

THE INFLUENCE OF APOCALYPTIC ON THE MIND OF JESUS

being

(A Psychological, Critical, and Historical Study.)

ProQuest Number: 13905287

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13905287

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

S U M M A R Y.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

Thesis defined viz.- The mind of Jesus too virile, well balanced, well grounded in the natural and normal to be dominated by Apocalyptic.

The mind of Jesus herein signifies His total attitude and outlook (*Προσέω*)

The attitude of Jesus herein maintained to be a friendship towards men which transcended while it embraced service--a faith which courageously faced and endeavoured to triumph over circumstances rather than sought escape from them--friendship and faith being inspired and nourished by constant fellowship with God.

....

C H A P T E R (I.) p.9.

The Mind of Jesus.

No other pre-supposition than the real humanity of Jesus-- racial, environmental and literary influences--wide cultural influences--emphasis on the Psalms--life (His) best understood as answer to human need--identified Himself completely with

th/

man experience--really tempted--walked by faith.

CHAPTER (11) p.21

Apocalyptic, Messianism, and the Son of Man

Impact of apocalyptic came by the avenue of Messianism--
 ssianism defined as an ideal--ideal as found in the Pss.of Sol.--
 ssiah and Son of man as names or titles for Jesus--His preference
 r Son of man--its individual and collective meaning("societary")
 meaning given to it by Jesus viz.- manliness, humanity, friendship,
 rvice, redemption, potential divinity.--Schweitzer's theory stated
 d rejected--Matt.X.23 and Mark.Xl11 not good evidence for
 ocalypitic note in Jesus' teaching--Mark XlV.62 valid--Jesus'
 eal not simply that of Is.L111--Views of Cadoux, Moffatt, and
 nson considered--Renan's emphasis on personalised ideal which
 aswer to human craving and need, herein upheld.--AUTHORITY--
 o what extent did apocalyptic messianism furnish Jesus with
 he necessary authority for the proclamation of His ideal?--
 esus avoids the title 'Messiah'--rejects 'Force' found in
 ocalypitic ideal--turns from Law of Moses and apocalyptic to
 ore ancient and inward authority- emphasises immediate experience
 f God, and witness in the general soul of men--stream of thought
 n O.T. which revealed man as potentially divine.--Isaiah Vll
 nd lX;Ps.Vlll and Zech.Xl1 support kinship of man and God--

Greek influence and teaching --Jesus teaches that sonship = identification of human and Divine will--from this union come Divine power and authority to men.

CHAPTER 111 p.65.

Apocalyptic Form

Did Jesus adopt an entirely apocalyptic Form for His message? No! --reasons for large measure of apocalyptic found in the Gospels due to ready made Christology and desire of the early Church to vindicate Jesus as the Messiah--evolution of apocalyptic eschatology found in the Gospels--Matthew's tendency to heighten the apocalyptic effect--Weiss quoted--Jesus rejected apocalyptic programme at the Temptation--adopted the apocalyptic note of urgency--balanced and harmonised it by means of His emphasis on growth of the Kingdom--His balance of mind and sanity seen in His parables which eminently human--Papyri quoted(Milligan)--His revelation of God's character fundamental to His Gospel--Love and generosity God's distinctive characteristics rather than justice and righteousness as apocalyptic taught--Lord's Prayer as revealing the form of Jesus' message--

CHAPTER IV. p.96.

Presence and Parousia

Jesus partly accepted the Jewish tradition and apocalyptic doctrine of Kingdom coming by manifestation of Divine power--

Presence the essence of Parousia, Epiphaneia, and Apocalupsis--all three imply Power of God and Kingdom--Jesus sets bounds to eschatological emphasis - His work not meeting with sufficient success, Jesus declares His faith that He will be sent back or come again to reap the rewards of His sowing. - This brings His doctrine in line with Apocalyptic. The Gospels confuse His actual statements in certain passages quoted e.g. Fall of Jerusalem jumbled up with End of the World. - His coming He associated with consummation of History. - Idea defended by modern standards - Salvation with apocalyptic is escape, with Jesus^{it} redemption by Power of God. Consummation of History though it may tarry comes suddenly - need for vigilance.

CHAPTER V.

Judgment p. 111

Apocalyptic not the only source of this doctrine. - apocalyptic doctrine inconsistent re. Gentiles. - Jesus connects Present with Final Judgment - based on men's reaction to Himself. - Apocalyptic Judgment entirely futuristic and sometimes narrow and vindictive. - Apocalyptic ready to condemn. Jesus ready to save. - Gehenna as symbol. - Jesus goes direct to O.T. sources. - Professor Sanday's theory that He belonged to Apocalyptic school of Similitudes rejected. - Psalms and Isaiah His chief sources. - Redeemer and Saviour His purpose - communion with God the secret of His whole mind and character. ~~Reveals~~ Idea from O.T. Book of Life - doctrine traced - the elect for privilege and favour in apocalyptic /

apocalyptic - for service with Jesus - elect and predestination
 - compare genius given for service.

CHAPTER VI.

Salvation

Apocalyptic Salvation is deliverance from outward circumstances, Jesus salvation is deliverance from evil - Apocalyptic salvation tends to be narrow and exclusive especially in future life: Jesus' salvation is universal in scope. - Difference of doctrine due to different conceptions of God viz. Transcendent Lord of spirits Holy and Just over against Heavenly Father, Loving, Righteous, merciful, generous. - Both apocalyptic doctrine and Jesus' doctrine agree that salvation is a gift and due to Power of God. - World awaiting expectantly the manifestation of a Saviour- vide Virgil, - Sibylline oracles, Isaiah.

CHAPTER VII.

Resurrection.

Greek doctrine of immortality. - O.T. sources of doctrine of resurrection - renewal of life is essential idea - Jesus. inspired by Psalms, finds His doctrine of the resurrection and of immortality in His immediate experience of God, Pss. XVI & XVII Moffatt's translation cited. $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$, $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$, considered to show whole personality involved in resurrection - some alleged evidences of dependence of Jesus on apocalyptic examined, e.g. Matt. XXII re. Sadducees /

duces and future life compared with Enoch Ll.4.--argument
 dependence here rejected yet influenced perhaps by Enoch XV.6.
 Jesus in agreement with apocalyptic concerning universal
 resurrection but opposed to apocalyptic doctrine regarding the
 antiles--agrees with the apocalyptic idea of transformation
 it enriches it.

Summing Up

A P P E N D I X

Influence of the Psalms on the Mind of Jesus

7.

This Thesis is that the mind of Jesus of Nazareth was too virile, too finely balanced, too deeply rooted in the normal and natural¹ to be carried away by the fanatic or fantastic elements of Messianic eschatology and apocalyptic. Or in other words, this Thesis declares that Jesus had a mind truly human, yet perfectly poised and pure and beautiful; and apocalyptic was a literature and movement of His earthly lifetime, some of whose terms and conceptions He used for the expression of His Purpose of Love towards men, without taking over from apocalyptic the form of His message or endorsing its view of salvation as escape from an evil and dying world.

What does the "Mind of Jesus" connote in this thesis?

The mind of Jesus in this Thesis does not signify merely the thought or mental equipment of Jesus but also His total attitude to men and things, and to God - that use of the word which is found in the exhortation of Paul:-

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."²

(Προνοεω. I set my mind upon, suggesting moral interest, considered /

-
1. Glover "Conflict of Religions" p. 130.
 2. Phil. II-5.

1.
 nsidered attitude) It has therefore much to do with the will
 and as so with the heart.

It is submitted here that it was the will of Jesus to maintain
 a attitude that was at once bold and humble, stern and sympathetic.
 It was the heart-felt desire of Jesus to make His life and religion,
 first and foremost an answer to human need. * It was the mind of
 Jesus to conquer evil circumstances by facing up to them - not in
 day-dreaming to seek escape from them; to serve and to suffer in
 humble sphere and spirit - not to clutch at office and titles, not
 even those of Messiah, and Son of God. Above all to enlighten men
 concerning, and to save them from fear and sin by establishing, a
 new relationship between man and God, and between man and man, through
 preaching the good news of God's character of Love, the nearness of
 His Kingdom, and through witnessing thereto by His own life and death.

THE MIND OF JESUS.

It is not intended in this thesis to examine in detail the whole
 range of apocalyptic literature. That has already been done by
 more competent scholars. Herein attention will be centred on those
 apocalypses which were written before 30 A.D. For our chief
 interest lies in the impact of apocalyptic on the mind of Jesus and
 His reaction to it.

But if our investigations have in one aspect a narrower, they
 have in another aspect a wider scope than the full range of
 apocalyptic.

1. Souter. 'Pocket Greek Lexicon p. 277.

For in order to determine what features of the mind of Jesus are the direct and peculiar result of apocalyptic influence it is necessary we should discover all the chief influences which went to mould the form and colour the expression of Jesus' thought.

In the present investigation no other pre-supposition is made than ^{that} Jesus was human - a historic figure. This seems a strong line of approach because the one certain fact about Him is that He had a human personality. Indubitably we know that Jesus was born a Son of the East, spoke Galilean Aramaic (cf. words *marmon*, *talitha cumi*, *abba*, *Martha*, *Barabbas*)¹, was country bred, was a carpenter, was a man of the people², was a friend of children, was a friend of animals.³ With this as our starting point we shall endeavour to show how fully and truly Jesus identified Himself with humanity, how universal was his appeal and how exalted were His ideas of the potentiality of human personality.

It is to be understood also that while we quote the Synoptic Gospels as our chief authority for our presentation of the mind of Jesus, these same Gospels are not regarded as actual bare records of facts, but a tradition and compilation of facts as seen through Christian eyes, through faith. Yet since the facts have been

1. Deissmann "Light from the Ancient East" p.64.

2. Do. Do. pp.246 f. 291. 314,397,466.

3. Do. Do. p. 275.

4. cf. Du Bose(p. 15. "The Gospel in the Gospels")

been seen and recorded by good men, since there is such inner harmony and such sublimity in the picture of Jesus as none could invent, since in every age men coming to Him have come into touch with God, we know that in the Jesus of the Gospels we have Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.¹

But if the Gospels be such records as we have stated we must go beyond the Gospels. If almost all we have in the Synoptics is coloured by the mind and experience of the Christian community which grew up in the course of the two or three generations after Jesus - under the influence of His original and creative personality - then the relation of Jesus to the Gospel records may not be so very far removed from that of Moses to the legislation of the Pentateuch and the Decalogue, viz:- the mighty personality who gave the moral and spiritual impulse which produced the records, the movement, and the community.

To understand, in the measure possible to us, the wonderful personality of Jesus, our first step is to observe and balance the forces - hereditary, environmental and literary - which were likely to mould his consciousness. Of these forces not the least powerful would be the influence of His Race.

We know that if Jesus was a real man He was influenced deeply by the history and consciousness of His Race. For "a man can /

1. Finlay "Byways In Early Christian Literature". p. 32.

can add nothing of importance to the social inheritance in any field unless there is already an inheritance to which to add..... A Pheidias would have been impossible in Jerusalem, an Isaiah in Athens."¹ Hence if "the prophetic genius of Israel felt called to deliver a message moral and spiritual (cf. "The Lion hath roared who will not fear? The Lord hath spoken who can but prophesy? - Amos III-8)" need we be surprised to find Jesus represented in the Synoptic record, as expressing the same distinctive ~~urge~~ ~~urge~~ from within:- (cf. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath annointed me to preach" etc. Lk. IV-18)

When we remember that this race concentrated its attention on religion for six hundred years; that the messianic hope which arose from the exile became intense because, only those whose religious zeal was intense thought it worth while to return to their desolate country and to the city of their fathers; that to this intensity was added breadth of outlook through the policy of Alexander the Great and of his successors planting colonies of Jews in all the cities which they founded: then we can accept Deissmann's ~~idea~~ that intensity is the keynote of the life of Jesus² and we understand the universal appeal of His character. The universal note is thus expressed by Isaiah "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples" (Is. LXI.-7)^{*} and

(*cf the 100th Psalm).

1. Streeter "Adventure" pp. 157-8.

2. Deissmann "The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul." pp 25f. 149.

the later religious ethical quality of the synoptic record finds its inspiration from the words of the same prophet "the wolf shall lie down with the lamb.... and a little child shall lead them they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Is. X-6ff.)

So much for the race heritage of Jesus, but we must also consider his Galilean heritage and environment. A religion of Galilee would tend to have a broad based, universal message since Galilee - the 'Region of the Gentiles'^x (a) was pressed and permeated on three sides by foreign tribes (b) became after the exile largely Gentile.

Nazareth, the immediate scene of the upbringing of Jesus was situated on one of the main roads of Galilee while its hills overlooked the great Roman roads, where passed to and fro the merchants of all nations and the armies of the Empire. We have to take account of the enlargement such environmental factors would have on the mental horizon of an intelligent boy and youth. Further, and more subtly playing upon his temperament were the influences of trees and flowers in such a well-watered and fruitful land. Here was found the impetus to poetic expression (cf Matt. VI-28.) Indeed "in all the words of Jesus we feel the quality of poetry"¹ and poetry is universal in /

1. Streeter op. cit. p. 142.

x. cf. O. Anderson Scott "Dominus Noster" pp. 10, 11, 12.

in its appeal.

But the most peculiar fact in His surroundings was the prevalence of earthquakes. "The nature of the people was also volcanic ... we remember two Galileans who wished to call down fire from heaven on those who were only discourteous to them. Yet this inner fire is essential to manhood".¹ Here again we have factors which are calculated to produce a personality characterised by intensity and broad human sympathy. But when Jesus came up to Jerusalem He would come away from the main Roman roads - away from the friendly, broad, human, cosmopolitan intercourse of merchants in which the common human elements would rise up from beneath race differences and predominate. He would come away from that kindly atmosphere and enter the atmosphere of officialdom where bitterness separated priests and soldiers and hatred rankled in Jewish hearts, hardening them in their national prejudices and narrow outlook.

Another environmental factor which seems to call for remark is the milieu of the carpenter's shop. A boy sitting daily in an English or Scottish smithy during the 18th. century was likely to learn much, more especially were that village on the highroad. Far more so in the land and in the days where and when the city gates were the newspapers, would the village carpenter's shop on the /

1. G.A. Smith "Historical Geography" pp. 431-2.

the highroad be the newspaper, parliament and religious debating room of the district. With His gentile antecedents, opinions of the great gentile world would have a ready soil in the mind of Jesus.¹ The hawkers and pedlars of those days would loiter here and echoes of the big world - echoes too of arguments heard at Jacob's well where merchants of every clime halted to water their cattle and converse; - such echoes must surely have been heard in that carpenter's shop. One of them would impress deeply the tender soul of Jesus, viz:- the universal cry for a God-man, the human cry that the gods or God would appear in human form as a real man whereby men might know God and His purpose for men. This was not only a universal cry. The literature of the time (including the papyri) - shows that with many it was a cry of agony.

The last environmental influence on the growing mind of Jesus to be mentioned here - i.e. apart from apocalyptic - was that of the Hebrew Scriptures. The documents lead us to believe that he was brought up in a pious home and therefore the study of the Old Testament Scriptures - the Bible of that day - would be enjoined and encouraged. The evidence that Jesus knew the O.T. Scriptures - nay, had meditated upon, pondered over, and conned them - the evidence of this in the Gospels is so ample that it needs no quotation nor verification. More especially does /

1. Jesus used Greek as well as Aramaic of. J.H. Moulton
 "Prolegomena to New Testament Grammar" p.8.

does the record show that He was steeped in the Prophets and in the Psalms. How He used this knowledge in proclaiming His message, we may find from His own words "Every scribe which is instructed into the Kingdom of Heaven ... bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old". (Matt. XIII-52).

What we may therefore expect to find in the mind of Jesus is the power of selective synthesis, along with (given a creative genius) a strong vein of originality. But His originality will consist mostly in His selection and emphasis. We need not expect so much entirely new doctrine, but rather a deeper insight into old doctrine, a new setting and a deeper intensity and passion in the expression.

Before we pass from the consideration of this powerful O.T. influence on the mind of Jesus it is desirable to note that while much has been made of the influence of the Prophets* on His mind - and we would not belittle that influence - not enough has been made of the influence of the Psalms.¹ It is this latter influence which is specially emphasised here. The songs of His nation sank deeply into the mind and soul of Jesus. It was a Psalm which rose to His mind at baptism (i.e. through which God's voice spoke to Him). It was a psalm which gave expression to His agony on the Cross. The psalms were that part of the literature of His nation, which, like most songs were universal in /

* cf. Du Bose op.cit. p.33 and {Abraham's "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels" pp.7,8. who nullifies Du Bose's argument}.

1. Vide. Appendix to this thesis p. 176 ff.

in their appeal - deeply, broadly, essentially human. The psalms of Israel were more universal and more excellent than the songs of any other nation. "The Book of Psalms contains the whole music of the heart of man, swept by the hand of his Maker.... The psalms are a mirror in which each man sees the motions of his own soul".¹

Referring to his favourite apocalypse - i.e. "Enoch" - R.H. Charles says "It is a noble work, yet it falls short of what was noblest in the past. It never reminds the faithful, as do some of the Psalmists that present life and communion with God more than outweigh every temporal blessing".² Here we have the all controlling factor of the mind of Jesus. "He set forth communion with God as the most certain fact of man's experience and as simple reality made it accessible to every one. Thus His teaching contains the note of universality".³ We should however remember that communion with God does not mean merely isolated contemplation but that on the contrary the earthly life of Jesus is a life of active goodness. It is best and most easily understood as an answer to human need (cf. Matt. VI-32; Lk. XII-24) It is always a cry of need that precedes his appearance in all the stories:- of distress, and Mary beholds Him; of fear, and He is in their midst; of doubt, and Thomas is satisfied for ever /

1. Prothero. "The Psalms in Human Life" pp. 13, 14.

2. Charles. "Enoch. Introduction. p. CVIII.

3. Encycl. Brit. Vol VI. p. 282. (11th. edit.)

ever; of fruitless toil, and Christ is on the beach at dawn. Moreover He still, though risen and gloriously alive, shows His wounds. He carries the memory and marks of His humiliation into the inner sanctuary of the Godhead. Those wounds are to be for ever not only the hope of sinful man but the pride of God and the object of worship for angels through all the ages.

But further when men say that Jesus came to reveal God to men they often fail to see that his mission was to reveal God through man, through human nature, and that thereby He at the same time revealed man to men.

Deissmann declares the universal appeal of the gospel was the expression of His personality and His personality was the key to his universal religion. It triumphed over the Jewish apocalyptic form. "People would never have united in a Christian community and later there would never have been a universal religion such as Christianity is unless by common loyalty to a personality - never by so many doctrines or religious ideas".¹ "The Christian Church would still throng round Jesus even if there were adequate grounds for denying that he possessed the Messianic consciousness."² Nevertheless "The Messiah idea is the precondition required to produce from the so-called Christianity of Christ, Christ Christianity or the Christcult".³

Deissmann /

1. Deissmann. "The Relig. of Jesus and the Faith of Paul" p. 147.

2. Ibid. p. 136.

3. Ibid. p. 146.

Deissmann appears to us to be right in his contention that the universal appeal of Jesus arises not from his doctrine so much as from his personality. But as Deissmann proceeds he tends to emphasise the official rather than the man. What we maintain is that the universal appeal was found for the most part in His humanity. It had its source in His human sympathy.

We may appreciate this better if we think of the modern Burns' cult. In the world's literature Burns occupies a relatively minor place yet no man of genius makes such a universal appeal. More especially the common people 'have heard him gladly'. To put the matter in one way the universal note belongs to the musician

"To whom the miseries of the world

Are misery, and will not let him rest".

To put it in another way the universal note is the cry of a suffering little child. Wherefore is explained the fact that of all Christian customs or festivals the observation of Christmas is most universal

"They all were looking for a King

To slay their foes and set them high

Thou can'st a little baby thing

That made a woman cry".

This truth is sometimes overlooked as when a Hymnary Committee /

Committee lately tried to substitute "Son of David" for "Son of Mary" in the last line of the hymn "When our heads are bowed with woe". Here we see at work even to-day the tendency to obscure the man by emphasising the official. But, to repeat, it is the self identification of God with humanity - the humanity of God - which gives Christianity its universal appeal. More especially is this so in the weakness and suffering of Christ. Here was a real man as well as an ideal man. "Jesus was not a king playing at being a carpenter. We have done him great disservice even in art by that perpetual halo that we have placed round his head. We meant well. We intended to give him status and prestige, instead we have limited his appeal by removing him from actual life."¹ "Often while we mean well we serve Christ badly by according Him a position and prestige which somehow suggests that He never was a real man; that he never was up against things as we are".² Is not this very apparent by the way we have whittled down those sublime and unforgettable words "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities but was in all points tempted like as we are" (Heb. IV-15)? Moffat translates "tempted in every respect like ourselves". In spite of this, however, it is maintained Jesus could not sin -- it was impossible for him to sin. /

1. Sheppard. "Impatience of a Parson". p. 155.

2. Ibid. p. 156.

sin. If that is so how could he be tempted in every respect like ourselves?

The position taken up here is not that of Mr Murry who says that Jesus probably did sin. All the evidence goes to show that Jesus never consciously opposed the will of God. But to say He could not have sinned seems to restrict the exceeding greatness of the Love of God, and of the kenosis. It argues that God did not put Jesus His Son to a real test. "Nothing short of liability to sin can make temptation a reality. It seems difficult to conceive of the purpose of the Incarnation if the process stopped short just where our human life is most beset with difficulty. It looks like a failure of love - it looks like fear, if we are to assert that Christ refused to shoulder this our last and heaviest burden."¹ If the historic experience of Jesus is to have value for us the Incarnation must have been not only a revelation of the Divine nature but also of human nature at its highest, i.e. a revelation of the possibilities of human life as we know it. The Incarnation was a revelation of God's love but "The proof of that love was strength laid by and weakness - our weakness - undertaken. We cannot say that that weakness was confined merely to physical conditions and maintain that there was in the child from the beginning the full knowledge and purpose which we ascribe to God He /

1. Catherine Chilcatt in Streeter's "Adventure" p. 232.

He must have shared too the ignorance and blindness, the conditions of growth incidental to birth in human form (otherwise) we rob the gospel of its message of hope, the perfect life which we see in Christ is for ever beyond our reach, we cannot take it for an example".¹ But it is an essential part of the message of the gospel that Christ is offering us a pattern of life and urging us to make it our own.

Again we must differentiate our position from that of the German Liberal School which (cf. Harnack) makes much of the distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion about Jesus. To us our Lord does not appear smaller but greater because in His earthly life he was a man of faith. To be our pattern Jesus must have been a man of faith. His filial consciousness could not have been such that he walked by sight having been told in a way different from the way in which all other men have received a revelation from God, that He was God's Son. "Highest truths come to men by flashes of insight such as poets receive". It is thus we must believe Jesus learned the great truth that he was the Messiah, and the greater truth that He was the Son of God in a unique sense. It was a flash - how often repeated we do not know - which came upon Him with great intensity at Baptism and at the Transfiguration. Yet we must never lose sight of the fact that it left Jesus One who, like us /

1. Streeter "Adventure" p. 233.

had to make the great venture of faith --nay the great Venture which is Faith.

What has just been said and quoted will show the angle from which our subject is approached. We have to conceive Jesus Christ as a real man, who was really tempted, who walked by faith, whose perfect humanity made such a universal appeal that it won the hearts of men of every nation and made them ready to trust and experiment with his revelation of the Divine Love and Purpose for all mankind.

.....

Chapter ii.

"Apocalyptic, Messianism, and the Son of Man"

We are now ready to ask and attempt to answer the question--What was the impact of apocalyptic on the mind of Jesus? First it should be noted that the impact came by the avenue of Messianism. Further, it should be observed that although messianism arose in Jewish literature, nevertheless it had a universal element. "Messianism is a doctrine common to the four Monotheistic religions. In all of them it centres round a person who is to affect life at its very core; in all it is a doctrine of hope for the future; and in all it is an establishment of a reign of righteousness and peace.....
...In the earlier prophets it is set forth as the establishment of a world-wide kingdom.....Still later, the idea of the advent of a Davidic prince who would effect a thorough redemptive process in which even the animals would share, is set forth."¹

¹Levison "Passiontide" pp.10,11,12.

Mr. Levison, writing of messianism, makes this significant statement:--"The common people heard Jesus gladly because they considered the man and not the prophecies concerning Messiah"...."Jesus died loving His people because they had an ideal, although it was too lofty for them."¹

There is abundant evidence that Jesus Himself considered the prophecies concerning the national ideal. We know for one thing that He pondered over the ideal depicted in Isaiah LIII,² and there is every reason to think that He would be familiar with it as set forth in the apocalyptic writing known as the Pss. of Solomon. This writing contains the most important of all Messianic doctrine outside the Canon of the O.T. previous to the First Advent. Here Messiah is called Christ almost for the first time (XVII-36; XVII-6,8;) He is raised up by God Himself (XVII-23,47). He has a mission which is restorative as well as destructive (XVII-23,35,36,47) He is to set up His kingdom and gather the dispersed tribes of Israel together. He is to make the Gentiles subject to Him and they are to be converted to the true faith .(XVII.) The character of His rule is spiritual holy/

1. Levison op.cit. p.22.

2. cf. Luke. XXII-37.

holy, and wise. His administration does not rest upon physical power (XVII-37). His trust is not in armies but in Jehovah. (XVII-38) Great stress is laid upon the fact that His rule is just. (XVII-31) But the Messiah of these Psalms is a vassal king and not supreme sovereign, neither is he Divine. Divinely appointed, endowed with divine gifts yet he is nothing more than a man. He is indeed an idealized Solomon and the picture of Messiah here drawn was doubtless inspired by the 72nd psalm in the O.T., which is called a Psalm "Εἰς Σαλωμών." Is the above picture one Jesus had only to amplify ~~for~~ to have before Him a picture of the ideal representative of Humanity." We shall see.

What was the reaction of the mind of Jesus to Messianism? To answer that question is difficult, but if we can, and where we can find a harmony between His human consciousness as already set forth in this thesis and His recorded words and actions we may be very confident that our answer is not far from the truth.

It may be said at the beginning that Jesus determined to be Himself the ideal whom His people desired. Yet not only because it was the desire of His own people but also because it was the cry and the need of the whole world. That is the conclusion we must arrive at when we remember His outlook and observe how it harmonises with His avoidance of the title of Messiah even when "He knows no more sacred task than to point men to His own Person"¹ When /

1. Mackintosh "The Person of Jesus" SC.M. p. 17.

When Professor Mackintosh asserts that "For Jesus ... no single word had such a burning intensity of meaning as "Messiah"¹ we must remember His preference for another term namely "Son of Man", also how this term has lived and grown in the esteem of mankind while the other has little currency except among the Jews. Why did He prefer this name Son of Man? Was it not that He might save His hearers and followers from ascribing to Him and to God's Messiah all their preconceived ideas and all the prophetic forecasts of Messiah's character? True it is, "Jesus' thoughts on the profoundest aspects of His own mission were moving among O.T. forecasts and symbols",² but, to say no more, He was a creative genius and practised a selective synthesis. How was He to impart His profound and universal thoughts to those around Him? Surely by choosing a name that would, as far as possible, cause them to keep in the background their preconceived ideas of the Hope and Ideal of Israel and see that ideal with unprejudiced eye in His own Person and Character. The position here taken up is supported by the fact that the expression 'Jesus the Christ' is never found in Paul and there are few places where the term 'Christos' can be translated Messiah. Messiah qua Messiah was to the Jewish mind a public functionary and with Paul the personal Jesus /

1. Mackintosh op. cit. p. 18.

2. Kennedy "Theology of the Epistles" p. 18.

Jesus has absorbed the messianic functions. Christ, for Paul and the early Church is a historical person who is the embodiment of grace and lowliness and love.¹

Such a person though not answering to the whole of the synoptic record is yet in harmony with it when taken in conjunction with the environmental factors mentioned above. A careful reading of the synoptic record itself will show that home and family life were governing conceptions in the mind of Jesus. The influence of His early home life comes out again and again in His parables. He lived among the great realities and the great simplicities. Hence He abjured the shows of things - all titles and outward dignities He avoided. - He preferred to be known as a man rather than a functionary or official.² Even God Himself He designated as Father; Heaven He likened to Home; the ideal subject of the Kingdom to a little child. We are convinced therefore that when Jesus used the name Son of Man in His public ministry He had fallen back on a name that had attracted Him in His early years. His pious parents, seeing how precocious and godly their child was, would express the belief that one day He would be a ~~Man of God~~ a prophet. The early ambition of Jesus was doubtless to become a prophet. Which prophet would be His hero? Ezekiel would be as likely as any other /

1. Kennedy. op. cit. p. 76.

2. cf. Matt. XXIII - (8-12) Moffatt's translation.

other. A sensitive, tender-hearted, and imaginative boy like Jesus would be touched by the picture of Israel in Exile and attracted at the same time by the weird pictures in Ezekiel. In His boyish rôle of prophet we can imagine Him calling Himself Son of man. Besides, most frequently would He find it used in Ezekiel. And here, we venture to assert, was the fountainhead of its meaning for Him later on. Moffatt declares we need not feel that Jesus was cribbed or confined in His use of the term by the connotation of the aramaic "Barnasha" but can we think that Jesus would fail to be fascinated by the sublime meaning of the term as exemplified in Ezekiel ^{chap. 3 v. 15}? For Jesus, the Son of man did not mean 'Man' as he was already known to men, but 'Man' as he might become. In Ezekiel he found Son of Man used of one who voluntarily suffered with those who suffered - "sat where they sat" or as Moffatt translates, "sat among them ... overwhelmed". Ezekiel has been blamed for his harshness (c.f. Robinson "Prophecy and the Prophets in Israel") but Isaiah and Jeremiah had pitied the people in vain. Ezekiel sympathised but did not pity. A harsh message was required because the people were pitying themselves (c.f. Psalms 137-8. "By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down, yea we wept etc."). Ezekiel put iron into their souls and made them men, able to suffer and conquer through suffering. (They needed a strong breath from God to make them stand up to things (c.f. XXXVII - Valley of dry / 1. of 1 Cor. 1X. 20; Matt. iii. 15; Hebs. ii. 14-18.

dry bones", 11-12: - "Son of man stand upon thy feet and I will speak unto thee. And the spirit entered into me ... and set me upon my feet) Compare this again with John's picture of the Messiah: "whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Matt. III - 11,12.)

When it is maintained that the term Son of Man in the apocalyptic sense begins with Daniel it should be remembered that "It is highly probable much of the material of the second part of the book (i.e. of Daniel) was suggested by the works of the later prophets, especially by Ezekiel.¹

As used in Ezekiel the term has two main meanings which may be stated thus:- strength and sympathy, or sternness and gentleness, or truth and love² (a) Those two meanings represent qualities of character which are opposites and yet are complementary - they are the foci of character round which a man's thoughts and actions form the perfect ellipse: held in perfect balance they make the perfect man - the 'Gentleman'; they did not find that perfect balance in Ezekiel but they found it in Jesus Christ³ (b) Ezekiel furnished Jesus therefore with the ideal in thought which the salvation and redemption of men required in life and action --- that Salvation and Redemption which it was His purpose in life to accomplish.

This /

1. R.H. Charles. Encyclopaedia Britannica. vol. 7 p. 805. 11th edit.
2. cf. Bossuet. quoted by St. Beuve "Essays on Men and Women (Sharp) p24.
3. cf. C.A. Scott "Dominus Noster" p24; Glover. "The Pilgrim" p.55 f.

This name as Jesus meant to use it and did use it was like Jacob's ladder - it reached up to heaven. "Man is properly human only as he is Divine";¹ Love is Divine, and it is no less Divine in that it is stern with sin and sloth. Strength is Divine only when it stoops down to sympathise by fellowship in suffering. This was the ideal before the mind of Jesus - the ideal He set Himself to realise. And since Divinity could not be less worthy than Humanity, since God could not be less noble than man, Jesus began by proving Himself from the outset - Manly, - one who was every inch a man. Hence the Son of man must not only endure suffering to win sympathy, He must also face suffering bravely,² go out to meet it willingly in order to win respect and trust. Such an one Jesus felt would appeal to men by his manliness.

He had grounds for thinking so for here again He was responding to a universal need as we see so far back as Jeremiah (Cf. chap. V-1 "Run ye ... and see if ye can find a man", or again in the story of Diogenes seeking for one with a candle at mid-day in the market-place of Athens. That the manliness of Jesus made an impression on men is a fact testified by the Acts of the Apostles (Cf. Acts IV-13 --- And when they saw the boldness of Peter and John they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.), and by such an unlikely person as Pilate, at /

1. Cf. Mackintosh, Orig. of Gospel p. 61. ("just in proportion as He is Divine".)
 2. Cf. Ps. XXIII-4. and Jn. X-11.

at least if we accept that at the trial of Jesus he spoke in his native Latin saying 'Ecce Homo' - behold a man, and not, as in Greek "ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱ ἁνθρώπου" behold the man. Truly Jesus would seem to have made good his resolution to become a man, such a real and true man as stirred even the soul of Pilate to acknowledge it with admiration. And does not the name Son of man stir our souls also since it reminds us that such manliness once appeared on the stage of human history?

We return then to Weizsäcker's view that Jesus adopted the term from Ezekiel. But we do not agree that He did so to designate Himself specially a prophet.¹ He used it to emphasise that He desired rather to be more of a man than more than a man. He wished to emphasise His kinship with common men and yet on the strength of His complete manhood He could assert "a greater than Solomon is here";² and implicitly (through His attitude to the Old Law) a greater than Moses is here; (cf. "Last of all He sent unto them His Son" etc.³) This view is supported by the fact that, as all the evidence shows, Jesus was deeply impressed with the use of 'son of man' in Psalm 8. "Psalm 8 seems specially adapted to fall in with these (the conceptions of Jesus) -- as it brings out with equal strength the two elements which we know to have entered into the consciousness of Jesus -- the combination /

1. Weizsäcker "Evang. Gesch. p. 426-431.

2. Matt. XII-42.

3. Matt. XXI-37.

combination of lowliness with loftiness, the physical weakness of man as contrasted with his sublime calling and destiny. The name later came to be regarded as a title and we can see here the appropriateness of the application of one and the same title to Him who, on the one hand, 'had not where to lay his head', and who must needs 'go as it was written of him' and who yet, on the other hand, looked to come again 'with power' in His Kingdom."¹

We agree therefore with Driver that: "The title ... designates Jesus as the Man in whom human nature was most fully and deeply realised, and who was the most complete exponent of its capacities, warm and broad in His sympathies, ready to minister and suffer for others, sharing to the full the needs and deprivations which are the common lot of humanity, but conscious at the same time of the dignity and greatness of human nature, and destined ultimately to exalt it to unexampled majesty and glory".² We would also agree with Westcott "It is inconceivable that the Lord should have adopted a title which was popularly held to be synonymous with that of Messiah, while He carefully avoided the title of Messiah itself".³ Our conclusion therefore is that Jesus adopted or rather held to this name because its universal application best expressed the length and breadth and depth of the passion that filled His heart namely the salvation of all men by the /

1. Sanday "Hastings Dict." vol. II. p. 623.

2. Driver "Hastings" vol. IV. p. 587.

3. " " " " " " p. 583

rhapsodist whose whole function was to incite his countrymen to look away from the present scene of duty towards some future mystic state of felicity which had no connexion with the actual world in which men lived and no real bearing upon their present character and moral discipline. In so far as He had a vocation in life He was first of all a prophet.¹ But before He had a vocation He was human, and right through His career He never ceased to be human--never ceased to be moved with compassion for the people. (cf. Mk.1.41; Vlll.2; Lk.XXlll.34) His method of teaching was also eminently human and considerate for He often illustrated but rarely argued--He was the greatest and most natural of storytellers. Likewise He was subject to development. His human development has little or no place in the Fourth Gospel but the Synoptics preserve for us this human trait. And if we would know how human and sane Jesus was even when the disciples had come to regard Him as the Messiah we have only to note His words in Mk.X.35-40; Xlll.32. There He explicitly disclaims powers which apocalyptic messianism would ascribe to Him.

What must now be determined is to what extent apocalyptic eschatological thought had affected the religious environment of Jesus and how far His use of its categories and especially of the term Son of man implies its direct influence upon His thinking. Dr. Scott asserts that in the time of Jesus there had spread "An idea of God as inactive for the present in the affairs of the

1. cf. Mk.Vl.4; Lk.Vll.16,39; XXlV.19.

people, but certain to intervene sooner or later on their behalf and for the discomfiture of their foes, material and spiritual: an inclination to look to Angels as intermediaries between man and the supreme Power: a belief that there is no hope for or in the present world or order of things, issuing in a conviction that it had fallen under the authority of an Evil Power."¹ "Only in two documents of the interval do we find traces of the old free belief in a God who does something now viz.-in 1 Maccabees and in the Pss. of Solomon."² What relation have these beliefs to the mind of Jesus?

"Historically regarded, says Schweitzer, the Baptist, Jesus and Paul are simply the culminating manifestations of Jewish apocalyptic thought...What is really remarkable in this (1st. century) wave of apocalyptic enthusiasm is the fact that it was called forth not by external events, but solely by the appearance of two great personalities. It is thus set down that the Baptist and Jesus gave life and motion to apocalyptic thinking. Jesus adopted an apocalyptic outlook from the Baptist and "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" is an apocalyptic doctrine and has an apocalyptic reference. Moreover Schweitzer sees a development in apocalyptic outlook and recognises in the non-occurrence of the Parousia promised in Matt. X. 23. the "historic fact in the estimation of Jesus, which in some way determined the alteration of His plans and His attitude towards the multitude...We have here the first significant

1. C.A.Scott "Dominus Noster" p.20 ; 2. Ibid. p.15.

3. Schweitzer "Quest of the Historical Jesus" pp. 366, 368.

date in the history of Christianity, it gives to the work of Jesus a new direction otherwise inexplicable."¹

Schweitzer then proceeds to describe the new direction thus: "Jesus' purpose is to set in motion the eschatological development of history, to let loose the final woes, the confusion and strife from which shall issue the Parousia, and so to introduce the supramundane phase of the eschatological drama."²

Altogether then, Jesus is to be regarded as being possessed by apocalyptic ideas. They were the dynamic of His public life and actions. When Schweitzer writes:- "Every life of Jesus remains a reconstruction on the basis of a more or less accurate insight into the nature of the dynamic self-consciousness of Jesus which created the history",³ it is to be understood that this self-consciousness of Jesus is a 'secret Messianic self-consciousness'. Jesus is first and last Messiah - everything in his life and teaching is explained by that so long as we keep in mind the Messiah as He is found in apocalyptic and especially as apocalyptic Son of Man. For instance, the miracle of the feeding of the 5000 is a Messianic Feast in which each member of the multitude receives only a morsel of food and does not understand its significance - not even the disciples understood what was happening viz: that this was an eschatological sacrament /

1. "Quest of the Historical Jesus" p. 358.

2. Ibid. p. 369.

3. Ibid. p. 393.

sacrament, therefore "the sacramental effect was wholly independent¹ of the apprehension and comprehension of the recipient."

Again the baptism of John is not to be contrasted but rather connected with Christian Baptism. It furnished a claim to baptism with the Spirit later on. It was sacramental. Thus it is averred baptism with water was taken over by Jesus from the Baptist and was not merely a symbolic act in the modern sense.²

In his later work Schweitzer declares that (according to Paul and John) it is the body and blood of the Son of Man which Christians are to eat at the Lord's Supper and not the body and blood of the earthly Jesus.³ In word and deed Jesus is thus depicted as an apocalypticist whose vision is confined to eschatological boundaries, and who, in His later ministry, is found trying to force on the direct intervention of God in human history.

Schweitzer's view is here rejected; first, because it "depends on the assumption that Matt.⁴X. is word for word an exact report of what was said at the time." For instance he asserts that Jesus, in His Charge to the Twelve "tells them in plain words (Matt.X.23)

.....⁵ that He does not expect to see them back in the present age". But the words of Matt.X.23 clearly reflect a situation which did not come into existence till the Missionary Journeys of Paul".⁶

(1) "Quest of the Historical Jesus" p.377-8n. (2) cf. Ibid p.376.

(3) "St. Paul and His Interpreters" p.200ff. (4) Streeter "The Four Gospels" p.255 n. (5) Schweitzer "Quest....Jesus" p.357 cf. pp.358,359.

(6) Streeter "The Four Gospels" p.255 n.

Moreover if we connect Matt.X.23. with Matt.X.5,6. we see evidence of a Judaistic version of Jesus' charge to the twelve. . And if we examine Matt.X. in its entirety we see the seven verses of Mark i.e. (Mark VI. 7 ff.) become the 42 verses of Matt. X. In other words we find an expansion by Matthew which gives an apocalyptic colouring to the words of Jesus. This is in conformity with the common practice of Matthew (cf. Mk.lX. 33-37, 42-48.) elaborated in Matt. XVlll and Mk. XlIl. expanded in Matt. XXV.¹ The immediacy of the Parousia is brought out in three passages in Matthew, of which one is absent from, the others are less emphasised in, the nearest parallel in Mark: Matt.X. 23; XXIV. 29; XXVI. 64.² Again, if it be said that Mk. XlIl. proves that Jesus regarded Himself as the Apocalyptic Son of Man and expected to make a visible return in the clouds; the following facts appear to discount Mk. XlIl. as evidence:-

(1.) The belief -- that our Lord would return visibly in the clouds of Heaven within the lifetime of the 1st. generation, is nowhere definitely expressed in those Apocalyptic sayings of His which are given by Q. (2.) A discourse 37 verses long at once stands out unique in Mk. (3.) Equally in contrast to Q. and notably to Q's Apocalyptic sections (cf. esp. Lk. XI.35 - 48, XVIl.23-37.) is its systematic and detailed scheme of prediction. (4.) It is in fact a complete and carefully articulated Apocalypse of the conventional type.

(1.) Streeter 'The Four Gospels' pp. 167, 263, 520 f.
 (2.) Do. Do. p. 425 n.

(5.) An Apocalypse is normally assigned, not to its true author, but to some great one of the past.¹ Moreover the allusions to later historical events, its purporting to have been told privately at first to certain disciples and the manifest purpose it served to warn Christians of the early Church against Anti-Christ~~s~~ that would precede the Parousia, and encouraging doubters by the assurance that delays in His coming had been foreseen by the Master - these and other aspects of this Chapter force upon us the conclusion that it is mainly comprised of an Apocalypse... put into the mouth of our Lord. Again, as for the declaration of Mk. XIV. 62. it should be remembered that "the disciples were not present at the trial and must have been dependent on the version of the trial circulated by His enemies. And since it was for the blasphemous admission that He was the Christ He was condemned, we may be pretty sure that the Apocalyptic terms of that admission at least suffered no toning down".²

Enough has been said to show that Schweitzer's thorough-going eschatological argument has very insecure foundations. This much, however is here acknowledged. The situation at the Trial seems to demand that Jesus made such a statement as enabled his enemies to say to the people that he had claimed to be the Messiah. And while we cannot depend on the Fourth Gospel for the

{ Streeter.
(1.) ^{Oxford} Studies in the Synoptic Problem p.179.
(2.) Do. Do. p.430.

ipsissima verba of Jesus yet in Jn. XIV-3. we have our conclusion somewhat strengthened that Jesus applied to Himself the saying about "The Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven". But He does not speak in this way until those latter days of His earthly life when:

"His spirit peers into the dark,
Foresees His end, his body nailed upon the cross,
His friends afraid, his teaching mocked, his
spirit wrung with doubt".¹

When He saw near the end that He was not to reap yet a while - i.e. in His earthly life-the full fruits of His mission and labour, He felt sure God would send Him again to reap that fruit. It was His spirit protesting, His faith protesting that the God He knew would vindicate Him and His teaching even as Job of old protested.² As Paul later was persuaded that not even death could separate us from the Love of God so it was the sublime faith of the Son of man that not even death could hinder the consummation of the purpose of God which He had felt Himself called upon to set in motion.

If we keep in mind that Jesus like Paul and every other religious genius had to find a common standing ground with those whom He would instruct and win as His followers and that therefore He must perforce use categories that are theirs rather than His /

1. Masfield. 'Trial of Jesus' p. 3.

2. Job. XIX. 25.

His own, we shall understand better His use of the picture of the Son of Man coming in the clouds. Along with that picture as used by Jesus we must take His words. "My Kingdom is not of this World." (Jn. XVIII-36. cf. Lk. XII-14).

To arrive at a conclusion as to the apocalyptic element in our Lord's use of the term Son of Man, all the known relevant facts should be taken into account. But, more than that, no previous statement by however eminent an authority should be taken as axiomatic. One such statement is that of R.H. Charles viz. - Jesus combined in His use of the term the "Messiah of Enoch and the Servant of Isaiah LIII." Another to the same effect is that of Moffatt "Fundamentally it is in the light of the Servant prophecy in Isaiah LIII that we ought to read the ransom-saying of Matt. XX. 28 - Mk. X. 45." ¹. But what are the facts? Surely, "It is perverse to insist that when Jesus said 'It is written of the Son of Man that He should suffer', He was referring to a scripture like Is. LIII, which does not speak of the Son of Man and is a record of suffering past, not a prediction of suffering to come." ². Indeed in the only reference Jesus makes to Is. LIII. (Lk. XXI. 37.) He does not use the term Son of Man. Wherefore the following facts should be noted:- (a) Daniel VII. does claim to be a prediction of the Son of Man and connects the name with suffering (Dan. VII. 13, 14, 16, 18, 21-27.) (b) In Dan. VII. the Son of Man signifies the saints of the Most High. (c) Mk. IX. 31. is strongly

(1) Moffatt "Theology of the Gospels" pp. 144-5.
 (2) Cadoux op.cit. pp. 32. [The Gospel that Jesus Preached]

strongly reminiscent of Dan.VII.25 in its form, as well as, meaning. (d) Dan.VII deals with two outstanding features of Jesus' teaching viz.-the Son of Man, and the Kingdom of God. (e) Mk.VIII.38 and XIV.62 evidently refer to Dan.VII.13 and have no connection with Is.LIII. Hence we may conclude that in connecting the term Son of Man with His sufferings and death Jesus "Thought of Himself and His sufferings as one with the saints of the Most High, which is the Danielic interpretation of the Son of Man."¹

That Jesus' mind was dominated by Is.LIII is contradicted by the facts cited above and by the following also:--(1) Nowhere does Jesus call Himself by the Isaianic term 'Servant of the Lord'. (2) The apostolic emphasis on Is.LIII "offered the Jew associations with the idea of animal sacrifice"--cf. "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter"--and it supplied a pretext for thinking of the death of Jesus as substitutionary suffering of the penalty deserved by men (cf. Is.LIII.6)² (3) In Mk.X.45 the ransom is from slavery not from death, not from the penalty of sin but from its tyranny.³ All this is of importance for this Thesis because it is here maintained that the Gospel of Jesus had first and foremost to do with the character of God. It was a message to men that God is Love and is neither an apocalyptic God who condemned sinners without compunction nor a Judaistic God who delivered up His servant or His Son as a sacrifice or scapegoat.

- (1) Cadoux op.cit. p.34.
- (2) Do. Do. p.35.
- (3) Do., Do. pp.37,38.

Only once is Jesus reported as quoting Is.LIII.(cf.Lk.XXII.37 "And He was reckoned with the transgressors") where the historical situation shows that it was not God who reckoned Him but the authorities and people of Jerusalem (cf.Mk.XIV.48,49.) and chiefly the leaders whose authority He was undermining.¹

In rejecting therefore the view that Jesus used the term Son of Man entirely with an apocalyptic connotation it is not held as proof in this Thesis that on His lips it signified the ideal of Is.LIII, without considerable modification. On the contrary His contest with Scribe and Pharisee and His cleansing of the Temple exhibit a virility of character not a little different. But what Jesus desired to teach men -- besides being valiant for truth -- was a friendship, human and divine, that included service and also transcended it because it transcended the ideas of duty and sacrifice implied in service (cf.1 Cor.XIII.3, Lk. XVII.10), for in Love and Christian friendship, duty and sacrifice become privilege and joy. This friendship is based on Divine sonship. But in emphasising the Filial Consciousness recent writers have tended to blur somewhat His message of friendship as well as to associate it too much with Is.LIII. For instance, Schweitzer's apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus' use of Son of Man is

1. cf. Cadoux. op.cit. pp.35,36.

(according to recent works by Professors Moffatt, Kennedy and Manson) - quite inadequate. Moffatt points out that it takes no account of the priority of the filial consciousness of Jesus to the Messianic consciousness. "It is the filial not the messianic consciousness which is the basis of Christianity".¹ The salient feature of the baptism stories is that they denote the filial rather than the messianic consciousness at the outset of His ministry".² "The messianic consciousness was the specific form which this sense of vocation (i.e. a consciousness of being sent to fulfil the ends of God on earth) assumed for Jesus, but it was determined and shaped by the inner consciousness of God's character as His Father and the Father of men."³

Manson speaks in the same vein. "Messianic eschatology was the form in which Jesus' thought of his redemptive mission to the world was cast".⁴ But Jesus' message was independent of the apocalyptic language in which it was cast. "We may define Christianity as the filial life towards God".⁵ (Matt. V-45; Jn. 1-12; IJn. III- 1,2;) cf Col.1-27. In the same work he has also written this significant sentence:- "Redemption, the triumph /

1. Moffatt "Theology of the Gospels" p.230

2. Ibid p. 130.

3. Ibid. p. 130.

4. Manson op. cit. p. 173

5. Manson op. cit. p. 174.

"Christ's View of the Kingdom of God"

triumph of God, the sovereignty of Love strives towards a social end, the accomplishment, of which alone abolishes the ills under which humanity labours". Manson deals a shrewd blow at the Interim-ethic of the Schweitzer school. All ethic, he says, is in a sense interim-ethic. But, "Is it a new life in another world that is promised as the reward of obedience to Christ, or is it in the first instance a new life here and now? Christ said to the rich ruler that by selling all that he had and giving to the poor he would have 'treasure in heaven' but was regard for the man's religious interest here and now not part of his motive for so dealing with him, not to speak of regard for the poverty of others? Did he not add 'And come, take up thy cross and follow Me' (Mk. X-21)?"¹.

But if Schweitzer and Tyrrell have over-emphasised Jesus' Messianic consciousness, Moffatt and Manson have overstated His Filial consciousness. For it may be taken for granted that, like every great and good man and in accordance with the spirit of his own teaching, Jesus would be distinguished for His unconsciousness of his greatness and official claims -- hence His saying to the disciples not to proclaim His Messiahship, and to the beneficiaries of his healing, not to publish His miraculous cures. The burning desire of Jesus was to identify Himself with common Humanity. While realising, therefore the great importance of both these,

1. Manson op. cit. p.175. of. Dobschütz " The Eschatology of the Gospels" p. 14.

these aspects of the consciousness of Jesus we believe that we get a much more finely balanced view if we pay more attention to His human - especially His Social - consciousness. Or to put it in another way, if we pay more attention to the real, thorough going Humanity of God.

In connection with Jesus' use of the term Son of Man we ignore an all important fact if we fail to note that "On all sides a cry was heard for new divine life, for a faith that could save all men and save their whole nature".¹ Did Jesus hear that cry? From what we have already found about His environmental influences can we believe He would fail to hear it? It was a deeply human cry therefore the answer must be a person not an abstraction. "L'humanité cherche l'idéal; mais elle veut que l'idéal soit une personne; elle n'aime pas une abstraction. Un homme, incarnation de l'idéal, et dont la biographie pût servir de cadre à toutes les aspirations du temps, voilà ce que demandait l'opinion religieuse."² "It expressed a comprehensive human need hence the choice of a comprehensive human name, and hence a present day

1. Mackintosh "The Originality of the Chrn. Message" p. 15.

2. Renan quoted by Angus "Environment" p. 68.

day writer points out that when the Son of Man came to establish the Kingdom of God He came "To establish it in a world not of sin merely, but of need, of pain, of death, of despair."¹ It was also a universal cry and before we can understand the apocalyptic element in our Lord's use of Son of Man we must view it combined with a universal element. The latter is central as the same writer says elsewhere. "Christianity came to meet the movement which had at its centre the craving for a Divine voice speaking to the single heart"²

The ideal therefore which Jesus (doubtless, in part at least, unconsciously) expressed by His use of the term Son of Man was broader and more human than that found in apocalyptic. Nearest in its conception to His ideal comes that found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This is not found, however, in the character of the Messiah but in scattered sayings which form part of the ethical teaching of the work. The conception of the Messiah is indeed lofty affirming that he would be free from sin;³ be a mediator for the Gentiles;⁴ Give to the faithful power to tread upon evil spirits and bind Beliar;⁵ Walk in meekness and righteousness.⁶ But He was also to be a warrior and /

1. Mackintosh "Person of Christ", S.C.M. p. 30.

2. Mackintosh "Orig." p. 66.

3. Test. Jud. XXIV -1.

4. Test. Levi. VIII-14.

5. Test. Levi. XVIII-12.

6. Test. Jud. XXIV-1.

and John Hyrcanus was the actual model from which this picture is painted. The conception here taken all together is not so lofty as that in the Pss. of Solomon. But when we turn to the ethical teaching of this work we do find ideals which Jesus endorsed, or incorporated into His teaching, e.g. forgiveness even towards enemies;¹ Love to God and man;² Universalism or salvation of the Gentiles.³

Since these are not attributes distinctly assigned to Messiah and yet were taught and practised by Jesus we must realise that if He adopted some maxims and even phrases from this work, that is a very different thing from being dominated by the apocalyptic movement and fashioned by its doctrine. Even in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Messiah is a man of worldly power and authority using material weapons. The passage (Test Jud. XXIV-1) is not in harmony with the context. This is evident from the fact that although it depicts a meek Messiah, the passages in the O.T. from which it evidently springs are Numbers XXIV-17 and Ps. XLV -4 where in both cases a warrior doing terrible things is portrayed and in Test Jud. XXIV-4 the same metaphors are used denoting war and power and earthly majesty. On R.H. Charles' own criteria⁴ for judging interpolations this looks like one. Moreover the portrait in Enoch supports /

1. Test. Gad. VI.3; T. Jos. XVIII-2;

2. Test. Iss. VII-6. cf Pirke Aboth I.10

3. Test. Benj. IX-2.

4. Introduction to Testament of Twelve Patriarchs. (Apoc. and Pseudep. Vol II p 291.)

supports this idea of majesty not meekness, rule and authority and not service.

The Son of man in Enoch sat not with men but at the right hand of the Almighty and judged men, wherefore he was a Son of man with great authority. Jesus as Son of man acquired the like and even greater authority by convincing men that He was in direct and constant touch with God. Indeed to those around Him Jesus revealed a nobility of character, a spiritual power, and an influence over men that seemed to reach beyond human attainment altogether. Close contact with Him opened their eyes to see that He represented God in the highest way in which God could ever be represented or unveiled to men. Nobler than the Son of man in Enoch, higher in His power and authority, Jesus Christ led men to see this Son of man was God among men till men were at length ready to give Him the new title 'Son of God'.¹ Hence while the Son of man in Enoch is a superhuman being -- less than Divine, the Son of man in the gospels and epistles of Paul has become the Deity² the Son of God; wherefore Paul can write:- "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords³ many). But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by Him" (I Cor. VIII-5).

1. of. Ryder Smith "The Christian/Experience" pp.96-100.

2. of. Jn. XX. 28.

3. of. Deissmann "Light from the Ancient East" pp. 353.f.

Authority and Power.

The next proposition we must face in this investigation is:- To what extent did Apocalyptic Messianism furnish Jesus with the necessary authority for the proclamation of His ideal?

Long before ~~the mass~~, Jesus had won recognition as the Son of God. He had to convince the Jews at any rate that He spoke with an authority greater than that of the scribes, greater even than that of the prophets, in short, that He spoke with the authority of God's Messiah. How does he attempt to establish this authority? When He is challenged Jesus implies He has been sent like the Baptist by God and declares He speaks with the authority of God's representative or Messiah. (Matt. XXI-23.f. of Jn. XII-35-6.)

This was an element in the ideal which men were seeking and men had to be convinced that His every word and act had this authority.¹ It was not enough that they should find in Him the two foci:- Strength and sympathy, or truth and love. Every turn of speech must be authoritative, must belong to the perfect curve - the ellipse of Divine Truth. Mankind must have a guidance that was perfect - perfect, that is, as far as it went. Jesus claimed to have the needed authority and to supply the needed guidance. But in claiming the authority of Messiah He did so in His own way. This way we shall now investigate.

We have already referred to His avoidance of the title of Messiah. It is evident, therefore, that Jesus wished to gain His

1. Cf. Macintosh. 'Originality of the Christian Message. pp.17-18.

His authority otherwise than by claiming the title. It is also evident that He did not wish to acquire authority in the way the Messiah of apocalyptic was expected to command it, namely by the exercise of force and external domination as thus proclaimed:-

'And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen... shall loosen the reins of the strong. And break the teeth of sinners'.¹ 'And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth shall fall down before him on their faces, Nevertheless that Lord of Spirits will so press them that they shall hastily go forth from His presence..... And they shall be a spectacle for the righteous and for the elect ... because the wrath of the Lord of Spirits resteth upon them and His sword is drunk with their blood.'²

There is never a suggestion that the Son of Man must suffer: that was an idea quite foreign to the ideas hitherto associated with the Messiah. There is no suggestion of gaining authority by forgiveness and mercy yet these have much to do with the authority exercised by our Lord, and by the time His teaching was beginning to permeate the Roman world we find Plutarch extolling forgiveness in dealing with slaves for he has found "Pardon rather than punishment the commencement of their reformation aye and made better slaves to some merely at their nod silently and cheerfully than to others with all their beatings and brandings."³

1. Enoch XLVI. 4.

2. Enoch LXII. 9, 10, 12.

3. Plutarch's "Moralia" translated by Shilleto p.279.

When we read that "The people were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes" (Matt. VII-28, 29) the context shows, and the astonishment shows that the feeling of authority was not created in the minds of the people by their knowledge that He was Messiah nevertheless, without pressing the assumption that in Matt. VII 21ff. we have the real context, we may safely assume that Jesus took up a position of authority also in virtue of being the Son of His heavenly Father and of exercising in the future the powers of the apocalyptic Messiah namely those of the Judge of all mankind (cf. "Many will say to Me in 'that day' Lord, Lord ... and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you, depart from me ye that work iniquity".¹ with "And He shall judge the secret things, And none shall be able to utter a lying word before Him;... And when the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the righteous, Where then will be the dwelling of the sinners, And where the resting place of those who have denied the Lord of Spirits?"²)

But having noted the above safe assumption we have by no means given a complete account of the seat of our Lord's authority. He claimed that the source of much of His authority was to be found in men's own hearts and experience and understanding. It was /

1. Matt. VII-23. (vide Dobschütz op.cit.pp.80,81.)

2. Enoch. XXXVIII-2. -

was due to the fact that His words were confirmed by what they themselves had experienced or knew in their deepest souls to be true. Consider how often He begins His parables and discourses with such words as these:- "Which of you ... What man of you..." and then proceeds to appeal to their own experience for confirmation of His words. All these are ways in which the Son of Man sought to exercise His authority and fulfil the human ideal in his own life. The teaching of apocalyptic as the teaching of the Jewish Canon was but an anvil on which He hammered out His own doctrine.

What was this doctrine? It declared that authority came from heaven above and also heaven planted in men's hearts. In other words God reached down to men and men reached up to God. In the first there was the action of God, in the second there was the reaction of men and when the reaction was universal then the authoritative witness was complete. But how were men to judge of authority when the human reaction was not universal? No man's mere ipse dixit could be taken on final matters as authoritative. Jesus was confronted with this difficulty when His enemies declared His testimony of Himself was not true. He then fell back on a unique relation to God. "I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me if ye had known me ye should have known my /

my Father also". (Jn. VIII-18, 19). Compare these words with Matt.XI-27:- "No man knoweth the Son but the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him"; also with 2 Cor. II-14:- "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God neither can he know them".

Now what was this unique relation to God? It was the relation of identity of mind and will.¹ By this the authority of God was committed unto Him: cf. "For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son and my judgment is just because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me". (Jn. V-22, 30).

Jesus had learned from the O.T. prophets that "the truth about men ~~that~~ matters is not what man sees but what God sees and what He reveals to his servants in measure in holy and prophetic moments where man sees ruins God sees the finished walls".² (cf. Is. XLIX-16). Hence no man knoweth the Father except Him who is entirely obedient to His will. "But, "If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine." (Jn. VII-17). "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God". (Matt. V-8.) Wherefore if the 'consensus gentium' or the witness of the light that lighteth every man failed Jesus felt this was because the light was obscured by want of perfect obedience /

1. Temple in "Foundations" p. 247 ff. (edited by Steeter)
 2. J.A. Hutton. "At Close Quarters" p. 213.

obedience or failure to commune with God. He claimed authority - unique authority - for His own witness in virtue of His unique obedience to the mind and will of God. Where there was the like obedience and intense communion there would be the like revelation and authority.¹

Now Jesus associated this claim with the name Son of Man (cf. Matt. XXVI-64 - "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power") and it has been thought that in this statement he was directly influenced by Enoch. But let us see if we cannot get a definition of the Son of Man which will embrace the various aspects of our Lord's use of it.

Manson would have us see in our Lord's use
of /

¹ Note: When Jesus was challenged about the source of His Authority he referred to the Baptism of John (Matt. XXI-25). The inference is that He received His authority like John from God because He was a prophet and more than a prophet. And why did Jesus esteem John as more than a prophet? Because (a) he universalized faith when he said to those who pleaded they were Abraham's seed:- It is God's goodness of heart that raises people to be his children. It is Repentance not race, Welldoing not Privilege that count with God, (b) He had the courage to revive prophecy after the canon of Old Testament scripture was closed. He was bringing men back to the final source of authority - Immediate experience of God."

of this term the (a) Messianic consciousness (b) the filial consciousness. But he would rule out the meaning of 'ideal' or 'representative' man.¹ Yet he says that Dan. VII-13 "is simply an imaginative symbolization of the humanity of the Kingdom of God as contrasted with the world empires of the past"² and "By the time the Book of Enoch comes to be written the 'one like unto a son of man' is interpreted as the Messiah".³ Now it is well authenticated that Jewish writers including the apocalypticists were not deterred from tearing a term or phrase out of its context. But granted that, and even ~~too~~, the supposition as proved that during our Lord's lifetime on earth the ideas which the Book of Enoch elaborates were 'in the air' yet is it not natural to suppose that Jesus was as well if not better acquainted with the significance of the term in Daniel than with that in Enoch? Moreover would the meaning which appeared in the Canon not have as much if not more weight with Him? Wherefore in His use of the name He would have the Danielic conception in mind. Nay more, from what we have already found about His consciousness He would universalize the idea thus: ~~To~~ ^{The} saintly or glorified Humanity is given the authority of God. This is the definition we require.

The central meaning, therefore, of the term 'Son of Man' is /

1. Manson op. cit. p.123f.
2. Ibid. p. 151.
3. Ibid. p. 151.

is that of saintly or glorified humanity. A saintly or glorified man is one who has given over his will completely to the will of God. Jesus alone has done this perfectly in this life and therefore He is the only perfect Son of Man. We venture to say that according to His own teaching it is the only difference that matters "Whosoever will do the will of my Father which is in heaven the same is my brother, and sister, and mother. (Matt. Xll.50) Compare the passage:—"Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in him" (Jn. Xll.31) The ordinary interpretation is that Jesus was glorified 'by death' but surely the meaning of the verse is this:—(a) The Son of man was glorified by a death that completed and sealed an earthly life lived in perfect accordance with the will of God,¹ and (b) that God was glorified by His Will being thus lived out perfectly in a human personality.² "The human affections of Christ are God's affections, His suffering is God's, His love is God's, His glory is God's."³ The last act no doubt was the greatest—how great and how vital for the well-being of humanity we may never comprehend. Yet Gethsemane shows that the keynote to the meaning of the Cross is that there Jesus did—in direst circumstances without, and terrible difficulties (if not actual doubts) within—the Will of God. Moreover /

(1) cf. Cadoux op.cit. p76; also Ryder Smith op.cit. p58.

(2) Lk. Xll.31f. ; (3) Temple "Foundations" p.24q. (edited by Streeter)

Moreover if we ask why death glorified the saints of the Most High mentioned in Daniel in so far that they were given dominion and authority do we not see the same law at work? Must we not conclude that they who had sought persistently to do God's will on earth had thereby given their nature a definite bent; and death, by removing all hindrances which might have undone or reversed the direction of their wills and character put an eternal stamp on that character and so made them worthy to have the dominion in God's Kingdom. Daniel may simply have meant that the saints received the dominion as a reward but what did Jesus think? Did He who analysed the ways of God's working with the lilies not analyse here also? Though Jesus saw essential truths by flashes does not the Temptation experience show that He thought out things as well? Did He not read here the implication of the great potentiality of human personality, namely that the sons of men might become the sons of God?

Indisputably Jesus regarded every human soul as of infinite value (cf. Matt. XVI.-26.) Whence had he derived this outlook? Jesus as already stated was deeply influenced by Daniel VII. and in greater measure directly than indirectly through Enoch. But He derived His high idea of human personality neither from Daniel alone, nor from intuition alone - though these /

these are both factors which must be reckoned with. But surely we must also take account of the following:- "Platonism filtered down among the masses, instructing them that the soul in a previous state had seen the things of God, and was so impressed with the love of the true and beautiful that, though enshrouded in the muddy vesture of decay, it recognised and yearned for the highest".¹ Further "The pagans had some sense of a greater bond-kinship with the Divine, or the Divine sonship of all men. Aratus and Cleanthes agreed in the sentiment approved by Paul "We are of His kinship".² This relationship He found in His own experience. That is the fact of premier importance:- The religion of Jesus is founded on experience. It has to be remembered, that the consciousness of His own "Character as God's Son had been a revelation to Jesus at the baptism. If it was not then revealed for the first time at least it was then powerfully confirmed. It was a revelation also to Peter at Caesarea Philippi:- "Flesh and blood have not revealed this to thee, but my Father in heaven"; though Peter failed to understand the full significance of the revelation.³ The flash we repeat which gave Him certainty of conviction as to His own Sonship came at baptism. Yet "It was only through steadfast /

1. Angus op. cit. p. 61.

2. Ibid. p. 66.

3. Moffatt "Theology of the Gospels" p. 112.

steadfast obedience to the Father's will, through prayer and temptation, that He came to realise the meaning of His Sonship for Himself and for men." ¹. The trouble is that none has shown that perfect devotion except the Son of Man, and His choice of the name was due to His burning desire that men might realise the glorious potentiality of human personality and to His conviction that in making no claim to the possession of such elements of the Godhead as Omniscience and Omnipotence He surrendered nothing comparable to a breach of Righteousness or a failure of Love. The perfect quality of His life entitled Him and gave Him, when He called for it, Divine Power so that He was able to say "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28-18.) (cf. Matt. XI-27. and the many passages dealing with the power given unto the Son of Man on the earth and at His second coming). But we should also note how power is given to every man - and will be given hereafter - who has this quality. (cf. parable of the

1. Moffatt "Theology of the Gospels" p. 112.

"The Talents", and "When the Son of Man shall sit in the throne ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones" - Matt. XIX -28. But whence did Jesus derive such ideas of human personality?

If we accept that our Lord knew the O.T. Canon as well as He knew the palm of His hand we shall not hesitate to say that He would be familiar with two passages, (a) that passage where is found the development of Isaiah's mind with regard to Immanuel. In Is. VII. we learn that the House of David need not produce the Messiah as prophesied and need not be blessed. Indeed by the folly of Ahaz, though the Presence of God is to be with the people of Israel, yet there is to be no glorious Messianic reign.¹ The child called Immanuel is to grow up suffering, as he grows, the ills which the policy of Ahaz has brought upon succeeding generations. But in Chapter IX. when things were at their blackest Isaiah comes out with his wonderful prophecy of the Messiah who is to be a God-hero or Divine Hero; a conqueror as well as a Prince of Peace: (b) And Zechariah XII. where the prophet declares that David's house shall be like God himself, like the angel of the Eternal, i.e. like the Presence which delivered the Israelites at the Red Sea and led them in the wilderness.² Hence in Isaiah we have described a marvellous child - a Messiah whose fourfold name is "too generous, perhaps, for a mere mortal",³ and in Zechariah /

1. G.A. Smith 'Isaiah' p. 117.

2. Dummelow op.cit. p. 610. (Commentary on the Holy Bible).

3. G.A. Smith 'Isaiah' p. 129.

Zechariah a family or clan or nation who are to have Divine quality.

From these passages we can understand our Lord's mind being influenced towards a very lofty conception of human personality as being closely related to the Divine. Psalm 8 would support this conception by its statement "Thou hast made him little less than divine, thou hast crowned him with majesty and honour, giving him sway over all thy hands have made etc."¹

Here, within the O.T. was a stream of thought flowing away from the Hebrew conception of a God whose Holiness caused Him to be dreaded and whose nature was far removed from the nature of men. Here was a stream of thought fed by many small tributaries of Hellenistic thought yet maintaining the best elements which had hitherto flowed from Hebrew sources. It was a stream which did not flow through Apocalyptic literature, but it was just the type of thought best calculated to feed and nourish a poetic, prophetic mind such as we conceive our Lord's mind to have been.

With the above factors before us and ere we turn to our Lord's reading of Daniel VII-27 there is one phase of the mind of Jesus which should be noted namely His tendency to appeal from accepted authorities to higher and more ancient authorities

1. Moffatt's Translation.

for instance from the Law of Moses to Direct Inspiration as when He said - "It hath been said ... but I say unto you" (Matt.V.38,39). For thus challenging Mosaic legislation as not being entirely of Divine authority Jesus had precedent in Jeremiah (VII.-22,23.) which denied the Divine origin of the ritual section of the Law ¹. This challenge Paul repeated when he appealed to the Faith of Abraham (Rom. 1V - 3.) In each of these instances a man of clear courageous mind perceives where the stream of religious thought has deviated from the true channel and, by His teaching directs it back to its true course. So is it the contention of this thesis that Jesus reacted to the Apocalyptic movement by going back to Daniel to study it for Himself and thenceforth by keeping more faithful to its spirit and teaching He redirected Messianic thought. For instance only in two pre-Christian documents of apocalyptic viz. - 1. Maccabees and Psalms of Solomon do we find traces of the old belief in a God who does something now. ². Jesus corrected this. ³.

In going to Daniel VII. Jesus would find verse 27. set forth clearly the meaning of verse 13. That meaning /

1. cf. Cadoux op. cit. p. 192.

2. cf. C.A.Scott "Dominus Noster". p. 15.

3. cf. Lk. XII. 6,7.

meaning is that glorified men - though in Daniel's mind restricted to the men of Israel - might become vice-gerents of God.¹ And if Enoch could individualise the conception so as to make the glorified men the Messiah, surely it is not too much to say that Jesus could universalise it, and declare that men were potential Messiahs - personalities who, by obedience to God's will should come in time to rule for Him (cf. They shall reign with Him for ever and ever - Rev. 22 - 5.) In other words when divine quality entered into men's lives divine power followed.

Now, that Jesus did think in this way we believe is evident by His use of the name Father, for God. Father certainly had been used before for God, even outside the Canon of Scripture, but in only a creative sense - God being the creator of all was the Father of all. But Jesus did not use the name chiefly in this way. According to His teaching God was the Father, in the highest sense, only of the faithful. This however, was not the sole

1. cf. Septuagint rendering of 2 Samuel XXIII. 1. also

Hort on 1 Peter 1.11.

sole intention of Christ in using the term Father for God. By its means he sought to convince men that God was near and not far away as they had thought hitherto. "The association of remoteness and ritual which had gathered round the divine name of 'holy' probably accounted for Jesus' avoidance of it; the moral purity and passion which it denoted, were expressed by Him in terms of the Father's love as opposed to sin in man".¹ Indeed there is only one passage in the Gospels where 'holy' is definitely applied to God, that is in John 17-11. "Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given to me that theirs may be a unity like ours".² But the term here has not its old association of aloofness. Besides Jesus used only sparingly other common titles for God, such as The LORD (ὁ Κύριος) THE BLESSED (ὁ εὐλογητός) THE MOST HIGH (ὁ Ὑψίστος).³

Was it not our Lord's desire to break down the Jewish idea of an impossible gulf between human personality and divine personality? In the thought of Christ when men had their wills obedient to the will of God they would be endowed with divine authority - having the divine love they would have the divine power.

How was that power to be given to the sons of men. Enoch states that the power is given to one like to a Son of man who is /

1. Moffatt. Theol. of the Gospel. p. 101.
2. Ibid. p. 102.
3. Ibid. p. 99.

is righteousness. The authority is thus, however, manifested not in a man nor in men, but in a supramundane being. But Jesus claimed that this power would be given to men even as it now was given in large measure to Himself while He was on earth, e.g. "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins". When we look into this claim there emerge the following two facts:- (a) Other men could forgive sins in so far that their forgiveness brought their fellows into right relations with themselves after those relations had been disturbed, (b) but when Jesus forgave sins men were restored to right relations not only with Himself but with God. Wherefore this difference? Was it not because His quality, His will was perfectly Divine and theirs was not. True! but they might acquire that Divine quality so that henceforward to be forgiven by a thoroughly Christlike person would be tantamount to be forgiven by God. (cf. Matt. XVI-19, XVIII-18, Jn. XX-23, I Cor. V-4.) In like manner we may interpret Matt. XII-8. Moreover according to the writer of the Fourth Gospel such power was to come upon men who were faithful to Christ as should enable them after He had left the earth to do greater works than many which He Himself had done. (Jn. XIV-12).

CHAPTER III .

Apocalyptic Form.

In the following chapter an attempt is made to answer the question:--"Had the message of Jesus originally an apocalyptic form"? The contention of this Thesis is that it had not.

CHAPTER IIIApocalyptic Form.

Jesus for his purpose of calling out the Divine that was in man required to show evidence of Divine Power in Himself. But how did He reveal it? Did He reveal it by acting and teaching along the lines of apocalyptic teaching, e.g. (a) by claiming to be Messiah or a supramundane Son of man, (b) By moulding his whole message on the belief of an imminent catastrophic intervention of God? In other words, did Jesus take over the current belief of His time about the coming of the Kingdom of God? From the preceding study of the mind of Jesus the answer is No! For the 'raison d'etre' of apocalyptic, psychologically expressed, is that wherever the outward conditions prevailing are stronger than man he tends to find refuge in fantasy and Jesus was too strong and robust a personality to seek any such refuge. But if the question be historically considered, the answer is also in the negative because of the evidence of the Gospels. For "the Gospel accounts of the Temptation show that this idea is a fallacy. The inner significance of the Temptation is that Jesus met this current conception of the Kingdom at the outset of His career, considered it, weighed it, and rejected it".. "Accepting the Messiahship He yet sees temptation in some aspects of the ideal." 1.

1. Streeter 'Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem' p.434.

The three temptations hang on the idea of Power. Jesus is found rejecting the attitude of calling on God to make catastrophic interventions, or manifestations of Divine Power divorced from the working out of the Divine purpose of the moral and spiritual education of men. Man does not live by bread nor by outward circumstances so much as by communion with God, i.e. by the living Word. The attitude adopted by Jesus was that set forth in Ezekiel,¹ "Son of man stand upon thy feet and I will speak unto thee". Neither grovel and fear nor presumptuously stand upon a supernatural claim, but stand upon thy manhood, stand up to a hard task, be bold in the service of God. Jesus saw thus early and clearly that while men were being taught to wait for God's intervention they were really forcing God to wait for their active faith and repentance by which they would be prepared and equipped to use God's powers and interventions wisely. Indeed thus early it might be said Jesus foresaw the later significance of the symbol of the Cross as representing the Hands and feet of God crucified, i.e., God's Powers held in check that man's powers may be developed by ^{man} being led to use his Hands and feet in the service of God, or to put it in another way, Jesus saw that men are called to be bold and courageous and active^{2/}

1. Ezekiel II-1.

2.cf. Isaiah XLII.4; Lk.XVIII.iff.;Du Bose op.cit.p.19.

active not quiescent, and to rejoice not because the world was dying and a good time was at hand but because an evil ^{time} was at hand; for in the evil time God would be with them and by overcoming the evil they would manifest the works of God. (cf. Jn. 1X.3)

This will appear clearer by a consideration of two closely related Greek words--χαίρει and θάρσει which are found in the N.T., The first of these imperatives--found most frequently in the plural form in the N.T.--was, and is till this day, in Greece, a word of greeting which one might use to comfort a child = cheer up, this which is troubling you will pass, the sky is clearing, there is a good day coming. But θάρσει is a deeper word signifying:-Be of good cheer. Be bold, -difficult times lie ahead but fear not- go forward, adventure. (of. θάρσει τόνδε γ' ἄβλον = take heart for this struggle ¹). One text of Luke represents Jesus as saying "Courage" even on the Cross when He spoke to the dying thief. ² Again in Acts XXIII.11 (R.V.) we read:-"And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, "Be of good cheer (θάρσει) for as thou hast testified concerning me at Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." No rejoicing here over imminent escape from hardship but rather in opportunity for further boldness and courage and activity by means of the Presence of Christ. (Is it not notable how often Jesus, while in the flesh, used the word? cf. Matt. 1X.2, 22, XIV.27. /

(1) cf. Kittell & Scott's Greek Dictionary θάρσει Att. θάρσει
(2) Glover "The Conflict of Religions.... Empire" pl30.

XIV-27, MARK, VI-50, XL-49; Luke VIII-48; John XVI-33. Is it not significant that Judas used "γαίρε"¹) Paul was to be bold because of the Presence of Christ even as Peter and John were bold (cf. Acts IV-13). His boldness was that of Christ Himself, who again was bold because of the Presence of God abiding with Him through communion. It is the great fact which is set forth in the Psalms:- that "communion with God and God's presence more than make up for evil circumstances". "Yea though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of death I will fear no evil for Thou art with me".² Here again looking at Christ through the Psalms we see into His very Heart - we see that His attitude at the Temptation and his whole life afterwards was an adventuring upon the Presence of God - not a seeking a way of escape as apocalyptic taught but a setting His face to go up to Jerusalem; a battling with, and over-coming of, the circumstances of life through the Presence of God. That Presence was God's Kingdom for it was the rule of God already present- forming and shaping the lives of men.

Yet if such be the case, how are we to account for the apocalyptic form which makes up so large a part of the presentation of Jesus in the Gospels and even in the Epistles?

The reason is that the resurrection appearances and Pentecost were experiences which exercised so powerful an effect and impression /

(1) Matt. XXVI.49.; (2) Ps. XLIII.

impression upon the early disciples that they dilated upon the Messiahship of Jesus and lost all sense of proportion. The tragedy of the Cross had taken away their boldness but in their new found experiences it returned and their all-absorbing desire was to vindicate the greatness of their master. They had, all ready to hand, the material for doing this, namely the messianic teaching both of the O.T. and of Apocalyptic and they made ample use of both. Johannes Weiss has made this very clear in the following passages:

„Die rapide Entwicklung der Christologie zu den höchsten und weitestgreifenden Aussagen hat ihren Grund darin, daß schon vor der Erscheinung Jesu eine Christologie d. h. eine Lehre vom Messias, oder wenigstens das Material für eine Christologie, bei Juden wie bei Hellenisten vorhanden war; und in dem Augenblick, wo in der Person Jesu der Messias gefunden war, schossen die verstreuten, eines bindenden Mittelpunkts entbehrenden Elemente zusammen wie Kristalle um ihren Kern. Es bedurfte kaum noch eines besonderen Nachdenkens; dieselben Aussagen, die man bisher über den zukünftigen Messias gemacht hatte, wurden ohne Zaudern auf den gegenwärtigen übertragen, natürlich mit den Verschiebungen, die durch die Eigenart Jesu, besonders durch seinen Kreuzestod, erfordert wurden - und die Christologie war im Wesentlichen fertig.“¹

1. J. Weiss { "Christus" Relig. Volk. p. 5.
 { Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher (Tübingen 1909).

(But whereas the Messianic hope of Judaism was feverish, a means of obtaining an elusive deliverance from the desolation and pain of the present - a hope that brought little joy and confidence, the cry of the early disciples "We have found the Messiah" is

full of joyous enthusiasm and conviction) (b) „Man kann es nicht oft genug sagen: das Christentum hat nicht durch eine unvergleichlich neue, besonders einschmeichelnde und überzeugende Lehre den Sieg gewonnen - im Gegenteil: was an der Lehre neu war, hat Juden und Heiden den schwersten Anstoß bereitet“¹

No! But the victory was gained by „die Freude und Seligkeit, welche das Leben auch der einfachsten Gemeindeglieder ausstrahlte“²

Here was an old doctrine and a new experience brought together. Yet they could never have been brought together but for two facts, viz:- (a) That the new experience was not essentially new for the Pentecostal power and boldness of spirit was recognized as identical with the power and boldness of spirit which had been theirs while they walked with Jesus in the flesh.

It was ^{not} something new but something renewed. (b) The Jesus whom they knew in the flesh was altogether worthy of the honour the doctrine conferred upon him. „Es heißt, allzu gering von der Persönlichkeit Jesu denken, wenn man annimmt, durch seinen Tod sei alles zerstört worden, was er in den Seelen der Jünger angebaut hatte - so schwach soll sein Einfluß, so

1. J. Weiss "Christus" Relig. Volk. p. 9.

(2) Do.

Do.

Do.

matt die Gewalt seiner Persönlichkeit gewesen sein? " 1.

"wenn in ihnen eine Spur von Zweifel an der Lauterkeit Jesu gewesen wäre, wenn sie nur einen Hauch von Ehrgeizem, selbstherrlichem, unfrohem Wesen an ihm beobachtet hätten, die Oster-erlebnisse hätten nicht die Kraft gehabt, diese Ein-
drücke zu überwinden und die Jünger in Verfolgung und Todesnot bei Jesus festzuhalten."

That the disciples were bent, absorbed in the attempt to indicate the Power of Jesus is made evident by the fact that the resurrection has not at first the important place in Christian doctrine which it had later with Paul.³ It is not the resurre-
ction but the ascension which is the all-important doctrine in those early days of Christianity.⁴ Even Paul puts great emphasis upon this in his earliest epistles - namely 1st and 2nd Thessalonians. The first meaning of the resurrection to the early Christians was not the conquest of life over death but merely a rising from the dead as a means to ascending and sitting at the Right Hand of the Power of God; the dominant thought is that the reawakening is a justification, a rehabilitation/

1. J. Weiss op. cit. p. 10.

2. J. Weiss do.

3. Romans. VI-2ff, I Cor XV.

4. Acts. II-24.

rehabilitation of him who was rejected by the Jews.¹ In his earthly lifetime Jesus was called prophet, teacher, Master - but not yet Messiah. Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi was a bold anticipation and Jesus' confession before the High Priest, a confident expectation of His future power and glory. But the anticipation and the expectation have been fulfilled and realised as a fact - a fact revealed by the resurrection. "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ".² Before his conversion, the likelihood is Paul held the belief as a Pharisee, that the Messiah existed from all eternity with God in heaven;³ and after his conversion he looked

for the day when God should reveal his son.⁴ At his conversion
 „Jesus ihm in der lichten Herrlichkeit seines Auferstehungsdaßens entgegentrat, da identifizierte er ihn mit seinem Christus und übertrug nun ohne weiteres auf Jesus alle die Vorstellungen die er von dem Himmelswesen bereits hatte, z. B. die, daß es schon vor der Welt existierte und an ihrer Erschaffung beteiligt war.“

5 5

Thus the question is answered as to how the apocalyptic form has such a large place in the New Testament.

Yet /

-
1. Acts. III-15; Mark XII-10f.
 2. Acts. II-36.
 3. ~~Apocalyptic literature~~ = work of the Pharisees
 4. I Cor. I-8.
 5. Weiss, op. cit. p. 33.

Yet "the element of apocalyptic eschatology cannot be eliminated from His (Jesus') preaching".¹ True!, but what was that element? Was it not similar to the element of the mystery religions found in Paul viz:- the use of its language and symbols to enforce His own teaching? (Even here Jesus made a very careful selection - wherefore there are no fantastic symbols in his preaching) Something more of apocalyptic than this however, formed the element in the preaching of Jesus. It resulted from seeing the present age in the light of an imminent, new world order which it was His mission to inaugurate but it led Him to call men to "the venture of living in a world not realised"² a world in which His spirit would be universalized. This we shall now proceed to show.

In order to do so let us return to the query, had the message of Jesus an Apocalyptic form? First we must ask what shaped that form? It was the doctrine of Divine Power intervening in human affairs. Jesus was confronted with the idea of divine power when He first heard the message of the Baptist. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" was an apocalyptic /

1. Moffatt. "Theol. of the Gospels. p. 76.
2. Oman Ency. Brit. (13th Edit.) Vol. I p. 634.

apocalyptic doctrine which expressed in its own way the ruling aspiration of the age - 'Power'. The word 'kingdom' denotes rule or power. They who were hitherto under authority were soon to have authority. Moreover by a Divine intervention Power was about to be manifested. When, therefore, Jesus took up the message the idea of power must have been present in His mind. But were His ideas as to the exercise of divine power identical with those of the Baptist or of apocalyptic? If it was His meeting with the Baptist which first brought Him into contact with the apocalyptic movement, as apparently it was, - (He may have had some relation with the movement previously but we have no record of it). was He likely to have adopted apocalyptic ideas so suddenly or was He not more likely to have seized on the message, because it furnished Him with something He required for His own message?¹ Ere we attempt to answer that question, but as a help to answer it, let us briefly sum up what we have already concluded about His character and consciousness.

We see Him, a young high-souled Galilean who has tried to live /

1. "The Baptist was a prophet as well as an apocalypticist. John speaks in his own person in the spirit and power of an Elijah" (Streeter "Foundations" p.93.)

live out what he conceived to be the national ideal of Israel; nay, more, we have pictured one who is trying to live out the human universal ideal. This was the object of His life ere ever He entered His public ministry. If this was not so, how came it that the Voice at Baptism said "Thou art my beloved son in whom I am well pleased" (Mk. I-11; cf. Matt. III-17; Lk. III-22). Well pleased with what? And why God's Son? Was He not God's son because He was doing God's Will - doing God's work in setting Himself the task of redeeming mankind and in the universal scope of His love (cf. Matt. V-45.)? Was it not above all because He was building up His faith on His own immediate experiences. His meeting with the Baptist settled His conviction or gave Him conviction that He was going on the right lines and started Him on His public ministry. Why? Not because He entirely followed the Baptist (cf. Matt. XI, 18,19) but the urgency of the message would have much to do with our Lord stepping into public life.

And now to our question and in view of what we have just said, was Jesus won over to the apocalyptic idea of the imminent exercise of Divine power in an outward material form or did He see the need of using this idea and at the same time correcting it? Can we imagine that One who could weigh up, analyse, and penetrate the teaching of the Sacred Canon till He grasped and set forth its inner spirit and power would fail to do likewise with /

with the apocalyptic teaching of His day? (cf. Matt. V-21ff). Is it not far more in keeping with His great penetration of mind referred to above and exhibited on many other occasions (cf. Mk. XII-14, 18ff.) that He would see where the real power of the apocalyptic movement lay and wish to turn it to account? Would He not see for one thing, that it was a powerful agent in causing men to look to God for deliverance; and, for another, knowing human hearts as He did - knowing the despair (acedia, taedium vitae) and apathy so prevalent in those days - would He not see in the message of this movement that by which alone human hearts in such a time could be moved strongly, namely, the hope - the confident hope of some present or imminent deliverance? Who would know better than Jesus that Hope is a universal dynamic? Who would realise more keenly than Jesus the long disappointment of Israel and the necessity for the proclamation of an early manifestation of God's goodness and power? Here in John's message was the very note required:- "The kingdom of heaven is at hand". Wherefore Jesus endorsed the faith and the hope which Apocalyptic engendered. These were the crying need of the age. They, however, were no new thing in His life, but the apocalyptic note of urgent, instant action was. Moreover the Age was impatient with the philosophical speculations of the schools and demanded something practical. And likewise the love of Jesus was too passionate to allow Him to acquiesce in mere speculation or /

or even in ethical teaching alone. His mission was to teach realities and 'this not by defining but by personifying'¹. Hence the dynamic of Christianity is found in the personality of Jesus who personified Faith, Hope and Love. Nevertheless, the personality of Jesus cannot be severed from its expression and the expression includes the urgent note of apocalyptic. Intensity is the key to His personality and His intense passion, His Galilean strain, the fire of His soul found their expression in the apocalyptic watchword better than in any other available. Apathy and acquiescence in the 'status quo' were anathema to His mind and temperament.

Yet is it not evident that although Jesus adopted the apocalyptic watchword and other elements in apocalyptic He was not tied even to the apocalyptic form in His teaching? Indeed Jesus could not be bound by any form or system. He did not come to men with any clear-cut programme; He did not speak to his hearers in the abstract terms of the Philosopher or theologian. For instance He did not speak to men of their souls in the way Greek philosophers did. With Jesus a man's soul was not the abstraction it was in Greek philosophy but — his living personality. He showed himself interested in men and women, qua men and women, and not merely in some metaphysical abstraction called their soul. Nevertheless He was interested in their /

1. Abbott. "Son of Man" pp. 29-30.

their souls if by that we mean their finer feelings - which He would fan into a flame until it devoured their dross and transformed them and made them all aglow. By His language and His life He brought His thoughts of the human soul within their everyday experience. Hence Deissmann declares:- "If anything can with certainty be affirmed of Him it is this: that He was no brooding theologian. He is completely non-theological. He is all religion, all life. He is spirit and fire He who undertakes to formulate a theology of Jesus from our Lord's testimonies behaves exactly like the infant who stretches out his arms to grasp the golden sun".¹ That is perhaps overdrawn but certainly if we limit His message to the Apocalyptic form i.e. as we know it among the apocalyptists of Israel, we unwarrantably cramp His message. For the message of Jesus was "Follow Me" a call to men to live as He lived, to live as the sons of God, to realise the power of Faith, Hope, and Love, in fellowship with God. It was the announcement of their true destiny, and it was supported by His own life as at once a revelation of the truly human and the truly Divine:- the Humanity of God. But whereas this divine destiny of humanity is regarded in our day as the "one far off divine event", Jesus, by the measure of His adoption of the apocalyptic form showed that this was not His outlook. On the other hand whereas apocalyptic directed men's attention to /

1. Deissmann. New Light on the New Testament (Quoted Expository Times. (Oct. 1928) p. 8.

to a near future event Jesus emphasised even more a present experience,-the experience of Faith.

There was not much faith¹ in apocalyptic. The power of the apocalyptic movement lay chiefly in its hope. But who could imagine the Gospel of Jesus without faith in the foreground. Jesus taught faith, Jesus impersonated faith. But in so far as apocalyptic had faith it was lacking in power and why? Because it was a faith of standing by - a waiting for God to act. That was not the Faith of Jesus. His faith led Him to work for God and to realise that God worked through men. This was a great source of power to men. The power came by contact or communion. It necessitated prayer - importunate prayer. (cf. Lk. XVIII-1² ~~10~~ ² But Jesus would set no limits to the power of importunate prayer in faith. "If ye shall ask anything in my name I will do it". (Jn. XIV-14; cf. Matt. XXI-22; Mk. VI-22; Lk. XI-9) "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed ye shall say unto this mountain remove hence to yonder place and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. XVII-20). The power was waiting to be manifested in men of faith - waiting on their faith. The kingdom was at hand. Faith was the moving belt (especially faith exercised in prayer) which connected the human spirit as machinery to dynamo. Prayer was the key which attuned human hearts to the right pitch of faith so as to receive the words and music of heaven - the Voice of the /

1. Fides, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ, ἡ πίστις, all passive till N.T. (cf. Lightfoot 'Galatians' p. 148.)
 2. cf. Mk VII. 24 f.; Matt. XV. 21 f.

the Heavenly Master. With Jesus every human life was a receiving set, meant neither for action nor inaction but for Reaction - a reaction brought about by the contact of faith. So Paul caught the Master's mind when he wrote:- "We all mirror the glory of the Lord with face unveiled, and so we are being transformed into the same like-ness as Himself, passing from one glory to another - for this comes of the Lord of the spirit" (2 Cor. III-18).¹ The faith of Jesus was therefore not like the hope of apocalyptic viz., waiting on God to act but rather an acting with God, by the power of God, since it was God's power being manifested through men of faith. Yet it was at one with apocalyptic in emphasising (to quote Paul) that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

"Jesus, having founded the Kingdom as a new Divine life in the world, retained for the Kingdom, so explained, (some of) the predicates with which Jewish faith and imagination had invested it" "The Kingdom comes not by evolution but by the power of God entering into the evolutionary process. Jesus laid all the emphasis on the power of God received by faith His faith in God made Him declare the Kingdom to be no result of ethical processes gradually attaining their end, but the immediate triumph of power from on high". "All this was the reading of history from the standpoint of faith".² It could be said not /

1. Moffatt's Translation.

2. Manson op. cit. p. 162

not only of apocalyptists but of all the parties of His day.

"Everyone was looking for the Kingdom of God, but while Pharisees said it was to be won by merit, and Zealots that it was to be established by force, Jesus said that it was to be received as a little child receives gifts from its parents." Here again it is received by faith.

But when the apocalyptists taught that the Kingdom would come suddenly being preceded by "the Day of the Lord" (Amos. V-18; Joel II-11, 31f; etc.) and also by strange signs in earth and sky - earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, the sun darkened and the moon turned into blood (e.g. Joel II. 30-31), how do the Gospels represent Jesus' reaction to these ideas?

Jesus endorsed the substance of this doctrine. He taught that Divine Power was about to be manifested in great measure and also that the present world order would have a sudden consummation. It may be a matter of surprise that our Lord had anything to do with a movement which had so many irrational features - so much "vague romanticism and unsubstantial pageantry" in its literary expression. But, as Lord Balfour has said, "all great movements are irrational" and Jesus was far too great a seer to be blind to the value of the substance and the form which were decked out in such fantastic figures and fancies. As a great religious genius, as a man of divine qualities of mind and heart He neither failed to see that this apocalyptic had a valuable /

valuable contribution to make to the religious advancement and development of the human race nor was He slow to use it. In using it, however, He realised that He must keep it sane i.e. keep it in touch both with the facts of earth and the facts of heaven: or, to put it in other words, Keep it human and Divine. We see this in His teaching of Humility as when He likened the Kingdom to a little child - also in the way He took up His vocation as Messiah. That He avoided the name and reputation while He more than lived the part - acted in such a way - and spoke also as to lead His followers to regard Him as the Messiah, shows that He endorsed the substance of the messianic expectations. But His ethical teaching reveals His steady and balancing influence. Indeed, "The mere fact that Jesus teaches at all - there is a surprise in this. Jesus believed himself to be messiah, and in his messianic vocation he set himself to instruct his age. We sometimes forget what a novelty that was No one had ever dreamt of such a function in connection with the Messiah".¹ Moreover His outstanding sanity and mental balance are evident when we look into the nature of His teaching. The eschatological sections are balanced by others "which seem unaffected by eschatological considerations of any kind ... What, for example, has eschatology to do with Christ's teaching about the Fatherly Goodness of God, about Prayer, about forgiveness /

1. Moffatt: "Approach To N.T p. 34,35.

forgiveness, about the Divine Renewal of the Penitent? Very different is Christ's thought of God's intimate nearness to His world and to His children from that cold distance to which the later Jewish theology had removed Him".¹ To the apocalypticist God's dwelling with men was not at all a present experience, but entirely a future event. What then did Jesus teach concerning the Kingdom? How far did He go in adopting the predicates of the apocalypticists? Certainly he adopted the apocalyptic predicate:- "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand". But observe how He modified the apocalyptic content. "Knowing that His questioners had in view the establishment of an earthly monarchy and the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, Christ replied: 'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation' ... It must have been on some such occasion that many of the Parables referring to the Kingdom were spoken .. especially those drawn from Nature, such as, The Parables of the Sower,(the Tares;),the Mustard Seed, and the Leaven. The object is obviously to show that the sudden catastrophic notion of the coming of the Kingdom must be subservient to the deeper and worthier idea of growth".² Again we should observe that in the Lord's prayer we have the petition 'Thy kingdom come' followed by 'Thy will be done'. "The Kingdom is God's Rule which means the fulfilment of God's will. Jesus came to establish God's sway upon the earth It is no/

1 Manson op. cit. p. 97.

2. Alexander "Expos. Times" p. 75-6 (vol. XL. - Nov 1928).

no vague aspiration for some far-off perfect state. It is a prayer for the immediate hour, for the living practical present!"¹

By comparing the apocalyptic doctrine of intervention with that of our Lord it should be kept clear before our minds that the task of the religious teacher is the same in all ages, viz:- to justify the ways of God to men. To do so is to reveal that there is a just distribution of power. The apocalypticist maintained that the ultimate power remained in the hands of God. Jesus taught the same doctrine but added that the source of God's power was love; nay, a Loving Personality. The apocalypticist regarded the source and seat of God's power as dwelling in His Righteous Will. The latter view kept Divine personality and human personality separated as by an impassable barrier. God became the Righteous Judge and man the prisoner at the bar. Our Lord's vision brought Divine personality in close relation to the human. God became the Father and man His lost and erring child. When, therefore, Jesus spoke of God intervening in Human affairs and when the apocalypticist appeared to speak of the same event the essential meaning was very different. Not different in every respect for even a loving Father may act as a righteous judge, but differing in emphasis and atmosphere. The apocalypticist envisaged a violent intervention in human affairs by the God of Deism - an outside, separated God. Jesus conceived /

1. Alexander, op. cit. p. 76.

conceived an invasion of the Divine through a human channel - a channel widened by faith and perfected by obedience. Jesus was concerned with the connection between human personality and the Divine - concerned to assert, restore and maintain it - whereby the Divine might invade the human. God was a spirit. A spirit was essentially a power. Man was essentially a human spirit.* Divine intervention would come by the Divine Spirit invading the human, by the Divine Power becoming human. That Jesus Himself was such a Divine intervention we have this testimony of Schweitzer:- "Jesus means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from Him and flows through our time also. This fact can neither be shaken nor confirmed by any historical discovery. It is the solid foundation of Christianity."¹ Further on he says:- "The truth is, it is not Jesus as historically known, but Jesus as spiritually arisen within men, who is significant for our time and can help it. Not the historical Jesus but the spirit which goes forth from Him and in the spirits of men strives for new influence and rule, is that which overcomes the world."² We reply - The Historical Jesus and the spirit - For how did the spirit go forth from Jesus? Was it not by human words? "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (Jn. VI-63.) Was it not /

1. Schweitzer. "Quest" p. 397.

2. Ibid. p. 399.

x. Cf. Temple "Foundations" [p. 255-6] ^{→ [Edited by Swales]} "Humanity is not alien from God but is spiritual as He is spiritual.]

not also by human feelings? "Those who would make us feel must feel themselves".¹ Yes and they must feel like us - have human feelings - feelings of a person. "The Gospel is not in word but in power", because the words are instinct with the spirit, life or personality of the speaker, i.e. of Christ. It is because the spirit spoke through the Historical Jesus that as St. John says, the words of Christ themselves are living powers; and so will ours be, if we have the mind of Christ".² Schweitzer would eliminate the human and introduce an all-embracing supernatural element when he says that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper it is the body and blood of the Son of Man which the worshippers eat and not of the earthly Jesus. At death Son of Man became "Holy Spirit" and united with the elements to transform them into His body and blood. But if it be true - and we hold it is true - that "The Messianic hope has been the crucible in which Judaism has found an individuality but lost its power",³ the reason is that the Messiah was a supernatural person and the same holds good of the apocalyptic Son of Man. Our reading is that the flesh of the Son of Man is the Divine Spirit expressed in human feelings. It is not literally human flesh but the form and colour which life in a human body gives to a Divine Spirit. Hence we read "He that /

1. Dean Inge. Sermon.

2. Ibid. cf. Cadoux. op. cit. p. 43.

3. Levison. Passiontide. p. 19

that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him" (Jn. VI-56.) And why? Because Christ and the eater have something in common - feelings in common, feelings which are at once human and Divine. So we must understand when the Word was made flesh, it was made not literally flesh but human nature - the Divine life becoming human by dwelling or being manifested in the flesh, and likewise we must bear in mind that if Jesus spoke those words at all (i.e. Jn. VI-56) He spoke them while He was yet living in the flesh. Moreover have we not a parallel to this manner of speaking in Ezekiel - the prophet from whom we suggest Jesus took the name: Son of Man? "Son of man, cause thy belly to eat, and fill thy bowels with this roll that I give thee And he said unto me, Son of Man, go get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them. For thou art sent to the house of Israel". If the Son of Man could eat the roll it was surely a small step for Jesus to take to ask others to eat the personification of the roll - the roll made living - human thought and emotion living in flesh and blood - Son of Man. (cf Ezekiel, III-1, 3, 4.) In fine, our contention is that if we separate the Son of Man from the historical Jesus Christianity will lose its power; the Son of Man was God and man, a union of the human and Divine natures in one personality ~~the~~ human nature informed by

by the Divine Spirit.

In the above passage which we have quoted from the 4th Gospel we submit that the writer - though perhaps not reporting the exact words of Jesus has caught the spirit of His teaching; Jesus taught that the Power of God was at hand for those whose faith led them to receive it by personal communion and contact. Jesus desired, therefore that men should experience, there and then, the inward power, the kingdom of God within, which He Himself had experienced through communion with, and obedience to God. But if we desire further to realise how Jesus emphasised Divine power working through the dedicated life - how far He was from being dominated either by the Baptist's message or by apocalyptic in general we have only to turn to Mark I-14, where we read in the revised version:- "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the good news of God" - not, as in the Authorised Version, the good news of the Kingdom of God. The revised reading has the support of the best manuscripts and it is generally accepted by scholars that the phrase "kingdom of God" crept in through a copyist repeating the common expression. Doubtless He went on to say as the next verse indicates: 'the kingdom of God is at hand'; but was that all the good news? Has the good news of His preaching nothing to do with God's character? (1) Have Christians in all the succeeding centuries been mistaken when they have read as the headline of that good news:

God /

(1) J. Cadoux op. cit. p. 15.

God is love and God so loved the world that He gave Himself that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have eternal life? Has the preaching of Jesus been so misunderstood by his hearers and by all after generations that the characteristic influence of Christianity which has been a growing reign of love in the world through the power exercised in it by Christian men and women, has been a different result from what our Lord intended? Let us go back to our Lord's own words for the answer. "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you, but whosoever shall be great among you shall be your minister and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be the servant of all". (Mk. X-42-45; cf. Jn. XIII-13,14.) Here was something basal and central in the mind of Jesus. He who preached the good news of God represented it by a life of service and suffering for men. Hence Jesus presented the picture of God - not as One about to exercise dominion by force but as one who would rule men's hearts by love, and sympathy. Where in apocalyptic can we find such a picture of the Messiah, or of the Son of Man, or of the heart and mind of God? This active sympathy, this passionate love, this self-giving was an ideal foreign to apocalyptic as indeed it was to Greek Philosophy also. "Stoicism, like Buddhism, aimed not so much at love /

(1) cf. Cadoux op. cit. p47.

love as at benevolent detachment. And benevolence is not love; there is no passion in it." In so far as this ideal was not original to the mind of Jesus He received it from the Old Testament. (cf. Is. LIII and Hosea etc.) Jesus preaches not so much a God of Righteousness as a God of Love. Hence when He makes His appeal to men it is an appeal to the heart even more than to the intellect. This human touch was our Lord's reaction to the coldness of Jewish legalism and apocalyptic. "The Christianity of the New Testament is a re-acting religion" and this is one of our Lord's reactions we do well to observe. It should be observed that the power which Jesus derived from His communion with God - the Power which alone could stir up the finer feelings in men to such a degree as to save them - that Power was exercised very largely through the 'human touch', through the human appeal. We see this not only in His teaching and preaching but in all his works of healing.

But the proclamation of the Kingdom by the Baptist had none of this human appeal. The Baptist himself was an ascetic. His message was great but harsh: Repentance and Duty summed it up. In taking up the message of the Baptist Jesus humanised, enlarged, transmuted it.¹ Again, He was doubtless acquainted with the parables of apocalyptic literature as in the Book of Enoch (Sections XXXVII-LXXI.) but when He came to utter His parables there is a wondrous transformation, for the apocalyptic parables /

1. Lk. 19-41 f. XIII-34; XIV-2; Matt. XIV-14, XX-9, XXIII-14.

parables are sometimes elaborate discourses, and they are always lacking in the simplicity and sublimity which make the parables of Jesus at once so human and divine. In the apocalyptic parables religion does not come into anything like such close contact with daily life as it does in the parables of Jesus. Enoch XXXVII begins thus:- "When the congregation of the righteous shall appear and sinners shall be judged for their sins and shall be driven from the face of the earth" Jesus begins:- "A certain man had two sons ..." or, "A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves..." The colour, the warmth, the human touch which are lacking in the apocalyptic parables are never absent from the parables of Jesus. The same human touch is evident in our Lord's references to the Kingdom of the future. Although Jesus did not give detailed descriptions of the future heaven such as we find in apocalyptic literature; although he practised a firm reserve as in the answer "Strive to enter in at the strait gate" to the man who asked, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" and again in that other answer "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage" where He seems to divorce the human from the Divine nevertheless in all His indirect and spontaneous references to heaven we find the human touch. In the parable of the mustard tree we find heaven depicted as giving shelter, and safety, and lodgment: In "The Lost Sheep" it is depicted /

depicted as a fold and in "The Prodigal Son" as a home. Moreover we are told that there is "More joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance" and to appreciate fully the human colour in the love and joy of these pictures we need only contrast them with this description of the Palace of Heaven by Enoch:- "It was hot as fire, and cold as snow, and nothing of the joy of life was in it. Fear came over me and terror laid hold upon me" (Enoch XIV-13.)

In Apocalyptic, too, the current thought of man's relation to God was the pharisaic one of 'Merit'¹ and 'Justice!'. Jesus said "No"! It is a human relationship of faith or trust, and generosity. Wherefore our Lord told the parable of the labourers who agreed to work for a penny a day - for an agreed sum - for a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, and then grumbled later at the generosity of God. When therefore Jesus speaks of God's intervention, we must keep in mind that the God of Jesus may intervene in love and mercy as well as in righteousness and justice. "When the Son of man cometh shall He find faith in the earth?" - perhaps not; but He may come to save the earth from utter destruction through loss of faith. He may come in love, generosity and mercy.^x Such at least is the zeal of the Lord of hosts (~~Is. IX-7~~) that "mixture of hot honour and affection to which 'jealousy' in its good sense comes near",² and which is mentioned in Isaiah IX-7.

Although /

1. Assump. of Moses XII-7,8 exception to this.(IX-4 pleads merit)

2. G.A. Smith 'Isaiah' p. 130.

x. Orchard "Foundations of Faith" vol. IV p. 174.

How essentially and broadly human was the teaching of Jesus, both in manner and substance, has recently been established by rediscovered inscriptions on coins and by writings on tombs, on ostraca, and on papyri. If we take His saying:—"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. XXII. 21) we realise without going beyond the N.T. text how He drove home His teaching by appealing to well known facts --in this case the inscription on a common coin. But when later He refers to a custom of the Gentiles of distinguishing princes and other eminent men by the title "ἑβεργέτης" we have the N.T. text verified by rediscovered inscriptions^{and} in a matter that is illuminative of the humanity of Jesus. For "He mentioned the title not without contempt and forbade His disciples to allow themselves to be so called."¹ And why? Because the name contradicted His idea of service in brotherhood -the human relationship, the friendship that should prevail in the Kingdom. The title savoured instead of patronage and arrogance.

But the Papyri have been more illuminative still of this human appeal of Jesus' message. That, as already stated, His gospel was first and foremost an answer to human need is strongly supported by the Papyri. Take the following excerpt:- "αἰδ[υ]σοπο[ύ]μην δὲ ἐλθεῖν εἰς Καρανίδα· ὅτι σαπρῶς παριπατῶ. Αἴγραψά σοι, ὅτι γυμνός εἰμι. Παρακαλῶ σοι, μήτηρ δ[ι]αλάγητί μοι..... οἶδα ὅτι ἡμάρτηκα."²

In this passage we hear the same desperate cry of the sinner which is heard in the parable of the Prodigal. But the parable has

(1) Deissmann "Light from the Ancient East" p. 254.

(2) Milligan "Greek Papyri" p. 94.

the answer of Redeeming Love.

Although we do not find this passionate and redeeming love in apocalyptic, we do find, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, an ethical teaching of a very high order. In this apocalypse, as we have it; the usual apocalyptic doctrine is thus balanced by doctrine for the present hour. R.A. Charles however seems to us to make too much of the ethical advance of the "Testaments" over the O.T. Even in the specially selected passage i.e. Gad VI, 3-7 the doctrine of forgiveness is no higher than that in Hosea except that it is required specifically of men whereas in Hosea it is represented as the forgiveness of God. Nor is it higher than Proverbs XXV, 21,22 and to limit the value of Proverbs XXV, 21,22 because in XXIV: 17,18 a much lower note is struck seems unfair criticism. Might not XXIV: 17,18 have been the verdict of a different personality from the author of XXV: 21,22 although a final redactor has both passages appearing in the same work? Besides we come back to Jesus' power of selective synthesis and here the O.T. furnishes ample material.

The truth appears to be that if we desire to know the mind of Jesus we should ponder the Lord's Prayer. In that prayer certainly we have the petition "Thy Kingdom Come" but there is no impatient demanding that it should come all at once.¹ Instead the next petition implies considerable duration for it asserts the condition of the coming of the Kingdom to be the doing of God's /

1. "It is not because of what the world by itself could ever be however much God changed it that life is changed from from frustrated desire to blessed purpose". Ency. Brit. (Edit. XIII) vol. 1. p. 633c.

God's will on earth and thereafter it connects earth with Heaven - raises earth to heaven. To say that "Thy Kingdom come" shows apocalyptic influence is not perhaps altogether wrong but it is only as true as to say that almost every other petition has some partial parallel or similarity to previous aspirations of men. But what we see in this prayer is a mind distinguished by a wonderful sense of proportion - a mind which may have thus expressed itself "Ask the great things, and the little things shall be added to you; ask the heavenly things and the earthly things shall be added to you"¹ but a mind also so human as to advise men to pray for their daily bread as on another occasion he advised the women of Jerusalem that their flight be not in winter when disaster overtook the city (cf. Matt. XXIV-20). The fact that no extra canonical apocalyptic work is mentioned by the Gospels although mentioned in later N.T. writings² should point to a growing apocalyptic influence after Jesus died. In any case the evidence would lead us to believe that if Jesus had a 'vade mecum' it was not any extra canonical apocalypse but rather the Psalms and possibly the prophecies of Isaiah. With the apocalyptic movement he had undoubted contact and hence was influenced by it. But He who directed attention to a Pharisee straining at a gnat while he swallowed a camel would see the unbalanced nature of apocalyptic doctrine /

1. Resch. Agrapha Logion. 41.

2. cf. Jude. v. 14.

doctrine. The Lord's Prayer itself is sufficient evidence that Jesus saw life clearly and saw it whole . A merely Jewish prayer of the date would certainly have been addressed to the Lord God of Israel—(of our fathers)¹, and would have contained a petition for the nation. Moreover if it be said that Joseph's forgiveness of his brethren was not made a model for later Israelites,² might not the same be said of the ethical teaching of the twelve Patriarchs until Jesus came along and not only illumined its teaching but repeated Joseph's example in a larger, fuller, grander life.

We see therefore that in His doctrine of the Kingdom as a present experience of Divine Power - and this was the heart and soul of it - Jesus owed little to apocalyptic. The rule He inculcated was the rule of a family³ - His universe was a House rather than a Court of Justice or a political state. Nevertheless although we have seen Jesus preached the kingdom as a present experience He did not altogether discard the apocalyptic idea of the kingdom as a future event.

CHAPTER IV.

Presence and the Parousia.

Jesus /

Dict^y."

1. Bernard Hastings, Vol IV. - p. 43.
2. R.H. Charles Pseudepigrapha p. 293.
3. Cf. Ency. Brit. (Edit XIII) vol. I p. 633c.

Did Jesus associate the coming of the Kingdom with the future exercise of Divine power and with His own return? It was the Jewish tradition that the Kingdom must come through an exercise of Divine Power. The apocalyptists held that God would exercise this Divine Power directly or else through His vicegerent the Messiah. The pious Jew maintained that "God's power has not yet been fully revealed".¹ God has not yet come to His Kingdom. But God shall yet reveal His power and "It shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation" (Isaiah XXV-9). Wherefore the revelation of God's power amounts to His Presence and the coming of His Kingdom. In Jewish literature and especially in apocalyptic literature, Power, Presence and Kingdom are practically synonymous terms when used in relation to God. Hence^{when} it was proclaimed that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand men understood that God was about to reveal His power and make His presence felt if not seen. What was the reaction of Jesus to this teaching?

Jesus appears to teach that the Kingdom of God was the Presence of God as a Divine energy, a power in active operation. God's Presence was everywhere as potential, but in the Kingdom it was realised as kinetic, spiritual energy.² It was a kingdom which was to come with power but its coming was so closely associated /

1. Manson op. cit. p. 27.

2. cf. ΠΙΣΤΙΣ Faith, active sense in N.T. Lightfoot 'Galatians' p. 148.

associated with the coming of the Son of man as to be sometimes identified or confused with it. This is evident from many parts of the N.T. and especially from the following parallel passages:-~~Mk~~^{Mk}.1; Matt. XVI.28; Lk. IX.27. In these passages we find Mark and Luke stating that some standing there shall not taste of death till they see the coming of the Kingdom (Mark adds "with power"), whereas ~~as~~ Matt. reports "till they see the Son of man coming in His Kingdom". Here we see the influence of apocalyptic on Matthew, causing him to report after his usual manner the words of Jesus with "as it is written in Daniel" at the back of his mind. But the difference of wording in Mark-the earliest Gospel-supported, as it is, by Luke leads us to believe that Jesus in this instance tried to encourage and put a feeling of urgency into the hearts of His hearers concerning the Kingdom by a skilful adaptation of Daniel's prediction. Indeed as in Daniel the "Son of man" goes to the Ancient of Days (cf. Dan. VII.13) the suggestion¹ that the original statement of Jesus is to be found in Lk. XI.9; Matt. X.33. has strong grounds to support it. Jesus was preaching and the tenour of His message was ethical. But His reference to His confessing or denying men before God in Heaven would lead naturally to the subject of His death. Jesus, doubtless, felt that His death would lead to a new era. Just what would happen we believe He did not know, no more its exact nature than its exact hour. In speaking of that era it was not so much an event He predicted as a process leading up to an event. He may also have referred to events -especially troublous events that were then pending. Certainly/

(1) Streeter "Oxford Studies" pp.428-9; "The Four Gospels" pp.520-1.

Certainly we believe Jesus saw from the trend of events that Jerusalem would fall. But we submit that in the parallel passages quoted above He did not predict merely any one event but the coming of the reign of God with power. Mark's "ἐλθὲν ἐν δυνάμει" may seem to indicate a catastrophic event¹ but the event is the beginning of a new age--it must begin at some particular moment. The concentration of attention upon a visible return has somewhat obscured, and minimised the significance of, the promise of power: such a manifestation of God's power as began with Pentecost and afterwards had as witnesses the conversion of the Gentiles and the upright conduct and character of the early Christians. The words of Jesus were therefore a promise of power--an assurance that a new power which belonged to this new and ideal kingdom and which had been found in the Son of man would be found in such measure in their own lives that they would realise the Son of man was present in their midst, and that Man (Barnasha) had come into his spiritual kingdom. The Son of man "used by our Lord .. seems to be on the one hand, 'ideal humanity' as embodied in Christ, and on the other, that kingdom which Christ was divinely ordained to establish and of which He is the head."² (cf. Paul's vision of "a redeemed humanity which had reached 'the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ'"³)

It is to be noted that while Paul in his earliest epistles lays great stress on the imminent visible return of the Son of man, in his later epistles the emphasis changes to the Presence of Christ ever with him and the blessedness of uninterrupted fellowship which comes after the death of the body--"To be with Christ is far better"

¹ Streeter "Oxford Studies" p. 429; ⁽²⁾ Orchard op. cit. p. 170; ⁽³⁾ cf. C.A. Scott op. cit. p. 213.

The view expressed in the last paragraph is supported by the right understanding of the apocalyptic term "The Parousia". When we examine this term it is discovered to have a double meaning, viz - Coming and Presence. Single words which denote both the former ideas are:- Arrival; Visit; and we find in the papyri that Parousia signifies the visit of a king. Parousia however, in the N.T. lays stress on the Presence of the Lord with His people, a Presence which while existing now will only at His Return be completely realised.¹ That exactly accords with what has been already said. The Presence of the Son of man was to be realised, not completely, but very distinctly and unmistakeably in the lives of some then living. John's Gospel speaks of a Helper (Moffat), hence of a Living Power and Our Calvinistic doctrine refers also to a Real Presence at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper - not in extent but realised in Power.

If we turn to the almost parallel word 'EPIPHANEIA'² (as used in the N.T. and in 2 Macc. II-21) we find the same idea of a present help - only here the word means a striking manifestation of a Divine intervention. It denotes a 'breaking in' an 'intrusion' - an idea which is central in apocalypse. Since also this word is used not only of the Second Coming but of the First Coming (II Tim. I-10) is it not evident that the Kingdom of God broke in when Jesus was born and comes with power /

1. Milligan "Thessalonians" p.145f.

2. Ibid. p. 148.

power wherever and whenever Jesus appears, arrives, or is present in the spirit?

If, further, we turn to the word 'APOCALUPSIS' we see that while it also refers to the second coming of our Lord, it has more distinctly to do with the revelation of the Divine plan and purpose of the ages, of hidden truths that are at length being revealed, having always been existent and ready to be revealed.¹ If knowledge is power, here is the gate.

When we sum up these meanings we find ourselves with this conclusion:- Parousia, Epiphaneia, Apocalupsis all refer to a Presence which implies the Kingdom of God and the Power of God - a kingdom which is 'At Hand' not so much, in the first instance, temporally as spatially (for want of a better word); but being near spatially it may be realised at any moment and so may be said to be 'At Hand' also temporally, because potentially so. This gave urgency to the message of the Kingdom in the 1st century.

Again the passage Matt. XVI-28 has already been discussed and by comparing it with Mk. IX-1 it has been suggested that Matthew's language shows a tendency to modify the words in an eschatological sense.² If we take Mark's version, "the coming of the Kingdom with power" might quite as well refer to the Descent of the Holy Ghost, to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, to the inner spiritual power within the early Church.

These /

1. Milligan op.cit. p. 149f.

2. cf. Streeter op. cit. p. 483.

"Oxford Studies"

3. "Like a descent from Heaven" Oman. Ency. Brit. Edit XIII vol. I p. 633c.

These facts all indicate a Presence and a Process. Moreover as the Bishop of Gloucester says: "To what purpose would have been the ethical teaching of Jesus if the end of all things was to come at once".¹ Professor Johannes Weiss has not overcome this difficulty by declaring there is no ethic in Jesus' teaching but only Interim-Ethic - an ethic of renunciation and watchfulness. That theory perishes on one saying of our Lord alone "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect". But far from Jesus propounding a mere interim-ethic we have very emphatic utterances of His to the contrary, e.g. "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away". As Harnack says "We cannot derive the ethical ideal of Jesus from the eschatological. There is nothing of an Interim-Ethic, nothing feverish and evanescent in humility, forgiveness, purity of heart, sacrifice or service; yet these, and virtues like these, are pillars of Christian Ethics". In considering the mind of Jesus one must keep a sense of proportion. One must also remember that what was unusual and startling would receive much more attention from His contemporaries and from His reporters because it would make a much greater impression on their minds. If we bear this in mind a careful reading will convince us that "The thoroughgoing eschatological interpretation /

1. Headlam "The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ."
p. 264.

interpretation of the Gospels confuses colour with form, by-product with main intention, and finds the ethics of Jesus impracticable because it sees His moral utterances out of that perspective which gave them beauty and truth". We may require to say more about the eternal value of His ethics further on but meantime we must take account of what is undoubtedly an apocalyptic aspect of His teaching.

Jesus accepted the Apocalyptic teaching of a sudden consummation of history as a Divine intervention corresponding to, though greater in its immediate effects than all such interventions that preceded.¹ He also associated with it in some way His own Second Coming.² Further He foresaw, as a man of His perspicacity was bound to foresee, the inevitable loss of patience of the haughty Romans with the intractability of the rebellious Jews and the consequent destruction of the Temple, the scattering of the nation, and the effects upon the religious life of the people. These we may take to be the generally accepted facts. Can we wonder that there arose confusion in the minds of His hearers over His references to facts having so much in common as these three have - and more especially as the years went by and they came under the influence of a growing mass of apocalyptic writings? That this confusion existed we have already demonstrated in comparing MK. IX-1, with Matt. XVI-28. We must now look more closely into this matter.

1. cf. Mark IV. 29; ^{(2) cf. Mark.} ~~XIV. 62.~~

First it should be observed that the Neronic and Domitian persecutions were likely to give a considerable stimulus to apocalyptic. The period which includes their reigns is that of the formation of the New Testament. Next should be noted the evident eschatological evolution in the Gospels. This is seen in epitome in the series--Lk. XI.9; Mk. VIII.38; Matt. XVI.27. Moreover Matthew not only heightens the apocalyptic effect of the materials before him, he also has a tendency to omit sayings inconsistent with the view of the Kingdom as entirely future and catastrophic. e.g. He omits the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mk. IV.26-29) and substitutes for it in the same context the Parable of the Tares (Mt. XIII.24-30) with its apocalyptic explanation.¹ But more germane still to our contention is the colouring given to the Parable of the Tares by the use of words taken from the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly.--"καθεύδον, βλαστάν, πρῶτον, κόρπος, σῖτος, κηρός, ἀκριβός"². Here is evidence not only of confusion but of conscious transposition and modification due to the desire to accentuate the apocalyptic outlook of Jesus.

Again the passage (Lk. XVII.20f.) is clearly a collection of apocalyptic sayings spoken at different times. Sayings referring to the fall of Jerusalem have been associated with sayings referring to the end of the world order. Verse 37 illumines all that precedes in the passage for in this verse Jesus gives us a glimpse of His mind and outlook. He saw that wherever there is corruption --as in the world of Noah and Lot--Judgment is at hand. And as Judgment was to fall on Jerusalem so would it fall on the world order because of the corruption of that Age.

(1) Streeter "Oxford Studies" p.432;
 (2) "and Note 3.

The incident recorded in Mk.X.35-45 is also illuminative. Indeed "No passage in the Gospels seems to cast more light than this on His (Jesus') real attitude to the Apocalyptic Hope. He does accept the Kingdom and the place for Himself therein implied by the request, but He does it in the half-playful spirit of one who speaks to little children about great things which he feels to be too great for himself, much more for them, fully to comprehend, and is fain to use the old simple words whose face meaning he has himself transcended only in the sense that he realizes that all words are inadequate and that there are things which the greatest can see only 'in a glass darkly'.¹ Consider especially His reply--"Ye know not what ye ask...to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give".

If we turn next to the Fourth Gospel we shall find two references to the coming of the Son of man which, on the plenary eschatological theory, cancel out each other. In Jn.XIV.3 we read:--"And if I go and prepare a place ~~for~~ ^{there} you I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I ~~am~~ ^{have} may be also". In Jn.XXI.22 we read:--"If I will that he tarry till I come". Since chapter XXI was written expressly to record that Jesus did not say the apostle would be alive when Jesus returned in His glory², and since Jn.XIV.3 definitely asserts that all or at least some of the apostles would be alive--more especially if this verse is to be regarded as a parallel to Mk.1X.1--then how can we imagine that Jn.XIV.3 means literally the visible return of/

(1) Streeter "Oxford Studies" p.435.

(2) Streeter "The Four Gospels" p.477.

of the Lord in that generation since the ^{Gospel} Fourth was not written till after 90 A.D. and the generation of the apostle had by that time passed away? How could the writer mean this especially in view of the alleged reason for chapter XXI and the presence of verse 22.

What then does Jn. XIV-3 mean and what did Jesus really teach concerning the 2nd Advent?

To understand this we will go back to the incident of the boy Jesus in the Temple mentioned in Luke II-49., whether we accept the translation "About my Father's business" or "In my Father's house" the essence of His reply was evidently this:- You tax me with being disobedient to you, my earthly parents, but do you not understand that even before you, comes God whom I must obey as my Heavenly parent. Any metaphysical distinction between the Divine and Human nature need not have entered into this reply. But we see here the point of view which Jesus maintained throughout His life, namely that obedience to God, doing the will of God constituted Him God's son. Thus early therefore, He had dedicated Himself to do God's will and when He came to see that His work on earth was not to be crowned with success without His death he was convinced, and openly declared that God would send Him again (as He had already sent Him) to complete the Divine purpose, for that purpose could not fail /

fail. This was not altogether an original idea on His part. since it had been prophesied that Elijah would come again and indeed Herod and others had thought Jesus Himself was John the Baptist come to life again. Jesus, would be confident in this declaration because He had already many tokens that God was working in and through and with Him. He had already experienced the power of God which comes to the man of perfect faith. But when He came to express these thoughts to the disciples they would be slow to understand. They would ask and did ask for details which He could not supply. They wanted to know especially if it would be soon and be associated with the events prophesied by Joel, by Daniel and, it may be, by Enoch.

Jesus may have said that some standing there would live to see all He said in process of being fulfilled. As we know, some of them saw the fall of Jerusalem; Pentecost, the incoming of the Gentiles and the beginnings of the Church. Jesus, of course, would not foresee all these details exactly as they afterwards happened but a seer like Him might easily have foreseen the general lines along which history was moving and was likely to move for some time after His death. No one can say exactly what Jesus foresaw in the travail of His soul. He may even have thought He would come back shortly in visible form, but this we think most unlikely. He was a man of faith -

He /

He walked by faith, but His assurance was that God's work which He was doing would be completed and He would have part in the harvest; but of that day knew no man - not even Himself.

What we have always to come back to is this: That though Jesus was doubtless a child of His age, as for instance, in believing in the existence of demons, nevertheless He spoke for all ages in that He had immediate experience of a power which, as one of its mighty works, expelled what were then considered the symptoms of demoniacal possession. Likewise although it was the current belief that the Messiah (in apocalyptic circles the Son of man) would come soon to judge the world, Jesus at most used this belief to express His own conviction that He would return, a conviction formed from immediate experience that His own will to return harmonised with the Will of God. He knew always by communion with God when His own will and the Divine Will were at one, not that they were ever consciously opposed but He had to grope, like other men sometimes in the darkness to find the Father's Hand.

We may therefore state our Lord's attitude to the current belief in the future coming of the Son of man thus:- The idea of the Son of man coming in the clouds was used by Him, we believe, as a symbol to indicate that He would be associated with the consummation of human history - a consummation in which there would be a transformation of values. It was an outward /

outward visible return used as a symbol of the coming of His inward spiritual Kingdom. But it was something more. It indicated that, according to the mind of Jesus, the spiritual kingdom would one day have an outward manifestation and that the Son of man, i.e. Christ Himself would appear unto men. The manner and time of His return were not known to Him. He had realised the difference of material and spiritual values which difference He had accentuated by associating with them respectively the ephemeral and the eternal. Nevertheless even when He told the Pharisees that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation He Himself was present and visible as its embodiment. After all, Spirit among the Hebrews was not entirely divorced from the material but was a kind of finer matter. Although there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage in Heaven yet we are not told there will be neither seeing nor hearing. But more significant still is the fact that when Jesus refers to His own individual personal life and to the individual personal lives of others - in Mark's Gospel - He uses the word soul "ψυχή" not spirit "πνεῦμα" and "soul" in the Bible usage belongs most essentially to man's life, - albeit when His bodily life has come to be regarded as a secondary thing. It comes near the modern conception of self".¹ Here again we see how essentially human our Lord was.^x Hence when He says

I /

1. Souter "Greek N.T. Lexicon".

^x Everywhere God fills the meanest detail of man's life with glory and revelation. (Glover. op. cit. p. 130).

I will come again or the Son of man will come we are justified in expecting the appearance of His soul as well as His spirit. Moreover although appetites which belong to the flesh "σὰρξ" and such categories of human thought as time and space shall be done away yet in our Lord's thinking we do not find the Platonic doctrine of the essential evil of matter with the necessary implication that the Kingdom of God cannot reign in a material world. To the mind of Jesus it was possible for the material world to be sublimated.* This would happen suddenly when it did happen.

Here our Lord was affected by apocalyptic but not dominated by it. It harmonised with his human universal outlook. Indeed this is an outlook which is with us still for "Unless we can hope for some such consummation of earthly existence and human history we seem to be faced with the alternatives of an everlasting progress to some infinite goal which can never be attained and therefore to something in itself meaningless and unsatisfying or, with the gradual decay of the material universe and the decline of the human race in fear, loneliness and agony. The idea of the need of some such divine intervention is neither unscientific nor unhistorical; there was at least such an intervention at the creation, there was certainly another at the Incarnation, and there will have to be a third to fulfil the purpose of both".¹ (cf. 2 Tim.I-10.)

Every/

1. Orchard "Foundations of Faith" vol IV p. 173.

* cf. Rydger. Smith "The Christian Experience" pp 93, 289.

Judgment

Every voice of antiquity proclaimed a day of judgment as does every savage tribe within the forest. It was, and is, a universal doctrine. The Old Testament is replete with it. Hence it need not be supposed Jesus was confined to apocalyptic for His ideas on this subject. Nevertheless the doctrine is found in apocalyptic and in its emphasised form probably for the first time in literature. In His references to final judgment Jesus directed his words specially to the danger of the ungodly at the resurrection. In the Pss. of Solomon III-13 Jesus would read:- "The destruction of the sinner is for ever". This doctrine of retribution was a cardinal one with the Pharisees. They would visualise the destruction of the Gentiles along with that of the unrighteous of Israel. Still, in Pss. of Solomon 17³⁸ the Gentiles are to be shown mercy, (cf. Enoch 50) The future condition of the wicked is stated (in Pss. of Solomon) in terms which leave the reader in doubt whether a doctrine of annihilation is intended, but the balance is in that direction. We see, therefore, that they did not limit the principle of retribution to the present stage of life. There is to be a day when the Lord will 'visit the earth with judgment'".

Here again we must ask ourselves:- How did our Lord make use of this variable apocalyptic doctrine of a day of judgment? To what extent is He indebted to apocalyptic for His doctrine? To /

To what extent does His exposition of it differ from that recorded above? Jesus is quite clear and emphatic on the fact that there is to be a final and universal judgment. So far He agrees. But while the last judgment was in the future, the first was in Galilee. Jesus connects the final judgment with a present judgment. A close reading of the Synoptic Records will discover Jesus represented as saying "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without all these things are done in parables: That seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand lest they should be converted" (cf. Matt XIII, 14, 15., Lk. VIII, 10; Acts XXVIII-27; Is. VI, 9, 10) This quotation from Isaiah is attributed to our Lord in what must have been the common original of all three Gospels, i.e. in one of our best and oldest sources.¹ It sums up in a broad way what He felt was and must be for many of those among whom He moved the final outcome of His mission, (cf. John XII-46, 48:) The son of man does not need to pass judgment on those who reject Him. His word judges them by an automatic process. That which is meant for their life becomes to them an occasion of falling. Why is this? It is because what is in a man, i.e. his real character, is made manifest in His reaction to testing circumstances. God Himself reacted to human sin by sending Jesus /

1. Hastings Dict. vol II p. 618. ; For discussion of this passage cf. Cadoux *op. cit.* pp. 58 f.

Jesus Christ into the world thereby showing that His character was Love and Mercy, as well as Righteousness, or that Love which includes the other two qualities. They who rejected Jesus, and they who accepted Him were alike judged by their reactions to His person and message. This is the teaching of Jesus on judgment and surely it goes far farther and deeper than the teaching of apocalyptic. Sometimes this present judgment takes the form of self reproach as when Peter said:- "Depart from me for I am a sinful man" (Lk. V-8) and when the centurion declared "I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee" (Lk. VII-6,7). This is not a judgment in which books are opened and the sins of the unrighteous are openly exposed or proclaimed in the hearing of all. Yet neither was that other judgment which Jesus knew His words and deeds executed upon the lives of His own generation, namely the judgment on those who demanded a sign. Nevertheless Jesus said:- "The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here". (Lk. XI. 32. cf. Matt. XII-38ff.) In other words, the judgment which the preaching and practice of Jesus exercised in the days of His flesh will be exposed and proclaimed openly in the final judgment.

The Fourth Gospel constantly refers to this present judgment which, although known to Jesus is not included in His purpose and does not depend upon His will (cf. Jn. IX-39) For judgment Christ is come into this world. cf. also "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I come not to judge the world, but to save the world the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day". (Jn. XII-47, 48.) "But judgment had been automatically inaugurated by His coming, since light having come into the world (cf. V.46) men would adjust themselves to it according to their preference for light or their love of darkness, and thus judge themselves".¹

In Jn. V-27 we read:- "The Father hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the son of man". This repeats verse 22: "For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son". The time referred to is the present, not the future. Moreover the article is omitted in V.27 (in contrast to III-13, and Matt. IX-6. where the thought is closely parallel), before both 'Son' and 'Man'. "The effect would seem to be to stress not so much the Messianic significance of the title but rather its human colouring. It is Christ's true humanity which makes Him a fitting agent of God's judgment (cf. Acts XVII-31, and God's words in the Testament /

1. Orchard op. cit. p. 66.

Testament of Abraham: 'I do not judge you; but every man shall be judged by a man'".¹ Thus Jesus is represented as judging in the present and judging in virtue of His Humanity. Is not Professor MacGregor right in his interpretation? Is it not the case that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is here supported by the writer to the Hebrews in chap. II vv. 14-18 (cf. IV-15), where the human sympathy and understanding are set down as the means whereby Christ delivers the tried and tempted? The historian of insight who writes at some distance from the actual events catches better the spirit and ideals which were at work in any age and thus we believe the Fourth Gospel and Hebrews record the same great truth that it was our Lord's true and perfect humanity which enabled Him to judge and deliver sinners.

It must, however, not be overlooked that in the above quotation from Matt. XII-38 Jesus refers to the final judgment. Jesus knew the human desire to see "how everything is motivated by absolute justice, a creative purpose and a final end which shall justify the power and life which the creator has brought into existence."² Let it be frankly admitted no ancient school of thought made it so clear as did the apocalyptic, that there was a creative purpose in history and a general judgment at the end. But as we have already seen Jesus enriched the idea by /

1. MacGregor "Gospel of John" p. 179.

2. Orchard op. cit. p. 68.

by His teaching of a present judgment and in so far as He endorsed the apocalyptic doctrine of a final judgment He endorsed a universal human sentiment and conviction.

But Jesus would derive his ideas about the judgment firstly and largely from the teaching of the O.T. anent "The Day of the Lord." The phrase meant primarily deliverance for Israel by the intervention of Jahweh. But as Jahweh was a purely ethical Being, the moral ruler of Israel and the nations, the first aspect of the day of the Lord is always a day of judgment. Judgment however is not an end to itself: it is only in order to redemption; 1. and behind the storm of judgment there always rose clear the day of salvation. Moreover the coming of the day was always regarded by the prophets as near. (cf. Is. XLIII-6, Joel 1-15; 11-1.) Finally though the Day of the Lord was a crisis, and itself of brief duration, the phrase 'that Day' is often used to cover the period ushered in by the day.

Now all these statements concerning the Day of the Lord find their echo in the teaching of Jesus. In His mind and teaching that Last Judgment is not a mere spectacle suddenly breaking on an astonished crowd. As the last page of a book is meaningless save through the pages that have gone before so the last judgment of the Son of Man is not to be considered isolated and apart. If we take two pictures drawn by Himself we shall at once see the resemblance. In Matt. X-34-35. we read /
1. cf. p.120 and Mk. IX.49,50.

read:- "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother and the daughter in law against her mother in law" and in Matt. XXV-31ff we have the following:- When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats". Of the second picture there are many counterparts in apocalyptic, e.g. the following in Enoch. sect. XXXVIII-3:- "When the secrets of the righteous shall be revealed and the sinners judged, and the godless driven from the presence of the righteous and elect" or again:- "On that day mine elect One shall sit on the throne of glory and shall try their works And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing; And I will cause mine Elect Ones to dwell upon it; but sinners and evil doers shall not set foot thereon"¹ Also this: "And the Elect One shall in those days sit on my throne, and his mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom and counsel ... and he shall choose the righteous and holy from among them: for the day has drawn nigh that they should be saved".² Of the first picture, however there is no real counterpart in apocalyptic. Dr. Charles has /

1. Enoch (Charles) Sect. 3 and 5.

2. Enoch. sect. LI- 3,2.

has indeed cited Enoch sect 100² as a parallel passage. It reads thus:- "For a man shall not withhold his hand from slaying his sons and his son's sons. And the sinner shall not withhold his hand from his honoured brother. From dawn till sunset they shall slay one another". But, as Dr. Charles makes quite clear in the heading to this section, the words describe how sinners will destroy each other. But if Jesus ever saw this passage in Enoch He has transformed it beyond all recognition. Jesus is referring to the division which will take place among blood relations according to their differing reactions to His message and spirit. This is the division which will also take place at the final judgment.

When we examine closely the parallel passages of apocalyptic including those quoted above, along with the sayings of Jesus anent the final judgment important differences soon manifest themselves as well as resemblances. Our Lord's teaching on this matter of a final judgment is for one thing so much more massive, spiritual and consistent. It is a doctrine of a universal individual judgment at the end of things in which judgment He Himself is Arbiter of human destinies.¹ In apocalyptic (vide above) sometimes the Lord of Spirits is judge and sometimes His Elect One - the Son of Man. Moreover the strong impression is given of encouragement being offered to the righteous by the prospect of the vengeance meted out to the unrighteous^{2/}

1. (cf. Matt XIII-36-42, 47-50; XVI, 27. XXV, 31 etc.)

2. cf. ~~Enoch~~ Enoch xxxviii. 5, 6.

This thought was not always absent from the minds of the early Christian martyrs (cf. „Der sehnliche Wunsch die frommen Märtyrer..... die Erbösewichte in empfindlicher Strafe ihnen zur Augenweide werden zu lassen“)*

In the teaching of Christ the purpose is rather to encourage and to warn all to be righteous. Yet the object of Christ also included the encouragement of the righteous in well-doing by his firm declaration of a general judgment which will bring home to every soul the justice and mercy of God, a final clearing up of all difficulties and obscurities, the apportioning of a destiny which all souls must approve, and especially those^{to} whom it is appointed".¹. Such a judgment too is necessary if the mind of man and his passion for justice are to be fully satisfied. This doctrine of Jesus "carried the O.T. conception to its proper issue, while it gave certainty, consistency and spirituality to the developed ideas which had arisen in Judaism in the period following the last of the Jewish prophets."². In other words we see here at work once more, our Lord's power and habit of selective synthesis.

If we consider either of the terms Sheol or Gehenna in connection with the destruction or punishment of the wicked we need not suppose that our Lord was here entirely, or even mainly dependent on apocalyptic. R.H. Charles admits the priority of the Psalms in the N.T. use of Sheol.³

1. Orchard op.cit. p. 68; (3.) R.H. Charles 'Apoc. & Pseudop. Vol. ii. p. 185.

2. Salmon in Hastings 'Dict. of Bible. vol. i. p. 791.

* A. Bertholet: 'Daniel in Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher p. 53.

and although he speaks of Matt. XlII.42,50. and Matt. XlII.43. as influenced by, or derived from, 1 Enoch XC.3, and CVIII.14, respectively, it must be recalled that the Parable of the Tares is suspect as already shown herein.

Our Lord's use of the symbol of fire is summed up in Mk.lX.49, where the emphasis is more upon salvation than upon destruction. Jesus here teaches that "the object of all retributions, even of the penal retributions of Gehenna, is to purify."¹ This is a purely ethical thought and no such thought can be found in apocalyptic. Moreover in this great saying of Jesus we find a universal note "every one shall be salted". Also there is implied the thought that life is an education rather than a probation. Thus Jesus gives the highest possible meaning to suffering and consequently to the ways of God with men.

The Valley of Hinnom (גֵּי הִנּוֹם) was well known to Him and He who could say to two fishermen "Follow me /

1. Gould "I.C.C. Mark" p. 181.

me and I will make you fishers of men" could surely also formulate a metaphor connecting the fires of Ge Hinnom with the destiny of evil-doers. Moreover Jesus had only to turn to Isaiah LXVI-24 to find the phrases he repeats again and again, viz:- "For their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched".¹ In fact whereas one finds Jesus quoting the ipsissima verba of whole sentences from the O.T. this cannot be said of His use of apocalyptic. (cf. Matt. XXVII-46 and Ps. XXII-1; Lk. IV-18- with Is. LXI-1.) Of course it may be said that Jesus was conversant with apocalyptic doctrine without knowing well the literature or without treating the literature with such reverence for verbal accuracy as He did the Canon. But the symbol of fire is so very commonly used in the O.T. in connection with the punishment of the wicked that our Lord's proved intimate knowledge of the Canon and constant use of it is sufficient to account for His use of it here in connection with the fires of the final judgment.

In regard to this doctrine of a final judgment the position taken up here is that Jesus Christ was first and foremost a man of faith who by his absolute faith and obedience knew God's character at first hand in such a way as to speak of many matters including a final judgment with so great authority as to astonish his hearers and prove that his teaching was not a mere reproduction of apocalyptic or any other school.² As a man of his race He had inherited traditions concerning this final judgment and

as /

1. cf. Psalm LXXV.10.

2. Matt. VII-29.

as a man of His Age He had imbibed the current thoughts of His time. But He rejected much and omitted much of the teaching of apocalyptic anent the final judgment, e.g., the gloating of the righteous over the punishment of the unrighteous.¹ He simplified and modified - simplified as for instance in relation to the detailed description given in apocalyptic of the future place of torment and modified in so far as Lazarus and the rich man have already gone to their destiny immediately after their death. Truth to say, we would go further than this in our advocacy of our Lord's comparative independence of extra-canonical apocalyptic. Our reading of the facts of His life leads us to believe that just as in the case of the discovery of the evolutionary process simultaneously yet independently by Wallace and Darwin, even so Jesus Christ independently if not simultaneously thought out His eschatological doctrine and even used the 'Son of Man' as a title led thereto by His own experience and convictions although perhaps influenced somewhat by current Messianic thought. Professor Sanday's theory that there was in the time of Jesus a small particular circle to which the Similitudes of Enoch belonged has as a corollary the theory that Jesus belonged to that small circle. For this is his argument:- In the similitudes of the Bk. of Enoch (chs 37-70) the Son of Man takes a prominent place It is He who holds the great judgment to which the Apocalyptic writings look forward. The attributes ascribed /

1. Eth. Enoch. LXII-12.

ascribed to Him are all more or less connected with this judgment
 Opinion at the present time is still more preponder-
 antly in favour of the view that it (~~is~~ ~~this~~ portion of the Bk.
 of Enoch)- is pre-Christian. The language of the Gospels re-
 quires that the title as applied to a person and to the Messiah
 should be not entirely new. It also requires that it should be
not perfectly understood and familiar. It is probable that its
 use did not go beyond a small circle, the particular circle to
 which the similitudes of Enoch belonged. This, however, would
 be enough to give the phrase a certain currency, and to make it
 at least suggest association with the Messiah."¹ Now this
 theory and argument is very plausible if taken by itself. But
 we might state the facts in another way, viz:- (a) The language
 of the Gospels requires that Jesus could use freely the name Son
 of man without anyone challenging Him (even when surrounded by
 enemies) for using the title of Messiah. (b) It was at least
 as likely, nay more likely that some among his audiences would
 belong to the circle of the Similitudes, (c) Jesus by His up-
 bringing, by His parental training was more likely to belong to
 another circle (the N.T. indicates his parents had come into
 touch with this circle during his infancy) which Sanday himself
 describes as the seed-plot of Christianity, but wrongly, we
 think /

1. Sanday "Hastings Dicty." Vol II p. 622.

think, associates with the Similitudes of Enoch. To quote his own words; "In general terms it may be said that when we seek for affinities to Christianity we find more of them the farther we recede from the centre of official Judaism. The one thing to which Christianity is most opposed is the hard, dry casuistic legalism of the Pharisee. If we are right in thinking of the Apocalyptic literature as in the main provincial, we shall not be surprised to find the points of contact with it become more numerous wherever there are traces of a fresher and deeper study of the Psalms and Prophets, there we have a natural kinship for the Christian spirit. Now there is one class among whom this continuity with the Psalms and Prophets is specially marked. It has been observed that there is a Group of Psalms (of which perhaps 9, 10, 22, 25, 35, 40, 69, 109 are the most prominent) in which the words translated in EV 'poor', 'needy', 'humble', 'meek' are of specially frequent occurrence They are the pious Israelites ... who refuse to assert themselves but accept in a humble spirit the chastening sent by God ... there is evidence that this class existed at the Christian era."¹ If that is so, if such a class existed we can well believe that Jesus learned from it His doctrine of humility. We can understand that His parents, like nearly all visitors to the Great Feasts, would have relations or friends at Jerusalem with whom they would sojourn /

1. Sanday. "Hastings Dicty". Vol II. pp. 607-8.

sojourn during the Holy Week and that the friends of Joseph and Mary would belong to this circle. But where is the evidence of a doctrine of humility in the Similitudes of Enoch? Certainly Enoch V-8 reads thus:- "But they who are wise shall be humble." That, however, is exceptional. The whole atmosphere of the Similitudes is impregnated with Self-Righteousness - that very quality against which Jesus hurled his bitterest invective. And although in the Similitudes the righteous are represented as waiting for the intervention of God and of the Son of Man, is it not a truism that the arrogant spirit can exist among the oppressed as well as among the oppressors? Doubtless in the Pss. of Solomon the tone is very different, e.g. "Let God remove those that live in hypocrisy in the company of the pious".¹ Man's goodness is (bestowed) grudgingly ... but thy gift is great in Goodness and wealth "Happy is the man whose heart is fixed to call upon the name of the Lord His ways are made even by the Lord. When he passes through the rivers and the tossing of the seas, he shall not be dismayed, he ariseth from his sleep and blesseth the name of the Lord. Blessed is the Lord who sheweth mercy to those that love Him in sincerity."² And though we have stiffened our neck, yet Thou art our chastener - overlook us not O our God".³ Here is indeed the pious spirit with /

1. Pss. of Sol. sect. IV.

2. Ibid. Sects. V and VI.

3. Ibid. Sect. VIII, 29.

with confession of sin - the spirit which Jesus blessed in Matt. V-3. (the "Πτωχοὶ τῷ Πνεύματι"). But how far this spirit is from that of the similitudes the following passage will serve to show:-

For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden
And the Most High preserved him in the presence of his
might.

And revealed him unto the elect

And all the Kings and the mighty, and the exalted and
those who rule the earth

Shall fall down before him on their faces.

And worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man.

.

And He will deliver them to the angels for punishment
To execute vengeance on them because they have oppressed

His children and His elect

And they shall be a spectacle for the righteous and for
His elect.

They shall rejoice over them.

Because the wrath of the Lord of spirits resteth upon them
And his sword is drunk with their blood".¹

Surely it was not from such writing or from a circle that
nourished /

1. Enoch. sect. LXII 7 to 12.

nourished its soul on such writing that Jesus learned to say, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance - surely it was not a member of such a circle who became the friend of publicans and sinners. Rather to members of such a circle we can imagine Christ saying "Judge not, lest ye be judged." The whole cry of the Similitudes is judgment and righteousness. There is little or nothing of love - neither of love to God nor love to man. The Son of man instead of trying to save sinners is to "break the teeth of the sinners"¹ Can we think that Jesus chose His title Son of Man directly and chiefly from such writing? ^{the} And while ^{the} burden of the message of the Similitudes concerning the Son of Man is of righteousness and judgment we find the Son of Man in the New Testament came to seek and to save that which was lost; to forgive sins, to ease the burden of the legal observance of the sabbath day, to redeem men and to raise their self esteem not because of their righteousness but because of their innate nobility of nature and potential divinity. He came to tell them that they were lost children of God and to show them how to love one another as God loved them and He the Son of Man loved them - yea loved even his enemies.² Not the fear of God but the love of God was the central note, or the dominant chord in our Lord's song of Salvation. (cf. Mk. XII, 32-34.) This was realised by writers like Paul and /

1. Enoch XLVI. 4: (2) cf. Cadoux op.cit. p.50:- "God's love for the unjust and evil, which love was the centre of Jesus' teaching and the ruling passion of His life."

and John who wrote at a time distant enough to get a right perspective and catch the central spirit.* Hence "The centre of gravity in Paul's religion was not eschatology but possession of the spirit (of Christ) as a pledge and foretaste of the blessedness of the future".¹ Also in the Acts of the Apostles the conviction is in the background "that the Messianic Age had already dawned because the spirit was present"² (cf. Acts. IV³¹ Jer. XXXI-33; Ezek. XXXVI -26,27) Of what nature was this Spirit? Let Jesus speak for Himself:- "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father who is in Heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good" (Matt. V, 44, 45.) Jesus gives the reason for the cultivation and the seeking of this spirit and it was not because the time was short. Eschatology has nothing to do with it. Neither has eschatology anything to do with I Cor. XIII where Paul expatiates on the same Love. The nearest the similitudes of Enoch come to such Love is probably in Sect L - 2 and 3 where we read:- "And the righteous shall be victorious in the name of the Lord of Spirits: And He will cause the others to witness (this) that they may repent ... They shall have no honour through the name of the Lord of Spirits yet /

1. Kennedy "Theology of the Epistles" p. 95.

2. Ibid. p. 113.

*cf. Streeter, "Oxford Studies" p.436.

yet through His name they shall be saved, And the Lord of Spirits will have compassion on them, For His compassion is great." But even here it will be observed that though the Gentiles will be saved as by fire they will not have the abundant entering in of the Jews. This may be a little advance on the O.T. Maxim "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy" but certainly it is far short of loving your enemies and forgiving them while hanging crucified. Even a Pharisaic Quietist like the Author of the "Assumption of Moses" pictures the elect rejoicing over the Gentiles and their other enemies in Gehenna.¹ Forgiveness is much more strongly advocated in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" and meekness in the "Assumption of Moses" than in the Similitudes of Enoch. But the "Testaments" were not followed in this, and the "Assumption" enjoins fasting. In any case Jesus cannot be said to have been a leader in the apocalyptic 'circle of the Similitudes', i.e. He was not so much influenced by Apocalyptic movement as acquainted with some of its literature and doctrines.²

Nevertheless though the love of God is the soul of the message of Jesus yet as one who deeply contemplated the finitude of mortal existence He often brought the minds of His followers before the Judgment-Throne of God. But just as He reacted to John's /

1. Ass. of Moses X-10.

2. i.e. Not so much influenced by Apocalyptic eschatology directly as by its Ethic. cf. Charles "Apoc. and Pseudep." Vol II p. 291f.

John's message by taking it up and then changing its character and revolutionizing men's conceptions of it; so we believe that He was reacting to questions put to Him and to opinions held by his hearers when He spoke of the Powers and authority and judgment of the Son of man. It would be put to Him that that son of man in Enoch had such and such said of him and Jesus would reply, Is that so - well this Son of man will also have great authority but first He must suffer etc. He would know well His own dignity but He would not be moved from his course. When two of the disciples went too far by asking Him for places in His kingdom He cut their petition short by telling them frankly such places were not His to give and when others asked Him about the date of the final Judgment He at once declared He did not know. All this is foreign to the atmosphere of apocalyptic where ignorance would be covered up by vague expressions and fantastic figures. To say therefore that Jesus was influenced by the similitudes of Enoch is doubtless true but only provided we realise it was the anvil and not the metal from which he hammered and shaped part of His teaching of the Kingdom.

This will be evident even when we come to such symbols in apocalyptic as the Book¹ of Records. The use of it goes as far back as Exodus XXII-32 where it represents a register of the citizens of the Theocratic community. cf. Ps. LXIX-28 and is called /

1. cf. Jubilees xxxix.6 ; (Tablet's in Jubilees xix.9. and xxx.20 ; cf. Daniel x.21.)

called the Book of the living (cf. Enoch XLVII-3) "To have one's name written in the book of life implied the privilege of participating in the temporal blessings of the Theocracy, (Is. IV-3) while to be blotted out of this Book meant exclusion therefrom. In the O.T. this expression was originally confined to temporal blessings only, but in Dan. XII-1 it is transformed through the influence of the new conception of the Kingdom, and distinctly refers to an immortality of blessedness",¹ This reference to an immortality of blessedness appears in Enoch XLVII-3 and CIV-1 and the same idea appears in Lk. X-20 in the words "Your names are written in the heaven". In the O.T. the idea of a Book or Record being kept by God develops to include evil deeds. (Is. LXV-6); Good deeds (Ps. LVI-8) and both Good and evil (Dan. VII-10). In the Canon therefore Jesus had every use of the symbol which is found in apocalyptic and when He is confronted with the apocalyptic teaching in these symbols we find Him keeping to His own course of doctrine. He certainly endorses the View of a Record being kept when He said "That every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. (Matt. XII-36). But first of all we have to note the massive way in which Jesus implies the record without restricting it to the metaphor of a book. Does not the sweep of his language embrace our present knowledge with our biological records, our scientific doctrine of records that are physical, mental /

1. Enoch (Charles' Notes) p. 91 (sect. XLVII-3).

mental and spiritual. Hence records written in the soul of man and in the mind of God was a thought of Apocalyptic better expressed by Jesus and of such universal, ancient, and modern, experience that He can scarcely be thought to have necessarily acquired it from apocalyptic.

But further when we consider the Records or Tablets as described in Enoch LXXXI-1,2, the idea is mainly predestinarian.¹ The heavenly tablets record all the deeds of men to the remotest generations and the favourite word for the righteous is 'the elect'. If we combine those two viz:- the idea of predestination with the term 'the elect' and examine the term as it appears in apocalyptic generally we shall discover the vast gulf that divides the doctrine of Jesus from the doctrine of apocalyptic. The general impression the reader of apocalyptic receives is that the elect are chosen for favour and blessing. (The word as it appears in Enoch is found chiefly in the parables cf. 40⁵; 41²; 48¹; 51⁵; 56⁸; 58¹⁻³; 61^{4,12}; 62^{7,8}). Also it is a blessing that seems to be enhanced by their viewing the destruction and suffering of sinners. "Sheol shall devour the sinners in the presence of the elect" "Blessed are ye, ye righteous and elect for glorious shall be your lot. And the righteous shall be in the light of the sun, and the elect in the light of the eternal life".² Jesus who knew /

1. Enoch. XXXIX - 9.

2. Enoch (Charles) Sect. LVI-8 and LVIII-2,3.

knew his O.T. so wonderfully would find a very different doctrine there especially among the prophets. In Isaiah XLIII -10. we read concerning Israel -"Ye are my witnesses (i.e. for Jahveh) And Amos is much farther from Apocalyptic when he says:- "You only have I known of all the families of the earth therefore I will "punish" you for all your iniquities."¹ Here the elect are neither the righteous nor the objects of blessing - at least in the sense of blessing in apocalyptic. The consequence is that Jesus who penetrated to the heart of the old Testament, who fastened on the fine essence and spirit of it; who came to fulfil the Law concentrated in his life and teaching not upon the glories and blessings of them who were already righteous but rather upon the ways and means of turning sinners to righteousness. Doubtless before His mind's eye He had the words of the prophet:- "And they that be wise² shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they that turn many to righteousness as the Stars for ever and ever". Dan. XII.-3)". But He concentrated on the latter part of the verse. The salvation of sinners was His theme - the saving of human souls. "For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" (Matt.XVIII-11). The idea of human souls being arbitrarily divided so that some are predestined to eternal bliss and others irrevocably predestined to eternal suffering or complete destruction has no place in the teaching of Jesus.³ Yet Jesus had a

1. Amos III-2.

2. i.e. instructors.

3. cf. Cadoux op.cit.p.58.ff. Mk.IV.11,12.(Matt.XIII.13-15 Lk.VIII-10 N.B. also Mk. XII.6; Matt.XI.20-24. Lk. X. 12-15. Matt.XVIII-14.

doctrine of election.—[We do not find it in Luke IX-35 where we read of the Heavenly Voice speaking these words:- "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλεκτός" "This is my Son, the Elect One." Nor in Lk. XXIII-35 where we have the term applied in derision: "σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἐκλεκτός") In these two excerpts from Luke we get a glimpse into the mind of the 1st century. They do not reveal the mind of Jesus. One is the taunt of his enemies (XXIII-35) the other IX-35) has a double difficulty for our acceptance namely (a) it is a variant reading (b) The Voice addresses the disciples, whereas the Baptismal Voice addresses (cf. Mark I-11) Jesus Himself. The voice at Baptism may therefore easily be regarded as an inner voice but not so the voice of the Transfiguration as represented by Luke. But enough for us that Jesus was 'sent' for this amounts to election and more especially to selection.] This was our Lord's doctrine, viz:- God elected men for service. Even if we accept Lk. IX-35. as authentic then the voice heralded our Lord's entrance upon His passion - His ministry of the suffering servant^{1.} and apocalyptic knows nothing of this, so far as the Elect One is concerned. Dr. Charles has pointed out that the name 'The Elect One' which appears in Enoch sect XL-5. is the designation of the Messiah and comes from Is. XLII-1. But the Elect One, as he admits, has /

1. Influenced by, but not limited to, the teaching of Is. LIII.

has as his chief, and we might almost add, his only function the execution of Judgment. That being so we need only turn to Isaiah XLV-1 to find another elect one whom God chose to execute Judgment even Cyrus - a Gentile, a heathen - one who did not even know Jehovah. (cf. Isaiah XLV-5). Jesus would know this passage and it would affect his doctrine of election. Indeed we maintain it affected his doctrine radically. It taught Him, and He in turn taught others that God can choose His instruments from the most unlikely quarters and even from outside the nation of Israel, and bless others too.¹ (cf. Luke IV-24,27). Jesus Himself called a publican and did He not also emphasise the fact that the spirit of God bloweth where it listeth when He told us the parable of the Good Samaritan. Our Lord's doctrine of the elect may therefore be stated thus:- God does choose His instruments and in so far as they are equipped for their vocation their equipment is a gift. But whereas the apocalyptic writers gloat over the high honour conferred upon the elect Jesus discovers the high dignity and status it confers upon all mankind. Chiefly however Jesus emphasises election for service as when in the synagogue he read:- "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set /

1. cf. John the Baptist's saying - "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham (Mt. III-9.)

set at liberty them that are bruised". (Lk. IV-18) Hence far from encouraging the elect to be satisfied no matter how many perished, God, as Jesus taught, elected some for the special purpose of saving others. God has indeed chosen some out of His mere good pleasure:- Here apocalyptic and Christ's doctrine may be said to agree. But what is God's good pleasure? If we consider the fact of genius we shall soon find the answer. No effort on the part of the ordinary man can produce genius though effort is required to bring it to its full flower and fruit, But, as we know, genius is not given to a man for his own delectation or profit merely nor chiefly, but that he may be the servant of his age - yea and of all succeeding ages. Whatever else or more Jesus was, He was at least a religious genius and so elected by God to be the servant of all ages in spiritual things. This view of election takes away any sense of unfairness or injustice on God's part. The religious genius becomes God's point of contact with the race. His privileges and gifts are balanced and sometimes far outweighed by his responsibilities and service. As we have seen, Amos considered God would punish Israel because she was an elect nation. Some have even held that God punished His own son. That idea certainly we reject. Nevertheless there is meaning in the words of the prophet where he says "The Chastisement of our peace was upon Him and /

and with His stripes we are healed". Is. LIII-5.

Such was the mind of Jesus concerning election, viz: The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life as a ransom for many.

CHAPTER VI.

Salvation.

We have now seen that apocalyptic is chiefly concerned with a Day of Judgment that ushers in the messianic kingdom or marks the end of the present world and ushers in the New. The apocalyptic doctrine is designed to encourage the righteous to hope for escape from their present sufferings and to expect their reward in the New Kingdom. Hence the apocalyptic doctrine may be said to be a doctrine of salvation. But salvation in apocalyptic thus signifies deliverance from outward circumstances to be brought in with the Messianic age, (cf. Jer. XXIII-6 and Is. XXV-9) or deliverance from punishment.¹ It was both outward and futuristic. This appears again in Matt. X²²; XXIV^{13, 22}; But this sense of the word appears so seldom in the Gospels and where it does appear the context is so confused that we are well within the mark in saying that it was incidental and not fundamental to the teaching and mind of Jesus. Indeed Matt. X and XXIV are unreliable² guides to the mind of

1. Cf. Enoch LXII-13; XCIX-10; Pss. of Sol. X-9; XII-7.

2. cf. Streeter "The Four Gospels" pp. 254f.; "Oxford Studies" (edited by Sanday) p. 242

Jesus. Even in the O.T. "with the deepening sense of moral evil 'salvation' acquires a more profound ethical and spiritual meaning"¹. We see the idea struggling to be born in the prophet Joel where he says:- "And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions" (Joel II-28) and a few verses later "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered" (Joel II-32). In verse 28 Joel is seen rising to the heights that Jeremiah attained (ch. XXXI-34) and Ezekiel (XXXVI-26), and Peter quotes his words in the Acts II-17. But the verse is remarkable for its universalism. After judgment is meted out to hostile nations, and Israel is delivered, the spirit of God is to be poured out upon all flesh. Here was the mandate for Jesus in the Canon for his Gospel of universal salvation.* Joel has strong apocalyptic features yet its eschatology has an ethical and spiritual purpose. Besides, if apocalyptic or eschatology was in the air in our Lord's day a far more permeating element in the religious thought and atmosphere of the time was the desire for a universal religion. "The keynote of the day was universalism, the demand for a universal religion"² Apocalyptic. /

1. Adams Brown. Hastings Dicty. Vol. IV p. 358.

2. Angus op. cit. p. 83.

* Jésus apporte au monde une parole qui rassure et qui console: c'est la bonne nouvelle du salut.... ce message universel" (Jean Lafon "ÉTUDES & PORTRAITS ÉVANGÉLIQUES" b. 3.)

Apocalyptic was here out of touch with the main current of the religious thought of the Age. It favoured the idea of an exclusive salvation.¹ Its doctrine, intended for the encouragement of the righteous led by a natural process to self congratulation of the elect and then to pride and self righteousness. At least that was the tendency, and these last were qualities of character which Jesus could not abide. That Jesus was not a wholehearted member of the apocalyptic party is evident in his whole teaching anent salvation. The essentially human note in his teaching appears in his use of "σώξαι" to denote physical healing. (cf. Matt. IX-22; Mk. III-4, V-34; X-52; Lk. VI-9; VIII-48, 50; XVII-19; XVIII-42.) Also although in apocalyptic the ideal is essentially worldly, involving the hope of earthly triumph and prosperity yet it was a far less human ideal than that of Christ for it led to despair of any salvation under present conditions whereas to Jesus the Kingdom was present already (cf. Mt. XII-28; Lk. XI-19 also Mt. XI-11, Lk VII-28; Mk. X-15 etc.)

The great difference of our Lord's doctrine of salvation and that of apocalyptic is to be found in His view of God. "In place of a purely transcendent being Jesus proclaimed a loving Father, profoundly concerned in all that affects His children, watching their affairs with a tender interest, infinitely wise and /

1. Notable exceptions to this are. Test. Benj. IX-2; Lev. XIV-4.

and great indeed, yet infinitely condescending".¹ Westcott's great phrase:- "Truth and Justice define omnipotence" Jesus would have modified to include mercy and love, for "There's a kindness in His justice" - a kindness which sent Jesus to proclaim that even while men were sinners God was loving them. That being so, salvation was deliverance from sin.² It was a present experience as much, if not more so, than a future one. It meant the entrance into a life fitted to the children of such a Father as God, whose character was love as well as Righteousness.³ It depended on that childlike trust which a child has for a father. (cf. Mt. VI-31, 34; and consequently a fellowship with the Father.⁴ This life of fellowship with God was sustained by the Divine life flowing into the human, and the marks of the Divine life were, humility, brotherly service and filial dependence on God. The lofty thought of the eighth Psalm 'Thou hast made him a little lower than God' - or, as Moffatt translates - a little less than divine - did not affect greatly Hebrew thought. But Jesus had pondered it deeply and here our Lord was nearer to the Greek way of thinking for "Through the course of Greek religious thought a single thread may be traced, in the essential unity of man and God".⁵ What binds man and man together is fellowship or oneness of spirit and Jesus taught that what would bind God and man together would be /

(2) cf. Cadoux. *op. cit.* p 38 (3) cf. *Ibid.* p 52.
 1. Adams Brown. *op. cit.* p. 363. (4) cf. Ryder Smith. *op. cit.* pp. 26f.
 5. Mrs. Adam. *Greek Ideals of Righteousness* p. 67.

be unity of spirit. Wherefore the great object of Jesus was the at-one-ment of man and God;¹ so "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"; - Observe 'the World' - not merely the Jewish nation. Joel had seen the largeness of the spirit's love - the Spirit which was to descend on 'all' flesh. But Joel had also seen the levelling of the spirit's love:- not the parents only but sons and daughters are visited by Him. Old men and young men are taught His supernal knowledge, - not the masters only but servants and handmaids utter His word. These were the hidden truths of the O.T. which Jesus brought to light - even from an apocalyptic book like Joel, and emblazoned by His own lowly life, sufferings and death on the Cross, for all after ages to see. But Apocalyptic did not develop along these lines. Direct action on the part of God instead of being proclaimed in order to emphasise that God is no respecter of persons or nations is made the all important means of exhibiting the omnipotence and transcendence of God. Salvation had an arbitrary, and Divine intervention a mechanical aspect. But the God of Jesus had called all to be saints. In our Lord's message the "Pathway to Redemption..is ethical from end to end".² Saints are "to give diligence to make their calling and election sure". (2 Pet. 1-10) But wherein Jesus endorsed the view of apocalyptic was his insistence that God was the source^{of power?} i.e. the power to keep the ethical path - the new life - was / 1. cf. "Romans" VI. 1-6, //.

2. cf. Mackintosh "Originality of the Christian Message" p. 110.

was a gift from the Father. It was received, however, only through faith. Hence again and again He declares "Thy faith hath saved thee". (cf. Lk. VII-50; XVIII-42 etc.) desiring thereby to inculcate the attitude and recommend the means by which God could exercise His power in the lives of men. - the power to redeem their lives. In all His ministry and doctrine of salvation Jesus was responding to a present and universal need, for not only the pious in Israel but also the "Paganism of the first century B.C. felt a hunger for Redemption".¹ It was a hunger for something to be given in the present. It is because Jesus offered to appease that hunger - showed the way to satisfy it through at-one-ment with God - that it can now be said "Union with God is the chief boon of Christianity and is given here in this world. Therefore the gospel is not essentially a futuristic message".² The heathen world yearned for salvation from "the almost universal sense of decay and degeneration, the oppression of fatalism and astral worship, from the evils of dualism, the inherent evil of matter and the body the sense of estrangement from the Deity, from the darkness of death, and emphatically from the power of the demons".³ The heathen world was also looking for a saviour. "There was an attitude /

1. Mackintosh op. cit. p. 94.

2. Ibid. Ibid. p. 114.

3. Angus op. cit. pp. 134-5.

attitude of expectancy in East and West about the time of the appearance of Christianity....The story of the Magi is evidence of a belief in a Saviour-King to be born".¹ In B.C. 40 Virgil writes:-

Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.

Tu modò nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum

Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,

Casta, fave, Lucina.....

.....si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostri

Irrita perpetuâ solvent formidine terras

Ille Deûm vitam accipiet.....

.....

Pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem".²

Virgil tells us in this eclogue that he has drawn his inspiration or at least his information from the Sibylline oracles, but the whole tone of the eclogue, its atmosphere of peace and its humane ideal are much more in keeping with Is. VII.14,15; LX.7; XL.6-8; XXXV.1. The expectancy of the O.T. has therefore become the expectancy of the Roman world. In Virgil is found the idea that the work of Redemption involves for the deliverer and saviour of men, suffering and disappointment; and /

1. Angus op.cit. p.136.

2. Virgil "Eclogue IV" lines 7ff.

and that its essence lay in a new spirit, a new and more humane ideal. There is little or nothing in Virgil's Eclogue of the Divine vengeance so prominent in the Sibylline Oracles.

Deissmann has shown how Christianity started with the masses, working from beneath upwards like the sap of the tree in spring,¹ but first ideas descended upon choice souls like the gentle rain from heaven and then filtered down to the roots of the human tree - down to the common intelligence and common feelings of the common folk. Among such ideas was that of Socrates that there was a Divine voice in man; and he only articulated a felt need of many when he said:- "O' if virtue had only a body and men could see her with their eyes, how they should run to embrace her."²

It is the Isaianic and Grecian ideas of salvation which Jesus propounds more than those of the Sibylline oracles. And although judgment is part of His theme and resurrection also..yet even in this last named doctrine Jesus has perhaps no greater affinity with apocalyptic than with Greek thought.

1. cf. Deissmann "Light From The Ancient East" p.8 (4th. edit.)

2. Quoted by Angus op.cit. p.180.

CHAPTER. VII.

Resurrection.

Greek thought maintained that the soul was immortal.

Jesus maintained the same so far as the power of human enemies was concerned. (cf. Matt. X-28. Be not afraid of them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul, etc.). But first we must note here the distinction between the apocalyptic view of the resurrection and the Greek view of immortality. In Homer (soul) i.e. $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ or 'Psyche' is distinguished from 'Thumos' (the mind) which dwelt in the diaphragm and disappeared with the body. 'Psyche' went to Hades but had no thought, emotion, nor contact with the upper world.¹ Plato's doctrine of the soul differs also, because it shows (a) unbridled individualism (b) pure intelligence. It is therefore not a human soul. The apocalyptic view, on the other hand, has for its leading thought not the abolition of the body, but its transformation. The animate body is sown under earthly temporal conditions but it is raised a spiritual eternal body; and in the apocalypse of John the New Jerusalem is represented as coming down from heaven but may fairly be made to represent the transformed earth or universe - transformed by the Power, Divine Energy, into the Quality of the Kingdom of God. Hence neither time, nor space, nor night, nor sorrow, nor crying are there. Yet though human beings are transformed they are human still.

1. Homer describes Tiresias among the dead saying "He alone had the breath of life and intelligence in him, while all the rest were but flitting shades." Meno. 100 A. quoted by E. Caird. 'Evol. of Theol. in Gk. Philosophers' vol. 1. p. 97.

No picture of the future life equals that revealed by the Apocalypse of John. Rightly presented, it must move the hearts of men in all times and places. These, however, are the fully developed ideas of apocalyptic. We must examine as to whether they are the seed or the fruit of our Lord's doctrine.

Jesus would imbibe ideas of resurrection from the Old Testament. The miracles of Elijah and Elisha (IK. XVII; IIK. IV)¹ even for those who refuse to accept them as facts, testify to the notion of resurrection being in men's minds long before Jesus was born, though ideas of resurrection in the O.T. were various. If we turn to the N.T., the substantive "ἀνάστασις" is found to have for its essential idea the restoration of life in its fullness to a person whose existence has not been absolutely cut off but so mutilated and attenuated as to be unworthy to be described as life. This idea of resurrection taken from the O.T. (cf. 2K. XIII-21) takes the rising of the body as the symbol of the whole fact. But the essential matter is the renewal of life; hence, with the Rabbis, "חַיָּוִת" (revival) became more frequent than "קִיּוּם" (resurrection).

Again, Genesis II-7 would teach Jesus that the withdrawal of the spirit at death must involve the break up of the existence of the individual. In Ezekiel XXXVII however He would find a revivification of the body as a symbol of a spiritual revival - ideas of bodily and spiritual resurrection being thus /

1. Cf. Ascension of Moses and Translation of Enoch, vide Weiss. op cit. p. 13.

thus early intertwined. In Daniel XII-2, He would learn that the religious thinkers of His nation had advanced not only beyond the idea of the salvation of the nation alone, but of the resurrection of the righteous alone. (cf. Is. XXVI-16). The idea of a resurrection of individuals, good and bad, would therefore be familiar to Jesus. In the Psalms He would find the notion of revival expressed by "deliverance of an existent personality from Sheol and its re-endowment with life in all its powers and activities".¹ But, chiefly and in the psalms, He would find the idea of communion with God.² God being eternal such a communion must partake of his nature and be eternal cf. "Lead me on the lines of life eternal. (Ps. CXXXIX-24. Moffat's translation). But Pss. XVI and XVII are the least ambiguous in this respect. Psalm XVI is the joyous and confident prayer of one whose highest satisfaction is the company of those who live "on the lines of life eternal" i.e. of God and good men (His saints). Above all it is the fellowship of God which is His true life.³ "Thou art what I get from life, O thou Eternal, thou thyself art my share; I keep the Eternal at all times before me, with him so close I cannot fail. And so my heart and soul rejoice, my body rests secure, for thou wilt never let me sink to death, nor leave thy loyal one to the grave; thou wilt reveal the path to life, to the full joy /

1. Bernard (Hastings Dicty.) Vol IV. p. 232

2. cf. C. A. Scott. "Dominus Hoster" p 20

3. cf. Ryder. Smith op. cit. p. 166f.

joy of thy presence, to the bliss of being close to thee for ever".¹ This Psalm is quoted in Acts II-25ff and XIII-35 as referring to our Lord. This is not its primary reference. But that our Lord had read it and been deeply impressed with its teaching we shall now try to show. But first of all it should be recalled that the standpoint of this thesis is that the Psalms were the most dominating literary influence and perhaps the most formative of all influences in shaping the mind of Jesus.² It was the words of a psalm that came to Him at His Baptism. It was a psalm which gave relief and expression to His agony on the Cross. ³ A psalm braced his soul to face it. (Mk. XIV-26).

Take these thoughts then. "Thou art what I get from life. O Thou Eternal, Thou thyself art my share, with Him so close I cannot fail; And so my heart and soul rejoice, My body also rests secure". Take these thoughts and we see into the very springs of the mind of Jesus. Here is Christ's assurance of resurrection, not from any apocalyptic or eschatological work, but from living experience - re-living the experience of the Psalmist. Jesus' chief affinity was with the Psalmists, for surely He was a poet. And as there has been no literary production in the world so human as the psalms, so there has been no mind in history so human as the mind of Jesus. We see this in the way Jesus simplifies and humanises his doctrines more especially those /

1. Moffatt's Translation"; 2. cf. Appendix. pp. 176ff.

3. Ps. 118 cf. v. 27.;

those which are implicit, but have a direct bearing on the resurrection. For instance Jesus uses the word: ("ζωή") 'Life' to denote salvation. (Matt. VII-14) and also lifetime on earth (Lk. XVI-25). And "ψυχή" (soul) is used similarly in a double sense viz: (a) the natural physical life in the body (Matt. II-20, VI-25), and (b) the higher life (cf. Matt. X-29, XVI-25, XI-29; Lk. XXI-29) and in Mk. X-45. "ψυχή" is used of our Lord's offering of Himself to give His life a ransom for many. Hence whether higher or lower, the life is still human. And when we turn to the Johannine writings we find in (ch. I-4). In Him was life ("ζωή") and the life was the light of men. Also in XII-25 He that loveth His life ("ψυχή") shall lose it and He that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.

Are we to believe there is no significance in this usage of these ordinary words "ζωή" and "ψυχή" to express the whole personality taken along with the fact that "the deliverance of the whole personality is what the psalmist proclaimed (cf. Ps. XVI-8, 9, 10)? As we have said already, Jesus did not address men and women as spirits and souls but as human beings. And to Jesus a human life was not complete except in fellowship with God. This thought does appear in pre-Christian apocalypses as in the following, "They that fear the Lord shall rise again to Life everlasting. And their life shall be in the light of the Lord /

1. cf. Rom. VIII. 19f.; Ryder Smith op. cit. pp. 287ff.

Lord and shall fail no more".¹ But whereas we see here the life of saints portrayed as having communion or fellowship with God it is a life that is given to them only after the resurrection whereas the life of fellowship with the Heavenly Father which Jesus promises to the saints is enjoyed in this present world. It begins here. Wherefore Jesus seems to combine or rather use selective synthesis in combining the Psalmist's teaching on communion with God, the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul and the Apocalyptic idea of the resurrection of the Righteous. Socrates' "Daemon;" (or, Divine Voice within, that restrained man from evil) perhaps expressed a somewhat similar experience of communion with God and His teaching in this matter may have directly influenced, somewhat, the mind of Jesus. Moreover the nearest word which the Greeks had for sin:- antithesis ("ὕβρις") meaning unbridled self-assertion (arrogance) provokes nemesis or righteous indignation in gods and men²; and, as arrogance in its more polished, developed, worldly-wise forms provoked the wrath of Christ, so to-day arrogance is considered the most unchristian of feelings: Per contra, Communion with God would produce the opposite kind of life from the arrogant namely the humble and the pure..

Apocalyptic made much of the distinction between the Righteous /

1. Pss. of Sol. sect. III-16.

2. W.G. de Burgh "Legacy of the Ancient World". p 94 f.

Righteous and the unrighteous but only so far as their destiny was concerned after the judgment and resurrection - first or final.* Jesus, however, was concerned, like Socrates, more with the cure of souls, only with Him the soul was a more human and comprehensive thing than Greek Philosophy ever conceived. Besides with the Greeks the body was essentially evil.

But Jesus used terms and expressions common in Apocalyptic in connection with the resurrection. The element of apocalyptic eschatology cannot be eliminated from his preaching¹; no more can it from his teaching about the resurrection. But always we have to keep in mind His idea of the worth of human personality, ^{that of} and communion with God which is central. Always too, we must remember that such doctrine as we have is mostly implicit: Doctrine is presupposed. The discourses are practical and it is in connection with conduct, and judgment upon conduct that the resurrection comes before us² in the Synoptics. Where Jesus does give direct teaching on the resurrection; two important facts have to be noted, (a) It is an answer to a current belief or unbelief, in other words it is our Lord's re-action (b) It may have similarity of expression to some extent with apocalyptic (and even of thought) but it can only be understood in the light /

1. Moffatt "Theol. of Gospels" p. 76.

2. Bernard (Hastings Dicty) Vol. IV p. 233.

x. There are notable exceptions e.g. T. Jos. XVIII-2; T. Dan. II-2.

light of its reaction and this is very different from apocalyptic. Take the case of our Lord's reply to the Sadducees (cf. Matt. XXII (23-32) Mk. XII-18-37; Lk. XX-27-38) and compare it with Enoch LI-4. At first Charles and others translated Enoch LI-4 - "They (the righteous) shall all be angels in heaven"; but later Charles himself realised this did not make sense and wrote:- "Hence the idea that the righteous shall become like the angels is not found in this passage"¹. In the same edition, however, he cites Enoch CIV-4, 6, as parallel to the above N.T. passages. In Enoch CIV-4 the text says:- "Be hopeful and cast not away your hope, for ye shall have great joy as the angels of heaven". Certainly the expression 'as the angels of heaven' is there and Jesus may have had it in mind but over against that possibility there are two considerations:- (a) The expression may easily have been a common one, used more especially to refer to people as being as happy as angels - having the joy of angels without any idea of their having the complete nature of angels. (b) The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection and therefore for our Lord to clinch His argument by quoting a writing (~~Book~~ (Enoch) composed by their bitter enemies the Pharisees as an authority for their acceptance, was not a very cogent method of argument. Moreover it was not our Lord's method here or elsewhere, for it was his invariable practice to confute His /

1. Enoch, Charles notes p. 101.; cf. Enoch XV.6f. for direct influence on Mark.XII.25.

His adversaries - out of their own mouth (cf. Lk. XIX-22; Mk. XII 15, 16) or out of their beliefs and accepted authorities. For instance they believed the Canon of Hebrew Scriptures and Jesus said it was from not knowing these that they erred. It was also to these Jesus pointed for confirmation of His doctrine and not to any extra-canonical apocalyptic writing (cf. Exodus III-6). But further, our Lord averred that the Sadducees also erred by not knowing the power of God, and how could the power of God be known for certainty except by that communion and fellowship with God which the Psalms portrayed. This indeed was the factor which determined our Lord's interpretation of Exodus III-6. (cf. Roms. I-16, 17 where in connection with the power of the Gospel we are told 'The just shall live by faith;' and Roms. XIV-7, 8 'For none of us liveth unto himself we live unto the Lord'.)

But again Apocalyptic tells of a resurrection not only of the righteous but also of the unrighteous.¹ Does this agree with the teaching of Jesus? Is the doctrine of a general resurrection implied in Matt. XXV-32f.? It is definitely stated in Jn. V-28,29. It is affirmed in Dan. XII-2 (cf. Is. XXVI-19) that the righteous and unrighteous Israelites shall rise and this idea would soon lead to the doctrine of universal resurrection. But /

1. Enoch (I- XXXVI) etc.

But what did Jesus teach? Some maintain that Matt. XXV-32 refers to Christians alone because that was the question which most concerned the Apostles and their future converts,— "That the persons to be judged are described ... as 'all the nations' is in no way inconsistent with this. Jesus foresaw and frequently prophesied that His religion would become universal (cf. Mt. VIII-11 etc.) and therefore appropriately described the Christians who at the Last Day will rise to be judged, as all the nations of the earth"¹ But Jesus as we have shown would be acquainted with the idea of a general resurrection; i.e. from His knowledge of the O.T. Moreover it was the habit of Jesus not to answer as Apostles and others expected but to be most unexpected. Usually He put their interests in a larger setting. Since too, as far back as Plato's Republic it is represented that a General judgment will take place in which the judges will command the just to take the road to the right upwards through the Heaven; while the unjust will be ordered to take the downward road to the left,² we may feel that Jesus was founding His argument on the broad human instinct which these widely expressed views denote namely:— That human instinct for justice which demanded a general judgment and therefore supported the idea of a general resurrection. This general judgment /

1. Dummelow Commentary p. 707.

2. Book X chap. 13.

judgment is a timeless universal human demand. It is not the peculiar product of apocalyptic. The truth seems to be that the doctrines of apocalyptic books like Enoch, were those current among cultured Pharisees - the more active religious party among them - but not necessarily known by the masses and it is to popular belief that Jesus so often appeals. Take for instance the post-resurrection attributes of the Son of Man in Enoch and note at the same time that in the passage Mk. XII-35, 37 we read:- "The people heard him gladly", and why? Because not only does He confute the scribes but He quotes their national songs (psalms)¹, the literature that would be most familiar to the people. And observe what His quotation implies:- (a) A seat at God's Right Hand - Wherefore with such direct testimony we need not seek in Enoch His mandate for this claim.² (b) Lordship over all the human race. (c) An eternal priesthood and empire. This passage also implies His pre-existence apart from His alleged saying:- "Before Abraham was I am" (Jn. VIII-58). We are told that in the Similitudes of Enoch we have the first hint of a pre-existent Messiah but Jesus³ we see, drew his authority from elsewhere for his pre-existence.

In relation to the Gentiles the apocalyptic teaching of the resurrection is very miserable - a narrow nationalism aggravated /

1. Ps. CX-1.

2. Enoch. XLIX-2; LI-3.

3. R.H. Charles admits the prior statement of the Psalms (cf. "Apoc. and Pseudepigrapha. Vol. ii p.135.) — on Sheol in N.T. sense.

aggravated in some cases by vindictiveness.¹

This is not found in the teaching of Jesus. Hence (to refer again to Dr. Sanday's theory) Jesus, so far from being one of the apocalyptic circle was in this matter in direct opposition. Jesus felt that Apocalyptic was developing prophecy on wrong lines by minimising the Ethical teaching of prophecy and by over-emphasising the future honour and glory of the righteous but more especially by leaving sinners to perish. Indeed, far and away the finest ethical teaching in any of the extra canonical apocalypse is that found in the Testaments of The Twelve Patriarchs which was among the earliest of these which were pre-Christian. The Ethical movement after that is backward not forward till Jesus came, i.e. so far as apocalyptic was concerned. When we turn to our Lord's attitude to the Gentiles we find a much wider outlook and more humane word. Whereas in apocalyptic we are told that some Gentiles shall be converted and yet there is no honour and glory for them - no resurrection to a future life, Jesus gives all honour to the good Gentiles. He was patriotic - none more so.² But his patriotism was not of the narrow exclusive type. On the contrary He early in His career indicated that Jewish religion must be replaced by a universal religion. The Fourth Gospel records/

1. Ps. of Sol. VI- (13-15).

2. cf. Matt. XXIII-37.

records one of His sayings¹ which is thus rightly glossed in Mark XI4-58:- "We have heard him say. 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands and within three days (i.e. a short period cf. Hosea VI²) I will build another made without hands'". Jesus gives evidence here of forecasting a spiritual resurrection on this side of the Grave, a thought which doubtless He had derived from Ps. 88. but which He had enlarged to take in what was afterwards Augustine's idea in the latter's interpretation of Rev. XX. VIZ:- the first resurrection is the spiritual awakening which began to work after the first coming of Christ and is going on now.³

Not much profit is to be derived from a discussion of the distinction between ἡ ἐξανάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν distinction between ἡ ἐξανάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν on the one side and ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν on the general resurrection. Nor need we consider Chiliastic views which had their roots in apocalyptic literature. "No where in the discourses of Jesus is there a hint of a limited duration of the Messianic Kingdom⁴ and yet Jesus must have been familiar with the fascinating combination of Gen. I; Dan. IX and Ps. XC-4.

But /

1. I. John II-19.

2. Ang. De Cir Dei. XX.9.

3. cf. Lk. XIV-14 and XX-35 also Phil. III-11.

4. Ency. Brit. Edit. XI. vol XVIII p. 461.

But a matter of real interest arises in connection with the apocalyptic teaching of the nature of the resurrection, i.e. whether it is of the soul and body or of the spirit only. In Enoch VI-XXXVI etc. the resurrection is to an earthly Messianic Kingdom and is of both soul (or spirit) and body. The body is a physical body. In the Similitudes the resurrection is to a spiritual kingdom in which the righteous are clothed with a spiritual body. In. XCI-CIV there is only a resurrection of the spirit.

Jesus taught a universal resurrection (cf. Matt. X-28) and a resurrection which was a continuance of life for man in his entire self, affirming it in harmony with the O.T. view of man's relation to God. (Matt. XXII, 31, 32; Mk. XII-26, 27; Lk. XX-37, 38). St. Paul herein doubtless caught the Master's mind when he conceived man as body, soul and spirit all capable of being preserved without blame through redemption. Here indeed is a thought which is found in Apocalyptic and which governs all our Lord's thinking namely:- The power of God to transform everything and every person. Christ came to preach the transforming power of the spirit of God.

In Enoch we read:- "And I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing".¹ This idea of the transformation /

1. Enoch XLV- 4, 5. cf. Ryder Smith op. cit. p.287.

transformation of the world was derived directly from Is. LXV-17 & LXVI-22, and probably originally from Zoroastrianism.¹ This is a thought which is overlooked by those who reject the resurrection of the body or of the entire self. In modern times the resurrection of the body has been much discountenanced and even ridiculed. Yet what is the body but a collection of so-called physical forces which have affinities and interaction (chemical or otherwise) with other forces and which are dominated by a life force more or less. To put these forces on the right 'lines'² would redeem them and this might be done by redeeming and transforming the individual soul. The gathering of molecules from the distant corners of the earth is an obsolete conception. Since, however, light waves and sound waves never really perish; and since sound may be transformed into light and light into electricity - since all the wonders of wireless and television are due to transformation and to having transformers that work with the speed of the last trump or the twinkling of an eye need we wonder if at the call of the soul and more especially at the call of God affinities in the universe will group themselves according to the grouping they have already known and prepared for themselves, even as the individual life force or the individual soul can call to the physical and chemical forces at the present time and so maintain its identity of /

1. For Persian influence on Apoc. cf. "A. Bertholet"
op. cit. pp. 52-53.

2. cf. Ps. CXXXIX -24. (Moffatt)

of body. In this connection the lines of Browning are significant:-

"O Saul, it shall be
 A face like my face that receives
 thee, a man like to me.
 Thou shalt love and be loved by for
 ever: a hand like this hand
 Shall throw open the gates of new
 life to thee. See the Christ stand.
 That one Face, far from
 vanish, rather grows,
 Or decomposes but to recompose.

The favourite figure in apocalyptic to denote the transformation of the body is that of clothing or garments, e.g: 'garments of life' 'garments of glory'.¹ Paul later uses this figure of 'being clothed upon' (2 Cor. V-2, 4) in regard to the transformation of the body after the resurrection or at least after death. And "the central truth to Paul was not the second coming of Christ but the transformation of man's nature here and now by the indwelling of the Divine".² Has not Paul caught the very core of His master's teaching here? The indwelling spirit needs only to be modified or enlarged to the /

1. Enoch LXII - 16.

2. Ency. of Relig. & Ethics. Vol. I p. 629.

the invading and pervading spirit and we have our Lord's doctrine of the Kingdom. This invading spirit was God's transforming power and when it pervaded the souls of men they became the sons of God. Thus we can understand Jesus taking up the cry "The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand" by saying in effect. Yes, it is at hand but instead of its transformation beginning with outward and inanimate things it must begin from within and work outwards. And in so far as great changes do take place or may take place in outward conditions by direct intervention of God they shall not compare in importance with the changes and the transformations of the lives of men and women. For what will a man give in exchange for His soul?

But this invasion of the spirit was, in the mind of Jesus, the direct act and intervention of God. It was the power of God manifesting itself and Jesus felt it as direct when it manifested itself in a human will as when it manifested itself in an earthquake. Communion with God broke down the barriers between man and God - those barriers which separated their wills. Every prayer was a call for God's direct intervention. Again as a parallel to this invasion of the Divine spirit we have the invasion of evil spirits. Jesus countenanced the idea that there were demons and that they were likely to enter "εἰς ἐρχομαὶ" into a man and might even pass into other animals, e.g. into the /

the Gadarene swine. A superior power, however, entering in was able to drive out *ἐκβάλλειν* the evil spirits or demons and thus a life was transformed. Jesus Himself was such a transforming power (cf. "The new thing that Jesus brought was not His teaching chiefly but Himself - His personality - the intensity of His faith. His creative genius and power").¹ Sometimes the transforming power is the Presence of God. The presence is conceived as Divine energy ready to infiltrate and transform Human nature as well as individual lives. It is this idea of an infiltration or intrusion of a higher transforming energy which Jesus allied with the apocalyptic idea of a higher order of nature descending upon and transforming the present human order. It was a thought so profound and mysterious that it had to be expressed by symbol.² It is a thought akin to that of Spencer when he writes:- "Among mysteries which become more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty that we are ever in the presence of an Infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed".² Jesus and the apocalyptists were certain of the presence of an Infinite Eternal Energy but they went further than Spencer and declared that it would break into Human History one day as in a flood. Around the shores of humanity /

1. Deissmann. "The Relig. of Jesus and the Faith of Paul" p. 149

2. Ecclesiastical Institutions (near close).

* Cf. Orchard op. cit p. 169. On use of parabolic form by Jesus.

humanity there was this ever present, ever surging ocean of Divine power. It was subject to tidal movements, wherefore history has its sudden climaxes. Jesus had been mentally nourished on stories of such great interventions in Israel's History. Apocalyptic by drawing attention to these interventions revealed to men that History had a purpose.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusion and Summing Up.

The influence of Apocalyptic upon the mind of Jesus as reflected in Jesus' attitude and teaching, concerning Messianism, Authority, Power, Apocalyptic Form, Divine Presence, The Parousia, Judgment, Salvation, Resurrection, - has now been examined.

In this chapter the general impression obtained of the outlook of Jesus in relation to the outlook of apocalyptic will be set forth and then a brief summing up of results will be given and the definite theories which are here rejected and advanced.

The outlook of Jesus has been considered in this Thesis from psychological, critical and historical points of view. As we are not often sure we have the exact words of Jesus: as his doctrine is often implicit - e.g. his doctrine of immortality in /

in the synoptics is verified by His life more than by His teaching - as the documentary sources cannot be understood apart from the background of history (1st century especially) the mind of Jesus could not be understood by His direct teaching alone.

The conception of Jesus which this thesis has attempted to substantiate is that of a powerful and compassionate Personality who had a new and disturbing outlook upon life. Jesus regarded life as a great adventure of faith and love, - a courageous, great-hearted answer to the cry of his age;¹ a hazarding all on the immediate experience and guidance of a Presence whom He called His Heavenly Father. By living his own human life in perfect obedience to the guidance of this Presence Jesus revealed God to man. But in so doing He also revealed and taught the Divine potentiality of human nature, i.e. as being capable of reaching up to, and becoming at one with the Divine nature.² Herein is explained His use of the name 'Son of Man'. He was ideal man - man with his potentiality realised, because in constant touch with God. This may appear at first too abstract for the mind of Jesus till we recall His method of speech as when He said "Man (not men) shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God". (Matt. IV-4) Jesus may have been no metaphysician, but Will, Power, and Love were a Trinity in unity which governed

1. Angus op. cit. p. 226.

2. Cf. Matt. V -45.

His conception of God; as Beauty, Goodness and Truth did for Plato. This abstract method of speech Jesus would learn from the Psalms where the expression Son of Man is also so used (cf. Ps. VIII). Hellenistic influence doubtless was also at work here. But Jesus was first and foremost a Great Human, full of human sympathy and understanding as well as of Divine Grace and Truth. Nevertheless His conception of humanity was such that the lower nature should be held in complete subjection to the higher and thereby His own humanity was constituted Divine. Dr. David Smith has drawn attention to certain aspects and evidences of His humanity in citing such expressions as "ραδιὰ ἡμεῶν"¹. But this 'homeliness' of Jesus must be allied and reconciled with tremendous claims of community, if not of absolute unity, with God. Balzac says "The will in man is nearest to what religious people call the soul". By the identification of His will with the will of God. Jesus made a union or at-one-ment between the soul of man and the will of God, and by His own immediate experience He realised such Divine Power from the union that He made His experience His good news to mankind. In all this Jesus was quite, or at least almost quite free from the influence of apocalyptic. Again by the intensity with which Jesus identified His will with God's will/

1. For His use of Galilean Aramaic cf. Deissmann "Light From The Ancient East" p.64.

will He set in motion a new tide within the human race - a tide which was the reverse of that fatal one we call original sin - so that the wills of men uniting with this tide by faith might flow towards righteousness instead of towards wickedness. Thus Paul later declared - "as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive". 1. Cor. XV-22.

Jesus experienced this reinforcement of His own will by the Divine will to such an extent that He had perforce to spread the good news. Moreover He found His own will so reinforced the wills of others that He realised it was God's will working through Him.¹ He came to point men to Himself, but in such fashion as to make them feel they were being directed through Him to God.² Thus like a prophet He spoke for God, but so personal was His teaching - and so much addressed to the individual heart that it took on no purely local nor even national colouring, but was universal in its application. Hence although Jesus did not go beyond Palestine - although He did not outline a world organisation such as the Christian Church has become, nevertheless He visited Samaria, spoke to one of the lowest of Samaritan women; told the parable of the Good Samaritan; and rebuked two of his own disciples for desiring to requite with harshness the hostility of certain Samaritans.² Having thus broken down the barriers between the Jews and their bitterest enemies, Jesus potentially broke down all barriers and gave the impetus

1. of. Denney. "Jesus and the Gospel" p.255.

2. of. Luke 1V.25, 26.

impetus which later brought the Gentiles into the church.

All these facts show the direction of our Lord's mind even although He may never have formulated a complete policy or system but, for the most part acted and spoke from the deeps in Him, as occasion demanded.¹ In all this we reassert Jesus was influenced little or nothing by eschatology - certainly not by the eschatological Son of man or Messiah.

But when Jesus did come into touch with apocalyptic He received a fresh urge - so that to His desire to spread the Good news there was added the eagerness to hasten the Kingdom. Henceforth speed is added to direction. It is no longer sufficient to tell all whom He meets how their wills may be governed and reinforced by the Divine will; He must now devote His whole time to this - begin a public ministry - urge the need for instant action - warn against delay. - take advantage of the movement, characteristically apocalyptic, begun by John the Baptist: Wherefore hasten the Kingdom became almost as much a part of our Lord's message as "spread the Gospel".

But His avoidance of fantastic apocalyptic symbols (cf. Temptation and his preference for natural and homely illustrations concerning the Kingdom); His calmness;² His deep interest in the needs and sufferings of the present moment, prove that the apocalyptic idea of Judgment could be held by Jesus without that panic, /

1. cf. Glover op. cit. p. 119.

2. Glover "Conflict of Religion" p. 117f.

panic, that scaremongering found later in the Church through constantly calculating when the end of the world and the Son of man would come. Jesus speaks of "My Peace", "My Joy". He was the first modern scientist in that He was content to watch nature like a little child and learn His lessons at her feet. Nothing is more original in His teaching than Matt. VI.28. The saying has nothing to do with apocalyptic neither in its source nor in its significance and likewise when He speaks apocalyptically of the harvest field (Mk. IV.29; Matt. ~~XIII~~ ^{XIII} 1.30ff.) He is not speaking at second hand as one dominated by apocalyptic writing or teaching.

Jesus was no predestinarian. Yet predestination was a cardinal doctrine of apocalyptic. Mk. IV.11,12 (cf. Matt. XIII.13-15, Lk. VIII.10) is an isolated example and only apparently so of Jesus entertaining predestinarian views. The saying must be taken along with many others of an opposite trend viz. - Mk. XI.8, Lk. X.12-15. Lk. XIX.42, Matt. XIII.24ff., ¹ XV.11.14. It will then be apparent that the saying means: - Disobedience brings on blindness and deafness to spiritual truth so that men come to see signs and hear words without understanding as a child hears a parable and perceives only its surface meaning. God is responsible only in so far that it is His law that eyes are darkened and ears hardened by neglect to use them.

Jesus saw that apocalyptic was taking a wrong direction and acquiring a false emphasis. It went astray from O.T. prophecy in its despair of the present world, in degenerating from the lofty ethical teaching of the prophets and in looking for a mechanical intervention of God. It acquired a false emphasis by concentrating

concentrating on a salvation of personal safety. The first led to want of effort, especially effort for social amelioration, the second led to selfishness - a selfish salvation. Jesus on the contrary preached the Gospel of the Power of God here and now, the good news that all things were possible to the Love of God, and He called on men to a great adventure of faith - faith in the Power of God to save and transform the world through the lives of redeemed men. Thus too, Jesus changed the emphasis from the future to the present, from the transcendent to the human. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these ye did it unto Me". (Matt. XXV-40). (Cf. I Jn. IV-20). We see how far removed He is from the salvation of apocalyptic when He cries "Whosoever shall save his life shall lose it but whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the Gospel's the same shall save it (Mt. X-35). But we see Him influenced by apocalyptic even in His doctrine of salvation in the following. "The harvest truly is plenteous but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into his harvest". (Matt. IX-37, 38.)

The decline in Ethical teaching in later pre-Christian apocalypses from Isaiah, Daniel, Joel and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs - the tendency towards world despair, Jesus tried to correct, but His correcting influence is somewhat obscured /

obscured in the N.T. owing to the fact that events like the Resurrection and especially Pentecost made many of the early disciples heady and unbalanced so that in their accounts of Jesus they gave undue proportion to the marvellous features in His life and thus gave a filip to apocalyptic. All revivals since, have shown a similar lack of balance and of sense of proportion at the beginning. Principal Denney has drawn attention to the "not only incongruous but repellent" idea contained in Luke's representation of the Risen Lord eating.¹ This shows how far accentuation of the marvellous could go.

Summing Up.

The Schweitzer theory of plenary eschatological influence is here rejected, and for the following reasons:-

- (1) At the Baptism Jesus heard the 'Voice of the Presence' say 'Thou art my beloved son' and not Thou art Messiah or 'Son of Man' - "Son" signifies one who does the Will of God.²
- (2) At the Temptation Jesus definitely rejected a plan of campaign such as an eschatological view would have dictated. The unmoral and unspiritual use of power rejected.
- (3) /

1. Denney quoted Expos. Times June 1928. p. 387.

2. Matt. V.44-45.

- (3) The great formative influences of His life pointed in another direction, viz:-
- (a) The Psalms:- emphasised communion with God - God's Presence and Fellowship as Chief Good here apart from a Hereafter.
- (b) The Prophets:- concentrated on ethical teaching.
- (4) The record reveals His intense concern is to save from sin and not from circumstances.
- (5) The term "Son of Man" can be sufficiently explained from its use in the Psalms¹ and Ezekiel expressing manliness (courage), humility - sympathy, the great characteristics of His Personality; and in Daniel VII, *expressing man's glorious destiny*
- (6) The early disciples had a ready-made Christology and a clear reason and incentive for applying it with necessary modifications to Jesus
- (7) As time wore on a truer perspective of Jesus was possible. (This especially necessary with a great man as with a mountain) The Christology changes and apocalyptic features fall into the background. This not simply because of non-occurrence of expected Parousia but of positive Presence of the Spirit of the Living Christ.
- (8) /

1. See Appendix ~~Page~~ 176ff.

- (8) Jesus taught need for growth, service, forgiveness, suffering, generosity rather than justice, present salvation; all of which find little or no place in apocalyptic.
- (9) Jesus not simply creature of His age and we are not reading modernity into His mind when we find that He speaks modern, because timeless, truths. This due to fact that He concentrated on things of the Heart, e.g. Sorrow, Joy, Home, friendship, kindness, Hatred, etc., things which denote human needs which are unchanged by the ages.

3.

The Manson theory¹ that Messianic eschatology was the form in which Jesus' thought of His Redemptive mission to the world was cast is also rejected although regarded as nearer the truth. Rejection of this theory is based on the following:-

- (1) Form as stated above given by His reporters.
- (2) No form or system could have furnished sufficient expression for so great a personality. Jesus did not express current beliefs of the Intelligentsia so much as surprise them - He was so unexpected - so spontaneous - had principles but no system.

(3) /

1. Manson op. cit. p. 173.

- (3) In Lord's Prayer if anywhere may see trace of form but not apocalyptic - implies time to carry out will of God.
(Thy will be done on earth = Kingdom).
- (4) Jesus avoids name of Messiah, teaches need of suffering and dying as a Ransom (cf. Dan VII) Has no apocalyptic visions, yet hears Divine Voice like the prophets - represents God as Father not as transcendent Lord of Spirits, emphasises faith rather than hope - transforming character rather than circumstances - except in reported use of Son of Man, no strange symbols - parables symbolic but simple and human - denationalized the Kingdom.
- (5) Adapted apocalyptic warning note of end of world at hand - to live as though end of world were to-morrow, or, ^{that} you may die to-day - wherefore spoke in parables - claimed no exact knowledge of the Day or details of Heaven.
- (6) His teaching on Coming of Son of Man is that the Coming is a process leading up to an event.

C.

Theory advanced here is that Jesus best explained as a great Human because:-

- (1) While His Filial Consciousness was so powerful as to be unique /

unique yet found authority in the Inner Voice, in human experience and intuition. He often illustrated, rarely argued.

- (2) Previously religion always tended to make the religious person a visionary, unbalanced, ascetic, unhuman, but Jesus, however much He towered above men, was never out of touch. Hence
- (3) Even as Son of God did not become a functionary or official but remained a Son of Man - always thoroughly normal and natural.
- (4) Too sane and balanced a mind to give way to apocalyptic day-dreaming.
- (5) Jesus drew his deepest words from direct experience, (a) Communion with God (b) memories of childhood and home (c) Natural objects such as lilies or harvest - not second-hand from apocalyptic.
- (6) Quoted from Old Testament not from apocalyptic and most movingly from the Psalms - that most human book.
- (7) Jesus human in His doctrine of resurrection - resurrection was of the 'self' the complete man. $\psi \cup \chi \eta$ not $\pi \nu \epsilon \psi \mu \alpha$ as later Apocalyptic taught.
- (8) Jesus proclaimed himself the universal judge but it is by His manhood we shall be judged - indeed we shall also be judged by the men of Nineveh etc.
- (9) /

9. Jesus' Gospel was the antithesis of predestination. It was the good news that men were free from predestination as from fate.
10. Jesus most intensely religious yet never fanatic as most apocalyptists were.
11. Jesus too unselfish, too self-sacrificing, too little self-conscious to expatiate upon His own glory --especially outward glory in a bodily advent in the clouds. It was the early Church which thus 'glorified' Him. His theme was rather the coming of man into his kingdom by an adventure of faith and love--
the redemption of man was the glory of the Son of man.
12. Jesus in the saying of Matt. XI. 27. was not (as Moffatt declares) demanding allegiance to Himself in His official capacity as the Son of God. He was not eager to draw attention to His official position in the universe. But He drew attention to what was due to Him for one reason only viz.- His character and quality. Like God He was to be obeyed and trusted because He was Good and True and Beautiful--because His will and God's will were one.
13. Schweitzer declares that the mind of Jesus was obsessed by the Messianic consciousness; Moffatt declares His mind was obsessed by the Filial consciousness; this thesis maintains His mind was as much obsessed by the consciousness of man's potential divinity and by the ardent belief that a "Revival" would realise it, bringing in a new order, viz.-

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Appendix to Thesis

Influence of the Psalms on the Mind of Jesus.

The following are the reasons for considering, as in the foregoing Thesis, the Psalms of the O.T. to be the most formative influence on the Mind of Jesus:-

1. What is deepest in a man comes out at the crises of His life and Jesus expressed Himself in the words of the Psalms at Baptism and Death.
2. The sublimest utterances of His teaching viz.-the Beatitudes are almost entirely drawn from, or related to, the Psalms:- Each beatitude is introduced by the word 'Blessed'--"Μακάριοι" in N.T. Greek corresponding to the frequent initial word in the verses of the Psalms (of LXX. Version). If we take Matthew's text we find the following correspondencies viz.-
 Matt.V.3 and Ps.LI.17; Matt.V.4 & Pss.XXI.1.4, XXX.11, CXXX, CXLV.1.3, CXXV.1.5; Matt.V.5 & XXXV.1.11; Matt.V.6 & Pss.I.11, XXXV.1.26, XL.1.1, LX.1.1,5, LXXXIV.2b.; Matt.V.7 & Pss.VI.4, XXXV.1.26, XL.1.1; Matt.V.8 & Ps. XV.2; Matt.9a. & Ps.XXXIV.14; Matt.9b. & Ps.LXXXI.6; Matt.V.10,11,12. & Pss.XVI.1.17-20, XXI.1.5, XXV.1.6,12.
3. Direct quotations are:- Ps.VI.8 in Matt.VI.23, XXV.41, Lk. XI.27; Ps.VIII.2 in Matt.XXI.16; Ps.XXI.1 in Matt.XXV.1.46, Mk.XV.34; Ps.XXI. in Matt.XXV.1.24. (direct reference); Ps. XXXI.5 in Lk.XXI.1.4; Ps.XXXV.1.11 in Matt.V.5; Ps.LXIX.25

in Matt.XXIII.38; Ps.CX.1 in Mk.XII.36,Lk.XX.42; Ps.CXVIII.22 in Matt.XXIII.42,Mk.XII.10,Lk.XX.17;Ps.CXVIII.26 in Matt.XXIII.39.

4.In Luke XXIV.44 Jesus claims that many things were written concerning Him "in the law of Moses,and in the prophets,and in the psalms".If this is a genuine utterance of Jesus or true to His spirit then there is an ascending order of importance observed--the Psalms furnishing the best things(of .~~Is~~.II.10) When Isaiah is stated to be the chief religious influence on the mind of Jesus,this is largely due to an interpretation of Mk.XIV.21 and kindred sayings of Jesus which refers them to Is.LIII,¹ whereas this text refers to Dan.VII.² Another example is Luke IV.17f. concerning which Du Bose³ sees proof that Jesus had a preference for Isaiah.But as Abrahams⁴ has pointed out, the Roll would be handed to Jesus with the passage to be read already turned up.Again,if we turn to Is.XLIII.2 we learn that the servant of the Lord shall not lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.But Jesus did lift up His voice both in the street and in the Temple.He was not the out and out quietist nor pacifist of Deutero-Isaiah. He had a virile personality and Ps.VII. shows a quality of God's character viz.-His righteous indignation and burning holy anger which was also found in Jesus.Jesus,however, transcended the psalms when He united in His own life,this holy anger and the love of His enemies.

1.O.A.Scott op.cit. pp.146,161,162.

2. Cadoux op. cit. p.32.

3. Du Bose "The Gospels in the Gospel" p.33.

4. "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels" pp.78.

5. Nearly all the outstanding qualities of Jesus' character are found in the Psalms viz.-(a) His passionate earnestness for God and Righteousness -- an earnestness He demanded of others. (of. Psalms XL. 8, XL11.1, LXXXIV.11, CXXXIX.21. with Matt.V.6; Jn.1V.34.) (b) His attitude to sacrifice and ritual - supreme emphasis being put upon moral and spiritual conditions (of. Ps.XL.6f.)¹. (c) His attitude to Messianic ideal is adumbrated in Pss. 2,8,16,22,45,72, 110, as generally recognised; but Ps.22. should specially be noted as pointing to a great victory for righteousness which shall be gained by some patient sufferer. (d) His attitude to authority and prestige as in Lk.X.20. would be found in Ps.LXXXIV.10. (of. Mk.X.43.) -- To be right with, and near to, God is the chief thing. Constant fellowship with God was an all pervasive note in the gospel of Jesus as in the Psalms (of. Ps.XXVII.4.)
6. Pss.96 to 98 gave Him material for his gospel of the Kingdom or kingship of God. The term Son of Man is found in Ps.8. The need for individual, spiritual, and eternal dealings with God is found in Ps.121. where the singulars ~~Thine~~ and Thee are prominent, and sin is an offence to God (of. Ps.L1.4. and Lk.XV.21.), and God suffers when we sin.

1. Cadoux op.cit. p.54.

7. In Ps. CXXX.4. we have the word ~~ἐλεησίν~~ "propitiation" used in the sense of forgiveness, hence no longer meaning the mollifying of irascibility but the annulling of separation. This was of the essence of Jesus' teaching and certainly not the teaching of apocalyptic. Jesus taught that God's anger with the sinful was that of a sorrowful and righteous father, not of a vindictive despot.
8. Pss. 37 and 73. are an attempt to reconcile the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked with God's moral government of the world. Jesus' gospel was the declaration of God's character and moral government; for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself". His mission was to induce men to have such faith in the character of God that they could leave the issues of the future to Him. This also was the attitude of apocalyptic (cf. Ps. 73.); ^{it was.} but ~~due~~ to trust in God's righteousness, whereas in Ps. L1.4. and Lk. XV.21. it is due to trust in God's loving kindness.
9. Jesus' attitude to immortality is based on fellowship or communion with God. If God is eternal then this fellowship is eternal because it must partake of God's nature and personality. (cf. Pss. CXXXIX.24, XVI, XVII.)
10. Pss. 88. was the source of Jn. ii.19, Mk. XIV.58. -- especially the Johannine version where Jesus forecasts a spiritual awakening of men and women on this side of the grave i.e. a spiritual resurrection (a temple made without hands)

11. That greatest word of Jesus concerning God's character viz. the searching, seeking, pursuing Love of God -- found in the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Prodigal Son -- the Master would find in Ps. CXXXIX. 7-9. Indeed many parables may be traced to the Psalms; for instance 'The House Built upon the Sand' (cf. Matt. VII. 26f. and Ps. CXXV. 1.)
12. The sublime faith of Jesus which made His life a venture of trust and confidence in God due, as it was, chiefly to direct immediate experience of God but also to observance of God's works -- this confidence which overcame the fear of death Jesus would find exemplified in Pss. XVI. 9-11, XVII. 15, XLIX. 15, LXXIII. 24, 25, XLI. 4. Such confidence on the part of the Psalmist paved the way for Jesus' teaching on immortality. Faith in Himself and Faith in God, as Jesus taught Faith, was not belief in a metaphysical proposition but trust in a gracious loving personality. This is repeatedly the teaching of the Psalms - Trust and confidence in God as a friend (cf. Pss. 23, 27, 31, 46.)¹. Moffatt says that 'Jesus believed the attitude of men toward Himself as the divine Son and Lord to be critical; by that their fate was to be determined.' The Psalms furnished Jesus with a bigger idea than that namely - not faith in Himself as an official (divine or human), not condemnation for rejecting this official irrespective of
1. cf. Ryder Smith 'The Christian Experience' pp. 26f.

His character, but condemnation because of the rejection of Divine Love personalised, and in the case of Jesus, humanly so.

13. Even the form of Jesus' language was sometimes definitely influenced by the Psalms (cf. the parallelism of Ps. LV.21 and Mk. X.44,45.)¹

14. The Psalms are poetry. They were the songs of the people. Unlike the prophets the psalmists did not grapple merely nor mostly with problems that were political, or of present or passing interest, but rather with the timeless problems of the soul. Jesus was a poet with a prophet's zeal and message. He left the political situation of His day severely alone. He was intensely interested in the things of the present but always in their relation to the timeless verities.

1. Cadoux op. cit. p.37.