

Faith and Thought

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation
of the Christian revelation and modern research

Vol. 95

Number 1

Spring, 1966

ALAN E. WILLINGALE B.A., M.TH.

The Development of Doctrine in the New Testament

Introduction

The twenty seven books of the New Testament were written, on a conservative estimate, over a period of fifty years, roughly coinciding with the second half of the first century A.D. A more radical reckoning would make it extend another forty years into the second century to overlap the extra-canonical works of the Apostolic Fathers. A further fifteen to twenty years added at the front to take in the time from the beginning of the ministry of Jesus gives a total formative period of between two and four generations. Brevity set a limit to corruption.

Evidence of Development. The register of change in the earliest Church is the New Testament itself, but the traditional arrangement of entries does not exhibit a progression. The general drift may be discerned by re-ordering the books chronologically and fixing their authorship and provenance. Thereby is brought to view a map of types and even schools of theology. But to determine the precise direction it is necessary to go further and analyze the books themselves into layers of thought representing stages in the progress of theologizing. A pattern then emerges of a cascade from source through a succession of strata emerging in a broken stream. The five most clearly defined levels are (a) the teaching of Jesus (b) the teaching in the Primitive Church (c) Pauline doctrine (d) Johannine doctrine (e) consolidated Church tradition. The first is recovered by sifting the sayings of Jesus in the four Gospels to choose between, or reconcile, differences. The extreme position of some Form Criticism is that the whole of the framework of the narrative and most of the *logia* themselves are a product of the Church and not of Jesus. The first stratum,

of this footing, is bulldozed off, and the source must be sought at some lower level. The second is reconstructed by the collation and conflation of excerpts from many books, but most notably those by Luke. C. H. Dodd in his book *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936) distinguishes between the public proclamation of the gospel message (*kerygma*) and the instruction of converts (*didachē*). He reconstructs the former from the speeches in the early chapters in Acts and from the mnemonic confessional formulae in the Epistles. It consists of a recital of the saving events of the birth, life, death, burial, resurrection, exaltation and promised return of the Christ, with the minimum of interpretation. This and similar formulae, credal and liturgical, belong to an oral stage before the writing of the New Testament. The third and fourth are reached by raking out of the writings attributed to Paul and John the material that is original to them as distinct from that which they share with and derive from their predecessors. Their meditations mark an advance upon the ungarnished *kerygma* and un glossed confessions. The fifth is retrieved by riddling from the later books of the New Testament the fused cinders of the first incandescence.

Conditions of Change. Three main factors have variously been held responsible for or contributory to the development of doctrine in the New Testament. Viewed as objective historical events they are indicated by three breaks in the continuity of growth at which the growing tips of Christian thinking may be thought to have undergone mutations; (a) the jump from the pre-resurrection to the post-resurrection situation (b) the transition from a Palestinian to a Hellenistic milieu (c) a putative postponement of the return of the risen Lord. Regarded as subjective experiences they correspond to three crises alleged to have confronted the infant Church and forced revaluations of belief. With these three factors are connected the three crucial questions to which all the main problems of development are reducible; of whether, or to what extent, (a) the distinctive doctrines of Christianity are a product of the mind of Jesus or of the early community (b) Hellenism rather than Judaism furnished the dominant thought-forms (c) a total transformation resulted from the apparent deferment of the Parousia.

The Originality of Jesus. The claim of Jesus to be recognized as the creative Founder of Christianity has been challenged in two ways. First, by the attempted demonstration that the record of His words and deeds reveals not the mind and intentions of the historical Jesus but of a Christ fabricated by the faith of the first generation of Christians. Second, by a search for parallels to His teaching in that of contemporary or near-contemporary sectarian or Rabbinical writings, or for alternative sources among the religio-philosophical systems of the Hellenistic world.

The older Source Criticism of the Gospels, which created the Synoptic Problem, went no further than to unplat the first three Gospels into a handful of literary sources used by the final redactors. That these rediscovered compositions recorded the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus and faithfully represented their original setting and the structure of His thought was not seriously questioned. The newer Form Criticism grinds the Gospels into granules of oral tradition, milling off the contexts and inter-connecting narrative as so much husk, attributable to the special interests of the primitive community, and in the end is scarcely able to arrest the process before the grains themselves are pulverized into the dust of scepticism. The way out of this valley of despair is not a retreat into precritical entrenchments but an advance into a firmer affirmation of the valid distinction between the primary fact of the preaching and teaching of Jesus and the secondary and derivative activity of apostolic interpretation. Undeniably the evangelists, writing as representatives of geographically dispersed churches with differing theological traditions, have allowed post-resurrections problems to determine in part the selection and ordering of their material (Lk. i. 3; Jn. xxi. 25). The Gospels are not biographies with any pretensions to scientific accuracy, but highly-charged, *ex parte* pamphlets pressing the unique status and vocation of their subject. The first three conform to the kerygmatic skeleton of the earliest preachers. The fourth has its own design, but this too, though marked by strong, chronological pointers, follows rather a thematic schema. In all four the Passion narrative has been cast in a mould determined by a dogmatic scheme of prophetic fulfilment. The

parables bear signs of their application to Church problems differing from those which perturbed the original audiences. It does not follow that the facts have been deliberately distorted, but it does mean that their recording is already and irreversibly interpretative. The Fourth Gospel has long been recognized as a deliberately theological document. Only in recent years have the Synoptics been seen to be comparably slanted. They are little less sophisticated, little less examples of evolved and florescent theologies. On this showing the sayings of Jesus in all four Gospels are like gems which have been cut and faceted, mounted and foiled, so that new lights flash from them as a result of the jeweller's art. In the Fourth Gospel the artistry is a degree more elaborate than in the synoptics, and the pasting is more obtrusive. But the stones themselves are natural and not synthetic. The second method of rejection may be considered under Hellenism. Here it remains only to observe two things. First, the possibility cannot be dismissed that the teaching of Jesus itself developed in the two or three years of His ministry as a result of the reaction or lack of response to His preaching. But, since the evidence is always likely to be too narrow either to prove or disprove the hypothesis, it would be wise not to rest too much upon it. Second, the dogmatism with which some critics treat every prophecy by Jesus of His impending Passion and Parousia as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, a forecast after the outcome, is always open to be rebutted by the demonstration that the cardinal tenets of Christian doctrine make more sense on the postulate that they go back to a creative impulse in Jesus than that they do not. It is the special merit of Alan Richardson's book *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (1958) that it does just this.

The Influence of Hellenism. The Gospel was broadcast on ground fertilized, since the conquest of Alexander, by the Greek language and outlook. The effect of the soil on the growing plant is already patent in the immediately post-canonical group of writers of the first half of the second century known as the Apostolic Fathers. By the second half of the century in the works of their successors the Apologists, what Harnack called the 'acute Hellenization' of Christian doctrine, had reached an advanced state. Furthermore by the mid-second

century a hydra-headed heresy was erupting within the Church known by the portmanteau term Gnosticism. The gnostic theory was that man is composed of a spark of intrinsic immortality expelled from the realm of pure flame for some primordial revolt of the gods and incarcerated in a body of inherently evil matter, escape from which, to return to the paradise lost, is only by the possession of the correct knowledge (*gnōsis*). The basic motif was worked up into a variety of complex cosmogonies all drawing upon a common pool of religio-philosophical syncretism compounded of Greek philosophy and oriental mythology which had for two centuries leaked into the Levant. There were myths of a primal or prototype man, a tyrannical demiurge and a redeemer demigod, and sacramental, mystical or frankly magical escape-routes for initiates. Granted that such was the nursery of developing dogma, was it earlier the very matrix of the Gospel? Conceding that patristic theology is so soon clad in Greek categories, were these also the very swaddling clothes? and more, was the germinating seed itself not merely couched in the Greek language but also informed by the Greek spirit?

Rudolf Bultmann avers that much of the distinctive thought of Paul and John is determined by gnostic motifs. R. Reitzenstein, W. Bousset and others sought to prove the dependence of Paul on a Heavenly Man myth and the Mystery Religions.

Two counter arguments may be advanced in support of the view that the source of Christian doctrine is, in germ as least, the mouth of Jesus, and that any Hellenistic elements are intrusive upon a stream already established in a Judaistic channel. First, no Gnostic document is extant which with any show of probability can be proved both to pre-date and act upon the New Testament. Bultmann has to assume that Gnosticism, which traditionally has been known as a second-century phenomenon, was already full-blown at the time of the Gentile Mission. Overt allusion in the New Testament, *e.g.* to the heresy at Colossae and the spurious *gnosis* of 1 Tim. vi. 20 are late and antagonistic. Second, scholars such as W. L. Knox and W. D. P. Davies have adduced arguments for tracing the main categories of early Christian doctrine to Rabbinic or sectarian Judaism rather than Hellenism.

Some early staining of the waters by Hellenistic (not pristine Hellenic) thought must be admitted as a major impulse to development, but the evidence is strong that they were first drawn from Hebraic wells by the hand of Jesus.

Frustrated eschatology. The thesis of the book by C. H. Dodd mentioned above is that the prime cause of doctrinal development in the New Testament was the fading of the hope of Christ's return and that Greek influence only came in as a secondary cause to fill a vacuum thus created. Dodd's point of departure is the difference between 1 and 2 Thessalonians. The first letter held out the hope of an imminent Advent. After a delay of three or four years with no consummation, some reappraisal was called for, and the rest of the New Testament, which was written subsequently, is the memorandum of it. 'The consequent demand for readjustment was a principal cause of early Christian thought' (op. cit. p. 33). Jesus Himself had taught that the kingdom was being consummated, the *eschaton* realised, within His active ministry (Mk. i. 15; Mt. xii. 28; Lk. xi. 20). When the Parousia failed to materialize the Church went back on this doctrine. Development took two main lines (i) a reconstruction on a modified plan of the futuristic Jewish eschatology such as appears in 2 Th. i. 7-10; ii. 3-10; Mk. xiii and the Apocalypse; this led to a blind alley and ran out, in the second century, into the barren sands of Chiliasm (Millenarianism), which in the end was disavowed by the Church (ii) 'a concentration of attention upon the historical facts of the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus exhibited in an eschatological setting which have made clear their absolute and final quality as saving facts' (op. cit. p. 42). Such a 'realised eschatology', backward-gazing to past event instead of forward-looking to future dream, is found especially in Paul's doctrine of the new creation, the Platonic reinterpretation of the Age to come as a supra-mundane sphere in Hebrews, and above all in the Johannine sublimation of Jewish apocalyptic into a non-temporal mysticism.

In later works Dodd has given greater recognition to the degree to which Jesus Himself propounded a 'realised eschatology'. In this thesis his conclusions do not differ greatly from consistent eschatologists, such as Albert Schweitzer, who

read the progress of Christian doctrine in terms of an Hellenic cure for Jewish Apocalypticism of which Jesus Himself was a crazed victim. The apparent deferment of the Parousia is supposed to have forced upon the disappointed Church a complete revaluation of belief and practice. For a physical return upon the clouds was substituted a re-entry in spirit. Whatever in eschatology the Church refused to relinquish, but would no longer project upon the future, was referred to the completed life of the Christ. This is the whole explanation of the Gospels, and of the Fourth in particular. The Church had to reorganize itself as a permanent society, to institutionalize itself for an interminable programme of expansion. Whereas Jesus had taught an *interimsethik*, i.e. a moral code binding only for the short interval before His return, a rule had to be devised that would be valid always and everywhere. For this reason Matthew reads *didache* into *kerygma* in the Sermon on the Mount. A new emphasis was placed on the presence of the Spirit in the persisting Church, standing proxy for the departed Lord. Hence the doctrine of the Paraclete which *prima facie* conflicts with the Ascension. Had the gap been shorter no surrogate had been required. The sacraments underwent a change from parabolic signs of readiness for the last things into quasi-magical techniques for maintaining vitality until they arrived. The acme of this process is reached in Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel. Before the validity of some of these judgments is tested a common misapprehension needs to be removed. Some have thought that a single fact tells decisively against this scheme: the absence from the New Testament record of any crisis which necessitated a root and branch revision of the Christian message. They object that the expressions 'postponement' and 'deferment' beg the question because they presuppose a datable turning point. The problem with which Paul dealt in the second letter to Thessalonians was a local one and not one affecting the whole Church. Moreover, unless Luke invented the conversation preceding the Ascension (Ac. i. 6-8), the disciples knew they were in for a long wait. Nevertheless, it must still be allowed that (i) there is a difference between the New Testament writings, especially the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, which seems to betray a modification in

the hope (ii) the effect of a fading of the hope could be as great if it were not the result of a datable crisis in Church experience but only an indeterminate, progressive loss of the primitive tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet' (iii) if the return had taken place as soon as at least some in the early Church appear to have expected it the New Testament itself would never have been written. To that extent the existence of the New Testament witnesses to a lengthening of perspective. In what follows an attempt is made to sketch the course of development through the main stages by reference to the documentary analysis of the New Testament and the isolation of the dominant causes. Considerations of space determine the selection of those doctrines which most plainly illustrate the trends.

The Second Coming of Christ

The Expectation of Jesus. Jesus inherited a ready-made, dogmatic scheme of the Last Things from the apocalyptic tradition of the inter-testamental period. This had been created by political agitators who, under the literary devices of pseudonymity and privileged access to Divine secrets, incited the Jews to rebellion against occupying powers. They had invented the cast of celestial *dramatis personae*, the deterministic timetable of supra-mundane acts and scenes, and the imminent, catastrophic dénouement to the cosmic drama. The twofold critical question is: whether Jesus accepted or transformed this scheme, whether, that is, His eschatological programme was 'futuristic' or 'realized', and whether it was exhaustively one or the other. According to the theory of 'realized eschatology' the 'kingdom of God' is not to be understood as a 'realm' but a 'reign', which Jesus claimed to be inaugurating in His own person, words and deeds (Lk. xi. 20 and perhaps xvii. 21; Mk. i. 15). There remains, however, a group of irreducibly futuristic sayings in which He expects the cataclysmic wind-up of history within the generation (Mk. ix. 1; Mt. xvi. 28; Lk. ix. 27 cf.; Mk. xiv. 62; xiii. 30; Mt. xxiv. 34-6; Jn. xxi. 21-23). These are an embarrassment even if the 'Little Apocalypse' of

Mk. xiii be dismissed as a composite Church product. A balanced view of the attitude of Jesus to the future must take account of three things: (i) He was obliged to interpret His mission by reference to and in relation to the preconceived pattern. (ii) Nevertheless, He revised and rewrote the cosmic drama by casting Himself in the leading rôle of the heavenly Son of Man, modified the characterization by interpreting the extra-canonical apocalyptic tradition by reference to the canonical Daniel and the older prophetic tradition, and gave a twist to the plot by planning and executing a paradoxical consummation to burst the vessel with fresh content (iii) Yet still, at the end, He recognised an unfulfilled residuum of futurity which His solution did not immediately resolve and on which He declared Himself within His lifetime not merely unauthorized to pronounce but ignorant (Mk. xiii. 32 cf.; Ac. i. 7) Talk of the analogies of the fore shortening effect of views from mountain peaks and the loss from view of valleys intervening serves only to bolster a docetic opinion of omniscience in the Incarnate Son in conflict with Scripture.

The Retarded Return. There appears on the face of it to be a conflict of opinion on the nearness of the end. In some contexts the Parousia is imminent (1 Pet. iv. 7; Mk. xiii. 29; Rom. iii. 12; 1 C. vii. 29; Phil. iv. 5; Heb. x. 25, 37; Jas. v. 8f.; 1 Jn. ii. 18; Rev. xxii. 20). In others considerable delay is expected (cf. Mk. xiii. 7f. with Lk. xxi. 7-9 and Ac. i. 6f.). The suspicion arises that the latter proceed from a deliberate policy of dampening excessive enthusiasm. F. F. Bruce (*New Peake* pp. 928-30) uses as one criterion for the chronological arrangement of Paul's Epistles indications of a progression in his thinking on the Parousia, in particular a growing apprehension that his own death might intervene. The advance has affected whole areas of his thought. For example marriage, which in 1 C. vii. 1-8, 26-38 was at best a temporary expedient before the end becomes in Eph. v. 22ff. a permanent analogy of the relation between Christ and His Church. If Paul, writing probably in AD 50, had to disabuse the Thessalonians of the belief that the apocalyptic count-down was approaching zero (2 Th. ii. 1-12; cf. 1 Th. iv. 16f.), and Luke, writing perhaps in the eighties, had to caution against the same kind of fever (Ac. i. 6ff.), the author

of 2 Peter, whoever he was, writing certainly later than either (2 Pet. iii. 15f.) had to meet the taunt of delay and deal with it as a recognized theological problem (2 Pet. iii. 4) requiring exegetical solution (vv. 8ff.). Clearly by the turn of the century, in some parts at least, there was some loss of vigour in the hope. The official response was not, however, a pretence that the Lord was putting off the day or 'tarrying', but that those waiting were being impatient. Nothing was allowed to count for evidence against the pristine assurance.

Greek Transmutation. The contrast between the treatment of the doctrine in the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel is so strong that scholars have been unable to resist the temptation to choose the one and reject the other. Those who think that Jesus expected only a cataclysmic conclusion to history, regard the former as standing closer to His thought, and the latter as a Greek perversion of the Gospel. Those who like to think that Jesus scrapped the futuristic element in Jewish Apocalyptic without remainder, judge the Fourth Gospel nearer the essential genius of Christianity and the Apocalypse a regression to a pre-Christian dispensationalism and particularism. The stark antithesis is false. The Apocalypse is the radical revision of Jewish Apocalyptic, first undertaken by Jesus, taken to literary perfection. Every concept of the old tradition from Daniel onwards has been brought into captivity to Christ. If the result is bizarre, that is the essential idiom of the genre.

In the Fourth Gospel, by contrast, a futuristic and a fulfilled eschatology stand side by side, and this is a feature with a considerable weight in deciding the question of common or diverse authorship. The momentous stages of the apocalyptic eschatology are said to be both yet to be fulfilled prospectively and already realized presently. The final hour is coming (Jn. iv. 21; v. 28; xvi. 2, 25; vii. 6, 30) and has already arrived (Jn. iv. 23; v. 25; xvi. 32; xii. 23; xvii. 1). The general resurrection is still future (Jn. v. 28f.; vi. 39f. 44, 54; xi. 24), although the resurrection life is a potential possession in the present (Jn. xi. 25 cf.; iii. 15f. 36; vi. 40, 47). The traditional last Judgement is still awaited (Jn. v. 27-29; xii. 48) whilst the 'crisis' or 'dividing' is already taking place in the response to the preaching of Jesus (Jn. iii. 18-21; v. 24). The public

Parousia of traditional apocalyptic is still promised (Jn. xiv. 3 cf.; xxi. 23) but the Advent is also reinterpreted as a private return of Jesus to His 'friends' (v. 19) on spiritual conditions (v. 23), effected through the presence of the Spirit in the Church (v. 16f., 26). Some commentators have stressed the second of those elements to the exclusion of the first, as though John invented them. This is wrong because, as we saw above, the Synoptic record contains statements of 'realized eschatology' in the life of Jesus. Nevertheless the extra emphasis given to this aspect of the teaching of Jesus, and the different way in which it is expressed, owes something to a fresh situation in the Church and in particular to the Greek climate of the (possibly Ephesian) provenance. Other factors enter into the question of authorship but on this ground alone the conclusion seems inescapable that whilst the Apocalypse was written by a Jewish émigré to Asia Minor someone who was born there has had a hand in the final form of the Fourth Gospel.

The Person and Work of Christ

Three questions plot the path. Did Jesus assume or the Church apply His titles? Do some derive rather from Gentile than Jewish sources? Does later usage betray an abatement or abandonment of the expectation of an imminent Advent?

The Self Designation of Jesus. All four Gospels agree that He was reluctant to accept the title Messiah or (which is the same, 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. ii. 7) Son of God, although He accommodated some enquiries privately (Jn. iv. 26; Mt. xi. 2-5). Wrede explained this reticence by his theory of the Messianic secret, according to which the evangelists invented the injunctions of Jesus to silence (Mk. iii. 12; Lk. iv. 41) in order to excuse their installing Him in office whilst He was still strictly only the Messiah designate: in primitive belief Jesus only took up appointment as from and as a result of the resurrection (Rom. i. 4; Ac. ii. 36; xiii. 33). The real reason for His reserve was His rejection of nationalistic and materialistic connotations (Jn. vi. 15; Mt. iv. 3, 6; xii. 35-37). The title He expressly preferred was Son of Man (Mk. viii. 29-31; xiv. 61f.; Jn. i.

49-51; ix. 35-37). The model He chose for His conduct and career was the Servant of the Lord.

Son of Man. The main facts are clear. (i) The title does occur in the New Testament outside the Gospels except at Ac. vii. 56 (ii) In the Synoptics it is used virtually only by Jesus and then always of Himself. Analysis of Synoptic occurrences reveals (iii) three contexts; a future parousia, an impending passion, a present vocation; and (iv) that its use was confined to the period following Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi and almost exclusively to private audiences with His disciples. (v) Pre-critical orthodoxy set the titles Son of God and Son of Man in antipodal relation, to signify full deity, and true manhood. Originally almost the exact opposite was true. The former referred to a human being (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. ii. 7). The latter was a celestial personage in the apocalyptic tradition represented by Daniel (2nd century BC or earlier), the Similitudes of Enoch (c. BC 35-71) and 4 Ezra (c. AD 81-96). (vi) Jesus adopted a predelineated role, but adapted it to His own requirements by giving it a Danielic rather than Enochic interpretation (Mk. xiii. 62 quoting Dan. vii. 13) and reinterpreting it by reference to the Isaianic Servant.

Servant of the Lord. The facts here too are plain. (i) Isa. liii. was one of the *testimonia* adduced by the early preachers (Ac. viii. 32f.; 1 Pet. ii. 22-25; Heb. ix. 28). And yet: (ii) Nowhere in the sayings of Jesus is the title used as a self-designation (Lk. ii. 37 only cites and like Matt. viii. 17 is not interpretative of His Mission) (iii) In all four Gospels the passion narrative bears signs of being moulded by Psalms xxii and lxix but contains no allusion to Is. liii. (iv) There is no express identification in Paul (v) The Jewish Targums on Is. iii, refer the exaltation and glory to the Messiah but the humiliation and suffering to the nation (vi) The Servant is never the subject of any pronouncement by Jesus about His vocation, though He often fills the predicate when the subject is the Son of Man (Mk. x. 45; viii. 31; ix. 31; Mt. viii. 20). Must we conclude that the evangelists introduced both appellations? The application of the sufferings of the Servant to the Messiah and the synthesis of the disparate concepts of Messiah, Son of Man and Servant are plainly Christian novelties. The creative fusion, however, took place

not in the Church, but in the mind of Jesus. The thesis has been put forward that because He began His ministry with the knowledge that He was the Suffering Servant (Mk. i. 11.; Lk. iv. 16-20; vii. 22) and did not mention the Son of Man until later, the former was normative to His thinking, which was fundamentally prophetic, and that He only adopted apocalyptic terminology to locate Himself on the thought-map of His contemporaries. This will not do. The frank admission that the whole mode of Jesus' thought is alien to the modern mind is preferable to an attempt to disguise the fact by an appeal to docetism.

Jewish and Gentile Christology. Why, if they were the chosen keys to His thought, is so little overt made of these titles outside the Gospels? Paul uses neither. Luke, writing like the other evangelists after Paul, represents Jesus as using them but drops both from Christian vocabulary early in Acts (Ac. v. 56 and iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). The writer of the Apocalypse cites Dan vii. 13 (Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14) without using the title Son of Man despite his perfect grasp of the synthesis in the yoking of the images of Lion and Lamb (Rev. v. 5ff.). The reason may be that the peculiarly Jewish nomenclature proved an embarrassment in the Gentile Mission. The literal translation of the Aramaic periphrasis 'Son of Man' (meaning only 'man' or 'the Man') made bad Greek, and was liable to be confused with oriental myths and speculations of a primal or archetypal man. 1 Cor. xv. 47 may be polemically oriented against this type of thought. Similarly, to have used the Hebraism 'slave of Yahweh' in an environment in which slavery was an accepted social institution would have been to misrepresent the status of Christ and the character of God. Paul does not mind calling himself a 'slave of Christ' (Rom. i. 1) but shrinks from calling Christ the 'slave of God'. Luke in Acts gets round the problem by using the word 'boy' but Paul in Phil. ii. 7 (quoting perhaps an existing hymn) softens it to 'form of a slave'.

Attempts to establish Greek antecedents for other titles attributed to Christ have not proved convincing. In every case there is a Jewish candidate. For example, the expressions 'Lord' and 'Son of God' which in a Greek environment signified respectively the object of worship in a mystery cult and a

deified wonder-worker were already controlled by the Messianic significance of the latter and the use of the former in the Septuagint of God before ever the Gospel broke out of Palestine. That 'Lord' sprang out of an Aramaic background seems clear from early credal formulae using *Maran* (1 C. xvi. 22; xii. 3; Rom. x. 9; 2 C. iv. 5; Heb. vii. 14 cf.; Mk. xii. 35-37). Even the Logos doctrine of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel which may contain allusions to a principle of cosmology in the World-soul or Reason of Stoicism, of revelation in the Philonic commentary on Genesis i. and ii., of transcendence in the use of the word *memra* in the Jewish Targums as a paraphrastic avoidance of the Divine Name, of meditation in the Wisdom of Hellenistic Judaism, of soteriology in the teaching of the Corpus Hermeticum and was developed in the second century solely in reference to the first, nevertheless depends primarily upon the creative command of Gen. i. 3; Ps. xxxiii. 6 and the prophetic message of Jer. i. 4.

The Pre-existent, Cosmic Christ. Harnack had a neat theory of development in Christology which attributed it wholly to progressive hellenization. He held that in primitive Gentile Christianity there was an earlier 'adoptionist' type and a later 'pneumatic' type. In the former a man was assumed into the Godhead; in the latter a pre-existent being descended into flesh. Divine Sonship originally dated from the Resurrection (Rom. i. 4; Ac. xiii. 33) was first transferred to the Baptism (Mk. i. 11), then to the Birth (Lk. i. 35), and at last carried back in Paul and John into a pre-mundane eternity (Phil. ii. 26; Col. i. 15ff.; Jn. i. 1; viii. 58). To put it bluntly, the early Christians promoted their Lord to Godhood by degrees. The Achilles' heel of the theory is the pre-existence and cosmic status already implicit in the title Son of Man taken by Jesus. Nevertheless a progression may be discerned in the understanding of Christ's Person and Work which may be partly the result of a more leisurely reflection on the past attendant upon a relaxation of tension in the hope for the future.

The original kernel of the *kerygma* was the Passion story. Mark, the first Gospel, has no infancy story, Paul is apparently ignorant of (Gal. iv. 4) or disinterested in (2 C. v. 16) the matter. Matthew and Luke show considerable interest, but John seems

deliberately to substitute his Logos Prologue. The infancy stories and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth cannot, of course, guarantee the Deity or sinlessness of the Saviour. Nor do they prove pre-existence. The motive for their introduction is not to point to the Birth as a stage in an already established career but to insist upon Divine origin. John may have felt that the job had not been done efficiently. For him the Redeemer not only existed before birth, not only came from God, nor even simply took His source and origin in God, but was God (Jn. i. 1). In similar fashion the Wisdom Christology of Hebrews and Colossians goes far beyond the limited cosmic status and pre-existence of the Son of Man in Apocalyptic. Heb. i. 8ff. calls the Son of God by implication, and Col. i. 15, 19 stops just short of identity. The shift of interest from Christ as the *telos*, or goal of Creation (1 Cor. xv. 24-28) to Christ as its *archē*, or start (Col. i. 15ff.), which is the distinguishing feature of Wisdom Christology (from Prov. viii. 22-31) may well owe something to a sense of eschatological delay. But that is not the main point. These New Testament writers simply press to conclusion the logic of the claims of Christ; not merely those of Jesus regarding Himself, but those which He made upon His followers.

The Person and Work of the Spirit

Bultmann has a very radical view of development in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In the primitive preaching the Spirit is an independant personal power that takes temporary possession and causes miracles and striking mental phenomena. In Paul the Spirit becomes the power and norm of Christian conduct and the Bestower of the *charismata* (spiritual gifts). In John He becomes the power within the Church which brings forth both knowledge and the proclamation of the Word. The reason for the development is the disappointment in the hope of the return of Christ which made it necessary to reaffirm the presence in the Church of the Exalted Lord. Hence Paul's teaching on *charismata* and John's on the *Paraclete*. More specifically in Paul there

was the need to claim that the present life in the Church was the life of the Age to come.

Jesus and the Spirit. The teaching of Jesus is no more than germinal and John explains why: the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified (Jn. vii. 39). How then did Jesus understand the Spirit and His relationship to Him? On the face of it the Paraclete doctrine is unparalleled in the Synoptics. The word *parakletos* means 'helper' or 'advocate'. Jesus promises that He will send a *locum tenens* (a) to replace His physical presence (Jn. xiv. 16, 18; xvi. 7) (b) to guide the Church into a fuller understanding of His work (Jn. xiv. 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13). Both functions are to be found in the Synoptics though in the much more restricted context of prompting in testimony before magistrates courts (Mk. xiii. 11; Lk. xii. 12; Mt. x. 20). Peculiar to Luke (xi. 13) and for that reason commonly regarded as the evangelist's gloss rather than an exact report is the statement that the Father is ready to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask. The usual assumption is that in the Synoptics Jesus is speaking only within the terms of the common Old Testament and Jewish doctrine of the Spirit of God and that the writer of the Fourth Gospel has elaborated and applied the legal metaphor of advocacy beyond its original bounds. Was he justified in doing so? Express references on the lips of Jesus are few. To them may be added references occurring in words addressed to Him or read by Him. All other allusions may represent His thought but in a scientific examination must be eliminated as gloss. The first and second groups fall into two main categories (i) the outpouring of Joel (Jl. ii. 28ff.) (ii) the Servant-Messiah as the Bearer of the Spirit (Is. xi. 1-2; xlii. 1). To the first belong the prophecy of John Baptist (Mk. i. 8; Mt. iii. 11; Lk. iii. 16; Jn. i. 29-34) which Jesus must have absorbed into His self-awareness, the advocate function already mentioned which is part of the promise of the New Age, the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mk. iii. 29; Mt. xii. 32; Lk. xii. 10), and the exorcism connected with it (Mt. xii. 28). To the second belong the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism (Mk. i. 10; Mt. iii. 16; Lk. iii. 22; Jn. i. 32ff.), and the reading from Is. lxi. if. in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk. iv. 18) Jesus

added no new element to the old Jewish doctrine of the Spirit. His originality lay not in any fresh conception nor even in any novel combination. John Baptist had already synthesized the Joel outpouring with the Coming One (Mk. i. 18; Mt. iii. 11; Lk. iii. 16; vii. 19ff.; Jn. i. 29ff.) and moreover identified Jesus as the Spirit-Bearer and Baptizer. The new thing in the teaching of Jesus was His claim to be fulfilling the rôle. This is the point of His reply to the imprisoned John (Mt. xi. 4f.) which alludes to Is. lxi. if., and the claim that His activity is the inbreaking of the Kingdom (Mt. xii. 28). The evangelist plainly understood what Jesus had in mind when he quotes Is. xlii. (Mt. xii. 17ff.).

The Pentecostal Afflatus. The first Christians were not therefore unprepared to recognize the fulfilment of the Joel prophecy in the miraculous events of Pentecost (Ac. ii. 16-21). They are depicted as astonished at the Death and Resurrection (Lk. xxiv. 6, 11, 19ff.) but as expecting the outpouring of the Spirit (Ac. i. 2, 5, 8; Mt. xxviii. 19). If Jesus had indeed represented His Mission as the irruption of the Spirit-Age then these are no mere *vaticinia ex eventu*. In one respect, however, the earliest believers seem at first sight to have regressed from the teaching of Jesus. Peter refers to the Spirit as 'this thing' *i.e.* neuter, a force or influence (Ac. ii. 33). John Baptist seems similarly to have conceived the Spirit as an impersonal element or spiritual stuff, not unlike water or fire, in which a man might be immersed, whereas Jesus must have conceived Him as personal if He could act as an advocate and be blasphemed against. The dynamic, quasi-material concept of the Spirit has roots deep in the Old Testament. The Hebrew *ruach* like the Greek *pneuma* means basically 'air in motion', breath, or wind. The Greek word came to mean in a purely Hellenic setting, spirit or mind, in contrast to body, the ideal against the real. In the New Testament the Hebraic idea persists. The Spirit is miraculous divine power in contrast to human frailty and impotence. The Spirit is God at gale force. Such antithesis lies behind Jn. iii. 1-8. The sub-personal concept of this Spirit persists throughout the New Testament wherever such words as 'outpouring', 'giving', 'poured out', 'sealing' are used (*e.g.* Ac. ii. 38, x. 45; Rom. v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 22; 1 Th. iv. 18). Simon Magnus'

crazy bid to purchase the power with money (Ac. viii. 18ff.) is only conceivable on this assumption. On the other hand a more animistic, personal view is implied in the expression 'to lie to the Holy Spirit' (Ac. v. 3) and the guidance of Philip (Ac. viii. 29). Luke has a strong doctrine of the Holy Spirit in his two-volumed work on Christian beginnings so that it is difficult to tell how far his references betray his own doctrinal tendencies, but it is clear that we have to reckon with two concepts in the early Church, parallel to the Old Testament; on the one hand, a personal power taking possession of a man daemonically and over-riding his natural powers with supernatural ones, and on the other, an impersonal force which fills and overflows a man like a fluid, or inflates him to new dimensions with a pneumatic blast. Perhaps, since we are speaking of God Himself in action, both figures are needed to correct each other.

Alongside this dualism is another, also paralleled in the Old Testament, between the possession of the Spirit as a permanent endowment or 'seal' and possession by the Spirit for specific occasions and tasks. Again, these two are not incompatible. All believers were believed to enjoy the former and to have received the gift normally at baptism unless special defects in knowledge prevented it (Ac. ii. 38; xi. 47; viii. 15-17; xix. 1-6).

R. Bultmann reckons that two potential dangers were latent in the early doctrine of the Spirit which spelt possible danger for the Church. On the one hand, if special deeds of power were to be regarded as signs of endowment, then there would be a tendency toward the Hellenistic idea of the 'divine man' in place of the Christian. This tendency did in fact break out and shows itself in the extant legendary apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. Paul cautions against this kind of arrogance in 1 Cor. xiii. On the other hand, if the Spirit were held to be in subjective emotional experiences, the result might be individualistic ecstasy or mysticism in which the divine and the demonic would become indistinguishable. Paul foresaw this hazard too (1 C. xii. 2f.).

Paul on the Spirit. The man who did most to avert these disasters was Paul. As A. M. Hunter puts it, he did not originate the doctrine but advanced it in that he moralized, personalized and christianized it. Paul is the only writer in the New Testa-

ment who understands the Spirit as the power for ethical living (Gal. v. 22ff.; Rom. viii. 14). John Baptist demanded repentance as a pre-condition of and preparation for the gift, in this going beyond the prophecy of Joel. Jesus endorsed his demand when He announced that the Spirit-Age had arrived (Mk. i. 15) Peter too made moral reckoning a condition (Ac. ii. 38). But it was left to Paul to conceive the indwelling Spirit as the source of moral renewal. Further, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God' (Eph. iv. 30) fully personalized Him. What does Dr. Hunter mean when he says that Paul 'christianized' the concept? He does not mean that Paul identified Christ with the Spirit, for he recognizes that such an exegesis of 2 Cor. iii. 17 is doubtful. He means rather that Paul fully integrates the manifestations of the power of the Spirit within the Church, in 'helps' and 'governments' and all the *charismata* of worship (1 Cor. xii) with the work of Christ. What contemporary Judaistic belief thought of as a crude miracle of a future Messianic age, Paul taught as manifesting in the present the power of the resurrection (Rom. viii; 1 Cor. xv). Paul may be said to have gone further and 'theologized' the idea of the Spirit, that is, achieved a fuller expression than his predecessors of the full Deity of the Spirit. Much of the language used of Him might if taken alone be regarded as describing an agent at work under God, or God in action in a sub-personal way. Paul conceives of the Spirit as privy to the mind of God as a man's thoughts are open only to his own mind (1 Cor. ii. 11). Only the Fourth Gospel, in the Paraclete passages, has so high a view of the Spirit as this. The trinitarian formula occurs fairly frequently in Scripture (*e.g.* Mt. xxviii. 19; Rom. i. 1-4; xv. 30; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Col. i. 3-8 *etc*) but the doctrine of the Three in One is a much later product, a logical construct from the revelational evidence. AV. 1 Jn. v. 7 is, of course, not genuine.

The Sacraments

Baptism: Dominical Institution. Jesus could not Himself within His lifetime (Mt. xxviii. 19; Ac. i. 5) positively ordain a rite of

initiation into the Church because, as the evangelist explains (Jn. vii. 39), as yet the Spirit had not been given. The logic of John's disparagement of his own limited form (Lk. iii. 16), the early Church's critical rating of it (Ac. i. 5; xi. 16; xix. 1-5) and the figurative use in Mk. x. 38f. argue that Jesus found a mere water-lustration symbolically defective; for which reason, perhaps, He did not personally administer it (Jn. iv. 2). John's baptism, which was no crude *opus operatum*, but effective only on moral conditions (Mt. iii. 2, 8, 11), offered security from shipwreck in the cloudburst of wrath that was to flood the world on the irruption of the reign of God (Mt. iii. 2,7). The Messianic baptism, by contrast, would be at once a kiln-firing by immersion in the very element of judgement, the very storm of wrath, itself and an unction of the promised Spirit by which the rule of God should be established (Lk. iii. 16; Is. xxxii. 15; Ezek. xxxix. 29; Jl. ii. 28ff.). By this reasoning John's baptism ought to have evaporated. It appears, however, that Jesus endorsed its appropriation and adaptation (Jn. iv. 1; iii. 22) as an oath of allegiance to Himself (and hence the formula 'in His name', Ac. ii. 38, *etc*); and that His own submission (Mt. iii. 14f.) marked His formal ratification.

Pre-Pauline and Pauline Innovations. Christian, but not necessarily Hellenistic, additions were threefold: the sealing by the Name (1 C. i. 13; 2 C. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; Ac. viii. 16), the bestowal of the Spirit (Ac. ii. 38; viii. 16, 18; xi. 17; 1 Jn. ii. 20) and the elevation to the resurrection state (Rom. vi. 4-7; Col. ii. 12; iii. 1). Conceivably the disciples had already introduced the first within the lifetime of Jesus. The second is a post-resurrection phenomenon, an 'advance payment' or first instalment' (*arrhabōn*, 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; Eph. i, 14) of the eschatological out-pouring. The endowment was not inevitably, invariably and automatically connected with the due performance of the rite (1 C. x. 1-5; Ac. xix. 1-7; Jn. xx, 22). The interpretation of baptism as a dramatic representation of dying and rising again with Christ, and a proleptic actualization of the resurrection condition, must be secondary because the ceremony does not suit the symbolism of burial. Close analogy with initiation ceremonies into the Mystery Religions argues, but does not establish, a relation of dependence and derivation,

perhaps merely of invitation. Nor did Paul originate it (Rom. iv. 6. Do you not know . . . ?) Paul's own view is conditioned by the thought of incorporation into the body of Christ (1 C. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27f.) which is rather a development of initiation into the redeemed community than induction to a state. If, as seems most likely, 1 C. xv. 29 refers to a peripheral practice of vicarious baptism on behalf of deceased relatives to ensure their participation in the final resurrection, some at least in the early Church must have thought the rite effected the results symbolized. But Paul did not hold this view. Participation in Christ's death takes place outside baptism also (cf. Rom. vi. 4-7 with Gal. ii. 19f.; vi. 14; Rom. vii. 4). Where effects are magically ensured exhortation is superfluous (Rom. vi. 11f.).

Sacramentalism. Allusions in books written by or under the influence of Paul to rebirth (Tit. iii. 5; Jn. iii. 3, 5; 1 Pet. i. 3, 23) and illumination (Heb. vi. 4; x. 32; Eph. i. 18) are probably all indirect references to baptism. It is a mistake to regard these as evincing a higher degree of sacramentalism or as the adoption of technical terms from the Mystery Religions. Sacramental efficiency was probably implicit from the start, albeit dependant on moral and spiritual conditions. Baptism in Scripture is not something a man does or does not to himself but that he submits to and receives. The New Testament writers were alive to the dangers of formalism (1 Pet. iii. 21). The Sacrament of Christian baptism is not directly mentioned in the Fourth Gospel although oblique allusions appear at Jn. iii. 5; xix. 34. The reasons for this cryptology are considered below in relation to the Lord's Supper. The story of the feet-washing (Jn. xiii. 3-20) does not merely supply an answer to the clumsy question, Who administered Christian baptism to the Twelve?; it explains more, that only that baptism joins men to Jesus, which is received at His own hand. This is John's anti-sacramentalist polemic.

The Lord's Supper

Dominical Institution. Did Jesus institute a cultic feast as a memorial of His death to be recurrently celebrated until

His return? There are three independent accounts; the Pauline (1 Cor. xi. 23–26), the Markan (Mk. xiv. 22–25, on which Mt. depends), and the Lukan (Lk. xxii. 16–19a; to which the Western reading 19b–20 is added from 1 C. xi). Their witness does not coincide. Of the two motifs, the sacrificial and the eschatological, Mark gives precedence to the first, Luke preserves only the second, and Paul holds both in balance, but with the latter transmuted. Which motif is the more original? The eucharistic prayer in the Didache, which clearly derives from a pre-Hellenistic, Palestinian source is eschatological throughout and makes no mention of the death. If ‘body’ in Luke xxii. 19a refers to the oneness of mystical fellowship (cf. 1 C. xii. 12f.) rather than the brokenness of death, Luke appears to concur and to preserve the more ancient emphasis. It seems likely, however, that Luke had a reference to the cup and therefore to the sacrificial death before the Pauline substitution. Both stresses are equally original. Jesus was acting a parable in which the Twelve stood proxy for the Israel-to-be. He was anticipating both the heavenly banquet which was a standard feature of the Age to come (cf. Mt. v. 6; viii. 11; xxii. 2; Lk. xiv. 15ff.) and also the covenant-union which He purposed His death should seal. The first element had already been adumbrated publically in the feeding of the five-thousand (Mk. vi. 32–44; Lk. ix. 11–17), whilst the foreshadowing of the second had been the subject only of private communications to His select disciples (Mk. viii. 31f.; ix. 9f., 31f.; x. 32–34, 45). The difficulty is that the eschatological references in Mk. xiv. 25 and Lk. xxii. 16 seem to envisage immediate entry upon the final reign of God without an interval, whereas Paul construes the words of institution to embody a command to repeated commemoration during an adjournment of the Advent. Even if 1 C. xi. 26 were discounted as Paul’s gloss, the words ‘remembrance’ and ‘as often as’ which are embedded in the very words of institution (1 C. xi. 24f.) would maintain the problem. It is inconceivable that Paul or any one of his predecessors should have interpolated them on his own authority. Paul claims to have received and be transmitting a tradition deriving from Jesus Himself (1 C. xi. 23) The antecedents of *anamnēsis* are Jewish (Exod. xiii. 9; Num. x. 10), not Hellenistic. The solution must

depend upon a total view of the intention of Jesus. If He meant to found a Church (*see below*) He might consistently have made provision for His influence to be kept live in it.

Pre-Pauline and Pauline Innovations. Some scholars have argued that the sacrament took its origin in the table fellowship of the common meals which Jesus shared with His disciples when He pronounced a grace or prayer of thanksgiving (*eucharist*). The celebration was originally in one kind only because wine formed no part of a poor man's meal. Hence the primitive title 'Breaking of Bread' (Ac. ii. 42, 46; xx. 7), the setting within the ordinary daily meal (Mk. xiv. 18, 22; Lk. xxii. 14; 1 C. xi. 25), and the meal-time appearances at which wine is not mentioned (Lk. xxiv. 30; Jn. xxi. 12-14). Paul is supposed to have added to this simple table tryst a re-enactment of the Last Supper, transforming it into a cultic banquet after the manner of the Mystery Religions at which initiates might participate in the death and resurrection of the chosen deity. The Corinthians could only have secularized their table communion (1 C. xi. 20-22, 23f.) if they did not know that it should be taken to stage again the Lord's death (1 C. xi. 26) and their taking part in it (1 C. xvi.; xi. 27-29). Paul was teaching them a new thing.

According to this view the Pauline doctrine has developed the original institution in five respects: (i) the cultic transformation of the Last Supper (ii) the symbolism of breaking the bread and pouring out the wine (1 C. xi. 24 RSV marg. 25 cf. Mk. xiv. 24) (iii) the perpetuation as a memorial feast (iv) the communion with the risen Lord conceived as personally present in the act, *i.e.* the real presence (1 C. x. 4, 14-22 cf.; Lk. xxiv. 30; Jn. xxi. 12-14) (v) the flesh and blood of the risen Christ as supernatural food by which His life is transferred to participants (1 C. x. 3f., 16-22; xi. 29 cf. Jn. vi. 51-58). But as regards these: (i) Paul seems to have been responsible for only one innovation consisting in the separation of the Eucharist or Lord's Supper from the *Agape* or Love-feast, and not the identification of the former with the latter (1 C. xi. 20, 23f.) (ii) If Jesus alluded to His sacrificial death He must almost inevitably have exploited the obvious symbolism (iii) To have established a memorial on the style of the Old Testament festivals to keep green the gratitude of the redeemed (*e.g.* Exod. xii. 14; xiii. 9) is in

keeping with Jesus' aim of founding a New Gospel (see below) (iv) and (v) which features are absent from the words of institution in any of the extant recounts and approximate most closely to the theory of the Mysteries, are not peculiar to Paul but common to all with a Hellenistic background.

John and After. A remarkable feature of the Fourth Gospel is the absence of an institution narrative. Its place is taken by the feet-washing (Jn. xiii. 1-11). At the same time a discourse on the bread of life arising out of the feeding of the five-thousand is the occasion for sacramental theorizing (Jn. vi. 26-35, 41, 47-58); and baptism finds mention in the same covert manner (Jn. iii. 5; xix. 34). Why is this? One possible answer is that already by the turn of the century mention of the sacraments is suppressed by a *disciplina arcani*. Another is that the omission is part of John's polemic against the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover Meal (Jn. xiii. 1; of Mk. xiv. 12, 16, 17). The fuller reason is rather that the Gospel was written not so much to divulge fresh information as to furnish an authoritative interpretation. John's total understanding of the Last Supper must be gathered partly from the theology of chapter six, and partly from his peculiar theological position. The final discourses, comprising a commentary upon a concluding theophany to a whole life of theophany, include the Paraclete sayings (Jn. xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7) which teach the risen Lord's presence in a new mode (compare Paul). The discourse of chapter six speaks of eating flesh and blood in what looks like crude material terms which are deliberately set against the foil of misunderstanding (Jn. vi. 52). The bottom hinge of John's sacramental theology is that the procession of the Spirit depends upon the prior glorification of the Son in death (Jn. vii. 39; xii. 23; xx. 22 and the Paraclete promises). The bestowal of life comes only through the Spirit. John must then consistently avoid an account of the Last Supper which might suggest that Jesus could distribute the effects of His death before it had occurred. The top hinge is that the most realistic language of feeding on flesh and blood is only tolerable if the Spirit be understood figuratively (Jn. vi. 63).

Outside the New Testament Ignatius takes the trend a stage further when he describes the communion elements as the

'medicine of immortality' (Ad. Eph. xx. 12). This is usually taken to represent Johannine theology at its logical terminus, but it is only fair to say that John would have repudiated the implication of immortality by dosage and that neither he nor Paul can be held guilty of Ignatius' replacement of their present foretaste of the future by his endless enjoyment of the timeless.

The Church

The Intention of Jesus. Did Jesus really mean to found a new religious community to which Gentiles would be recruited, or did He seek only the reformation of Israel through the medium of another Jewish sect? J. Jeremias points out that Jesus condemned the foreign missions of the Pharisees (Mt. xxiii. 15) and within His lifetime forbade His disciples to preach to non-Jews (Mt. x. 5). He expressly limited His own mission to the house of Israel (Mt. xv. 24) making exceptions only for the most importunate Gentiles (Mk. vii. 26; Mt. viii. 5ff.), a policy confirmed by Paul's description of His ministry (Rom. xv. 8). Verses which presuppose the Gentile Mission *e.g.* Mk. xiii. 10; xiv. 9; Mt. v. 13f.) or its inception by the risen Christ (Mt. xxviii. 19) are rated inferior evidence of His historical purpose. Similarly Jn. iv. 21-26, 41f. is supposed to illustrate Church hindsight.

On the other hand, within the Synoptic record, His breaking off the reading of Isa. lxi. if. before reaching the reference to God's vengeance on the Gentiles (Lk. iv. 16ff.), and His promise that they should have a share in salvation (Mt. viii. 18f.; xii. 41), an allusion to the Old Testament theme of the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion (Isa. ii. 2f.; Mic. iv. 1ff.), argues a less myopic view.

Albert Schweitzer opines that He may have thought of the elect from the heathen (Mt. xxi. 43) as destined to take the place of those among the elect of Israel who were disobeying His call (of the threat of John Baptist, Mt. iv. 9). For this reason He restricted His personal Mission to Israel because God Himself would appoint the Gentile candidates who were to fill up the number of the elect. The task which His commission did

not take in fell to Paul (Rom. xi. 13f., 25f.), who regarded the mystery of the inclusion of the Gentiles as a post-resurrection disclosure, and one with which he was peculiarly favoured (Eph. iii. 1-10). The germ of the formation of the Church lay, no doubt, in a unique loyalty demanded by Jesus the reward for which would be the future participation with the Son of Man in glory (Mt. v. 11f.; Mk. viii. 35ff.). If T. W. Manson is right, the Son of Man is a corporate, inclusive concept (so originally Dan. vii. 13 and 'the many' Mk. x. 45; xiv. 24 from Isa. liii. 11). Jesus was setting out to collect the true Remnant about Him to form the corporate entity, Son of Man. The description 'little flock' (Lk. xii. 32) exactly expresses the idea, and for that reason must surely be genuine. Every action of Jesus was studied. He set out to reconstitute Israel. His choice and appointment of the Twelve (Mk. iii. 14ff. and parallels) was an acted parable typifying and constituting a nuclear Israel. In the new world they were to be princes and patriarchs of a re-created People of God (Mt. xix. 27; Lk. xxii. 28ff.; Rev. xxi. 14) That is why Peter attached so much importance to making up the number and by the deliberately non-natural method of co-option by sacred sortilege (Ac. i. 22, 26). The crux at Mt. xvi. 18 coheres with this design. Jesus recognises Peter's confession that His Father has selected this member of the Twelve to be the first stone to be cemented to the foundation on which re-built Israel was to be erected (cf. 1 C. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 4ff.). But has the word *ekklēsia*, or its Aramaic or Hebrew equivalent, been read back on to the lips of Jesus? That depends on how the word was used in the early Church.

The Eschatological Congregation. Did primitive thought move from the idea of totality to the parts or from separate communities to the whole, from a 'catholic' concept of a transcendental entity manifesting itself in every place or from a 'congregationalist' picture of a host of little groups federating or amalgamating into one whole? In the Septuagint the Greek *synagōgē* as a rule is used to translate *ēedah*, the empirical congregation, whilst *ekklēsia* is reserved for *qahal*, the ideal covenant community, except that in the plural the latter is occasionally employed of separate meetings of people. Statistically nearly all

the New Testament occurrences of *ekklēsia* refer to local communities, a usage which probably owes more to the ordinary Greek for a public assembly of citizens duly summoned than to either the Septuagint plural or to etymology. No New Testament writer ever uses the singular as a collective, but very occasionally of a heavenly entity. (Eph. i. 22; v. 32f.). The Church idea, the concept of a spiritual seed or Remnant, a hidden band of loyalists who constitute a core of hope for the nation, has roots deep within the Old Testament (e.g. 1 Kg. xix. 14, 18; Isa. vi. 13; Ezr. ix. 2). Contemporary sectarian Judaism was full of the boast. *Ekklēsia* (*qahal*) on the lips of Jesus at Mt. xvi. 18 is a perfectly possible, and indeed probable, indication of His plan. Moreover, the currency of the New Israel concept in the New Testament is only explicable on the assumption that Jesus introduced it (Ac. iii. 25; Gal. vi. 16; Rom. ii. 29; Phil. iii. 3; Jas. i. 1; ii. 4-10; Rev. xxi. 9-14; Jn. iv. 22). The earliest Church had this awareness of being the 'congregation of Israel' at the 'end of days' (Ac. ii. 17ff.; xv. 14ff.) only because Jesus Himself had induced it.

The Body Concept. As time went on the Church lost the sense of proximity to the end of all things and began to come to terms with living in a pagan world. The Church ceased to be regarded as a dynamic fellowship of salvation galvanized by the Spirit, and came rather to be thought of as a static institution ruled over by priests who, as technicians in the sacred, were trained to draw strengthening grace from a cultic machine. The drift is already clearly discernable in the Apostolic Fathers. Can we also detect the trend within the New Testament? The plainest indication is supposed to be Paul's adoption and development of the body concept. F. F. Bruce (*New Peake* p. 938) notes a progression. At first he uses it as a mere simile by social analogy of the local congregation (1 C. xii. 12ff.; cf. vi. 15ff.; Rom. xii. 4). At this stage the head is one member amongst others. Later the figure of speech reaches beyond simile, Body and Head are set in hierarchical relation, and the application is to the Church catholic (Eph. i. 23; iv. 12; xv. 23; Col. i. 18; ii. 19). Radical scholars hold that Ephesians and Colossians are deutero-Pauline and represent a stage at which the concept had developed in a gnostic direction, when the

Church was conceived as a cosmic entity and celestial bride, as pre-existent and supramundane as the cosmic Christ Himself (so Eph. v. 25ff.; Col. i. 15ff.). Certainly these ideas appear shortly afterwards in the Apostolic Fathers (2 Clem. xiv. 1ff. Hermas Vis. ii. 4, 1; Ign Ad Smyr. i. 2; Ad Tr. xi. 2; Ad Eph. iv. 2). However, there is nothing peculiarly Greek or pagan or gnostic about the body-concept or the divine marriage that goes with it. There are four possible sources from which Paul could have derived the former: (i) the classical metaphor of the body of a commonwealth (ii) the eucharistic reference (1 C. x. 16f.) (iii) the Semitic category of social solidarity or corporate personality (iv) his own experience on the Damascus road (Ac. ix. 4 cf.; Mt. x. 40; xxv. 40). The first of these would not account for the catholic idea in Ephesians and Colossians. Possibly the last three were all united in Paul's mind by the doctrine of faith-union (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25). The idea of a divine marriage of God with Israel is writ large in the Old Testament (Ca.; Isa. lxi. 10; Hos. iii. 1ff. *etc*). There is no clear instance in the New Testament of an allusion to a pre-existent Church (the meaning of Rev. xii. 1ff. is extremely obscure).

The most noteworthy feature in the Pauline use of the body-concept is his care to stop short of such identification between Head and Body as would justify the highly misleading expression 'the extension of the Incarnation'. The combination with the marriage metaphor strengthens this resolve. The same care appears in John's use of the Old Testament image of the Vine (Jn. xii. 1f.). There is no gnostic confusion here, even if both writers have elevated the Church from earth to heaven. They are, of course, simply anticipating the eventual eschatological fulfilment of the union between the congregation of the last days and the Lord from the future.

The Ministry

The idea of the ministry matches the idea of the Church and the development in the one marches in step with development in the other.

The Provision of Jesus. Jesus made the very sketchiest administrative arrangements for the rule of the Church. The reason for this is not that He intended no such body but that He wanted it to be entirely Spirit-ruled in the interval before His return. Nor was this a foolhardy attitude in one who did not know the length of the interval. If the ultimate state of the heavenly community was to be awash with the Spirit there was no point in half-measures. The very lack of organisational detail was a deliberate policy (Mk. x. 35-45). The only provisions He did make were aimed to determine the specific nature of and encourage cohesion in the Church. These provisions were the appointment of the Twelve, the commissioning of Peter and the conferring of the power of the keys.

The twelve were not appointed to be office-holders in an institution but symbolic representatives of an ideal community and the cohesive core of its inception. They were the compendium of the New Israel, its fresh foundation (Eph. ii. 20 [perhaps]; Rev. xxi. 4). The fact that no two lists of their names agree suggests that their corporate significance exceeded their individual importance. Did Jesus Himself call them apostles? Luke says that He did (Lk. vi. 13) and Matthew associates their appointment with their dispatch on a mission (*apostellō*; Mt. x. 2, 5). Both depend on Mark who does not use the title in his account of their selection (Mk. iii. 14), although he does in connection with their mission (Mk. vi. 30). The Evangelists depict Jesus as sending the Twelve on a training course in Palestine in preparation for the world-wide mission that should follow His resurrection. Do they misrepresent Him any more than the Fourth Gospel which, without using the term 'apostle', portrays Jesus as commissioning the Twelve to be His witnesses (Jn. xiv. 26; xv. 27; xx. 21). Whether as a patriarchate or apostolate, their function was to be an active kernel of the New Israel to which true Jews should adhere. Jesus kept them by Him throughout His ministry (Mk. iii. 14) so that they might be His witnesses.

The primacy of Peter and the power of the keys are bedevilled by controversy but incontrovertibly scriptural. Peter received a special commission from the Chief Shepherd (Jn. x. 10; 1 Pet. v. 14; Heb. xiii. 20) to shepherd in His absence

(Mk. xiv. 27) not only the sheep of the little flock (Jn. xxi. 5; Lk. xii. 32) but also his fellow shepherds (Lk. xxii. 32). In different imagery, the authority of the keys wielded by the exalted Christ (Rev. i. 18; iii. 7) was vested in the apostles as a group (Mt. xviii. 15-20; Jn. xx. 23; Mk. xiii. 34) but the actual exercise of the prerogative conferred upon Peter (Mt. xvi. 19; Ac. v, 9). Peter was the first to be given a commission by the risen Christ (1 C. xv. 5; Lk. xxiv. 34 cf.; Gal. i. 16ff.; v. 9). The basis of this privileged position was not the possession of special qualities of intellect or character but the election of God. Jesus Himself did not choose him as He had selected the Twelve, but merely acknowledged His Father's nominee (Mt. xvi. 17). There was no question of Peter's being His sole vicar in His absence; the whole apostolate, even outside the Twelve, claimed this right (2 C. v. 20). Nor was Peter promised precedence at the Parousia; otherwise James and John could not have still contended for it (Mk. x. 37). Nor is there any word of a Petrine succession. The opportunity to mention it is not taken at Jn. xxi. 18f. If Peter appoints James his successor at Ac. xii. 17, which is extremely doubtful, it cannot be as leader of the Twelve. Nevertheless Jesus accorded to Peter a peculiar priority in the launching of the Church which polemical zeal has generally prevented Protestants from acknowledging.

Ecclesiastical Offices. The burning questions are (a) why within so short a time as the mid-second century there appeared first a diversification of offices within the Church, subsequently their graduation into a hierarchy and eventually the transformation of the institutional officials into entlic functionaries (b) to what extent this movement is already showing in the New Testament. The Church Order of the Pastorals is patently different from that in Ac. ii.

The twelve never ruled the Church as an exclusive college, although their special dignity continued to be recognized (1 C. xv. 5). Probably from the start the apostolate was a much wider body. To be one of the Twelve the qualifications were first-hand experience of Jesus from the time of John's baptism and witness of the resurrection (Ac. i. 21f.). To enjoy equal rank demanded a direct commission by revelation of the risen Lord (so Paul and James, 1 C. xv. 7ff.). But many others were apostles

(Ac. xiv. 4, 14; Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Th. ii. 6). The earliest Church was a pneumatocracy, ruled and guided by the Spirit (Ac. v. 3, 9; viii. 18ff., 29, 39; xiii. 2, 4 *etc.*). The wording of Gal. ii. 9 is not a jibe at the authority of the Jerusalem triumvirate but an accurate description of the indeterminate nature of their authority. The apostolate had an extensible complement and elastic function. The Twelve, no doubt, first set the norm of doctrine and association (Ac. ii. 42 cf.; 1 Jn. ii. 19) and tried to retain supervisory rights over the whole Church (Ac. viii. 14ff.; xi. 22) but it was not long before their rudimentary machinery of government could not cope with the explosion of membership. Each apostle was then presumably left to be responsible for the Churches of his own planting.

Since events overtook the inadequate administrative structure the theory of the ministry must be largely *ex post facto*. James, who appears to have enjoyed some sort of presidency in Jerusalem (Ac. xii. 17; xv. 2, 18) might well have founded a caliphate had not the Gentile Mission brought in the Greek world to redress the balance of the Jewish. Perhaps because the Twelve were being scattered (Ac. xii. 2, 17) the rule in Jerusalem began to pass into the hands of elders (Ac. xv. 4, 6, 22; xxi. 18) on the model of the synagogues. Events overtook the Apostles in the election of the seven Hellenistic 'deacons' (Ac. vi. 1f.). The Twelve did not appoint them but only ratified their popular election (Ac. vi. 3ff.). One of their number, Stephen, began immediately to usurp the authority and function of the Apostles in exercising a preaching task which they had reserved to themselves (Ac. vi. 2, 10ff.).

All these facts suggest that in the earliest Church there was no clear idea of the ministry, and in particular, no clear distinction of function. Later, there becomes apparent a distinction between officials of the institution and *charismatics* *i.e.* persons whose only authority derives from manifesting 'spiritual gifts'. At first probably all officials were *charismatics*. In the Pastorals the emphasis has changed and the qualifications for a bishop or deacon began to read like the job description for an advertisement in *The Guardian* (1 Tim. iii. 1ff.). The names now stand for substantive ranks in an establishment which has settled to the expectation of permanency in history.

The bishop has not yet been raised and singled out as in Ignatian nonepiscopacy.

Theories of Development

Space forbids an attempt to answer the questions whether the changes noticed may properly be said to be an unfolding of elements already present at the start or represent injections of novelty from extraneous sources, or whether, again, they were bound to occur by some necessity of logic, history or revelation. Many dogmatic theories have been propounded, of degeneration from pristine purity, of immanent entelechy, of *ad hoc* revelations to selected apostles. The theory expounded in the New Testament itself is of the transmission from Christ and the Apostles of a fixed tradition (1 Th. ii. 13; iv. 1; 2 Th. ii. 15; iii. 6; Gal. i. 9; 1 C. xi. 2, 23; xv. 1, 3; Rom. ii. 16; Phil. iv. 9; Col. ii. 6; Jude. iii; 2 Pet. ii. 21). In the Pastorals the *paradosis* (tradition, transfer, transmission) becomes (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14; ii. 2) the *parathēkē* (desposit, trust) of 'the Faith'. Two things should be noticed in this theory (i) The Apostles are thought of not as receiving additional impartations of information by revelation (1 C. xv. 1; Gal. i. 18; ii. 2) but only as being inspired with a fresh and deeper understanding (Gal. i. 11, 17; 2 C. xii. 1-4; and the Paraclete passages in Jn.) The theory itself undergoes development; the Pastorals admit, in effect, that the age of discovery or formative period is past in the change-over from a dynamic to static metaphor.