or final.

In this ethic of the body we see that, however difficult it may be to understand Paul's concept of Christ and the Christians comprising one single organic unit in a radical break from the old solidarity 'in Adam', he can state what this means in readily understandable terms of human relationships which have all the intensity of the relationships which bind a family together into a close-knit unity. We all know how a mother or father not only does suffer in and with a child but at times longs to be able to do the suffering for the child. We know how an entire family can be elated at the joys of any one member and deeply depressed and involved in his shame. It is an unnatural family which, having the means, would allow any one member to be in want, or did not care what he did or what happened to him. For Paul it is these sorts of relationships which mark (not should mark) the Christian church which has been brought into being by the death and resurrection of Christ and our incorporation into him. In this sense, therefore, while the word does lack the depths of unity of which Paul speaks, the Atonement can be spoken of as a community-creating event and, since baptism cannot be treated in isolation from the death and resurrection of Christ it too is that same community creating event. Similarly every Eucharist is both expressive and creative of that same unitive community 'in Christ'.

In addition to this ethic of the body there is for Paul the problem of how the body is to relate itself to those who are 'in Adam'. A thorough examination of this general ethic would call for a detailed examination of the relationship between the universality of the Gospel in Paul's thought and his strong doctrine of election. Such an examination would not be strictly relevant here. Let it suffice to say that despite everything that must be said about the doctrine of election in Paul (cf e.g. Rom 8.29f, 'Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and who he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified!') this election never leads him to an exclusivism; 'There is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich in mercy unto all that call upon him: For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall

they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?' (Rom. 10.12-14). In fact the whole of Paul's life shows that election in no way excludes evangelism.

We have seen that since Christ there are two identities in the world, an identity 'in Christ' and an identity 'in Adam' which lead to life and death respectively (1 Cor. 15.22), and these two identities are mutually exclusive. As such this leads to a strong element of 'separation' from the world in St. Paul's ethic. This is expressed most forcefully in 2 Cor. 6.14ff, 'Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? for we are a temple of the living God.... Wherefore come ye out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord.' Again, 'Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them' (Eph. 5.11), 'Be ye not therefore partakers with them (the sons of disobedience)' (Eph. 5.7).

If the judgement in 2 Cor. 6.14ff is a part of the earlier Corinthian correspondence, then its call for a total separation from the world is certainly explained as not being complete separation from the world but rather a demand to sever company with the brother who sins (1 Cor. 5.11f). The call to separation in Ephesians is given an evangelical motive 'Have not fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them; For the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame to speak of. But all things when they are reprov'd are made manifest by the light: for everything that is made manifest is light. Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.' (Eph. 5.11-14).

On occasion Paul can speak of the Church's relationship with the world as one of independence; 'That ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you, that he may walk honestly towards them that are without, and have need of nothing' (1 Thess. 4.11f), and it is the Christian's ethical relationships within the Church, rather than with the world, that constitute the evangelical challenge, 'Do all things without murmurings and disputings that ye may be blameless and harmless children of God'.
l. of above p. 442.

without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world' (Phil. 2.14f).

More generally the relationship is defined as one of love, a love which 'worketh no ill to his neighbour' (Rom. 13.8-10), and the Christian is exhorted to 'work that which is good to all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith' (Gal. 6.10). What this 'love' means in relation to outsiders is worked out in Rom. 12.14, 17-21. 'Render to no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honourable in the sight of all men' (verse 17). 'In relations with the outside world, the Christian will show respect for the moral standards of his non-Christian neighbours'. The assumption of this precept is that there is a certain moral standard common to Christians and pagans - doubtless the "the law written on their hearts", which good pagans "obey instinctively" - and love requires the Christian to make the most of this as a basis for harmonious relations.¹ This leads on to the exhortation 'If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men' (Verse 18). Since Christ died to make peace (Eph. 2.14-18) the Christian must always strive for peaceful relations with his neighbours. 'If collisions occur, as they almost inevitably will, the provocation must not come from the Christian side.'² The Christian is not only to abstain from taking revenge, in the knowledge that the retribution inherent in the moral order will work itself out,³ but is to give drink and food to his thirsty and hungry enemy (verses 19, 20). Whether or not Moffatt's rendering of the curious phrase derived from Prov. 25.21-22 ('in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head') as 'in this way you will make him feel a burning sense of shame' is correct, the principle involved is the law that evil can never be overcome by evil, but only by a greater good, 'be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good' (verse 21).⁴

A comparison of this with what Paul has to say about the relations within the Christian community both in Rom 12.9-13, 15-16 ('In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned to one another; in honour preferring one to another... communicating to the necessities of the saints.... rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another') and 1 Cor.13

1. C.H. Dodd, Romans, 1959, p.206. (verses 9-13 and 15-16, as Dodds has argued, applying to the intense personal relations within the Christian society).

2. ibid p.206f.

3. ibid p. 207

4. ibid p.207. Cf also ibid pp. 46-50.

(following hard on the description of the Church as the body of Christ in 1 Cor. 12.12-31) indicates that while the Christian's relationship with those outside the Church consists in doing good to them, and never having an ethical standard which is lower than theirs, it lacks all the intensity and warmth of the relationships in the unity in Christ. For the Jews Paul feels a burning agony at his separation from them by his being in Christ ('I wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh' (Rom. 9.3), and though they are 'as touching the election...beloved for the fathers' sake', yet they are 'as touching the Gospel.... enemies for your sake' (Rom. 11.28). This emotional detachment, which is never there in respect of the Jews, in the ethical relations between the Christian community and those outside it in contrast to the intense relations within the body, is indicative of how seriously Paul took the 'oneness' which is created in Christ. But the intensity of his evangelical longing that all might be included in this same unity (cf e.g. Rom. 9.3 and Rom 11) is a clear indication of the cruciality of Christ for him, and that it is only by being 'in Christ' and thus out of the old solidarity with its inevitability of sin and division that peace is possible for men. The theological basis for the Church's mission and ethics in the thought of Paul is that it is in and through Christ alone that it is possible for men to be free from all the old bondages 'in Adam', and thus 'in Christ' alone that men can be reconciled to God and joined to one another. Consequently while there is an evangelical fervour towards those outside the body, there is not a corresponding ethical fervour. This ethical fervour is to be found only when pointing to the ethics of the body in its unity. In this sense Christ's death, resurrection and exaltation creates, by our incorporation into it, a community which for Paul is not possible outside of the new creation which has come in Christ.

(e) Conclusion

While Paul's Christology in no way threatens his strict monotheism, despite the 'traces of a Trinitarian ground-plan' in 1 Cor. 12.4-6 and 2 Cor. 13.13, Christ is and remains absolutely crucial to Paul's soteriology and ecclesiology. He is the one in whom God has broken the all-pervading consequence of Adam's sin, shutting men up in a bondage to sin, death, the powers, and the law. This does not mean that these hostile forces have ceased to exist, for the Christian as Christ's contemporary is with Christ in the process of gaining

1. JND. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, 1960, pp. 21f.

the victory. No man stands in the peace of a victory already won. Every man, however, can gain the victory by participating in Christ's victory.

This 'participating in Christ' is taken so literally that for Paul Christ stands neither alongside of nor above the Christian, rather Christ is the total reality of everything that is in him, so that in confronting either the whole or any part one confronts Christ himself. It is in this corporate personality of Christ that God is present, because He was 'in Christ reconciling the world to himself' (2 Cor. 5.19). A man's relationship with God, therefore, is wholly dependent on God's relation with Christ without this implying that Christ was divine, and in virtue of the fact that the only redeeming relation with Christ that Paul knows of is being in an organic relation with Christ which entails being organic parts of one another, man's relationship with God is only 'in Christ' which means 'in the Church' and 'in one another'.

Against the background of Paul's Semitic totality thinking which has its roots not in mysticism but in historical and social realism, being 'in Christ' as a saving situation means both that a radically new thing has happened in history and that we are taken into a new solidarity with others who have been liberated by that event. Consequently this new solidarity expresses itself not in a Christ mysticism but in intense inter-personal relationships of belonging to one another, caring for one another, sharing with one another 'in Christ', something that is possible only because we are being liberated 'with Christ'. This entails maintaining a certain detachment from those outside the community, in order to remain free from the power for evil which will inevitably be present in too close a relationship, and yet at the same time an evangelical fervour to include others into the fellowship, and a readiness to receive into the intense personal life of the community any man who is 'in Christ'.

It is this close inter-personal life, made possible by the death and resurrection of Christ and by dying and rising with him, which is life 'in Christ' or life 'in the Spirit'. Without this human unity it is presumed that we are still 'in the flesh' (1 Cor. 3.3), and this because to be united with another 'in Christ' is to be united with Christ himself. If it would be true to say that for Paul 'outside the Church there is no salvation', which would mean that outside Christ there is no salvation, it would be equally true to say 'in a divided Church there is no salvation'. And this would mean not only a Church

divided denominationally, but divided by jealousies, contentions, strifes, and not waiting for late-comers at the eucharistic meal. For Paul the unity of Christ is the unity of the Church for Christ is the whole body in which we are inter-related organs serving one another in love in the service and love of Christ.

For Paul it is this concept both of soteriology and ecclesiology which is the theological setting of the sacraments.

CHAPTER IIITHE JOHANNINE CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH AS A
'CORPORATE BODY' 'IN CHRIST'

As with Paul so with John an adequate analysis of the concept of the Church in the Johannine corpus (for our purposes excluding the ^{1.}Apocalypse) requires an initial examination of his understanding of the Atonement, and the relationship between Christ and the Father. A thorough and detailed examination of these two major aspects of Johannine theology would require a book in itself. Taking into account what we have already said of the Soteriology and Christology, we shall confine ourselves here to as brief generalisations as possible, adding only those details which are necessary as the foundations of the Johannine ecclesiology.

(a) Salvation(i) Creation of Community

Throughout this essay we have shown how John, like the rest of the New Testament writers, conceived of the Atonement as the creation of a community through the life, death, resurrection, ascension of Christ and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. This is most baldly stated in John's comment on the high priest's statement 'that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not' (Jn. 11.50); 'Now.... he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (Jn. 11.51, 52) The same thought is expressed in many different ways throughout the Gospel and epistles. We have seen this in Jn. 2.19 and 21; 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up..... But he spake of the temple of ^{2.}his body'. The fact that here alone Jesus is made the agent of his own resurrection in John militates against the possibility that the reference is solely to the resurrection of Jesus on the third day and indicates that it is also of the Church that John is speaking, despite the fact that John does not develop this Pauline concept of the Church. A similar Pauline conception is found in 12.24; 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.'

2. Cf above pp. 119ff.

1. For detailed argument in support of the common authorship of the Gospel and 1 and 2 John cf A.E. Brooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, 1912, ii-iv; C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, pp.49ff.

The idea here is clearly of the planted seed coming to life through the planting as a new body which, as a living plant, bears fruit. What this fruit is is stated in 12.32; 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself', which 'being lifted up', as we have seen, refers to both ^{1.} the Cross and the resurrection and ascension. The task of the good Shepherd, we are told is to bring in the sheep, 'and they shall become one flock, one shepherd' (Jn. 10.16), and the very heart of the high-priestly prayer of Christ for his disciples is 'that they may be one, even as we are one' (Jn. 17. 21, 22). In 1 Jn. 1.3 it is stated that the purpose of proclaiming Christ is 'that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ', and to walk in the light is to 'have fellowship one with another' (1 Jn. 1.7).

What constitutes this unity we shall have to see later, as also the cruciality of the corporate relationship with Christ, but that this is a unity which can be stated in terms of inter-personal relationships is everywhere apparent in John. For example; 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you' (Jn. 15.12), and the repeated assertion of the epistles 'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death' (1 Jn. 3.14 and many other places).

The most outstanding illustration of this community in Christ is given in John's account of the Last Supper. One of the most difficult things to understand in John's Gospel is why he, whose Eucharistic teaching, as ^{2.} Cullman has shown, pervades the whole should have no account of the institution ^{3.} of the Eucharist. It is inconceivable that he was not aware of the tradition in the Synoptics and Paul. Various conjectures as to why this should be so have ^{4.} been forthcoming. Schweitzer explains it as the result of John's conviction that the sacraments first became possible after the gift of the Spirit which was consequent upon the death and exaltation of Jesus (cf Jn. 6.63). While there is truth in this, as an explanation it fails to satisfy. If this were the reason it is hard to understand why John did not simply add an explanatory comment to this effect - something he is by no means reluctant to do on other

1. Cf above p. 367ff.

2. O. Cullman, Worship, 1959.

3. It is understandable that the Synoptics whose attention is concentrated on the institution of the Eucharist, should not have recounted the scene of the footwashing. The fact that they have not done so in no way militates against its historicity. (cf ibid p.106).

4. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, 1931, p.357.

1. occasions. Scott believes that while John could not escape the weight of the Church's sacramentalism, he did his best to spiritualise what he found; to emphasise in the sacraments the work of the Holy Spirit and to minimise that of water, bread, and wine. While John does indeed emphasise the work of the Holy Spirit, he does anything but attempt to draw attention away from the water and the bread and wine (cf Jn. 3.5; 6.53f). It cannot therefore be that the reference to the Eucharistic elements in the tradition of the institution of the Lord's Supper has led to its complete suppression and the substitution of the foot-washing incident.² According to Barrett, John has refused to root the sacrament in a particular moment and a particular action, but rather roots it in 'the total sacramental fact of the incarnation'.³ For Cullmann the reason is that 'it is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel that it deals with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper not in terms of a simple description of its institution as the synoptics do, but by showing how from other events in the life of Jesus a connecting line is to be traced to this Sacrament.'⁴

The views of Barrett and Cullmann can easily be supported from the Gospel, and Cullmann is undoubtedly correct in pointing out that the relation of the sacrament to the atoning death of Christ has already been dealt with in Chapter 2, and the life-giving resurrecting power of it in Chapter 6.⁵ This being so it would be superfluous to deal with the same themes here, themes which would have been suggested by a recounting of the institution. It is significant to note, however, that all John's allusions to the sacraments of baptism (especially in Chapter 3) and the Eucharist (especially in Chapter 6) presuppose that his readers are familiar with these sacraments, so we must assume that John was aware that in recounting the events of the Last Supper his readers - as much the first as the twentieth century readers - would have expected to find a record of the institution. Knowing this, his omission of the institution and the inclusion of the story of the foot-washing cannot but be intended to draw attention to what the sacrament means, i.e. what it effects, in this incident.

What it effects is stated in Christ's dialogue with Peter who objects to having his feet washed by the Master. In reply Christ says 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me' (Jn. 13.8).

1. E.F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology, 1920, pp. 125ff.

2. For a summary of various other views of O. Cullmann, Worship, 1959, p.106-110.

3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, p.42, 71.

4. O. Cullmann, Worship, 1959, p.106. (Cullmann's italics).

5. ibid p. 107.

That he is referring here to the Eucharist through which a union with Christ is effected, and not to baptism is made plain in the verses that follow. When Peter replies 'Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head'^{1.} (Jn. 13.9) Jesus says 'He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew him that should betray him'. (Jn. 13.10, 11). What is asserted here is that it is in baptism, i. e. in the 'bathing', that the disciple is cleansed, and sins committed after baptism are not to be cleansed in re-baptism. A similar prohibition on re-baptism is found in Heb. 6.6, where it is founded on the grounds that Christ could not be twice crucified. Here the ground is that the total regenerating cleansing has already taken place in baptism (Jn. 3.5) as has union with Christ (Jn. 3.15). But again and again in the Eucharist, symbolised in the foot-washing, the baptised is to come for cleansing and the renewal of his union with Christ. The reference to the betrayer in this episode, in common with a similar reference to Judas in the Synoptic account of the institution^{2.} of the Eucharist (cf Mk. 14.18 and par.), again points indubitably to the fact that it is the Eucharist that is in mind in the footwashing.

Now if it is in the Eucharist that the Christian is made to have a 'part with Christ', i. e. creates fellowship with Christ, then a few verses further on (Jn. 13.14) Christ says 'If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet'. In washing the disciples' feet is expressed Christ's humble service in love of his disciples, which act binds Master and disciple together. So also in washing one another's feet the disciples give expression to the love of Christ which is theirs in their union with him, and in this act are made parts of another. The idea here is precisely the same as in Jn. 17.21, 22, 26. 'That they may all be one; even as thou Father art in me,^{3.} and I in thee, that they also may be in us....

and the glory which thou has given me I have given them; that they may be one

1. The words εἰ μὴ τοῦς πῶδας are lacking in Sinaiticus, in some Latin translations and in the Church Fathers. They are otherwise well attested. Cf. C.K. Barrett, *John*, 1955, ad loc. for detailed textual evidence and argument in support of the originality of the words. R. Bultmann, *Johannes*, 357, does not regard the words as original, rejects any baptismal allusions, and interprets the verse in the sense of a word picture: 'As he that is washed needeth no more washing so he who has received fellowship with me by washing of feet needs no further washing'. In the foot washing he sees represented the service of Jesus to his own which he performs through his word. (Jn. 15.3)
2. The parallel is closest in Luke's account of the institution where, as here with the footwashing, the reference to the betrayer is placed in intimate association with the institution (Lk. 22.19-21) and not, as in Mk. and Matt., preceding it.
3. While this passage contains references to the relationship between Christ and the Father, to which we must return later, the essential idea is that it is in union with Christ that the disciples share in the glory of Christ and are filled with himself and his love. It is this which is the ground of their unity. (Please refer next page).

even as we are one.... that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them'.^{1.}
 While these verses contain no specific reference to the Eucharist, in Chapter 13 it is in and through the Eucharist that the union with Christ is achieved, a union which is at the same time a union with one another. When that foot-washing is repeated in the Church, as John obviously believed it should be, then it would be that the communicants who would wash each other's feet and in that act become parts with Christ and parts with each other. The concept here is precisely the same as we saw in Paul's understanding of the Eucharist in 1 Cor. 10 and 11.^{2.}

Consequently for Christ to cleanse us by washing our feet and thus make us part of himself in the Eucharist means and effects that we are made part of each other in our union with him. What Christ effects in making us part of himself is making us parts of one another 'in him', and so being 'in him' is to be given expression not simply in devotion to Christ but also in humble service and love of one another. Eucharistic or sacramental devotion is therefore not simply to partake of the elements, but it is to partake of the elements in the act of washing each other's feet, just as for Paul it is to partake of the elements in the act of sharing with one another.

(ii) Being in Christ

In dealing with the community we have been unable to avoid noting that the very essence of the community is that it is 'in Christ'. While we have not yet examined what salvation by being 'in Christ' means for John, it is perhaps best that we note at this stage how thoroughly like Paul John is in stressing that we are made sharers in the redemption which Christ has won by being 'in Christ'.

The conclusion of the baptismal section of the great discourse with Nicodemus is that the Son of man must be 'lifted up' in death and exaltation so that 'whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life' (Jn. 3.15). As Barrett has noted John never has the verb $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ followed by $\epsilon\nu$, but in Jn. 1.4 we find the assertion $\epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \eta\epsilon\nu$. Consequently he rightly concludes that 'in him' is not to be constructed with 'believe' (as in the R.V. margin) but with 'eternal life' (as in R.V.).^{3.} Baptism, therefore,

1. But bearing in mind that these words are spoken in the context of Christ's meal with his disciples.

2. Cf above p. 427ff.

3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, ad loc.

which is baptism with water and the Spirit and demands the response of faith, is that which includes us in the Kingdom of God. (Jn. 3.3,5) and incorporates us into Christ. This incorporation into Christ in the Kingdom is our birth ² ἄνωθεν . This does not simply mean that we are regenerated by the working of the Holy Spirit 'from above', but is also expressive of what it means to be born 'from above'. In the immediately preceding verses we have been told how the Son of man 'descended out of heaven' (Jn. 3.13), so we too are born ² ἄνωθεν when we are included 'in him'. It is by being 'in him' who is the Son of God that we are the 'sons of God' who are born 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God' (Jn. 1.13). 'In him', who is not of this world, we are not of this world (Jn. 17.14,16). In Jn. 8.23 it is made plain that Christ's being 'not of this world' is his being 'from above' (ἐκ τῶν ἄνω). Our being not of this world is not simply that in baptism we are made 'like Christ'. It is, rather, that in our incorporation into him we share his very nature. This is made plain in Jn. 17.21-26, where the mutual indwelling of Christ and the Christian is repeatedly stressed, the sharing of his nature is stated (verse 22), and that we are 'with him' (verse 24).

Incorporation into Christ is attained also through the Eucharist. Jn. 6.56; 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him'. While the great Eucharistic discourse in Chapter 6 springs out of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, it has frequently been noted that in the eucharistic discourse proper, i.e. Jn. 6.51ff, the idea of drinking is strangely introduced into a context which speaks only of bread, and of Christ as the bread 'come down from heaven to give life to the world' (Jn. 6.32-35). In this passage there is nothing to correspond to 'I am the bread of life' (Jn. 6.35) as an explanation of the eucharistic drink. In Jn. 15.1, however, is found the assertion 'I am the true vine'.

If Barrett is correct in his argument that Chapters 15-17 are an
1.
alternate conclusion to Chapter 14 of the Last Supper, then 'I am the true vine' following hard on the account of the Last Supper in Chapter 13, carries obvious eucharistic connotations. In any event the eucharistic character of
2.
the farewell discourses has long been seen by most exegetes, and strongly

1. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, pp. 378ff.

2. G.H.C. McGregor, Eucharistic Origins, 1928, p.217ff. A. Loisy, Le Quatrième Evangile, 1921, ad. loc., M. Goguel, L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr, 1910, p.197f.

1. 2.
emphasised by Hoskyns and Cullmann. The whole setting in which these speeches were spoken points to this fact. Whatever the original order was, they have their place at the Last Supper when Judas, the traitor, having taken the sop 'went out straightway; and it was night' (Jn. 13.30,31), while Jesus remains in the room with the other disciples, whose feet he has washed, and with whom he has eaten.

'I am the true vine', refers back to the wine of the Last Supper, even if Old Testament imagery is also being employed. Having asserted, therefore, that it is Jesus himself, the true vine, who meets the believers in the eucharistic cup, Jesus continues to paint a picture of an organic union with himself which is as organic a union as any we saw in our analysis of Paul:

3.
'Every branch in me..... abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from me (χωρίς ἐμοῦ, i.e. cut off from me) ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered.' (Jn. 15.2-6).

The intimate union which enables the branches to bear fruit is, above all, the eucharistic communion of believers with Christ.

However, the Old Testament imagery is also important for an appreciation of what John is saying here. In the Old Testament the vine is used of Israel; e.g. Jer. 2.21, Ezek. 15.1-8; 19.10-14; Ps.80.9-16. In these passages the pure and favoured origin of Israel, and also its degeneration or danger is described. The same use of the ἄμπελος ἀληθινή⁴ is to be found in rabbinic literature; the fullest example being Lev. R. 36.2. Symbolic speech based upon vines and vineyards is found in the synoptic gospels; Mk. 12.1-9; Matt. 21.33-41; Lk. 20.9-16; Matt. 20.1-16; 21.28-32; cf Lk. 13.6-9. All these New Testament parables have in common the fact that the vineyard, or persons connected with it, represent Israel, as God's vineyard. A contrast is drawn between the fruit which Israel, as God's vineyard, or the labourers in his vineyard, ought to bear or produce, and the scanty results which in fact appear.

What must be noted in our passage is that the vine does not

1. E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, (ed. Davey), 1947, p.471ff.
 2. O. Cullmann, *Worship*, 1953, p.110ff.
 3. Cf O. Cullmann, *Worship*, 1953, pp.111-113 for detailed arguments for the Eucharistic character of Chapter 15 based on the close parallels of this both with chapters 6 and 13 and also with the Didache. These arguments need not be repeated here.
 4. Quoted at length in *Strack and Billerbeck*, Vol. 11pp. 563f.

represent Israel but one Israelite only, Jesus. And it is not stated that Jesus is either the root or stem of the vine, but the vine itself. He is himself the whole thing, which includes root, stem, and branches. A vine is not something other than its root, stem, and branches, but is that organic totality. Consequently when we are told that Jesus is the vine and we are the branches 'in him', the image is not that of branches grafted onto a stem, but is nearer Paul's concept of ourselves as organs of a body, which body, composed of its various organs, is Christ himself.

The Johannine concept of our 'abiding in the vine' as the branches which themselves make up the vine, expresses at once the corporate character of the Church and the cruciality of Christ. As the branches of the vine, who is Christ, we possess the identity of Christ himself. The life of the branches is the life of Christ. Cut off from the vine the branches have no life at all, but wither and die, and this means both cut off from Christ and cut off from the Church. In fact, being cut off from the one entails being cut off from the other.

Remembering this, the assertion 'This is my commandment that ye love one another, even as I have loved you' (Jn. 15.12), which is what bearing fruit means, is not simply an exhortation to imitation. If the being of the vine is to love his friends and lay down his life for them (Jn. 15.13f), then the being of the branches, which are an organic part of the vine, is to love one another. This is expressed most forcefully in 1 Jn. 3.14; 'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death', which expresses quite explicitly what is implied in Jn. 15.4-6. In the vine our very nature is his, which is to love and which love is the fruit of his love. Cut off from the vine, we can do nothing but perish, i.e. 'He that loveth not abideth in death', for he is not 'in Christ the vine'.

While John frequently speaks of Christ's exhortation that we should do as he did (cf Jn. 13.15), his thought lies much deeper than mere imitation. More truly it is 'we love, because he first loved us' (1 Jn. 4.19). We can only love, when we abide in Christ the vine, which means to abide in his love (Jn. 15.9), which means to love one another with the same love with which he loved us and them (Jn. 15.12). When the corporate character of the Church

1. Cf C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, on Jn. 15.2 ad loc.

in the organic union in Christ is grasped, then the logical conclusion is that sharing in the being of that organic entity is to give expression to his mode of existence, which is to love the brethren. The very essence of sharing in the being of Christ is sharing in his love for the brethren.

Our analysis of what being 'in Christ' means in John has already shown that this can never be conceived as an individual's communion in isolation with Christ. As such it indicates that as much for John as for Paul being 'in Christ' is a communal being. Here we see the intimate link between the Atonement as community-creating and being 'in Christ'. But we see also that being or abiding in Christ is not used by John to express a fellowship or communion between two distinct entities, as it would be if Christ were the stem of the vine and we its branches, but expresses rather being made a part of, or having a part in Christ (μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ Jn. 13.8) which means, ultimately, the same thing as being part of the Church which is Christ himself. If Christ loved us, therefore, it is not simply that we ought to love one another but rather if we don't love the brethren, then we cannot be in Christ (1 Jn. 3.14).

This being 'in Christ' because of its organic nature can also be expressed, as by Paul, as Christ being 'in us'. 'Because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you' (Jn. 14.19,20); 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him' (Jn. 6.56); 'That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us:... I in them, and thou in me.... that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them' (Jn. 17.21,23,26). So intimate is this union between Christ and the Christian community that it can even be said 'I am glorified in them' (Jn. 17.10); and 'He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (Jn. 13.20).

The cruciality of this being 'in Christ' or parts with Christ lies for John in what Christ is and what he has done, being who he is.

(iii) Deliverance from this world

κόσμος is a common and important word in John. In general the κόσμος is not the totality of creation, but the world of men and human affairs (Jn. 11.9; 17.5,24; 21.25 being exceptions to this). Even in

Jn. 1.10 the world made through the Word is capable of knowing, or of not knowing its Maker. The world is sometimes further defined as ὁ κόσμος οὗτος¹. This expression is not simply equivalent to the rabbinic ha'olam hazeh (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, 'This age') and contrasted with a future world, but is contrasted also with a world other than this but already existing, i.e. the heavenly world (cf Jn. 8.23), 'Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world; I am not of this world.') John appears to use this expression, 'not of this world' to combine the ideas of an eschatological future anticipated already in the ministry of Jesus, and also of the intrusion of the heavenly world into this purely earthly one.

The definition of the world as 'this world' necessarily involves a measure of dualism, which is at times very strongly expressed (Jn. 1.10; 7.7; 14.17,22,27,30; 15.8f; 16.8,20,33; 17.6,9,14ff in addition to the places where ὁ κόσμος οὗτος is used). The world not only does not receive or know Jesus, but it hates him and his disciples. Yet the world into which he comes is also the scene of the saving mission of Jesus (Jn. 1.9f; 3.17,19; 6.14; 8.26; 10.36; 12.46; 13.28; 17.13,18; 18.20,37) and his mission to the world is grounded in God's love for the world (Jn. 3.16). It is noteworthy that in Jn. 3.16 the κόσμος does not simply remain the κόσμος in its entirety, but through the incarnation of Christ is immediately divided into ἡς ὁ πιστεύων and, presumably, those who don't believe. He who is from above, and therefore not of this world (Jn. 8.23) comes in order that those who are 'of this world' might share in his being 'not of this world' (Jn. 17.6) although 'in the world' (Jn. 16.33; 17.11) just as he was Incarnate 'in the world' (Jn. 1.10; 9.5; 17.11f). And being 'not of the world' as he is, they are sent 'into the world' (Jn. 17.18) just as he himself was sent 'into the world' (Jn. 17.18; 18.37).

John's conception of the world is that as the world of men it is the object of God's loving care and concern. As such Christ is sent as its Saviour (Jn. 4.42; cf 1.29; 3.17; 6.35,51; 8.12; 9.5) and it is emphatically repeated that he did not come to judge the world (Jn. 3.17; 12.47). But the world is also a world in bondage to the ruler of the world (ἀρχῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) (Jn. 12.31; 14.30; 16.31; cf 1 Jn. 3.8) and therefore in bondage to sin (Jn. 8.34; 1 Jn. 3.8). It is he who has been judged (Jn. 1. Jn. 9.23; 9.39; 11.9; 12.25,31; 13.1; 16.11; 18.36.

12.31; 16.31; 1 Jn. 3.9) and who has neither power over nor part in him who is from above (Jn. 14.30). It is this world in bondage to its ruler and to sin whom Jesus did come to judge (Jn. 9.39; 12.31; cf 3.18; 5.30; 8.16, 26; 12.48; 1 Jn.3.8) and overcame it (Jn. 16.33). Those who by unbelief and by refusing to come to him, who is not of the world, choose to remain both in and of the world, convert salvation into judgement (Jn. 3.16ff), and remain in bondage rather than freedom (Jn. 8.31ff).

This judgement of the ruler of this world and overcoming the world does not imply that the power^{of evil} no longer exists in the world, as is made quite clear in Christ's prayer 'I pray not that thou shouldst take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil' (Jn. 17.15). Similarlyⁱⁿ 1 Jn. 3.8 the destruction of the works of the devil is spoken of, and yet in 1 Jn. 3.10 the distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil is drawn. What is implied, rather, is that those who are 'in Christ' and so share in his nature of being 'not of this world' are removed from the sphere of this world's ruler's and sin's dominion.

If for Paul the whole of salvation was focussed in the deliverance Christ wrought for man in his death and resurrection, despite his incarnational Christology, for John the incarnational Christology is of the very essence of his soteriology. This by no means implies that the death and exaltation of Christ have receded into the background of his thought. It remains through the 'lifting up of the Son of man' in his death and exaltation that men are drawn to him (Jn. 12.32), and in his death that he is to 'gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (Jn. 11.52) and his body is to be raised up after it has been destroyed (Jn. 2.21). It is into this crucified, risen and exalted Christ that we are incorporated by the Spirit in our baptismal and eucharistic union, and are delivered from the world's solidarity in bondage to sin, and included into his freedom. However, far more strongly than in Paul, for John the incarnation of Christ is crucial.

It is along these lines that Jn. 8.28ff is to be interpreted.

1.

We have already examined 8.28 in detail and noted that it is through the 'lifting up' of the Son of man on the Cross and, by implication, the

1. Cf above pp. 365 ff.

resurrection and ascension that the Jews will know that he is the Son of man who has come down from heaven (Jn. 3.13) It is then that they will 'know the truth, and the truth shall make you free' (Jn. 8.32). Whatever 'truth' might mean generally in John there is a studied ambiguity in its use here. At one level it points back to the declaration in Jn. 2.28 and means that after the death and exaltation of Jesus they will know the truth about him, that he is the heavenly Son of man. But at a second and deeper level, it refers to Jesus himself who is the truth (Jn. 14.6). Consequently to 'know the truth', as Barrett points out, bears both the gnostic meaning of knowing revealed truth, and the Hebrew meaning of knowledge as an intense union most completely expressed in the sexual union. The knowledge or faith union with Christ the truth does not by any means make knowledge of who he is superfluous. But it is clear that it is not simply revealed knowledge about Jesus which sets a man free, it is rather being one with him who is not of this world; it is sharing in the Son's permanence in the Father's house.

That from which a man is liberated is sin. John does not here make quite explicit what this sin is to which a man is in bondage. In the closely similar passage in 1 Jn. 3.8ff it is defined as the work of the devil which the Son of God has been manifested to destroy and consists in not doing righteousness and not loving his brother. The man who is born of God, who is 'in Christ' and whose 'seed abideth in him', 'doeth no sin', in fact 'cannot sin', and this because Christ is righteous (1 Jn. 3.7) and Christ loved us (1 Jn. 3.16), i.e. because in that mutual indwelling we share in the very nature of Christ we cannot do what is not righteous, nor can we not love our brothers in Christ. Or conversely not to love the brethren is to be in death rather than Christ who is life (1 Jn. 3.14). This 'cannot do sin' does not mean that the man who is in Christ never sins at all, as 1 Jn. 5.16ff makes plain, it points rather to the fact that in being in him who is 'not of this world', who has overcome the world and drawn us to himself in his death and exaltation, we so share his nature that we are delivered out of the bondage of this world and sin, which means unrighteousness and hating the brethren which issues in death, and that we are righteous because he is and do love one another because he loves us. It is a deliverance from

1. On this cf C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp.170-178.
2. cf also Jn. 17.7 'Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth', and yet, as the prologue declares Jesus is himself the word, Jn. 1.1,14.
3. C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, ad. loc. cf also the note on Jn.110. C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1950, pp.151ff.
4. For a most adequate treatment of the inter-relationship between knowledge, faith, and union with God and Christ in John's Gospel, cf R. Bultmann in TWNT Vol. 1 pp.711-715.
5. The 'seed' here probably refers not to the remaining image of God in man, but to God's seed, i.e. His son.

destructive hate into creative love through knowledge of the truth which liberates us.

In all of this we see the cruciality of John's incarnational Christology and of the Cross and resurrection, and we see also why being 'in him' is the fundamental basis of the Christian's salvation and life. Inevitably we have been brought back again to see that being 'in him' is to love one another. He creates the community which is his own being and so determines its character.

(iv) From death to life.

'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death' (Jn. 3.14). 'He that believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement, but hath passed out of death into life' (Jn. 5.24). While death is not a common Johannine concept, these sayings do summarise John's teaching. What concerns him more is 'life' or 'eternal life'. The very purpose for which the Gospel is written is: ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχετε (Jn. 20.31). It is the purpose for which Christ came into the world: ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν (Jn. 10.10). 'Life' is a major theme of the gospel.

In just short of half the occurrences of the word ζωή it has the epithet αἰώνιος without any apparent difference in meaning. As Dodd has convincingly demonstrated, John's use of ζωὴ αἰώνιος rather than ἀθανασία (the usual Greek term to denote immortality) betrays the Jewish affiliation of his language. We can assume, therefore, that behind John's usage lies the Hebrew hayyey 'olam, which in the Greek versions of Dan. 12.2 is rendered

ζωὴ αἰώνιος .

For the Hebrew as much as for the Greek ζωή² is possible only because of God. For the Hebrew it is given in the covenant relationship between man and God.³ 'olam, as we saw, denotes not so much timelessness as timefulness.⁴ This does not mean that there is nothing of duration present in the idea, but that whatever duration it has is given entirely in the content and character of the time, and supremely it is associated with those great figures of the covenant with God who have so stamped all time with their own character, which is derived from God through the covenant, as to pass on their covenant blessing. 'olam is

1. C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 144-146.

2. Cf ibid, p.146

3. Cf above pp.395ff

4. Cf above p.390.

time as it is experienced as contemporaneous with the ancestors sharing in the blessing they have received from God. As such it is life constantly renewed by God, and later came to bear the meaning of everlasting life.^{1.}

Alongside this usage arose a usage which distinguished between two solamim or αἰῶνες. 'This Age' and 'The Age to come'. This doctrine did not supplant the doctrine of 'everlasting life' or the resurrection, but placed even stronger emphasis on the old Hebrew idea of God's time as bearing a character and stamp quite different from this present evil age of suffering and defeat. Consequently they looked forward to the breaking in of the 'new heaven and new earth', of the time of God's final and complete victory over every force arrayed against Israel in particular. The Hebrew never prized life which consisted simply in an infinite duration, but always life from God which bore the character of God, and of God through his covenant relation with the ancestors. It is this quality of life, in communion with the source of life, which gives it its duration.

As Dodd has shown there are usages of ζωὴ αἰώνιος which have an explicit reference to this doctrine of the two ages (Jn. 5.39; 4.36; 12.25; cf also 4.14; 6.27; 5.28-29).^{2.} These passages indicate at least that the evangelist is developing a doctrine of eternal life with reference to the Jewish idea of the life of the Age to come, qualitatively as well as quantitatively different from this one.

There are, however, other passages which point to a different conception. In the dialogue preceding the raising of Lazarus the evangelist appears to be contrasting the popular eschatology of Judaism and primitive Christianity with the doctrine he wishes to propound. Jesus says to Martha, 'Thy brother shall rise again' (Jn. 11.23). Martha replies; 'I know that he will rise again at the resurrection of the last day' (Jn. 11.24). The reply of Jesus is no simple assent to this doctrine: 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die' (Jn. 11.25-26) Here the doctrine is stated in two forms. First: 'He who believes in me, even if he dies, will come to life (ζήσεται)'. This is confirmation of the primitive belief in the general resurrection. But the second statement is not a simple equivalent of this: 'Everyone (πᾶς) who is alive and has faith in me will never die'. The implication is that the believer is already living in a sense which makes ceasing to live impossible.

1. For details of C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, p. 144.

2. ibid, p.146 for detailed argument for this conception in John.

In other words, the 'resurrection' of which Jesus has spoken is something which can take place before bodily death, and has as its result the possession of eternal life here and now.

The same must be said of Jn. 5.24-25 'He that heareth my word and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement but hath passed out of death into life. Verily, verily I say unto you, The hour cometh and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live'. The word of Christ has the power to give life both now and hereafter. The same combination of ideas is found in Jn. 6.54; 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood (i.e. through the Eucharist enters into union with Christ) hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day.' The evangelist agrees with the popular belief in a general resurrection, but for him the far more important thing is that the believer, or the man in union with Christ, already enjoys eternal life.

All of these passages stress the need for union with Christ, whether that union be of faith or through the Eucharist. The reason for this is that Christ himself is 'the resurrection and the life' (Jn. 11.25), the life (Jn.14.6), in him is life (Jn. 1.4), has 'life in himself' (Jn. 5.26). To be 'in Christ' through eating his flesh and drinking his blood and so to have life (Jn. 6.54-56) is possible because he is himself the 'bread of life' (Jn. 6.35,48) which came down from heaven and gives 'life to the world' (Jn. 6.33). If his words have the power to give life it is because they are the words of eternal life (Jn. 6.68; cf 6.63). Consequently to 'abide in Christ' is to have life (Jn. 6.54-56; cf. 15.1-8) and to abide in his word (Jn. 8.31; 15.7) is to be liberated from sin which is death.

How it is that Jesus has this life in himself is because the Father, who has 'life in Himself', has given this to the Son (Jn. 5.26). What the Son has manifested is eternal life, because that eternal life is 'with the Father' (1 Jn. 1.2). Everything that the Son does and says brings eternal life because 'His (the Father's) commandment is life eternal: the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak' (Jn. 12.50). In other words his words are the words of eternal life because they are the words of God spoken by him who is himself the incarnate Word of God (Jn. 1.1,14). 'Life' or 'eternal life' is that which the Father alone gives, and has given it to the Son.

He is, therefore, truly immortal, since no one can take away his life; if he is to die he must lay down his own life (Jn. 10.18; cf. 19.10f). If Jesus is the bread of life which the Father has given for the life of the world (Jn. 6.32) it is not simply because Jesus has come from the Father and been sent by Him, but because the whole life of Jesus is characterised by a mutual indwelling of the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father (e.g. Jn. 17.21) so much so that they are one (Jn. 10.30; 17.11,22). That this is a union of dependence is made quite explicit when Jesus is accused of making himself 'equal with God' (Jn. 5.18), he continues immediately 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing: for what things soever he doeth, these the Son doeth in like manner' (Jn. 5.19). More baldly it is stated 'The Father is greater than I' (Jn. 14.28).

What all this indicates is that in John we have the thoroughly Jewish conception that 'life' is God's gift, preserved in the covenant union of obedience (cf Jn. 12.49f). Because of the unique, pre-existent and incarnate union between the Father and the Son, the Son himself has life in himself as the Father's gift. As such those who are in him have life or 'life in themselves'. As he is the resurrection and the life, or the one in whom is life, so those who are 'in him' have eternal life (Jn. 3.15). This is most fully asserted in Jn. 6.57 'As the living Father hath sent me, and I live because of him; so he that eateth me, he also shall live, because of me' (cf also 1 Jn. 5.11 'God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son'). As we have seen, to be 'in Christ' is to possess the very character of Christ himself, so when it is said that God's gift of life is in him it follows that to be 'in him' is to possess that which is his, eternal life. Consequently 'eternal life' is not so much something that is passed on by Christ to his followers, but is his quality of life which the followers themselves possess in their organic union with him, and consequently it is the quality of life which they themselves must express. Since the quality of the life of Christ is love, love and life themselves become virtually synonymous in John. Abiding in him who is life is being an organic part of him who laid down his life for his friends (Jn. 10.11,15.13), and so to pass out of death into life is to love the brethren (1 Jn. 3.14). Not to love the brethren is not to have eternal life abiding in us (1 Jn. 3.15). 'Eternal life' both as quality and duration cannot be distinguished in John. Eternal life, i.e. life which does not have the possibility of death, is the life of love and conversely

the life of love is the life which has passed out of the dominion of death. Both the quality of life and the freedom from death are given in him who is life and loved us, and they are in him wholly from God.

Again in this we see the intimate link between Johannine Christology and soteriology, and the cruciality of being 'in Christ' whether this is expressed as through faith or knowledge or through the sacraments or in the organic metaphors. We see also that if John's Christology is the key to his soteriology, it is also the key to his ecclesiology and his ethics, for the Church is that corporate body which, being in him, must share his characteristics of life and love.

(b) God, Christ and the Christian

For John Jesus is supremely the one who has been with God from the very beginning (Jn. 1.1) and loved by God before the foundation of the world (Jn. 17.24; cf 17.5). As the incarnate one, therefore, he is the one who has 'come down from heaven' (Jn. 3.13; 6.38, 42, 62) or 'from above' (Jn. 8.23) or from the Father (Jn. 16.27, 28; cf 6.46 8.14; 13.3 (come from God)). Above all he is the one who has been sent by the Father. Most frequently this being 'sent' is a simple assertion of the relationship between Jesus and the Father (e.g. Jn. 5.23, 24; 6.44, 57; 7.18; 8.16, 18; 10.36; 12.44; 15.21; 16.5; 17.3, 18, 21, 23, 25; 20.21). In addition we are told that the will of Jesus is to do the will of him who sent him (e.g. Jn. 4.34; 5.30; 6.38, 39, 40); to speak the words of him that sent him (Jn. 3.34; 14.24; 17.8); to do the works of him that sent him (Jn. 3.56; 9.4); that his teaching is the teaching of him who sent him (Jn. 7.16); or most inclusively that everything which he either does or says and especially his act of laying down his life (Jn. 10.18 with which cf. 12.50) is what the Father has given him to do and say (Jn. 5.19ff; 12.49f).

This, however, never means that as sent Christ now works as an independent emissary. It is frequently asserted that 'I can do nothing of myself' (Jn. 5.19, 30; 8.28; cf 9.33). In fact it is the Father Himself, abiding in Christ, who does the works (Jn. 14.10; cf 10.37). In various ways the continuing union between the Father and the incarnate Son are expressed. The Father loves the Son (Jn. 3.35, 5.20); knows him and is known by him (Jn. 8.16, 29; 16.32). Above all this is expressed as the mutual indwelling of the Father in the Son

1. Having established this in what we have said thus far, little purpose will be served by examining the other great Christological and soteriological concepts in John. They are all so inter-related that they cannot help but lead ultimately to the conclusions we have reached.

and the Son in the Father (Jn. 10.38; 14.10,11,20; 17.21,23), a mutual indwelling which is so close that Father and Son are one (Jn.10.30; 17.11,22; cf. 5.19); that no worded prayer is necessary ('I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it' (Jn.11.42); that to have seen the Son, who alone has seen the Father (Jn. 1.18), is to have seen the Father (Jn.12.45; 14.9; cf 14.7), to believe in him is to believe in the Father (Jn.12.44) and to hate him is to hate the Father (Jn.15.23).

This union for all its intensity and completeness is a union of dependence of the Son on the Father who 'is greater than I' (Jn. 14.28; cf 10.29). When Jesus is accused of making himself equal with God in asserting that 'My Father worketh even until now, and I work' (Jn. 5.17, implying that because there can be no Sabbath rest for God neither can the Son not work the works of God on the Sabbath, (cf the accusation in v.18 'he not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God')), we are immediately told that of himself the Son can do nothing, but does only what the Father does, ^{and} in the power that he has received from the Father (Jn.5.19-26).

What then are we to make of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\mu\dot{\iota}$?^{1.} In Judaism after the Old Testament period the gradual withdrawal of the name YHWH from public use, and the ultimate suppression of its pronunciation, was accompanied by a growing sense of the extreme power and sanctity of the actual name - the shem hammephorash as it came to be called. Of this shem hammephorash Pinchas ben Jair (c. A. D. 130-160) said: 'In this age the prayer of the Israelites is not heard, because they do not know the shem hammephorash; but in the age to come God will reveal it to them.'^{2.} And he understands Is. 52.6 as 'Therefore my people shall know my name, therefore on that day, that 'Ani-hu' is speaking: here am I'. That is to say he treats 'ani hu' as the Name of God, the shem hammephorash, which is to be revealed in the age to come. The LXX renders 'ani hu' as $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\mu\dot{\iota}$, and appears to have taken it as the equivalent of the Divine name. They render 'anokhi 'anokhi hu' moheh pesha'ekha of Is. 43.25 by $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\mu\dot{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\mu\dot{\iota}\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\lambda\lambda\epsilon\dot{\iota}\phi\omega\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\dot{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ('I am "I AM" who takes away your iniquities'). They appear to have understood the name YHWH in same sense, for in Is. 45.18 they render 'ani YHWH we'en 'od by $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\mu\dot{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \acute{\omicron}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\tau\dot{\iota}$, and in the following verse they seem to have rendered YHWH twice,

1. For excellent treatments of this problem cf C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, pp. 93ff; 349f; C.K. Barrett, John, 1955, ad loc on Jn. 6.35 and 8.24; E. Schweizer, Ego Eimi, 1939; L. Cerfaux in Coniectanea Neotestamentica, Vol. XI, 1947, pp.15-25.

2. cited by C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960. p.93.

once by $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\iota$ and once by $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

There was, however, a tradition which gave for 'ani hu' the slightly altered form of 'ani wehu'. According to R. Judah ben Ilai (c 130-160), when at the Feast of the Tabernacles the priests circled the altar chanting the Hosanna from Ps. 118.25 instead of 'annah YHWH they sang 'ani wehu' which was interpreted by R. Abbahu (c.300) to be a prayer that God would help both his people and Himself. R. Aqiba (A.D. 135) on 1 Kings 7.23 interpreted lekha as the direct object of the verb giving the sense 'thou hast redeemed thyself out of Egypt'. The same idea is found in Is. 63.9 bekhol 'arathah lo' ear, where by reading lo for lo' we get the sense 'in all their affliction He had affliction' (so also the A.V.); and in Ps. 41.15 'immo-'anokhi bha'arah, 'I am with him in affliction'. Thus the name 'ani wehu' came to signify the solidarity of God with His people, Israel. At the same time it came to signify the obligation on Israel to become like God. Thus Abba Shaul (c A.D. 200) commented on Exod. 15.2 zeh 'eli we'anewehu 'Let us be like God; as He is merciful and gracious, so be thou merciful and gracious.' It appears that he read we'anewehu as 'ani wehu', 'I and he', implying a community of character between God and Israel, as elsewhere there is a community of sufferings.

While much of this evidence is late, and there is a great deal more, the fact that it is so wide-spread in the Second Century suggests that it is older than the explicit statements of it going back at least to Aqiba. Since also the doctrine is implicit in the Old Testament there is no solid reason for rejecting R. Judah ben Ilai's assertion that the form 'ani wehu' was actually used by the priests in the temple (i.e. before A.D.70). 'It is not impossible that the traditional interpretation of it may have had its beginnings during the period to which the Fourth Gospel belongs, and that the evangelist may have been aware of the profound idea that the Name of God can be known (that is, His true character can be apprehended) only when His intimate unity with His people is appreciated.'

There is in Jn. 8.24 and 28 ($\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\iota$... $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\omega\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\iota$) and Jn. 13.19 ($\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\eta\tau\epsilon\ \dots\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\iota$) a remarkable parallel to the LXX of Is. 43.10 ($\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon\ \dots\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\iota$). It is difficult not to see here an allusion

1. Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, 1960, p.94.

2. ibid p. 95.

3. ibid p.95.

to the divine name 'ani hu'. The implication would seem to be that God has given His own name to Christ; and this is actually stated in Jn. 17.11.

At the same time on each occasion where this absolute use of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$ is employed there is an immediate sequel. In Jn. 8.28 we read, 'Then ye shall know that $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things; and he that sent me is with me.' Here quite unmistakably the $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$ carries the sense of the solidarity of Christ with God. Again in Jn. 13.20, after pronouncing the $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$, Christ goes on, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.' This statement again implies the solidarity of Christ with the Father. Cf also Jn. 16.32, 'I am not alone, because the Father is with me'; 8.16 'I and the Father that sent me'. The phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\psi\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon$ looks very like an echo of 'ani wehu' as understood in the later tradition signifying the close union between God and His people Israel.

The absolute use of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$ and the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\psi\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon$ both therefore appear to reflect at least the idea of 'ani wehu'. In John, however, it is not with Israel that there is the divine union, but with Christ. This fact may also account for the stressing of the $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ in the various expressions. If this interpretation is correct then the expressions stress what is common to early Christianity, and particularly the Fourth evangelist, that the true Israel of God is Christ. Bearing in mind also that the name 'ani wehu' expressed the community of character between God and Israel, it is easy to understand how $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\psi\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon$, as expressions of the intimate union between God and Christ, are expressions also of the oft-repeated assertions in John that God has given His own character to Christ. This is most strongly and eloquently expressed in Jn. 5.19-26, but is everywhere apparent in the Gospel.

The frequent use of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota$ coupled with a predicate is a striking characteristic of John's style; e.g.

- 6.35 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \xi\omega\eta\varsigma$ (cf vv. 41, 48, 51).
 8.12 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$
 10.7,9 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota\ \eta\ \theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\ (\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu)$
 10.11,14 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\omicron\iota\mu\eta\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$
 11.25 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\iota\ \eta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \xi\omega\acute{\eta}$

14.6 Ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ
 15.1,5 Ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ ἄρπελος ἡ ἀληθινή

As Barrett has noted it is remarkable how the subject matter of these Johannine 'I-sayings' is paralleled in the synoptic parables of the Kingdom of God which has come in the person and ministry of Jesus.¹ Consequently the Christological Ἐγὼ, hidden in the synoptic parables and incidents is made explicit in the Johannine sayings. Further, while some of the predicates reproduce the Old Testament symbols for Israel, notably the vine, others reproduce the characteristics of God, notably light, life, and shepherd. This again points to the 'ani wehu' formula signifying the communication of character through intimate union between God and Israel; Israel here being present in the person of Christ alone.

All of this indicates that for John, despite Jn. 1.1 (θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος) and Jn. 20.28 (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου) Jesus is not God or, in the later Christian language, the Second Person of the Trinity. He is rather the one in whom the ideal union between God and Israel is given an abiding permanence.

In this connexion it is significant to note that of the relationship between God and the world almost nothing is said by John. That relationship is focussed wholly in Christ. When we are told of God's love for the world, that love is given expression by sending His Son to redeem the world (Jn.3.16). More frequently, as we have seen above, we are repeatedly told how Jesus has come to do the work and the will and to speak the word of God, and also that apart from God he can do nothing.

If it is true, as it undoubtedly is for John, that God's union with His people the true Israel, is wholly given in Christ, then it is equally true that our union with God is given in and with our union with Christ. Thus every expression of Ἐγὼ εἶμι is followed immediately by some expression of union with Christ: Jn. 6.35 'I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me'; Jn. 8.12 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me....'; Jn.10.9 'I am the door: by me if any man shall enter in....'; Jn. 10.14 'I am the

1. C.K.Barrett, John, 1955, p.243, and the notes on the various sayings.

good shepherd: and I know my own, and mine own know me.'; Jn. 11.25 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me...'; Jn. 14.6 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father but by me.' Jn. 15.1f 'I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me...' Jn. 15.5 'I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me...' Similarly in the major passages where $\xi\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \epsilon\iota\pi\iota$ is used without a predicate; Jn. 8.24 'Except ye believe that I am....' Jn. 8.28 'then shall ye know that I am.' (cf Jn. 8.31 'If ye abide in my word....') Jn. 13.19f '...ye may believe that I am. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me...' This last passage reflects just how complete is the union between Christ and the believer in John's thought.

That our union with God is given in our union with Christ because of Christ's union with God is everywhere in evidence in the Gospel. Most strikingly is this stated in Jn. 14.6 'No one cometh unto the Father but by me.' It is also stated unmistakably in Jn. 14.23, 'If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. We find a similar use of the plural (again suggesting ʿani wehu) in Christ's high priestly prayer, 'That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us' (Jn. 17.21; cf. v.22.)

It is to be noted that this union with God, which is through or in Christ into whom all believers are incorporated as branches of the only true vine, is not an individual thing but corporate. Christ's prayer for the unity of his disciples (Jn. 17.11) and the whole church (Jn. 17.21) can hardly be construed as an argument for church unity in a denominationally divided Church. When the Church has reached this state of affairs, which cannot always be described as an all-embracing love for one another, John would have said that we cannot be in Christ at all. We have not passed out of death into life, but rather abide in death (1 Jn. 1.14). The prayer form of these words must not mislead us into thinking that what Christ is expressing is a hope that the Church will remain united. This becomes apparent when, as we have seen, in the intimate union between God and Christ, no worded prayer is necessary but is given for the sake of others (Jn. 11.42). A similar idea appears to be present in Jn. 17.13, 'But now I come unto thee: and these things I speak

in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves'. The meaning here appears to be that Christ, speaking this prayer in the presence^{1.} of the disciples in the room where they have shared in the Last Supper, is declaring in their presence what their joy will be. 'That they may be one' is therefore, in prayer form, a declaration of a unity as inevitable and complete as the union between Father and Son. At least they must be united if they are branches abiding in the vine, for then they must share his character of love, just as there is a communication of character in the mutual indwelling of Father and Son. Union with God, therefore, is as corporate as union with Christ because union with God is given in and with union with Christ. This corporate union is expressed in love for one another, for if God is love (1 Jn. 4.8), then in union with God the Son must bear this character of love (Jn. 15.13), and the disciple in union with Christ (and therefore with God) must also bear this same character of love (Jn. 15.12; 1 Jn. 4.12).

(c) Johannine Ecclesiology

In dealing with the Johannine soteriology and Christology we have already had to trespass deeply into the Johannine ecclesiology. This has been unavoidable for, as should be clear by now, John's ecclesiology is given in and with his soteriology and Christology. When we remember how all important being 'in Christ' or 'union with Christ' is in John and that Christ is and remains the whole Church, then it becomes self-evident that John's doctrine of the Church is still his doctrine of Christ.

That Christ is himself the whole Church of whom we are organic parts is expressed most fully in the passage which we have already examined, that Christ is the vine and we the branches (Jn. 15.1ff).^{2.} Little needs to be added here to what we have already said on this passage, except to note that the language of mediation is, properly speaking, inappropriate here. While the concept of Christ as Mediator between man and God does preserve the undoubtedly Johannine view of the absolute cruciality of Christ, it must be remembered at the same time that a vine mediates nothing to its branches. Roots and stems of vines may carry food and water to the branches and leaves, but vines, being

1. That this is still in this context is made plain in Jn. 18.1, which is the point at which he and his disciples leave the upper room to go to the garden of Gethsemane.

2. Cf. above p. 465f.

the whole organic thing, can only be in a relationship of mediation with something that is not the same vine. In this image of the vine it is even incorrect to speak of an organic relationship between Christ and the Christian. If Christ is the vine, then what is being asserted is that Christ himself is the whole living thing, and to be branches of the vine is to be in organic relationship with other parts of the vine which together make up the vine itself. However, since Christ is the whole, it is false to make too sharp a distinction between union with one another and union with Christ. We must conclude, therefore, that the Church, the new Israel, was and is and always will be Christ himself. To be a vital part of the Church, therefore is to be part of Christ which entails being in an intimate organic union with every other part of the vine. This relationship between the parts is defined as the relationship of love (Jn. 15.12) as it must be since the character of the vine itself is love (Jn. 15.13).

That this interpretation of the Church as Christ himself is correct is proved when we turn to that other 'I am' saying of Jesus in Jn. 10.11,14. 'I am the good shepherd' (ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός), where again we have a reference to the quality of love which is prepared to lay down its life for others (Jn. 10.15). The conclusion of this is, 'And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd' (Jn. 10.16). To whom the 'other sheep' refers need not detain us here but is most probably, as in 17.20, a reference to those who were not the disciples of the incarnate Christ. What is of special note is the play on the word ποιμῆν in μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμὴν i.e. one flock of sheep and one shepherd of sheep. Both of these are governed by the verb γενήσεται so that what is being asserted is that all who are brought by ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός will become μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμὴν, not simply a single flock with a single shepherd, but rather a single flock which is itself a single shepherd. However much violence is done to language in this assertion it is clear that John's intention is to assert that the flock will itself be the shepherd which is Christ. There is no doubting that the single united flock is to bear the identity of Christ himself.

The two concepts μία ποίμνη and εἷς ποιμὴν express two different things. μία ποίμνη parallels the assertions in Jn. 11.52; 12.32;

17.11,21,22; and has pointers also to our being branches of a single vine (Jn. 15.5). It expresses the call to being parts of one another. $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ $\Pi\sigma\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, on the other hand parallels the assertion that Christ is himself the vine (Jn. 15.1). The play on the words at the same time links the two ideas of being parts of one another in being parts of Christ. $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha \Pi\sigma\iota\mu\eta$, $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\varsigma \Pi\sigma\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ therefore expresses the same idea as Jn. 15.5, 'I am the vine: ye are the branches', stressing that the corporate identity of the flock or the branches is the identity of Christ the shepherd or the vine.

In both Jn.10 and Jn.15 we have clearly presented the twin pillars of the Johannine concept of the Church. In the first place it is a community of men bound together in an intense union with one another. On the other hand that community has a single identity which is Christ so that the whole community is Christ and Christ is the whole community. In more characteristically Johannine language this 'Christ identity' is expressed as the mutual indwelling of Christ in the believers and of the believers in Christ (e.g. Jn. 17.21) or as a union with Christ which may be expressed as knowing and being known by Christ (e.g. Jn. 10.14); believing (e.g. Jn. 3.15); coming to Christ (e.g. Jn. 6.35) or Christ coming to his own (e.g. Jn.14.23); abiding in Christ (e.g. Jn. 15.2) or Christ abiding with his own (e.g. Jn. 14.23); following Christ (e.g. Jn. 8.12); or loving Christ (e.g. Jn. 14.23, 16.27). This union with Christ, as we have seen, is essentially a union with the ascended Christ and is given to men in the sacraments of baptism (e.g. Jn. 3.15) and the Eucharist (e.g. Jn. 6.56; 13.8) and in his word (e.g. 8.31; 15.7). We have already considered both the aspects of community and being in Christ above. While it has been necessary to hold these two aspects apart for the purposes of exposition, it is clear that the two ideas are inseparable in John's thought. To be in the community is to be in Christ as much as to be in Christ is to be in the community.

The community which is in Christ, as we have already had to see in our examination of the relationship between God, Christ and the Christian, means to be in the one in whom God uniquely dwells. Because God's

1. Cf above pp. 460ff

2. Cf above pp. 464ff.

3. This concept of the community being the whole Christ carries within it also the old Hebrew idea of the whole being manifested in any of its parts. When the whole is Christ, it follows that it is Christ himself who is manifested in any single Christian. Thus it can be asserted 'He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me' (Jn. 13.20).

4. Cf above pp. 476ff.

relationship with men is wholly and solely given in His relationship with Christ, it follows that Christ alone is the way for man to achieve union with God (Jn. 14.6) and equally that to be in Christ is to become part of him in his relationship with God, which is a relationship of mutual indwelling (e.g. Jn. 14.23; 17.21). Because of the unique indwelling of the Father in the Son, God has communicated His very being as love, life, light, truth, shepherd, judge and His power and word to Christ.¹ Consequently the community that participates in the being of Christ comes to share in the very character of Christ communicated to him by God. Consequently it can be asserted either that 'God is light' (1 Jn. 1.5) or that Christ is the light (Jn.8.12; 9.5) and both therefore constitute the grounds for the Christians being 'in the light' (1 Jn. 1.7) or that God is love (1 Jn. 4.8) and that Christ loved us (Jn. 15.13 cf Jn. 10.17) and both constitute the grounds for the very character of the Christian being defined as 'love one another' (e.g. Jn. 13.34; 15.12; 1 Jn. 4.10-12).

The Church in John can therefore be defined as; that community of men who are 'in Christ' which, as an organic whole, is Christ himself and thus bearing the character of Christ himself, which character he has received in his union with God, in which union the community participates in and with their union with Christ. The fruit of this union with God in Christ is above all that the community manifests the same love for another that Christ manifested for them.

One consequence of this concept of the Church as the whole Christ constituted in its union with Christ is that there is and must be a strongly stressed dualism between the Church and the world, simply because a dualism between Christ and the world is pre-supposed in the Johannine concept of salvation.² While both Christ and the disciples are 'in the world' neither Christ nor those who are in him are 'of the world' (Jn. 17.16). It is true that the incarnation arises out of God's love for the world (Jn. 3.16), but given the incarnation the Father's love is for those who have responded in love to the Son (Jn. 14.21,23; 17.23). This being loved by God can even be stated as the consequence of having loved Christ (Jn. 16.27). In his high priestly prayer it is explicitly stated that Christ prays for his disciples, not for the world (Jn. 17.9)

1. Cf above pp. 479f

2. Cf above pp. 468ff.

What the coming of Christ into the world does is expose the world for what it is (Jn. 3.19ff), and this the ascended Christ continues to do (Jn. 16.8-11). It is exposed as a world in darkness, without the hope of life, and in bondage to sin and Satan. The coming of Christ is both a hope and a judgement for the world. It is a hope for those who respond in faith to him and are included in him, and so share in his nature of being 'from above'. It is a judgement for those who turn away from him in disbelief and hate.

This concept of the free response is crossed in John by thoughts of predestination and election. He gives at times the impression that the world is divided into two groups, those who when the light shines come to the light, and those who avoid the light (Jn. 3.19ff). He seems to imply that the predestined groups of those who will respond, and the sinners who won't, must forever remain what they are. It is similarly stated that a man can only respond to Christ as he is drawn by the Father (Jn. 6.44) and that those who have responded are those who have been given to Christ by the Father (Jn. 17.6, which conveys both the ideas of divine predestination and divine choice). Yet it is also stated that Jesus took away the sin of the world, and that no one who comes to Christ will be rejected by him (Jn. 6.37). This tension between election and response is, of course, not peculiar to John but is characteristic of New Testament theology as a whole.

However this tension is to be explained, it remains true that the terms of a radical distinction between Christ and the world are carried over into a distinction between the Church and the world, as indeed our whole examination of the Johannine thought-forms shows they must be. This distinction between the Church and the world by no means precludes evangelism. It is the very purpose for which the evangelist writes (Jn. 20.31). At the same time there is no simple human fellowship between the Church and the world. As 1 Jn. 1.3 states it, the purpose in proclaiming Christ is, 'In order that (ἵνα ἐῴητε) ye also may have fellowship with us'. It is evangelism for fellowship in the Church not arising out of fellowship of the Church with the world. The fellowship in the Church, by its very nature, includes a fellowship with the Father and the Son. Similarly it is the intense union of love within the Church which is evangelical (Jn. 17.21,

'that they may be one..... ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ i.e. in order that the world may believe) not an expression of loving fellowship with the world which is so. It would be better to say that love for the world is expressed in evangelism, while love for the brethren is expressed in an intense union with one another, just as God's love for the world is expressed in sending His Son, while His love for those who respond to His Son is expressed in a mutual indwelling.

There is in John a sharp distinction between the Church as the intense community of love which is in Christ, and which shares his very nature, and the world which stands utterly hostile to Christ and the Church (Jn. 15.18) but which is still the object of God's love demanding that that love be expressed in proclaiming Christ.

(d) John's Ethics

John's ethics is a function of his 'being in Christ' who is in union with the Father. Its quite fundamental premiss is stated at 1 Jn. 4.17; 'as he is, even so are we in the world'. It is made abundantly clear in the epistle that this is not simply an assertion of the Christian's location 'in the world' as God in Christ was 'in the world' but asserts that our nature is as his is.

In 1 Jn. 1.5-7 the basis of the argument is that 'God is light', consequently to be in him is to be in the light, which, as a corporate participation in God through Christ leads to the inevitable conclusion 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another'. Equally 'He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now' (1 Jn. 2.9). Similarly, when it is asserted that Christ was manifested to take away sins and that 'in him is no sin' (1 Jn. 3.5), the conclusion 'whosoever abideth in him sinneth not'. (1 Jn. 3.6) is given in the premiss, since to abide in him is to share in his nature. That this is a corporate abiding and sharing in the nature of Christ is so ever-present in the mind of John that the children of God are defined as those who 'do not unrighteousness nor hate the brethren' (1 Jn. 3.10). Or again, given the premiss 'God is love' (1 Jn. 4.8,16) or that love is known in Christ's laying down his life (1 Jn. 3.16) then the conclusion is not simply that we ought to love one another but both 'He that

loveth not knoweth not God' (1 Jn. 4.8) and 'Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and do his commandments' (1 Jn. 5.2). In other words to be in union with God who is love through union with Christ who loved us, entails being in a relationship of love with the brethren as much as being in a relationship of love with the brethren indicates beyond any shadow of doubt that we are born of God. Love for the brethren both springs from and is indicative of being in union with God in Christ.

All of this indicates that John's ethic of love is not a willed imitation of Christ. Having passed out of darkness into light (1 Jn. 2.9) or out of death into life (1 Jn. 3.14) is to have passed out of the world's nature of hate into Christ's nature of love. To be in that nature of love is to be in it as a corporate body. Consequently that nature of love reaches its highest and fullest expression in the Christian's love for one another.

That this love is essentially a love for one another and not a general love for all men is shown firstly in the fact that Christ's great calls to love one another and his expressions of the unity of Christians all occur in the farewell discourses in the context of the Last Supper; (Jn. 13.14f; 34f; 15.12,17; 17.11, 21, 22, 26), in which discourses are to be found also some of the strongest expressions of the opposition and distinction between the Church and the world (Jn. 14.22; 15.18f; 16.2f; 17.6,9,16). Where the injunctions to love and unity are found, in most instances the purpose given for this is 'that the world may believe' (Jn. 13.35; 17.21). It is indicated secondly in the fact that there are not only indications of an opposition between the Church and the world, but also calls for a separation, particularly, as in Paul, from apostate brethren. This is asserted most explicitly in 2 Jn. v.10f, 'If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh of his evil works', and less explicitly in 1 Jn. 2.19 'They (i.e. the antichrists, who deny that Jesus is the Christ and so deny also the Father 1 Jn. 2.23) went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest how that they all are not of us'.

In John's ethic, therefore, it is evangelism that is called for in the Church's relationship with the world not fellowship, while within the Church what must be is an intense fellowship which is the union of love. And evangelism

itself is both that men may believe (Jn. 20.31) and have fellowship with God in Christ (1 Jn. 1.3) and also that they might share in the love union within the fellowship of the Church (1 Jn. 1.3).

(e) Conclusion

The parallels between John and Paul in the over-all concept of the Church as a corporate body but yet a single individual, Christ, are as striking as the differences in terminology and the details of the doctrine of salvation. The differences are so great that any suggestion of John's dependence on Paul must be ruled out. On the other hand the similarities are so great that it is impossible to believe that they are not both drawing on the stock of the primitive Christian tradition. When it is noted that these parallels are to be found not so much in how salvation came through Christ, but that salvation is being in Christ resulting in a corporate being who is Christ himself, then it would appear that in the primitive tradition how Christ saved us was open to various interpretations (that he saved never being in dispute), but the concept of the Church as an intense fellowship 'in Christ' and thus bearing a Christ-identity was so much part of the common stock that however the soteriology and Christology was conceived this was the inevitable outcome. How this Christ-identity of the corporate body was conceived varied only as a function of the differing soteriologies and Christologies.

The points of similarity between John and Paul which, for our purposes are the most important are the following:

- (i) The cruciality of Christ as the locus of God's relationship with the world. It is through him that God acts, and it is through him that man has fellowship with God. (In neither John nor Paul can it be proved beyond any shadow of doubt that they would have approved the later Christian definition of Christ as the Second Person of the Trinity.)
- (ii) The concept of Christ's salvation as bringing freedom from a bondage to an old solidarity.
- (iii) The concept of Christ's salvation as including us into a new solidarity whose nature, characteristics and possibilities are wholly given by Christ (or better by God through Christ.)

- (iv) That new solidarity is not something 'alongside' Christ, but is Christ himself.
- (v) It is this that makes the Church as a corporate body an organic whole which is Christ, and as individual persons organic parts of one another in the whole.
- (vi) Both the Christ-identity of the whole and the solidarity of its members with one another leads to a dualism between the Church and the world.
- (vii) This dualism is reflected in the Christian ethics of both writers. On the one hand the ethics within the Church is stated in passionate and intense terms of love, brotherhood, and fellowship. On the other, the relationship between the Church and the world is that of evangelism for fellowship within the Church rather than evangelical fellowship with the world.
- (viii) Since brotherhood, love and fellowship is both the result of and an expression of being in Christ, who is the whole Church, and since that which is the whole is manifested in any of its parts, it follows for both John and Paul Christ himself is encountered in any man who is in Christ; union with Christ is union with one another in him; and this encounter and union is the encounter and union of love, service, and concern for one another.
- (ix) If Christ's presence in the world in his life, death, resurrection, ascension, and bestowal of the Spirit was to create a new community in himself, then his continuing presence whether in the sacraments, or in those who are in him is still to create this community. To draw a distinction, therefore, between union with Christ in the sacraments and union with Christ through a union with one another (expressed in terms of loving and caring inter-personal relations) is false.

Having seen in Part I how widespread in the New Testament is the concept of the atonement as the creation of a new community (the New Israel) through the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, from whom the community derives not only its existence but also its character, and the cruciality of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which, against the background of the Jewish understanding of this as sharing in the blessing of the deliverer, entails that the

new community, the Church, shares in the nature of Jesus; and in Part II having seen the strong New Testament teaching of the Church as the 'corporate personality' of the risen Christ, which entails, on the one hand, a character-communicating union between Christ and the Church, and on the other intense interpersonal relationships between those who are 'in Christ', we are now in a position to see how this Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology, as the fundamental setting of the sacraments in the New Testament, helps us to understand both the theology and practice of the sacraments in the New Testament.

PART IIITHE SACRAMENTS (BAPTISM AND THE EUCHARIST).CHAPTER I.BAPTISM(a) Introduction (Summary of Study)

Throughout this study of the theological setting of the Sacraments in the Church's understanding of the person and work of Jesus and of the Church we have already had to deal at some length with the new Testament conception of baptism. This has been unavoidable for the primitive understanding of Christ, his work and the Church is inextricably tied to their understanding of baptism. One could as little understand the New Testament doctrine of baptism without placing it firmly in the context of Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology as one could understand any of these related doctrines without taking into account the New Testament teaching on baptism. Here we shall summarise the major conclusions which we have reached in the course of our study before moving on to consider some of the more practical questions related to the Doctrine of Baptism.

(i) The Baptism of Christ

In our study of the baptism of Christ by John¹ we saw that the significance of that baptism is Christological and soteriological. It was not a sign of Christ's self-identification of himself with sinful men or with the messianic fellowship created by the preaching and baptism of John. Its significance is theological rather than psychological. It was the point at which Jesus was anointed with the Spirit of God for his work as the ʿebhed Yahweh and Messiah. Here Jesus knew himself to be commissioned and equipped by God as the one who would bring in the Kingdom of God by defeating every power which held man in² bondage.

The narrative of the baptism of Jesus therefore sets the stage for what is to be unfolded in the Gospel drama of salvation. He who in baptism has been irrevocably anointed as God's eschatological deliverer begins his work of proclaiming in word and deed the advent of the Kingdom of God (Mk. 1.15 and par.) All the Gospels bear witness to the fact that this authority- and power-endowed figure (seen to be such particularly under the title of the Son of man) is

1. Cf above pp. 38f and 86ff.

2. Cf above pp. 100ff, 402ff, 460ff.

rejected by the religious authorities, a rejection which leads ultimately to Golgotha. No less unanimously do they record Jesus' own understanding of his work to be that he must die in obedience to God and in fulfillment of Scripture. His death is both a tragedy and a mission. Again the New Testament record is quite clear that the death of Jesus the Servant/Messiah/Son of Man is completely unintelligible to his disciples. When the hour of crisis came, Jesus was left utterly and completely alone. Consequently his baptism in the river Jordan, understood both in terms of commission and equipment by God, contains within it the inevitable consequence of his death which can itself, therefore, be spoken of as his baptism (Mk. 10.38 and par.)^{1.}

But death is not the end. The unanimous verdict of the New Testament is that on the first day after the Sabbath of that momentous Passover in Jerusalem God raised Jesus from the dead which resurrection, we have argued, was understood as a complex event including his ascension-exaltation to the right hand of God and the bestowal of the Spirit, which Jesus had himself received in his baptism, upon his disciples.^{2.} In this was fulfilled the prophecy at Jesus' baptism that he who was baptized with the Spirit would be the one who would baptize with the Spirit.

We have seen that in the traditions behind the New Testament use of the titles ebhed, Messiah, and the Son of Man this bestowal of the Spirit meant sharing in the corporate personality of the Spirit-endowed deliverer and therefore participating in his divine endowment. At every point we have seen how the understanding of the person and work of Jesus points to his creation of the Spirit-endowed community and in particular we have argued that Luke's great record of the events of Pentecost was motivated by his understanding of Pentecost as the festival of the in-gathering of the harvest consecrated in the offering of the first fruits on the day after the Passover Sabbath.^{3.} The baptismal promise that God's anointed one would baptize with the Spirit is fulfilled when after his life, death, resurrection and ascension Jesus pours out the Spirit upon his followers including them in the Spirit-filled community of the ebhed, Messiah, Son of man.

Because of the inherent link between New Testament Christology and soteriology and the creation of the community, Christian baptism, like Christ's,

1. Cf above pp. 231f.
 2. Cf above pp. 39ff.
 3. Cf above pp. 46f.

is understood both as baptism with the Holy Spirit (e.g. Acts 2.38; Jn. 3.5) and as an anointing by God (2 Cor. 1.21; 1. Jn. 2.20, 27). In a sense, therefore the Christian in his baptism is included into Christ's baptism, but he is included in it only when on Golgotha and in the resurrection and ascension Christ has fulfilled his baptismal commission. Then God fulfilled the promise that men should share in the baptismal gift and commission of Jesus, his anointing with the Spirit. Between Christ's baptism and Christian baptism must stand the fulfilment of Christ's work particularly in the Cross and resurrection and ascension.

We have here spoken of Christ's creation of community as if Christ were the one who gathered a fellowship around himself which was external to himself. If ever we are to appreciate fully the link between baptismal union with Christ and incorporation into the community we need to draw together our conclusions on the relationship between Baptism and Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology.

(ii) Baptism and Christology

Of the Christological titles we examined in some detail we noted that in the pre-history of the ʿebhed Yahweh and the Son of man there were indications that both stood not for an individual, or even a representative individual, but for Israel, or at least the righteous remnant within Israel. In our examination of the New Testament material we saw that neither title was applied by the community in this collective sense. Rather they were applied to one Israelite alone, Jesus of Nazareth. In fact the whole of the New Testament bears witness to the primitive belief that God's covenant with Israel had been reduced to God's covenant with Jesus. In him alone is God's dealing with the world.

At the same time we noted that the concept of the community was never far from the minds of the various New Testament authors. Whatever the concept of the person and work of Christ was with which they portrayed Christ, the end product was always the same. He was the one who had created a new community, the new Israel, the new people of God. He had brought in the Kingdom of God (or of the Son of man in Matthew), broken the old solidarity of man in bondage because of Adam and had created a new solidarity of redeemed man.

These two concepts of Christ alone being the true Israel and the sole

place of God's relationship with the world and yet of the creation of a new community which is the true Israel and which can know fellowship with God are by no means incompatible concepts in the primitive tradition. As we have seen, Christ is and remains the one and only true Israel, the 'seed of Abraham' (Gal. 3.16), the 'true vine' (Jn. 15.1). The community is such only in so far as it is a part or 'organ' of that one man. The more accurate New Testament language is that the community is the 'body of Christ' by being 'in Christ'. He is its head, Lord, Master. Yet the relationship is so organically and spatially conceived that Christ and the community together constitute 'one man', 'Abraham's seed' (e.g. Gal. 3.28f).

In consequence baptism is conceived of as 'putting on Christ' (Gal. 3.27) or 'the new man' (Eph. 4.24; Col. 3.10). It is the way in which we participate in the very being of Christ himself, rather than simply the way to fellowship with Christ.

In his incarnation, therefore, Jesus is seen to be one man separated from all other men by his election, divine equipment, and union with God. When his work is completed in his death, resurrection and ascension he is no longer so. It would be false to say that a collective meaning has been given to the Abhed/Messiah/Son of man in the post-ascension period, for this might be thought to imply that Jesus and his followers now constitute a 'collection' of individuals. It would be truer to say that Jesus has become the one inclusive individual and that by incorporation into this individual we come to share, in dependence, his very nature. In this sense the individual Christology of the incarnation becomes, through redemption, the corporate Christology which is New Testament ecclesiology.

The relationship between Christian baptism and Christology is that in and through this sacrament we are made to share in this corporate Christology, i.e. in the nature of him whose uniqueness and cruciality is described under many different titles and concepts in the New Testament. By it we do not become Christ, but part of the living, single, indivisible whole which is Christ and yet utterly dependent upon Christ.

(iii) Baptism and Soteriology

It is somewhat artificial to draw a distinction between Christology and soteriology in the New Testament. For the biblical authors Christ is able to do what he does because he is who he is. For the sake of clarity, however,

it is useful to make such a distinction.

Of all the New Testament writers Paul gives us the most closely worked out soteriology in relation to the death (particularly) and resurrection of Christ.¹ His basic premiss is the solidarity of man 'in Adam' and because of Adam's sin, in bondage to sin and death. It is being 'in the flesh', the basis of man's weakness, which makes man totally powerless against the whole array of hostile forces robbing man of the possibility of union with or obedience to God. Christ entered into this solidarity of man in bondage and, despite his sinlessness, this solidarity led ultimately and inevitably to his death. But unlike other men who die because of sin and disobedience Christ died 'to sin' in obedience to God. His death, therefore, was not the point of the final triumph of the hostile powers, but of his triumph over them. By 'putting off his flesh' in death he broke the solidarity of weakness which would have held him in bondage.² His death in consequence marks the possibility of a new solidarity for man, a solidarity which is characterised by freedom from the enslaving powers because of Christ's triumph.

In the moment of death Christ stands alone as the one victorious individual. Him God raised from the dead as a spiritual body. Because of this the possibility of sharing in the victory he achieved through death is made available to men.

For Paul, therefore, this unique saving event is the substance of Christian baptism. In baptism the Christian is grafted into Christ and participates in his death, burial, and resurrection.³ We have argued that Paul's concept here is not that of doing the same thing now in baptism as Christ did on the Cross. Nor is it that in baptism Christ does again what he did once-for-all in his death and resurrection. It is rather that in baptism the Christian is made completely one with Christ and, as such, contemporaneous and co-extensive with him in his act of dying and rising. He is involved in the self-same conflict as Christ (hence the baptismal renunciation of Satan rather than a simple acceptance of the fact that Satan is so completely routed that the Christian can bask in the after-math of victory already won),⁴ assured only that so long as he remains 'in Christ' his participation in the freedom and victory of Christ is secure.

1. Cf above pp. 402ff

2. Cf above pp. 418ff.

3. Cf above pp. 422ff.

4. Cf above pp. 154ff; 434.

The relationship between baptism and soteriology is, therefore, that in baptism the Christian is made so completely one with Christ in the process of his gaining victory and freedom that Christ communicates to the Christian his nature of having 'put off the flesh', being the 'new man', the 'life-giving Spirit'. Consequently the Christian is he who, through baptism, has 'put off the flesh', 'put on the new man', become a 'new creation', and is spiritual.

(iv) Baptism and ecclesiology

If the New Testament Christology and soteriology point to the absolute cruciality and uniqueness of Christ and man's complete dependence on him, the very way in which the relationship between Christ and the Christian is conceived points to a corporate identity of Christ and the community, which identity is never the community's or that of any individual within the community, but is Christ's. Christ and all those 'in him' constitute one living whole, so that either the Church itself or any individual within it is encountered as Christ.

When the clear-cut distinctions we might like to make between Christ and the community are found to be inappropriate in the New Testament, then it follows that baptismal incorporation into Christ means at the same time incorporation into Christ both as the ascended 'head' of the Church and as the community which is his body. Being made an 'organ' of the total living Christ means therefore being made 'organs one of another' (Rom. 12.5, Eph. 4.25) 'in him'. For the New Testament there is just no possibility of a union with Christ which does not include union with one another, for that would imply that the Church is fundamentally something other than Christ himself.

It is this that makes the heated debate whether the Church is or is not the Kingdom of God somewhat misleading. It is true that the Kingdom in the sense of the final inclusion of everything that is not yet 'in Christ' has not yet come. But everything that is meant by the Kingdom of God is given in and with the person of Christ. He is the kingdom. Therefore to be 'in Christ' is at the same time to be 'in the Kingdom of God'. The reality of the Kingdom has come and is given 'in Christ'. The final and total victory of Christ, and therefore of the Kingdom, is still to come. There is a very legitimate sense in which the Church is the Kingdom, but only in the sense of the corporate unity of Christ and the Church. So baptism into Christ is at the same time inheritance of the Kingdom of God which, because of the organic

1. Cf above pp. 438 ff, 482 ff.

2. Cf. 1 Cor. 15.24.

singleness of Christ and the Church, entails the most intimate union with all those who are in the Kingdom which is 'in Christ'.

Baptism in the New Testament can therefore be described in two major aspects. On the one hand it is inclusion into the very being of Christ in which we share in his unique relationship with God and participate in dependence in his nature. On the other it is inclusion into the community which is 'in Christ'. While the second aspect is entirely dependent on the first neither is complete without the other...Unfortunately in the history of the practice of baptism insufficient attention has been given to the concept of incorporation into the community. This does not mean that no theologians have stressed the concept of baptism as inclusion into the Body of Christ. Such an allegation would be manifestly false. But what it means in practical terms has seldom been made evident in the practice of the Christian Church. It is to this we shall return later in our consideration of some practical questions relating to baptism.

(v) Baptism and the Spirit

We have already seen how baptism in the New Testament is viewed as
 1. our incorporation into Christ, who at his baptism was endowed with the Spirit
 2. for his mission as the ebhed Yahweh/Messiah, and that his work was fulfilled
 in the creation of the Spirit-filled community through his death, resurrection
 3. and ascension. Consequently baptism as incorporation into Christ and into the
 Spirit-filled community is baptism for the reception of the Holy Spirit.
 4. Paul in Romans 8 can speak of the Christian life as life 'in Christ' or life
 'in the Spirit' with little apparent difference in meaning.

Despite this emphasis in New Testament baptismal teaching there are three passages in Acts which seem to offer evidence to the contrary.

The first is found in the story of the conversion of Cornelius. Here it is made clear that baptism is administered to Cornelius and those with him because they had received the Holy Spirit and not in order to receive him ('Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?' Acts 10.47). It would appear that baptism is presented here as a sign of an already accomplished reality, but

1. Cf above pp. 494f

2. Cf above pp. 492f

3. Cf above pp. 495f.

4. Cf Acts 2.38; Jn. 5.5 (and above pp. 352if); 1 Cor. 12.13; Eph. 4.4, 23 (on Eph. 4.23 cf above p. 160. n.2).

from this we dare not generalise. The context of Acts 10.47 makes it plain that the narrative has been preserved because it dealt with the crucial problem of the mission to the Gentiles and their inclusion in the Christian church. Some such clear indication of God's acceptance of Gentiles was necessary for the Jewish Christians before they were prepared to accept Gentiles. This is confirmed by the fact that it is precisely in this way that Peter argued at the Council of Jerusalem.

The second passage in Acts 8.14ff again deals with the Gentile mission. We are told here quite explicitly that the Holy Spirit had not yet fallen on the Samaritan converts 'only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus'. Because of this the Jerusalem church sent Peter and John who prayed for the Samaritan Christians that they might receive the Holy Spirit and, when they had laid hands on them, they received this gift. Here a clear distinction is drawn between baptism 'into the name of the Lord Jesus' and the reception of the Holy Spirit. Again one needs to be careful not to generalise on the basis of this incident. Pedersen, Eichrodt, and Ringgren, among others, have shown that in the Israelite practice of laying hands on the sacrificial victims there is an element of identification of the man with his victim. We have also seen how the laying hands on Paul and Barnabas for the Gentile mission (Acts 13.4) was both a commissioning of them by the church, and the church's identification with them in their mission. Consequently Lampe is probably correct when he interprets this incident in terms of the identification of the Jewish church in Jerusalem with the Samaritan church, and refuses to allow it as evidence of a primitive separation of the rite of baptism from a later rite for the reception of the Spirit. In view of the wellknown antipathy between Jews and Samaritans it would be most natural for the Samaritan Christians to look for acceptance by the Jerusalem church, and it would be unexceptional if they exhibited a certain reticence and reserve until this acceptance was shown to them. Consequently the visit of Peter and John as ambassadors and representatives of the Jerusalem church and the laying of hands could well have brought a sense of joy and liberation to the converts in Samaria, which Simon longed to be able to emulate. Such an interpretation would be confirmed by

1. Cf Acts 15.8

2. Acts 8.16.

3. Acts 8.17.

4. J. Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, pp.108ff.

5. W. Eichrodt, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, 1967, pp.218ff.

6. H. Ringgren, *Sacrifice*, 1962, pp. 78f.

7. Cf above pp. 101ff.

8. G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, 1951, pp.96ff.

9. **Acts 8.18f**

what we have seen of the community- and unity-creating character of baptism. In this incident there appears to be an understandable nervousness about both unity and community because of the racial tensions which has led to a unique separation in the New Testament of Christian baptism and reception of the Holy Spirit.

The third incident concerns the disciples at Ephesus who, despite the fact that they **had** believed in Christ had neither known whether the Holy Spirit was yet available, nor had they received him. This fact calls from Paul the disbelieving question, 'Into what then were ye baptized?' which shows that Paul understood that Christian baptism and reception of the Holy Spirit belonged inalienably together. Their reply is that they have not in fact received Christian baptism but John's baptism. As a result they received Christian baptism. This narrative, however, preserves an idea that reception of the Holy Spirit was associated with the rite of laying on hands and not baptism. We are told that 'when Paul had laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them' (Acts 19.6). While the explanations given above for the separation of baptism from the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 8 and 10 cannot apply here, it is clear that baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit are tied very closely together. If it was customary at this time for baptism to be followed immediately by the laying on of hands, then Paul's question 'Into what then were ye baptized?', which was raised by the fact that the Ephesian disciples had not received the Holy Spirit, would contain no contradiction. They would have received Christian baptism 'into the Lord Jesus' accompanied by the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit. If, on the other hand, such a practice was not customary (and this is possible since Paul asked only about their baptism), then it is hard to reconcile his question with his practice of following Christian baptism with the laying on of hands. Whatever may have been the practice this incident shows how closely baptism and reception of the Holy Spirit were connected.

We conclude, therefore, that none of these three incidents in Acts can count against our conclusion that Christian baptism, as incorporation into the Spirit-endowed Christ, is for the sharing in that same Spirit.

1. Cf above p. 91f.

2. Acts 19.1ff.

3. Acts 19.3

4. Acts 19.3

5. For evidence of this as primitive practice cf G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, 1951, pp.10ff.

(b) The Ordering of Baptism

Here we shall direct our attention to some of the practical questions relating to baptism.

(i) Infant Baptism

'An inadequate order and practice of baptism can obscure its nature, power and meaning, can dull and render difficult the understanding of it.'

While Barth is quite unambiguous in his affirmation that baptism is not dependent for its effect on its ordering and that since God in Christ is himself the one who baptizes the character indelibilis which is imparted cannot be denied to those who have been baptized and is not to be looked for in any re-baptism, he is equally convinced that the practice of infant baptism cannot be scripturally justified and in fact has obscured the real nature of the sacrament.

This forthright challenge to the church by one of the greatest and most respected theologians of this century has sparked off the most lively discussion on the question whether or not infant baptism is scripturally and theologically justifiable. The material which we have examined thus far in this study is able to serve only as a general introduction to this particular practical problem. For an answer we need to return to the New Testament evidence and the theological grounds it presents for the practice (or lack of it) of infant baptism.

1. The baptism of children of parents joining the Church in the earliest period.

The baptisms recorded in the New Testament without exception belong to a missionary situation. They are the baptisms administered when Jews and Gentiles were received into Christ in his body, the Church. Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in urging that the question of the baptism of the children of converts should be dealt with independently of the baptism of the children of parents belonging to the Church.

1.a The $\hat{\omicron}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ formula and Jewish Proselyte Baptism

To Stauffer belongs the credit of having examined in detail in an important article the many variations on the formula 'He and his whole house' in the Old Testament. The investigation of this rich material led Stauffer to the conclusion that from early times there was a constant biblical ' $\hat{\omicron}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ formula' which 'not only referred to the children in addition to the adults but

1. K. Barth, Baptism, 1956, p. 35.

2. ibid pp 35f.

3. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p. 19

4. E. Stauffer, 'Zur Kindertaufe in der Urkirche in Deutsches Pfarrerblatt, Vol. 49, 1949.

had quite special reference to the children, and not least to any small children who might be present.^{1.} Our own examination of the family solidarity in Israel's thinking would have led us to a similar conclusion even without the more detailed investigation of Stauffer. As a first provisional conclusion we note that it is unlikely that the New Testament 'ὄικος formula' would have excluded the children or infants who might have been in the household. If the intention were specifically to exclude children then we should expect to find such a specific instruction.

A most adequate summary of the much-studied question of Jewish proselyte baptism is presented by Jeremias.^{2.} His main arguments are so widely supported that they need not be repeated here.^{3.} The close parallels between proselyte baptism and Christian baptism in respect of the language^{and} concepts employed, and even in details of administration (by immersion) are so striking that the conclusion that the one practice is dependent on the other cannot be seriously doubted. With the relationships between the Christian Church and Judaism being what they were in the latter half of the first and the second centuries it is inconceivable that the Jewish practice was modelled on the Christian. That the Christian practice is dependent on the Jewish is therefore inevitable. In any event the practice of John the Baptist, attested by Josephus, can only be explained as a peculiar application of a well-known practice of receiving Jewish converts into the community.^{4.} If it were not well known the significance of his demanding a purificatory baptism of those who were already Jews would have been lost on his hearers.

Because of the almost certain dependence of Christian baptism on Jewish proselyte baptism the Jewish practice in relation to children has a real bearing on our question, especially in view of the other close parallels between the two rites.

Strack and Billerbeck have demonstrated decisively that when Gentiles adopted the Jewish faith it was taken for granted that at the same time the children also, including even very young children, should be received into the Jewish faith.^{5.} The oldest rabbinic sources, the Tannaitic traditions, give numerous instances of the reception of small Gentile children and babies into the Jewish faith. The

1. E. Stauffer, 'Zur Kindertaufe in der Urkirche' in Deutsches Pfarrerblatt, Vol. 49, 1949. p. 153.

2. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960. pp.24ff.

3. Cf ibid p.29 n.1 for impressive list of supporting scholars.

4. Cf V. Taylor, Mark, 1955, pp.151ff.

5. Strack and Billerbeck, Vol. I, pp.110-112.

information is given because legal questions arose whose answer varied according to the sex of the child.

In the case of the reception of boys the all-important question was to determine the date of circumcision. b.Shab 135b (Bar.) lays down the procedure relating to children born to a newly purchased Gentile slave. The fact that slaves were considered as part of the household of the Jewish owner indicates that the fact of purchase included the child in the Jewish faith. As such the child had to be circumcised, and the rule lays down that if the slave-girl was pregnant on the day of purchase, then the normal Jewish procedure of circumcision on the eighth day was to be followed. If, however, the child was already born, then it was to be circumcised on the day of purchase. An analogous distinction holds for the Gentile boys born in freedom. 'A (male) proselyte (child) is under certain circumstances circumcised on the eighth day. What do "certain circumstances" mean? If the boy was born before the baptism of his¹ mother, then he is circumcised on the first day. If he was born after the baptism of his mother, he is circumcised on the eighth day.¹

In the case of Gentile girls the question was whether they were to be treated on a par with Jewish girls in relation to the law preventing mixed marriages. The oft-repeated rule was that if they came into the Jewish faith² before the age of three years, then they were treated on a par with Jewish girls.

This evidence is cited by Jeremias in support of his conclusion that they bear indirect testimony to the practice of the baptism of infant proselytes as early as the beginning of the first century A.D. It is note-worthy, however, that no single passage refers to the baptism of these infants. When in reference to the children born to free Gentile converts the baptism of the mother is specifically mentioned, there is reference only to the circumcision of her son. Neither is any reference made to the proselyte baptism of girls under three years of age. Jeremias is doubtless correct in saying that proselyte baptism was the³ only manner of admission to the Jewish community for girls, but it is significant that no reference whatever is made to their baptism. It is therefore possible that in this early period the proselyte baptism of infants was not in fact practised. It is probable that in this period the infant was regarded as so completely dependent on the parent that they were regarded as belonging

1. Ger. 2.1 (Jeremias' translation)

2. Keth. 1.2,4; 3.1,2; E.Qid.78a(Bar.) par.b. Yeb 60b; j.Qid.4.66a. 10; j.Bik. 1.64a. 31f; j.Yeb.3.9b. 62f.

3. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.38.

inextricably together, and therefore the child would have been included in the parent's baptism without itself being baptised. This would explain the absence of any reference to the baptism of proselyte children in the early Tannaitic traditions, while reference to the baptism of their parents is made. Clearly this would not have rendered the practice of the circumcision of boy children untenable as even the sons of Jewish parents were circumcised. Nor would this contradict Strack and Billerbeck's evidence that the conversion of Gentile children to the Jewish faith was taken for granted in and with the conversion of their parents.

The first direct mention of the baptism of young proselyte children is by Rab Huna (c.212-297)^{1.} Thereafter the evidence becomes much more profuse. It is during this same period, i.e. 200-250 that there is the first unmistakable^{2.} evidence for the Christian baptism of infants. The evidence for this Christian practice during the second century is certainly very scanty and ambiguous.^{3.} The clear statements on the Christian practice during the third century are based on very clearly stated theological premises which mark a decisive trend away from the premises of the second century. The fact that in both Jewish and Christian traditions we have the first clear indications of the baptism of infants in the same period indicates the strong probability that the same presuppositions underly both practices.

This basic presupposition concerns the question of the 'innocence' of children. Paul draws a distinction between the children of non-Christians as ἀκάθαρτα (unclean) and those of Christian or 'mixed' marriages as ἅγια (holy) (1 Cor. 7.14). His meaning would appear to be that the children of Christian parents are members of the Church, included among the saints. Similarly when Paul directs his instructions to children regarding their behaviour towards their parents in Colossians and Ephesians he speaks of them being 'in the Lord'^{4.} (ἐν κυρίῳ), and both epistles are addressed to the 'saints and faithful'^{5.} (ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς) Whether or not this means that they were baptized, as Flemington maintains,^{6.} is a debatable point, and can only be answered in the affirmative if there is any really substantial evidence in the New Testament for

1. b.Keth, 11a, cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. I p.112.

2. Cf J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, pp.59ff.; K. Aland, Baptize, 1963, pp.42ff

3. K.Aland, Baptize, 1963, pp.53-79, who submits the claims of Jeremias that infant baptism was practised during the second century (J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, pp.59ff) to the most searching scrutiny. At best one can say that the evidence for the practice during this period is inconclusive.

4. Col. 3.20; Eph. 6.1.

5. Eph. 1.1; Col. 1.2

6. W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, p.132.

the baptism of the children of those already Christian. What is clear, however, is that the designation 'the saints and the faithful' includes all the groups referred to subsequently in the letters, including the children, 'in the Lord'. We can therefore assume that for Paul the children of Christian parents were 'holy', included 'in the Lord' and thus in the Church and, as we shall contend below, they were regarded as such in virtue of their Christian parents and not in virtue of their baptism.

In the Apostolic Fathers we find repeatedly the presumption of the 'innocence' of children. It is not always clear whether this is a general innocence of all children, a thought which would have been preposterous to Paul, or in the Pauline sense of the children of Christian parents being included among the saints. Nor is it clear precisely how Christ's words regarding children in the Synoptics were interpreted by the Church.¹ On the whole, however, the general impression gained from the Apostolic Fathers is that of the general innocence of children. In the Letter of Parnabas (6.11) it is declared that Christ renews Christians in the remission of sins as if they were born for a second time, 'so that they should have the soul of children' (ὡς παιδίων ἔχειν τῆν ψυχὴν)² In the Shepherd of Hermas we find: 'Keep simplicity and be guileless, and thou shalt be as little children, who do not know the wickedness that destroys the life of men.'³ The whole of chapter 29 of the ninth parable is concerned with this theme. Here the twelfth mountain of Sim 9.1 is interpreted; it is completely white and in the series of the twelve mountains that symbolise the Church it represents the highest. The believers who belong to this group are 'very babes, into whose heart no guile enters, neither have they learned what wickedness is, but they have remained as babes for ever'.⁴ Since they have not violated the commands of God in any respect, but have passed their whole life in this child-like purity, they receive immediately a place in the kingdom of God. Accordingly an exhortation is given to Hermas and all Christians to remain and to become as βρέφη, without guile (κακίαν μὴ ἔχοντες),⁵ and the angel of blessing pronounces the blessing on all who are 'guileless as infants'.⁶

1. Mk. 10.13ff and par. To a discussion of this we shall return in the next section

2. Mand. 11.1

3. Sim IX, 29.1. Being set so completely in the context of the Church, and the reference to having remained as babes forever suggests that it is the children of Christians who are in mind here, though a more general reference is by no means excluded.

4. Sim IX, 29.2. The fact that it is unambiguously asserted that they have spent their whole life in this state of purity strengthens the claim that these are the children of Christian parents who have at no point deviated from the faith they received at their mother's knees.

5. Sim IX, 29.3

6. Sim IX 31.3

Among the Apologists (Aristides 15.11) occurs the statement about giving thanks to God (ὡπερ εὐχαριστοῦσιν) at the death of a child (νήπιον) because it has died sinless. Jeremias' conclusion that this text 'can hardly refer to the innocence of childhood, but more probably to the forgiveness which is given in baptism'¹ is really asking the text to contain more than it plainly does.² Aland has shown convincingly that Jeremias' interpretation cannot be correct.³ Athenagoras in his De resurrectione mortuorum 14 says of very little children that they will not be judged at the resurrection. Here also the very young child is regarded as sinless without any reference to baptism or to Christian parentage.

This evidence shows that the concept of the innocence of children, whether in the Pauline sense of the children of Christian parents or in a general sense, was held continuously until the time of Tertullian. According to Tertullian (De bapt. 18.5) children have no need to 'hasten to the remission of sins'. Clearly the argument of Tertullian against infant baptism is that if baptism is a bath of cleansing and the children of Christian parents are sinless then they do not need to be baptized.

In Tertullian, however, we find the first assertion concerning the baptism of older children of Christian parents. His argument is 'Let them come when they grow older; let them come when they are able to learn, when they can be instructed whither they should come; let them become Christians when they can know Christ.'³ Tertullian is not of the opinion that children remain in the state of innocence indefinitely. Even children who are born of Christian parents lose their innocence at puberty.⁴ The conception here differs from what we noted above in the Shepherd of Hermas, who seems to have believed that it was at least possible for the children of Christian parents to maintain the faith unbroken. Here it would seem is evidence of a change in conception which stands in marked contrast to the views of Cyprian and Origen.

According to Cyprian a new-born child 'has not sinned, except that, being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth; yet on this very account he approaches the more easily to the reception of the forgiveness of sins, because it is not his own sins that are forgiven him but the sins of another.'⁵ The statements of

1. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.71.

2. K. Aland, Baptize, 1965, p.56.

3. De baptismo 18.5. 4. De anima 38.1.

5. '...nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antique prima natiuitate contraxit, qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendi hoc ipse facilius accedit quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata.' Ep. 64.5.

Origen are quite parallel: to objections against infant baptism he counters ever and again the view that the saying of Scripture (Job. 14.4 etc) applies even to the newborn, 'No one is pure from stain, yea though he be but one day old'^{1.} From the first day the infant participates in sin. Admittedly a child cannot himself sin, but is caught up in the sin of its history and society.

It is striking to note that the first clear references to the Christian baptism of infants occurs at a time when the older concept of the innocence of children, even the children of Christian parents, has been abandoned in favour of a concept of a participation in the sin of all history and society in the sin of Adam. Tertullian appears to mark the transition between the two points of view, and in Tertullian we find the first clear reference to the baptism of the older children of Christian parents. It is possibly also significant that it is at the same time (i.e. at the beginning of the third century) that we find the first clear allusions to the baptism of the children of converts to the Jewish faith.

If therefore our first conclusion was that a 'household' in the Old Testament most certainly included children,^{2.} and our second that the children of Jewish proselytes (whose parents we know were baptized) were regarded as sharing their parents' conversion,^{3.} we cannot with any degree of confidence assume that during the New Testament period when a 'household' was converted, either to Judaism or Christianity, the children or infants in that household were in fact baptized. Until the third century there is no direct evidence in either tradition, and in the Christian tradition the argument for the need for infant baptism is based on the premiss that every child participates in the sin of Adam, a view which was not previously held. This indicates fairly clearly that probably in the earlier period infants were not baptized. In any event we cannot assert that Christians would have taken over from Jewish proselyte baptism the baptism of infants because we cannot be sure that the third century practice prevailed before or during the New Testament period.

Without pre-supposing that if there were children or infants in the famous 'households' in the New Testament passages they were baptized, let us turn to a more detailed examination of the various passages.

1 Cor. 1.16 'And I baptized also τὸν Στεφάνου οἶκον.' We are given no specific details about this 'household of Stephanas' which Paul baptized,

1. Nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei vita eius (e.g. Lev. hom. VIII, Luc. hom. XIV; Comm. in Rom. V.9).

2. Cf above p. 502

3. Cf above p. 502

but two pieces of information related to this context do provide us with some indication of what the 'οἶκος formula' entailed.

The first is that in 1 Cor. 16.15 Stephanas comes before us again, together with his οἰκία . Presumably οἰκία in 1 Cor. 16.15 is the same as οἶκος in 1 Cor. 1.16. Now it is instructive to note that Paul exhorts the Corinthian Church to be 'in subjection' to the house of Stephanas. It is the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας and attends to the διακονία of the Church. They are also those who 'help in the work and labours' (1 Cor. 16.16). When these qualities of leadership and service are attributed to the house of Stephanas, the most natural conclusion is that the 'household of Stephanas' which Paul baptized consisted of maturer persons.

The second is that, in recalling whom he had baptized, Paul makes reference to Crispus (1 Cor. 1.14). Of Crispus we read again in a most instructive passage in Acts 18.8: 'And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ'. That the same person is in view can hardly be doubted. Now it is striking that when specific reference is made in 1 Cor. 1.16 to the baptism of the household of Stephanas, in 1 Cor. 1.14 it is Crispus alone whom Paul baptized and not his 'household'. If we can accept the accuracy of both the Pauline and Lukan accounts of what happened in Corinth, then the most natural conclusion would appear to be that when Crispus as head of the house was converted and baptized his whole house was received into the Church.

It would seem that 1 Cor. 1.14 and 16 when taken together with 1 Cor. 16.15f and Acts 18.8, forbids the conclusion that any infants or small children were baptized. It would appear to be more in conformity with the New Testament record on this point to conclude that if there were any small children in the household of Crispus, their baptism was reckoned to be included in the baptism of Crispus so that they came into the Church with him through his baptism.

Acts 10.2; '(Cornelius) a devout man, and one that feared God σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ' and Acts 11.14. 'Who (Peter) shall speak unto you (Cornelius) words whereby thou shalt be saved, σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου'. These are the only two occasions in which the οἶκος formula is used of Cornelius in either Luke's narrative or Peter's address to the Council of Jerusalem. It is not found in the account of the conversion of Cornelius. However, what these two references do imply is that both before and after the conversion of Cornelius he and his 'house' were regarded and acted as a unit. His conversion obviously

had implications not only for himself but also for his household.

Against this it is instructive to note ~~that~~ what we are told in the account of the conversion of Cornelius which furnishes us with a fair number of details. In Acts 11.14 Peter recounts before the Council in Jerusalem how an angel had told Cornelius of his coming visit when he would speak words that would bring salvation to Cornelius and his house. At this Cornelius sent for Peter (Acts 10.7f), and prepared himself for his arrival and the fulfilment of the promise. How he prepared we are told in Acts 10.24 'having called together his kinsmen and his near friends'. It is these relatives and close friends whom Peter found gathered with Cornelius (Acts 10.27); it was to them he spoke, on them the Holy Spirit fell (Acts 10.44), so that they spoke in tongues (Acts 10.46), and it was they who were baptized (Acts 10.47f). Quite clearly we are not dealing with an assembly of slaves and small children here. It is an assembly of relatives and intimate friends. The events that occurred make it most unlikely that infants, if there were any in the household of Cornelius, were included. The most natural interpretation of the narrative is that it was an assembly of adults.

It would seem therefore, that if there were small children in the household of Cornelius to whom salvation was promised according to Acts 11.14, the conversion and baptism of Cornelius would have embraced the whole household including them in his salvation.

Acts 16.14f: 'And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, one that worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul. And when she was baptized, καὶ ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς.....'

Here we are given no information at all concerning Lydia except her occupation, and the assertion that both the house (Acts 16.40) and the household were hers. This in itself precludes the possibility of there being a husband in the background. It is, of course, possible that she was a widow. But this we do not know. If she was a widow with a family the references to her imply a stability in her occupation and possession of her house which makes it unlikely that she had been so recently widowed that there would be any infants or very young children in the family. It is equally possible that she had no children, if she was a widow, or that she had never married. If she had no children then the 'household' would most probably refer to the slaves. On the analogy of the

household of Crispus, Stephanus and Cornelius to which we have referred, the most natural conclusion is that the adult members of her 'household' were baptized when she responded to the preaching of Paul.

Acts 16.30-34: 'And he (the Philippian jailor) brought them (Paul and Silas) out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΟΝ i.e. believe thou (sing)) on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου (the same formula as is used of Cornelius in Acts 11.14). And they spoke the word of the Lord unto him καὶ πᾶσιν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ . And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized (ἐβαπτίσθη(sing)) καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ ἅπαντες immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set meat before them, and ἠγαλλιάσατο (sing!) πανοικεῖ πεπιστευκῶς (sing!) in God.

Two interpretations of this passage are possible. Cullmann suggests that the most instructive aspect of the story is that it deals throughout primarily with the jailor, and the reference to his 'household' appears as a continuing parenthesis. The promise of salvation to his house is based on the claim that the jailor must believe, and later in the story, after his baptism and the baptism καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ ἅπαντες¹, it is asserted that his rejoicing πανοικεῖ² is because he has believed. On this interpretation no reference is made to the response of faith of any but the jailor. As such it parallels the situation in the story of Lydia exactly.

The second interpretation would give far greater weight to the references to the household. It is possible that καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου in 16.31 should be understood both with ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΟΝ and σωθήσῃ to mean that the faith of the household as much as that of the jailor is the precondition of salvation. Weight is added to this interpretation when it is noted that in verse 32 Paul addressed the 'word of the Lord' not only to the jailor but also to 'all that were in his house'. Again in verse 34 πανοικεῖ² can be taken both with ἠγαλλιάσατο and πεπιστευκῶς implying that the household is associated with the jailor both in his rejoicing and in his believing.

If we follow Cullmann then the situation in this story, as in the story of Lydia, is markedly different from what appears to have happened on the conversion of Crispus and Cornelius - if both 1 Cor.1.14 and Acts 18.8 in respect

1. O.Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.53

2. a verse to which Cullmann omits reference.

of Crispus and Acts 11.14 in respect of Cornelius can be trusted. With Crispus and Cornelius it appears that the family is included in the baptism of the head of the household without the individual members all being baptized. With Lydia and the Philippian jailor (on this interpretation) the whole household is baptized when the head of the household is converted. As a guide to the interpretation of this difference in practice we need to take into account the story of Stephanas whose whole household was baptized, which, in the light of Acts 16.15, appears to indicate that the household did not contain small children. This is the most likely interpretation also of Lydia's situation. Of the 'household' of the Philippian jailor the only certain thing appears to be that there were slaves (of Acts 16.29). He probably also had a wife and may have had children. If it is true that his faith alone was counted as sufficient grounds for the baptism of the whole 'household', this is no evidence for the presence of infants.

If we follow the second interpretation then it would appear that while the emphasis falls on the jailor in that his faith is the pre-condition of his salvation (v.31), to him the word of the Lord was addressed (v.32), he was baptized (v.33), and he rejoiced having believed in God (v.34), at every stage his 'household' is associated with him. This means that they were not baptized simply on his profession of faith, but that v.31 makes their faith also the pre-condition of their salvation, that they also listened to Paul's proclamation of the Gospel (v.32), and that they also rejoiced because they had responded in faith (v.34). On this interpretation, especially in view of verses 32 and 34, it is difficult indeed to imagine that infants or very small children were included in the proceedings of that momentous night. I.e. this interpretation suggests very strongly that all concerned were maturer persons.

It remains true, however, that even if we follow the second interpretation it seems perfectly natural to Luke that the 'household' should follow the head of the household in his actions. And if we can trust Luke's account of what Paul said, it appears that his prime interest is not simply with the jailor as the most significant person in the company, but that Paul did understand that hope for the whole household was based firmly on the attitude and response of the jailor. Cullmann is right when he stresses that Paul said 'Believe thou on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy household'. In this the cruciality of the jailor is unmistakable. He is on less firm ground when he

suggests that no response of faith was necessary for the salvation of the 'household' (v.31), and that no such response was in fact made (v.34) before their baptism. The most we can say is that it appears that the baptism of the jailor's 'household' was dependent on his conversion.

As a result of this more detailed examination of the particular reference to 'household baptisms' we see that there is evidence that the conversion of the head of a household meant that he brought his whole family into the Church with him but a lack of evidence that this coming of the whole family into the Church always included the actual baptism of the whole household (e.g. Crispus and Cornelius). Consequently, we should guard against the too easy assumption that the New Testament 'household baptisms' included the baptism of small children and infants. In fact where we do have fairly clear evidence (e.g. Stephanas) it would appear that when a household is baptized that household consisted of maturer persons. It is indeed possible that if there were small children in the family they would not themselves have been baptized but they would have been included in the baptism of their parents, and thus made 'children in the Lord' (Col. 3.20; Eph. 6.1), members with the saints (Col. 1.2; Eph. 1.1).

1.b The promise 'to you and to your children' in Acts 2.39

Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in his conclusion that Acts 2.38f has
 1. come from the Jewish-Christian Church. The strong indications of Aramaisms in
 2. the text are in themselves sufficient evidence of this. From this he concludes
 that we have here 'a witness for the practice of infant baptism in apostolic
 times, at any rate in the time of the composition of Luke's twofold work; that
 is to say for the baptism of the children of Jewish parents on their admission
 3. into the Christian Church.'

He reaches this conclusion on three major grounds. Firstly, he notes that in 2.39 Codex Bezae changes the person and writes ἡμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν whereas the text unequivocally reads ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν. Jeremias concedes that we must be careful about basing too far-reaching conclusions on variant readings but says also that we cannot simply ignore them. 'The most natural explanation of the variant is that the formulation "Be baptized every one of you..... for the promise is to us and our children" came naturally to the redactor's pen, because the baptism of Christian

2. Cf K. Lake and F.J. Foakes Jackson, The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, pp. 56ff;

1. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p. 40.

3. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p. 40

1.
children was a custom taken for granted.¹

Admittedly Codex Bezae comes from a later period, and can be taken as evidence for firmly established practice in the second century; but even so is this really the most 'natural explanation'? Aland has shown how often Codex D makes similar alterations.² In Acts 2.17 ὑμῶν appears four times; D replaces it twice by αὐτῶν(υἱοὶ and θυγατέρες αὐτῶν), and twice omits it (after νεανίσκοι and πρεσβύτεροι). The same thing happens in 2.38: D reads εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν instead of εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν. The most illogical of these alterations is in Acts 2.22: Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα δεδοκιμασμένου ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς... Particularly this change in 2.22 indicates the determination of the redactor to apply the whole to himself and his readers, and cannot be regarded as anything approaching evidence for the practice of infant baptism with reference to Acts 2.38f as well established in the West before A.D. 150.

Secondly, Jeremias maintains: 'At the most one can ask whether in Acts 2.38f an age-limit is indirectly presupposed. H. Windisch reckoned that here older children must be thought of, namely such as are ripe for the repentance mentioned in 2.38 and can prophesy (2.17).³ This limitation is however highly improbable because the salvation from the final judgement mediated by baptism (2.40; of 2.21) excludes any limitation of age.'⁴ This is undoubtedly correct, but does not prove whether or not such small children were baptised on this occasion.

A similar judgement must be made about the third ground for Jeremias' conclusion. He concedes that at the time of Luke the τέκνα mentioned by Peter may be used to refer to 'descendants'.⁵ 'But the context speaks against it.' For the ἐπαγγελία of which Peter speaks is the promise of Joel 2.28 which Peter cites in Acts 2.17. 'Thus the children are not coming generations, but the sons and daughters of the hearers. Since the gift of the Spirit is linked with baptism (2.38), 2.39 contains the challenge to have the children baptized also.'⁶

Against this Aland has argued that not a word about the baptism of children occurs in 2.38, 'but only the baptism of the (adult!) hearers, who are

1. J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism*, 1960 p.72.

2. K. Aland, *Baptize*, 1963, p.85

3. H. Windisch, 'Zum Problem der Kindertaufe im Urchristentum' in *ZNW* Vol. 28, 1929, p.123.

4. J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism*, 1960, p.41.

5. *ibid*, p.40.

6. *ibid*, p.40.

1. exhorted to repent and get baptized.' Aland agrees that the τέκνα of Acts 2.39 means the same as the υἱοὶ ὑμῶν and the θυγατέρες ὑμῶν of Acts 2.17 (= Joel 2.28) which adduces scripture as proof that the children will share in the fathers' endowment with the Spirit and that they will prophesy. He notes also that the text continues immediately to speak of 'πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρᾶν, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.' On the basis of this Aland interprets the τέκνα as equivalent to πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρᾶν and 'refers to coming generations'.^{2.} This looks very much like special pleading. What would be the point of saying 'to your children, and to all that are afar off' if the reference was not to the children which the hearers had borne and would bear as well as future generations. In fact the most natural interpretation of Acts 2.39 would be that Peter says to his hearers that the promised gift of the Holy Spirit is to them and their family, but it is more than this. The same promise is for any one who in the future would respond to the call of God and submit to baptism. There is indeed an implied reference to the future generations of those baptized, but it is ridiculous to suppose that this excludes any reference to the children these converts already had.

Does this mean, however, that these children of the converts were baptized that day? They would have been if they were a part of the 'every one of you' on whom Peter urges repentance and baptism (Acts 2.38) and also part of the 3,000 who received Peter's word and were baptized. Then they would also be those whom Peter could classify at the opening of his address 'Ye men of Judaea (Acts 2.14)... Ye men of Israel (Acts 2.22)'. This would be most unlikely to include infants and small children. Is Jeremias right then in saying that Acts 2.39 contains an exhortation to have the small children of his converts baptized? This is a possible interpretation. It is equally possible that what the verse claims is that the gift of the Spirit promised by Joel will be given to the children of those baptized in and with their parents' baptism, and that it will also be given to those 'afar off' when they respond to God's call and are baptised. Such an interpretation would be perfectly natural to a Jewish audience for whom the solidarity of the family is taken for granted so that the 'blessing' of the father is communicated to his whole family.^{3.} This would mean that those children who remain in the father's house would participate in the gift of the Spirit to him and would be regarded with him as being 'in the Lord' and thus in the Church.

1. K. Aland, *Baptize*, 1963, p.86.

2. *ibid* p. 86.

3. Cf above pp.391ff

1. c Baptism and Circumcision

Jeremias¹ and Stauffer², along with many other scholars support³ the claim that infant baptism was practised in the primitive Christian community by asserting that Christian baptism has taken the place of circumcision. The key passage in support of this contention is Col. 2.11 (In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ). The really crucial question is whether this text can be used to support a view that the ceremonial laws concerning circumcision, including those which demanded the circumcision of the sons of baptized proselytes,⁴ were carried over and applied to Christian baptism. If they were then clearly there could be no doubt that baptism of the children of both converts and established Christians would have been practised. But this text is unable to support the confidence of Jeremias and Cullmann⁵ that this did in fact occur.

In our examination of this baptismal section we have seen that the force of the whole argument is that in his death Christ 'put off the body of flesh' so that when in baptism the Christian is united with Christ he is joined to him in his act of 'putting off the body of flesh' and so is able to participate in Christ's triumph. Ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to this act of putting off the flesh in Christ's dying and has nothing whatever to do with Jewish ceremonial law. In fact, as Aland suggests, the force of the reference to circumcision here is to present a pictorial image of how in circumcision, Christ's death, and Christian baptism, flesh is 'put off'.⁶ This being so the argument for Christian baptism having taken the place of circumcision and therefore for carrying over ceremonial regulations from circumcision to baptism is materially weakened.

The case is further weakened when we consider that it can be taken for granted that the primitive community in Jerusalem circumcised their children in a manner parallel to their continued observance of the prescriptions of the ceremonial law, but we have no evidence whatever that the Jerusalem community practiced circumcision and baptism at the same time. Nor do we have any evidence that in the Pauline churches that they did in fact baptize the children of converts, as we have seen, or the children of established Christian parents

1. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960. pp. 46ff.

2. E. Stauffer, 'Zur Kindertaufe in der Urkirche' in Deutsches Pfarrerblatt, Vol. 49, 1949, p. 21.

3. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, pp. 56ff.

4. cf above pp. 502f

5. Cf above pp. 418f

6. K. Aland, Baptize, 1963, p. 84.

as we shall see below. In fact if our conclusions are correct the evidence would seem to indicate that they did not practise it. While language and concepts derived from circumcision were applied to Christian baptism it is asking too much of the New Testament evidence to support the conclusion that ceremonial regulations derived from circumcision were also applied to baptism. If an argument from silence is at all legitimate, in view of the super-abundance of regulations concerning the circumcision of Jewish and proselyte boys it is remarkable that at no point in the New Testament is it urged, even on those who may not have been familiar with Jewish practice, that the children of Christian converts or established Christians must be baptized. The absence of any such evidence makes it dubious indeed to draw a straight line from the practice of circumcision to the practice of infant baptism.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that it is probable (and we cannot be any more dogmatic) that the children of converts were not baptized, but that they were none the less regarded as being 'in the Lord' and thus in the Church because they were included in the baptism of their parents or the head of the house. Against the background of the concept of the strong solidarity of the family, which solidarity stemmed from the father, such a practice would be easy to understand. This entails no mystical view of the family nor an optimistic view of the purity and innocence of children. It is rather a realistic view, (particularly in an age which knew little of the modern 'technopolis' and the weakening of family ties and influence of parents on their children), of the dynamic role of the parents in shaping a child's total personality.

2. The baptism of children born to Christian parents in the earliest period

We shall restrict our attention here to those passages used by Jeremias to support the conclusion that established Christian parents did baptize their children.

2.a 1 Cor. 7.14

Since Jeremias' final position on this text is given in the English edition in which he modifies the conclusion he reached in the German editions, we shall confine our attention to it.

Like Cullman and Aland, Jeremias takes careful note of the form of Paul's argument in this verse. 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife
 1.
 L. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, pp. 25, 44; K. Aland, Baptize, 1963, pp.80ff;
 J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, pp.44ff.

and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean (ἀκάθαρτα): but now are they holy (ἅγια).¹ The major premiss of the argument is that the children of a Christian parent are holy (presumably because of their solidarity in the family with the Christian parent); the minor premiss is that any member choosing to remain in the family solidarity with a believer is made holy; and thus the conclusion is that the Christians need not fear continuing in marital relations with an unbelieving partner, such a relationship would not defile the Christian. As Cullmann and Aland rightly conclude the holiness of the child is grounded in its birth to a Christian parent and continuing in the family solidarity. It is NOT based on baptism. Cullmann points in support of this conclusion to the evidence cited by Strack and Billerbeck that proselyte baptism was not administered to children born to Jewish converts after their baptism.¹ From this he concludes that the children of established Christian parents were not baptized. If Paul can base his argument for the membership of children among the saints on the grounds of birth even in a mixed marriage, and a mixed marriage in which it is by no means assumed that the Christian partner would dominate the heathen one (cf 1 Cor. 7.11,16), how much more would the argument hold for him if both parents were Christian.

This was the conclusion which Jeremias himself had reached in the earlier editions of his work. But in the English edition he says 'I have begun to doubt the validity of this reasoning. For it overlooks the important fact that in Judaism all boys, whether their birth was "in holiness" or not, were circumcised on the eighth day. Since Col. 2.11f tells us, in the Christian Church baptism was the rite which replaced circumcision, we must conclude that the fact that the children mentioned in 1 Cor. 7.14c were "holy" from their birth does not preclude the possibility that they were baptized.... We must accordingly be content with the conclusion that 1 Cor. 7.14c bears no reference to baptism.'² The fatal weakness in this argument is the reliance it places on Col. 2.11 for the conclusion that the cultic practice of circumcision became the cultic practice within Christianity and according to the same ceremonial regulations. We have seen that Col. 2.11 cannot support this conclusion.

While Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in asserting that the language of 1 Cor. 7.14 is derived from Jewish cultic language, it becomes most significant

1. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol. 1, pp.110ff.

2. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.47.f.

3. ibid p. 46.

that this cultic language is now applied to the children of Christian parents on the grounds of birth and not any cultic rite. This would suggest that Cullman's conclusion that the children of Christian parents were not baptized is 1. valid. It is significant to note here that the grounds of this Pauline argument are directly linked with the Jewish conception of the solidarity of the family and indirectly linked with the baptism of the Christian parent. It is because of the solidarity of the family that when the parents are included among the saints their children are also members of the church and 'in the Lord'.

2.
2.b Acts 21.21

'And they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs'. All we can learn from this passage is that in the year A.D. 55 new-born male infants of the Jerusalem Church were circumcised, and that in the Pauline Churches they were not. About their baptism Jeremias leaves a question mark over the Jerusalem Church, but of the Pauline churches he says 'Since Paul designates baptism as the ritual which replaces circumcision (Col. 2.11), it is very probable that these children were baptized.' 3. Jeremias' query concerning the Jerusalem branch cannot be answered in the affirmative by making reference to the Symmachians (who might have done so) by the Donatist Cresconius c. A.D. 400, or the present practice of the Coptic and Abyssinian churches. Jeremias' italicised probability statement concerning the Pauline Churches rests again on Col. 2.11 which cannot support this probability, and which, in view of 1 Cor. 7.14 is probably false.

2.c Mark 10.13-16 (cf Matt 19.13-15; Lk. 18.15-17).

This is the Gospel pericope dealing with the blessing of children by Jesus. Jeremias affirms at the beginning of his argument, 'The narrative itself, 4. as we must emphasize, has nothing to do with baptism, but is "pre-sacramental"'. His conclusion is that, 'This suggests... that the narrative of the blessing of the children was important for the early Church not only on other grounds, but because the Church took it as authority for the practice of infant baptism. We may conclude from this that in Rome at the time when the Gospel of Mark was 5. written the children of Christian parents were baptized.' The bridge between

1. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p.70.

2. Cf J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.48.

3. ibid p. 48

4. ibid p. 49

5. ibid p. 55

these two assertions is gained by a comparison between Matt. 18.3; Mk. 10.15=Lk. 18.17; Jn. 3.5; Justin, Apol. 1. 61.4; and the Apostolic Constitutions VI. 1. 15.5. For the sake of convenience Jeremias' table is reproduced here.

	Matt. 18.3	Mk. 10.15 = Lk. 18.17	Jn. 3.5	Justin Apol. 1. 61.4	Apost. Const. VI 15.5
a.	Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	Ἀμὴν Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι		
b.	Ἐὰν μὴ	ὅς ἂν μὴ	Ἐὰν μὴ τις	ἂν μὴ	Ἐὰν μὴ τις
c.	στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε	δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ	γεννηθῆ ξὺ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, (γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν)	ἀναγεννηθῆτε	βαπτισθῆ ξὺ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος,
d.	ὡς τὰ παιδία οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν	ὡς παιδίον οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆ εἰς αὐτήν	ὡς ὄνματα εἰσελθῆ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ	οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν	οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν

Let us consider in some detail the arguments of Jeremias which, via this bridge, are used to support his conclusion, which rests on proving that all five formulations have to do with one and the same saying.

(i) 'In all four Gospels the logion is introduced by "Truly" (ἀμὴν ; John + ἀμὴν) "I say unto you" (λέγω ὑμῖν ; John 'thee', σοι)'. A glance at a concordance shows that Matthew has a saying of Jesus commencing with ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (σοι) 31 times, Mark 14 times, and Luke 7 times. John has the characteristic double formula 25 times. This formula occurs far too frequently for any argument of literary dependence to be built on it. Only if there were agreement in an unusual formulation would there be any justifiable basis for the assumption of dependence of one writer on another.

(ii) 'In all the formulations a negative condition is added ("unless", Ἐὰν μὴ ; "whoever does not", ὅς ἂν μὴ)'. The introductory formula followed by a negative condition is found in John, in addition to Jn. 3.3 also in Jn. 5.19. The structure of Jn. 3.5 is therefore by no means unique in the Fourth Gospel making argument for the literary dependence of Jn. 3.5 on Mk. 10.15 considerably weaker.

(iii) Jeremias concedes that the material conditions for entering into the kingdom of God are differently conceived in the Gospels, but regards the

1. ibid p. 51

2. ibid p. 51

3. ibid p. 51

Synoptic and Johannine conceptions as equivalent: 'While the Synoptics (among whom Matthew's version is most sharply coloured by Semitic turns of phrase) speak of "becoming a child again" (Matthew) or "receiving the kingdom of God like a little child" (Mark, Luke), John speaks of "being born again". The synoptics thus lay more emphasis on the human attitude (ὡς παιδίον "by becoming like a child"), and John on the action of God. In essence, however, both say the same: a complete new beginning of life is the pre-condition of anyone finding admission under the rule of God.'

It is indeed true that what John is talking about is a radical new beginning and that he links this new beginning with baptism which, as we have seen, means sharing in Christ's nature of being 'from above'. But is this really what the Synoptics have in mind?

Jeremias' contention that it ^{is} based on his argument that the saying of Justin is derived not from Jn. 3.5 but from Matt. 18.3. 'The fourth formulation of our saying (Justin, Apol. 1, 61.4) is commonly reckoned a quotation from John 3.5, especially as Justin in the following sentence makes an allusion to John 3.4; accordingly our passage is regularly cited in introductory manuals to the New Testament as evidence that Justin used the Gospel of John, although there is nowhere in Justin a demonstratable word for word quotation from the Gospel of John. Even formulation IV is not in that category, but is instead a reproduction of Matt. 18.3, and is influenced only in the one word ἀναγεννηθεῖς by John 3.5 (γεννηθεῖς ἀνωθεν³).' while Jeremias may well be correct in his conclusion that Justin is following an 'oral tradition', the crucial point is whether or not he knew the Nicodemus story and from the Nicodemus story made the application to baptism. As Aland has convincingly shown, in view of Apol 16.5 and its close approximation to Jn. 3.4, Justin's dependence on Jn. 3 cannot be doubted. This being so Jeremias' argument for the derivation of the saying in Justin from Matthew 18.3 and its application to the baptism of the children of Christian parents collapses. It collapses because in its dependence on Jn. 3.5 we have to do with a very adult and very Jewish Nicodemus, i.e. a man who is neither an infant nor a child of Christian parents.

If, as is possible though by no means susceptible to any kind of proof, Jn. 3.5 is dependent on Mk. 10.15, what is most significant is that a

1. *ibid* p. 52.

2. Cf above pp. 454f, 485

3. *ibid* p. 52.

4. *ibid* p. 52.

5. K. Aland, *Baptize*, 1963, p.96 n.4

clear baptismal application of the saying is made in an adult conversion situation, and the failure by John to recognise or apply the reference to the children of his Synoptic source would indicate a conclusion contrary to that drawn by Jeremias; namely that infants were not baptized, least of all the infants of Christian parents.

In addition to this argument based on the structural parallels between the various sayings the use of κωλύειν on the lips of Jesus is believed to provide an allusion that Mark 10 belongs to the context of baptism. There is no doubt, as Cullmann² has shown, that the verb κωλύειν is found as a technical term in connection with certain baptismal texts, cf Acts 11.17 in Peter's report on the baptism in the house of Cornelius, etc. But there is no indication of such a context in Mark 10.14; ἄφετε τὰ παῖδιά ἐρχεσθαι πρὸς με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά. Here κωλύειν is used with the normal sense of 'hinder' or 'prevent'. κωλύειν is used in the New Testament 23 times, and by far the preponderate number cannot be interpreted in the sense of baptismal technical term. It is probable that when a developed baptismal liturgy had come into being with a question relating to hindrances to baptism and baptism was applied to infants an authority for this practice was found in this Synoptic pericope. To argue that it was so understood by the Synoptic authors themselves demands evidence not only that they were aware of κωλύειν as a technical baptismal term but also that they did practice infant baptism. The first evidence we have in early Christian literature of the application of this pericope of the blessing of the children to child baptism is found in Tertullian (De. Bapt. 18.5). It is significant that this occurs at a time when we do know that infant baptism was practised.

Finally, Jeremias supports his conclusion on the grounds of the textual amendments made to his Markan source by Luke. 'It is to be noted that instead of παῖδιά (Mk. 10.13, Matt. 19.13) Luke says τὰ βρέφη (Lk. 18.15, with the article). This change was not motivated by the narrative itself, and should be explained as arising from the Sitz im Leben of the passage. The early Church already practised child baptism as infant baptism, and with this in mind Luke will have inserted the expression τὰ βρέφη.' This use of the article is linked with Luke's change in the introduction to the story in which the words are no longer addressed to the disciples (as in Mk. 10.14) but to the parents. This

1. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.53f.

2. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, Appendix, 'Traces of an Ancient Baptismal Formula in the New Testament' pp. 71ff.

3. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960, p.54.

Jeremias sees to be evidence of the baptismal interpretation given to the saying by Luke, and is coupled with Luke's omission of Jesus' taking the children in his arms, laying his hands on them and blessing them.¹

Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in saying that the liturgical use of texts brings into prominence elements that are universally valid to the detriment of what is historically unique.² He concludes therefore that Luke has omitted Jesus' laying hands on the children from his source because it was liturgically inappropriate. Such a conclusion is truly amazing in view of the fact that he has just argued that the laying on of hands 'belongs to the ritual of baptism; its mention must have been a further reminder of baptism to those who heard the story.'³ If that is so, then Luke's omission of the act takes on a significance directly contrary to the view of Jeremias. He has probably omitted it precisely because it did remind him of baptism, and he knew that infants were not baptized. When this is taken together with Luke's change of the address to the parents and the introduction of the definite article it is hard to avoid the conclusion that both Luke and Paul knew that the children of Christian parents were not baptized, but that they were already sharers with their parents in their inheritance of the Kingdom. Hence Luke may have felt that Mark's $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ declared a universal inheritance of the kingdom by small children, whereas $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\beta\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\phi\eta$ would apply only to the infants of those parents Luke had in view, i.e. those who had themselves come to Jesus (the Christians) carrying their children.

We conclude therefore that the Sitz im Leben of the pericope of the blessing of the children in the early Church was not baptismal but was rather a word of the Lord which was used as proof that the children of Christian parents had immediate access to the kingdom of God. As such it would obviate the necessity both of their circumcision and their baptism. In view of the other New Testament material we have studied this would seem to be the most natural conclusion.

3. Summary

From the New Testament evidence it would appear as most probable that neither the children of converts nor^{of} established Christians were baptized in the New Testament period. It is equally probable that the adult sons and daughters of Christian parents, who were infants at the time of their parents' baptism, were not baptized when they reached the age of discretion. There is no evidence of

1. ibid p. 54 n.5

2. ibid p. 54 n. 5

3. ibid p. 54.

the baptism of the older children of Christian parents whatsoever until the time
 1. of Tertullian. The grounds for this in New Testament baptismal theology had nothing whatever to do with minimising the primacy of the act of God or the cruciality of Christ's death and resurrection, and therefore argument for the practice of infant baptism cannot be grounded on an appeal to faith as a response
 2. to grace. The primary character of grace is indeed a predominant aspect of New Testament baptismal theology, but for the New Testament this has to be placed alongside the concept of the solidarity of the family. An infant born to a parent who is included in the 'one man' which is Christ and the Church, shares with the parent in that incorporation. With the lack of stress on the individual as an isolated individual in favour of the strong sense of the vital role played by history, society, and family in shaping the total personality of the individual, it is easy to understand that the child of a parent who, in baptism, has made the decisive break with 'this world' and is included in a new solidarity in history in the Church, is taken with the parent into a whole new range of relationships, attitudes and values. To a very large extent, therefore, his faith is given in and with the faith of his parents and the Church. Consequently, it would seem, that in the New Testament the baptism of the parents was regarded as including that of their children.

Before we can meaningfully turn to the question of the desirability of the practice of infant baptism today we need to consider two related questions; that of baptism and faith, and the role of the community (including the family) in baptism.

(ii) Baptism and Faith

In his penetrating analysis of the relationship between baptism and faith, Cullmann reaches the following conclusions:

1. after Baptism, faith is demanded of all those baptized;
2. before Baptism, the declaration of faith is a sign of the divine will that Baptism take place, demanded from adults who individually come over from Judaism or heathenism, but in other cases lacking;
3. during the baptismal act, faith is demanded of the praying
 3. congregation.'

Let us examine each of these aspects in a little more detail.

-
1. I. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p.26.
 2. As, for example, by O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, pp. 47ff; W.F. Flemington, Baptism, 1953, pp.130ff.
 3. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p.55. Cullmann's italics.

1. Faith after baptism

Since for the New Testament baptism is the act by which the baptized is incorporated into Christ and, with the ecclesiological dimension given to New Testament Christology, into the body of Christ, it is self-evident that faith in and allegiance to Christ, the distinguishing characteristic of the Church, is a condition of remaining in the body of those who have been baptized. The cruciality of this post-baptismal faith is made evident in Heb. 6.6 and 10.26, which speak of the irretrievable 'falling away' from the grace given in baptism. Similarly 1 Cor. 10.1ff carefully distinguishes between what happened in the course of the rescue of the people of Israel as they crossed the Red Sea, which is the prototype of baptism, from the further occurrence implied by and dependent on this event, namely, the negative reaction on the part of $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ to this miracle and its tremendous consequences. A further indication both of the fact that baptism is regarded as the saving miracle which incorporates a man 'in Christ' and into the body of Christ, and that ^{it} demands a continuing life of faith is seen in the harshness of both Paul and John towards those members of the body whose belief or behaviour disrupts the unity of the body.¹

For the Church of the New Testament baptism is essentially a radically new beginning; a 'regeneration' (Tit. 3.5; Jn. 3.3ff), an inclusion into the death and resurrection of Christ (e.g. Rom. 6.3ff). It is the act through which we are made contemporaneous with the redeeming act of God in Christ. All of this points to the fact that baptism effects something which has to be maintained in the response of faith in Christ and love for one another. But this by no means implies that everyone will necessarily remain in unity with the Church and therefore in unity with Christ. Consequently faith after baptism is demanded of all those baptized who would remain in Christ in the Church.

2. Faith before baptism

In the majority of instances of baptism in the New Testament it is clear that faith was demanded of their adult converts before they were baptized. But, as we have seen, the stories of the baptisms of the households of Lydia and, possibly, the Philippian jailor tell us nothing at all about whether anyone other than Lydia or the jailor believed, and the story of Lydia is even more striking than that of the jailor. According to Acts 16.32 Paul and Silas

1. Cf above pp. 452f, 483f.

addressed both the jailor and all those in his house, but according to Acts 16.14 it is not only that Lydia alone believes but also no reference is made to Paul speaking to anyone other than her. Apart from the question of whether or not there were any infants in these households it would appear that the faith of the head of the household, whose influence over the household was undoubtedly very great in the New Testament period, was sufficient grounds on which to baptize their households.

Because of this Cullmann is undoubtedly correct in his assertion that the demand for faith before baptism was the demand for some sign by the Church which baptized that there was a prospect of perseverance in Baptism within the community. Where only an individual is mentioned in connexion with baptism, then it is his own declaration of faith which provides the only possible assurance to the Church. Where an individual is associated with a household as the head of a household, then his position in this close social unit provides this assurance when he declares his faith. This is so even when it must be taken for granted (they were baptized on the profession of faith of the head of the household) that there were adult members in the household. Infants, we have seen, whose openness to the faith and life of their parents would have been even greater than that of slaves or maturer members, were probably not baptized, but were regarded as included in the baptism of their parents.

We will never understand the relationship between faith and these 'household baptisms' or the lack of baptism of the infants of Christians, if we limit our understanding of 'faith' to an individual's dateable 'conversion experience'. In a missionary situation the proclamation of the Gospel to those who have never heard it does indeed very often bring with it a rejection of a previously held religious belief and an acceptance of the Christian faith. Even here the New Testament would declare that it is not that faith alone which has united a man to Christ in the body of Christ. Rather, that union is given in baptism which enables the New Testament emphasis to remain fixed on the divine election, call, and grace to which faith is the response. But for a child born and brought up in a Christian home within a Christian community it is possible sometimes to date a decisive rejection of the faith he took in with his mother's milk, and even periods of increasing awareness or moments of enlightenment, but not any comparable moment of accepting the faith. The same would be true of adult slaves in an age when a master held the power of life and death over his

L. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p.50.

slaves. To be a part of a believing community, especially in the close relationships within a home, means to learn one's beliefs, commitments, responses, values, and 'way of life' in that situation. Understanding this the New Testament appears to give us evidence that the small children in such a situation were not baptized, and that the adult members of such a closely knit group were baptized without the profession of their 'personal faith'.

Such a practice is indeed logical. When we baptize the infant child of Christian parents we effect nothing to alter his relationships with his parents or the Church, for his relationships with the Church are determined by 1. his parents. Nor do we effect any change in these relationships when we baptize the adult children of Christian parents. In not baptising either infant or adult children of Christian parents nothing is done to minimise the sacramental grace of Christian baptism nor the historical and social cruciality of Christ in the history of salvation. Rather in not doing so we confirm the community-creating significance of the atonement which runs through history and society, binding men together in their corporate union with Christ. Unless we wish to introduce a baptismal legalism in the place of circumcision legalism (which cannot have been Paul's intention), then it is possible to accept that a child born to Christian parents without faith (in the sense of a maturer adult response) and without baptism is a member of that body with which Christ is so completely united that it bears his identity. If we could accept this social realism in respect of Christian children we could be spared the embarrassment of making high sounding assertions about what baptism conveys to such an infant without toppling off into what approaches very close to superstition and magic.

3. Faith during baptism

Cullmann draws attention to the Church that prays for the person being baptized (Acts 8.15). It prays that God may complete the miracle of baptism in the baptized person. 'This faith which has the person baptized as its object 2. is in fact an indispensable element in the baptismal act'.

This role of the congregation Cullmann sees to be confirmed in the cruciality of the faith of the parents or friends in the healing miracles performed by Jesus; 'When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son thy sins be forgiven thee' (Mk. 2.5). It is indeed a leading theme of many healing miracles in the Gospels that the faith of those who beg Jesus for the healing of someone belonging to their house precedes the miracle.

1. but cf Below, pp. 537ff. 2. O. Cullmann, Baptism, 1950, p. 54

'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel,' says Jesus to the captain of Capernaum, before he heals his servant (Matt. 8.10); and the stories of Mk. 9.14ff (Matt. 17.14ff; Lk. 9.37ff) are told by the evangelists to show that Christ is able to heal where there is faith. Here it is the father of the healed invalid who believes: 'If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe' (Mk. 9.23f); and on the other hand the unbelief of the disciples is said to be responsible for their inability to heal an invalid (Matt. 17.19f).

It is precisely this sort of relationship between the faith of a man (or woman) and the baptism of a whole household that we have seen in the New Testament. It is therefore the believing congregation which receives an individual, through the divine miracle of baptism, into itself (in which act Christ receives the individual into himself) on the basis of some indication that the baptized will remain in the fellowship, and prays that in and with it the individual who has been 'added' (Acts 2.41) will remain, through faith, in the union effected in baptism.

(iii) Baptism and New Testament 'body' ethics

We have stressed repeatedly that while the cruciality of incorporation into Christ cannot be overlooked, Christ and the community cannot be separated. Thus baptismal incorporation into Christ and baptismal incorporation into the Christian community are two sides of the same coin. This is so because, according to New Testament ecclesiology, Christ and the Christian community constitute one living organism.

While we might have difficulty in interpreting precisely what this means, we have seen that what it does mean for the New Testament writers is that no radical distinction can be drawn between Christ himself and the individual Christian. To sin against a member of the body of Christ is to sin against Christ himself and to receive a member of the body of Christ is to receive Christ.

More than this is also implied. To be an 'organ' of Christ is to be an 'organ' of everyone else in the body, and the way this 'organic' union of members of the body with each other 'in Christ' is understood in the New Testament is in the most intimate relationship of love, caring, and sharing. Therefore, for the Church to receive a new member is to receive him into this context so

1. Cf above pp. 450ff, 487ff.

that it could be said of him 'And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it.' (1 Cor. 12.26).

It is easy enough for the community to express its faith in the context of baptism by praying for the person baptized. It is not nearly so easy for the community to give expression to its understanding of itself in relation to baptism in terms of the New Testament ethics which, as we have seen, is so intimately related to New Testament Christology and ecclesiology.

If baptism in the New Testament is a community-creating event in that a new member is 'added' (Acts 2.41), it is also, when the ethics that accompanies the concept of the Church as the body of Christ is fully appreciated, an experience of community. I say 'is' rather than 'should be' deliberately for Paul was unable to see how a Church divided by quarrels and jealousies could be 'spiritual' (i.e. in Christ) and thus the Church at all. (cf 1 Cor. 3.3). No matter how strongly the effective power of Christ in baptism is emphasised, Barth is undoubtedly correct when he says that the whole understanding of its meaning is clouded and obscured by the manner of its practice. No matter how strongly or how often we assert that baptism is inclusion into the Church, the very body of Christ, that assertion will lack any sense of reality when in the majority of baptisms the baptized is received into a community which is seen to be such only in theological text books. If the community dimension of baptism is ever to be anything more than a biblical theologian's ideal, then there needs to be a community in the New Testament ethical sense of that word, into which the person is received in baptism. This means that there needs to be a community with a sensed 'belongingness' to one another which is given expression not simply in meeting together once a week in a formal act of worship, but in the human relationships of kindness, concern, sharing, and love.

Since it is impossible to spread one's relationships with others at this New Testament depth over too many other persons, this would seem to demand that baptisms be administered in the context of a group of 'kinsmen and near friends' (Acts 10.24). While this would weaken the sense of being incorporated into the much wider fellowship of the Church, it would make the community's undertaking to care for the baptized more realistic.

If it is felt that the loss of the wider context of the Church is too high a price to pay, then community expression and community responsibility need

to be given a greater and more realistic emphasis than is given at present in baptismal practice. Let us look at the aspects of community expression and community responsibility in relation to baptismal ritual and baptismal ceremonial.

Firstly; community expression in baptismal ritual and ceremonial.

Most liturgies focus attention rightly on the cruciality of Christ. The ceremony in relation to the water in itself focuses attention on our incorporation into the death and resurrection of Christ. Most baptismal liturgies give undoubted centrality to Christ in the words used. Particularly in the Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran liturgies inclusion into the body of Christ, the Church, is also expressly mentioned. But none dwell at any length on the character of the community in terms of the intense New Testament inter-personal relations which stem from the nature of the Church as being a single organic unit which in its totality is Christ himself.

If this aspect has been lost or obscured in the ritual it is seldom, if ever, given expression in the baptismal ceremonial. In some modern Eucharistic liturgies and experiments an attempt has been made to give expression to the community character of the Church through the re-introduction of the kiss of peace, but there is little that is comparable even to this symbolism in baptismal liturgies. A means needs to be found in which expression can be given to a sense of community which has a place at least equal in depth and range of expression to the Christo-centricity of the liturgy. The writer is no expert in social psychology or community dynamics, but is convinced that the regimentation of worshippers in pews must inhibit the possibility of contact and communication between them. It is possible that a simple shared meal in the context of a baptism would create opportunities not only for the members of the Church to communicate with one another, but also for them to communicate with the baptized (or in the event of infant baptism) the parents of the baptized. In such contact joys, needs, concern, faith and love could be communicated in inter-personal relationships rather than simply in formal liturgical assertions. If acceptance into the fellowship of the body of Christ could be made an experience rather than merely a doctrine, and this built into the very structure of the act of baptism, then the practice of baptism would facilitate an understanding of its theology. And understanding through experience the liberating character of true community would in its turn facilitate an understanding of the cruciality of Christ from whom the character of the community is derived and thus of the New Testament

insistence on the historical basis of its faith in a man who within history has given history a fresh start.

Secondly; community concern in baptismal ritual and ceremonial. From the earliest times, as we have seen (of Acts 8.15), the congregation in the act of baptism took upon itself a responsibility towards the one being baptized into union with itself. This sense of responsibility has been given expression in most baptismal liturgies in some form of congregational vow in relation to the baptized. Unfortunately this has too often become a vague promise which all those present make even if they have neither the inclination nor the ability to carry it out in any positive and creative sense at all. This situation is made worse when the congregation itself has neither trained persons nor effective organisation through whom the congregation's acceptance of responsibility can be carried out.

In a country such as South Africa with its acute poverty and related problems (such as health and education) undertaking responsibility by the Church for those it receives to be 'organs' of itself in the intense caring relationships which characterise the New Testament ethics of the body is an enormous undertaking. If we really do accept that being members of the body of Christ entails suffering when any one member suffers, how is it possible to receive a person who is jobless, homeless, and starving into an organic caring union with ourselves and yet do nothing to alleviate his suffering? How is it possible that we have stretched right across the country thousands of men and women who are set aside solely to the work of preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments, and specially trained for this task, but so pitifully few who are effectively trained in the art of ministering to the fundamental needs of men, e.g. health education, poverty relief, housing problems, the care of the children whose mothers must work, and the children of migratory labourers? How is it possible that we can expend our means on erecting fine Churches (buildings) equipped with the finest organs, carpets, pews, and even marble baptismal fonts while so many baptized members of the Church (people) are enslaved in the mesh of poverty situations? The declaration of the Church's intention to care for the baptized can be little more than empty verbiage related to a meticulously correct theology unless it is backed by having persons to whom responsibility can be delegated and who have the means (arising out of a real concern on the part of the Church), training, freedom and equipment to carry out the responsibility.

If we undertook our total Christian responsibility towards the baptized seriously in providing Christian, social, and ethical guidance and help (because we understand the nature of the Atonement and the Church) then the indiscriminate practice of baptizing all-comers would either have to be radically modified or the means of carrying out our responsibilities enormously increased. Assuming the continuation of the practice of infant baptism, for the Church to carry out its total responsibility in relation to the baptized quite clearly demands the co-operation of the parents of such children. To baptize such children without the firm undertaking of the parents to co-operate with the Church is intolerable. While theological theory might maintain that such baptisms continue to express the divine initiative in man's salvation, and that, because of this, they effect incorporation into Christ and into the Church, it is understandable that for the man in the pew (if the parent happens to occupy a pew on any other occasion) the rite appears to be little above superstition or magic. This does not make it superstition or magic. But the practice of baptism which can communicate this misunderstanding needs to be modified so that it can communicate what it intends to communicate.

What it should communicate, we have maintained, is both union with Christ and union with one another which are the dual aspects of understanding both the nature of the Atonement and the nature of the community created by it. If the aspect of union with Christ is emphasised at the expense of union with a caring community which derives its character from Christ we are in danger of replacing the historical and social realism of the Gospel with another mystery religion. If the aspect of community is emphasised at the expense of union with Christ we are in danger of losing the New Testament emphasis on the cruciality of Christ in whom the social and historical realism is centred and replacing it with a simple humanitarianism which fails to take into account the New Testament distinctions between the Church and the world.

In these New Testament distinctions between the Church and the world, thus and the distinctions we have noted between the ethics of the body and the ethics of the body in relation to the world, there is a great deal of common sense. The Church, according to John, is to win its way in the world by the character of its life of union and love. If this is experienced as the reality of life in the Church which is in Christ, then it carries within it its own evangelical appeal.

But if the Church dissipates its energies on too wide a front then it must crumble at its very centre. It must crumble for our widening relationships of love and concern spring and overflow from our experienced sense of belonging which can be known only in more intimate relationships. If these are removed from the centre of the Church's life then also will be lost the emotional motivation for more universal ethical actions. At the same time the attractive power to build into existing relations will be lost and thus Christ's prayer 'that they may all be one.... that the world may believe' (Jn. 17.21). There is nothing wrong with humanitarianism (or universal ethics) ethically. It is psychologically unrealistic. And the Gospel is concerned with freedom and liberation which mean nothing if they do not involve the whole person.

Christ and community constitute the twin foci of the New Testament doctrine of baptism and thus should be the two elements given equal and inter-related emphasis in the Church's 'ordering' of baptism.

(iv) Baptism and Unity

In view of (i) the nature of the Atonement as community creating; (ii) the nature of the Church as a corporate Christology stemming from its corporate, nature-communicating union with Christ; (iii) the intense interpersonal relationships which mark the ethics of the body; (iv) the nature of baptism as union with Christ which means incorporation into the Christian community; it follows that the unity of the Church is a presupposition of Christian baptism. For Paul the Church is 'one man', which 'one man' is Christ (Gal. 3.27f) so that in baptism 'putting on Christ' (Gal. 3.27) and putting on the whole new man (Eph. 4.24) are but two emphases within one and the same reality. Consequently a divided Church is theologically illogical for it must imply that Christ is divided (1 Cor. 1.13). Bearing in mind also that baptism is the act in which we are made contemporaneous with Christ in his death and resurrection, it follows logically that a divided Church implies that someone other than Christ has been crucified for us, or that we are baptized into that someone else (1 Cor. 1.13). Since, however, the Church is the corporate 'one man' who is Christ, the fact of being divided places a great theological question mark over whether we can speak of the Church at all. And with that question mark it becomes, as Barth saw it so penetratingly, seriously debateable whether we can speak of Christian baptism at all. The almost complete focus on a mystical and sacramental union with

L. K. Barth, Baptism, 1956, p.38f.

Christ and the emphasis on the divine grace and initiative in baptism to the virtual exclusion of the community or Church dimensions of baptism have helped to keep this question from reaching agonising proportions. When, however, the community dimensions of baptism are grasped as being of equal importance to the union with Christ and the divine initiative in man's salvation, which in themselves entail the united, corporate community, then the question cannot be shelved.

There is a sense in which the proponents of 'spiritual union' are right. For Paul tells us that as 'spiritual' there is no room at all for 'jealousy and strife' (1 Cor. 3.3). Where these things exist so far from being 'spiritual' the man is still 'in the flesh'. 'Spiritual union' in biblical terms means being 'in Christ' and 'organs one of another' (Rom. 12.5; Eph. 4.25) as organs of Christ.

The proponents of 'spiritual union' are manifestly wrong when this is interpreted as sharing a common faith. No matter how high or how low we set the criteria of what is to count as 'sharing a common faith', when this kind of 'union' is set beside the centuries of bitter controversy, severing of fellowship, and denunciations, which things are by no means confined to the past, and contrasted with what both Paul and John saw to be the nature of inter-personal relationships which constitute the 'union' of the Church, then it becomes immediately apparent that this concept of 'spiritual union' cannot be true to the full range of the Biblical revelation. But we have seen that this ethics is given a causal basis in the New Testament. We can and do manifest this nature of love, concern, fellowship, and sense of belonging because we are united with Christ through which union Christ communicates his nature of love to us. In this sense New Testament ethics is hardly philosophical ethics at all. It is rather a communicated 'way of life' which is open, like any 'way of life' to ethical judgement. When this is remembered and placed beside a 'way of life' which can hardly, in all fairness, be described as approaching the depth and intensity of inter-personal relationships which characterise the Church in the New Testament, then it becomes questionable indeed whether we can speak meaningfully of union with Christ in a divided Church.

Full weight must be given to this causal character of New Testament 'ethics'. The logic of a causal explanation is that of a conditioned hypothetical, i.e. if A then B. For example IF I strike a match (which lacks none

of the necessary ingredients) against an enemy board THEN the match will burst into flame. Conversely IF the match does not burst into flame THEN either I did not strike it properly or I did not strike it at all. This same sort of reasoning is apparent in the New Testament. IF a man is in Christ, whose nature is love, THEN he loves the brethren (cf 1 Jn. 2.10). Conversely, IF a man does not love the brethren THEN he is not in Christ. (cf 1 Jn. 2.9). Similarly IF Christ is one and undivided and the Church is 'in him' (cf. Gal. 3.27ff) THEN the Church is united (cf Jn. 17.21). Conversely IF the Church is divided THEN either Christ is divided (1 Cor. 1.13), a manifest impossibility, or the Church is not 'in the Spirit' (1 Cor. 3.3). Consequently unity and the Christian ethic of love are functions of being 'in Christ'. Where unity, which is expressed in close interpersonal ties within the Church, does not exist, then it becomes questionable indeed whether the Church is 'in Christ' or is the Church at all. Because baptism is so intimately linked both with union with Christ and union with the Church the fact of a divided Church must raise serious questions about the validity of its baptisms.

If 'spiritual union' is totally inadequate when it is not interpreted in the New Testament sense as organic union, so also is 'organisational union'. Admittedly there could never be 'organic union' with organisational separation, cleavage and hostility, but 'organic union' in the New Testament sense of a shared life in both its physical and 'spiritual' dimensions quite clearly goes far deeper than an administrative or hierarchical decision. Such top-level decisions can be based only on theological and administrative or organisational agreement. While such decisions to end the theologically impossible divisions of the Church will in themselves increase the possibility of inter-personal relationships between the divided Christians, they will not effect such relationships. For this to happen in the present state of affairs will require new ways of worship and life together in the Church which will be community-creating occasions.

Perhaps one of the most illogical (and yet understandably charitable) aspects of the present 'divided Church' is that the various communions recognize as valid the baptisms of other communions. Since union is a pre-supposition of Christian baptism this acknowledgement must also be an acknowledgement of the union of the Church. But since this union is causally-ethically conceived

in the New Testament it is impossible (theologically and biblically) to speak of a union of the Church which lacks these dimensions of personal relationships. We have, therefore, the affirmation of an already existing union, which is necessary theologically if we are to speak of Christian baptism at all, which is denied by the fact of the divisions and their nature. Consequently the nature of union which is affirmed in recognising baptisms administered in other communions cannot be the nature of union which is affirmed by the New Testament. While the affirmation of unity is theoretically necessary it is biblically inapplicable. It is difficult to see how it is possible to escape this impasse which must call into question the validity of baptism because it must call into question the applicability of the New Testament concept of the Church to the present 'divided Church.'

(v) The Practice of Infant Baptism Today

Having surveyed the whole range of concepts associated with Christian baptism, and in the process having seen that Church unity is a necessary pre-supposition of Baptism and also that the evidence of the New Testament points to the conclusion that infants were not baptized whether they were the children of converts or established Christians or not, let us return now to the question of whether it is justifiable for the Church to continue its practice of infant baptism. This question resolves itself into two distinct questions: (i) Is it justifiable for the divided Church to baptize at all? (ii) Is it justifiable for the Church to baptize the infants of Christian parents?

1. Is it justifiable for the divided Church to baptize at all?

We have seen that Christian baptism, resting on the pre-supposition of the unity of the Church, enters into crisis when the Church is experienced as divided. When the New Testament speaks of the unity of the Church as an experience rather than simply as theory then the question of the validity of any baptism (whether adult or infant) is raised. Is there any way out of this impasse? I believe that there is, though it is by no means completely satisfying.

In the first part of this essay we saw how the various titles of Jesus as the 'ebhed Yahweh, the Messiah, and the Son of man all pointed to an understanding of his work to be to create a new community. In our study of the soteriology of Paul we saw that his understanding of the work of Christ was in

his death to break the old solidarity of man in bondage and in his resurrection to create a new solidarity in freedom. In John we saw how the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ were understood to be the means of creating a community which, in union with the ascended but present Christ, participated in his incarnate nature. Thus throughout the New Testament there is an understanding of the Atonement as community-creating and that the unity of this community is pre-supposed in that New Testament ecclesiology is predominantly a post-ascension corporate Christology.

This being so, to deny the unity of the Church is either to deny the New Testament Christology^{and} claim that Jesus was not what the New Testament community claimed him to be or to deny the atonement. To say that there is no unity of the Church at all is to deny the Gospel. To deny is, of course, possible. But it is hardly a Christian answer. To be a Christian demands that we believe in Christ, i.e. that we believe that he was who he claimed to be and that he effected what he claimed to effect. This, therefore, demands that we accept the unity of the Church as an indispensable datum of our faith. ~~However much the divisions in the Church as an indispensable datum of our faith.~~ However much the divisions in the Church, which are real enough for us to be able to experience them and their inhibiting effect, may cloud and obscure its unity, to deny it is to deny the Gospel.

This does not make the divisions of the Church any more tolerable. Rather it raises the divisions to crisis proportions. Where the Church recognises how its own manner of existence falsifies the very Gospel which it proclaims and is concerned to become the Church not only in theory but also in practice, which means that it is continually in the process of becoming the Church, then 'baptism in the Church which is under reformation is genuine baptism'. A Church which is content not only to remain in but also to maintain its cleavages and hostilities exhibits in this such an absence of love, which is of the very essence of the Church, that it becomes impossible to give any valid meaning to the word 'unity' at all. Without the affirmation of unity being supported by clear and open indications of a passionate determination to become in practice what it understands itself to be in theory (if it is true to the New Testament understanding of the Church) then Baptism in such a Church can be no baptism at all. It can be counted as baptism only if we do complete violence to the

L. K. Barth, Baptism, 1956, p.40.

New Testament understanding of the relationship between Christ and his body by separating them into completely distinct doctrines and then affirming that it is possible to be united with Christ without at the same time being united with his whole body. No matter how strongly we affirm the divine grace given in baptism, such an interpretation is a distortion of the New Testament teaching and makes the historical emphasis in Christianity unintelligible. If we want mysticism we need no historical Christ.

On the other hand, if we recognise how our loveless divisions in themselves obscure the reality of baptism and consequently are engaged in the process of becoming what we are, then while a full appreciation of the meaning and significance of baptism will remain obscured, baptism in such a Church has a real claim to validity. The Church has the right to administer the New Testament Sacrament of baptism only when it is attempting to affirm its unity, and that not simply at the level of hierarchical decrees but also at the New Testament level of deeply significant inter-personal relationships.

2. Is it justifiable for the Church to baptize the infants of Christian parents?

Aland, whose conclusions strongly support that the early Church did not practice infant baptism, is undoubtedly correct when he says that the Church is not for all time bound to the details of practice and manner of administration of the sacraments found in the New Testament. More crucial than historical details of practice are the grounds given for that practice. The question of whether to baptize infants of Christian parents today is bound up with answering the question whether or not the New Testament grounds are still applicable in the twentieth century.

We have seen that the grounds for not baptizing the infants of Christian parents had nothing whatever to do with the faith or lack of faith of the infant, for the faith of Lydia was clearly regarded as sufficient grounds on which to baptize her household, even though her household undoubtedly had adult members. The reason for baptizing these adult members of the household almost certainly rested on the semitic concept of the solidarity of the household, so that the profession of faith on the part of the head of the household was a sufficient indication to the Church that the members of the household would

1. K. Aland, Baptize, 1963, pp. 112ff.

2. In the instance of the Philippian jailer it is clear that if his faith was not a sufficient ground for baptising his household, it was at least the prime factor in all the baptisms that took place that night.

remain in the Church and grow in the faith.

Where this is so in the case of adult members of a household, then clearly it cannot be argued that the inability of infants to declare their faith was the reason why they were not baptised. In fact the baptism of Crispus and Cornelius seems to have included the baptism of their children so that when the head was baptized the children were regarded as being 'in the Lord' and members with the saints. Consequently we cannot escape the conclusion that the infants of converts and established Christians were not baptized because of the strong sense of the solidarity of the family, which was regarded as so strong, particularly with regard to infants, that they, unlike any adult members of the family unit, were not baptized.

The question of the justifiability of baptizing infants today therefore rests on whether or not the family unit can still be regarded as having the same force. To a certain extent it is obviously still very strong in most normal homes. But to a large extent the ancient and honoured rôle of the parent has been taken on by others who are not necessarily members of the family or of the Christian Church. The personnel of creches and nursery schools have children committed to their care for large proportions of their waking hours, and therefore play an important role in shaping the personality of their charges. This is so not only of children whose parents both work but also of others on whom this particular necessity is not placed. In South Africa African mothers, often unable to afford these amenities have to leave their children in the care of the best available unemployed person in the vicinity. This rôle of the wider community in shaping the personality, values, beliefs, and attitudes of our children is continued into the years of formal schooling. The influence of parents, and particularly of fathers, is further decreased by the practice of commuting to work in the larger cities, which means, very often, that a father will leave his home early in the morning and return after his children are already asleep. The week-end therefore becomes almost the only time when father and children share a common life together - and for Christian parents a large segment of this time is taken up with Sunday School and Sunday worship.

Since parents, and not least Christian parents, have ceased to a large extent to be the creative and unifying focus of family life it would be understandable if the Church did not regard their faith as sufficient indication in

itself of their children's faith response and life in the Church. If so, our practice of baptism should be determined by the extent to which we believe that the influence of the parent has been weakened, and by the rôle that the Christian community is prepared and able to play in relation to the children of Christian parents.

If we believe, on the grounds of reliable evidence, that the influence of the parent has been weakened to the extent that the faith and values of the Christian parent have no longer any significance in shaping the responses of their children, then the most logical practice would be to baptize such children only after a profession of faith on their own behalf. While the rôle of the parent has unmistakably been weakened, and in some instances may have been weakened to this extent, it would seem rash to suggest that this is either universally or even generally true. However, to regain the confidence of the primitive Christian community regarding the children of Christian parents as members of the Church the Christian community itself will need to play a larger rôle than at present in taking a share in the parents' responsibility towards their children. For example, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Church cannot simply leave the vital creches and nursery schools in the hands of those who are not members of the Church. This is not because Christians make better nursery school teachers but because the Christian has, hopefully, a different set of values and beliefs which will be communicated to the children.

Consequently, if the Church accepts that the influence of Christian parents has been weakened though not obliterated by twentieth century family relationships, and if she is prepared to accept a far greater share of responsibility in relation to caring for Christian children, then the practice of infant baptism has a strong claim to being justifiable. On the one hand it will affirm the divine grace which has called the children into union with Christ. On the other, by the public reception of the child into its fellowship and affirming its determination to care (in the full New Testament sense of the word) for the child (backed by the necessary structures and persons to carry out this responsibility) the solidarity and influence of the Christian family will be strengthened by the wider solidarity of the Christian community. In South Africa the value of such a community undertaking in respect of the children of Christian parents would be immense. To receive such a child as an 'organ'

of itself, the body of Christ, in which the whole body senses being part of the suffering of any single 'organ', would demand not only the provision of nursery schools and competent educators, but also health educators, efficient clinics, and family guidance centres in order to deal in kindness and love with the children born into so many and so complicated enslaving situations.

This does not mean that the sacrament of baptism is a ceremony of reception into the Christian community in which the community publicly undertakes responsibility for the care of the children it receives into membership. This, as we have seen, has always been a vital element in Christian baptism, but it is dependent on being received into union with Christ. If we accept that the primitive Christian community did not baptize because of the strength of the family unit and that in our present age this strength has been weakened though not destroyed, then it follows that union with Christ is not wholly given in birth into a Christian home. Baptism is still, therefore, that union with Christ which entails union with the Christian community out of which springs the community's responsibility to those it receives. But infant baptism, if it is to be true to the New Testament at all, demands some confidence on the part of the Church in the strength of the family unit and the faith of the parents. Without these the rite has lost touch both with the New Testament and common sense.

CHAPTER 2.

THE EUCHARIST.a) Introduction (Summary of study)

In our study of the Eucharist within the setting of the primitive Christian community's understanding of the person and work of Christ and of herself the following are the chief points which have emerged.

i) The Eucharist is a fellowship meal with the risen and ascended Christ.

For all the Synoptic writers Christ's messianic feeding of the multitude in the miracle of the loaves is seen as a foretaste of the Eucharist in ^{1.} which Christ would continue to feed the faithful. In John the Eucharistic dimension of the feeding miracle of the Incarnate Christ is made perfectly explicit (Jn. 6.51ff). ^{2.} Since Jn. 14.18 belongs to the context of the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples and thus to John's understanding of the nature of the Eucharist, ^{3.} the reference to Christ's coming again to his own means his coming to them in the Eucharist in addition to whatever else ^{4.} the promise may mean. Similarly also Matthew's version of the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. 25.1-13) ^{5.} with its reference to the arrival of the bridegroom at the wedding banquet may carry an understanding of the Eucharist, as in ^{6.} Lk. 22.28-30, as 'a meal of the kingdom, a glorious messianic banquet, for it is eating and drinking with the Son of man in his kingdom.' ^{7.} In any event Luke's version of the parable (Lk. 12.35f), which speaks of the bridegroom returning from the wedding feast to the waiting disciples, with the remarkable parallels between this passage and John's account of the Last Supper (Jn. 13.1ff) makes it clear that the Eucharist is in mind, which is understood as sharing in the ^{8.} wedding banquet with the Son of man.

In our analysis of the Son of man saying which carried the charge that Jesus is 'a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners' (Lk. 7.34; Matt. 11.19), we saw that the charge rested on the practice ^{9.} of Jesus of having table-fellowship with publicans and sinners (Mk. 2.15-17).

In this saying the use of the title Son of man stressed the supreme authority of Jesus in the fulfilment of his mission to break the ceremonial law in his

1. Cf above pp 106ff

2. Cf above pp 110ff

3. Cf above pp 465f for evidence that the farewell discourses in John are not only in the context of the Last Supper but also Eucharistic.

4. Cf above p 465

5. Cf above pp 284f

6. Cf above pp 323ff

7. Cf above p 325

8. Cf above p. 285

9. Cf above pp 264ff

action of including the morally and religiously suspect into his fellowship. Yet, as we saw, more than fellowship was implied. Köhler has shown that the Hebrew concept of 'covenant' is derived from this table fellowship, which means 'a relationship of weaker and stronger in which the stronger imparts his character to the fellowship! 'For the stronger it is a question of making covenants in order to carry through one's aims; for the weaker to make a covenant with the strong in order to enjoy his strength.' For the Son of man (the title of Jesus which expresses his strength and authority) to share in a table fellowship with 'tax collectors and sinners' or with his disciples, is therefore to share with them in a covenant-making meal in which the weaker share in his nature and his union with God, and in which the stronger (Jesus) carries through his mission of including the weaker into his fellowship. Consequently, since the Eucharist is understood as the fellowship meal of Jesus with his disciples it is also the covenant-making meal by which the disciples are made to share in the very nature of Christ through his including them in his fellowship.

But for all the New Testament writers the Eucharist as this covenant-making table-fellowship, foreshadowed in Jesus' meals with his disciples and the 'tax collectors and sinners', is fulfilled when after the Cross, resurrection and ascension, he comes to his own to give life (cf Jn.6.57f). It is a fellowship with the Christ who has completed his earthly ministry, and comes to communicate his own nature to his own in the Eucharist.

ii) Christ himself is the Eucharistic food and drink.

John most emphatically of all the New Testament writers presents the Christian Eucharist not simply as a fellowship meal with the ascended Christ, but as a meal on him (cf Jn.6.53; Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood; Jn.6.57, he that eateth me). Thus to feed on the Eucharistic elements is to feed on Christ himself. Since for Paul, all the baptized constitute 'one man' since they have all put on Christ (Gal. 3. 27ff), it follows that when in 1 Cor. 10.17 he tells us 'Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread', this must mean that he understood the meal on the common loaf as a partaking of Christ himself. For the New Testament writers, partaking of the eucharistic elements is the means of entering into union with Christ.

1. Köhler, Old Testament Theology, 1957, p.152.

2. Cf above p 395

3. J. Pedersen, Israel 1-11, p.286.

4. Cf above pp 110ff

iii) The Eucharist and becoming parts of Christ.

Closely associated with the concepts both of the eucharist as a covenant-making meal and of entering into union with Christ himself through the eucharist is the fundamental New Testament concept that in the eucharist the communicant is made a part of Christ, and in this union shares in his nature. As we have seen in our analysis of the eucharistic Son of man saying in ^{1.} Jn.6.53 this is made perfectly explicit, especially when this verse is compared with Jn.5.26. According to Jn.5.26. we are told 'For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself', and in Jn.6.53, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.' The same character-communicating nature of the eucharistic union we have seen also in our analysis of John's record of the ^{2.} Last Supper (Jn.13.1ff). In being made 'part of Christ' (Jn.13.8) we are made to share in the nature of him who washed the feet of his disciples, and as such this union with Christ implies that we too must wash one another's feet (Jn. 13.14).

Similarly also, according to Paul in 1.Cor.10.17, to partake of the ^{3.} 'one bread' is to become 'one bread'. And, as we have seen, in his account of the Last Supper and the eucharist in 1.Cor.11.17 ff, to partake of the 'body of Christ' in the eucharist is to be the body of Christ. Since Christ's body is 'for you', to be the body of Christ through incorporation into him is to be 'for' one another, which means that if we 'rightly discerned ourselves' (1.Cor.11.31) we would know the impossibility of celebrating the eucharist without giving thought to the less privileged. If his giving of himself was for others, then we in the eucharistic union with him share in his nature of being 'for others'.

In all of this we see the necessity of affirming that in partaking of the eucharistic elements we are entering into a union with Christ, in which covenant union Christ imparts his own nature to those thus united with himself.

iv) The Eucharist as community-creating and community experience.

In our analysis of the Son of man saying in Mk.10.45 = Matt.20.28, ⁴
(the Son of man came to give his life $\lambdaύτρον \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$) we saw that

1. Cf above pp 360ff
 2. Cf above pp 461ff
 3. Cf above p 429
 4. Cf above pp 234ff (cf also pp 53ff)

here was combined a Son of man and ‘ebhed Yahweh Christology and understanding of the work of Christ. Most significantly these two titles are those which were applied in the pre-history of the New Testament usage in a collective sense, but in the New Testament were applied to Jesus alone. At the same time, however, we have seen repeatedly how the understanding of Jesus as the ‘ebhed/ Son of man looked past his death to his exaltation and the bestowal of the Spirit. In this complex event of death, resurrection, and exaltation and the coming of the Spirit we saw how the new community was created by Christ, which community shared in his endowment with the Spirit. Thus as for the ‘ebhed Yahweh of Deutero Isaiah so also for Christ, his suffering and vindication are the means whereby the new community, the true Israel, is created by God. The assertion that Jesus is the one who gave his life a $\lambdaύτρον \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ is therefore an assertion that in the suffering, death, and exaltation of Jesus God has created the new community.

In saying that God has created the new community we have to bear in mind what we have noted so often before that in the New Testament the understanding of this new community is not that of a number of associates of Jesus, but that Jesus is and remains the single historical individual who is the ‘ebhed Yahweh, Son of man, and Messiah, and yet that the post-ascension Church which is 'in him' constitutes that 'one man' who is Christ. Thus the giving of his life ' $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ ' is the act by which the many are included into the corporate identity of Christ.

Since we have seen that there are good grounds for believing that the $\lambdaύτρον$ saying in Mk.10.45b did not belong originally with the serving saying in Mk.10.45a, but was appended to the serving saying, probably by Mark, from the words of institution (Mk.14.24)¹, it follows that Mark understood that what Christ effects in the Eucharist is what he effected in his Atonement. When not only Mark but all the New Testament writers understand the Atonement as the creation of the corporate body 'in Christ', then the Eucharist is equally to be understood as community creating.

This is made perfectly explicit by Paul in 1.Cor.10.17, where not only does partaking of the 'one bread' make those who partake 'one bread' but also 'one body'. In this Paul's doctrine of the Atonement, baptism and of the eucharist co-incide. The atonement is that act of Christ who in 'putting

1. Cf above pp 234 ff.

off the flesh' in his death broke the old solidarity of man in bondage, and, when God raised him from the dead created the beginning of a new solidarity. By being 'in him', organs of his body, we participate in his triumph. Supremely baptism is the rite in which we are incorporated into Christ. Similarly in the eucharist when we partake of the 'one bread' we become 'one body' which clearly is Christ himself. But whether we speak of the atonement, baptism or the eucharist, becoming organs of Christ entails inevitably becoming organs of one another in the corporate body. In this the community creating dimensions of being 'in Christ' as organs in his body is immediately apparent. Union with Christ, whether in baptism or the eucharist thus always carries within it the concept of community.

For Paul the community dimensions of the eucharist are made perfectly explicit in 1 Cor.11.17ff.^{1.} If through participation in the eucharist we are made the body of Christ then this entails the intense inter-personal relationships which characterise Paul's ethics of the body.^{2.} Where this community of love and brotherhood is not present (evidenced among the Corinthians in their refusal to wait for the late-comers) then the celebration of the Lord's Supper is no Lord's Supper at all (1.Cor.11.20).

The same community creating understanding of the eucharist is seen in John's account of the Last Supper (Jn.13.1ff).^{3.} If in the eucharist we become 'parts of Christ' (Jn.13.8), then in this union we so share in the nature of the Christ who washed his disciples' feet that the life of the disciple becomes that of service of one another symbolised in washing each other's feet.

Thus the New Testament bears solid testimony to the eucharist as a means to union with Christ. But since union with Christ is always the union of the corporate body with him, it is always and at the same time union with one another in love and service.

We have seen, however, that it is false to tie the presence of Christ in the eucharist to the eucharistic elements.^{4.} Against the background of the Semitic concept of the whole being manifested in any of its parts we have seen how the New Testament understanding of the Church as Christ himself

1. Cf above pp 427 ff.
 2. Cf above pp 450 ff.
 3. Cf above pp 461 ff.
 4. Cf above p.429 n.1.

meant that in any individual member Christ himself is present. To believe that a man can partake of Christ in the eucharistic elements without at the same time partaking of one another is seen to be a distortion of the eucharist itself. This is the basis on which the charge of 'unworthy' participation in the eucharist is laid by Paul against the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11.27).¹ And this charge is based not simply on the grounds that partaking of Christ in the eucharist creates this community which is Christ himself. If that were so Paul's argument would have been applicable only after participation in the eucharist. As it is he is concerned with the manner of their participation. Thus we need to look behind this eucharistic participation to Paul's understanding of baptism in which we are already made 'one man' in Christ and thus 'organs of one another' (Rom. 12.5; Eph. 4.25). Consequently the manner of our participation in the eucharist should affirm the truth of our baptism. In this sense, therefore, the eucharist is not simply a community-creating event. It is that but it is also an experience of community which, in the context of 1 Cor. 11.17ff means a truly shared meal by all those who are in Christ.

For the New Testament the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, and his sharing of his nature with his disciples is the event in which the new community is created. We are incorporated into that community through our incorporation into Christ in baptism. Every eucharist celebrated by this community is therefore, on the one hand expressive of the truth of baptism (i.e. an experience of this true community which is 'in Christ') and on the other a renewal of that community ever and again through Christ uniting us with himself both in our partaking of him in the elements and sharing with one another in humble service of one another. The eucharist both expresses and renews the fact that we are 'organs' of Christ and as such 'organs' of one another.

The twin foci in the eucharist are Christ and community. If we understand the New Testament concept of Christ and his work rightly then this leads immediately to community. Equally to understand the New Testament concept of the Christian community rightly necessitates giving due regard to the cruciality of Christ. But so inextricably inter-related are Christ and the community that union with Christ entails union with one another in the Christian community as much as union with one another is expressive of union with Christ

1. Cf above pp 427ff.

and is in fact in itself union with Christ. Thus it is no eucharist which is not both a community and a community-creating experience, both of which rest firmly on union with Christ as the fundamental pre-supposition. These twin foci are given expression in Paul's use of the concept of the body of Christ to mean both the eucharistic bread, through which Christ unites us to himself (1.Cor.11.24), and the Church, in which as 'organs' of Christ we are 'organs' of one another. And the way in which we give expression to our being organs of one another stems from our union with Christ in which he communicates his own nature of love and service to us.

Against this general understanding of the eucharist in the New Testament, (which depends so largely on seeing it in the context of New Testament Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology and doctrine of baptism) we turn to a more detailed examination of the eucharist words of Jesus used in the context of the Last Supper and their interpretation.

- b) The Eucharistic words of Jesus.
 - i) The occasion of the Last Supper?
 - 1) The Problem.

All four Gospels agree that the day of the death of Jesus was on a Friday (Mk.15.42; Matt.27.62; Lk.23.54; Jn.19.31,42). Since at the time of Jesus the day was reckoned from 6 p.m. - 6 p.m. that Friday would include the whole of the Last Supper, Gethsemane, the arrest and trial, the crucifixion and burial. All four evangelists agree also on this (Mk.14.17-15.47; Matt.26.20-27.61; Lk.22.14-23.56a; Jn.13.2-19.42). They differ, however, in regarding this day as the day which began with the celebration of the Passover meal, (i.e. after 6 p.m. on Thursday according to our reckoning) or as the day preceding this meal. Since the Passover meal was celebrated at the beginning of Nisan 15, when the Synoptics regard the Last Supper as a Passover meal, then it follows that they regarded that Friday as Nisan 15. When John 18.28 speaks of the Passover being eaten on the day following the trial of Jesus, it is evident that he regarded that Friday as Nisan 14. Thus the heart of the problem is was that Friday in that year around A.D. 30 Nisan 14 or Nisan 15 and therefore was the occasion of the Last Supper a special meal preceding the Passover or was it a Passover meal?

After a careful consideration of astronomical chronology for the years A.D. 27 - 34, Jeremias reaches the conclusion that; 'It (astronomical

chronology) establishes the possibility that Friday, April 7, 30, and Friday April, 3, 33, fell on Nisan 14, which would correspond to the Johannine chronology. But it does not completely exclude the possibility that Friday, April 27, 31 (or, as a considerably weaker possibility, Friday April 7, 30), fell on Nisan 15, which would agree with the synoptic Chronology. The only certain result which astronomy gives us is that in A.D. 29 and 32 neither Nisan 14 nor Nisan 15 could have fallen on a Friday; both of these years therefore must be excluded from consideration as possible years for the crucifixion.¹ Consequently we are thrown back on the New Testament evidence and the evidence of contemporary Jewish practice to find a solution to the problem.

Various attempts have been made in ^{the} history of the debate concerning the occasion of the Last Supper to harmonize the synoptic and Johannine dating. These have been so adequately summarised by Jeremias and so convincingly dismissed, that reference to them here is superfluous. More detailed consideration, however, needs to be paid to those who, accepting the Johannine chronology, have regarded the Last Supper as a kiddush meal, a haburah meal, or an essene meal.

2) The Last Supper a Kiddush meal?

^{3.} Maxwell, building on the pioneering work of G.F. Moore and particularly ⁴ Oesterly speaks of the common practice of a rabbi to hold a Kiddush meal with his disciples particularly in Messianic circles, and describes the ritual of such a meal as being; first there were religious discussions followed by a simple meal 'of common bread and wine mixed with water'. With these and other learned scholars of Jewish and Christian worship supporting this Kiddush meal theory, we need to examine the evidence for the nature and ritual of the Kiddush in the time of Christ.

Kiddush means sanctification, and was the blessing pronounced at the beginning of each feast day or Sabbath. The blessing was quite simple: 'R. Eleazer b. Zadock (born A.D. 35-40 in Jerusalem) said: My father used to say over the cup, "(blessed be) he who has sanctified the Sabbath day".

-
1. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words 1966, p.41
 2. Ibid pp 20-26.
 3. W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, 1955. pp 5ff.
 4. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. 11, 1927 ff, p.36.
 5. W.O.E. Oesterly, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, 1925, pp 167 ff, also W.O.E. Oesterly and G.F. Box, Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, 1911. (cf also G.F. Box, 'The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist', JTS, Vol 3, 1901-2, pp 357-369, especially p 363.)

1.
He did not add a closing benediction.¹ It was the blessing which marked the holy period from the profane. Any evidence that it was ever separated from the holy day is totally lacking, and would be rather pointless as a blessing of the Sabbath or feast period.

The rite appears to have been performed in the following way. After sunset (i.e. at the beginning of the holy day and, on the Sabbath, after the lighting of the Sabbath candle) the head of the household says the blessing 2. at table over a cup of wine in the midst of his family and guests. Then he drinks of the wine followed by the others present. If the Friday meal extended past sunset (i.e. into the Sabbath), then the meal was ended, and the 3. kiddush inserted into the grace after the meal. 4. At the Passover, the only 5. meal of the year which began after sunset, the sanctification of the feast took place at the beginning of the meal. Consequently there is not a shred of evidence to support Maxwell's contention that the Last Supper was a kiddush meal because there is no evidence that it was a meal at all. It was a special blessing pronounced on the feast day, and may have taken place during a meal if the Sabbath or feast began before or during the meal.

There is evidence that at the Friday Sabbath-kiddush the blessing of the wine was followed by the breaking of bread. This has led many to 6. identify the Last Supper with such a Sabbath-kiddush. But, as Jeremias has shown, this only arose in the late Tannaitic, or perhaps early Amoraic period, and then because of the development of a Friday evening service in Babylon. There is no evidence that it was true of Judaism in Jerusalem in the time of Jesus. In any event the unanimous verdict of the Gospels is that the Last Supper took place on a THURSDAY not a FRIDAY evening. In view of this 7. Oesterly has explained the Last Supper as a special Passover-kiddush. Since

-
1. Tos. Ber. 3.7 (6.22) b. Ber. 49a gives a longer wording for the Sabbath Kiddush, which gives also a feast-day kiddush.
 2. The taking of the wine called for a further blessing of the wine. The two blessings, i.e. the sanctification of the day and the blessing of the wine was a matter of dispute between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, i.e. in the 1st Century A.D. the rite was not stereotyped. Cf. Ber. 8.1; Pes. 10.2; in more detail, Tos. Ber. 6.1 (13.6); Tos Pes. 10.2 (172.14); b. Pes. 114a; Mek. Ex. 20.8. The first mention of the cup is found in the passage quoted above Tos. Ber. 3.7 (6.22) i.e. about A.D. 50.
 3. So R. Jose (c 150). Cf. Tos Ber. 5.2 (11.23) par. b. Pes. 100a (Bar.); 102a, b (Bar.); j. Pes. 10.37b.37.
 4. For detailed evidence Cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, P 27, n5 and p. 45 n 4.
 5. Cf. ibid p 46 for detailed evidence of the times of Jewish meals generally and the Passover in particular. From this evidence it is clear that the main Jewish meals were a light breakfast in the morning and the main meal in the later afternoon. The Paschal meal, in contrast, invariably began at the beginning of Nisan 15, i.e. after sunset on Nisan 14.
 6. ibid p 27 n.5, p. 28
 7. W.O.E. Oesterly, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy 1925, p.175

he accepts the Johannine chronology (i.e. that the Last Supper took place at the beginning of Nisan 14, 24 hours before the beginning of the Passover meal at the beginning of Nisan 15) we are left with the utterly impossible conclusion, unsupported by any evidence, of a sanctification of a feast day 24 hours before it began.

In consequence the kiddush hypothesis must be abandoned on the grounds that it lacks any evidence whatever in contemporary Judaism, and also on the grounds that the words of interpretation Jesus placed on the breaking of the bread and taking the cup bear no conceivable relation to the words of blessing of the day found in the Jewish kiddush.

3) The Last Supper a Haburah Meal?

1.
Another explanation has been given by Lietzmann followed, among
2.
others by Dix. This is that the Last Supper was a 'Jewish meal, invested with religious solemnity, which might be held by a company of friends, hbrh,
3.
whenever they felt the need'. Of this suggestion it needs to be said firstly, that every Jewish meal was invested with religious solemnity because of the grace said whether it was taken alone or in company. Secondly, while there were 'fellowship meals' these fellowships were 'fellowships for the observance
4.
of a commandment', and the meals in which they took part were connected with
5.
betrothals, weddings, circumcisions and funerals. That these fellowships or other 'communities of friends' met at any time 'whenever they felt the need to do so' to hold a ritual meal, let alone a sacramental meal, cannot be
6.
proven. As Dugmore rightly warns: 'constant repetition of the Haburah theme
7.
does not constitute proof.'

4) The Last Supper an Essene Meal.

Kuhn, in the course of his important investigations into the Qumran scrolls has advanced the view that the Essene cultic meals may have influenced the Christian Eucharist in two ways (1) the form of the early Christian meals, and (2) the reports of the evangelists (except Luke) about the Last Supper,
8.
but not what Jesus himself did at the Last Supper.

-
1. H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 1953ff, pp 170ff.
 2. G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 1945, pp 50-70.
 3. H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 1953ff, p 185.
 4. Sanh. 8.2; Pes. 113b.
 5. K.G. Kuhn, 'Die Abendmahlsworte', Theologische Literaturzeitung, Vol 75, 1950, col 401. Cf also Tos. Meg 4.15 (226.13) par. Semahoth 12 (Babylonian Talmud, Frankfurt a.M., 1721, 1X, fol. 16b).
 6. Cf J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.31.
 7. C.W. Dugmore, 'review of G. Dix, "The Shape of the Liturgy"', JTS, Vol 47, 1946, p.109.
 8. K.G. Kuhn, 'The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran' (E.T.) in The Scrolls and the New Testament, (ed. K. Stendahl) 1957 pp 65-93, 259-265.

(1) Between the Essene meals and the early Christian meals there is in common; that they were daily communal meals. Here the similarity ends. The monks at Qumran met twice daily for their meals which were an integral part of their monastic life, whereas from the very beginning women took part in the Christian meals (cf Acts 6.1 also 1.14; 12.12, Matt. 14.21; 15.38), which were held in private homes (Acts 2.46), and though each had a blessing of bread and wine (if the Essene tiros did mean wine)^{1.} the order of the blessing is bread/wine among the Essenes and wine/bread in the Didache (9). Further the Essene meal began with the blessing over the bread and wine (tiros) whereas it is virtually certain that the Christian blessing of the eucharistic bread and wine took place at the end of the meal.^{2.} It is therefore, highly unlikely that either influenced the other.

(2) On the grounds that Mark and Matthew have the interpretation of the wine following immediately on the interpretation of the bread whereas Luke and Paul insert a meal between them, Kuhn has argued that Mark and Matthew 'reflects an earlier pre-Christian usage, namely that of the Essenes cult meal', whereas Luke and Paul have 'no longer understood the distinctive character' of the older liturgical formula in Mark and so returned to 'common Jewish usage' and separated the words of interpretation by the insertion of a meal.^{3.}

Against this it must be noted that in the Essene practice the words of blessing over the bread and tiros took place at the beginning of the meal. According to Mark 14.18-21; Matt. 26.21-25, 26, Jesus broke the bread during the course of the meal. It is true that the words 'as they were eating' (Mark.14.22 par. Mat. 26.26) are probably a redactional transition to the institution of the Eucharist,^{4.} yet even without them Mark.14.18-21 par. Matt. 26.21-25 presupposes that the meal was already in progress before the breaking of the bread. Further when Paul writes to the Corinthians the tradition he hands on to them as he states quite explicitly was what he had received 'from the Lord' (1.Cor.11.23). Whatever else this may imply it makes it clear that Paul does not regard himself as an innovator, but believes that this is in fact the universal Christian tradition. It is, therefore, inconceivable that this earliest written record of the Last Supper is an attempt

1. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 51f shows that the word tiros did bear several meanings and is on occasion expressly distinguished from yayin the common word for wine. Thus it is not certain that the Essenes did drink wine at their meals.

2. Cf below pp 572 ff.

3. K.G. Kuhn, op.cit., p 73, cf p 260 n 25. 4. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 113.

to return to 'common Jewish usage' because Paul 'no longer understood' the 'distinctive' (i.e. Essene) character of the liturgical formula in Mark.

The other major evidence adduced by Kuhn in support of his thesis is that the Last Supper is portrayed like an Essene meal in that Jesus is not characterized as paterfamilias, but as 'leader and master of the circle of his twelve disciples'. While this was the Essene practice it was also the practice at the Passover when the meal was celebrated by a group of pilgrims in Jerusalem. It was also common for the rabbis to eat the meal with their students.

(3) If it is not possible to prove that the Essene practice has influenced either the early Christian Eucharist or the accounts of the Last Supper, then Cross has argued that Jesus himself was following an Essene pattern as he celebrated that Supper. On the grounds that the Essenes saw their meal as an anticipation of the Messianic banquet he holds that Lk.22.16 reflects this same understanding of his meal with his disciples by Jesus.

Against this two facts must be noted. In support of his claim Cross cites IQSa 2.21f which, after the description of the order of precedence in which the table companions take their place and help themselves to the food at the future Messianic banquet, continues 'And they shall proceed according to this rule at every meal at which are assembled at least ten men.' Cross interprets this to mean that the Essene community understood every meal to be an anticipation of the coming Messianic banquet. This is not what the text says. It states simply that the order of precedence to be followed at every meal is that which will be followed at the Messianic banquet. It is possible, however, that since the whole section is concerned with the future Messianic time, the verse does not refer to the Essene meals at all, but rather asserts that in the Messianic age the rule of precedence is to be followed by groups even as small as those consisting of ten persons.

Secondly, even if the Essenes did understand their meals to be a liturgical anticipation of the Messianic age, Jeremias has demonstrated convincingly that the conclusion of the Passover ritual in the reciting of the Hallel (Ps.118.25-29) was in anticipation of the coming Messiah.

-
1. K.G. Kuhn, op. cit. p 84.
 2. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 113.
 3. F.M. Cross Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies 1958, pp 177f.
 4. So J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 35, following the suggestion of C.H. Hunzinger.
 5. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 256ff. Cf also J.B. Segal, The Hebrew Passover, 1963, pp 259f; and below pp 604 ff.

The influence of the Essene meals upon Jesus, the accounts of the last Supper, and early Christian practice has not been demonstrated. We are thus left with the question of whether the Synoptics are correct in designating the Last Supper as a Passover Meal.

(5) The Last Supper a Passover Meal?

(a) Major Objections to the Last Supper as a Passover Meal.

So many and varied have been the objections to the Last Supper as a Passover meal that we shall confine our attention to the major and most widely supported of them all.

1) Many of the incidents reported in Mk. 14.17-15.47 could not possibly have taken place on Nisan 15 which, as the first day of Unleavened Bread had the character of a feast day and so, to a limited extent, that of a Sabbath. ⁽¹⁾ The most significant objections are those raised against ;

(1) the participation by Jews in a session of the Roman court on the morning of a feast day;

(2) The execution of Jesus on a high feast day;

(3) The meeting of the Sanhedrin and condemnation of Jesus during the night of the feast;

(4) The purchase of the shroud for the burial on the evening of the feast day.

The first two objections cannot be sustained because these events were in the hands not of the Jews but the Roman Governor. In connection with (1) it is to be noted that the occasion arose out of the demand by the crowds following the carrying out of the Passover amnesty (Mk.15.6.) Thus it is probable that Pilate did not intend to hold a court hearing on the day. In connection with (2) it is to be noted that the attempts to kill Jesus recorded in Lk.4.29 took place on a Sabbath, and those in Jn.10.22-39 at the feast of the Dedication of the Temple. Further Polycarp of Smyrna was executed by the Romans 'on the high Sabbath', and 'the fact that it was a Sabbath did not prevent the Jews ^{from} making a notable contribution to the carrying of wood and twigs to the pile.'^{2.}

The really serious difficulty is (3). Could the Sanhedrin have sat on the evening of Nisan 15 and condemned Jesus? This difficulty applies equally

1. Cf Ex.12.16; Lev.23.7; Num.28.18. According to Ex.12.16 the preparation of food was permitted on Nisan 15, and this was interpreted in the Mishnah (Bes. 5.2; Meg.1.5) to include all acts necessary in preparing food, and even certain acts such as carrying objects from private to public property and vice versa even if these acts had nothing to do with preparing food.^{2. see over}

to the Johannine chronology. The law that 'None may sit in judgement
 1. on a feast day' applied equally to the day of preparation for a feast.
 2.

Bultmann is surely correct in his judgement that the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin was not simply a 'personal ruling' of Annas and Caiaphas, but that Jn. 18.24 is intended to describe an official hearing at which the High Council is present.
 3. This being so neither the Synoptic understanding of Good Friday as Nisan 15 nor the Johannine as Nisan 14 is favoured by this rule in the Mishnah. Blinzler has shown that it is questionable whether these prescriptions were in force at the time of Jesus. Further in Deut.17.12f we read 'And the man that doeth presumptuously, in not hearkening unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die and all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously.'
 4. According to Tos. Sanh.11.7 (432.1) this was interpreted to mean that the most serious offenders 'are not executed at once but are brought to the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem and kept in prison until the feast, and the sentence carried out at the feast; for it is said: "And all the people shall hear it, so that they may fear it and not act presumptuously again (Deut.17.13)." It is evident here that R. Akiba had interpreted the gathering of all the people to witness the carrying out of the sentence as taking place during a feast. Since Jesus was undoubtedly regarded as a false prophet (cf Mk.14.65), which was one of the serious offences mentioned by R. Akiba necessitating the carrying out of a sentence by the Sanhedrin at the feast, it is easily understandable that the Sanhedrin should have met and claimed the sentence of death on Jesus on Nisan 15. According to b.Sanh 43a it is claimed that Jeshu, the pupil of Joshua b. Perahiah was hanged on the day of preparation of the Passover (Nisan 14) because he 'practiced sorcery (Deut 18.10) and misled Israel (into idolatry, Deut. 13.7), and enticed them to apostacy (Deut.13.14)'
 5. There is thus reliable evidence for the fact that for special reasons the Sanhedrin did meet to execute sentence during feast days. The objection to the synoptic chronology which dated Good Friday as Nisan 15 cannot be sustained on these grounds.

-
- 2.(cont.from previous page) J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966 p.76 On the Martyrdom of Polycarp cf Mart. Polyc.21.1; and the 'high Sabbath' cf 8.1; and the actions of the Jews of 13.1 For the dating of this event in A.D. 167/8 cf J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 1960 pp 60-62.
1. Bes.5.2.Tos. Bes.4.4 (207,15); Philo, De migr, Abr.91 Cf Strack and Billerbeck Vol 11, pp 815-820.
2. Sanh. 4.1; b. Sanh 35a.
3. R. Bultmann, Johannes, pp 500f.
4. J. Blinzler, The Trial of Jesus 1959 pp 149-157
5. Of the parallels in Deut.13.11 and 21.21.

(4) According to Mk.15.46 Joseph of Arimathea purchased a shroud on Good Friday. This report, found only in Mark, seems to contradict the rule against buying and selling on a Sabbath. However the express rule of the Torah required the burial of Jesus on the day of his death (Deut.21.22f). When this is taken together with the fact that the necessities of life led to a relaxing^{1.} of the rule to allow the purchase of food stuffs on a Sabbath and that according to Shab. 23.4 these necessities were taken to include coffins and shrouds, **then** even if Mk. 15 46. is historically correct, it does not present any real difficulty.

Consequently the passion narratives portray no incident that could not have taken place on Nisan 15.

2. Wellhausen has maintained that the use of ἄρτος (bread) instead of ἄζυμα (unleavened bread) in Mk. 14.22 counts decisively against the last Supper as a Passover Meal.^{2.} However, the evidence for the use of both ἄρτος and lehem (instead of Hebrew massah and the Aramaic pattira, the words commonly used to mean unleavened bread) to refer to unleavened bread in contemporary writings is overwhelming.^{3.} This objection must therefore fall away.

3. A third objection is that the account in Mk.14.22-25 contains no explicit reference to passover ritual, and in particular none to the paschal lamb and the bitter herbs.^{4.} This argument can only be sustained if we forget that Mk. 14.22-25 is a cultic formula and not a historical description. Its attention is fixed on those moments which are of significance for the celebrations of the primitive Church. Even when Luke and Paul insert a meal between the bread-word and the wine-word it is significant that they give no description at all of what was consumed apart from the bread and wine. Similarly when John designates the Christian eucharist as a passover celebration it is significant that in the whole of chapter 6 no attempt whatever is made to insert any reference to the passover lamb into the account. What concerns all these New Testament writers is not the details of the Jewish passover celebration but the Christian eucharistic meal. It is perfectly natural and only to be expected that only rites which continued to be performed should be mentioned in the liturgical formula.

1. Strack and Billerbeck, Vol 11 p 832 for evidence.

2. J. Wellhausen, 'Ἄρτον ἔκλασεν' Mc.14.22' in ZNW, Vol 7, 1906, pp 182 ff.

3. For details of the evidence cf J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966 pp62-66

4. e.g. J.B Segal, The Hebrew Passover, 1963 pp 242ff

5. Cf Jn. 6.4, the strong parallels which B. Gärtner 'John 6 and the Jewish Passover' in Coniectanea Neotestamentica, Vol. 17 1959, p.24n,26-29, has shown to exist between the account and the Jewish Haggadah, especially in the occurrence of the four questions (Jn.6.28,30f,42,52,51c-58), and the convincing arguments of O. Cullmann, Worship, 1955 pp 93ff and C.H. Dodd, Fourth Gospel, 1960 pp 333ff, all prove beyond any possibility of doubt that John did regard the eucharist as a passover celebration.

Jeremias has drawn attention to a most instructive parallel in Pes. 10.3 which, despite the elaborate descriptions of the preparations and slaughter of the paschal lambs in Pes. 5ff, mentions the eating of the lamb only as an aside ('And in the time of the Temple they used to bring before him the body of the passover offering'). The reason for this is clearly that Pes. 10.3, very conscious of the contemporary situation in which no lambs were eaten because of the destruction of the temple, hardly makes any reference to this crucial feature of the temple celebrations.

In view of this the probable reference to the paschal lamb in Lk. 22.15 ('And he said unto them I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer) and to the bowl of bitter herbs in the 'dipping' (Mk. 14.20 and par.) is significant.

4. A fourth objection is that if the Last Supper had been a passover meal, how is it possible that the Lord's Supper was not an annual celebration? Against this it is to be noted that the early Church, as we have just seen, did regard the eucharist as a passover celebration and did observe it weekly on the 'Lord's Day'. Whether or not the Last Supper was a passover for the primitive Christian Church to celebrate a weekly passover would be unparalleled.

5. Closely allied to the previous two objections is the objection that the connexion between the passion and the passover is severed by John's dating of the passion at the time when the passover lambs were being slaughtered. According to Jn. 19.36 the Scriptures were fulfilled when not a bone of his body was broken (cf the prescriptions of the Torah in this regard relating to the paschal sacrifice Ex. 12.46; 12.10, LXX; Num. 9.12). This comparison of Jesus with the paschal lamb is very early (cf 1 Cor. 5.7; 1 Peter 1.19; Rev. 5.6, 9, 12; 12.11; Jn. 1.29, 36). The way in which Paul uses the concept of Christ as the sacrificed passover lamb presupposes that this is well known to his Corinthian hearers.

When Christ's death is understood as the sacrifice of the passover lamb, i.e. the new Exodus act of God for man's deliverance from his bondage, and the Christian eucharist as a passover celebration of that Exodus, then it is easy to understand how this salvation typology comes to be presented as historical chronology. This is not to suggest that there is anything forced or artificial about the chronology in John, any more than the precisely similar procedure in Luke's account of Pentecost in Acts is forced.

1. Cf above pp 39ff.

The fact that Luke could fit his theological convictions into the typology of Pentecost and present a most unforced narrative indicates how natural this typological narrating was in the primitive Church. It is possible, therefore, that the quite explicit understanding of the Christian cultic meal as a passover celebration, carrying within it an understanding of Christ's death as the sacrifice of the passover lamb, has led to the wide-spread understanding of Christ as the passover victim and to John's typological chronology. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to suggest that the wide-spread tradition of the eucharist as a passover based on the unique 'Exodus-event' of Christ's death, resurrection and ascension and the coming of the Spirit, has led to a minimising of the passover character of the Last Supper in John.

6. The sixth objection concerns Mk. 14.2. Here we are told of the decision of the Sanhedrin not to arrest Jesus ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ which is usually translated as 'not during the feast', thus rendering the synoptic chronology impossible for it asserts that Jesus was arrested during the night of Nisan 15.

It is, however, very difficult to make sense of this statement in Mark if it is given a time reference. If it is taken to mean that Jesus was to be arrested not during but before the feast this is unintelligible. The Sanhedrin has demanded some ruse in order that there be no uproar from the people. Because of the demands for the ritual purifications for the passover Jerusalem would have been thronging with people as much on the day or two before the passover as during it. If they are interpreted as not during but after the feast, we have to reckon with the fact that pilgrims could return on the second day of the feast (Nisan 16) and there would be no guarantee that Jesus would remain for the full seven days of the feast.

The thesis of Jeremias, that the words ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ should be given a local rather than a temporal meaning (i.e. 'among the festal crowd'), is most attractive. If so, we find a similar usage in Jn. 2.23, and Mk. 14.2 would correspond exactly in substance to Lk. 22.6 ἄτερ ὄχλου ('in the absence of the multitude').

-
1. e.g. H. Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord's Supper*, 1953 ff p.173. (cf also the authorities cited in V. Taylor, *Mark*, 1955 ad.loc.)
 2. Cf V. Taylor, *op. cit.* ad. loc. for authorities cited supporting this interpretation.
 3. Cf *ibid* for supporting authorities.
 4. J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 1966 p. 72.
 - x. It is indeed very likely that if the Last Supper was a passover meal such an understanding may have been given by Christ himself during the passover haggadah on the lamb.

Even if the statement has a temporal meaning, then V. Taylor is probably correct in asserting that while Mark may have believed that the priests intended to act before the feast, they themselves proposed to act after it, but they were able to proceed almost at once because of the treachery of Judas and still prevent the uproar.

Whether we follow Jeremias or Taylor, it is impossible to fit these words easily and naturally into the synoptic chronology.

7. Finally, the most crucial objection is that of the Johannine chronology. Under 5. above we have already argued that it is impossible that John's understanding of the crucifixion in terms of the typology of the sacrifice of the passover lamb, derived from the passover interpretation of the eucharist, has led to a typological rather than historical chronology. Consequently he could have set the death of Christ within the Jewish calendar on Nisan 14 just as Luke set the gift of the Spirit within the Jewish calendar on the day of Pentecost. In addition the following needs to be borne in mind.

7a. While John 18.28 does imply that Jesus was crucified on Nisan 14, this chronology is not necessarily supported by Jn.13.1 and 19.14.

'Before the feast' in Jn. 13.1 is not a time reference to the occasion of the ensuing Last Supper (Jn. 13.2ff) but qualifies 'knew' and means simply that Jesus knew before the passover what was going to happen to him.

In his examination of $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$, Torrey has contended that the phrase may represent an Aramaic genitive construct, (arubta di pasha, and, since arubta was established in early Aramaic usage to mean Friday, has translated it as 'Friday of Passover week'. In any event the phrase in Jn.19.14 which is undoubtedly an Aramaism, has no equivalent in Aramaic which has yet been discovered. This may be accidental, in which case Jn.19.14 does lend support to Jn.18.28 but it is not a support which can be claimed without reservations.

-
1. C.C. Torrey, 'The Date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel', in *JBL*, Vol 50, 1931, pp 232-241; 'In the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper was a Paschal Meal' in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol 42 1951-1952, pp 237-250 S. Zeitlin's attempt to refute Torrey's thesis 'The Date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel' in *JBL* Vol 51, 1932, pp 268-270 cannot be sustained. His thesis that the $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta$ is used by non-Jewish writers to refer only to the eves of Sabbaths and feast days is refuted by Jn.19.14 itself, where the reference is to the sixth hour, i.e. 11 a.m. to noon. His second thesis that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ refers only to the paschal lamb and not to the seven-day feast is refuted by Jn.2.13; 11.55; 12.1; 18.39; Acts 12.4
 2. Cf Strack and Billerbeck Vol. 11, pp 834-837.
 3. Cf J. Jeremias Eucharistics Words, 1966 p 80.

7b. Bultmann has contended that the reference to the high Sabbath in Jn.19.31ff comes from a 'tradition....according to which Jesus was already crucified on Nisan 15 as in the synoptics'. This is based on the grounds that if this high Sabbath is the day of the sheaf-offering (Lev.23.11), then according to the pharisaic tradition this was Nisan 16. Thus John may represent the tradition in which the offering of the sheaves took place on Nisan 16 irrespective of whether it was a Sabbath, rather than Nisan 17 if Nisan 16 was a Sabbath. This appears to be confirmed by his designation of that Sabbath as *μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα*.

7.c. Further, there are a number of details in John's account of the Last Supper which parallel the synoptic accounts and can only be explained if it is accepted that the meal was a paschal meal.

7.ci. According to John the Last Supper took place in Jerusalem (Jn.18.1 despite the overcrowding of the city by the passover pilgrims (Jn.11.55; 12.12, 18,20). This is true also of the synoptic accounts (cf Mk.14.13 par., 14,26 par.). We know that the old Josianic reforms, which required the eating of the meal in the temple precincts (Deut.16.7; 11 Chron.35.13f; Jub.49.16ff), had had to be relaxed because of the physical impossibilities from the first century B.C. While the slaughter took place in the temple, permission had to be given to the pilgrims to eat the sacrifice in private homes (Pes.5.10; 7.12f; 10.1ff; etc). Not only this, it was impossible for Jerusalem to accommodate all the pilgrims within its gates. Accordingly permission had to be given for the passover night to be spent in the immediate environs of Jerusalem, but the passover meal itself had to be eaten within the gates of Jerusalem. In view of this the unanimous verdict that Jesus went to Jerusalem for the Last Supper is most readily explicable if that meal were the passover meal.

7.cii. After the meal Jesus did not return to Bethany although, according to Mk.11.11f; Mt.2.17, this was where he had spent the preceding nights. Rather he went to the Mount of Olives (Mk.14.26 par), into a garden (Mk.14.32 par) which, according to John 18.1, was situated on the east bank of the

-
1. R.Bultmann, *Johannes*, 1950, p 542 n.5.
 2. *Strack & Billerbeck*, Vol 11, p 848.
 3. For the evidence cf *ibid* Vol 1, pp 839f, who show that at the time of Jesus Bethpage was included in the definition of Jerusalem for the spending of the passover night.
 4. Siphre Num 69 on 9.10; Num.R.7.8 on Pes. 7.9; Makk 3.3; Kel. 1.8; Tos. Sanh. 3.4 (418.22); Midr. Tann. on Deut 14.23; 15.20.
 5. According to Lk.21.37; 22.39, Jesus was staying on 'the Mount of Olives'.

brook Kidron. The most natural explanation of this, in the light of what we have seen above, is that the meal was the passover and that Jesus was therefore obliged to spend the night in the prescribed precincts of Jerusalem. Since this included Bethpage and thus the Kidron valley and Gethsemane his departure to the garden rather than his return to Bethany (which lay outside the permitted area) is most readily explicable if that Friday (i.e. Thursday night) was Nisan 15.

7.ciii) According to John 13.30, in agreement with 1 Cor.11.23, Mk.14.17 and Mt. 26.20 the meal was held at night. Nowhere else do the Gospels record a meal of Jesus which was held at night, except in Mk.14.15 (the feeding of the 5,000) and then it is expressly stated that the time of the meal 'is already past' (Mk.14.15). It is certain that in the time of Jesus it was not customary to eat after sunset but from its very inception the passover was a meal which was eaten at night. The passover was a meal which began after sunset and lasted well into the night. The conclusion is therefore that Jn.13.30 has preserved an allusion to the paschal character of the meal.

7.civ) A further point on which John agrees with the synoptics (cf Mk. 14.18; Mt.26.20; Lk.22.14) is that Jesus and his disciples reclined at table for the Last Supper (Jn.13.12,23,25,28; 21.20). At the time of Jesus we know that the normal posture at a meal was sitting. Wherever the Gospels speak of reclining at meals they refer to meals in the open or a party (Mk. 12.39 par.; Lk.7.36f,49; 11.37; 14.15; Jn.12.2), or a feast (Mk.2.15 par., especially Lk.5.29), a banquet (Mk.6.26 par.), a wedding feast (Mt.22.10f; Lk.14.8,10) or the final messianic banquet (Mt.8.11; Lk.13.29; 16.23; 22.27). Lk.12.37, bearing so many similarities to the Johannine description of the Last Supper, is to be explained in terms of the fact that they did recline at that meal. The only two exceptions are Lk.24.30 and Mk. 16.14. It is note-worthy that Lk.24.30 describes the action of the two disciples and Jesus after the Emmaus walk and at which meal Jesus made himself known in breaking the bread. That the passage is eucharistic through and through can scarcely

-
1. cf above p 559 n.3.
 2. cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 44ff for the main evidence in this regard.
 3. Ex.12.8; Jub.49.1,12; Tos. Pes. 1.34 (158.4); j.Pes.5.31d.27; Siphre Deut. 133 on 16.6; Mek.Ex.12.6.
 4. cf. Jub.49.10,12; Pes.10.9; Zeb.5.8; Tos.Pes.5.2 (163.17) etc. cf also the statement by Josephus (Ant.18.29) that on the passover night the gates of Jerusalem were opened at midnight.
 5. cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol IV, pp 617f. cf also the rabbinic evidence of j.Ber. 7.11c.48; j.Ber.8.11d.57, and Aramaic sources, b.Sanh.38a; j.Ber. 7.11b.62; 11c.42.
 6. Cf above pp 318ff.

be doubted and thus, like Lk.12.37, probably reflects the fact that at the Last Supper Jesus and his disciples reclined at the table. Mk.16.14 is very probably modelled on this Lukan verse (Lk.24.30).

The fact that it was not a common Jewish practice to recline at table, and that Jesus and his disciples reclined only on these special occasions makes the reference to reclining at table at the Last Supper the more remarkable. That all the Gospels bear testimony to this suggests very strongly that the Last Supper was a passover meal at which it was a ritual duty to recline as
 1. 2.
 a symbol of freedom and 'for the poorest man in Israel'.

7.c v) According to Jn.13.10 the Last Supper was eaten in a state of purity. While it is undoubtedly true that the washing contains baptismal allusions the immediate context would be provided by some Jewish ritual cleansing. Segal has detailed the evidence for such cleansing baths at the passover at the time of Jesus, and also the evidence that these laws were
 3.
 being somewhat relaxed. These ritual baths were not customary at ordinary meals, but were required, despite their lenient interpretation, at the passover. The unexpected reference to the fact that the disciples are 'bathed' in Jn.13.10 in the midst of the foot-washing bears testimony to the Johannine account of the Last Supper being a passover meal.

7.c vi) According to Jn.13.29 the sudden departure of Judas is interpreted by the disciples in two ways. Firstly some thought he had gone to 'buy what things we have need of for the feast'. If this meal had been at the beginning of Nisan 14 it is difficult to understand why they would have thought this as the whole of the next day would have been available to make the necessary purchases. If it were Nisan 15 it is more understandable, although, as we have seen, even on feast days necessary purchases could be
 4.
 made. If these relaxations were not in force at the time of Jesus we know that a distinction was drawn between the passover night itself and the feast of
 5
 Unleavened Bread, on the basis of Lev.23.5f, Num.28.16f and 11 Chron.35.17. This being so it is possible that the strict Sabbath laws did not come into force until the morning of Nisan 15.

Secondly, some thought that he had gone to give alms to the poor. Strack and Billerbeck have suggested that since it was not normally permissible for the passover meal to extend beyond midnight at which time the temple gates

1. j.Pes. 10.37b.53f

2. Pes.10.1; Tos.Pes.10.1 (172.12)

3. J.B.Segal, The Hebrew Passover, 1963, p 262 especially notes 3 and 4.

4. Cf above p 555 n.3.

5. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol 1, pp 987f.

1.
 were opened, co-inciding with the end of the paschal meals, was both to
 allow those eating the passover in the city to go out into the permitted
 environs, and also to allow the beggars in to receive alms from the passover
 pilgrims.² In any event we do know that it was customary to do something for
 the poor on passover night,³ but we do not know that it was a common practice
 of Jesus to make gifts to the poor at other meals. That the disciples are
 said to have interpreted this action of Judas in this way makes it probable
 that the meal was a passover where some such action would be customary.

7.c vii) Finally, according to all the Gospels Jesus celebrated the
 Last Supper with the Twelve. When we bear in mind the fact that Jesus was in
 the habit of eating with large circles of his hearers,⁴ and that the passover
haburah had to consist of at least ten persons which was the average number,⁵
 though it was permitted that the number exceed this minimum,⁶ then the exclusive
 character of the meal makes it appear very much as though it was a passover
 meal. It is perhaps noteworthy that within John's account, while the Master/
 servant relationship is affirmed (Jn.13.13f), we find also express reference
 to the disciples no longer being servants but 'friends' (Jn.15.15). Is it
 possible that in this the ancient family character of the passover meal is
 asserting itself? In any event we know that close friends among the pilgrims
 in Jerusalem did celebrate the passover together.

In view of this the only real objection against the Last Supper as a
 passover meal rests on Jn.18.28. Against this, while none of the individual
 pieces of evidence mentioned above taken by themselves constitute proof of the
 paschal character of the meal, taken together the evidence is very strong.
 It is possible that Jn.18.28 has arisen out of John's chronological typology
 of Jesus as the true paschal lamb in the midst of the thousands being sacri-
 ficed in Jerusalem, and the foundation (through his death and exaltation) of
 the Christian passover.

Conclusion

We have seen that none of the major objections to the synoptic
 chronology constitute decisive proof against the Last Supper occurring at the
 commencement of Nisan 15 and thus being a passover meal. When this is placed
 against the positive evidence for it being a passover meal, the most natural

1. According to Josephus Ant. 18.29f.

2. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol 11, pp 842f.

3. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 54 for the evidence.

4. Cf Mk.1.29-31; 2.15; 3.20; 6.31,32-44; 8.14; 14.3; Lk.7.36; 8.1-3; 11.37;
 13.26f; 14.1; 15.1f; Jn.1.39; 2.1-11; 4.8,31; 21.12.

5. Pes.7.13; 8.1,4,7; 9.10; Tos.Pes.4.3(163.4) Zeb.5.8; Josephus Bell.6.423ff.

6. Pes.8.3.

conclusion is that it was a passover meal.

b) Major Arguments in Favour of the Last Supper as a Passover Meal

We shall limit ourselves to a discussion of what may be regarded as the two most decisive arguments in favour of the Last Supper as a Passover meal.

1. According to Mk.14.18-22; Mt.26.21-26, Jesus broke the bread during the course of the meal. As we have seen, even if the words 'as they were eating' in Mk.14.22 = Mt.26.26 are a redactional transition to the institution of the eucharist,¹ the redactor must have been aware that he was describing a sequence quite different from that of an ordinary meal. Even without these words it is clear from what precedes them that the meal is already in progress. Strack and Billerbeck have shown that the only exception to the rule that a normal meal began with the breaking of bread was on festival occasions among the higher classes where a preliminary course was served in an ante-room.² There is nothing in the Gospel records to suggest a preliminary meal in an ante-chamber.

In addition to this Mk.14.22 describes the breaking of the bread following on the serving of a dish (Mk.14.20). According to the Mishnaic source Pes. 10.37d.4f, at the passover meal there was a preliminary dish served before the breaking of bread. This unusual procedure was designed to evoke from the children the question, 'How is it that on every other evening we dip bread into the dish but on this evening we simply dip (without bread) into the dish?' This ritualised children's question was designed to fulfil the requirement of the Torah that the significance of the passover meal be explained via the questioning of the children (Ex.12.26f). The form of the children's question proves that the passover meal was the only meal in the year at which the serving of a dish (Mk.14.20) preceded the breaking of the bread (Mk.14.22).³

2. At the Last Supper Jesus announced his impending passion by speaking words of interpretation over the bread and wine. In this the parallel to the fixed procedure at the passover meal is striking. At the passover, on the basis of Ex.12.26f; 13.8, the peculiarities of the meal were the occasion for arousing the children's questions which were answered by relating the peculiarities to the Exodus story. In this interpretation three elements of

1. Cf above p.551.

2. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol 1V, p. 616.

3. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.30 and cf p.30 n.4 for supporting authorities.

1.
 the meal had to be mentioned specifically: 'Rabban Gamaliel used to say:
 "Whoever does not mention (in his interpretation) these three things at the
 Passover has not fulfilled his obligation: the passover lamb, the unleavened
 bread, and the bitter herbs (Ex.12.8)"' (Pes.10.5). This passage continues,
 'The passover lamb: because God passed over in mercy the house of our fathers
 in Egypt (Ex.12.27); unleavened bread: because our fathers were redeemed from
 Egypt; the bitter herbs: because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our
 fathers in Egypt (Ex.1.14)' (Pes.10.5). That the interpretation of the bread,
 'because our fathers were redeemed from Egypt' is meant to refer to the nature
 of the Exodus from Egypt is proved by the Mekilta on Ex.12.39 and Philo (De
 spec. leg. 2.158), in which reference is made to the great haste in which the
 Exodus took place, and Josephus (Ant.2.316) who bases the interpretation on
 Deut.16.3 as a 'memory of the misery' of the Israelites who had to eat
 unleavened bread because of the lack of other food. Consequently the bread
 also came to be known as the 'bread of affliction', based on Deut.16.3.
 2.
 The principle which lay behind the interpretation of the ritual passover acts
 is that they were designed to enable the participants at the meal to re-live
 the Exodus deliverance. 'In every generation a man must so regard himself as
 if he himself came forth out of Egypt' (Pes.10.5). The idea is precisely
 that which we found in Paul's doctrine of baptism as a contemporaneity with
 Christ, going through the same process of deliverance with him and thus sharing
 with him the victory he had won. 3.
 The Jews at the passover are to regard
 themselves as actually there at the Exodus, sharing in the miseries, but
 sharing also in the miracle of God who through the Exodus made them his people
 4.
 in the land of Canaan.

Strack and Billerbeck have drawn attention to the differences between
 the use of allegories by the Alexandrian and Palestinian scholars. 5.
 While
 the Palestinian scholars adhere as closely as possible to the Scriptures, the
 Alexandrian scholars use the Scriptures as the form in which a more 'spiritual'
 interpretation is given. Thus we find at least four interpretations of the

-
1. Almost certainly Gamaliel 1 (c A.D.30) cf D.Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, 1956, p.187.
 2. Cf Siphre Deut. 130 on 16.3 ('R.Simeon said: Why is it called the bread of affliction? Because of the affliction they had to endure in Egypt.') and the Yemmenite Siddur (Aramaic) quoted by G.Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, 1929, p.139; ('Behold, this is the bread of affliction which our fathers had to eat as they came out of Egypt.')
 3. Cf above pp 436f.
 4. Cf J.Pedersen, Israel, Vol III-IV, pp 384ff; R.K.Yerkes, Sacrifice, 1953, pp 83ff. M.Thurian, Eucharistic Memorial, Part 1, 1966, pp 27ff.
 5. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol III, pp 397f.

unleavened bread in Philo. Firstly it is 'unfinished', and thus reflects nature before harvest, and is intended to raise man's hopes for the gifts of 1. nature. Secondly, as unleavened bread is natural but leavened bread an artificial product, the use of unleavened bread is a call to return to the purer life of earlier times. 2. Thirdly it is 'bread of affliction' and thus a reminder of the truth that man can accomplish great tasks only by labour and self-denial. 3. The unleavened bread is a warning to turn away from arrogance. 4.

According to the Jerusalem Talmud, we find also that an interpretation is given to the four passover cups. Among the various interpretations we find an allegorical interpretation, an interpretation which looks back over salvation history, and an interpretation which looks forward to the messianic salvation. 'R.Johanan said in the name of R.Bennaia: (the four cups) correspond to the fourfold description of redemption (in Ex.6.6f)...R.Joshua b. Levi said: (they) correspond to the four cups of Pharaoh (Gen.40.11,13).. R.Levi said: (they) correspond to the four world empires. The scholars said (they) correspond to the four cups of punishment which the Holy One, blessed be he, will one day give to the nations of the world to drink....And similarly 5. the Holy One, blessed be he, will give four cups of comfort to Israel to drink.'

In the Midrash on the Song of Solomon 1.18 we find an eschatological interpretation placed alongside the historical interpretation of the unleavened bread. "'Go thy way forth to the ends of the flock (of Israel)"(S. of S.1.18). R.Eliezer said: Of the ash-cake (the unleavened bread) which Israel took out of Egypt have they eaten for 31 days.....From this you may learn what I shall do to them subsequently in the End, and so it is written, "There shall be an abundance of corn in the land" (Ps.72.16). 6. Here we see linked the miraculous bread on which God had fed Israel on her desert wandering and the coming messianic banquet on unleavened bread. We have seen how John understands the eucharistic bread, which is Christ himself, as the restoration of the Mosaic manna in the messianic feast of the Christian passover. 7. A similar declaration of messianic salvation is found in 1 Cor.5.7b-8. This early 8. Christian passover haggadah asserts that 'Our passover...hath been sacrificed,

1. De Spec. leg. 2.158.

2. De Spec. leg. 2.159-161.

3. De congressu eruditionis gratia 161-7.

4. Cf R.Marcus, Philo. Supplement II. Questions and Answers on Exodus (The Loeb Classical Library), 1953, pp 24f

5. j.Pes. 10.37b.61 - 37c.10 (quoting different authorities) Gen R.38.4 on 40.9-11; Midr. Ps.75.4 (anonymous).

6. Following the translation of J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.59.

7. Cf above pp 111ff.

8. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 60.

even Christ'. Here is a clear echo of the passover interpretation of the lamb from which two main eschatological conclusions are drawn. Firstly, the leaven which is removed from Jewish homes on Nisan 14 is a symbol of removing the wickedness which characterises the old world, and secondly, the Christian community is already the new dough, the eschatological community.

When we remember that the early Church did understand the eucharist to be a passover celebration of the deliverance wrought by Christ in his death and resurrection, so that he himself is the passover lamb, then the fact that no reference is made to the lamb in the cultic formula of the institution of the eucharist is easy to understand (apart from the clear allusion to it in Lk.22.15). When we remember also that the fulfilment of the passover duty required an interpretation of the bread in terms of the redemption that God had wrought in the Exodus and also in terms of the coming messianic salvation, then Jesus' words over the bread fit most easily into a passover context. We have seen also that it was not uncommon for an historical and eschatological interpretation to be placed on the four cups, which again indicates the context of the wine-word in a passover meal. Finally, the linking of the betrayal of Judas with the 'dipping' (Mk.14.20; Mt. 26.23; Jn.13.26)^{1.} preserves the Jewish procedure of interpreting the bowl of bitter herbs.

We conclude, therefore, that Jn.18.28 apart there is nothing in the account of the Last Supper in the Gospels which proves that it did not take place at the commencement of Nisan 15 and thus was a passover meal. Within the context of a passover meal Jesus' words of interpretation being so revolutionary must have burned themselves into the memory of the participants at that meal and would undoubtedly have been interpreted in terms of the salvation events which followed so shortly after in the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. In the context of a passover meal he pointed to a new Exodus which was shortly to take place, which Exodus was 'remembered'^{2.} in the Christian eucharistic passover celebrations.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the customary place in which the interpretation of the various elements of the passover meal was given was in the passover haggadah which preceded the meal proper.^{3.} We can only assume that at the Last Supper Jesus followed this Jewish procedure of interpreting

1. Luke's special source which contained the similar saying (Lk.22.21) after the meal has necessarily dropped the interpretation of the herbs as the betrayal by Judas, so that he quotes from Ps.41.9 (cf also Jn.13.18 who, nevertheless still preserves the Markan interpretation of the bitter herbs)

2. On this cf below pp 601ff.

3. Cf below pp 567, 586.

the various passover elements, probably in terms of himself, and thus prepared his disciples for the radical innovation of adding further interpretations at the graces over the bread and wine during the meal proper.

ii) The Words of Interpretation

1.

1. Their context in the passover meal

At the time of Jesus the general outline of a passover meal would almost certainly have been as follows;

A. Preliminary Course

Word of dedication of the day and of the cup spoken by the paterfamilias over the first cup (the kiddush cup)

Preliminary dish of bitter herbs etc.

The meal proper was served but not yet eaten; the second cup mixed but not yet drunk.

B. Passover Liturgy

Passover haggadah by the paterfamilias (in Aramaic)

First part of the passover hallel (in Hebrew) (Ps.113 or 113 and 114)

Drinking of the second cup (haggadah cup)

C. Meal

Grace spoken by the paterfamilias over the unleavened bread.

Meal consisting of passover lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, with fruit purée and wine.

Grace over the third cup (the cup of blessing)

D. Conclusion

Second part of the passover hallel (in Hebrew)(Ps.114-118 or 115-118)

Praise over the fourth cup (hallel cup)

Accepting that the Last Supper was a passover meal, it would seem clear that Jesus did not give his interpretation of the bread and wine during the passover haggadah, but during the main meal. If this is so, it is probable that he used a normal haggadah at this point, confirming God's history of salvation through the Exodus. It is also probable that during this haggadah he prepared his disciples for the words of interpretation by identifying himself with the passover lamb as God's true passover.

We know that Christ spoke his word of interpretation over the bread, which was not eaten during the preliminary course. It would appear therefore that he has added his word during the grace spoken at the beginning of the main meal. It is his new interpretation spoken at this point in the meal which is most significant. Building on what we can only assume was part of his passover haggadah he now says not only is this true, but also the messianic deliverance for which the Jews have longed is being fulfilled. So far as the interpretation of the wine is concerned, this was probably spoken in

1. For the evidence for the following general outline of the passover meal at the time of Jesus, cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol IV, pp 41-76; J.Behm, art. κλάω, TWNT, Vol III, pp 722f ; J.E.Segal, The Hebrew Passover, 1953, pp 231ff ; J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 85ff.

connexion with the grace at the end of the meal (Mk.14.23, 'having given thanks'). According to Mark this wine-word was spoken after the breaking of the bread (Mk.14.22) but before the singing of the hymn (Mk.14.26). This is supported by the very archaic 'after supper' of 1 Cor.11.25, and the expression the 'cup of blessing' of 1 Cor 10.16. Consequently, it is these words spoken in connexion with the graces at the beginning and the end of the meal proper which became the heart of the eucharistic celebration in the church and, as such, have displaced the other features of the meal which would have been in accordance with the traditional passover celebrations.

2. The Eucharistic Words : Their Form

a) The various accounts as independent traditions

That in the three major accounts of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper we have three independent and very old traditions can be shown from the following facts.

Mark, who is closely followed by Matthew, has three sections in his account of the Last Supper which belong to quite different strata of the tradition. (i) The preparation of the passover room (Mk.14.12-16 and par.) is a late section as is shown in the reference to 'the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the passover lamb' (Mk.14.12). This must either be a faulty expression of a non-Jewish author or a mistranslation by him. Although there is some evidence that learned exegetes of Ex.12.15,18 did speak of the eve of the passover as the first day of the feast, Dalman's observation is still generally true that such a designation of Nisan 14 is most unusual. This time reference shows that Mk.14.12-16 belongs to a different tradition to Mk.14.1. Further, in Mk.14.12-16 the disciples are referred to as 'the disciples' in verses 12,13,14,16 but verse 17 refers to them as 'the twelve' (cf also vv 10,20). Again when verse 17 refers to the twelve, it would appear that this tradition does not belong to the context of verse 16 which has just referred to two of the disciples being sent out - i.e. it should have

-
1. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 121 n.2.
 2. Cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol IV, pp 628, 630f, also pp 58,72, for evidence that the 'cup of blessing' was the technical term for the third passover cup.
 3. Matthew's account is a slightly expanded and more liturgical form of Mark's. Thus we note the addition of 'eat' after 'take'; the parallel command to drink instead of Mark's statement that the disciples all drank of the cup; the reason for the command to drink ('for this is my blood' etc.); the blood is shed 'for the remission of sins'. These Matthaean features must be regarded as secondary additions to the earlier Markan tradition.
 4. Strack & Billerbeck, Vol 11, pp 812-815.
 5. G.Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, 1929, p.105.

spoken of ten of the twelve. (ii) The announcement of the betrayal at the Supper is common to all four Gospels. Since Mark, Luke and John are independent of one another in their depiction of the announcement of the betrayal, the tradition that it took place at the Last Supper must be early and have circulated in different forms. (iii) When Mark and Matthew open the actual account of the Supper with the introduction 'as they were eating' (Mk.14.22) which competes with Mk.14.18 ('As they were at table eating'); when this account is not connected with the preparations for the meal mentioned in Mk.14.12-16; when Mark's narrative style gives way to a solemn stylized language which piles up participles and finite verbs; when words and constructions not used elsewhere by Mark are found frequently; when the strongly semitic character of the whole passage is seen; then the most natural explanation of all this is that at this point in the narrative Mark has reverted to the liturgical formula which has become fixed in the Christian celebrations, and that this tradition in this form of words is much older than Mark's Gospel.

The Lukan account of the Last Supper (Lk.22.7-39), as is generally accepted, follows Luke's special source from verse 14 onwards. It is well known that when Luke is following his Markan source he does so 'painstakingly ...pericope for pericope' and does not generally deviate in the order in which he presents the material. When we note that in the account of the Last Supper there are a significant number of deviations in the order, then the conclusion must be that he is not following Mark but what he regards as an independent and more reliable tradition. Thus in Luke we find Jesus' avowal of abstinence preceding the words of institution (Lk.22.15-18; cf Mk.14.25); the announcement of the betrayal follows them (Lk.22.21-23; cf Mk.14.18-21); the lament over the traitor (Lk.22.22, cf Mk.14.21) precedes the speculations of the disciples (Lk.22.23; cf Mk.14.19); and the prophecy of denial comes before the departure to Gethsemane (Lk.22.33; cf Mk.14.27ff). We conclude, therefore, that Luke's account of the meal comes from a tradition independent of Mark.

When Paul quotes the words, 'for I received of the Lord what I also delivered to you' (1 Cor.11.23) there is no doubt that παραλαμβάνειν and παραδίδόναι represent the rabbinic terms kibbel min and masar le. In

1. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.97 n.4 for detailed evidence.
2. τοῦτό ἐστιν, πίνειν ἐκ, διαθήκη, ἐκχεῖν, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, οὐκέτι οὐ μῆ, γενήμα, ἀμπέλως, ἕως... ὅτου, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the absence of the characteristic Markan historic present.
3. For an excellent discussion of the semitisms in the Markan tradition of the eucharistic words cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 173-184.
4. ibid p 98.
5. Cf W.D.Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1948, pp 248f.

the transmission of Rabbinic tradition what was handed down from one generation to another was the substance and explanation of the Torah which had been communicated by God to the first member of the series. 'Similarly we are not to understand from Paul's account of the Last Supper that he is quoting the ipsissima verba of Jesus, but we are to find there the precipitate of those words percolated through the mind of a rabbi....This approach to Paul's account makes it possible for us to understand why it is, as has often been pointed out, that the essential meaning of the Markan and Pauline accounts is the same while the formulation differs.^{1.} Particularly relevant here also is the observation of Cullmann who has drawn attention to certain passages in Paul's writings (1 Cor.7.10;²⁵ 9.14; 1 Thess.4.15) in which 'the Lord' occupies the place of 'tradition', and to the combination of these in 1 Cor.11.23^{2.} which he translates as, 'I received (by tradition) from the Lord'. Thus the assertion that he received the tradition 'from the Lord' does not necessarily imply a vision, but rather that behind the tradition which he has received is the exalted Lord who works in it and preserves it.

That Paul did receive what he delivered from a pre-Pauline tradition can be shown by the fact that the account of the Last Supper has idioms foreign to Paul. Only in 1 Cor.11.23-25 do we find in Paul παραδίδοσθαι used absolutely, εὐχαριστεῖν used absolutely to designate grace at table, κλᾶν without an object, καὶ εἶπεν, ἀνάμνησις (twice), μετὰ with an infinitive used as a noun, δεῖπνεῖν, τοῦτο placed before the noun, and ὁσάκις. Most important is the fact that the 'body of Christ' in the central words of his account are used elsewhere, as we have seen, with a different meaning. For Paul the body of Christ designates the Christian community which is 'in Christ'. Even in 1 Cor.11.29f Paul reverts to his more usual understanding of the body,^{3.} and in 1 Cor.10.17 he speaks of partaking of the 'one bread' through which we become 'one body'. Thus it is plain that 1 Cor.11.24 is couched in an idiom foreign to Paul, and the whole account is pre-Pauline.

This by no means proves that the whole account is uncoloured by Paul. W.D.Davies refers especially to the cup-saying as a 'Rabbinization of the tradition'.^{4.} Jeremias has pointed out that 'the positioning of a prepositional attribute with an article after the noun, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (1 Cor.11.24) is a^{5.} 'characteristic Pauline idiom'. Similarly the placing of the personal

1. ibid p 250.

2. O.Cullmann, "'KYRIOS" as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus (Paradosis and Kyrios)' in SJT, Vol 3, 1950.

3. cf above pp 422ff.

4. W.D.Davies, Paul & Rabbinic Judaism, p250

5. J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1963, p.104.

pronoun before the noun which we find twice in the words of institution (v.24: τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα and v.25: ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι) and in none of the other accounts, may also be attributable to Paul.

We conclude, therefore, that the three main accounts which differ in details but not in essence from one another are not dependent upon one another and are not the compositions (apart from some details) of the New Testament authors. They all stem from independent traditions on which the authors have drawn for their accounts and are considerably older than the Gospels in which they occur.

b) The influence of liturgical practice on the accounts

While we have seen that the tradition behind the various accounts is very old, this does not mean that eucharistic practice has not affected the accounts. They represent the result of a living process of growth in the tradition.

b i) The proclamation of the Lord's death

As he cites the institution of the eucharist Paul adds 'for as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come' (1 Cor.11.26).^{1.} Schniewind has shown that καταγγέλλειν means 'to proclaim' and designates the 'proclamation, announcement of a completed event', and that the general usage suggests that this 'proclamation' was made in words.

We find a clear indication of how this was done in the New Testament period in Jn.6.51c-58. We have already seen that Jn.6.51c is an independent version of Jesus' words of interpretation over the bread which is remarkably similar to that of Paul.^{2.} Consequently Jn.6.53-58 appears to be a eucharistic homily based on the words of institution contained in Jn.6.51c. This being so this passage preserves a valuable indication of how the 'proclamation of the Lord's death' was carried out in the celebration of the eucharist.

At the same time, however, a comparison of Jn.6.51c and 1 Cor.11.24b indicates how the form of the proclamation has influenced the words of institution.

Jn.6.51c
the bread which I will give
is my flesh
for the life of the world.

1 Cor. 11.24b
this
is my body
which is for you.

John's account is clearly influenced by its context in the discourse on Jesus as the 'bread of life' who has come to give 'life unto the world'(Jn.6.33 etc.)

1. J.Schniewind, art. ἀγγελλίαι κτλ in TWNT, Vol 1, pp 70f.
2. Cf above pp 114f.

consequently the universally attested simpler 'this' has become expanded as has also the $\tau\upsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma$ formula. However, knowing Paul's concept of the 'flesh' it would be impossible for him to say with John 'this is my flesh'. Equally we know John's proclamation that Jesus is the Word become 'flesh' (Jn.1.14) and that the assertion about eating the flesh of Jesus gave rise to serious misgivings among Jesus' followers (which probably reflects the uneasiness of the primitive community about these words). Consequently we can be sure that John's use of 'flesh' rather than 'body' comes from a pre-Johannine tradition and ^{it} must be left as an open question whether Jesus used 'flesh' or 'body' at the Last Supper. In any event, what is clear is that the form of the 'proclamation' was both dependent on the tradition regarding the words of institution and yet at the same time did affect the tradition.

b ii) The separation of the eucharist from the meal

It is becoming increasingly more certain that already within the New Testament period the eucharist was celebrated at the close of a fellowship meal. Schweizer has argued convincingly that this was so on the basis of Paul's account in 1 Cor.11.17-¹34. When we remember that the abuse against which Paul railed, which led to his advice that the hungry man should eat at home first, was that they did not wait for the late-comers at the Lord's Supper, it makes the most sense if we assume that the meal (which the Corinthians took less seriously than the sacramental act) took place before the eucharist. The words 'after supper' in 1 Cor.11.25 do not necessarily count against this conclusion. We have already seen that they were a part of the old tradition which has been preserved despite the fact that it is no longer applicable.

There is also an instructive change in the word order in Luke. In 1 Cor.11.25 we read: 'In the same way also the cup after supper', i.e. Jesus took the cup in the same way as he had taken the bread, but he took the cup at the close of the supper. In Luke the same words appear in the order: 'Also the cup in the same way after supper', i.e. Jesus took the cup in the same way as he had taken the bread, and both of them after supper (Lk.22.20). This Lukan version of the words found in Paul is most probably secondary, reflecting the practice of the early church in which the eucharist did follow after the meal.

Further indications of this are found in the Markan tradition where the

1. E.Schweizer, 'Abendmahl im Neuentestament' in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 1957ff, Vol 1, col.11.

words of institution follow one another and all reference to the intervening meal has fallen away. It is instructive, however, that the redactional words 'as they were eating' (Mk.14.18,22 = Mt. 26.21,26) with which the institution is introduced, should appear. They indicate the liturgical practice of the meal preceding the eucharist.

Jeremias has argued convincingly that the words in Acts 2.42 indicate
1.
the same practice:

'they were devoting themselves to the teaching of the apostles
and to the κοινωνία
to the breaking of bread
and to the prayers.'

On the grounds that the verb προσκαρτερεῖν in Acts regularly means 'to attend worship' (Acts 2.46 Temple worship; 1.14 communal prayer; 6.4 prayer and ministry of the word), which, as the participle (προσκαρτεροῦντες), is translated as 'devoting themselves', it should be translated as 'they were attending worship regularly'. This being so the list may well describe the usual order of such Christian worship consisting of (a) listening to the teaching of the apostles, (b) κοινωνία (c) breaking bread, and (d) prayers.

(a) That the early Christian worship did begin with teaching is directly indicated in Acts 20.7ff; Justin, Apol 1. 67.4; Acts of John 106-110 etc., and indirectly by the exhortation to the kiss of peace in Rom.16.16; 1 Cor.16.20; 11 Cor.13.12; 1 Thess.5.26; 1 Pet.5.14, which kiss appears to have begun the meal after reading the apostolic letters.

Further proof of this is found in Luke's account of the Emmaus walk (Lk.24.13-31) where we find, before the risen Lord's making himself known in the breaking of the bread Luke records; 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets he (Jesus) interpreted to them in all the Scriptures concerning himself.' (Lk.24.26f) Here the sequence is a declaration of Christ's atoning death and its interpretation followed by the 'breaking of bread'. What we have here is a reading back into a resurrection narrative of primitive eucharistic practice.

(b) To what does the κοινωνία refer? It could refer to the 'contribution' or 'donation' which the word is used to designate in Rom.15.26. But it could also be translated 'table fellowship'. As such it would refer

-
1. J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 118ff.
 2. Cf Eccles.6.10, κοινωνός τραπέζων (table friend); Tob.2.2 (Codex Sinaiticus) φαγεταί κοινωνῶς μετ' ἐμοῦ ; 1 Cor 10.18,20 κοινωνοί ('table-fellows' cf H.Gressmann in ZfW, Vol 20, 1921, p 226); τοῦ Θυσιαστηρίου τῶν δαιμονίων . So also H.Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 1953ff, 204.

to the Christian Agape and give to the 'breaking of bread' the meaning of the subsequent eucharist.

(c) As J. Lightfoot saw a long time ago 'breaking bread' never refers to a whole meal but to the action of tearing the bread and the rite with which the meal commenced.¹ It is possible that this technical term for the eucharist arose from an early practice of celebrating the eucharist in one kind only. It is noteworthy that in Jn. 6.51c there is no word in connexion with the wine although the ensuing discourse speaks unmistakably of 'drinking Christ's blood' (Jn. 6.53, 54, 56). Similarly Luke's account of the Emmaus walk ends only with the breaking of the bread (Lk. 24.30). Further traces of such a practice may be found in the limiting clause 'as often as ye drink it', which Paul adds to the word over the wine (1 Cor. 11.25) and the absence of the command to repeat the rite with the wine in the Lukan account (Lk. 22.20; contra Paul of 1 Cor. 11.25).

If, as is certainly possible if not probable, the primitive Christian community did often celebrate bread eucharists, and these took place after the Agape, then the technical term 'the breaking of bread' would be wholly appropriate, for it would not describe a meal but the ritual which on other occasions began the meal.

Outside the New Testament we have clear indications that the eucharist had become separated from the Agape and took place at its conclusion. Since the discovery of the Didache there has been the most lively discussion whether the prayers in Did. 9-10 are for an Agape or for a eucharist. M. Dibelius has convincingly demonstrated that what we are dealing with here is an Agape followed by a celebration of the eucharist.² Did. 9.1 - 10.5 has the prayers of the Agape before and after the meal, 10.6 is the introductory liturgy to the following eucharist. His main arguments are that a wine-bread sequence for a eucharist is completely without parallel, the liturgical ejaculations which greet the coming Lord, and the warning 'if any one is holy, let him come: if he is not let him repent', are meaningful only as the introduction to the eucharist not as the conclusion of either an Agape or a eucharist.

We conclude, therefore, that the eucharistic practices of (possibly) celebrating in one kind fairly frequently and of placing the eucharist at the end of a preceding meal have influenced the tradition regarding the eucharistic words of Jesus and the account of the meal in the following ways:

1. J. Lightfoot, 'Hebrew and Talmudic Exerciitations on Acts 2.42' in The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot (ed. J.R. Pitman) Vol VIII, p. 384.
2. M. Dibelius, 'Die Mahlgebete der Didache' in ZNW Vol 37, 1938, pp 32-41.

- (i) the preservation of words relating to the bread only (Jn.51.c);
- (ii) the falling away of the intervening meal between the words of interpretation in Mark and Matthew;
- (iii) the slight alteration in the words in Lk.22.20 to imply that both actions took place at the end of the meal rather than at its beginning and end as in 1 Cor.11.25;
- (iv) in addition to this we should expect to find an increasing parallelism of the word over the bread and the word over the cup. When the intervening meal falls away and the two words of interpretation are placed alongside each other the most natural tendency is to make them parallel. We shall see the importance of this in the next section in which we attempt to ascertain the most probable form and order of the words used by Jesus at the Last Supper.

(d) That the celebration ended with psalms and prayers can be concluded from Acts 2.46f; 12.12 as well as by the eucharistic liturgies of the whole ancient church.

We see now that although the traditions behind the various accounts are independent of each other (except Matthew's account and, as we shall see below, Luke is also indebted to a certain extent to the Pauline tradition) and are very old, they are none the less all of them parts of a living developing life of eucharistic worship and thus are by no means impervious to the influence of that worship.

c) The most probable form and order of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper

1.
i) Jesus' avowal of abstinence

It is well known that Jesus' avowal to abstain from the 'fruit of the vine' with its so-called 'eschatological prospect' occurs as the introduction to Luke's account (Lk.22.15-18) but at the end of Mark's account (Mk.14.25 = Mt.26.29) and is absent from Paul's account although the eschatological element is retained in the assertion that the eating and drinking is accompanied by a proclamation of the Lord's death 'till he come' (1 Cor.11.26) which occurs at the close of the account. Who is right? Mark or Luke?

The solution to this question is intimately tied to the problem of whether the longer (i.e. including verses 19b and 20 of Lk.22) or the shorter (i.e. excluding them) text is to be preferred. This problem has been given

1. This term is derived from J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 207. Cf n.6 for the reasons given by Jeremias for its preference over 'vow of abstinence'.

2. On the meaning of 'till he come' cf below pp 609f.

such close attention by Jeremias, that his conclusion, now widely supported,
 1.
 that the longer text is to be preferred seems indubitable. Undoubtedly the
 overwhelming weight of the manuscript evidence is in favour of the longer text.
 In addition to this the shorter text provides us with the order wine-bread.

2.
 The Didache, as we have seen, cannot be used to support such wine-bread euchar-
 ists in the early Church. It cannot be argued that verses 19b and 20 have
 been added to the original shorter text in order to bring it into conformity
 with liturgical practice, because its result is to create the completely unique
 feature of two cups. But it cannot be argued either that 19b and 20 have been
 removed to avoid the awkwardness of the two cups, because the result is the
 reversal of the liturgical bread-wine order, or that they have been removed to
 preserve the actual mysteries of the words from any but initiates, because then
 we should expect that 'this is my body' would also have been removed. We
 conclude, therefore, that the 'longer text' is the original one in Luke.

How is the shorter text to be explained? I venture the suggestion that
 Luke has combined two traditions which were circulating. We have seen how
 Luke, the companion of Paul, has introduced a slight change in the Pauline word
 order of 1 Cor. 11.25 in Lk.22.20 in order to make both the bread and the wine

3.
 word come after the supper; that he appears to know in Lk.24.30 of bread

4. 5.
 eucharists as well as in Acts 2.42; that the command to repeat is absent from

6.
 the words over the wine (Lk.22.20); and that the words over the cup 'this cup
 is the new covenant in my blood' (τουτὸ τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ^{αἵματι} μου
 (So Luke) ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ^{ἐρυθρῷ} αἵματι (so Paul)) in Paul and Luke are so

closely parallel, Luke simply having altered the characteristic Pauline phrase
 ἐν τῷ ^{ἐρυθρῷ} αἵματι, and yet so markedly different from Mk.14.24 ('this is my

blood of the covenant'), that the conclusion is unavoidable that the Lukan
 cup-word is derived from the same tradition as that reflected in 1 Cor.11.25.

7.
 This being so it would appear that Luke has drawn together two traditions;

1. Cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp 139-159. Cf also A.J.B.Higgins, Lord's Supper, 1956, pp 37ff.

2. Cf above p 574

3. Cf above p 572f

4. Cf above p 574

5. Cf above p 573

6. Cf above p 574

7. Further features in which Lk.22.19b-20 agrees with 1 Cor.11.24b-25 against Mk.14.23b-24 are: ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν against ὑπὲρ πολλῶν; the command to repeat applied to the bread word τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, absent from Mark; εἰς τὴν ἐρυθρὴν ἀνάμνησιν, absent from Mark. Despite this impressive list of parallels between Luke and Paul, Luke agrees with Mark in speaking of the blood being 'poured out' (ἐκχυσθέντων). Luke may have derived this from Mark and added the Pauline ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν to it instead of the Markan ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. There can be no doubt that Luke did know the Markan tradition.

the one contained in Lk.22.15-19a, and the other (the pre-Pauline tradition) in Lk.22.19b-20. Thus it would be perfectly natural that when the Gospel of Luke circulated in certain circles in which the Pauline tradition was not known (and possibly bread and wine eucharists were not celebrated, for the cup mentioned in Lk.22.17 is not a eucharistic cup¹), the words contained in Lk. 22.19b-20 were omitted. Such an explanation of the shorter text has at least this to recommend it; it does not demand that we accept the impossible assumption that all the manuscripts supporting the longer text would have added exactly the same words. We should expect some at least to show the influence of the Markan tradition.

We conclude therefore that in his account Luke has combined two distinct traditions; the one containing the cup over which Jesus made his avowal of abstinence and the bread word, and the other the pre-Pauline cup word which has been amended slightly by Luke to bring it into conformity with the Markan tradition. As a result Luke has an account in which two cups are mentioned but the first most certainly cannot have been intended by him to be the eucharistic cup. This conclusion is important for our interpretation not only of Luke's record of Jesus' avowal of abstinence, but also of the words of institution themselves.

What are we to make then of the conflicting order of the avowal of abstention followed by the meal in Luke and the meal followed by the avowal of abstention in Mark. Schweizer, in an important article, argues tentatively for the Markan order.² His main arguments are that Mark is generally the more reliable witness, especially with the eschatological utterances; that the eschatological-messianic joy at the passover is at least as well attested with the third cup, at the end of the meal, as with the first cup; that the third cup was the more important because of the prayers spoken over it; and that in the time of Jesus the third cup was followed by the singing of the latter part of the Hallel, which expressed eschatological expectations characteristic of the passover.

Against this the following points are to be noted; (a) The majority of critics prefer the Lukan position, where the connexion with what precedes is certainly more satisfactory than in Mark; (b) In Mark's order the word of institution has just compared the wine with the covenant blood which is to be

1. Cf A.J.B.Higgins, Lord's Supper, 1956, p 24, 40

2. E.Schweizer, 'Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwärtigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl?' in Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol2, 1946 pp 96-98.

poured out, while in the next sentence it is called 'the fruit of the vine', and is mentioned in order to focus the thoughts of the disciples on the renewal of the fellowship in the Kingdom of God. (c) In the blessing over the first cup the wine was called 'the fruit of the vine' according to the ^{1.} Mishnah. (d) It is highly unlikely that Luke is responsible for transferring the avowal of abstinence from its Markan position for, as we have seen, Luke dislikes ^{2.} transporting Mark's order. (e) If Luke's order is correct then the implication is that Jesus did not take part in the passover meal with his disciples. This is made self-evident in Jesus' expression of his unfulfilled desire to eat the passover with his disciples, and would not do so until the true passover was fulfilled in the coming of the Kingdom of God (Lk. 22.15,16), and his command to 'divide the cup among yourselves' (Lk. 22.17). This would then make better sense of the words of institution, for it is difficult to imagine that Jesus ate the bread which he designated as his body or drank the cup which he had said was his blood. In view of all of this it is certain that while the saying occupied different positions in the different traditions, the Lukan order is to be preferred as the most historical. In view also of ^{3.} the strong possibility that the Lukan account is a translation of Hebrew Luke's account is to be accepted as the more accurate.

Support for this Lukan order is found in the practice of the Quarta-decimarians. That their practice goes back to a very early time in Christian ^{4.} history has been demonstrated by Schwartz. We know from the recent discovery of the Epistula Apostolorum, that these Christians fasted during the time of the Jewish passover meal, and broke their fast at cock-crow during passover ^{5.} night, i.e. at about 3 a.m. Their passover celebration took the following ^{6.} form; (a) while the Jews were holding the passover meal the Christian community fasted representatively for Israel; (b) Exodus 12 was read and explained; (c) After midnight the fast was broken by the celebration of the Lord's Supper - an Agape and Eucharist. The whole period of waiting throbbled

1. Ber. 6.1.

2. Cf above p. 569.

3. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp. 196f.

4. E. Schwartz, 'Osterbetrachtung' in ZNW, Vol. 7, 1906, pp. 10f.

5. An English translation of the Ethiopic text has been published by G. Horner, The Statutes of the Apostles, 1904.

6. Cf B. Lohse, 'Das Passafest der Quartadecimarer', in Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Vol. II, 1953, pp. 62-89 for detailed evidence.

with an anxious expectation of Christ's return. If he had ^{not} come by midnight, then they broke their fast and united themselves with him in the celebration of table-fellowship. This eager expectation of Christ's return is readily explained by the abundant evidence that the coming of the Messiah was not only linked with the passover celebration, but that he would come at the time of the Passover.¹

This very primitive practice has probably influenced the transmission of the account to the extent that the practice is the reason why the tradition was preserved. But this does not mean that the tradition is an artificial construct to bolster up the practice. It is impossible to imagine how such a practice could have grown up so early among Jewish Christians if they were not following the practice of Jesus.

(ii) The words of interpretation over the bread

1 Cor. 11.24	Lk. 22.19	Jn. 6.51c	Mk. 14.22	Matt. 26.26
<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ</u>	<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ</u>	<u>ὁ ἄρτος δὲ</u>	<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ</u>	<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ</u>
<u>μου ἔστιν</u>	<u>ἔστιν</u>	<u>ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω</u>	<u>ἔστιν</u>	<u>ἔστιν</u>
<u>τὸ σῶμα</u>	<u>τὸ σῶμά μου</u>	<u>ἢ σὰρξ μου</u>	<u>τὸ σῶμά μου</u>	<u>τὸ σῶμά μου</u>
<u>τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</u>	<u>τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</u>	<u>ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ</u>		
	<u>διδόμενον</u>	<u>κόσμου ζωῆς</u>		
<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ</u>	<u>ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ</u>			
<u>εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν</u>	<u>εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν</u>			
<u>ἀνάμνησιν</u>	<u>ἀνάμνησιν</u>			

In the above table the material common to all five texts is underlined. If one accepts that John's context has necessitated the expansion of the simple ΤΟΥΤΟ, then it can be seen at a glance that all five texts transmit the sentence; ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου/ἢ σὰρξ μου

What is to be said of the material which is not common to all the witnesses?

(a) The invitation to 'take' (Mk/Matt) and to 'eat' (Matt.). It is

1. For the evidence of J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.256ff.

certainly true that the addition of 'eat' has arisen from the liturgical use of the words in the eucharist. It is not so of $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ for although this is missing from the bread-word in Luke it is found in Lk. 22.17. The addition of the word 'take' to the grace before the meal is most unusual. Its presence is to be explained by the fact that although Jesus said the grace and added his word of interpretation, he himself did not eat the meal. It has, therefore, a strong claim to authenticity, and would have been remembered because of its unexpectedness related to the remarkable behaviour of Jesus in not eating the passover with his disciples.

(b) The $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ - phrase.

If we accept the hypothesis that Luke is dependent not on his special source for this phrase but on the pre-Pauline tradition, then the pre-Pauline and the Johannine traditions support the phrase against the Markan which omits it. From this it does not follow that the statistics prove the originality. As Jeremias has noted the phrase is 'impossible' to re-translate into Aramaic. Since we find $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\nu$ in 11 Cor. 7.12 and $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\nu$ in 11 Cor. 9.3, the phrase in 1 Cor. 11.24 is to be ascribed to Paul. This speaks also against Luke whose word order in any event is unsemitic. The most decisive argument against the originality is that in Mark/Matthew the bread saying without this theological explanation leads to a decided imbalance of the two sayings. As they were originally separated at the Last Supper by the meal, this imbalance would not have been noticed. When they came together in the Christian eucharists at the end of the meal the natural tendency to give the two words a rhythmically parallel structure would have been most natural. If also there were bread eucharists in the primitive Church then the need for a theological interpretation of the word over the bread would be felt to be pressing. This need would have been met by supplying the interpretation from the word over the cup.

(c) $\acute{\xi}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$

Although all five sources agree on this word it cannot have belonged to the semitic original, and has been quite naturally supplied in the Greek translation. It is notable that it is lacking from Luke's record of the word over the cup.

1. Cf above pp. 575ff

2. Cf above p. 576.

3. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 167.

4. Cf above pp. 572ff

5. Cf above p. 574f.

(d) ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ἔμῃν ἀνάμνησιν

Although this phrase is attested by both Paul and Luke, it probably owes its presence in Luke to the tradition from which Paul has derived his ^{1.} account. This does not mean that it is to be attributed to Paul. Since ἀνάμνησις is not used elsewhere by Paul the conclusion is inevitable that it came from a tradition which was established before he wrote his letter to the Corinthians, i. e. before c. 50. Thus while the command to repeat is certainly ancient it cannot be accepted as part of the utterance of Jesus at the Last Supper.

As the probable original tradition of the words of interpretation spoken after Jesus' avowal of abstinence (Lk. 22.15-18) and after the grace spoken at the beginning of the passover meal proper we have: λάβετε τοῦτο τὸ σῶμά μου / ἡ σὰρξ μου (Take, this (is) my body/my flesh).

(iii) The words of interpretation over the wine

1 Cor. 11.25	Lk. 22.20	Mk. 14.24	Matt. 26.27b-28
<p>τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἔμῳ αἵματι</p>	<p>τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἔμῳ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον</p>	<p>τοῦτό ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν</p>	<p>πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες τοῦτο γάρ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρ- τιῶν</p>
<p>τοῦτο ποιεῖτε ὅσάκις ἔαν πίνητε εἰς τὴν ἔμῃν ἀνάμνησιν</p>			

Again the elements common to all four traditions have been underlined. Although there is a disparity in the actual words used Paul/**Luke** and Mark/Matthew say essentially the same thing. For both traditions the subject is the red wine contained in the cup, i. e. τοῦτο (τὸ ποτήριον) and τοῦτο signify the same subject. Similarly the predicate in both

1. Cf above p. 576 n.7.

traditions is the same. Just as Mark/Matthew (the wine (is) 'my blood of the covenant') so also Paul/Luke (the wine (is) 'the new covenant brought about through my blood') compare the wine with the blood and assert that through it the covenant or new covenant is to be established. The common text is therefore : 'This (wine) (is) my blood (for the establishing) of the covenant'.

This raises the hotly disputed question of whether the Paul/Luke or the Mark/Matthew form of words is the more original. The fact that the Mark/Matthew tradition is supported by Heb.9.20 (τοῦτο τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης) and more generally by Jn.51c-58 is no argument for its authenticity. It simply reflects the wider spread of the tradition. There are, however, two major grounds on which the authenticity and originality of the Mark/Matthew tradition are to be supported.

Firstly: Jn.6.60, 'This is a hard saying' indicates that very early in the history of the eucharistic tradition exception was taken by Jews to the idea of drinking the blood of Christ. There is abundant Jewish evidence that such an idea was an abomination to Jews. The Jewish scholar Montefiore in his commentary on Mark wrote of the difficulty of believing 'that a Palestinian or Galilaeen Jew could have suggested that in drinking wine his disciples were, even symbolically, drinking blood. For the horror with which the drinking of blood was regarded by the Jews is well known.' Similarly Klausner thinks it 'quite impossible' that Jesus would have invited his disciples to drink his blood. It is this that has led many scholars to believe that this form of the saying originated in a non-Jewish situation and that therefore the words in Paul/Luke are the more original. As Dalman has rightly remarked, however, it is precisely the impossibility of the saying that indicates its historicity. It is perfectly easy to understand how the offensiveness of the 'blood' saying would have been softened in Paul's 'Rabbinization of the tradition', it is impossible to understand how Paul's 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' could have become the thoroughly offensive 'This is my blood (of the covenant)' in Mark/Matthew and be preserved in this form by both John (Jn.6.51c-58) and the author of Hebrews (Heb.9.20).

1. A.Schlatter, Das Evangelium des Lukas, 1931, p 422 demonstrates that ^{2v} here is to be interpreted causally.
2. Gen.9.4; Lev.3.17; 7.26f; 17.10-14; Deut 12.16,23f; 15.23; 1 Sam.14.23ff; Acts 15.20,29; Josephus Ant. 3.260. For rabbinic parallels cf Strack & Billerbeck, Vol 11, p 737.
3. C.G.Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol 1, 1927, p 332.
4. J.Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, 1957, p 329.
5. e.g. F.J.Leenhardt, Le sacrement de la sainte cène, 1948, pp 51ff.
6. G.Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, 1929, p 157.
7. W.D.Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1955, p 249.

Secondly: It is true that the Markan phrase 'my blood of the covenant' is 'very difficult in a literal translation into Hebrew and Palestinian Aramaic: a noun with a pronominal suffix can generally tolerate no genitive after itself. How unusual the phrase sounds for Semitic idiom is observed in the Syriac versions. Mk.14.24 syr^{sin} and Matt. 26 str^{pala} are the only texts before the Peshitta which venture a literal rendering. All others solve the problem by taking - quite artificially - the τῆς διαθήκης as apposition: "This is my blood, the new covenant" or by changing the personal pronoun of the first person into that of the third person: "This is his (covenant) blood, that of the new covenant". Therefore the expression "my blood of the covenant" in its present form does not sound Palestinian.¹ However, as Jeremias continues, why is it necessary to pre-suppose that Mark would have adhered slavishly to the semitic word order of his original? That the Syriac versions attempted to adhere to the Greek word order is no indication that Mark did the same thing with his translation. Both Hebrew and Aramaic demand that the pronominal suffix be appended to the governed rather than the governing noun, i.e. blood-of covenant-my (Heb. dam berithi; Aramaic adam keyani). Such a semitic word order ('This blood-of covenant-my) could only be rendered in Greek by transposing the pronoun. Thus the phrase cannot be dismissed as impossible on linguistic grounds.

If the phrase cannot be dismissed on linguistic grounds, nor can it be dismissed on the grounds of its content. Higgins is certainly correct in his contention that 'blood of the covenant' or 'covenant blood' in later Judaism signified the blood of circumcision (cf Gen.17.10).² But does this mean that this is 'another factor telling against its correctness in the context of the Last Supper'?³ One needs here to remember that in Col.2.11 Paul describes the death of Christ as his circumcision. Such a remarkable image is surely best explained on the grounds that Christ did speak of his blood as 'covenant blood' and that Paul with his Rabbinic training quite understandably drew the conclusion that his covenant-making death was his circumcision.

Equally the fact that the covenant played no part in the old passover liturgy cannot be used against the originality of these words. We know that the interpretation of the passover meal and its cups belonged not to the graces at the beginning and end of the meal but to the preceding haggadah. When Jesus adds his new words of interpretation to these graces the radical departure from

1. J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.194f

2. A.J.B.Higgins, Lord's Supper, 1956, p.33. For the evidence cf J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 99; G.Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, 1929, p 167.

3. A.J.B.Higgins, Lord's Supper, 1956, p.33.

tradition does not count against the authenticity of the words. Rather, this fact explains how these particular words came to be remembered in the primitive community with such uniformity. Now since Jesus clearly did speak of the wine of the third passover cup as his blood, and since blood and covenant are so intimately linked in Judaism (e.g. Ex.24.8; Zech.9.11; cf Heb.10.29; 13.20) it would be perfectly natural for Jesus to have spoken of a new covenant in the context of speaking of his blood. In addition we learn through the Essene writing, especially the Damascus Document, how important the concept of the new covenant (Jer.31.31-34) was in the days of Jesus. When both the Essene texts and Jesus speak of this new covenant community in terms of building, of planting, of the Temple, and of the flock, then clearly the concept of creating the new community through his death and resurrection and the covenant would never have been far from the thought of Jesus. Thus we conclude that the covenant-saying, linked with the blood-saying cannot be dismissed as not belonging to the words of Jesus at the Last Supper.

Included also among the phrases common to the four traditions must be the ὑπὲρ - phrase. While this phrase is lacking in Paul it is most probable that it belonged originally to the wine-word. The reasons for this are; (a) the lack of theological explanation of the bread-word would have occasioned the application of that of the wine-word to the bread-word; (b) this process would have been facilitated by the tendency to parallel the two words when they were no longer separated by a meal in the Christian eucharists; (c) if bread eucharists were fairly common in the primitive community the need for theological explanation would have been more acutely felt. Thus we conclude that the ὑπὲρ -phrase did belong originally to the wine-word.

The remaining question is which of the various formulations of the ὑπὲρ -phrase is to be counted as original? Since Matthew is following Mark his περὶ plus εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is to be regarded as secondary. The question is therefore whether we are to follow Paul/Luke and read τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑρῶν ...or Mark and read τὸ ... ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. The question is to be decided in favour of Mark in view of (a) the semitic word order in which the participle is placed between the particle and the prepositional phrase (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν); (b) as a semitism Mark's πολλῶν² is to be preferred to Paul/Luke's ὑρῶν¹; (c) ὑρῶν, as Lohmeyer has shown, is to be regarded as the

1. Cf J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 1966, pp 179ff.

2. E. Lohmeyer, 'Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde' in *JBL*, Vol 56, 1937, p 243.

result of liturgical usage where it acts to assure the worshippers that they are being addressed personally by the risen Lord.

We conclude, therefore, that the common words here are; $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$ (or $\acute{\eta}$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$) $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$.

What is to be said of the material which is not common to all the witnesses?

(a) The invitation to drink (in Matthew alone).

The alteration of Mark's narrative account (Mk.14.23b 'and they all drank of it') into direct speech (Mt.26.27b, 'Drink all of it, all of you') is clearly secondary. It is probably to be explained as a liturgical parallelism with the authentic 'take' spoken with the bread-word.

(b) $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho$ (Matthew alone).

This word is necessitated by the secondary alteration of the narrative in Mark into direct speech in Matthew, and thus serves to link the command to drink with the words of institution.

(c) $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\pi\omicron\tau\eta\acute{\rho}\iota\omicron\nu$ (Paul/Luke)

This is to be regarded as an explanatory definition of $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$.

(d) $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$ (Paul/Luke)

The unsemitic placing of the adjective before the noun counts against the originality of the further definition of the covenant as 'new'. Since Luke is probably dependent on Paul for this phrase, which is Pauline (cf 2 Cor.3.6; 'God who also made us ministers $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$; not of the letter, but of the Spirit', where the influence of Jer.31.31-34 is patent), the adjective is to be regarded as secondary.

(e) The command to repeat the rite.

We have already seen that the command to repeat is not part of the original tradition. The command to repeat in Paul, not followed by Luke, is further indication of the tendency to parallelism of the words spoken both over the bread and the wine when they are no longer separated by a meal.

We conclude that the probable original form and setting of the words of interpretation spoken by Jesus were; (at the grace spoken at the breaking of the bread at the commencement of the passover meal $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\sigma\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}$

1. Cf above p 576.

2. Cf above p581 under (d)

μου/ ἡ σάρξ μου (and at the grace spoken over the third passover cup at the conclusion of the passover meal and before the singing of the concluding Hallel) τοῦτο τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης/ἡ ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου/ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

d. A Reconstruction of the Order of Events and Words at the Last Supper

<u>Passover</u>	<u>Last Supper</u>
<p>A. <u>Preliminary Course</u></p> <p>Word of dedication over the first cup (<u>Kiddush</u> cup), whose wine is spoken of as the 'fruit of the vine'.</p> <p>Preliminary dish.</p> <p>The meal proper served but not eaten, the <u>haggadah</u> cup poured but not drunk</p>	<p>A. <u>Preliminary Course</u></p> <p>Lk.22.15-18.</p> <p>'With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: For I say unto you, I will not drink the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come.' (cf Mk.14.25. 'Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until the day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God. = Mt.26.29)</p>
<p>B. <u>Passover Liturgy</u></p> <p>Passover <u>haggadah</u>, when in reply to sons' questions, the lamb, bitter herbs, and unleavened bread are explained (also four cups)</p> <p>Everyone is to regard himself as if he had come out of Egypt. (Pos 10.4,5).</p> <p>The singing of the first part of the passover <u>Hallel</u></p> <p>Drinking the second cup (the <u>haggadah</u> cup).</p>	<p>B. <u>Passover Liturgy</u></p> <p>Jesus' description of himself as the true passover lamb (cf 1 Cor.5.7; also Jn.1.29,36¹⁹⁻²⁰; 1 Pet.1.19; Rev.5.6,9,12; 12.11; Justin, Dial. 72.1).</p> <p>The interpretation of the bowl of bitter herbs as the betrayal by Judas? (Mk.14.18ff = Mt. 26.21ff; Lk.22.21? Jn.13,21f)</p>
<p>C. <u>The Meal</u></p> <p>The president takes the unleavened loaves, blesses God in the words; 'Blessed art thou who bringest forth bread from the earth', breaks it in pieces and hands it to the guests.</p> <p>The meal consisting of passover lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, with fruit purée and wine.</p> <p>Grace over third cup (the cup of blessing)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">λάβετε, τοῦτο τὸ σῶμά μου/ / ἡ σάρξ μου.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">τοῦτο τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης/ / ἡ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου/ τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.</p>
<p>D. <u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Second part of the passover <u>Hallel</u></p> <p>Praise over the fourth cup (<u>hallel</u> cup)</p>	<p>D. <u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>'And when they had sung a hymn they went out unto the mount of Olives' (Mk.14.26 = Mt.26.30).</p>

3. The Meaning of the words and events in the setting of the passover and eucharist

We shall consider the interpretation of the Last Supper and the Christian eucharist which grew out of it under the following headings;

- a. The avowal of abstinence,
- b. The meal,
- c. The words of Interpretation,
- d. The $\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$,
- e. The Hallel.

a. The Avowal of Abstinence

In view of what we know of the practice of the Quartodecimanians whose practice of fasting during the time of the Jewish passover celebrations before beginning their annual eucharistic celebration after midnight, which practice must have developed out of the practice of Jesus at the Last Supper, the reasons given for this fast by these Christians are to be accepted as the earliest records of how Christians interpreted this fast. This does not mean that these interpretations are necessarily correct, but their unanimity is so striking as to suggest that the tradition is so primitive as to be the most reliable guide in interpreting the fact that Jesus fasted while his disciples ate the passover meal.

What are the reasons given for the primitive Christian passover fast? Epiphanius of Salamis (c.403) quotes from the Diatexeis of the Apostles (c.200): 'The same apostles say, "While they (the Jews) are feasting (in the passover night) you are to fast, mourning for them."² The Apostolic Constitutions give the following regulations for the passover fast: 'fasting....all of you with fear and trembling, praying for those that are perishing.'³ 'He (the risen Lord) therefore charged us himself to fast these six days (of the passover week) on account of the impiety and transgression of the Jews, commanding us withal to bewail over them and to lament for their perdition.'⁴ In chapter 21, the Syriac Didascalia, when dealing with the passover and the resurrection, says : Therefore, when you fast, so pray and petition for the lost; for the

1. Cf above pp 577 f.

2. Epiphanius, Panarion, 70.11.3 (quoted from J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p 217). This work is probably a preliminary stage of the Didascalia and the verse quoted is not found in the Syriac Didascalia.

3. Ap.Const. 5.13.3f (F.X.Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum 1, 1905, 271¹,5-7.)

4. Ap Const. 5.14.20 (Funk, 279.1-4)

sake of your brothers.....(you) should do it.^{1.} In the Didache we find the
 general rule, 'Fast for those who persecute you'.^{2.}

In these interpretations there are two major elements. On the one hand the fast is to be held in mourning for the Jews for they are 'lost'. Having rejected the salvation which has come in Christ they have been rejected by God. On the other hand the fast is to be the occasion for intercession on their behalf. These interpretations may help to show why Jesus abstained from the meal and how that action throws light on the Christian eucharist.

The passover was not simply a celebration of God's deliverance of his people out of Egypt to make them a people in the land of Canaan, it was also an eschatological meal in anticipation of the coming Messiah who would again bring about the deliverance of his people. Jesus knew that not only was he the true passover lamb (cf 1 Cor,5.7; Jn.1.29,36;^{19.16} 1 Pet.1.19; Rev.5,9,12;^{6,} 12.11) and that he was God's eschatological Messiah, but also that he was rejected by the Jews and was about to be put to death. This act would not only mark the final rejection of the messianic salvation which had come through him, but would be the event in which that salvation would come. Because of this event the pass-over celebration year by year would end, for through it God would fulfil the kingdom of God (Lk.22.16). Jesus therefore abstains from this meal knowing that his next meal with his disciples will be the fulfilment of all his previous meals; it will be the true messianic banquet; it will be the fulfilment of the apocalyptic saying: 'The Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with the Son of man shall they eat, and lie down and rise up for ever and ever' (1.En.62.14). Then, says Mark, Jesus will drink 'new' wine. As Behm has shown, to be 'new' is a mark of the time of salvation, of the transformed creation.^{3.} When Matthew adds 'with you' (Mt.26.29) he clearly understands that those who have been with him at the Last Supper are those who will eat with him in the eschatological meal. Jesus' abstaining from the passover meal with his disciples, therefore, is a mourning for Israel who have rejected the true passover lamb of God and in so doing rejected the new act of eschatological salvation, and a declaration that he is the one who, in bringing the celebration of the Exodus to a close, is about to accomplish the new Exodus deliverance through which the new people of God is to be created. But the fulfilment of this lies through his death and exaltation when he will come again to the waiting disciples and feed them. So it is not

1. Quoted from J.Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p 217.

2. Didache 1.3,

3. J.Behm, καινός, κτλ in TWNT, Vol III, p451f; also R.A.Harrisville, The Concept of Newness in the New Testament, 1960.

the Last Supper but the Christian eucharist which is the eschatological banquet of salvation.

If in abstaining Jesus points to the event through which the eschatological banquet will be fulfilled in the Christian eucharist where no lamb is slaughtered because the true lamb has already died once for all, it points also to his rejection by the Jews which will itself bring in the Kingdom. The fast of Jesus might also be interpreted as his passionate intercession for them, a fast for those who persecute him (Did. 1.3). He fasts in intercession just as the 'ebhed Yahweh made intercession for the transgressors (Is. 53.12).

Such an interpretation of the abstinence of Jesus confirms what we have already seen to be the character of the eucharist in the New Testament as a covenant- and community-creating meal with the crucified but exalted 'ebhed/Messiah/Son of man in the Kingdom of God.^{1.}

(b) The meal

In assessing the meaning of the meal and the role it played in the New Testament eucharistic theology the following points need to be remembered;

(i) All the Gospels bear witness to the fact that Jesus celebrated the Last Supper with his twelve chosen disciples, in contrast to what we are told of so many of the other meals of Jesus.^{2.}

It is here that Jesus tells his disciples that they are no longer servants but friends, in fact the friends for whom he is to lay down his life (Jn. 15.13-15). These words are, however, spoken not to all of the twelve as Judas has already left their company (Jn. 13.30). The character of this particular meal is that the company that shares it is a group of close friends and associates.

(ii) As we have seen, on this occasion Jesus did not share in the meal. He was the one who served his disciples. On the interpretation just given, the abstinence of Jesus pointed forward to the coming events of his death and exaltation and to the next meal to which he would come to the redeemed community still as the one who would serve them (Cf Lk. 12.37; 22.27).

(iii) Although the Markan $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ formula is to be preferred to the Pauline and Lukan $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ which gained its significance from its ^{3.}

liturgical usage, nevertheless it is preserved by Paul and Luke in the context

1. Cf above p.541

2. Cf above p.569.

3. Cf above pp541ff.

of the Last Supper and felt by them to be appropriate there. Similarly Matthew adds the words 'with you' to the promise that he will eat the new passover in the coming Kingdom of God (Matt. 26.29). Just as John limits the designation of those who are the 'friends' to the eleven (i.e. without Judas) so Luke, immediately after recording Jesus' words; 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you' (Lk. 22.20) continues immediately to speak of the betrayer on whom the solemn 'woe' is pronounced which is introduced by the excluding 'but' (παλῆν Lk. 22.21f).

These three features point to the Last Supper as an intimate fellowship meal in which Jesus serves those who are close to him, his table-fellows, in the covenant making meal. It is they who are assured of belonging to the eschatological community which would be created through his coming death and exaltation, and it is they who would be the ones to whom he would come to share in the coming Messianic banquet in the Kingdom of God ('they' here does not, of course, include the betrayer Judas). Consequently this meal is both a community experience and, both in reality and in prospect, a community-creating meal. It is community creating through the understanding of a table fellowship of the stronger with the weaker creating a life-communicating covenant, and it is community creating in prospect for it looks to the fulfilment of that covenant through the death and exaltation through which the new covenant community of God is to be created.

It is precisely this which we have seen to be Paul's understanding of the Christian eucharist. If, as is probable, the tradition in 1 Cor. 11.17-34 reflects a practice when the eucharist has already become separated from the meal and takes place at the end of the meal, then the charge against the Corinthians that they partake 'unworthily' of the body and blood of Christ in that they do not wait for the late-comers at the meal is all the more significant. As the assembled company of Christians, i.e. those who have been baptized into Christ and thus indissolubly linked with each other, they are those whose life should be characterised as a life together in close dependence on one another expressed in the deeply inter-personal relationships of love and service (cf also Jn. 13.12ff). Therefore the way in which they meet and conduct themselves at the eucharist should be a confirmation of their baptismal

1. Cf above pp. 543f

2. Cf above p.572f.

union with one another in Christ just as at the Last Supper Jesus met with the close circle of his intimate friends. Both the eucharist and the Last Supper are already intimate community occasions. It is this community which both in theological doctrine and ethical practice is the setting in which the celebration of the eucharist takes place. Just as the community that shared with Jesus at the Last Supper is 'purged' when Judas left, so must the Christian community 'purge out the old leaven' (1 Cor. 5.1ff).

But the fact that the eucharistic assembly is already a close community does not mean that it is not also the occasion when the community is re-created or re-newed. It is here that the Christian is once again united with Christ and through this union re-newed in his union with all those who together form the body of Christ (Cf 1 Cor. 10.16f). The parallel here with what we have said of the community creating character of the meal of the Last Supper confirms our interpretation.

(c) The words of interpretation

τοῦτο τὸ σῶγά μου / ἡ σάρξ μου = τοῦτο τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (ἡ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου) τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν The disciples must have regarded these words, spoken by Jesus at the dispensing of the unleavened bread and of the third cup, as an astonishing addition to the customary observance. It is unlikely that they would have been able to understand them any better than we are if they were not already prepared for them by the preceding haggadah. Before proceeding to show how the assumption that Jesus did speak of himself as the true passover lamb who was to be slain helps in interpreting these words, we need to pause to ask ourselves to what the τοῦτο in both the bread- and wine- words refer.

There is a wide-spread opinion that Jesus meant by τοῦτο the action of breaking the bread and pouring out the wine and that the words are an explanation of the symbolic pre-enactment of his death on the Cross. This is impossible unless τοῦτο ἔστιν coincided with the action of breaking the bread and pouring out the wine. In neither did the words coincide with the action. In the bread-word the fact that it is preceded by λάβετε shows that the words were spoken as the bread was being distributed after it had already been broken. This is even clearer with regard to the wine-word.

1.

Between the pouring out of the wine from the mixing bowl into the 'cup of blessing' and Jesus' words of interpretation would have come the grace at the end of the meal which consisted of the elevation of the cup (Mk. 14.23), an invitation to prayer, the grace itself consisting of several benedictions, and the Amen. It is not the action of breaking and pouring therefore which Jesus interpreted but the bread and the wine itself. This is confirmed by the fact that Jn. 6.51c says quite explicitly 'the bread which I will give is my flesh...' Equally unambiguous is 1 Cor. 11.24, 25 where the positioning of $\xi\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ shows that $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$ and $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$ τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη is the subject and everything that follows the predicate.

A second word of caution is necessary. This concerns the word $\xi\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. Although this would not have been expressed in the original Aramaic or Hebrew ~~original~~, as is evidenced by its absence from the Lukan wine-word, it is present in all of the rest of the Greek versions of the words. On this Higgins affirms quite categorically, and without any supporting evidence, that we must reject the 'Catholic view that "is" ($\xi\sigma\tau\iota$) must be taken literally - the bread and the wine are in fact, if not in appearance, the actual body and blood of Christ', for 'such a view would have been impossible to a Jew'. How difficult such a concept was for a Jew is made perfectly clear within the New Testament in Jn. 6.60. Nevertheless we have to reckon with the probability that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Jew, and that he speaks of 'eating my flesh and drinking my blood' (Jn. 6.56) which in the next verse is expressed as 'eating me' (Jn. 6.57). It is not our purpose to enter into a debate into the meaning of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, it is sufficient to note that within the New Testament the words of institution were interpreted, and that by Jews, to mean that Christ was himself the eucharistic food.

We have already seen that there was a wide-spread tradition in the primitive community which spoke of Jesus as the paschal lamb (1 Cor. 5.7; Jn. 1.29, 36; 19.36; 1 Pet. 1.19; Rev. 5.6,9,12; 12.11). In 1 Cor. 5.7 the way Paul uses the argument pre-supposes that the Corinthians are already familiar with the tradition. In John the tradition is so strong that, despite the traces that the Last Supper was a paschal meal in his Gospel, the paschal

4.

-
1. On the mixing of the wine G. Dalman, Jesus-Joshua, 1929, pp.149ff; Strack & Billerbeck Vol. IV, p.58.
 2. Cf J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.110.
 3. A.J.B. Higgins, Lord's Supper, 1956, p.51.
 4. Cf above pp. 563ff.

lamb typology has become theological chronology. The most natural explanation of this widespread tradition is that Jesus himself spoke of himself as the true passover lamb. We have no direct evidence of this, but on the conclusion that the Last Supper was a passover meal we know that as the head of the group that met with him he would have had to interpret the passover lamb during the passover haggadah. Since the words of institution show that he spoke of himself as the unleavened bread and the wine of the 'cup of blessing' it is highly probable that during the haggadah he spoke of himself as the true passover lamb. Such an assumption at least allows us to assume that the disciples were prepared for the startling words of interpretation placed on the bread and wine during the meal. When, therefore, Jesus spoke of the bread and the wine as his body/flesh and blood, the most natural interpretation is that he is speaking of himself as the true passover victim.

Jeremias has demonstrated that the word pairs flesh and blood (κρέας/σάρξ - αἷμα) and body and blood (σῶμα - αἷμα) denoted the sacrificial separation of the flesh/body and blood. Now it is well known that 'the Paschal victim was not a sin-offering or regarded as a means of expiating or removing sins'. While there is some evidence that in contemporary exegesis it was held that the sacrifices at the actual Exodus were expiatory, it is not necessary to suppose that Jesus confined his thought to the passover lamb. We have already seen how Jesus' abstinence from the meal awakened echoes of the 'ebhed Yahweh, and this is confirmed by the use of ὑπὲρ πολλῶν with its allusion to Isa. 53.11 which is directly related to sacrifice (Isa. 53.10). In these words Jesus speaks of himself as the Passover Lamb/'ebhed Yahweh, who is to be sacrificed ὑπὲρ πολλῶν and by this bring in the new διαθήκη.

Jesus' assertion that he is going to his death as the passover sacrifice, and yet of himself as the passover victim is strange. The passover victims were sacrificed before and not after the passover meal. This identity yet radical difference indicates that he believed himself to be the true passover lamb in whose death and resurrection the true Exodus of deliverance would take place and so bring to an end the old passover celebrations, for

-
1. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.222.
 2. G.B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, 1925, p.397.
 3. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.107f.
 4. Cf above p. 589.

they would be replaced by the celebration of this new 'passover' of deliverance.

Jesus' identification of himself with the passover lamb and the ebhed/Messiah in sacrificial words points clearly to his understanding of his death as a saving death. For the sake of clarity we need to separate these two conceptions in order to see what was the nature of the salvation which he envisaged would come through his death.

In speaking of his coming death as God's new Exodus act of deliverance it is hard to believe that his conception of that deliverance was uninfluenced by the understanding of the first Exodus according to the Torah. In Exodus 6.6f we read: 'Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Yahweh, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgements: and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God....' This same thought is expressed in Deut. 4.20: 'But Yahweh hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as at this day'. These twin conceptions of deliverance from Egypt and the creation of a people who are the people of God is a constantly repeated theme of the meaning and significance of the Exodus.

According to the Torah we know also that the passover celebration of the Exodus was a 'memorial' (Ex. 12.14, 13.9). During the grace at the breaking of bread at the beginning of the passovermeal it was said: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Our God, King of the earth, who hast given to thy people Israel this season of festivity for joy and for a memorial". According to the Mishnah this memorial meant that every partaker in the passover was to think of himself as actually being there with his forefathers at the time of their deliverance from Egypt, 'they became contemporaries of their forefathers and were saved with them'. How literally this contemporaneity was conceived is seen from the ritual prescribed for the offering of the first fruits in Deut. 26.5ff; 'A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there, few in number; and he became there a great nation.... and the Egyptians evil entreated us, and laid upon us hard bondage: and we cried

1. Cf e.g. Num. 22.5,11; Deut. 7.6; 14.2; 29.13; 11 Sam. 7.23f; Jer. 13.11, etc.

2. Cf F.J. Leenhardt, Le sacrement de la sainte cène, 1948, pp. 15ff; J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, 109f. M. Thurian, The Eucharistic Memorial 1, 1966, p.19.

3. Pes. 10.4,5.

4. M. Thurian, op. cit. p.19.

unto Yahweh, the God of our fathers, and Yahweh heard our voice, and saw our affliction, and our toil, and our oppression; and Yahweh brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand... and he hath brought us into this place, and hath given us this land...'¹ This concept of deliverance from Egypt to become a people with^a land, the people of Yahweh, pervaded the whole of Israel's life and provided the main concepts for the later more universal concept of Yahweh's creation of the whole world.

When the Exodus is understood as this 'people'-creating event and the passover memorial as a participation in that event by later generations as the contemporaries of that event, then it is clear that every passover has the same character of being a people-creating act of deliverance from Egypt.² The rule of the Torah (Nu. 9.13) that there is no possibility of forgiveness to the man who fails to attend the passover if he is able to do so (i.e. who is 'clean and not in a journey') is perfectly easy to understand. By his action he has willfully cut himself off from being part of the people of God created ever anew in their participation with their forefathers in the deliverance from Egypt.

Therefore when Jesus speaks of his death as the passover lamb which is to be sacrificed as God's new passover of deliverance, then it follows that that event would be the event in which the new Israel of God, the new community would be created. Although the phrase ὑπὲρ πολλῶν belongs inextricably to the ideas associated with the 'ebhed and is nowhere found in terminology belonging to the passover or the Exodus, it expresses essentially the same ideas as belonged to the Exodus and the passover. As we have seen the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν of Isaiah 53.11 expresses the idea that the 'ebhed is to become the centre of the new Israel, the new and true people of God.³ It is precisely in this way that Paul understands the meaning of Christ's death as the paschal lamb. (1 Cor. 5.7f). Because of it the Christians are the 'new lump'.

Similarly, according to 1 Cor. 10.16 to partake of the bread broken in the

2. It must be stressed that the passover celebration, reflected in all the detailed prescriptions such as the reclining, the bitter herbs, the fruit purée, the passover lamb, etc., allowed the participants to be parts in God's deliverance of them from Egypt and was not a deliverance from any present bondages. It is therefore natural that in the time of heightened Messianic expectations the passover gained the element of a longed-for future Messianic deliverance alongside the strong backward look at the Exodus in history. The only contemporary element in it was that those present were the contemporaries of their forefathers, sharing in that salvation event and becoming God's people again through participating in that event. There is no evidence whatever that the passover was ever thought of as a deliverance from present enemies.

1. Cf D. Evans, The Logic of Self-Involvement. 3. Cf above pp30ff.

eucharist is to participate in the body of Christ, and in the following verse it is asserted that to partake of the bread is to become 'one bread, one body' (1 Cor. 10.17). More directly the New Testament tradition that Jesus is the passover lamb carries the corollary that the community born out of that redemptive event is a 'people'. Therefore when 1 Pet. 1.19 says that we were not redeemed with silver and gold 'But with the precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ', the conclusion is: 'Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession.... which in time past were no people, but now are the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy!' (1 Pet. 2.9,10). The heaping up of phrases derived from the Old Testament descriptions of Israel makes it perfectly explicit that Christ's death as the passover lamb is that which has created the new Israel. Similarly when Rev. 5.8 speaks of Christ as the passover lamb he is worshipped 'for thou wast slain and didst purchase with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth.' (Rev. 5.9) It is doubtful whether the sacrifice referred to in Titus 2.14 is the sacrifice of the passover lamb, but here again we find the link between Christ's death and the creation of a people; 'Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession'. (Tit.2.14). We know also that John understood Christ's death to be the death of the passover lamb, and significantly we know that he understood this death (and exaltation) to be to 'gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (Jn. 11.52) and to 'draw all men unto' himself (Jn. 12.32).

Since the tradition that Jesus was the true passover lamb is probably to be attributed to Jesus during the passover haggadah, the fact that wherever this tradition is preserved in the New Testament it is accompanied by the idea of creating a new people the conclusion is inevitable that the concept of creating a people through the death of the true passover victim is also to be attributed to Jesus and in the context of the Last Supper. If this were not so it is hard to explain how both the concepts of Christ as the passover sacrifice and the creation of a people are found together wherever this tradition is preserved. As we have seen for Jesus to link himself with the

passover lamb who is about to be sacrificed and to conclude that this means the creation of the new covenant people of God would have been no innovation. It was already present in the tradition concerning the Exodus from Egypt and its passover 'memorial'.

We conclude, therefore that the words $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\acute{o}\ \sigma\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\acute{o}\ \alpha\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$ express Jesus' identification of himself with the passover lamb and of his death as the sacrifice of the true passover lamb. When that death is interpreted as being $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ as the means of creating the new covenant, then this must be interpreted in terms of the Exodus and passover concepts as a people-of-God-creating-deliverance. Because the people of God is so intimately linked with the concept of the covenant in the Old Testament (for proof of this we have only to look at Ex. 6.7; Deut. 4.20; 11 Sam 7.24; Jer. 13.11) which express the very essence of the covenant (cf Gen. 17.1ff) the use of covenant in the context of the Last Supper is by no means forced and unnatural, however unusual it may have been. The suggestion is ventured that Jesus used it not because of its appropriateness at the passover, but because what he was declaring was that his death as the paschal lamb was to be the means by which God would create his new people of the covenant.

We turn now to a consideration of the same words in terms of Jesus' understanding of his work as the 'ebhed Yahweh. The addition to the wine-word $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\omicron\upsilon\nu\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ is so remarkably close to Isa. 53.12, 'because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bore the sins of many and made intercession for the transgressors', that the conclusion is inevitable that it was of this figure that Jesus was thinking.

To whom does $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ refer? In our examination of this passage we concluded that the servant in all probability stands for the righteous remnant within Israel who, through their suffering in the exile, are being prepared by God to become the dynamic centre of the new Israel. He brings salvation when 'you' 'make his soul an 'asham', i.e. he includes within the new Israel all those who recognize their sinfulness and his sinlessness and unite themselves to him as the dynamic centre of the new community. When

Jesus said that the wine of the 'cup of blessing' was his blood of the

1. The fact that these words are not dependent on the LXX but the Hebrew text is evidence of the age of the tradition.
2. Cf above p. 34.

covenant (which was to be poured out) ὑπὲρ πολλῶν he almost certainly meant that the new covenant community which was to be created through his death and exaltation and the coming of the Spirit would consist of those who united themselves to him. In our analysis of the Son of man sayings we have seen how frequently Jesus spoke of the distinguishing mark of the new Israel as allegiance to himself (and there can be no doubt at all that the primitive Christian community understood this to be the very essence of their life).

The earliest interpretation of these words is found in Paul's use of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in the place of ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. This is doubtless the influence of liturgical practice on the words of institution, but Luke, following the pre-Pauline tradition sets these same words in the context of the Last Supper. As they stand interpreted there, the meaning is that those who were present with Jesus at the Last Supper (with the exception of Judas) are those who through their attachment to Jesus will constitute the new Israel, the redeemed community, created through the suffering and exaltation of Jesus the 'ebhed Yahweh.

This, however, needs to be set alongside the concept of the 'people' associated with Jesus as the paschal lamb for, as we have seen ὑπὲρ πολλῶν and the new covenant people created through the new Exodus deliverance mean essentially the same thing. When we turn to the New Testament passages to discover who these 'people of God' are, we find that Rev. 5.9 tells us that they are 'of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.' According to 1 Pet. 2.10, they are those who 'in time past were no people, but now are the people of God.' And Peter, in his defence of the mission to the Gentiles is reported in the following words; 'How God did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.' (Acts 15.14). And we see how the New Testament understands that the people, the πολλοί (rabbim) are all those who give their allegiance to Jesus irrespective of their race, tongue, or nationality.

Jeremias has argued that such an understanding of the πολλοί¹ of Isa. 53.12 was already present in pre-Christian literature. There is no doubt at all that in post-Christian Jewish literature the πολλοί was taken to refer to Israel. Jeremias' contention that in pre-Christian literature

1. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic words, 1936, pp. 228f.

it referred also to Gentiles is unconvincing for two major reasons. Firstly, he places great weight on 1 Enoch which is uncertainly pre-Christian, and secondly, as he himself notes the passages which give a more inclusive meaning to the πολλοί all, without exception, refer to Isa. 52.14f which speaks of the 'kings' who become silent in repentance and shame. His argument that these, however, are also included in the redeemed πολλοί of Isa. 53.10.12, fails to convince. These verses belong to the context of the 'we' of Isa. 53.1f who, we have seen, are probably the Jews who remained behind in Judah when the exiles were carried off or over against the Jews of the Dispersion and who thought that the suffering of the exiles or Diaspora was God's punishment of them for their sins. If this is so they were Jews, and it is clear that no contemporary exegete of these words thought that they were anything but Jews.

Consequently we must assume that by the πολλοί Jesus meant Israel as the New Israel characterised not by allegiance to the Torah but to himself. Whether or not he envisaged non-Jews being included within that new community is impossible to say with any certainty. What is clear is that he cannot have given any specific teaching to the effect that Gentiles were to be included. If he had then the conflict between the Jewish and Gentile churches over the Gentile mission is unintelligible. What he had done, however, by his reference to the ʿebhed Yahweh and his mission being ὑπὲρ πολλῶν was to make allegiance to himself the feature of the new Israel rather than nationality. From here it was but a short step to see that Gentiles as well as Jews could give this allegiance to him and therefore to see them as a part of the πολλοί who are the new Israel as the true people of God.

We conclude that in the words of interpretation Jesus was pointing to his coming death and exaltation through which he was to create the new people of God and also to clarify that of the very essence of that community would be an allegiance given to himself.

But there is more still to be said of these words. They were not simply parable and instruction. They were said at the time when he offered the bread and the wine to his disciples and they doubtless received, ate and drank them.

1. Cf above p.172
2. Cf above p. 34.

It is an ancient oriental idea that a common meal binds the table companions into a table fellowship which is religious and thereby making any violation of the fellowship particularly intolerable (Ps. 41.10), hence the deep grief felt by Jesus at the betrayal of Judas, witnessed also in the hard 'woe' pronounced on him (Mk. 14.20 par.). At every common meal the table fellowship is constituted through the breaking of bread. When the paterfamilias recites the blessing over the bread and then distributes it to each of those at table, then in eating the bread each receives for himself a part of the blessing. The same is true of the cup; 'drinking from it mediates a share in the blessing'. This was true of every meal and would therefore have been an idea well known to the disciples.

Jesus, however, at the Last Supper did two remarkable things. Firstly he did not share with his disciples in the meal proper but, secondly, to the graces over the bread and wine he added his words of interpretation saying that this bread and this wine were his body/flesh and blood which were to be the means of bringing in the new covenant 'for many'. While these words clearly refer to Jesus and his people-of-God-creating act of deliverance to be accompanied through his death and exaltation, when Jesus interpreted the words in this way and the disciples immediately thereafter eat and drink the meaning is that by eating and drinking he unites his disciples with himself so that they are to share with him in his atoning death and so become the people of God in union with himself. ~~As recipients of Jesus' gift of himself the people of God in union with himself.~~ As recipients of Jesus' gift of himself to them and the efficacy of his death the disciples are representatives of the new people of God.

This interpretation is confirmed by Paul, the earliest commentator on the Christian eucharist. In 1 Cor. 10.16 he says that to receive the eucharistic elements is to 'participate in the body of Christ' and 'participate in the blood of Christ'. Since 1 Cor. 10.17 uses the 'body of Christ' in his characteristic way to refer to the Church, and that the blood of Christ means his saving death (Cf Rom. 3.25; 5.9; Eph. 1.7; 2.13; Col. 1.20), then the eucharistic gift is that union with Christ in his people-of-God-creating act of deliverance and inclusion into the redeemed community.

1. Cf. G. Dalman, Jesus Jeshua, 1929, p.137.

2. Cf. J. Pedersen, Israel 1-11 pp. 46ff.

3. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.232ff. For detailed evidence of the communication of blessing through participation in a common meal over which the blessing has been spoken of ibid pp. 233ff.

'This is my body/flesh; This is my blood of the covenant for many' therefore signifies Jesus' gift of himself to his disciples, uniting them with himself in the new Exodus act of deliverance through which the new people of God is to be created at whose heart stands Christ's union with his disciples through their allegiance to him. But in this union Christ, who is the true Israel, and his people, who are the true Israel by being 'in him', constitute one single, living, organic whole. This interpretation of the words of Jesus is confirmed by everything we have seen in this work of the understanding of the person and work of Christ and the Church's self-understanding in relation to him.

(d) The ἀνάμνησις

Jeremias has demonstrated how completely untenable is the thesis of 1. Leitzmann that Paul has derived the ἀνάμνησις^{2.} formula from ancient commemorative meals for the dead in the hellenistic world. The facts that in these meals the formula εἰς ἀνάμνησιν^{3.} is never found; that they were generally annual celebrations on the birthday of the dead and never held daily or weekly as were the Christian eucharists; and that there was a marked tendency away from giving them any religious significance make it unlikely in the extreme that either the source of the expression or its meaning is to be found in these rites.

Jeremias' own interpretation of the words, as 'that God may remember me' by bringing in the parousia, has itself been submitted to a detailed scrutiny by 3. van Unnik and found to be untenable. van Unnik's own treatment of the words 'do this in remembrance of me' as paraphrased in 1 Cor. 11.26: 'For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come', is equally unsatisfactory. It is unsatisfactory firstly because we know that in the primitive eucharists this 'proclamation of the Lord's death' was a verbal 4. exposition of the words of institution, and as a Christian passover haggadah. 5. this proclamation preceded the eucharistic meal. We must therefore interpret 5. 'For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death until he come' as meaning that at every eucharistic celebration there is to be a passover haggadah in which the significance of Christ's death and resurrection

1. H. Leitzmann, An die Korinther 1, 1907, ad loc on 1 Cor. 11.25ff.

2. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp. 238-243.

3. W.G. van Unnik, 'Kanttekeningen bij een nieuwe verklaring van die Anamnese-woorden' in Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift, vol. iv, 6 (Aug 1950) pp. 369-377.

4. Cf above pp. 571ff.

5. Cf above p.573.

(till he come' obviously includes the resurrection) and the eucharistic elements is to be explained and proclaimed. It is unsatisfactory secondly because everything we know about the passover 'memorial' proves that the 'memorial' belonged to the act of eating the meal and not to the preceding haggadah.^{1.}

When we remember that Paul's doctrine of baptism was that through it a man was made contemporaneous and co-extensive with Christ in the act of his atoning death and resurrection, and that according to Pes. 10.4,5 the passover memorial is being made contemporaneous with the forefathers in the act of deliverance from Egypt to be made God's people in their own land so that the passover makes those who partake of it delivered from Egypt and renewed as the people of God, then it is by no means difficult to see how Paul could have understood the eucharist as a 'memorial' in the sense that through it we are made contemporaries of Christ in his new Exodus deliverance.^{2.}

Εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, therefore, we suggest, does not mean 'that God may remember me' or that 'we may remember Jesus' or that it refers to the Christian haggadah, but rather that this act of eating the bread and drinking the wine is the act in which we are made contemporaries of his and are united to him in that act of dying and rising through which the new Israel is created. In this sense every eucharist renews ever and again the community created by God through the death and resurrection of Christ into which we were incorporated through baptism. Just as the Exodus and the creation of God's people is the fundamental premiss for the passover memorial making it both a community occasion and a community-creating event, so the fundamental premiss of the Christian passover 'memorial' is Christ's new Exodus in which the new community in union with himself is created. The eucharist grows out of this life in community in union with Christ given in baptism and ever and again renews the life of the community through renewing its union with Christ.

Such an interpretation of the ἀνάμνησις is shown to be correct in the three major passover passages in 1 Corinthians. In 1 Cor. 5.6ff it is already assumed that the Corinthians are the 'new lump' because Christ the pass-over lamb has been sacrificed, and it is as this unleavened bread that the

1. Cf above pp.594f. Particular note should be taken of the wording of Ex. 12.14; 'And this day shall be unto you for a memorial, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord: throughout your generations ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever.

2. Cf above pp.422ff; 495ff.

Christians are to 'keep the feast'. Here the community that keeps the feast is emphasised. In 1 Cor. 10.16f it is asserted that the Christian community is 'one bread, one body: for (γὰρ = because) we all partake of the one bread.' Here firstly union with Christ which results in sharing Christ's nature is emphasized; by partaking of the 'one bread' (Christ) they become the 'one bread' (the Church). But this is a union with Christ in his act of delivering men; 'The cup of blessing which we bless, it is not a communion with the blood of Christ?' Secondly the creation of the community through the eucharistic union with Christ is stressed in the characteristically Pauline use of the phrase 'the body of Christ'; 'The bread which we break is it not a communion with the body of Christ?', 'we, who are ... one body: for we all partake of the one bread.' Thirdly the union and intimate personal inter-relationships which characterise the 'body' are stressed in the assertion that the bread which we break is a 'participation in the body of Christ' and the emphasis on the one body. In 1 Cor. 11.17-34, in the midst of which appears the assertion that the eucharist is the ἀνάμνησις of Christ, the affirmation is again made that the community which meets to celebrate the Lord's supper is already the body of Christ, and the Corinthians are told that they destroy the very nature of the eucharist (1 Cor. 11.20) because in the manner of receiving it (unworthily' 1 Cor. 11.27) they deny the reality of the atonement and their baptism. They do so because it is through these events that they have been made the body of Christ and therefore members of one another. This they deny because they do not think it important that they should wait for their less fortunate brethren. If their life together has sunk to this level how can they celebrate the Christian passover ἀνάμνησις? How can they come for the renewal of their community through union with Christ when they show no desire for community? Such a Lord's Supper is no Lord's Supper at all, for the ἀνάμνησις is becoming contemporaries with Christ in his act of creating the community. Certainly the Lord's Supper is to restore our union with Christ - otherwise the ἀνάμνησις of Christ would be meaningless. But just because it is this it is also to restore our union with one another 'in Christ' in the Christian community. It is consequently not the Corinthians' attitude to the sacrament but to the community that calls forth from Paul the exhortation to discern the body (1 Cor. 11.29) by discerning who they in fact

1. Cf above p. 429, 436f.

are - that body of Christ and therefore members of one another and the presence
 1.
 of Christ to one another (1 Cor. 11.30). This community is the very foundation
 upon which the Christian ἀνάμνησις is built, and into which the eucharist
 comes as the means to renewing the union with Christ and therefore with one
 another in the body of Christ.

We conclude therefore that τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
 is an exhortation to the Christian community, which is a community through its
 corporate union with Christ, to renew that community through renewing its union
 with Christ in his people-of-God-creating act of deliverance.

(e) The Hallel

The saying of the grace after the meal was followed immediately by the
 2.
 singing of the hallel, Pss. 114-118. It was sung antiphonally: one member of
 the table fellowship recited the text, and the others responded after each half-
 3.
 verse with the Hallelujah. There is no good reason to suppose that this is not
 the hymn which Jesus and his disciples sang at the close of the meal (Mk. 14.26=
 Matt. 26.30). Jeremiah has shown how in late Judaism the whole of this hymn was
 4.
 interpreted eschatologically of the coming Messiah. Of particular significance,
 not only for understanding how Jesus himself interpreted his meal but also for
 its close parallels with early Christian liturgies, is the Midrash on Ps. 118
 22, which interprets 'This is the day which the Lord hath made' (Ps. 118.24) as
 referring to the day of redemption which ends all enslavement for ever, i.e. it
 is the day of Messianic redemption. Then follows a depicting of that eschato-
 logical day as the inhabitants of Jerusalem watch the Messiah drawing near at
 the head of a caravan of pilgrims from Judea. The Jerusalemites and the
 caravan greet one another by singing antiphonally Ps. 118.25-29, until the
 climax is reached as the two groups unite in praising God. In the Midrash the
 5.
 text is as follows;

From inside the walls, the men of Jerusalem will say,
 "We beseech Thee, O Lord, save now!" (25a)

And from outside, the men of Judah will say,
 "We beseech Thee, O Lord, make us now to prosper!" (25b)

-
1. Cf above pp. 427ff.
 2. The first part of the hallel (Ps. 113, according to the school of Shammai, Pss. 113-114, according to the school of Hillel) was sung during the passover haggadah (Pes. 10.6; Tos. Pes 10.9 (173.2)), The second half (Pss. 114-118, Shammai, or 115-118, Hillel) after the ending of the meal (Pes. 10.7)
 3. For the evidence of J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p.256 n.1.
 4. ibid p.256 n.3
 5. Translation of W.G. Braude, The Midrash on Psalms (Yale Judaica Series), Vol. 1, 1959.

From inside, the men of Jerusalem will say,
 "Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" (26a)

And from outside, the men of Judah will say,
 "We bless you out of the house of the Lord!" (26b)

From inside, the men of Jerusalem will say,
 "The Lord is God and hath given us light" (27a)

And from outside, the men of Judah will say,
 "Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto
 the horns of the altar!" (27b)

From inside, the men of Jerusalem will say,
 "Thou art my God, and I will give thanks unto Thee!" (28a)

From outside, the men of Judah will say,
 "Thou art my God, I will exalt Thee" (28b)

Then the men of Jerusalem and the men of Judah, together,
 opening their mouths in praise of the Holy One, blessed be
 He, will say:

"O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, for
 his mercy endureth for ever" (29)

This Midrash on the Psalms is not dated, but the evidence collected by Jeremias is certainly sufficient to support his conclusion that the New Testament shows that it certainly goes back to the days of Jesus.... and that Jesus himself was very much concerned with Ps. 118 and that he also interpreted it Messianically. We see, therefore, how the passover meal reached its climax in the joyous expectation of the coming Messiah. If the emphasis of the meal and the preceding haggadah had been on the historical deliverance from Egypt, here in the concluding hymn the attention is shifted to the future when the Messiah would come to bring in the final glorious kingdom of God. When Jesus, therefore, ends the Last Supper with his disciples in the singing of the Messianic hallel, further light is thrown upon the meaning of that meal. Since Jesus certainly did understand himself to be the Messiah, but at the Last Supper speaks of his imminent death, then that hymn points to his conviction that he would rise to return to his disciples in the glorious meal of the kingdom which is anticipated in the Last Supper itself.

When we look at the earliest Christian liturgies we find that they began the eucharist with the joyous acclamations to greet the coming Messiah derived from Ps. 118. They clearly understood their eucharistic celebrations to be the fulfilment of the promised Messianic banquet with the Messiah whose work was completed in the death and resurrection of Jesus and his coming to them again as the Holy Spirit.

From the Didache we learn that they cried 'Hosanna to the house of

1. J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp. 258ff. For detailed examination cf. ibid. There is little purpose in repeating the evidence here.

2. Cf. above pp. 86 ff.

David' as they began their eucharistic celebration (Did. 10.6; cf. Ps. 118.26).
 The allusions to the verses just quoted from Ps. 118 in the three-part dialogue^{with}
 which the Christian eucharist began are self-evident in the following quotation
 1.
 from the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus;

Bishop : The Lord be with you.
 People : And with the spirit.
 Bishop : Lift up your hearts.
 People : We have them with the Lord.
 Bishop : Let us give thanks unto the Lord. (Ps. 118.12f)
 People : (It is) meet and right. (Ps. 118.28f)
 Bishop : We render thanks unto thee, O God, through thy Beloved
 Child Jesus Christ.... (Ps. 118.29)

Leitzmann has interpreted the words 'lift up your hearts' to mean 'to
 2.
 leave the travail of the world'. When the background of Ps. 118 and its
 Messianic interpretation is borne in mind, the meaning of the cry is surely to
 'lift up your hearts to meet the coming Messiah'.

There is evidence of such a greeting of the coming Messiah at the
 Eucharist already in the New Testament. This is most clearly seen in Revelation
 22.10-20. The significant verses read as follows;

"He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still: and he that
 is filthy, let him be made filthy still: and he that is righteous,
 let him do righteousness still: and he that is holy, let him be made
 holy still. (3)
 Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me.....
 Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to
 come to the tree of life.... (4)
 Without are the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the murderers, and the
 idolators, and everyone that loveth and maketh a lie...
 And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth let
 him say, Come.
 And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the
 water of life freely. (5)
 He which testifieth these things (i.e. Jesus cf Rev. 1.2) saith, Yea:
 I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus (ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ).

1. The translation followed here is that of J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, p. 116. Our reference to the allusions to Ps. 118 is not intended to deny the results of the detailed comparison of this eucharistic introduction with the grace said over the cup of blessing by H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 1953ff, p.125ff; G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 1945, pp.79ff and J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 1966, pp.110, 116f. What is significantly different, however, is that here, as in the Hallel recitation at the Passover (ibid, p.255f), we have an antiphonal versicle and response. Since the grace of the Cup of blessing was followed immediately by the singing of the Hallel, we can presume that each has influenced the other in the development of the Christian liturgy. Thus the grace has become a Hallel greeting of the Messiah.
2. H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 1953ff, p.187.
3. Cf the opening call to the eucharist in the Didache; 'if anyone is holy, let him come; if he is not, let him repent' (Did. 10.6).
4. The reference to having washed the robes is clearly to baptism, cf what we have said above p. 545 of the link between baptism and the eucharist in Paul's eucharistic theology. The following words make it plain that the eucharistic celebration is for the baptized alone.
5. The reference to coming to the tree of life, and drinking of the water of life make the eucharistic implications of the passage plain. This is an invitation to the eucharistic banquet. (Cf M.H. Shepherd, Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, 1960).

That we have here a very primitive invitation to the eucharist can scarcely be doubted. The whole passage is so couched in baptismal and eucharistic language that this conclusion is inevitable. It is significant therefore that this passage also rings with echoes of Psalm 115-118, i.e. the concluding paschal hallel. When Rev. 20.15 speaks of those who continue in their sinful ways, and of the righteous who continue in their righteousness the thought is precisely parallel to Ps. 115.4-11, the idea of Rev. 22.12: 'Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me to render to each man according as his work is' is surely precisely the same as Ps. 116.2, 118.7; 'Because he hath inclined his ear unto me, therefore will I call upon him as long as I live.... The Lord is on my side among them that help me: therefore shall I see my desire upon them that hate me'; Rev. 22.14: 'Blessed are they that wash their robes' expresses the same thought as Ps. 116.15: 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints' for in Rev. 7.14 those who have washed their robes clearly hovers in meaning between the Christian martyrs and baptism; The constant repetition of 'In the name of the Lord I will cut them off', i.e. those who do evil and are threatening the life of the Psalmist (Ps. 118.10-12) is echoed in Rev. 22.15; 'without are the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and idolators (cf Ps. 115.4), and everyone that loveth and maketh a lie' where it refers to those who are cut off from the eucharistic celebration; When the Psalmist sings 'Open to me the gates of righteousness, I will enter into them, I will give thanks to the Lord. This is the gate of the Lord; the righteous shall enter into it' (Ps. 118.19, 20), the Apocalyptist sings, in stark contrast to the evil doers mentioned in Rev. 22.11,14, 'Blessed are they that wash their robes that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates of the city'; Finally the Psalmist's hymn of acclamation 'Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord' (Ps. 118.26a) is expressed in the Apocalypse: 'He which testifieth these things (i.e. Jesus Christ) saith, Yea: I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus! .

This list of parallels between Rev. 22.11-30 and Ps. 115-118 is so striking that the conclusion is unavoidable that this invitation to the eucharist is modelled on the concluding hallel of the passover liturgy. This means that the song in anticipation of the Messiah who would come to deliver at the Jewish passover has become the introductory song of the Christian

eucharist, expressing the conviction that between the Last Supper and the Christian eucharist has come the Messianic salvation in the death and resurrection of Jesus making the eucharist the joyous Messianic banquet of the kingdom. The promise of Christ's coming and the answering cry 'come, Lord Jesus' are to be understood primarily as a greeting of the risen Messiah coming to feed his own at that banquet.

Further evidence of this use of the passover hallel and the greeting of the returning Lord is found in 1 Cor. 16.20,22. We have seen that it was the practice at the primitive eucharist to begin with a reading of an apostolic letter as part of the Christian paschal haggadah.¹ In 1 Cor. 16.20 we read at the close of the epistle; 'Salute one another with a holy kiss'. When we bear in mind that the primitive Christian eucharists did begin with such a 'kiss of peace' the conclusion is unavoidable that Paul envisages this epistle to be read by the Corinthians in their preparation for the eucharist which begins now with this brotherly kiss. In the short verse 22 the number of allusions to Ps. 115-118 is remarkable: 'If any man loveth not the Lord (Cf Ps. 115.11; 115.1) let him be anathema (cf Ps. 118.10-12).² Maran atha (μαράν ἄθα cf Ps. 116.2,4,15,17; 118.26).³ It is well known that the Aramaic Maranatha can mean either 'the Lord comes' or 'Lord, come' depending on whether one reads maran atha (= the Lord comes 1 Cor. 16.22) or marana tha (= Lord, come cf. Rev. 22.20).³ The ambiguity of this Aramaic exclamation, which has passed into the liturgical language of the primitive Church, expresses the heart of the Christian eucharist. It is at the same time an affirmation of Christ's return to feed his own at the Messianic banquet and a plea that he will come. As such it is an affirmation that at the heart of the eucharist stands the Christ returning in triumph to unite the faithful to himself, and yet also an affirmation that his presence is not theirs to command but is dependent on his gracious favour. So the cry hovers between acclamation and petition. While there may indeed be overtones of a longing for the final breaking in of the kingdom when all things have been subjected to Christ (1 Cor. 15.25f) its primary meaning at the commencement of the eucharist is a call of greeting to the returning Messiah who in his death and exaltation has fulfilled the hopes of the passover hallel.

1. Cf above p. 573.

2. i.e., let him be excluded from the eucharistic meal. Cf 1 Cor. 5.1ff; Rev. 22.15.

3. M. Thurian, The Eucharistic Memorial, 1, 1966, p.29.

This interpretation helps to throw light on Paul's words in 1 Cor. 11.26; 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come (ἀχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ). The meaning of the phrase ἀχρις οὗ^{1.} is 'until the time appointed by God', i.e. the expression means 'until he comes at the time appointed by God'.

We have seen that the 'proclamation of the Lord's death' refers not to the eucharistic action itself but to the preceding Christian haggadah when the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection as the new Exodus act of God and the eucharistic ἀνάμνησις^{2.} is expounded. 'Till he come' therefore has the same force as maran atha in 1 Cor. 16.22, and means that at every celebration the 'proclamation' continues until the time appointed by God for Christ to come in the Messianic banquet to unite them with himself in his people-of-God-creating act of deliverance.

This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that although these words stand at the close of the recital of the tradition concerning the Last Supper, Paul immediately continues to exhort the Corinthians to examine themselves before they come to partake of the 'memorial' feast (cf Rev. 22.11-15). In fact as our interpretation of 1 Cor. 16.20,22 shows this whole section is part of the Christian haggadah^{3.} and, like Jn. 6.51c-58, is part of the preceding interpretation of the words of institution and the eucharistic elements. This interpretation makes it far more intelligible why the whole section is concerned more with the way in which the Corinthians conduct themselves as they come to the Lord's Supper than with the effects of such a participation. What Paul is saying, therefore, might be paraphrased as follows: 'Whenever we meet to eat the bread and drink the cup of our passover memorial we proclaim the Lord's death. This is the death that has liberated us from our bondage by making us organs of himself and therefore organs of one another.^{4.} Such we are because in our baptism we have been united with him in his death and resurrection and have 'put on Christ'. This union with one another in Christ entails a life^{5.} of caring and loving personal inter-relationships in the community he has created. In rejecting one another we reject Christ himself (1 Cor. 8.12). Our loveless attitude to the less privileged brethren is cutting ourselves off from Christ so that "when...ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the

1. Cf Arndt and Gingrich, p.128.

2. Cf above pp. 571f, 601ff.

3. Cf above p. 571

4. Cf above pp. 418 - 445

5. Cf above pp. 451f.

Lord's Supper". Therefore we are to recognise what the body of Christ is (1 Cor. 11.29), it is ourselves (1 Cor. 11.31), and we are to examine our relationships with one another whether it is true of us that when any one member suffers the whole body suffers with it (1 Cor. 12.26). We are to do this self-examination so that our actions might match our self-understanding as being the body of Christ, for at the time appointed Christ himself will come to celebrate with us the joyous memorial of our Exodus from bondage into the freedom of love and so renew our union with himself and each other'. What that appointed time is is shown at the close of the epistle when, after the eucharist begins with the kiss of peace the joyous cry arises 'maran atha', 'the Lord comes'.

We contend therefore that 1 Cor. 11.26 is not a confirmation of the 'eschatological prospect' which, according to Mk. 14.25, concluded the Last Supper. It is rather an anticipation in the Christian haggadah of the joyous cry of fulfilment with which the eucharistic celebration begins (1 Cor. 16.22).

The results of this investigation show that the eschatological hopes contained in the hallel with which the Last Supper concluded have become in the Christian eucharist an introductory affirmation of fulfilment in which the central **feature** is the joyous greeting of the returning triumphant Messiah who in his death and exaltation has made them the redeemed community.

(c) Some Practical Considerations.

(i) The Eucharist and Unity

When Paul wrote to his Corinthian readers, 'when therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper' and the main ground for this is that they do not wait for one another (1 Cor. 11.33), i.e. they exhibit a lovelessness which denies their claim to be the body of Christ, what would he have said to modern Christians? Not only do they not wait for one another, they actually deny one another access to the eucharist. If the eucharist is truly the 'memorial' of that people-of-God-creating act of deliverance which renews our oneness with Christ and therefore with one another, then such divided eucharists must imply radically distinct and separate people of God - and this, in New Testament thinking, is utterly impossible for Christ is himself the whole people of God into which we are included by our inclusion into him. Thus radically separate people of God (i.e. separate

enough to exclude one another from the new Exodus passover memorial) must imply a divided Christ or more than one new Exodus.

Admittedly there are marked differences of opinion concerning the doctrine of the eucharist, but when these are elevated above the foundation on which every eucharist is built; one Messiah; one saving death and exaltation; the creation of one new people of God who are both organs of one another and of Christ, then indeed we have a classical example of being unable to see the wood for the trees.

Here is another instance of the dilemma which we noted of Christian baptism. Not to affirm that the Church is a unity, a single body, is to deny that Jesus is the Messiah who created the new community in union with himself in the new Exodus he accomplished at Calvary. At the same time the affirmation of this unity is not simply theological but works itself out in ethical human inter-relationships of love within the body. Because of the first affirmation we have to say that every eucharist is truly a memorial of Christ's act of deliverance. Because of the second affirmation it is difficult indeed to say that any present eucharist in the divided Church is such a memorial celebration. Without completely abandoning Christianity we have to affirm the major premiss of our eucharistic celebration, that Jesus is the ^{who has created the Church} Christ, which is his corporate personality, which affirmation entails being involved in the work for the renewal of the Church until theological theory concerning unity is experienced reality.

(ii) The Eucharist and Community

Throughout this exposition of the New Testament doctrine of the eucharist we have seen repeatedly how it is an action dependent on Christ but ^{1.} which springs out of a life together in the Christian community. It has no other foundation, for Christ implies true community (i.e. love) as much as true community implies being in Christ. In New Testament concepts it is simply not possible to affirm the one without affirming the other.

Paul's charge against the Corinthians was that they regarded the sacrament more highly than community, and in so doing had rendered 'impossible' the eucharistic celebration (1 Cor. 11.20). This he said at a stage in the

1. Cf above especially pp. 589ff, 604ff.

development of the eucharist when it had become separated from the meal, but nevertheless followed upon a community Agape. The Corinthian error in focussing all attention on the eucharist at the expense of ethical community did not die despite 1 Cor. 11.17-34. Rather the Agape itself eventually fell away leaving only the eucharist. Even this was still tolerable when the Church lived mainly in rural areas where the community was small enough for the different members at least to know one another. The Church no longer lives mainly in such areas. It has moved into the great industrial cities. Now the communicants come to the Lord's Supper not simply not waiting for one another but being so ignorant of who the vast majority of worshippers are that they would not even know whether anyone was missing at all (unless the congregation was unusually small), and if they did they would have no idea who was not there (unless they happened to know of a friend who was not attending). In such a situation it is perfectly natural that an almost complete individualism and sacramentalism has replaced the New Testament emphasis on community. This process of creeping individualism has been in no small measure facilitated by liturgical practice. In 'non-liturgical' denominations spontaneity (which is of the essence of inter-personal communication and relationships) is virtually restricted to the officiant at the eucharist. In liturgical celebrations what is expressed is prescribed, and any further meditations on what is prescribed must remain private and unspoken in the context of the celebration. Consequently over the whole celebration there descends a holy awe of quiet passivity. That such silent reverence has its place must be taken as read. But that it should constitute the whole should by no means be taken as such, if it does are we not closer than we care to believe to 1 Cor. 11.20? Our sacramentalism may be right and proper. Our lack of experienced community in the sacrament is not. Without it the eucharist itself stands in constant danger of degenerating to the level of superstition and magic, at least in the understanding of the worshippers - and what is communicated to them cannot be ignored as unimportant. On the other hand, a eucharist which springs out of a life of felt belongingness has, in the experience of many Christians, been shot through with deeper and richer significance for them.

It is true that many modern experiments in the field of liturgical renewal have re-introduced or stressed the significance of the ancient 'kiss
 1. Cf above pp. 572ff.

of peace' (1 Cor. 16.20; cf Matt. 5.23ff) in order to symbolize the reality of the ethical nature of the Church. More radical has been the re-introduction of the ancient Agape in the form of a Church supper or parish breakfast before or after the eucharistic celebration. But symbolism which does not express what does exist only what ought to exist will always be empty and unsatisfying. Where deep friendship does exist such symbolism will be filled with meaning and significance but liturgical ceremonial will not cover up our divisions or our lack of community within the Christian Church. It is the poverty and sickness of our life together in the body of Christ which needs to be remedied if not first at least at the same time as liturgical symbolism.

How this is to be done is not the purpose of this thesis to examine. What we have attempted to do is set out the biblical premises which should form the basis for study in other fields by those more competent to do it in order that renewal of the Church might come about and with it renewal of our sacramental worship. What is clear, however, is that we need to find the means both of creating and expressing human inter-relationships and community in our eucharistic celebrations and that in the "setting" of the celebration not simply in its consequence; e.g. if we are going to have Church suppers or Parish breakfasts in association with the Lord's Supper they should precede rather than conclude the eucharist.

(iii) The participation of children in the eucharist

If two fundamental premises of this thesis¹ are accepted, i.e. that the children of Christian parents were not baptized in the primitive Church because they were regarded as belonging together with their parents to the body of Christ, and that the Christian eucharist was regarded as a passover 'memorial' by the New Testament Christians, then there can be no doubt that children of Christian parents did partake in the early eucharists of the Church. While we have seen that there is good reason to doubt that infants of Jewish proselytes were baptized, there can be no doubt whatever that the children of Jewish parents were members of the haburah that celebrated the annual passover. The fact that from a very early time it was the children who asked the leading questions in the passover haggadah (cf Ex. 12.46) puts the issue beyond any reasonable doubt. When the Christian Church designated the eucharist as a passover it would be self-evident that children would also

1. Cf. above pp.501ff
2. Cf. above pp.559ff, 587ff.

have taken part. If there had been so radical a departure from tradition as to exclude them from the Christian passover, then surely we should expect to find some express rule forbidding their participation. In the absence of any such indication the only possible conclusion is that Christian children did share in the Christian eucharists from the earliest times.

This is confirmed by what evidence we have of baptismal and eucharistic practice in the post-New Testament Church. We do know that the regular practice was that baptism was immediately followed by the reception of the first communion. Thus Tertullian tells us; 'Flesh is washed, that the soul may be cleansed: flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated: flesh is signed, that the soul may be fortified: flesh is shadowed by the imposition of the hand, that the soul may be enlightened by the Spirit: flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may fatten upon God.' It is significant that Tertullian, who so resolutely opposes infant baptism (De. Bapt. 18.4), has nothing to say about children not participating in the eucharist. The fact that he opposes infant baptism indicates that it must have been a current practice, and when he knows that reception of the eucharist follows on baptism he must also have known that very small children also received the eucharist. His silence on this is surprising unless, unlike the baptism of infants, he knew that this had been a long-standing Christian practice.

Hippolytus shows that when infants were in fact baptized (Apostolic Tradition xii.4 'And they shall baptize the little children first. And if they can answer for themselves, let them answer. But if they cannot, let their parents answer or someone from their family') they were also among those who received the eucharistic elements (Apostolic Tradition xxiii). Similarly also we read in the Pilgrimage of Etheria (c.400); 'The paschal vigils are kept as with us, with this one addition, that the children, when they have been baptized and clothed, and when they issue from the font, are led with the bishop first to the Anastasis; the bishop enters the rails for them, and then he goes with them to the greater church, where, according to

1. De Res. Carne, c.8, quoted from the collection of baptismal documents made by E.C. Whitaker, Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy, 1960, p.9. For further evidence of this widespread practice of The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus which in xvi-xxii describes the rite of baptism which immediately in xxiii proceeds to a description of the eucharist (cf Whitaker, pp. 2-7); The Acts of Judas Thomas, which in both the Greek and Syriac versions ends each baptism with a celebration of the eucharist (cf Whitaker pp. 10-16); St. John Chrysostom, 1st address. 27 (cf Whitaker p. 33) Theodore of Mopsuestia Part 2. Sermon 4 (= Whitaker, p.42)
2. E.C. Whitaker, op cit. p.5.

custom, all the people are keeping watch. Everything is done there which is customary with us also, and after the oblation has been made, the dismissal^{1.} takes place.'

There is evidence, therefore, from Rome, Jerusalem, Africa and Syria of the practice of admitting children to the eucharist. While the baptism of infants is probably a late feature, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the participation of Christian children in the eucharist arose at the very beginning of the Christian Church.

It does not follow from this that we should return to this ancient practice, a practice still followed in the Orthodox Churches. It may be that such a practice in the present state of our liturgical life would be disastrous. Not only would the presence of large numbers of small children make the performance of the liturgy impossible but also with all attention focussed on individualism and sacramentalism their participation would probably lead to ridiculously superstitious and magical notions of the eucharist.

If, on the other hand, we were able to give due consideration to^{2.} the role of the community and community life in both baptism and the eucharist then there may be a great deal to recommend it. We are basically not self-made men but the products of our society and more particularly of our home and family life. It is here that we learn our faith and our values. The seeds that are planted in our childish minds seldom die completely but most often mature into the full-grown person that we become. This being so, if the eucharist were the occasion when friendships were made and our deepest convictions, hopes, and beliefs expressed, then our children would be drawn into a community where they would learn through participation in the life of the community what our Christian faith is all about. Here too, if we could learn the art of communicating with children by recognising them as persons with needs and thoughts - not simply as empty barrels into which we deposit our wisdom, we might learn from them what it means to be in Christ, and 'in Christ' organs of one another.

2. Cf above pp. 527ff, 535ff.

1. E.C. Whitaker, op cit. p.36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. Abrahams Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospel (2 Vols), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1917.
- K. Aland Did the Early Church Baptize Infants? (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, London, 1963. (Baptize)
- W.F. Arndt & F.W. Gingrich Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature (E.T.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957. (Arndt & Gingrich)
- J. Barr 'Further thoughts about baptism' in SJT, Vol 4, Sept. 1951.
 'Daniel' in Peake's Commentary of the Bible (new edn., ed. M. Black and H.H. Rowley), Nelson, Edinburgh, 1962.
- C.K. Barrett The Gospel According to St. John, S.P.C.K., London, 1955. (John)
 'The background of Mark 10.45' in New Testament Essays, Studies in memory of T.W. Manson, (ed. A.J.B. Higgins), University Press, Manchester, 1959.
From First Adam to Last, A & C Black, London, 1962.
The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, S.P.C.K., London, 1966.
- K. Barth The Teaching of the Church regarding baptism, S.C.M. Press, London, 1956. (Baptism)
- J.V. Bartlett St. Mark (Century Bible), T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1922.
 'Baptism (New Testament)' in ERE, Vol 11 (ed. J. Hastings), T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1909.
- W. Baumgartner 'Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung' in Theologische Rundschau, Vol 11, 1939.
- F.W. Beare The First Epistle of Peter (2nd edn. rev.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1958.
A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, A & C Black, London, 1959.
- G.R. Beasley-Murray Jesus and the Future; an examination of the criticism of the eschatological discourse, Mark 13, with special reference to the little apocalypse theory, Macmillan, London, 1954.
- J. Beattie Other Cultures, Cohen & West, London, 1964.
- J. Behm art. 'κλάω' in TWNT, Vol 111.
- A. Bentzen King and Messiah (E.T.), Lutterworth, London, 1955.
- J.H. Bernard The Gospel According to St. John (ICC) T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1928.
- W. Bieder Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi; Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Vorstellung vom sog. descensus ad infernos, Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich, 1949.
- M. Black 'The Servant of the Lord and Son of Man' in SJT, Vol 6, 1953.
An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1954.
- F.W. Blass & A. Debrunner A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Literature (E.T.), University of Chicago Press & Cambridge University Press, Chicago & Cambridge, 1961. (Blass & Debrunner)
- J. Blinzler The Trial of Jesus (E.T.), Mercier Press, Cork, 1959.

- A.W.F.Blunt The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Clarendon, Oxford, 1955.
- T.Boman Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. (Hebrew Thought)
- D.Bonhoeffer Creation and Fall (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, London, 1959.
- G.H.Boobyer St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1942.
- G.Bornkamm in 'Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Vol 1) (revised K.Galling & H.v.Campenhausen), J.C.D.Mohr, Tübingen, 1957.
- Jesus of Nazareth (E.T.), Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1960.
- 'End-expectation and Church in Matthew' in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ed. G.Bornkamm, G.Barth & H.Held) (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, (New Testament Library), London, 1963.
- W.Bousset Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter (rev. H.Gressmann), J.C.B.Mohr, Tübingen, 1926.
- G.H.Box The Apocalypse of Ezra, S.P.C.K., London, 1917.
- 'Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist' in JTS, Vol 3, 1901-2
- B.H.Branscomb The Gospel of Mark (Moffatt New Testament Commentary), Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1937. (Mark)
- W.G.Braude The Midrash on Psalms (Yale Judaica Series) Vol 1, Yale University Press, New Haven (Conn.), 1959.
- A.E.Brook A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, (ICC) Scribner, New York, 1912.
- F.Brown & S.R.Driver & C.A.Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1906.
- W.H.Brownlee 'The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls' in Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Bul 132, Dec. 1953; Bul 135, Oct. 1959.
- R.Bultmann 'Die Frage nach der Echtheit van Matt XVI. 17-19' in TB, Vol 20, 1941.
- The Theology of the New Testament (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, Vol 1, 1959, Vol 2, 1958. (Theology)
- Das Evangelium des Johannes (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1950. (Johannes)
- Jesus and the Word (E.T.), Scribner, New York, 1958.
- The History of the Synoptic Tradition (E.T.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1963. (Synoptic Tradition)
- F.C.Burkitt The Gospel History and its Transmission, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1906.
- C.F.Burney The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Clarendon, Oxford, 1922. (Aramaic Origin)
- E.D.Burton Galatians (ICC), T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1921.
- Fr. Büschel 'Die Blutgerichtssbarkeit des Synedions' in ZNW, Vol 28, 1931.
- A.T.Cadoux The Sources of the Second Gospel, J.Clark, London, 1935.

- C.J.Cadoux The Historical Mission of Jesus, Lutterworth, London, 1941.
- P.Carrington The Primitive Christian Catechism; a study in the Epistles, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1940. (Primitive Catechism)
- R.H.Charles The Book of Enoch, S.P.C.K., London, 1917.
A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Clarendon, Oxford, 1929.
- N.Clark An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments, S.C.M., London, 1956.
- T.Colani Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps, Treuttel & Wurtz, Strasbourg, 1864.
- Y.M.-J.Congar The Mystery of the Temple (E.T.), Burns & Oates, London, 1962.
- H.Conzelmann 'Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition', in ZTK, Vol 54, 1957.
The Theology of St. Luke (E.T.), Faber & Faber, London, 1960.
- G.A.Cooke A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel (ICC), T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1936.
- J.Coppens 'Les Saints du Très-Haut sont-ils à identifier avec Milices Célestes?' in ETL, Vol 39, 1963.
'Les Saints dans le Psautier' in ETL, Vol 39, 1963.
'Le Fils d'homme Daniélique, vizir céleste?' in ETL, Vol 40, 1964.
- J.Coppens & L.Dequeker Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Dan VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans les Nouveau Testament, Publications Universitaires, Louvain, 1961.
- W.Cosser 'The house of God' in The Livingstonian, Vol 1 No. 5, 1965.
- C.E.B.Cranfield The Gospel According to St. Mark, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959 (Mark)
- J.M.Creed The Gospel According to St. Luke, Macmillan, London, 1942. (Luke)
'The Heavenly Man' in JTS, Vol 26, 1925.
- F.L.Cross 1 Peter; a Paschal Liturgy, Mowbray, London, 1954.
- F.H.Cross Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, Doubleday, New York, 1958.
- F.M.Cross & D.N.Freedman 'The blessing of Moses' in JBL, Vol 67, 1948.
- O.Cullmann Christ and Time (E.T.), S.C.M. Press, London, 1951.
Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr (E.T.), Meridian, New York, 1958. (Peter)
Early Christian Worship (E.T.) S.C.M., London, 1953 (Worship)
The State in the New Testament (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1957.
The Christology of the New Testament (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1959 (Christology)
'"KYRIOS" as a designation for the oral tradition concerning Jesus' in SJT, Vol 3, 1950.

- O.Cullmann Baptism in the New Testament (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1950.
(Baptism)
- G.Dahl 'Some recent interpretations of Second Isaiah' in JBL, Vol 48, 1929.
- M.E.Dahl The Resurrection of the Body, S.C.M., London, 1962.
- N.A.Dahl Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums, J.Dybwad, Oslo, 1941.
- G.Dalman The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1909.
(Words)
- Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert, Berlin, 1888.
- Jesus-Jeshua; Studies in the Gospels (E.T.), S.P.C.K., London, 1929. (Jesus-Jeshua)
- D.Daube The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, Athlone Press, London, 1956
- J.G.Davies 'The Prefiguration of the Ascension in the Third Gospel' in JTS, Vol 6, 1955.
- He Ascended into Heaven, Lutterworth, London, 1958.
- W.D.Davies Paul and Rabbinic Judaism; some rabbinic elements in Pauline Theology, S.P.C.K., London, 1955.
- G.A.Deissmann Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History (E.T.) Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1926.
- R.de Vaux Ancient Israel (E.T.), Darton Longman & Todd, London, 1961.
- M.Dibelius 'Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus' in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (ed. H.Leitzmann), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1909.
- Die urchristliche Ueberlieferung von Johannes dem Taucher, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1911.
- 'Das historische Problem der Leidengeschichte' in ZNW, Vol 28, 1931.
- From Tradition to Gospel (E.T.), Nicholson & Watson, London, 1934.
(Tradition)
- Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1942.
- Jesus (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1949.
- 'Die Mahlgebete der Didache' in ZNW, Vol 37, 1938.
- G.Dix The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945.
- C.H.Dodd 'The fall of Jerusalem and the "Abomination of Desolation"' in Journal of Roman Studies, Vol 37, 1947.
- The Meaning of Paul for Today, Allen & Unwin, London, 1956.
- According to the Scriptures; the substructure of New Testament Theology, Nisbet, London, 1953.
- The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1956. (Apostolic Preaching)
- The Parables of the Kingdom, Nisbet, London, 1956. (Parables)

- C.H.Dodd The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Moffatt Commentary), Fontana, London, 1959. (Romans)
- The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960. (Fourth Gospel)
- S.R.Driver The Book of Daniel, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1900.
- S.Drummond The Jewish Messiah. A Critical History of the Messianic Ideas of The Jews from the rise of the Maccabees to the closing of the Talmud., London, 1877.
- C.W.Dugmore 'Review of G.Dix "The Shape of the Liturgy"' in JTS, Vol 47, 1946.
- G.S.Duncan Jesus, Son of Man, Nisbet, London, 1947.
- A.Dupont-Somer The Essene Writings from Qumran (E.T.) Blackwell, Oxford, 1961.
- E.Durkheim The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (E.T.) Allen & Unwin, London, 1957.
- B.S.Easton 'The Pauline Theology and Hellenism' in The American Journal of Theology, Vol 21, 1917.
- The Gospel According to St. Luke, Scribner, New York, 1926. (Luke)
- W.Eichrodt Man in the Old Testament (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1951.
- The Theology of the Old Testament(E.T.) (2 Vols), S.C.M., London, 1967.
- R.Eisler The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, Methuen, London, 1931.
- O.Eissfeldt Einleitung in das Alte Testament, unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphen artigen Qumranschriften, J.C.B.Mohr, Tübingen, 1956.
- J.A.Emmerton 'The origin of the Son of man imagery' in JTS, Vol 9, 1958.
- D.Evans The Logic of Self-Involvement, S.C.M., London, 1963.
- A.M.Farrer A Study in St. Mark, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1951.
- J.C.Fenton St. Matthew, Penguin, London, 1963.
- J.E.Fison The Christian Hope, Longmans Green, London & New York, 1948.
- W.F.Flemington The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism, S.P.C.K., London, 1953. (Baptism)
- R.N.Flew Jesus and His Church, Epworth, London, 1943.
- H.Frankfort Kingship and the Gods, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1948.
- D.N.Freedman The Secret Sayings of Jesus According to the Gospel of Thomas, Doubleday, New York, 1960.
- R.H.Fuller The Foundations of New Testament Christology, Lutterworth, London, 1965.
- The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, Allenson, Chicago, 1954. (Mission & Achievement)
- C.J.Gadd Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1948.
- B.Gärtner 'John 6 and the Jewish Passover' in Coniectanea Neotestamentica Vol 17, 1959.
- The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas, Collins, London, 1961.

- B. Gärtner The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1965.
- T.F. Glasson The Second Advent, Epworth, London, 1945.
'The reply to Caiaphas (Mk.14.62)' in EXT, Vol 67, 1956.
Moses in the Fourth Gospel, S.C.M. London, 1963.
- M. Goguel L'Eucharistie des origines á Justin Martyr, Payot, Paris, 1910.
The Life of Jesus, (E.T.), Macmillan, London, 1933
'A Propos du Procès Jésus' in ZNW, Vol 31, 1934.
L'eglise naissante, Payot, Paris, 1947.
- E.J. Goodspeed Problems of New Testament Translation, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1945.
- G.B. Gray Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Clarendon, Oxford, 1925.
- H. Gressmann 'Der Messias' in FRL. Vol 43, 1914.
- W. Grundmann Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Evangelische Verlag., Berlin, 1961.
- H. Gunkel Schöpfung and Chaos im Urzeit, und Endzeit, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1895.
- F. Hahn Christologische Hoheitslitel, Ihre geschichte im frühen Christentum, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen, 1963
- W.D. Hammond-Tooke 'In Search of the Sacred' Rhodes University Inaugural Lecture, Grahamstown, 1965.
- A. Harnack The Sayings of Jesus, (E.T.) Williams & Norgate, London, 1908
'Der Spruch über Petrus als den Felsen der Kirche' in SBA, 1918.
- R.A. Harrisville The Concept of Newness in the New Testament (E.T.), Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1960.
- E.W. Heaton The Book of Daniel, S.C.M., London, 1956.
- A. Heidel The Babylonian Genesis (New Edn) University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963.
- A.J.B. Higgins Jesus and the Son of Man, Lutterworth, London, 1964
(Son of Man)
'The Son of Man-Forschung since "The Teaching of Jesus"' in New Testament Essays, studies in memory of T.W. Manson (ed. A.J.B. Higgins), Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1959.
The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, S.C.M., London, 1956.
(Lord's Supper)
- E. Hirsch Frügeschichte des Evangeliums, Vol 2, Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1961.
- N. Hoffmann 'Emmaus among the Resurrection Narratives' in JBL. Vol 64, 1945.
- A.M. Honeyman 'The evidence for regnal names among the Hebrews' in JBL, Vol 67, 1948.
- S.H. Hooke Myth and Ritual, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1933
'Myth and ritual patterns in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic' in The Labyrinth (ed. S.H. Hooke), S.P.C.K., London, 1935.
- M.D. Hooker Jesus and the Servant, S.P.C.K., London, 1959.

- M.D. Hooker The Son of Man in Mark, S.P.C.K., London, 1967. (Son of Man)
- G.W. Horner The Statutes of the Apostles, London, 1904.
- E.C. Hoskyns The Fourth Gospel, (ed. F.N. Davey), Faber & Faber, London, 1947.
- E.C. Hoskyns & F.N. Davey The Riddle of the New Testament, Faber & Faber, London, 1952.
- A.M. Hunter Paul and his Predecessors, Nicholson & Watson, London, 1940.
- E. Jenni 'Das Wort "olam" im Alten Testament' in ZAW Vol 65, 1953.
- J. Jeremias 'Erlöser und Erlösung im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum' in Deutsche Theologie, Vol 2, 1929.
 Ἄρνός τοῦ Θεοῦ - Πᾶσι Θεοῦ in ZNW Vol, 34, 1935.
 'Das Lösegeld für Viele', in Judaica, Vol, 3, 1947.
 'Zur Geschichtlichkeit des Verhörs vor dem Hohen Rat' in ZNW, Vol 49, 1952.
The Sermon on the Mount, (E.T.), Athlone Press, London, 1961.
The Parables of the New Testament, (E.T.), Scribner, New York, 1956.
 (Parables) ..
Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, (E.T.), S.C.M. London, 1960, (Infant Baptism).
The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, (E.T.), S.C.M., London, 1966.
 (Eucharistic Words).
- A.R. Johnson The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1961. (The One and the Many).
- The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1949. (Vitality of the Individual).
- J.N.D. Kelly Early Christian Creeds, Longmans, London, 1960.
- G.D. Kilpatrick The Trial of Jesus, Oxford University Press, London, 1954.
- G. Kittel (& G. Friedrich ed) Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1932ff. (TWNT)
- J. Klausner Die messianischen Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1904.
Jesus of Nazareth (E.T.), Macmillan, London, 1925.
- E. Klostermann Das Matthäusevangelium, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1927
 (Matthäusevangelium)
Das Markusevangelium, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1926.
 (Markusevangelium)
Das Lukasevangelium, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1929.
- J. Knox The Death of Christ, Abingdon, London & New York, 1958.
- W.L. Knox St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 1939.
The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957.
- R. Koch 'Der Gottesgeist und der Messias' in Biblica, Vol 27, 1946.

- L.H. Köhler Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (ed.) Brill, Leiden, 1953.
Old Testament Theology (E.T.) Lutterworth, London, 1957.
Hebrew Man (E.T.) S.C.M., London, 1956.
- C.H. Kraeling Anthropos and the Son of Man, Columbia University Press, New York, 1927.
- E. Kruatzch Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1900.
- K.G. Kuhn 'Die Abendmahlsworte' in Theologische Literaturzeitung, Vol 75, 1950.
 'The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran' (E.T.) in The Scrolls and the New Testament (ed. K. Stendahl) Harper, New York, 1957.
- W.G. Kümmel Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus, Max Niehans, Zürich, 1943.
Promise and Fulfilment, (E.T.) S.C.M. London, 1961.
- M.J. Lagrange Évangiles Synoptiques, Gabalda, Paris, 1929.
Évangile selon Saint Matthieu, Gabalda, Paris, 1923
Évangile selon Saint Marc, Gabalda, Paris, 1929
Évangile selon Saint Jean, Gabalda, Paris, 1948
Le judaïsme avant Jesus-Christ, Gabalda, Paris, 1931
- K. Lake & F.J. Foakes Jackson The Beginnings of Christianity, (5 Vols), Macmillan, London, 1920. (abbr. Jackson & Lake)
- G.W.H. Lampe The Seal of the Spirit, Longmans, Green, London, 1951.
- F.J. Leenhardt Le sacrement de la sainte cène, Delachaux & Nestlé, 1948
- H. Leitzmann An Die Korinthier I, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1907.
 'Der Prozess Jesu' in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1931
 Bemerkungen zum Prozess Jesu' in ZNW, Vol 28, 1931
 'Bemerkungen zum Prozess Jesu II' in ZNW Vol 29, 1932.
Mass and the Lord's Supper, (E.T.) E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1953ff.
- J.B. Lightfoot The Whole Works of the Rev John Lightfoot, (ed. J.R. Pitman) (Vol 8), London, 1925f.
- E. Lohmeyer 'Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2.5-11' in SHA, No.4 1927-8
Der Brief an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon erklärt, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1930
Das Evangelium des Markus, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1951 (Markus)
 'Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde' in JBL Vol 56, 1937.
- B. Lohse 'Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner' in Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Vol 11 (neue Folge) Gütersloh, 1953.
- E. Lohse 'Martyrer und Gottesknecht' in FRL Vol 64, 1963.

- E. Lohse Martyrer und Gottesknecht; Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1955.
- A.F. Loisy L'Évangile et L'Église, A. Picard, Paris, 1902.
Les évangiles Synoptiques, Chez l'auteur, Ceffonds, 1908
Le quatrième évangile, Émile Nourry, Paris, 1921.
- H.K. Luce The Gospel According to St. Luke, (Cambridge New Testament). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1931.
- G.H.C. MacGregor Eucharistic Origins, J. Clark, London, 1939.
- T.W. Manson The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959 (Teaching)
The Sayings of Jesus, S.C.M., London, 1957, (Sayings)
 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels' in JRL, Bulletin 32, 1949/50.
The Servant Messiah, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1953.
 'Realized eschatology and the messianic secret' in Studies in the Gospels; Essays in honour of R.H. Lightfoot (ed. D.E. Ninham), Blackwell, Oxford, 1955.
 'The life of Jesus: Some tendencies in present-day research' in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in honour of C.H. Dodd (ed. W.D. Davies & D. Daube), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1956.
 'The New Testament basis of the doctrine of the Church' in JEH, Vol 1, 1950.
- W. Manson The Gospel of Luke (Moffatt N.T. Commentary), Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1930. (Luke)
Jesus the Messiah, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1943.
- R. Marcus Philo Supp. 11. Questions and Answers on Exodus (The Loeb Classical Library) Heinemann, London, 1953.
- H.G. Marsh The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism, University Press, Manchester, 1941.
- R.P. Martin Carmen Christi, Philippians ii.5-11 in recent interpretation and in the setting of early Christian worship, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967. (Carmen Christi)
- W.D. Maxwell An Outline of Christian Worship, Oxford University Press, London, 1955.
- A.H. McNeile The Gospel According to St. Matthew, Macmillan, London, 1910. (Matthew)
- N. Messel 'Den angivelige jødiske laere om Messias injente herkomst' in NTT, Vol 21, 1920.
 'Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch' in ZAW, Vol 35, 1922.
- W. Michaelis Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, C. Berstlemann, Gütersloh, 1926 (Matthäus)
- O. Michel Der Brief an die Hebräer, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1955.
- J.T. Milik Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (E.T.), Allenson, Naperville, 1959.

- C.J.G. Montefiore The Synoptic Gospels (Vol 1) Macmillan, London, 1927.
- G.F. Moore Judaism in the first Centuries of the Christian Era, the age of the Tannaim, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass) 1927-1930. (Judaism)
- F.D. Moule 'From Defendant to Judge and Deliverer: an inquiry into the use and limitations of the theme of vindication in the New Testament' in SNTS, Bulletin 3, 1953.
- '"Fulness" and "fill" in the New Testament' in SJT, Vol 4, 1951.
- J.H. Moulton & G. Milligan Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1952. (Moulton & Milligan)
- S. Mowinckel He That Cometh (E.T.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1956.
- 'Review of Engell's "Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East"' in NTT, Vol 45, 1944.
- The Psalms in Israel's Worship (E.T.) (2 Vols), Blackwell, Oxford, 1962.
- E. Mühlhaupt Luthers Evangelien-Auslegung (5 Vols), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1954-1960.
- D.E. Nineham The Gospel According to St. Mark, Penguin, London, 1963.
- C.R. North The Second Isaiah; Introduction, Translation & Commentary to chapters 40-55, Clarendon, Oxford, 1964.
- The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, Oxford University Press, London, 1948.
- M. Noth. 'Die Heiligen des Höchsten' in Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (ed. M. Noth), Chr. Kaiser verlag., Munich, 1960.
- A. Nygren Commentary on Romans (E.T.), S.C.M. London, 1955. (Romans)
- H. Odeberg The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World (E.T.), Almqvist & Wiksells, Uppsala & Stockholm, 1929.
- A. Oepke 'Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche, Matt. Xvi, 17-19 in der neuesten Forschung' in Studia Theologica 1948-1950.
- W.O.E. Oesterly 11 Esdras, Methuen, London, 1933.
- The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Clarendon, Oxford, 1925
- W.O.E. Oesterly Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, Pitman, London, 1911. & G.F. Box
- W.O.E. Oesterly Hebrew Religion, its Origin and Development, Macmillan, London, & T.H. Robinson 1930.
- R. Otto The Idea of the Holy (E.T.) Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1950.
- The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man (E.T.) Lutterworth, London, 1938
- H.P. Owen 'Stephen's Vision in Acts VII.55-6' in NTS, Vol 1, 1955.
- J. Pedersen Israel (Vol 1-11, 111-1V) (E.T.), Geoffrey Cumberlege, London, 1926, 1959.
- N. Perrin The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, S.C.M. London, 1963. (The Kingdom of God)
- A.M. Perry The Sources of St. Luke's Passion Narrative, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1919.

- E.Pfister 'Die στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in den Briefen des Apostel Paulus' in Zeitschrift für die Klassische Alterum, Vol 69, 1910.
- F.C.Porter The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers, J.Clarke, London, 1905
- N.W.Porteus Das Danielbuch, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1962.
- T.M.Preiss Le fils de l'homme, Montpellier, 1951.
- A.M.Ramsey The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, Longmans Green, London & New York, 1949.
The Gospel and the Catholic Church, Longmans Green, London & New York, 1956.
- A.E.J.Rawlinson St. Mark (Westminster Commentaries) Methuen, London, 1940.
(Mark)
'Corpus Christi' in Mysterium Christi (ed. G.K.A.Ball & A.Deismann), Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1930.
- F.Rehkopf Die lukanische Sonderquelle, J.C.B.Mohr, Tübingen, 1959.
- K.H.Rengstorf Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1949.
- H.Ringgren Sacrifice in the Bible, Lutterworth, London, 1962. (Sacrifice)
- H.Wheeler
Robinson 'Hebrew Psychology in relation to Pauline anthropology' in Mansfield College Essays presented to A.M.Fairbairn, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1909.
The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Duckworth, London, 1949.
'Hebrew Psychology' in The People and the Book (ed. A.S.Peake), Clarendon, Oxford, 1925.
The Christian Doctrine of Man, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1947.
'Prophetic Symbolism' in Old Testament Essays (ed. D.C.Simpson), Charles Griffin, London, 1927.
'The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality' in Werden und Wesen des Alten Testament, Töpelmann, Berlin, 1936.
Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Clarendon, Oxford, 1956.
- J.Armitage
Robinson St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, Macmillan, London, 1914.
- J.A.T.Robinson 'Expository Problems: The Second Coming of Christ in Mark 14.62' in Ext, Vol 67, 1956.
Jesus and His Coming, S.C.M.Press, London, 1957.
The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology, S.C.M.Press, London, 1963.
- H.H.Rowley Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Athlone Press, London, 1957
Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1935.
The Servant of the Lord and other Old Testament Essays, Lutterworth, London, 1952.
- D.S.Russell The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, S.C.M.Press, London, 1964.

- W.Sanday & A.C.Headlam Romans (ICC), T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1902.
- A.Schlatter Die Geschichte des Christus, Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1923.
Der Evangelist Matthäus, Calwer, Stuttgart, 1929 (Matthäus)
Das Evangelium des Lukas, Calwer, Stuttgart, 1931.
- K.L.Schmidt Der Rahmen Geschichte Jesu, Trowitzsch & Sohn, Berlin, 1919.
'Das Kirchenproblem im Urchristentum' in TB, Vol 6, 1927.
'Die Kirche des Urchristentums' in Festgabe für A.Harnack, J.C.Heinrichs, Leipzig, 1921.
'ἐκκλησία' in TWNT, Vol III.
Kanonische und apokryphe Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten, Zwingli-verlag., Zürich, 1944.
- N.Schmidt 'The Son of man in the Book of Daniel' in JBL, Vol 19, 1900.
- J.Schniewind Das Evangelium nach Markus und das Evangelium nach Matthäus (2 Vols), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1937. (Markus, Matthäus)
- S.Schulz 'ἀγγελία' 'κτλ in TWNT, Vol 1.
Untersuchung zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1957.
- A.Schweitzer The Quest of the Historical Jesus (E.T.), Macmillan, London, 1911 (Quest)
The Mystery of the Kingdom of God (E.T.), Macmillan, London, 1914
The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul (E.T.), Macmillan, London, 1931
- E.Schweizer 'The Son of Man' in JBL, Vol 79, 1960 (E.T.)
Lordship and Discipleship (E.T.) S.C.M.Press, London, 1960.
The Church as the Body of Christ, S.P.C.K., London, 1965.
Ego Eimi, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1939.
'Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwärtigung des Todes Jesus oder ein eschatologisches Freudemahl?' in Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol 2, 1946.
'Abendmahl im Neuen Testament' in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Vol 1 (rev. K.Galling & H.v.Campenhausen), J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1957.
- C.A.A.Scott Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957.
- E.F.Scott The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1926.
The Kingdom and the Messiah, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1929.
- R.B.Y.Scott 'Behold He Cometh with Clouds' in NTS, Vol 5, 1959.
- J.B.Segal The Hebrew Passover from Earliest times to A.D.70, Oxford University Press, London, 1963. (Hebrew Passover)
- E.G.Selwyn The First Epistle of Peter, Macmillan, London, 1946. (First Peter)

- M.H.Shepherd Pascal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, Lutterworth, London, 1960.
- A.N.Sherwin-White Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1963.
- E.M.Sidebottom The Christ of the Fourth Gospel, S.P.C.K., London, 1961.
- U.E.Simon A Theology of Salvation (A Commentary on Isaiah 40 - 55), S.P.C.K., London, 1953.
- E.Sjöberg Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch, C.W.K.Gleerup, Lund, 1946. (Menschensohn)
- Der Verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, C.W.K.Gleerup, Lund, 1955. (Verborgene Menschensohn)
- M.Smith 'Notes on Goodspeed's "Problems of New Testament Translation"' in JBL, Vol 64, 1945.
- W.R.Smith Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, A & C Black, London, 1927.
- W.Staerk Die Erlöserwartung im den östlichen Religionen. Untersuchungen zu den Ausdrucksformen der biblischen Christologie., W.Kohlhammer, Stuttgart & Berlin, 1938. (Erlöserwartung)
- E.Stauffer 'Zur Vor- und Frugeschichte des Primatus Petri' in ZKG, 1943-44.
- 'Zur Kindertaufe in der Urkirche' in Deutsches Pfarrerblatt, Vol 49, 1949.
- Jesus and His Story (E.T.), S.C.M.Press, London, 1960.
- New Testament Theology (E.T.), S.C.M.Press, London, 1955.
- J.S.Stewart A Man in Christ, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1954.
- N.B.Stonehouse The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ, Tyndale, London, 1958.
- H.L.Strack & P.Billerbeck Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Beck, München, 1922-28. (Strack & Billerbeck)
- B.H.Streeter The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Macmillan, London, 1924.
- V.Taylor Jesus and His Sacrifice, Macmillan, London, 1943.
- Forgiveness and Reconciliation, Macmillan, London, 1941.
- Behind the Third Gospel, Clarendon, Oxford, 1926.
- The Names of Jesus, Macmillan, London, 1954.
- The Gospel According to St. Mark, Macmillan, London, 1955 (Mark)
- G.H.P.Thompson 'The Son of Man : Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls' in ExT, Vol 72, 1961.
- L.S.Thornton The Common Life in the Body of Christ, Dacre Press, London, 1950. (Common Life)
- M.Thurian Eucharistic Memorial (2 Parts) (E.T.), Lutterworth, London, 1966.
- W.Thüsing Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1960.
- H.E.Tödt The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (E.T.), S.C.M.Press, London, 1965. (Son of Man)

- C.C.Torrey 'A Twice-buried Apocalypse' in Munera Studiosa. Studies presented to W.L.P.Hatch, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.) 1946.
- The Four Gospels, Harper, London, 1933.
- The Apocalypse of John, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1958.
- The Second Isaiah, Scribner, New York, 1928.
- 'The date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel' in JBL, Vol 50, 1931.
- 'In the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper was a Paschal Meal' in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol 42, 1951-52.
- C.H.Turner Catholic and Apostolic, Mowbray, Oxford & London, 1931.
- W.G.van Unnik 'Kanttekeningen bij een nieuwe verklaring van die Anamnese-woorden' in Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift, Vol iv (6), Aug., 1950.
- J.van Wageningen 'τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου' in Theologische Studien, Vol 35, 1917.
- P.Vielhauer 'Jesus und der Menschensohn' in ZTK, Vol 60, 1963.
- 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu' in Festgabe für Günther Dehn (ed. W.Schneemelcher), Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, Neukirchen, 1957
- B.Violet Die Ezraapokalypse, Leipzig, 1910.
- P.Volz Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, J.C.B.Mohr, Tübingen, 1934.
- C.von Orelli Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit, genetisch und sprachvergleichend dargestellt, Leipzig, 1871.
- J.Wach Sociology of Religion (E.T.), Kegan Paul, London, 1947.
- W.Weiffenbach Die Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu, Leipzig, 1873.
- J.Weiss Die älteste Evangelium, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1903
- Das Markusevangelium (Die Schriften des Neuen Testament) (rev. W.Bousset) (2 Vols), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1906-7.
- Earliest Christianity (= The History of Primitive Christianity) (2 Vols) (E.T.), Wilson & Erikson, New York, 1937.
- J.Wellhausen Das Evangelium Matthaei, Reimer, Berlin, 1904.
- Das Evangelium Marci, Reimer, Berlin, 1903.
- Das Evangelium Lucae, Reimer, Berlin, 1904.
- Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, Reimer, Berlin, 1911.
- 'Ἄρτιον ἔκλασεν, Mk.14.22' in ZNW, Vol 7, 1906.
- H.D.Wendland Die Eschatologie des Reich Gottes bei Jesus, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1931. (Reich Gottes)
- E.C.Whitaker Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy, S.P.C.K., London, 1960.
- D.E.H.Whitely The Theology of St. Paul, Blackwell, Oxford, 1964.
- R.McL.Wilson Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, Mowbray, London, 1960.

- H.Windisch 'Zur Problem der Kindertaufe im Urchristentum' in ZNW, Vol 28, 1929.
- H.W.Wolff Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, Evangelische verlag, Berlin, 1952.
- P.K.Yerkes Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism, A & C Black, London, 1953. (Sacrifice)
- Th.Zahn Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Deichert, Leipzig, 1922. (Matthäus).
- S.Zeitlin 'The date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel' in JBL, Vol 51, 1952.
- W.Zimmerli & J.Jeremias 'πᾶς Θεοῦ' in TWNT, Vol V, 1954, pp 653-713. (E.T. The Servant of God (rev. edn.), S.C.M. Press, London, 1965.) (Servant)
-