

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE
OF THE
PRIMITIVE CHURCH

("Primitive" Church denotes the Church prior to Paul's influence)

by

Rev. P.G.S. Hopwood, B.D.(Lond.) B.Litt. (Oxon).

ProQuest Number: 13905263

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 13905263

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

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE
OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

("PRIMITIVE" CHURCH DENOTES THE CHURCH PRIOR TO PAUL'S INFLUENCE)

The following investigation is claimed to be an original approach to the important question of the origins of the Christian Church. The effort has been made to reach behind the tradition to the experiential roots of the Christian Church through the Primitive Church to the personal impacts of Jesus in life, and human contact with him. This, in the first place, and even in the last resort, is the cause of the Christian Church.

The final chapter sets out the conclusions of our investigation, and in it there are the findings of this discussion.

The footnotes indicate much indebtedness to the works of many scholars, but in many cases they are simply confirmatory of points of view advanced. This investigation seems to meet a gap, for there is no book the writer has been able to discover which deals with the "Primitive" Church along the lines of religious experience.

Finally, the actual limitation of the period under review to the period prior to Paul's influence has enabled the writer

to explore thoroughly the 'dark' twilight of the time before Paul's light came to be shed upon the scene, a period which is usually dealt with summarily in books on the Apostolic Age. It seemed to him that there was a need that this obscure period should be dealt with and studied for its own creative merit.

To the Very Rev. George Milligan, of Glasgow University, the writer owes much for kindly encouragement to persevere with a subject that seemed to hold out little promise of result, and to him the writer wishes to accord his gratitude.

The thesis is the entire composition of the writer, and is entirely the product of his own work and thought, except where indebtedness has been indicated in the text.

192 Wilton Street,

Glasgow, N.W.

April 18th. 1934.

C O N T E N T S

CHAPTER I	THE SUBJECT AND THE SOURCES	1-67
Our Approach is 'empirical-historical'		1-3
Scope of the word 'Primitive' as applied to the church before Paul		3-4
Ambiguity of terms like 'pre-Pauline,' 'Church Origins,' 'Church Beginnings,' 'Christian Beginnings,' 'Ancient'		4-5
Comparative neglect of our period by Church History		5-6
Scarcity of material for providing needful data		6-7
Study of possible sources of information		7-67
I. The Synoptic Gospels		7-17
Luke's preface the true starting-point		8-10
Influence of 'Formgeschichte'		10-12
Characteristics of the Synoptics		12-13
Mark's Gospel		13
Supposed 'Paulinism' of Mark		13-15
The Q hypothesis		15-16
Matthew and Luke and Q		16-17
II. The Acts of the Apostles		
Importance of opening chapters		17
Problem of their historical value		18
The trustworthiness of Acts suggested by		
(1) An author proved to be so in one work is likely to be careful in a second one		19-21
Common authorship of Luke and Acts		19
Merit of the author shown by his principles of research		20
Luke's opportunities for obtaining authentic tradition		21
(2) Source discussions have established the primitive character of the earlier chapters of Acts		21-25
Tracing sources a matter of great delicacy		21-22
Source theories		22-23
Further considerations touching reliability of Acts		23-25
III. The Epistles of Paul		25-51
Paul and the Primitive Church		25-26
A. His acknowledged indebtedness to previous tradition, and studies of		26-36
(1) II Thess. ii. 15		26-27
(2) I Thess. i. 5, 10, ii. 15, iv. 13-17, v. 1-3		27-29
(3) II Thess. iii. 6		29-30
(4) I Cor. xi. 2		30-31
(5) xi. 23		31-32
(6) xv. 3		32
(7) Indirect hints		32-34

Summary of Pauline evidence	34-36
B. Pauline developments not to be read back	36-44
(1) Developed Christology	36-37
(2) A more mature church consciousness	37-39
(3) Possible new features in the Ordinances	39-42
(4) A wider content of Salvation	42-44
C. Active influences of the Pauline developments	44-51
(1) Paul's own religious experience	44-46
(2) The Jewish elements in his interpretation	46-47
(3) The Greek elements involved	48-51
IV. The Post-Pauline Literature	51-64
(1) The Pastoral Epistles	51-52
(2) The First Epistle of Peter (II Peter, 53n.**)	52-53
(3) The Epistle of James	53
(4) The Epistle to the Hebrews	54-56
(5) The Johannine Writings	55-64
The Epistles and the Apocalypse	55-56
The Fourth Gospel and its Experiential Origins	56-64
Further possible sources	64-67
(1) The Old Testament	64-65
(2) Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	65
(3) New Testament Apocrypha	65
The Gospel According to the Hebrews	65-66
The Gospel of Peter	66
The Agrapha	66-67
(4) The Didache	67

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER II THE RELIGIOUS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH EXPERIENCE 68-120

The Jewish foundation of the primitive church	68-69
A. The Inheritance	69-78
Influence of the age-long religious history of Israel	69-70
The prophets as spiritual educators	70
The prophets as antecedents of Jesus	71
The enthronement of 'Torah'	71
Limitations in Jewish religious experience	72
Real spiritual worth of the Jewish faith	73
The increasing sense of sin	73
Prophetic religion and apocalyptic	73-74
The Suffering Servant not a Messianic figure	74-76

No synthesis of the ideas 'Messiah', and 'suffering'	74-75
Possibility of foreign cultural and religious influences on the Religion of Israel	76-78
B. The Religious Environment	78-120
Position of Judaism in the time of Jesus	78-79
This not necessarily the exact type as in the Talmud	80-81
Rabbinic Judaism	81-82
Jesus not a typical Jewish Rabbi	82
Pharisees, Essenes, Sadducees	83-84
The importance of the 'am ha-aretz'	84
Militant Messianism of Galilee	85
The place and power of contemporary apocalyptic	85-86
Psychology of phantasy inadequate to account for this	86-90
(1) Israel's confident faith in the divine consummation not the product of psychical weaving from the past	86-87
(2) Phantasy here would imply collective neurosis due to repression of tragic experience, but Israel's history betrays no such psychical breakdown	87-88
(3) Intense religious reality the clue, not phantasy	88
(4) "The Truth Value of Visions"	88-89
(5) Religious experience is the reality in apocalyptic, while much of the luxuriant imagery is due to literary embellishment and device	89-90
The problem of the repeated failure of the consummation of the Messianic kingdom for Israel's faith	90-91
Widespread influence of apocalyptic ideas among the Jews, with replies to the view that these were only on the fringe of Judaism	91-93
Galilean enthusiasm for apocalyptic	93-95
Attitude of religious authorities at Jerusalem to Galilee	94-95
Religious ideas in apocalyptic significant for the Primitive Church	95-111
(1) The kingdom of God	95-100
(a) The 'sensuous' conception	96-97
(b) The temporary kingdom	97-98
(c) The kingdom not of this world	98-99
(d) The 'Millenium' conception	99
(2) The Messiah	100-105
Messiah not always mentioned or even assumed	100
The supernatural Messiah of Enoch xxxvii-lxxi	100-102
A mere figure-head in Enoch lxxxiii-xc	100
A descendant from Levi	102
The Davidic Messiah	102-103
The suprahuman (heavenly) and the human conceptions of Messiah	103
No association of Messiah with suffering	103-104
Messianic expectations vital for Primitive Church	104-105
(3) Ideas of Resurrection	105-107
(4) Development of Angels	107-109
(5) Demonology	109-111

Human personality readily accessible to invasive supernatural influences	111-112
This is the point of departure for the experience of the Spirit; connotation of term	112
Ideas of the operation of the Spirit carried over into the Primitive Church	112-117
'Corporate Personality'	117-119
Human personality	119
Tendency to the recognition of individual personality	119-120
Significance of the inheritance and environment for the Primitive Church	120

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER III	THE INITIAL CONTACTS AND THE IMPRESSIONS	121-188
Jesus and his personal impact		121
A. The Crowds		121-130
His spreading fame		121-124
'What manner of man is this?'		124
The appeal of the miracles		123-124
The interest in the teaching		124
Danger of popular Messianic fervour		125-126
Various impressions formed of Jesus		126-127
Jesus was a 'herald' of the coming kingdom		127-128
His Messianic reserve		128
The Triumphal Entry		128-130
The disappointment of the anti-climax of his arrest, and the demand for his crucifixion		130
B. The Reactions of the Jewish Authorities		130-136
Observation of Jesus by Scribes, Pharisees, etc.		130-131
Their attempts to discredit him		131-132
The alarm of the authorities when Jesus is in Jerusalem		132-133
Jesus condemned for blasphemy against the temple		133-134
Confession of his Messiahship extorted to force the hand of Pontius Pilate		134
The authorities impressed by the uniqueness of Jesus		134
Jesus seen to be up alongside the Law and Traditions		135
The issue of religious experience on which Jesus challenged the Jewish authorities		135-136
C. The Publicans and the Sinners		136-142
The uniqueness of Jesus here compared with the Rabbis		136-137
Unpopularity of the taxgatherers		137
Who the 'sinners' were		137-138

Jesus' friendship and its effects	138-140
Jesus here in contact with Gentile elements	140-141
Significance of this for the Primitive Church	141-142
D. The Works and the Words	142-164
The miracles productive of tremendous impressions	142
Limitations of modern psychology in the understanding of the miracles	142-144
(1) Organic disease is the object of Jesus' healing as well as what is known as functional nervous disease	143
(2) Jesus' direct power contrasts with the prolonged interviews often necessary, to psycho-analysis	143
(3) The psychological approach tends to allegorize	144
The impact of Jesus' personality on the suffering	145
The fever of Peter's wife's mother	145
Healing of leprosy and religious significance	145-146
Demon-possession and its nature	146-147
The demoniac at Capernaum	147
The 'objective' character the demons had for the people	147-148
The miracles attest the divine kingdom heralded by Jesus	148-149
The Parables characteristic of Jesus' teaching	149
The Primitive Church inference that Jesus spoke in parables to hide his truth erroneous	149
Discussion on Mark iv.11f.	149-150
The kingdom the central subject of the parables	150-155
Jesus urges his hearers to their duty to non-Jews	151-154
The parables designed to evoke a sense of crisis	155-158
Elements of judgment in them	155-156
The demon cures the signs of the crisis	156-157
The crisis judgment on the nation's leaders	157-158
Unhistorical to read hints of any new community foreshadowed in the parables as signifying the church	158
Parables aim at developing spiritual and moral quality	159-163
The apocalyptic 'Weltanschauung' of the Parables	163-164
E. The Empirical Response of the Disciples	164-188
General psychological considerations	164-165
Positive and negative aspects of the disciples' contacts	165-166
Who the disciples were	166-167
The 'call' of the disciples	167-169
Probable previous contact through John the Baptist	168
The 'zealot' in the group	169
The disciples had not the exalted position the church afterwards came to feel they had	169-170
Fellowship, not officialism, the determining factor in their appointment	170-171
The disciples become less legally-minded	171-172
Peter's confession and its experiential significance	172-174
The Transfiguration experience	174-176
Apocalyptic literalism and the disciples	176-177

Jesus and apocalyptic	177-179
The disciples and apocalyptic	179-180
Their Great Misunderstanding of Jesus	180-188
Their view of the kingdom was different from his	180-181
They did not recognize what kind of Messiah he was	182-188
Messiah could not suffer	182-183
Peter's rebuke at the pronouncement of the death	183
The predicted flight of the disciples a foreshadowing of their disillusion about Jesus	184-185
The Last Supper and Gethsemane	184-186
The reason why Judas betrayed Jesus	186
The reason why Peter disowned Jesus	186-187
Other indications of the misunderstanding concerned	187-188
The root cause of the disciples' failure here	188

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER IV THE EMPIRICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

189-219

Between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection	189-194
The Crowds	189
The religious authorities	189
The publicans and sinners	189-190
Judas realizes his profound mistake	190
The disciples begin to wonder whether they were not mistaken	190
The creative power of Jesus in the subconscious mind	190-191
The influence of his suffering and death on them	191-192
The disciples' bewilderment and its psychological tone	192
The disciples being prepared unknowingly to receive the experience of the Resurrection	193-194
The disciples probably hovering near the scene of Jesus' death	194
Their conviction that Jesus had risen	194
What was the mode of apprehension that he was alive	194-195
If it were not his physical body it does not follow that the disciples were victims of hallucination	195-196
The Gospels attest no consistent mode of apprehension, since they refer to (1) physical appearances of Jesus, (2) appearances suggestive of vision, and (3) a mixture of (1) and (2)	196-197
Need to distinguish the disciples' psychological outlook from our own	197-198
(a) A mixture of physical and psychical in thought	198
(b) 'Body' for them meant what we mean by personality	198-199
(c) Their prevailing ideas of personality as being accessible to 'supernatural' influences causes no difficulty in their acceptance of the 'angels'	199-200

(d) Various prevailing ideas of resurrection	200-201
Eyewitnesses received their apprehension in thought-forms material, spiritual, or a mixture of both	201-202
This conclusion concerns only the mental categories in which the Resurrection was received and interpreted	202
The Resurrection as a piece of attesting miracle is against Jesus' own deprecation of 'signs and wonders'	202
The physical resurrection of Jesus is blunted in its aspect by the thought of his transformed body, i.e. the raised physical body transfigured into a heavenly	202
Value of the previous religious experience of the disciples in interpreting the Resurrection	203-204
The evidence of Paul	204-205
He assumes that his experience of the risen Christ is of the same nature as his authorities had	205-206
His experience of the risen Christ	206-207
His discussion on the resurrection body in I Cor.xv.	207-208
The conflict in the inner mind of the disciples	209-210
The immediate cause of the Resurrection report	210
The women at the tomb	210
The Resurrection experiences for the disciples were the crown of their experience they had had of Jesus	211
The Resurrection experiences of the nature of integrating vision which liberated the deeper apprehensions of Jesus in the minds of the disciples	211
The objective corrective power of vision	211
If vision is delusion the religious message of the Old Testament prophets is delusion	211
The vision-hypothesis does not reduce the Resurrection experiences to delusion	211-212
Objective correction of subjectively prepared truth	212
Illustrated by the universal charge to the disciples	213-214
The weeks subsequent to the first Resurrection appearance were a period of visionary experience	215-216
The Ascension the final appearance	216
The Resurrection experience that satisfies the soul	217-218
The authority of Jesus restored	219

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER V	THE EXPERIENCE OF THE SPIRIT	220-293
The coming of the Spirit		220-221
The abnormal features not metaphorical		221-222
The 'speaking with tongues' not diverse languages		222-223
An inspired speech characterized by unintelligibility		223-226
The psychology of the Pentecost experience		226-227
The abnormal effects the 'symptoms' of the Spirit		227-228
The empirical content of the abnormal forms		228-229
Analogies to the Pentecost experience from George Fox,		

David Brainerd, President Finney, Montanus, the Camisards, the Irvingites, an Oecumenical Salvation Army Council, John Woolman, with a glance at the non-Christian Chaitanyite Revival in India	229-234
Influence of Pentecost on all these analogies	234-235
The psychological influence of the group	235
This factor as seen in Pentecost	235-236
Jesus himself the vehicle of the Spirit's power	236-239
The group that emerged from Pentecost	239-240
<i>activities</i>	
Marvellous ^{activities} attest the Spirit's activity in the community, including healings	240-242
The change in the disciples here	242
The faith-atmosphere of the Spirit-community	242-243
Analogies to this atmosphere from Bede, Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, Luther and Melancthon, George Fox, John Wesley, Father John of Cronstadt	243-247
The gospel of the kingdom a gospel that banished fear	247-248
The Spirit the energizing power in all these activities	248
Visions and dreams as symptoms of the Spirit's presence	248-251
The trance of Peter	249-250
Analogies from Basilides, Monica, Francis of Assisi, Patrick of Ireland, George Fox, Sadhu Sundar Singh	251-254
The primitive community the heir to the visions of the apocalyptists	254
Vision as the vehicle of truth	254-257
The 'something other' in the phenomena	255
Not necessarily due to pathological or neurological disturbance, for this disintegrates, but the visions due to religious intensity integrate, the personality	255-256
The integrating power of the primitive church's experience of the Spirit	257
Angels in dreams and visions	258
The Spirit the unifying power conceived to be behind the activity of the angels	259
The Spirit not identified with any archangel	259
Physical marvels attest the Spirit's energy	260-261
Analogies from John Wesley, <i>etc.</i>	262
Minor ^{other} inspirations of the Spirit's presence	263
The more 'normal' channels of the Spirit's activity	263-280
(1) Wisdom	264
(2) Guidance	264-265
(3) Prayer	265-269
Connection of prayer with the laying on of hands	266
Jesus and his life of prayer	368-369
(4) Joy	269-270
Analogies from President Finney and Billy Bray	270-271

(5) Courage	271-272
(6) Comfort	272
(7) Faith	272
Summary of the Primitive Church's experience of the Spirit	273-274
Foundation laid for later developments	274
Paul's experience of the Spirit	274-280
A Spirit-possessed personality	275
Stands with Primitive Church, and draws out what is already existent there	276
Christo-centric mysticism is also mystical experience of the Spirit	276-278
This has its roots in the Primitive Church	278-279
Relationship between experience of Spirit-possession and that of demon-possession	280-292
Similarity between these experiences, one could be taken for the other	280-281
Similarities	281-283
Accounted for on the psychological conception of the invasion of personality of a supernatural, overpowering energy, either for good or ill	284
Further notes on the experience of demon-possession	284-285
The Primitive Church confronted demon-possession with the energy of the Spirit as stronger than the demons, and therefore able to cast them out: the need was to substitute for demon-possession, possession by the Spirit	285-286
Experience of the Spirit and of the demons brings us to a 'something beyond', or 'numinous' element which in the last resort defies analysis	286
Vital connecting links account for the similarities, with a discussion on these as seen in the Old Testament and in the Pseudepigrapha	286-288
Vital hints, too, which point to the ultimate divorce of the two experiences	288-289
The vital differences between Spirit-possession and demon-possession	289-292
The empirical test, 'By their fruits ye shall know them'	292
The Primitive Church controlled in all its activities and witness by the Spirit	292-293

CHAPTER VI	THE EMERGENCE OF THE CHURCH	294-354
The 'detached vignettes' of the community		294
The group before Pentecost		294-297
The question of the successor to Judas Iscariot		295-297
A more developed church conscious here than the situation warrants		295
The function of the 'Twelve'		295-297
The group receives the Pentecost experience		297-298
The Spirit's coming is the 'earnest' of eschatological triumph		297-298
The community aware that its message is to Israel		299
Growth and progress		299-300
A Messianic community emerges with fairly clear consciousness of itself as such		300-301
Why Jesus the Messiah suffered		301-302
The persecuting activity of the authorities and its sharpening of the self-consciousness of the community		302
The Hellenistic elements		302-303
The scattering of the Hellenistic preachers and its result in the evangelization of Gentiles		303-304
The significance of this		304
The communities that emerge here and there as the spontaneous expression of the gospel's power		305
The creative propagating power of the new experience		305
Its experiential roots in the contacts with Jesus		305-306
The church consciousness revealed by the names used to denote its members		306-323
They are 'disciples'		306-308
The communities are frequently known as 'the disciples'		308
Paul does not use this designation for the church		308-309
The term reflects an awareness of personal and collective relationship to Jesus		309-310
The members are also known as 'brethren'		310-317
The brotherhood grounded in fellowship with Christ		311-312
Practical expression in love as observed in Jesus		312
The 'brethren' were aware of being a new society		312-313
As such they were members of the family of God, and kinship was determined by moral and spiritual considerations		312-313
The practical expression of this in the so-called communism		313-317
The communism prepared for by Jesus' teaching on renunciation, and detachment from worldly possessions		316-317
The members are also known as 'friends'		317-318
They are called 'the believers'		318-320

This term denotes especially their Christ-consciousness as believers in Christ	320
They are 'those being saved'	320-321
Anticipation of being among the 'saved' in the kingdom	321-322
They are known as 'saints'	322
'Nazarenes' and 'Christians' are applied by observers, the latter term indicating that in the eyes of those outside the church, the members' devotion to Christ was noticeable enough to warrant a specific name	323
The community is aware of itself as 'The Fellowship Jesus and his friends form the antecedent 'Chaburah'	324-328
Community of spirit	325
The Fellowship of the Spirit	325-326
The Ecclesia	326-328
The unity amidst the diversity of communities	328-345
Notes on qāhāl and ʿdhāh	328-330
The Christian ecclesia not 'called out' of the world	331-333
The use of ecclesia connects in self-consciousness with Israel	334
Belief in Jesus the Messiah distinguishes the community from the Israel to which it belonged	335
The Primitive Church not aware of itself as the New Israel	335-336
The Primitive Church urged Israel to live up to the best it knew	336-337
This was Jesus' message	336-337
Jesus sought to win Israel to redemption in view of the kingdom of God	337
Only an Israel redeemed to be a light 'to lighten the Gentiles'	337-338
This desire to redeem Israel that the redeemed Israel may win the world is the explanation of the particularist and universalist elements in the First Gospel	338
While the Primitive Church sought to redeem Israel, it did not reach out to the mission to the Gentiles	338-339
The meaning of 'ecclesia' in Matt. xvi.16, xviii.17	339-340
No break indicated with Judaism by Jesus' use of it	340
A possible explanation of Jesus' meaning in Mt. xvi.16	340-341
Ecclesia contrasted with the synagogue	342-344
The Ecclesia develops its own 'Way' of life	344
This 'Way' may be the subject of the apostles' teaching Q, rather than the Epistle of James or the Didache	345-354
indicate the atmosphere of the 'Way' in the Primitive Church	345-346
	347-354

CHAPTER VII

THE INFLUENCE OF APOCALYPTIC UPON THE
FAITH AND HOPE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH
355-369

Cradled within an atmosphere of apocalyptic	355
The tendency to literalize Messiah and kingdom carried over into the Primitive Church	355-357
Heirs of the imminent kingdom	357-358
The 'sensuous' view of the kingdom in evidence	358
The difficulty of conceiving the kingdom as present	359
The experiential synthesis of 'future' and 'present' kingdom	360-361
(a) The church emerged as the result of the non-fulfilment of the apocalyptic hopes	361
(b) The fading of these hopes helped on the growing awareness of the kingdom as present possession	362-363
(c) The consummation of the eschatological kingdom becomes transmuted into the hope of eternal life in the kingdom not of this world	363-365
Influence of the Gentiles here	364
(d) The series of apocalyptic concepts are of the experiential framework of the Primitive Church	365-366
As these faded, the abiding realities enshrined came more clearly forward	366
(e) The realism of apocalyptic induced a spirit of abandon which helped on the emergence of the Church	366-367
The Church is therefore a 'throw-back' from the failure of the apocalyptic hopes, into the world, and becomes aware of itself as having a divine mission to the world and a glorious consummation in eternal life	367-369

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION 370-380

Salvation eschatologically conceived at first	370
Jesus is therefore looked on as Saviour in this sense	370-371
The unit of salvation is the community, but the sharp eschatological emphasis has enhanced the moral responsibility of the individual	371-372
Individual religious experience comes therefore forward	372
Salvation included moral submission to Jesus the Messiah	373
The transition to salvation as a matter of present experience	373-374
Connection of Jesus' death with the salvation experience	374-380
How did Jesus regard this?	375-376
The death felt to be redemptive in so far as it was the means of winning the kingdom for others	376-377

The death viewed also in the light of the Suffering Servant	377-378
The death is probably not regarded as penal	378-379
The death connected in some way with the forgiveness of sin, but this is not clearly defined	379
Some redemptive significance attached to the death	380

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER IX	THE WIDENING HORIZON AND THE ISSUE OF THE GENTILES	361-410
The Primitive Church entrenched in Judaism		381
Hence the conventional attitude towards the Gentiles		381-382
But Jesus' example would induce a more sympathetic attitude		382
Publicans and sinners were among the new converts		383
The presence of Hellenistic Jews and of God-fearers encouraged a more liberal outlook		383-384
A most potent discovery was that non-Jews were capable of receiving the new experience of the Spirit		384
The sudden appearance of these elements in Acts vi.1ff.		385
The dissension over the Hellenist widows had deeper roots than mere controversy over charity		385-386
The appointment of the Seven implies a division of spheres of activity rather than one of duties		385-386
The two types of outlook in the Primitive Church, viz. the characteristic Jewish, and the semi-Gentile		387
The trial and speech of Stephen		387-389
Possibly the speech may be a specimen of his preaching		389-390
A reaction taking place from traditional Jewish observance		390
No hint of any freer attitude to the law on the part of the Twelve		391-392
The ferment that arose around Stephen		392-393
Stephen and Paul		393-394
The conversion of Cornelius		394-395
The reaction of the Jerusalem leaders to this in glad- ness		395
But Gentile religious experience regarded as of an inferior type		395-396
The receiving of Cornelius no more than a limited widening of the church consciousness		396
The church at Antioch and its distinctive development of the self-consciousness of the church to include the Gentiles		396-397
By force of circumstances the church is being uprooted from its typically Jewish traditionalism		398-399
The less trammelled Hellenist section of the Jerusalem church, then, begins the wider mission		399-400

The alarm at Jerusalem over events at Antioch	400-401
'Except ye be circumcised...'	402
Critical questions on the Council of Jerusalem	403
Acts xi.30 and xv. are independent accounts of the same visit to Jerusalem of Paul	403
The apostles concede the admission of the Gentiles as legitimate, but this did not commit the Jerusalem church to missionary activity, nor did it imply any abrogation of the law by Jewish-Christians	403-404
But there is the further problem of intercommunion	405-407
The Jerusalem Decree had to do with ceremonial, rather than with moral requirements	407-408
The Decree did not lay down the terms of intercommunion, for there could be no such thing for the Jewish section	409
The Jewish-Christians not prepared to fraternize on any basis of religious equality	409
The stage set for later Pauline development	409-410

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER	X	THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AS EXPRESSED IN ORDINANCES	411-449
Baptism			411-422
Three viewpoints in Acts on baptism			411-412
Baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus, and which did not in itself confer the Spirit			411
Baptism in water resulting in possession of the Spirit only if the baptism was in the name of Jesus			411-412
Baptism of the Spirit given to members of the community over against baptism in water associated with John the Baptist			412
The two experiences, viz. those of Spirit-possession and of Baptism were probably originally separate			413
Jesus and baptism			413-414
The baptism of John			414-415
Influences which tended to draw the experience of the Spirit to the ordinance of baptism			415-416
Experiential significance of being baptized 'into the name of the Lord Jesus'			416-422
Analogies from the ancient world inadequate			416-418
The 'name' derives its meaning from the Old Testament			419-421
'Into the name of Jesus' meant a personal relationship to Jesus, the one who baptized represented Jesus, the new convert was aware of coming into the possession of Jesus, and also into Jesus' community			421-422

(3) The experience of the Spirit	455
(4) Since God was conceived to be present, although high above the heavens, so Jesus is conceived, by analogy, to be near his disciples, although at the right hand of God	456-457
(5) The influence of parallel experiences of the kingdom and of salvation, both of which passed from the eschatological significance as being future to facts of present experience. So the eschatological Messiahship of Jesus faded in the believers' minds, and the way was open for a closer apprehension of Jesus as being an object of present experience	457-458
In Jesus the believers reached a new experience of God	459
Jesus the Messiah receives characteristic Messianic categories in which his person and office are construed	460-466
As Messiah	460-461
(1) Jesus is the Judge	461-464
Is this aspect of Jesus due to the primitive church with its eschatological conceptions?	462-464
(2) Jesus the Messiah as Revealer	464
(3) Jesus the Messiah as quickener of the dead	465
(4) Jesus the Vindicator of the Righteous	465-466
(5) Invested with preëxistence	466
Jesus as Lord	467-473
This name used early in the community	467-468
Not borrowed from Gentile cultus	468-469
The Primitive Church had its supply of dignified categories from its own background	469-470
Earliest ideas of Jesus as Lord in Q	470-471
Significance of the appellation	472
The Christ-consciousness of the Primitive Church	472-473

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

CHAPTER XII THE CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER 474-511

The justification of the empirical method	474-475
Criticism of the historico-critical viewpoint	475-478
Summary of the development into the Primitive Church	478-489
The intrinsic worth of the primitive church's religious experience	489-504
Psychological evaluation of same	494-504
An experienced gospel	504-505
Suggested possible modifications in viewing church origins as a result of this investigation	508-510
Conclusion	510-511

APPENDIX	I	THE RESURRECTION APPEARANCES-JERUSALEM OR GALILEE	512-513
APPENDIX	II	THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON THE HOLY SPIRIT	514-516
APPENDIX	III	FURTHER EXAMPLES OF THE INTEGRATION CAUSED BY EXPERIENCE OF VISION WITH RELIGIOUS REFERENCE	516-518
APPENDIX	IV	A FURTHER EXAMPLE OF ABNORMAL ACCOMPANIMENTS OF RELIGIOUS REVIVAL MOTIVED BY THE SPIRIT	519-520
APPENDIX	V	"THE TWELVE" AND THE APOSTLES	520-523
APPENDIX	VI	WHO WERE THE HELLENISTS?	523-524

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

INDEX	I	REFERENCES TO CANONICAL, NON-CANONICAL, AND OTHER ANCIENT WRITINGS	525-541
	II	BIBLIOGRAPHY	542-551

The approach to the origins of the Christian Church has been frequently made along the lines of dogmatic theology. Within more recent years the interest has been chiefly historical, involving intensive critical analysis of the literature presenting the history to be investigated.* There is need, however, for a study of the religious experience at the basis of the history, making inevitable the literature, and yielding ultimate data for the later theological interpretation.

Our investigation seeks to approach the study of church origins through the observed religious phenomena which gave the church its birth. For example, there was the pressure of the religious environment in which Jesus was nurtured, and which he combined with all the force of his own personality as he came to be the centre of the new faith. Again, what happened in the experience of the people who came into contact with him? What actually occurred when some of them received those experiences which made them conclude that Jesus was risen from the dead? What took place when these people began to relate to others what they had seen and

*For a recent statement on the historical investigation of Christian Origins see "From Locke to Reitzenstein," by Luigi Salvatorelli, in *Harv.Theol.Review*, Vol.XXII.Oct.1929, pp.268-369.

heard? What processes were begun amidst such a ferment as to result in the emergence of the Christian Church?

We shall therefore endeavour to observe, as closely as the evidence will allow, the behaviour of personal and group reaction to the vital forces creatively in operation. A new group will be seen to emerge; new habits, new customs, and new ideas will come forth. Yet the new creative environment will not be wholly independent of the older empirical background which furnishes material for the apprehension and interpretation of the new life. There are the new, vital facts, so far as these can now be recovered in their purity; there is the interpretation which the recipients of the new experience placed upon it as they sought to explain it. The interpretative process, indeed, goes much deeper, since it forms the inherited psychological equipment which provided thought-forms and mental categories whereby the empirical facts were received and understood.

Edwyn Bevan finds it impossible to distinguish between the experiential content and the mental categories ~~that~~ contain it.* "If it be hard to define religion," says E.S. Waterhouse, "it is impossible, in the strict sense, to define experience."** When we explain or analyse experience, the very explanation or analysis itself belongs to experience. When some new religious experience is interpreted, the very interpretation is a part of the experience.

* "Sibyls and Seers" 1928. p.64.

** "The Philosophy of Religious Experience," 1923, p.19.

Some effort, however, must be made to distinguish the facts from their interpretation by those who experienced them, and to do this we have to view both facts and interpretation within the circle of the experience concerned. This enables us to check to some extent the reference back of later interpretations, and to detect erroneous deductions made by the writers of the documents that set forth the data to be studied. Luke's misinterpretation of the Pentecost phenomena is a case in point (Acts ii.5-12).

The empirical approach we have in mind will of course combine with it the historical one, as the attempt is made to find out what actually took place. The historical operation of the dynamic influences created by the religious experience has to be observed along with the activity of the experiential processes. Our method of study is really twofold; we are to observe the empirical facts together with their historical accompaniments and consequences. If the term be allowed, our approach is "empirical-historical."

Some explanation is needed in respect of the meaning of the word 'primitive' as applied to the subject of our investigation, viz. "The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church." Some years ago the writer pursued a course of study dealing with the religious experience of the church of the Apostolic Age, in which he sought to distinguish the several psychological types as reflected in the New Testament, as e.g. the Pauline, the Johannine, and types represented by I Peter, James, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. In the course of the investigation he began to feel how imperative it

was to understand the nature of the church prior to Paul's influence. Without this, the effort to appraise the later types seemed not unlike the erection of a building that becomes top-heavy through lack of adequate foundations. He therefore set himself the task of studying the religious experience of the church during the formative years preceding Paul's activity.

The difficulty was to find a term that would indicate the period in view. To describe it as 'pre-Pauline' seemed to make Paul the architect of the structure. It would assume that his influence was such that the history of the Apostolic Age must regard what went before the apostle as 'pre-Pauline,' and what followed as 'post-Pauline;' the latter reference is justly a recognition of the apostle's immeasurable influence on church thought and development, while the former would imply that influence in a retrospective manner. Indeed, the editors of the church tradition, or the circles they represented, did imply this, since, as Wrede remarks, "the tradition is not so far wrong in making all the rest disappear behind Paul." But the earliest years of the church are not a prologue to the real drama of church creation at the hands of Paul. This prior period, on the contrary, provided the foundations on which Paul and the rest were to build.

Or again, titles such as 'Church Origins' or 'Church Beginnings' do not adequately designate the intention of our

*"Paul," Eng.Tr. 1907, p.42.

investigation, for they give no incentive to keep as clearly as possible the earliest period as distinct from that of Paul and his successors. The title, 'Christian Beginnings' is unsatisfactory, since the word 'Christian' was not applied to believers at first, and then not to the members of the Judaeo-Christian community.

We therefore use the term 'Primitive Church' to describe the initial period prior to Paul. Sometimes the word 'primitive' is used to denote Church history up to the Council of Chalcedon (AD 451). B.H. Streeter uses it in reference to the first two or three centuries of the church's existence.* It would be better to regard this wider period as 'the Ancient Church', with its literature, its detailed organization and increasing power in the larger world of Graeco-Roman civilization, and reserve 'primitive' for the dawn days of the twilight period when no historical records were thought of. The new believers were probably aware that they were making history in some way, as they were possessed by a new religious experience without being quite aware of what it all meant, but the incentives to record their impressions and findings were not there as yet.

Church history, on the whole, has revealed a neglect of this period, or else has been content to view it as the ante-room leading to the stately hall beyond. The light of Paul is so worthily

* "The Primitive Church," 1929.

dazzling, his contribution so remarkable, that the historian treats of the 'primitive' period as some minor phase leading up to the major activity of the apostle, whereas it seems historically more correct to view it as the 'new something' without which there would have been no material for Paul to use. The fact that a paucity of data is characteristic of this period is no evidence that the period itself is of scanty importance. It is true, as someone has fittingly said, that Christianity grew up in the dark, yet the darkness should not hinder the realization that something did grow up in the dark, and that something was well on its way by the time Paul's searching light began to play on the church.

An initial difficulty arises with regard to the religious experience of the primitive church. This is the lack of material for providing the needful data. The reason why we know so much about Paul and why the origins of the church are interpreted so much in the light of the Pauline tradition is that a number of the letters which the apostle wrote to various churches have been preserved to posterity, and in these we have valuable information with regard to the church of his time. Further, the document which purports to be an account of the acts of the apostles is, curiously enough, assigned to the life and activities of Paul. Apart from the earlier chapters of "The Acts of the Apostles" we have not any direct information, even if these have come down to us with authentic primitive tradition. If any of the twelve apostles

corresponded with the churches none of their letters, are now extant. "Wir besitzen leider keine persönlichen Aufzeichnungen oder Briefe der Urapostel aus dieser Anfangszeit."*

The problem of the sources, however, has certain mitigating considerations. The New Testament is, after all, a collection of documents the writing of which was made possible because in the first place there had been the primitive church with its formative religious experience.** There are the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pauline Epistles, which at least afford some evidence of what took place in the primitive church.

I. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

In the main the first three gospels form a series of impressions made by Jesus upon those who came into contact with him during his earthly life. We are shown what his followers and others made of him, the general drift of his teaching as it came through to their sensibility, and follow the course of his life to the cross and resurrection. The gospels in their present form are much later than the events they chronicle. As the process of compilation went on, the Christian experience was shaping the character of the tradition, and traces of the more developed standpoint are discernible. "Incidents were described from the point of view of actual conditions; sayings were adapted so as to

*J. Weiss, "Urchristentum," 1917, p. 1. **Cf. D. W. Riddle, "Approach to the New Testament from the Study of Religious Experience," Journal of Religion, Vol. XI. Oct. 1931, pp. 570ff.

bear more immediately on present difficulties and needs; later reflection on the Gospel story was thrown back on the historical picture."* Inner meanings were more and more discerned in what Jesus said and did, while "strange as it may seem to us, a good many early Christians felt no scruple in making the Risen Christ a mouthpiece for their views,"** although some of these later features may have found their way into the tradition through vision.**

The Synoptic Gospels are therefore a combination of historical matter and later accretions from the reflection of growing Christian experience. B.W.Bacon draws attention to the need for "the recognition of motive"‡ in the study of the biblical narratives. The motive, however, is mainly religious, and religious experience, in the last resort, is the aetiological influence in the formation of the evangelic tradition.

The true starting point for the experiential approach to the Synoptics is Luke's preface (i.1-4). (1) There were the recipients of the original experience indicated by the words, ἐξ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀκούοντες καὶ ὑπηρέτες γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου (ver.2). The religious experience of the primitive church had its roots in what Jesus said and did, in the manifold impressions he made upon his contemporaries. As far as we know, Jesus never left any word in writing, at least on papyrus or parchment, but he wrote deeply on the hearts of many of

*E.F.Scott, "The Beginnings of the Church," 1914, p.8. **F.C. Burkitt, "Christian Beginnings," 1924, p.93. ***Cf. pp. 174ff, 214f.
‡"The Beginnings of Gospel Story," 1909, p.ix.

those around him, and their experiences began the gospel tradition.* As they saw and heard, "they wondered, or they rejoiced and praised God, or took courage, and later they remembered or told. They recollected how their hearts burned within them. They recognized that Peter and John had been with Jesus. They reminded one another of the words of the Lord Jesus."** (2) In the course of time and through the force of circumstances the impressions passed on as the experiences were shared with the new converts into the primitive church. As the church enlarged its borders the impressions were handed on from town to town, city to city, and country to country. This process finds expression in the words, *περὶ τῶν πεπληροφωρημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, καθὼς παρέθεσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτλ.* (i.1f). Step by step a corpus of tradition grew, motivated at the beginning by impressions of Jesus. The more or less firm outline which this tradition slowly assumed, even in its oral stage, served to check extravagancies. The communal religious experience of the church in its growing awareness of all that Jesus was, of salvation to the kingdom of God through his death, of life in his name, would exercise selective control in the handing on of the impressions. (3) The literary climax of these processes appears in the more formal writing down of the tradition, indicated in the words *ἐπειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν*

*"Jesus Himself wrote nothing, and the only words He is said to have taught His disciples are the words of the Lord's Prayer," F.C. Burkitt, "The Gospel History and its Transmission," 1907, p.143. Cf. also below, Chap.III. **H.J.Cadbury, "The Making of Luke-Acts," 1927, p.23.

ἀνατὰξασθαί διήγησιν (Lk.i.1). Beyond what the literary analysis of the Synoptics reveals, none of these earlier efforts are extant.*

The general critical conclusions formulated by Synoptic criticism** have not been modified to any extent by the recent study of 'Formgeschichte.' The two-document hypothesis being firmly established, it now remained to study these sources in detail. Certain attempts had already been made to trace earlier revisions and combinations within the gospels,*** but the results were of an extremely hypothetical character. The newer efforts have been directed towards distinguishing and characterizing the elements that make up the text according to their 'form' or pre-literary type, and 'Formgeschichte' has become "the history of certain pre-literary forms not consciously created by individuals but developed by the force of constant oral repetition."† These types are moral or religious illustration, tale, legend, myth, apothegm, sententious saying, comparison, parable. Negative results were reached when the attempt was made to prove that the connecting links between the elements in the Synoptic tradition were artificial,‡ but positive efforts are seen in the attempts to account for the origin and

*Luke may have had Mark in mind, and set it aside as his primary authority (cf. B.H. Streeter, "The Four Gospels," 1924, pp. 201-8). **Mark is the basis of Matthew and Luke, who also used a source common to themselves, viz. Q, in addition to matter peculiar to their respective gospels. ***J. Weiss in "Das älteste Evangelium," 1903, with its detailed analysis and classification of the earlier material of which Mark had made use. †B.S. Easton, "The Gospel before the Gospels," 1928, p. 31. ‡As K.L. Schmidt reaches in "Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu," 1919.

character of these several types, and to trace their history prior to their incorporation into the gospels. The material for forming judgments was found in the varied life of the early church, the common concerns of the believers, the promptings of religious experience, and the needs of preaching, teaching, and worship.*

The most promising possibility inherent in this approach to the Synoptic tradition as far as our subject is concerned, is that the literary history of the gospels may become a religious history of the primitive church, or at least that the close connection between them may become more defined with the result that light would be thrown on the religious experience of the primitive church. This aspect, however, has yet to be more fully developed before it can offer results for the consideration of the student of religious experience, while the determination of the 'forms' is still too much a matter of subjective judgment as is also the setting up of the standard whereby to test their historical trustworthiness. If 'Formgeschichte' becomes an end in itself, its contribution will be no more than a literary 'tour de force;' if, however, it can make scientific contact with the religious experience which in the first place began the

*As M. Dibelius, "Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums," 1919, and R. Bultmann, "Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition," 1921. The possibility of the material yielding something of how it came to be made up may perhaps be overstated. Cf. H. J. Cadbury, op. cit. p. 33, where we read, "as surely as the excavator's spade yields to the trained archaeologist reliable information on extinct civilizations, so does the analysis of the written record disclose the forces at work in its transmission." Alas! would that we had a reconstruction of primitive church conditions and characteristics as Flinders Petrie and others have given of ancient Egyptian civilization! At the moment the 'formgeschichte' data are not sufficiently reliable.

processes which found expression in the preliterate forms of gospel tradition, considerable light would be shed on the living activity of the primitive church. But a great deal yet remains to be done before these possibilities are brought within the view.

The Gospel of Matthew reflects later interpretation at work on the new experience. Jesus is being commended to the Jewish consciousness. The genealogy traces his descent from the Davidic dynasty (i.1-17); his birth took place in accordance with prophecy (i.22-25). The self-consciousness of the church is revealed at a fairly mature stage (xvi.16-19, xviii.17f.), while the later awareness of the universal mission of the gospel is traced back to a command of Jesus (xxviii.19). The threefold reference to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in a defined baptismal formula, itself a product of later interpretation (xxviii.19), suggests a time when theological definition was at work on the religious experience. Some of these later elements may have found their way in by vision,* but even so the vision was realized only at a later stage. Both Mark and Luke also show the influence of later reflection on the original facts; the current church theory as to why Jesus spoke in parables is that he desired to veil the real truth:** the failure of the disciples to understand Jesus' prediction of his passion is that its significance was purposely withheld from them.*** Luke is somewhat instructive in the way in which the wider mission of the gospel

*Cf. p.8 and pp. 174ff. 214f. **Mk.iv.12, cf.pp. 149f.

***Lk.ix.45, xviii.34, ~~and cf.pp.~~

has become interwoven with the original experience and the apprehension of it by the first believers,* although it seems to go too far to say that "Luke is frankly universalist in the spirit of Paul, and shows the marked influence of the Gentile expansion of Christianity under Pauline auspices."**

The Gospel of Mark has for its basis a collection of notes of Peter's preaching, for there is no reason for suspecting the tradition preserved by Papias.*** No doubt the evangelist reveals his own personality as well as that of Jesus in his gospel, but the series of anecdotes certainly read like original stories of impressions made by Jesus; this is confirmed by the naïve style, the non-literary character of the language, and the absence of any corpus of teaching and of any logical scheme of presentation. The minute analysis of J.Weiss**** and the more recent investigations of the 'formgeschichte' school have not materially affected the probability that we have in this gospel, fragmentary though it may be,‡ a copy of the original autograph.‡‡ At least the second gospel seems freer from later interpretation than is the case with the other gospels. One point, however, in this connection needs comment. The prominence given to the Cross and the events leading up to it in this gospel has influenced the formulation of the theory that Mark presents the

*ii.10,31f. iii.6. Jesus' ancestry is traced back to Adam, the father of mankind,iii.28-38. **J.Mackinnon, "The Historic Jesus," 1931, p.xiii, but cfr H.J.Cadbury's cautions on this point, op.cit. pp.254f. ***Eus.H.E.iii.39, which preserves this tradition. ****Op.cit. and cf.above,p.10. ‡E.G. its ending is lost. ‡‡Cf.B.H.Streeter,op.cit.pp.305,313,331.

evangelic tradition interpreted by Paul, with the corollary of Pauline influence in Matthew and Luke. For example, "the Paulinism of Mark is supremely manifest in this evangelist's whole conception of what constitutes the apostolic message," which is stressed as being "the continual reiteration of the doctrine, 'He that would save his life shall lose it.'"^{*} But even if we discern the influence of Paul here we are forced back upon the problem as to where Paul received the doctrine of the Cross, and the answer ultimately goes back to the experiential contact of men with Jesus. Undoubtedly the disciples did not know what to make of Jesus going to his death. They were at latent cross-purposes with him since their minds could not bring together the contradictory ideas of Messiahship and suffering in one and the same person. But the very intensity of their misunderstanding could not fail to impress the disciples with what was taking place before their eyes,^{**} while the very importance that seemed to be ^{attached to} ~~laid on~~ his death as Jesus pursued his lonely way quickened all the more their latent opposition to any such course. The fact of the misunderstanding, manifest and deep-seated as it was, presupposes the prominent place of the cross and what led up to it, in the mind and words of Jesus. We are therefore justified, on grounds of empirical probability, in accounting for the Marcan emphasis on the Cross, less by the influence of Pauline interpretation read retrospectively into the original data of the gospels, and more

^{*}B.W.Bacon, op.cit.pp.xxviii. ^{**}On this interpretation of the disciples' experience see pp. 181-188

by the likelihood that Mark preserves elements which Paul also received from the same source, viz. the impressions of the eyewitnesses. Paul may have interpreted these facts more freely in the light of his own spiritual experience and reflection, but the empirical facts were already within the primitive church experience before his mind began to work on them.*

The material which Matthew and Luke have in common, apart from what they have borrowed from Mark, is usually designated by the symbol Q. This carries with it the hypothesis that the first and third gospels made use of a source which supplied this common matter. Attempts to reconstruct this source from Matthew and Luke can be no more than tentative,** but it seems to have been a corpus of some sayings of Jesus, the product of reminiscence and thoughtful recollection on the part of those who heard Jesus. A process began, arising from the necessities of the new experience, of gathering together the words of Jesus as these came back to the memory, soon to be grouped in a manner enabling them to be easily remembered by the new converts to whom they were transmitted through the apostles' teaching.*** Q represents a stage in the growth of such teaching on empirical lines, and is now generally

*For Paul's later interpretations see pp. 36ff, and on the much needed corrective to reading Paulinism into Mark see M. Werner's book, "Der Einfluss paulinische Theologie im Markusevangelium."

The reconstruction of Q, as F.C. Burkitt (JTS Apr. 1907, pp. 454ff.) and B.H. Streeter (op.cit. p. 185) remind us, is a delicate and hazardous task. Cf. A. Harnack, "The Sayings of Jesus," Eng. Tr. 1908, pp. 127-146. *For the contents of Q as revealing the nature of 'The Way' followed by the primitive church.

regarded as being older than Mark; already it seems to have passed through a number of revisions, expansions and modifications, the roots of which carry us down into the heart of the primitive church.* In Q, therefore, we begin to touch closely the experience at the basis of the gospel tradition.

Matthew has grouped his Q material to a great extent,** and has added to it from some source used only by himself;*** so also does Luke, but much of his Q is scattered here and there, being often found in a context differing from that of the first gospel.**** There may well have been different recensions of Q available for either evangelist, and in some quarters it is held that Luke found his recension already combined—or he combined it himself—with tradition found only in his gospel, and which formed the framework into which Luke inserted Marcan narrative.† The value of a saying is not lessened for religious experience if two versions of it appear in diverse contexts. The peculiar Matthaean material, in view of its Judaistic tendency, may well reflect some genuine recollections well-known in primitive church circles in Jerusalem. If Luke set aside Mark as his primary authority, it does not follow that the second gospel is to be regarded as less trustworthy, but only that Luke has judged some other gospel as more suitable for his purpose. That there were combinations of tradition involving variations in

*On Q cf. B.H. Streeter, op.cit. pp. 273ff. **e.g. v. 2-4, 6, 11-13, 25f. 44ff. vi. 9-13, 19-33. vii. 1-5, 7-14, 16-18, 24-28. viii. 5-10, 11f. 19-22 etc. ***e.g. v. 5, 7f. 19, 27-31, etc. ****Mt. x. 24f. cf. Lk. vi. 40, for example. †Streeter, op.cit. pp. 201ff, ~~pp. 348-353~~

narrative, and in the context and wording of sayings, is shown by Matthew's and Luke's treatment of both Mark and Q, but the experiential content which gave rise to the original tradition deposits is not intrinsically impaired by these changes.*

II. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The opening chapters of the Acts are all-important for our effort to understand the religious experience of the primitive church. Here we have the stories of the Ascension, the coming of the Spirit, and the rise of the new community around the name of the exalted Jesus. This community is discerned through occasional glimpses into its activity rather than in the continuity of its development (ii.42ff. iv.32f.). We become aware of some religious ferment of which Stephen is the centre**, the community is dispersed through persecution of which one named Saul seems to be the chief instigator, but during a journey Saul made to root out believers and bring them to judgment he received the spiritual experience which was to issue in his mission as the apostle to the Gentiles. The early problems in connection with the admission of non-Jews into the new community are seen in Caesarea, Antioch and elsewhere, the culmination of which appears in what has been called 'The Council of Jerusalem,' where the whole question is discussed and a considered decision forthcoming (x-xi.18, 19ff. xv.1ff.). Thereafter Acts is

*On this section as a whole, cf. A.Dakin, "The Psychology of the Presentation of the Gospels," *Expos.Times*, Oct.1931, pp38-41.

**For this movement and its consequences, cf.pp 385-391

chiefly devoted to Paul's witness and activity.

The precise historical value of these opening chapters is not easy to determine. The chronological gap between the document as it stands and the events the early chapters purport to chronicle is even wider than in the case of the Synoptic gospels.* It has to be admitted that there is room for much modification and change of emphasis, that there is much time allowed for the accretion of legendary elements, while the standpoints of the later period would be found to enter in along with any particular motive of the author in writing the work. Moreover, we are not helped to the ^{same} extent as we are in the case of the Synoptics, where one gospel is used by the other two, thus facilitating comparison and contrast. The isolation of Acts leaves us much in the same position as we should be if we had only Luke among the Synoptics.

Such considerations, however, are in themselves no proof that in Acts we are dealing exclusively with the imaginative portrayal of an earlier period by a later generation. If we had only Luke among the gospels the value of that gospel would not in itself be lessened. At the minimum, events and experiences must have taken place without which there would have been no incentive to write of the beginnings of the church. If the Acts be due to the beliefs of an organization known as the ecclesia existing at the time when the book was written we have still to answer the deeper question, "What in the first place produced the beliefs?" Thus we should be carried back to the

*See p.8. Acts is usually dated A.D.80-100.

empirical facts arising from the contacts which men made with the historical Jesus.

But there are several reasons why Acts may be regarded as more trustworthy than some scholars are inclined to think. (1) There is little doubt that the third gospel and the Acts are by the same author.* "Their unity is a fundamental and illuminating axiom. Among all the problems of New Testament authorship no answer is so universally agreed upon as is the common authorship of these two volumes.** J.de Zwaan develops the theory that Acts was edited by "a post-Pauline Christian," whose work was based "on the unfinished writings of Luke, the author of the gospel, who had collected and partially arranged a variety of material drawn from various sources, including a diary of his own experiences, but had never finished his work.*** But this theory seems to break down in view of the evidence of linguistic consistency and continuity of both gospel and Acts. "If anything can be proved by linguistic evidence, this fact is proved by it," i.e. "the common authorship of Luke and Acts."**** The bearing of this conclusion on the historical trustworthiness of Acts lies in the fact that the historian who in one writing works on definite principles to present his data as

*The view taken here is that the author was Luke the physician, the friend and companion of Paul, but if he be some unknown personality of the Apostolic Age, the same anonymous pen is responsible for both writings. Cf. "The Case for the Tradition," C.W. Emmet, and "The Case against the Tradition," H. Windisch, in "The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, Vol II, 1922, chaps. 265 ff. 298 ff. **Cadbury, op.cit.p.8. ***"Was the Book of Acts a Posthumous Edition?" in Harv.Theol.Review, Vol.XVII. ****Cadbury, op.cit.p.8.

accurately as he can is likely to execute a second under the inspiration of similar ideals, especially when this is a sequel to the first (Acts i.1). The historical merit of the third gospel receives various estimates, but there are good grounds for regarding it as trustworthy.*

*Luke's preface (i.1-4) indicates the principles on which the historian proposed to work. He will go to the original eyewitnesses and the authoritative ministers of the word; he intends to investigate from the very beginnings of the gospel story (ἀνωθεν); everything is to be undertaken in a spirit of thoroughness, inquiring into all things (πᾶσι) in an accurate (ἀκριβῶς) and consecutive (καθ' ἑξῆς) manner. The gospel reveals that he was faithful to his principles of investigation. There is an orderly presentation of events from the pre-natal announcements of the respective births of the Messiah and his Forerunner, to his ascension to glory, and the return of the eyewitnesses to Jerusalem. Therefore both ἀνωθεν and καθ' ἑξῆς are not unjustified. Thus there is a completeness which is lacking, for example, in Mark, hence πᾶσι is satisfied. Mark and Q are among Lucan sources, the latter being so combined with matter peculiar to this gospel and forming so large an element independent of Mark as to suggest the hypothesis (cf. p.16) that Luke takes it for his framework, deeming Mark to be less valuable as a primary authority. This possibility suggests that there were other streams of tradition available, and that Luke has used one of them along with Mark and Q as his sources. This points to careful and accurate sifting of his evidence and justifies the principle expressed by ἀκριβῶς.

The probability is, therefore, that Acts is the result of ~~similar~~ processes of investigation ^{similar to those} as are revealed by the third gospel. Luke would make use of whatever authoritative witness he could obtain. He seems to have been a fellow-traveller of Paul at various times.** The apostle's knowledge of the earliest church

**This is the most natural explanation of the 'we' passages in Acts xvi.11-18, xx.5-15, xxi.1-18, xxvii.1-xxviii.16.

facts would be available for him. They were both guests of Philip the evangelist whose personal experience of the earliest years of the primitive church was at the historian's service.* The local church at Caesarea, too, could furnish him with facts during the stay there, not the least interesting being the reception of the Gentile Cornelius into membership with the new community(x.44-48). Luke seems also to have been with Paul in Jerusalem, where he had abundant opportunity for collecting and sifting information. If Eusebius (H.E.iii.4) is right in supposing Luke to be a native of Antioch, and this ancient church tradition be taken along with the occurrence of a further 'we' passage in the text of the MS Codex Bezae at Acts xi.27, the connection of the author with Antioch would help to account for his knowledge of the church there.**

(2) The tracing of possible sources used in the composition of Acts is a task of great delicacy, and as yet no sure results are forthcoming. The Semitic colouring of the early chapters, especially i and ii has led to the search for Aramaic originals which Luke used in this section of his work. The linguistic arguments of C.H.Torrey*** have been summed up as affording "many indications of an Aramaic source...which...taken together seem to present an extremely strong case in favour of Aramaic," although "such evidence can prove nothing as to the extent or number of the documentary

*Acts xxi.8; cf. vi.5,viii.5-13. **Acts xi.19-30,xiii.1-3, xiv.26-xv.2,22f.30-40. ***"The Composition and Date of Acts," 1916.

sources used."* The Semitic features, however, may be due to the primitive Aramaic tradition which still at its oral stage ^{was} being rendered into Greek to meet the needs of Hellenistic Jews who had come into the church, or ~~because~~^{to} of the Gentile elements in the growing churches ^{which} made the change into Greek a matter of practical necessity. In this case the presence of Semitic colouring in the earlier chapters of Acts would point to the primitive nature of the tradition underlying them.**

*Foakes Jackson and Lake in "The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol II. p.145. **Until there is more agreement as to the documentary sources supposed to be used, the Semitic features are better accounted for by the translation of primitive church Aramaic tradition into Greek. The wealth of theories as to documentary sources may be illustrated. The single source hypothesis usually takes the form of a Jerusalem writing by Mark who is supposed to have written a sequel to his own gospel narrating Jesus' resurrection appearances and the acts of the Jerusalem apostles. Just as Luke used Mark in his gospel, so he is assumed to have used as his source for Acts Mark's supposed sequel (cf. F. Blass, "Acta Apostolorum sive Lucas ad Theophilum liber alter," 1895, ivf. and a reference to the theory also in his "Philology of the Gospels," 1898, pp.141f.). Two-source theories are more in vogue. Spitta, e.g. discovers two primary sources designated respectively as A and B, the former superior to the latter which has many legendary elements due to the popular tradition on which it rests (cf. his "Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren Geschichtlicher Wert," 1891. Cf. further, J. Weiss, "Urchristentum," pp.3-8). Harnack traces a Jerusalem-Caesarean source (iii.1-v.16, viii.5-40, ix.31-xi.18, xii.1-23), and a Jerusalem-Antioch source (vi-viii.4, xi.19-30, xii.25-xv.35). A third source accounts for the narrative of Paul's conversion (ix.1-30) since this presents distinct features (cf. Harnack's "Acts of the Apostles," Eng. Tr. 1909, and for a recent full discussion of the sources underlying Acts see Foakes Jackson and Lake, op.cit. chap. v). The verdict of Schmiedel perhaps indicates the trend of such discussions; "no satisfactory conclusion has as yet been reached along these lines; but the agreement that has been arrived at upon a good many points warrants the hope that at least some conclusions will ultimately gain general recognition," (Enc. Bi. Vol. I. 1899, p.45). J. Moffatt thinks there is reasonable ground for conjecturing the use of an Aramaic source by Luke, but confesses the difficulty of being sure of any written source underlying the narrative: "oral tradition of a

heterogeneous and even of a legendary character may be held to explain most, if not all, of the data" (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament," 3rd. Edn. 1918, p. 290).

The various source discussions have at least established the primitive character of the material in the first half of the Acts, while the antiquity of the first few chapters is distinctly brought out. While the literary facts do not warrant the too confident judgment that "it is difficult to rate too highly the historical value of the Book of Acts," and therefore "employ Acts as an historical document of the first order,"* in view of the primitive character of the tradition, and in view of Luke's proved methods of investigation as a historian, we ^{may} have a fair degree of confidence that Acts is by no means unreliable. The presence of so-called doublets in the early chapters does not tell against the credibility of the narrative, since parallel facts are brought together as tradition grows, or they may mean no more than alternative versions of the same incident.** Inconsistent presentations such as Luke's interpretation of the Pentecost phenomena as the power of speaking foreign languages, although he makes Peter reply only to the charge of intoxication,*** may be no more than the use of a secondary stage in church tradition which probably arose owing to the spread of the

*C.F. Nolloth, "The Rise of the Christian Religion," 1917, p. 53. **As are sometimes seen in ii. 1-13, iv. 31; ii. 14-36, iii. 12-26; ii. 37-41, iv. 4; ii. 42-47, iv. 34-37. Cf. the doublet of the miraculous feeding of the multitude in Mk. vi. 32-42 (the five thousand), and Mk. viii. 1-10 (the four thousand). These may be versions of similar occurrences, or alternative accounts of one and the same incident. ***ii. 5-11, 13, 15, and cf. p. 8 and pp. 223f.

gospel to many provinces and countries; the idea may have arisen that the early missionaries were linguistically endowed for the gospel advance, and Luke may be reflecting this secondary source along with the primary one which indicated that ecstatic speech resulted from the Pentecost experience (cf. p. 3 and pp. 223ff.). Again, the criticism that Luke prefers the miraculous version of some incident loses force in view of the abnormal phenomena which religious upheavals bring up, to which the primitive church experience in its many-sided expression is no exception.* Or it may well have been that Luke wrote with some dominating motive of showing how the gospel spread among all nations and therefore has cast his narrative in a 'universal' atmosphere from its beginning;** or the motive may have been the political one of presenting the case for Christianity to the Emperor Domitian in view of impending persecution;*** but the resulting moulding of the primitive material does not thereby take away historical value from the basic facts that are the subject of the writer's portrayal. On the contrary we are helped, by a recognition of any such motive, to observe its influence, and to make allowance for it. If Acts is a historical picture rather than a scientific history, a 'Geschichtsbild' as W. Mundle describes it,**** it does not follow that no trustworthy

*For studies of these abnormal phenomena see pp. 221-262. **As E.F. Scott thinks, op.cit. p. 60f. ***D.W. Riddle, "The Occasion of Luke-Acts" in the Journal of Religion, Vol. XI. Oct. 1931, pp. 545ff. ****"Das Apostelbild der Apostelgeschichte" in ZNT. Vol. XXVII. p. 36. Cf. too J. Weiss, op.cit. p. 3, "Die Apostelgeschichte gibt nur in ihrem ersten Teil (1-12, 15) ein farbenreiches Bild der Urgemeinde und ihrer Schicksale."

information is forthcoming. The portraiture of "The Trojan Dames" may leave much to be desired* as far as its scientific historical details are concerned, but there is no doubting the impressions of the tragic experiences that befell the vanquished heroes and heroines of the fall of Troy. In the same way the fundamental empirical facts of the primitive church come through the tradition on which the early chapters of Acts rest, with a wealth of impression that justifies the use of Acts as a vital source for the experiential data to be considered. Further, the connection of Acts with the gospel is empirically determined as well as being linked in a literary manner, and we are ^{confronted} in Acts, as J. Moffatt aptly remarks, with "the conception that the work of the church is a continuation of Christ's energy."**

III. THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

The apostle who was a citizen of "no mean city" achieved no mean reputation as the first great missionary to the Gentiles, the organizer of many Christian communities or churches after the model of the Jewish synagogues with their semi-independent spirit but possibly drawing on the practices of the guilds and associations so common in the ancient world of Rome. He kept in touch with the many churches through his visits, but where such proved impossible, or urgent problems in the churches demanded his attention, he wrote letters giving his counsel and advice. Some of these are

*In the famous play of Euripides. **op.cit.p.285.

fortunately preserved in the New Testament.* A large part of the Acts deals with his conversion, missionary travels, and the circumstances which lead him to Rome.** His personality seems to overshadow the Christian community of his generation, and his influence has been read into the conceptions of the primitive church.*** "Two names contain in themselves the primitive history of Christianity: the names of Jesus and Paul. Jesus is himself alone—Paul needs some foundation. What Paul is, he is in Christ."**** But the primitive church ought to be included among the apostle's foundations, as Wrede sees; "between Jesus and Paul stands the original community. It is the precondition of Paul's existence, and forms beyond doubt a kind of bridge from one to the other."‡ Is it possible to stand on Paul's side of the bridge and view not only the other side, but the bridge itself? Do these occasional letters of Paul throw any light on the religious experience of the primitive church? Does the apostle reveal in them any hints of his own dependence, not only on Jesus, but on the faith of the community that was prior to his own activity?

A. In certain places Paul refers to what has been received from the primitive church.

(1) In II Thess. ii. 15 we read, ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι'

*Rom. I and II Cor. Gal. Eph. Col. Phil. Philem. I and II Thess. Cf. p. 51f. for the Pastorals. **Acts vii. 58, viii. 1, 3, ix. 1-30, xiii. ff. ***cf. pp. 4, 5f. 13-15. ****Deissmann, "Paul," Eng. Tr. 1926, p. 3. ‡op. cit. p. 167.

ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν. The construction of κρατεῖν with the accusative "may be due simply to the tendency to enlarge the sphere of the acc. in later Greek," but it "serves also in the present instance to lay emphasis on the παραδόσεις as being already in the Thessalonians' possession."* The context makes it clear that these traditions were given them by Paul, who transmitted them by his preaching there (διὰ λόγου) and by means of a letter he sent to them (δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν). With regard to his visit to Thessalonica, the narrative in Acts (xvii 1-10) is taken up with the circumstances of the mission rather than with the content of the preaching, but enough is given to indicate that Paul taught (i) the necessity that Messiah should suffer and be raised from the dead, in accordance with the scriptures, and (ii) that this Messiah was Jesus (xvii.2b.3).

(2) The letter to which Paul refers is probably I Thessalonians.** Does this epistle suggest anything of the primitive church tradition? There are no direct items of tradition enumerated, yet whatever was handed on seems to have been in the nature of a body of definite teaching.*** We observe, however, a few indirect references. (a) in i.5, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ἑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι indicates a gospel which came as an

*G. Milligan, "St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians," 1908, p. 107.

Durch Exc. zu wird es möglich, dass hier I Th gemeint ist. Da nicht τῆς steht wie 3, 14, musste, wer ihn kannte, fast sicher an ihn denken. Freilich kann trotzdem II Th gemeint oder wenigstens eingeschlossen sein," P. W. Schmiedel, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, II. 2nd. Edn. 1893, ad loc p. 44. Paul may have written other letters, but I Th is probably indicated here. *cf. the εἰδοχρησις in II Thess ii. 15 above.

experience of power motivated by ^{the} holy Spirit, not simply by a set of taught beliefs; the new experience hinted at is not unlike what we sense in the Pentecost atmosphere (Acts ii.1-4, cf. iv.31). This may be taken as confirming what usually happened when a church came into being, and affords a reflection of the primitive church experience.* (b) In i.10 we read how the Thessalonians turned to the living and true God, and how they were ἀναμένειν τὸν ὕψιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυθμισμένον ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς ἐργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης. Here we have what are probably references to the traditions of the resurrection of Jesus, the exalted Messiah's return, this Messiah being Jesus who would deliver the community from the imminent judgment.** (c) The death of Jesus and the responsibility of the Jews for this, is mentioned in ii.15, τῶν (sc. Ἰουδαίων) καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἀπεκτείναντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοῦς παροφθαλμοῦς. Here the primitive church standpoint is distinctly clear; at the Jewish door lies the guilt of the crucifixion, and this followed up the spirit that had at one time driven out the prophets.*** (d) If I Thess. be any guide, little seems to have been made, in the transmitted traditions, of the human life of Jesus; there is more concerning his death, resurrection, and expected return. The rare occurrence of the name 'Jesus' points this way, since ^{it} ~~this~~ was the name by which he was known on earth. This feature *is in entire accord with the general trend of Pauline

*On this cf. pp. 221 ff. Cf. also I Thess. i.6, μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου. **Cf. Acts i.11 and pp. 296 ff. 370 ff. ***Acts ii.23, vii.52, and pp. 129 ff. 135 ff.

teaching, the centre of which is to be found not in the earthly but in the heavenly and exalted Christ."* It would, however, be hazardous to infer a similar lack of interest in the historical Jesus within the primitive church. (e) The eschatological passages in iv.13-17, v.1-3 suggest the experience of the primitive church expectation of the imminent return of the Lord Jesus. Some doubt had arisen in respect of the believers who had died as to whether these would miss the glory of the Parousia,** the teaching about which had evidently formed a part of Paul's message on the occasion of his visit to Thessalonica. The tendency to neglect the ordinary duties of life, which Paul deprecates, seems to be a new feature.

(3) In II Thess.iii.6 we have the following reference:

παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν. ἀδελφοί, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν.

The tradition received from Paul by the Thessalonians evidently embodied religious experience which had power to change life in the character and conduct of the believers. Where such results were lacking or results inconsistent with the new experience were seen, the tradition was being set at nought. J.B.Mayor notes that the Christian tradition "also included rules of action,"*** but as is the case when we speak of the beliefs of the church, the question arises, "What in the first place produced the rules of action?"**** As the religious experience

*Milligan, op.cit.p.135. **On this point see pp. ^{356f.} 465f. ***"The Epistle of St.Jude and the Second Epistle of St.Peter," 1907, p.63, where Mayor quotes II Thess.iii.6 to illustrate his point. ****cf.p19

is the ultimate motivation of the beliefs or rules of belief, so inherent in it is the creative power issuing in Christian conduct and character. Therefore it is better to approach the ethical side of the primitive church tradition reflected by Paul here less from the assumption of any set of rules of action, and more from the believers' possession of a dynamic experience of ^{the} holy Spirit which moved them to conduct themselves as Christians should. The word *παραλαμβάνειν* may point to the receiving of the tradition in an outward sense when accompanied by *δέχεσθαι*,* the latter verb denoting the subjective welcome of it, but when the former verb stands alone it probably includes the inner experiential character of the tradition as well as the outward expression in the formulations of the tradition.

(4) I Cor xi.2, *ἐπαινω δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μνησθεσθε καὶ καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, κτλ.*, introduces a section dealing with the worship of the church, and leads on to a discussion about the resurrection of the dead (xv.). The specific traditions are mentioned in xi.23-25 and xv.3-7, and their contents given. If I Cor.xi.3-16 recapitulates tradition referred to in ver.2 above, to remind the Corinthians of certain principles respecting the place of women in the church, two conclusions follow: (a) the tradition contained much of a trivial nature; we are not so much amidst the

*cf. I Thess.ii.13, and Milligan's note ad loc op.cit.p.28. For the outwardly receiving of the tradition cf. I Thess iv.1, II Thess.iii.6, Gal.i.9,12, I Cor.xv.1,3, Phil iv.9, Col.ii.6, conveyed by *παραλαμβάνω*, and for ~~the~~ the inner apprehension cf. I Thess.i.6, II Th.ii.10, I Cor.ii.14, II Cor.viii.17, Gal.iv.14.

tradition based on the primitive church experience as among the beginnings of the process by means of which the experience, like that of Israel came to be, is being diffused into a series of "delivered instructions."* (b) We are afforded hints of another process modifying the primitive church experience through contemporary thought-forms and usages being brought to bear upon its interpretation. Rabbinical teaching regarding the status of womanhood and the social conventions of Paul's age are at work on the facts of the primitive tradition, the former through the apostle's Rabbinic training,** the latter through the social ideas and conventions as the church came into the wider world of Roman civilization.

(5) I Cor.xi.23, ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, follows with the received tradition about the observance of the Lord's Supper. This is one of the traditions referred to in xi.2, and this fact places the derivation of the tradition from the primitive church as xv.3ff., not by direct revelation as the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου has led some commentators to suppose. It is true that we must allow for the insight of Paul or his awareness of receiving direct revelations (Gal.ii.2,II Cor.xii.2ff), but "why assume a supernatural communication when a natural one was ready at hand? It would be easy for St.Paul to learn everything from some of the Twelve."*** It is therefore reasonable to infer that the

*Robertson and Plummer, I Corinthians, ICC. 2nd.Edn.1914, ad loc. p228.
 Paul was a pupil of Gamaliel, cf. Acts xxii.3. *Robertson and Plummer, op.cit.p.242.

reference is to the primitive church tradition.*

(6) Another of the παραδόσεις of xi.2 is mentioned in xv.3, παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ἃ καὶ παρέλάβετε. The tradition which Paul received from the church before him (for this is the force of ἐν πρώτοις) are (i) Christ died for sins in accordance with the scriptures, (ii) Jesus was raised on the third day, (iii) a list of appearances of the risen Jesus to sundry persons and groups.** The reference to the 'sins' in connection with Christ's death may have elements in it suggestive of the later interpretation rather than of the primitive church ideas, and as such may receive Paul's own unique emphasis, but there are real grounds for concluding that the primitive church believers discovered a real connection between the death of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins.***

(7) It may be that many indirect hints of what had been received from the past are afforded by Paul's use of certain terms to express what it is with which he has to do in his preaching. The most significant of these is εὐαγγέλιον, with its cognate εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, both of which are very common in the epistles. The study of these words, however, yields surprisingly scanty information, if any, about the primitive church experience. For the most part they are used in a semi-technical sense to indicate 'the gospel,' or to the act of preaching the good news, referred to as 'my gospel,' 'our gospel,' 'the gospel of Christ,' 'the gospel of God'**** with no reference

*On the relation of this tradition to the gospel accounts cf. pp. 416-428
 Cf. pp. 205f. *Cf. pp. 374-380 ****Rom i.9,15; ii.16; I I Cor. iv.3; I Cor. ix.13; Rom. xv.16.

to the contents of the gospel. In I Cor.xv.1 it is equated with the tradition Paul had received and passed on. In several places the emphasis is on the Gentiles as partakers of the gospel as it reveals a righteousness of faith (Rom.i.15f), or the reconciling of Jews and Gentiles (Eph ii.13,iii.8) in the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph v.26). The gospel is of the Gentiles (Gal ii.2), or of the uncircumcision (Gal ii.14; cf.Rom xv.16). Paul is quite sure that he is faithful to the gospel as he received it in urging his world-wide mission to the Gentiles, and in fact designates the narrower conception of the salvation for Jewish Christians properly circumcised as a 'different gospel', i.e.a differing tradition (Gal i.6f). While the seeds of the universal scope were in the primitive church experience from the first, although there was to be a long struggle before the church became world conscious; Paul's own spiritual insight had discerned the true scope of the salvation in Jesus Christ and the gospel.* The gospel is attested "in the power of signs and wonders, in power of Holy Spirit"(Rom xv.19);** it includes among its contents the confession that 'Jesus is Lord' (Rom x.16,cf.ver.9), which is the substance of "the word of faith which we preach"(τὸ ἔπος ver.8), and the belief that God raised Jesus from the dead, i.e.exalted him to be Messiah (ver.9);*** in all these instances we are back amidst the primitive church experience. The gospel of salvation in Christ finds the seal of believers' faith

*For the primitive church problem here cf.pp.381-410 **For the spirit's attestation in these ways cf.pp.240-243 ***cf.pp.450f.

in the holy spirit of promise, which is the 'earnest' of redemption, i.e. the pledge that the promise is to be fulfilled (Eph i.13f).

Here Paul stands solidly on the primitive church experience.*

When we sum up the evidence of the epistles in the light they ~~throw~~^{shed} back on to the primitive church we are able to discern a cumulative body of references and suggestions confirmatory of the earlier fundamentals. While it is true that there is a strange silence concerning the facts of the life of Jesus, with the result that Paul throws no light on the reactions of men to the historical Jesus, at the same time there is cumulative positive evidence of the nature of the primitive church faith and outlook. The apostasy of Israel was responsible for the rejection of Jesus as their Messiah in his crucifixion, with the corollary of the summons to the nation to repent that God may use it in the redemption of the Gentiles. But the nation must be redeemed before it was able to undertake its divine mission of redeeming the world, hence the gospel is "to the Jew first, and then to the Greek" (Rom i.15). Yet in another way it was divine necessity that made inevitable Messiah's death, as the scriptures foreshadowed, had they only the insight to discern the truth, while the scriptures also revealed the fact that the death of Christ was connected with the forgiveness of sins. All these points turned on Jesus because he, and no other, was this divinely appointed Messiah who was crucified and whom God raised

*For this significant fact see pp. 239f. 278f.

from the dead, and of that resurrection many were eyewitnesses. The exalted Christ would return immediately, the expectation of this being intense, while those who had died before his coming would be raised up in glory to meet him. A new community of salvation had come into being on the basis of these experiential facts; this community was invested from the outset with the power of the spirit promised as the earnest or pledge that the salvation of the kingdom was to be fulfilled. The presence of the spirit was attested by abnormal phenomena such as signs and wonders, in the experience of supernatural power motivated by Holy Spirit which worked out in joy, and in the outward expression of spirit-possessed personality in Christian conduct and character, which also was seen to be abnormal when placed alongside the usual pagan standards of the Roman world. The observance of the Lord's Supper was not only a memorial of Jesus, from whose death and resurrection all these experiential fundamentals had resulted, but ^{also} ~~as~~ the pledge that the exalted Lord was to return with his kingdom.

If so much in Paul's teaching can be traced back to the primitive church—as our subsequent investigation will reveal*—the probabilities are that there are many more elements that go back to the church before him. Further, the fact of the church being already in existence for him to enter is a strong support for the conclusion that if Paul influenced the church's outlook, the church's

* Cf. pp. 205-209, 278-280

influence on the apostle was equally formative, if not more so. The primitive church strictly introduced him to Jesus, albeit the Jesus of resurrection and exaltation. As a Jew he was perfectly at home with the Jewish environment without which the primitive church cannot be understood, and although we need not follow Paul's ideas of the church as the New Israel (Rom ix-xi) in reading them back into the primitive years* we can see how easily his root conception of the church would be of the same nature as what had gone before him.

B. With the primitive church experiential basis of Paul's religious outlook as a disciple of Jesus Christ we have to reckon with the undoubted developments that took place under his influence, as these are revealed in the epistles. We may therefore use these epistles as sources for the primitive church experience in a negative way. These developments are not to be read backwards, and we are able to discern the character of the ^{previous} ~~prior~~ period in the negative sense of what did not characterize its faith and outlook. For Paul brought his own distinctive experience and contribution to the interpretation of the original Christian facts. For example, while he knew who were the witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, he himself received an appearance of Jesus (Acts ix.3-6; I Cor.xv.8).

(1) The developed Christology of Paul stands in marked contrast to the Jesus of the gospels and the primitive Messianism of the church

*As E.F.Scott does, op.cit.p36f. So also H.F.Hamilton,"The People of God,"Vol.II.1912,pp.24-39.

before Paul, with its conception of the earthly Jesus raised from the dead and exalted to God's right hand as Messiah, soon to return in the glory of the divine kingdom (Acts ii.22-24,36).* In the Pauline Epistles, however, Jesus is set forth as the Son of God (Rom i.4), a divine being of the same dignity as God (Phil.ii.6), the very image of the invisible God, the heavenly being invested with the powers of creation (Col i.15f), who had surrendered his divine status in a sacrificial self-emptying of himself by becoming a human being, and submitting to crucifixion that men might be redeemed (Phil ii.6-8)** This divine Christ is also "the second man, the higher type of humanity, the beginner of a movement towards life in mankind, destined to retrieve the movement towards death which began in Adam, that he is not of earthy but of heavenly and spiritual material, and has the power of changing those who believe in him into the same element."*** While the Messiah-Saviour would appeal to Jewish-Christian elements in the church, Paul had to develop his insight into Christ as the Divine Saviour who as God would appeal to the wider Graeco-Roman world.

(2) The developed church consciousness presents features that cannot be discerned with any clearness in the previous period. (a) The awareness of its universal mission is much to the fore, and the Gentiles are now the objects of salvation (Eph xi.22) as follow-

*See below, on what Jesus was to the primitive church, pp 450-473
 cf. also Gal iv.4, II Cor.v.14,21,viii.9,Rom viii.3f.,Phil ii.5-11, Col ii.9-15. *A.Menzies,"The Second Epistle to the Corinthians," 1912,p.lvi.

citizens with Israel's chosen of the divine community. (ii) The church has become aware of its own distinctiveness over against the traditional Israel, ^{and is} not to be confused with the literal theocracy since the Jews entered it on the same conditions as did the non-Jews, viz. those requiring faith in God, the very quality which brought Abraham the great national ancestor into favour with God (Rom iv.3, Gal iii.7ff). The divine acceptance of Abraham came while he was still uncircumcised (Rom iv.10), the rite being no more than an outward sign (ver 11). Entrance into the church of Christ is spiritually, not physically, conditioned, and on this basis the Jew, being justified by faith, could still feel himself in line with his traditional religion; the non-Jew found no barrier in lack of circumcision in the way of salvation. The synthesis of the two elements was the new thing, and made the church distinctive from the Israel, and even the primitive church, which never attained to it.

(iii) There are many hints of definite church organization (I Cor xii. 28ff), an evolving procedure in worship (I Cor xiv), the place of women in the church (I Cor. xiv. 34f). "In the New Testament itself there can be traced an evolution in Church Order"*, and this points to the growth of the church consciousness that was not to be found in the earlier period. (iv) Christ has now become the head of the Church (Eph i.22, Col i.18, 24); the church is now 'the Body of Christ' (I Cor x.16) and this "represents, so far as a concrete and visible thing can represent an abstract and invisible, the relations and the

*B.H. Streeter, "The Primitive Church," p. ix.

functions of the community, alike within itself and in relation to its invisible Head."* The original community awaiting the advent of Messiah has now become the developed church aware of Christ as its organic Head.

All these various phases are definite advances on the primitive church experience and should not be read back into the earlier years. The germs were there, no doubt, but the larger environment of the world and the non-Jewish elements that met it brought in many new features which were not original. Paul was not the originator of the fundamental concepts here; for example the wider mission had already ^{taken} ~~took~~ its rise before he came on the scene.** The recognition that the primitive church had more to contribute than is sometimes recognized would prevent the unhistorical generalizations about Paul being the creator of the church.**

(3) The possible developments in the observances of ~~B~~aptism and the Lord's Supper may present new features of which the primitive church knew nothing. Here "we need to distinguish carefully between earlier and later conceptions"*** With regard to baptism the distinctively new thing in Paul is that "it is on the basis of the mystical being-in-Christ, as the centre of his teaching, that Paul explains baptism."**** ~~As~~ In the primitive community baptism

*C.Anderson Scott, "The Fellowship of the Spirit," 1921, p.73. **cf. the force of the Stephenite movement, pp.385-94J. Estlin Carpenter is wide of the mark here when he writes in his preface to Wrede's 'Paul' (Eng. Tr. 1907) pvi. "those who plead that the Church should go 'back to Jesus,' must never forget that but for Paul there would (humanly speaking) have been no church at all." ***E.F.Scott, op.cit. p.162. ****A.Schweitzer, "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle," Eng.Tr. 1931, pp261f.

was the rite which marked the admission of the new convert into the church, but as Paul teaches in the light of his mystical concepts, the believer now reenacts the death and resurrection of Jesus by his going down into, and coming up again from, the water (Rom vi.3). In the burial-like entrance into the water the convert was deemed to have died unto sin; his emergence from the water vault was the realistic process of rising to a new life (Rom vi.4), while the empirical identification with Christ is defined as putting on Christ (Gal. iii.27). This mysticism is not found in the primitive church.

The observance of the Lord's Supper seems, however, to follow the lines of the previous period's practice. There is some uncertainty in the tradition as to whether the cup precedes the bread or vice versa (I Cor x.16,21,xi.23-25),* The cup as the pledge of the Messianic kingdom, and the bread as having reference to Christ's death,** have, however, received associations derived from the Christ-mysticism of Paul. The *κοινωνία* of the blood and of the body of Christ passes over from the idea of 'fellowship' to 'communion' and thus to 'union.'*** The experience of mystical union with Christ is very marked, hence the observances are neither symbolic nor sacramentarian.****

*Similar uncertainty exists in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk xiv.22-24, cf. Lk xxii.17-19), cf. pp. 427 f. **On these points for the primitive church, see pp. 431-38 ***cf. G. Abbott-Smith, "Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament," 1921, p. 251. ****An array of weighty opinion has within recent years decided that Paul was a thoroughgoing sacramentarian. "There is little doubt," write Foakes Jackson and Lake, "as to the sacramental nature of baptism by the middle of the

first century in the circles represented by the Pauline Epistles, and it is indisputable in the second century," (op.cit. Vol I, 1920, p.385). Lake in an earlier investigation is even more certain: "Baptism is for St. Paul and his readers universally and unquestioningly accepted as a 'mystery' or sacrament which works 'ex opere operato' and from the unhesitating manner in which St. Paul uses this fact as a basis for argument, as if it were a point on which Christian opinion did not vary, it would seem as though this sacramental teaching is central in the primitive Christianity to which the Roman Empire began to be converted" ("The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," 1911 p.385). H.T. Andrews has no doubt that "as far as exegesis is concerned the sacramentarian interpretation of Paulinism has won a decisive victory, and the Symbolical school has been driven off the field" ("The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St Paul," *The Expositor*, *see Bibliography*, p.543). J. Weiss thinks the germs of the later catholic sacramentarianism are already in Paul, although he is cautious against reading too much of this into the epistles, "Nicht, dass der Gedanke des immer wiederholten Opfers Christi hier schon vorhanden wäre, wohl aber ist ein Keim zu dieser katholischen Deutung der heiligen Handlung nicht zu verkennen, zumal da zweifellos Brot und Wein nicht mehr als gewöhnliche Speise empfunden werden, sondern in irgend einer Weise schon Leib und Blut Christi symbolisch darstellen, ja, geradezu verkörpern," (Urchristentum, p.508).

One caution seems to be necessary. It is often assumed that Paul and the readers of his epistles at the time of their reception are identified in religious experience and outlook. Preaching the gospel in a background of 'Mystery' religion as far as many Gentiles were concerned, the apostle is probably only making use of points of contact with them. The 'mystery' which for him denotes union with Christ, or the mystical fusion of Jew and Gentile into the one body of Christ, may have meant just this empirical significance to him in the baptism and the Lord's Supper; but many of his Gentile hearers would have no difficulty in reading into his words an interpretation thoroughly sacramentarian, just as the disciples read apocalyptic significance into many of Jesus' words which he may not have intended himself (cf. pp. 177-179). H. Weinel seems to point the way, when he says, "Dem Apostel, der ohne Riten und Zeremonien das Göttliche in sich erlebt hatte, mussten freilich solche Mysterien ferne liegen. Aber er konnte sich weder dem Zuge der Zeit noch dem Zwang des Gemeindebrauchs entziehen, der bereits die Taufe aufgenommen und das Abendmahl in ein Sakrament verwandelt hatte" ("Paulus" Zte. Aufl. 1915, p.90). It was the Gentile environment that began to motive the sacramentarianism that does not really appear, as Schweitzer has insisted (op.cit. pp.269ff), until Ignatius (ad Rom vii.3, ad Philad. iv. ad Eph xx) and Justin Martyr (Apol. lxvi), for even the reference in the Fourth Gospel (vi.53-56) has to be understood in the light of the words, "the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (vi.63). The new faith went out amid the peoples of the Graeco-Roman world, and who brought

religious ideas to the interpretation of their new Christian experience, derived from pagan cults and mystery religions.

Paul himself stands in the direct line of the primitive church practice with its freedom from the later accretions. Hence the need for keeping the earlier period distinct from what follows, for even if Paul were a sacramentarian, we are still left with the earlier experience of the observances of baptism and the Lord's Supper in the primitive church, in view of which the assumption that the sacraments were from the outset 'ex opere operato' in nature, is unhistorical, since these ideas were grafted on by the incoming converts from the wider Roman world.

(4) The widening of the experiential content of salvation, especially as this is connected with the death of Jesus, is a marked development in Pauline thought from the "experience of a risen and glorified Redeemer",* characteristic of the primitive church outlook.** The Cross comes to be the centre of many fruitful interpretations in Paul, who draws on the practices and thought-forms of the wider world to explain the death of Jesus to his numerous Gentile audiences. Thus Christ's death is (a) a ransom, freeing slaves to sin, law, idols and death, for possession by Christ who had purchased them in his blood;*** it was (b) a sacrifice, as the paschal lamb was offered up, as the 'fragrant odour' was sent up as in the case of the burnt-offering;**** the sacrificial idea comes out in the phrase, 'the

*H.R. Mackintosh, "The Person of Jesus Christ," 3rd. Edn. 1920, p. 43. **cf. pp. 450 ff. for this. ***Rom vi. 6, 17, 19f. Gal iv. 1-7, 8f. Rom viii. 20; cf. I Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, Eph i. 7, 14, Col i. 14, Rom iii. 24. ****I Cor. v. 7, Eph v. 2.

blood of Christ; '* again, the death of Jesus is (c) a legal penalty borne by the guiltless one for the sinner richly deserving it himself (II Cor v.21), with special reference to propitiation by the substitution of Christ, in view of whose death the sinner stands acquitted since what Christ does in his death is sufficient for divine righteousness; only Paul has given his own emphasis to the propitiation idea inasmuch as he sets forth God Himself as providing the propitiation in Christ (Rom iii.25);, or once more the death is (d) reconciliation, whereby estrangement from God is done away where men are hostile to God (Rom viii.7) making the preaching of the cross a ministry of reconciliation (II Cor.v.18-20), the news of God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; or (e) Jesus' death leads to the 'adoption' of the believer into the status of children of God, whereby in the power of the spirit they are able to say, 'Abba, Father' (Gal iii.25, Rom viii.17); we are on primitive church ground in the view of the cross as (f) an Instalment or 'earnest' of the redemption to come. The primitive church saw in the death of Jesus, since this was the prelude to his exaltation as Messiah, the 'earnest' that he would bring final salvation in the expected kingdom; but a new note is heard here in Paul in that the climax of salvation was to be away from earth in the heavenly places; he who is joined to the Lord will have a spiritual body (I Cor I Cor xv.35ff) and know the Lord face to face (I Cor xiii.12). Possibly the primitive church began to break away from its eschatological salvation in the future kingdom

and, realizing the kingdom in present experience, looked for the final salvation in the kingdom not of this world (cf. pp. 359ff), but this viewpoint is much to the fore in the church of Paul.

All these developments of the salvation process are absent from the primitive church in the main,* and the ideas indicated should not be read back into its experience. Along with the Christology, the enhanced church consciousness, and the sacraments, the salvation experience of Paul illustrates the need for the application of the negative principle we have enunciated, viz. that such developments should not be regarded as characterizing the primitive church outlook. But may not all these elements have found place in what was there prior to Paul?*** The probabilities are against this, in view of the influences that entered in with Paul, and which were brought to bear on the interpretation of the original Christian facts.

C. Three streams of influence have joined the main current of the church experience in Paul, which have actively assisted the developments we have noticed.

(1) The formative influence of Paul's own religious experience upon the Christian facts needs to be observed. The records of his conversion are ^{has set} ~~best~~ with many critical problems, but he seems to have been journeying to Damascus intent on persecuting those who believed in Jesus the Messiah. "On the way something happened. Paul

*Cf. section on the experience of salvation, pp. 370-380 **Cf. G. B. Verity "The Gospel according to St. Paul," in the Church Quarterly Review, Vol CVII, 1928, pp. 318-22, who reads back all these elements into the earliest years. ***Acts ix. 1-19, xxii. 3-21, xxvi. 2-20.

arrived at the city of Damascus in sorry plight...As he recovered, instead of carrying out his commission he commenced a vigorous campaign on behalf of the faith he had set out to destroy."* There is little doubt that psychologically there was preparation for this change;** what glimpses we have from his autobiographical comments shows us a soul at grips with the impotency of the Law to solve moral problems and spiritual need, with the resultant lack of religious peace;*** yet he seems to have noticed that those whom he was persecuting possessed what he did not. The Messiahship of one who had been crucified was doubtless fatal to his conscious acceptance of Jesus as the primitive believers were doing, but subconsciously the issue was being determined, and the conflict within him found its solution in a vision of the Messiah Jesus (cf. Gal i.16). The recognition of Jesus as Messiah, the break with the Law which apparently was distinctive in his experience, turned his thoughts almost from the first to the experience of Messiah as the centre of the world's salvation, the way for which was opened through his conviction of the impotency of the Law, and by his own touch with the more liberal movement in the church that had gathered round the name of Stephen.**** Here Paul comes closely to the primitive church, at least on its more liberal side, but his thoroughgoing 'universalism' and his struggle with the Law led him to formulate his Christian

*C.H.Dodd, "The Meaning of Paul for Today," 1920, p.23. **Cf. Weinel, "St. Paul," Eng. Tr. 1906, pp.82f. ***Rom vii.7-25, Gal i.13f. Phil iii. 5-6... Cf. I Cor vi.11. ****cf p38; for the place of Stephen in the primitive church, see pp.387-394

experience in categories to which the primitive church was strange, categories which set forth the death of Christ and its meaning for faith in many ways, which helped in the wider reference of the church consciousness, and ^{in drawing} ~~to draw~~ out the greater divine dignity of Jesus himself.

(2) The Jewish elements in the Pauline interpretation turn on the fact~~s~~ that he was a Hellenistic Jew, and yet ~~he~~ was brought up in the strictest Pharisaic circles (Acts xxii.3,xxvi.5). The Rabbinical education he received (cf.p.31) gave him the habit of thinking in forensic terms such as justification. When he became a Christian, he still used these categories, but the experiential content was changed in that an experience of faith in the believer in Christ superseded legal obedience required in a Jew. As a true Pharisee, Paul was in bondage to the Law and the Traditions, both of which constituted the evolving of revelation, with the Traditions an integral part of the Law as this called for interpretation. If we compare the freedom of Jesus ^{from} ~~to~~ the Law and Paul's bondage to it, we shall see that Paul's interpretations of the new faith in many of the old categories and thought-forms provided some possible hindrance to the integral understanding of the life in Jesus, and that therefore the primitive church may have preserved elements here that Paul has obscured. A further Rabbinical element emerges in Paul's interpretation of the new faith in a sort of philosophy of history (Rom ix-xi), in which he makes use of the dignified categories of predestination which went back to Pharisaic concepts. "The

Pharisees held in general the doctrine of predestination, which was a natural outgrowth of their strict literalism, attributing the origin of everything, even of evil, to the far-seeing wisdom of Yahwe,"* while Josephus' account of Pharisaic ideas on this point is in entire agreement with that of Paul.** Once more, "even the belief in the pre-existence of Jesus was for Paul primarily the consequence of his personal experiences and his Jewish mode of thought," ~~and~~ which made what might have stayed short at an ideal pre-existence become "a real one, such a pre-existence indeed... as Jewish thought ascribed to the Messiah."*** Messianic hopes ran high in Pharisaic circles,**** and throughout the Psalms of Solomon with its Messianic expectations (xvii.23ff), "it is the Pharisaic piety that breathes."‡ Paul inherited these ideas and applied the highest categories in which Messiah was placed in their thought, to the person of Jesus. These, rather than extra-Jewish influences and ideas,‡‡ furnish the sources for the apostle's exalted Christology, and his intensive thinking probably made him see the significance of Jesus as Messiah in ways that the primitive believers would not generally notice.

*J.D.Prince, Enc.Bi.IV.1903,col.4324. **Ant.xviii.1,3;8,3,cf.B.J. II viii.14,and Ant.xiii.5,9. ***Clemen,"Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources,"Eng.Tr.1912,pp.337f. ****W.Robertson Smith and E.Kautzsch in Enc.Bi.III.1902,cols.3061-2. ‡G.Buchanan Gray in "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,"Vol II,1913,p.630,cf.‡‡As in Jewish-Hellenic ideas of the "heavenly man," (cf.H.R.Mackintosh's criticism of this,op.cit.pp68f), or the Primal Man of the Hermetic literature, or Babylonian influence with Marduk as Mummu's son (on all of which see Clemen,op.cit.pp.158,205,338f), or from the pagan myths as Pfleiderer suggests,"Primitive Christianity," Eng.Tr.Vol I.1906,pp.466f. and cf.his "The Early Christian Conception of Christ,"1905,chapsi-ii.

(3) Since the Christian experience passed through to the wider world of Roman civilization, the influence of Greek elements in the interpretation became possible, while the apostle himself, on his Hellenic side, would be ~~aware~~^{familiar} to some extent with Greek ways of thought and life. (a) There was the permeation of Hellenistic ideas and thought-forms in the world and their possible contacts with the Christian experience in Paul as the Gentile converts brought their contribution conditioned by the general psychological outlook of the Hellenistic world. Mere resemblance, however, does not denote dependence, and even^{by} Lightfoot's thorough investigation,* it is not proved that Paul's interpretation of the Christian facts was influenced by philosophical **Stoicism**, for, at the most, "ideas, like germs, are in the air."** Popular thought of the time bore as little resemblance to the Stoicism of the schools, as the modern popular ideas about evolution, for example, ~~resemble~~^{do to} the biological facts, or the philosophical implications of evolution. Paul may have made use of popularized Stoic images and ideas in interpreting the Christian facts to his Gentile converts, but more than this cannot be assumed. The Stoics could never have said, "weep with them that weep" (Rom xii.15), nor "if one member suffer, all the

*"St. Paul and Seneca," in Commentary on Philippians, 6th. Edn. 1890, pp. 270-332. Lightfoot adduces (1) the ideal self-sufficient wise man, wanting nothing, possessing everything, and (2) the conception of the divine commonwealth, the city not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, as examples of Paul's indebtedness to Stoic thought (cf. II Cor ix.8, 11, Phil iv.11, 13, II Cor vi.10; Phil iii.20, Eph ii.16, 19, Gal iii 28), see pp. 304ff. in the Commentary. **E.L. Hicks, "Studia Biblica," Vol IV. p.8.

members suffer with it" (I Cor xii.26). Still less can the ideas be read back into the primitive church. We have to keep in mind all the while the things in Paul for which alien influences could not account. (b) The influence of language on the interpretation needs to be kept in mind. The transition from Aramaic to the Greek vernacular was made early, and involved a far more plastic medium for the expression of the primitive religious experience, and at the same time it provided "an unusual number of terms which express moral, religious, and theological conceptions."* There were bound to be modifications when the original facts were explained in a linguistic medium different from the original language. (c) The linguistic influence has frequently led to the assumption that Paul depended on the mystery religions for much of his Christian statements. Identity of terminology has been taken to imply the dependence of Paul's faith on the mysteries of the Roman world.**

*H.A.A.Kennedy, "Sources of New Testament Greek," 1895, p.8. For the existence of the Koine cf. Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament with its wealth of papyri parallels, and proving that the New Testament was written in the common parlance of the first century; this language dominated the ancient world for many centuries, and "as an advertising medium there was at that period nothing comparable to the ubiquitous speech of Hellas, nor was there any other language spoken among men that could approach it in respect of power to give adequate expression to a new creed" (W. Fairweather, "Jesus and the Greeks," 1924, p.274). J.H. Moulton's "Prolegomena to the ^{Prolegomena to} Greek New Testament" (3rd. Edn. 1908) furnishes sufficient evidence to show that the Koine, while having close affinities with the scholastic Greek of the schools, had its unique idioms. Cf. too, Deissmann, "Bible Studies," 2nd. Edn. 1909.

**R. Reitzenstein is the most thorough exponent of this viewpoint. Through Paul's influence the movement cradled in Jerusalem has become a product of the wider religious movement of the world. "Einstweilen scheint uns aus dem Dunkel der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Apostels

eine Tatsache mit wachsender Bestimmtheit entgegenzudämmern: er hat ernstlich darum gerungen, auch den Hellenen Hellene zu werden. Die hellenistische religiöse Literatur muss er gelesen haben; ihre Sprache redet er, in ihre Gedanken hat er sich hineinversetzt, wohl weil die gleiche Gedankenwelt ihn schon früher berührt hat. Jetzt schlossen sich diese Gedanken mit innerer Notwendigkeit an die neue, über alles Judentum hinausgehende Lebenserfahrung. So gewannen sie für ihn..lebendige Kraft." ("Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 2te Aufl.1920,p.66). The remainder of this book is devoted to various studies bearing on the Mysteries, and are mainly linguistic in character, but it is noteworthy that the literature of which the author makes copious use to explain Paul's thought comes from a much later age, and is therefore disposed to read back into earlier times the ideas and experience of a later age. A step further, and the primitive church is included within the orbit of the Mystery Religions, so that Bousset makes not only Paul but also the primitive church communities borrow largely from the Mysteries (cf."Kurios Christos,"1913).

H.A.A.Kennedy reveals the opposite tendency to Reitzenstein. After studying exhaustively the terminology of the Mysteries he concludes that "the evidence we have adduced from the Old Testament makes it wholly superfluous to seek for the explanation of any of these terms in Hellenistic Mystery Religion. What we do learn from the parallels is the ability of many of his (Paul's) readers to catch the meaning of the more or less technical terminology, due not merely to a course of instruction in the Old Testament, but to their acquaintance with a religious vocabulary already current among the Mystery associations" ("St. Paul and the Mystery Religions,"1913,p.198). This verdict goes too far in the Jewish direction and does not allow for the new contacts with the pagan environment. Paul may have known where he stood with his Pharisaic training, but it is psychologically inconceivable that the Greek-speaking converts from the cities should bring to their new faith the presuppositions and ideas derived from Judaism; ~~even~~ the 'God-fearers' were not at home in the Jewish outlook and psychology, even though they accepted the Jewish doctrine of God.

(ST. PAUL. Chs. iv-vii),
A more mediating position is put forward by Deissmann, who while allowing to the full the Judaic elements in Paul's experience, gives due recognition to the Hellenistic influences; he therefore inclines to give less credit to the influence of the Mysteries. S.Angus detail the faith and practice of the Mystery Religions, and while commenting on the possible connections between these and the Christian faith, is more concerned, and rightly so, with placing Christianity and the Mysteries in contrast with each other ("The Mystery Religions and Christianity,"1925,especially chaps.vi.and vii.).

Whatever the Gentile converts read into their new faith from their former religious experience should not be ascribed to Paul,

who, when he made use of images and ideas derived from the circle of his converts' outlook was doing no more than making use of what they knew to explain what they did not know, viz. the Christian experience and its vital facts. Analogies are only illustrative; they do not prove dependence in any way. Paul stands nearer the primitive church experience than the advocates of the influence of the Mysteries seem to allow. And if Paul is free from such influence how much more is the primitive church experience independent of such alien influence!

IV. THE POST-PAULINE LITERATURE&

(1) The Pastoral Epistles (I and II Timothy, Titus), with their later ecclesiastical atmosphere, the stress on orthodoxy, together with the linguistic phenomena they present, are products of the closing decades of the Apostolic Age.* "The general impression one gets...is, that as a doctrine Christianity was now complete and could be taken for granted."** The type of Christian character required may have roots in the primitive church, but "it denotes a second stage in the Christian life; that life has passed through the excitement of conversion...the sense of the speedy Parousia of the Lord had passed away."*** They therefore afford no reliable material for the character of the primitive church experience.

*I Tim i.10, iv.1,12, v.8, vi.3,10, II Tim i.13, iv.3, Tit i.9,13, ii.1; cf. J. Moffatt, *op. cit.* p.410f. **J. Denney, "The Death of Christ," Revised Edn. 1911, pp.148f. ***W. Lock, "The Pastoral Epistles," 1924, p.xv. The linguistic studies of H.J. Holtzmann ("Die Pastoral-Briefe, Kritisch und Exegetisch behandelt," 1880) and P.N. Harrison,

("The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles," 1921) have shown that the case for subapostolic authorship is overwhelming. Neither style nor vocabulary have affinity with the Pauline Epistles, but they are strikingly similar to the linguistic character of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, thus making possible the conclusion that the Pastorals belong to the second century. In certain sections (e.g. II Tim i.16-18, ii.10f. iv.1f.5-22, Tit iii.12-15), the familiar Pauline style and vocabulary appear (cf. Harrison, pp.87ff), and these facts lead Harrison to conclude that a number of genuine Pauline fragments were embodied in these epistles, but Holtzmann regards even these as the invention of the author to give verisimilitude to his writings.

(2) Julicher's assertion that "if the first word, Peter," of I Peter, "were absent, no one would have imagined that it had been composed by him,"* is answered by the fact that a pseudonymous author would have emphasized the personal qualifications of apostleship.** The reference to persecution (iv.12-16) need imply no later period than Nero's attack upon the Christians to free himself from the responsibility of setting fire to Rome, and this would well be within Peter's lifetime. A slightly more developed view of Christ than what is afforded in the early speeches in Acts, appears in the epistle,*** but there is a primitive tone about it. The church consciousness, however, is fairly developed, as is seen in the idea that the privileges and status of the old Israel have been transferred to the church.**** The epistle is inspired by the apostle Peter, with Silvanus as his amanuensis (v.12), and therefore breathes the thought and outlook of one who was intimately concerned in that

*"Introduction to the New Testament," Eng. Tr. p207. (1904) **II Peter illustrates this principle (cf. i.1, 14ff); a pseudonymous is making all he ~~best~~ of the apostle's credentials to support the impression that the epistle is by Peter. Cf. also "The Book of John the Evangelist," for the same tendency, where an apocryphal writing is passed off as that of the evangelist. ***Mackinnon, op.cit. p47. ****i.12, ii.9, 14, 10.

Primitive church experience of which he was so distinguished a witness. Peter wrote the epistle, or caused it to be written, "at the beginning of the Jewish war, when it had become apparent, even to the ἀπόστολος τῆς περιτεμῆς (Gal ii.9) that God had withdrawn His choice from the Jewish nation, as a nation, in order to fix it on a new people of God gathered out of all nations."*

(3) The Epistle of James is regarded as the earliest of the New Testament writings,** and as among the latest,*** while various intermediate dates are suggested.**** A document lending itself to such diversity of opinion does not bear on it the hallmark of its period and authorship, yet many have no doubt that it comes from James, the Lord's brother (i.1)‡ The superscription, however, is no evidence that he was the author, who seems to be one of the unknown personalities of the later Apostolic Age. This takes away from the authority the document would have could it be established ~~that~~ X he who presided over the Council of Jerusalem is the author. While it reflects Judaeo-Christian thought, it is the Jewish Christianity which developed after the struggle between Paul and the Judaizers, when the Jewish-Christian section of the church hardened into a rigid conservatism. The document therefore can be of little use in helping to understand what the primitive church was like.

*W.Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology," Eng.Tr.2nd.Edn.1896, Vol.I.pp378f
 **J.B.Mayor, "The Epistle of St.James," 3rd.Edn.1918, pp.cxlivf.
 ***A.S.Peake, "A Critical Introduction to the New Testament," 1909, p87.
 and Julicher, op.cit.pp224f. ****R.St.John Parry, "St.James," 1903, p99.
 and F.J.A.Hort, "The Epistle of St.James," 1909, p.xxv. ‡As G.H.Rendall
 "The Epistle of St.James and Judaic Christianity," 1927, p.11. cf. below
 pp.347, 352f.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is a product of the time when the issue of the church and the world has begun to declare itself; the burning questions of the Law, circumcision and admission of the Gentiles had long been settled. This brings the document up to the eighth or ninth decade of the apostolic age. The Alexandrian thought-forms in which the discussion is cast removes the epistle from the zone of the primitive church experience as far as its interpretation is concerned, and it is therefore to be regarded as an exposition of the Christianity of a much later period. Analogies between Hebrews and the primitive church have led to the assumption that the type of Christian experience reflected in the Epistle rests independently on the primitive church instead of being mediated by Paul's influence,* and there is no doubt that the Gentile offshoot originating with Stephen followed independent courses in addition to the Pauline one. One of these may well have found its home in Alexandrian circles and become the independent centre of thought and restatement, quite apart from anything Paul may have done. This primitive strain may possibly be seen in the apocalyptic setting of the Epistle,** but it is ^{the} apocalyptic that is rapidly becoming spiritualized into the expectation of the kingdom not of this world.*** The church as the true Israel appears in Hebrews,**** and no break with Judaism is contemplated maybe, yet these features are better explained by the view that Gentile

*cf. E.F. Scatt, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," 1922, pp. 58-68. **i.1, ii.8-10, ix.26, xii.26-28; ***iv.1, 9-11, vi.18-20, viii.5f. ix.23-28, xi.10, 13-16, xiii.14, and cf. the idealizing character of the thought as a whole, with the high priest, the holy place, the law, the covenant, etc. being shadows of the real counterparts in the heavens.

the truth

Christianity has taken over into itself, that the church is the community of the true people of God, that what the Jews claimed as their prerogative was now seen to belong to all who embraced the faith in Jesus Christ. The analogies between Stephen's speech (Acts vii) and Hebrews are not indications of the dependence of the latter on the former.* It is not possible therefore to use this epistle in any detail for the shedding of light on the primitive church practice, although the continuity in it of the Christian experience based on the original facts shows that the new faith had gained, rather than lost, by the developments reflected in such dignified and spiritual exposition.

(5) Of the Johannine writings, the epistles are too remote and sketchy to be of use for our purpose. The Apocalypse throws back little light on the eschatological outlook of the primitive church since such sources^{as} it uses,** were available to the primitive church, while the phase of the Nero-Redivivus myth, represented as Nero returning from the abyss as a demon, "combining in his own person the characteristics of Beliar and the AntiChrist"*** groups the apocalyptic ideas into a setting which was not known to the earlier period. Insofar as the primitive church was influenced by the ideas drawn from the apocalyptic literature, it was independent of what the

*In both the history of Israel is reviewed with certain episodes stressed, the 'types' method is used to interpret the Old Testament, worship is central, both refer to the Law as given by angels and the tabernacle modelled on a heavenly pattern. All these go back to the common tradition of Israel, and are distinctive in their own right.

cf. R. H. Charles in "The Revelation of St. John," ICC Vol I. 1920, pp. Lxviii ff. where lists are given. *ibid. p. xcvi.

Apocalypse used in this way; insofar as the Apocalypse drew on materials not accessible to the primitive church it could have no relevance to that period.

The real problem of the Fourth Gospel is, "How far does it go back to the religious experience of the Primitive Church, i.e. to impressions which were received of Jesus by the original eyewitnesses recalled in the light of the experiential discoveries of the earliest years of the church?" Insofar as dependence is supposed to be shown on the Synoptics* the facts may be accounted for by the supposition that Synoptic tradition was also in the **hands** of those who were ultimately responsible for the Johannine tradition, and that for some reason, preference was given to the Johannine aspects of the experience from which the tradition was evolved.

What, for example, are we to make of the classic discourse in the Upper Room (xiii-xvii)? ^{Are} ~~Is~~ this and other discourses modelled after the manner of Thucydides who used to make his orators speak what he supposed would be the appropriate thing for them to say in view of the occasion(1.22)? Were the words to Nicodemus no more than the writer's own view of the sort of thing Jesus would say under the circumstances(iii.3,5-14)? G.H.C.Macgregor thinks that "John has preserved many authentic sayings of Jesus which, it may be, provide the core round which a discourse developed,"** but what is the criterion for deciding which is a saying and which is developed discourse?

*E.F.Scott, "The Fourth Gospel," 2nd. Ed. 1920, pp. 32-45; Huck places the Johannine parallels by themselves in his "Synopse der drei Ersten Evangelien," 5 Aufl. 1915, pp. 223-247. **"The Gospel of John" 1928, p. xxii

The following suggestion is put forward tentatively to urge the recognition of the influence of religious experience as originating this gospel. What we have to consider here is the growth of Christian experience, living, and insight into the meaning of what Jesus said and did. The words of Jesus given in the later gospel and absent from the Synoptics take their experiential start from the fact that when they were spoken the hearers were not sufficiently developed in their religious experience to be paying attention to them. The simpler Synoptic data would be apprehended at first, while the other tradition took longer to make its way.

There may have been, however, among the disciples in the Upper Room one who was more responsive than the rest, and upon his more receptive mind the discourse of Jesus made deeper impression than he at the time realized. The receptivity was probably ~~sub~~conscious, or alternatively, at the moment the strength of his religious insight was not sufficiently developed for him consciously to grasp the import of what Jesus was saying. The subconscious nature of the process is further suggested in that there was no time to ponder the words of Jesus, for they ^{disciples} all went out into the night when for them came tragedy in the trial and crucifixion of their Master. The shock to their Messianic hopes in Jesus which the Cross gave damped down for the time being any impressions received in the Upper Room. Then came the unexpected reunion with Jesus in the resurrection, and with it the memory processes were quickened which recalled what Jesus had said and done, interpreted in the light of the new contacts with

Jesus.

But in the mind of the more thoughtful disciple the process of recall took a more individual turn. As time went on the words of Jesus which had subconsciously lodged in his mind gradually came to consciousness. They were then brooded over, developed, and expanded in terms of the effect they were producing on that mind, especially as lighted up in the contemporary religious experience of the Primitive Church. Further, as these sayings returned and found their place in the forefront of the disciple's conscious meditation, they were inevitably being worked up with other ideas already present to that mind, and were subject to the psychological influence of ideas, emotions and dispositions already present, into which the new recollections were introduced as they came into memory. As a saying was recalled it mixed with and grew within the texture of the receptive mind, and therefore would be subject to certain modifications. It would not be easy to recall the exact words, and gaps would have to be bridged. The whole process would be profoundly influenced by the environment of the growing church experience with its increasing perception of the significance of the exalted Jesus, and may be likened to the activity of germs which contain the potency of life within themselves, yet draw upon the environment within which they are growing. Thus as the words of Jesus came back to the mind, they were intertwined with many other ideas which had been inspired by the earliest tradition and the growing insight of the church.

This process must be viewed as going on during a number of years. Doubtless this reflective disciple would compare notes with other eyewitnesses, but his creative intuitions would be the inspiration of the particular channel of tradition that was to culminate at long last in the Fourth Gospel, after the influences of Alexandrian philosophy* or possible Pauline ideas,** together with any aims the final writer or redactor of the gospel may have had in view in producing the gospel*** were brought into play.

"We may conceive the process in his mind as follows. He had not merely a retentive memory, but also an active intelligence; he meditated on what he remembered, and so gradually, inevitably, and insensibly reflexions attached themselves to, or even modified, reminiscences. A non-thinking person is more likely to retain the 'ipsissima verba' of a remembered conversation than a thoughtful one; the more active the intelligence, the stronger the influence of meditation on recollection. It is quite credible that when preaching or teaching the witness could not always have distinguished the original germ of reminiscence from the subsequent development of reflexion."****

If we take the discourse with Nicodemus (iii.3ff.), there is a fitness of the words which suggests a germinal historical reality, but it has undergone development under a growing mystical experience working on the germs, this experience itself being stimulated by them

*W.F.Howard, "The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation," 1931, pp.158ff. **E.F.Scott, op.cit.pp.46ff. ***ibid, chs.III-IV.
****A.E.Garvie, "The Beloved Disciple," 1922, p.75.

It does not follow that Jesus was there alone with Nicodemus, and our witness may have been there along with other disciples. Into his mind there entered the germs of that conversation, later to be recalled, meditated upon, and interwoven with other ideas in his mind from what he had observed of Jesus, and the discourse comes to fruition in the light of later mystical experience, and viewed through Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension.

The discourse on the bread of life (vi.26ff.41ff.) takes what many have felt to be a sacramentarian turn, but here again, the recalled words of Jesus have been reinterpreted in the light of later mystical ideas. Moreover, the sayings may have been grouped by the later interpretation, or indeed by the disciple.* As he recalled the words he would not always be sure of the occasion, he would remember only portions here and there. Jesus must have spoken at one time on the bread of life and cognate themes, and as his words came into the memory of the witness they combined with other impressions, meditated and brooded upon, and finally brought into a sort of speech containing words which Jesus may have spoken on different occasions.

The discourses to the Jews (vii.15ff. 28ff. viii.131ff. etc.) are apparently emphasized in view of the later Jewish attacks on the Christian Church towards the end of the century. Jesus undoubtedly had plain words to say to the Jews** and some of these sterner

*Cf. the grouping of Jesus' sayings in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount (Mt.v-vii).n. **As we see from the Synoptic Gospels (Mk.ii. 25-27.iii.28-29,etc).

words have found a place through the recollections of our witness, although it is likely that the more bitter sayings are due to the later polemic rather than to Jesus or to his disciple's reminiscences. Such ~~of~~ sayings as "You are of your father the devil" (viii.44) are due to the later imperfect Christian experience rather than to imperfection in Jesus.*

The discourses in the Upper Room particularly reveal the experiential process we have outlined. Jesus and his circle of friends formed a 'Chaburah', ^{and} met together to celebrate the Passover Kiddush** at which the conversation turned on the deep things of the religious life. The connection of the Last Supper with the Kiddush ceremony*** gives at once points of contact between what was usually spoken at Kiddush and the ideas of John xiv-xvii. Dr.Oesterley enumerates points such as the Vine (xv.lff.), the teaching on which would be quite natural in view of the importance of the Kiddush Cup;**** the completion of Christ's creative work (xvii.4f.) recalls the finishing of the work of Creation with the hallowing of the Sabbath in the Kiddush blessing; the election of Israel with Jesus choosing his friends(xiii.18,xv.16,19), and the experience of joy which was a feature too (xv.11,xvi.22,xvii.13). All these items are selected examples of Kiddush echoes, and while as Dr.Oesterley points out, ~~that~~ they corroborate the fact that the Last Supper was the Kiddush

*If this experiential principle were kept in mind criticisms of the character of Jesus such as Lenwood makes ("Jesus, Lord or Leader," 1930. pp.57f) would be seen to be irrelevant. **W.E.Oesterley, "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy," 1925, pp172. ***For this, cf. pp. 425f. ****op.cit.pp170ff.and see below, pp. 432f.

meal leading to the Passover,* at the same time they indicate that there is a larger nucleus of genuine utterances of Jesus in the farewell discourse than is sometimes supposed.

Aided by the Kiddush atmosphere the disciple we have in mind received the germinal ideas of what Jesus said. Later on, in his meditative moods, these came back to the memory, the association of ideas bringing to light once more many sayings of Jesus, and all gathered up in the form through which they passed in his mind. In the course of time this original deposit received interpretations from the later developments of the Christian experience, while there may be sayings that were uttered on other occasions, all blended in the processes of reminiscence.

There is some reason therefore for discerning behind the Fourth Gospel a genuine experiential basis in the impressions and experience of the disciple who was more spiritually receptive than his friends. We obtain a glimpse of his personality in several places,** though he is not to be regarded as the author of the gospel, albeit he was the ultimate authority for much of the tradition on which the author drew.***

*op.cit.p.172. **xiii.23,cf,xix,26,xx.2; ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἰς
 τὴν γαστήρα καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ πατρὸς. It is tempting to see in the personality of this beloved disciple none other than John, the son of Zebedee. Who would be more likely to be this receptive one than this disciple who was found within the inner circle of Jesus' disciples (Mk ix.2,xiv.33,Mt xxvi.37)? If this suggestion were truly founded, the fourth gospel would have at its heart the religious experience of this apostle. But the evidence is against any such identification. (1) The divergence of the Johannine stream of tradition from the more usually accepted Synoptic one, based through Mark on apostolic authority (cf.the Papias tradition above,

p13), suggests the unlikelihood of another apostle being the authority for it. (2) The personality of the beloved disciple seems to be on a higher level from what we can glean about the son of Zebedee. The latter name calls up at once ambitious disputations as to the greatest in the kingdom (Mk x.35,41) and their misunderstanding of Jesus as to suppose the kingdom to be the conventional apocalyptic one with the chief places reserved for James and John; the perverse spirit of vindictiveness displayed in their desire to call down fire upon the churlish Samaritans (Lk ix.54), the narrow jealousy which attempted to hinder another from doing good in Christ's name on the ground that he did not belong to the inner circle of authority (cf. the force of the imperfect ἐκλάουσεν in Lk.ix.49), all point to Mark's reference to John and his brother James as "sons of thunder" (iii.17). Such a temperament "reflects little either of the nature we would look for in one deemed worthy of such peculiar intimacy with Jesus, nor of the spirit of the gospel to which tradition has attached his name" (Macgregor, op.cit.pzxliv). (3) This fiery disciple may have become transformed into the gracious personality which tradition has associated with the apostle's old age (so Iren. preserved in Eus.H.E.v.8, cf.iii.23,v.20). But the beloved disciple meets us as a gracious figure in personal contact with Jesus at the time when John the son of Zebedee was known as a son of thunder. (4) Since John disappears from the New Testament, although there is no explicit reference to this, the probabilities are that one of his nature would belong to the definitely Judaic element of the primitive church. If so, the anti-Jewish speeches in the gospel would be difficult to reconcile with the apostle's outlook. Indeed the anti-Judaic tone of the gospel is in itself almost sufficient to deny any possibility of apostolic authorship, since the apostles were largely ranged on the side of Jewish law and requirements in the church (cf.pp.381 ff).

The disciple whom Jesus loved was not numbered with the twelve, yet he was present with Jesus in the Upper Room at the farewell meal, as he was also on other occasions. His spiritual receptiveness was responsible for the beginning of another set of traditions about the life and words of Jesus, and it is possible ~~that~~ since he did not belong to the apostolic circle, that whatever contribution he made to the increasing store of reminiscences in the primitive church would not receive the needful apostolic authority. Hence the tradition based upon his religious experience appears to have

taken its own way, and becoming centred in some particular circle of Christian believers, became the nucleus from which a later age produced the Fourth Gospel. Hence this gospel has a direct authority given to it from personal experience of the ways and words of Jesus; an experience which in the first place sprang from the possession of a receptively spiritual consciousness of an eyewitness who saw and heard, and who meditated over and brooded upon it all in the light of an experience at once spiritually discerning and having the power to take in and reproduce with all the richness of a mind's content centred in love for the Master who loved him, with the resultant spiritual intimacy that showed its fruits in the experiential nucleus of the Fourth Gospel.*

Our survey of the New Testament sources for the primitive church needs to be completed by a reference to possible information that may be obtained from literature other than these documents.

(1) The Old Testament has profoundly influenced the primitive church experience. Jesus himself was nurtured on the Law and the Prophets. His followers were "a conventicle within the synagogue, rather than a sect,"** and were therefore pious Jews with the utmost reverence for their traditional scriptures. The primitive church appeal to the Old Testament as supporting the Messiahship of Jesus

*"It belongs to such a character to take ideas and truths into the mind so that they become a part of the very self, and only when they have been thus appropriated and absorbed, to give them utterance and expression" (W. Richmond, "The Gospel of Reminiscence," in the Church Quarterly Review, Jan. 1933, pp. 172f.). **G. F. Moore, "Judaism," Vol. I. 1927, p. 90.

and the need of his suffering and death, together with the resurrection, illustrates the apologetic use made of Israel's sacred writings to reinforce the message of the primitive church (cf. Acts ii.25).*

(2) "It may be said...that a knowledge of Apocryphal literature is even more essential for the study of the New Testament than a knowledge of the Old Testament itself."** It is the Apocalyptic writings of the apocryphal literature that have profoundly influenced the primitive church. The part these play in the religious inheritance and environment of the earliest believers will be investigated in the next chapter.***

(3) The New Testament Apocrypha with its counterparts in Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses, ~~which~~ grew up luxuriantly during the earliest centuries of the Christian era.**** Of all these it is enough to say that they belong to much later periods than the Apostolic Age, and are prolific in legends, phantasies, extravagancies and absurdities, by the side of which the canonical gospels stand out in their freedom from such characteristics. The Gospel to the Hebrews, however, has some claim to our consideration, but unfortunately we know of it only from a few fragments preserved in the writings of the early church Fathers, Jerome being the principal source of information.† It seems to have originally existed in either ~~a~~ Hebrew or Aramaic and had sufficient resemblances to Matthew's gospel ~~as~~ to have given

*See next chapter, pp. 74ff. **H.T. Andrews, "The Apocryphal Books," 1908, p6) ***The Book of Enoch, especially its Similitudes xxxvii-lxxi, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, the Psalms of Solomon, with which Daniel should be classed, are the chief literary influences on N.T. ****M.R. James, "The Apocryphal New Testament," 1924, ~~ibid.~~ pp. 1-8.

rise to the idea that it was the original Hebrew of that gospel. But few scholars accept this now. Although the Aramaic tradition of the primitive church was soon rendered into Hellenistic Greek, doubtless Aramaic tradition still lingered in the Jerusalem church, and gave rise to the Gospel to the Hebrews, an independent version in Aramaic, compiled probably for the use of the Jewish-Christian churches in Palestine. Since this Judaeon Christianity was to stagnate in the backwater of its own conservatism, so did its gospel fade into insignificance, odd fragments being preserved here and there in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. "Its anonymity, its primitive character, and the authority it afterwards enjoyed, point to a very early origin. It may have come into existence about the same time as the Synoptic Gospels, and in obedience to some at least of the same motives as led to their appearance."* This gospel may reasonably be used therefore to interpret the religious experience of the primitive church.** The heretical Gospel of Peter is sometimes used as evidence for the resurrection appearances, but its late date, viz. the latter half of the second century calls forth the greatest caution in the use of it for the primitive church life; while the obviously legendary elements in it ^{do} ~~does~~ not inspire much confidence in its value.*** The Agrapha or Sayings of Jesus are a

*Allan Menzies, HDB Extra Vol. 1909, p. 343. **e.g. in its description of the resurrection appearance to James, cf. Jerome, 'De Illustr.' 2, trans. M.R. James, op. cit. p. 3. ***Gardner-Smith approves of the resurrection evidence, "The Narratives of the Resurrection," 1926, pp. 103ff., which however is described as "a fantastic description of the coming forth from the tomb, worthy of a nursery tale" (Mackinnon, op. cit. p. 291). Cf. Rendel Harris, "The Newly-Recovered Gospel of St. Peter," 1893, pp. 59ff.

group of some logia attributed to Jesus, and found ^{mainly} among the Oxyrhynchus papyri. They may possibly preserve genuine elements of tradition, but no satisfactory solution of them has been yet forthcoming.* (4) One book alone needs consideration among the wealth of the literature of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, viz. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," or the Didache, as it is often called. Neither the problems of its literary origins ^{nor those} and ^{of its} date have been solved in a way that commands general agreement.**

Dr.C.Taylor inclines to the view that the Didache came down from the primitive age in which the Christian faith had divided off from its parent Judaism, and concludes that it must be regarded, "in whatever may be its original form, as a genuine fragment of the earliest tradition of the Church."*** But the primitive church goes further back than the age of separation. There are however good grounds for the view that the eucharist prayers preserve genuine elements of primitive church experience.****

*cf.M.R.James, op.cit.pp.25,33f. for translation. **For a full discussion of these cf.J.V.Bartlet in HDB,Extra Vol.pp.438ff. The various dates fluctuate between 70 and 140 AD; "the way in which the book bears on debated questions has some influence in leading different minds to lean in the one direction or in the other," so Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church,"1902,p.59. Perhaps Bartlet's verdict may be taken as the best among many possibilities; "it seems best best to say with confidence, 'before rather than after A.D.100,' and with diffidence, 'A.D.80-90 is the most likely decade known to us,'"ibid. p.449 and footnote. ****"The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,"1886,p.118. *****See discussion on this,pp.447f.

CHAPTER II THE RELIGIOUS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND
OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH EXPERIENCE

"It is not possible," says J.S.Haldane, "to distinguish personality from the concrete environing interests and values associated with it."* This is true also if the personality be that of a group or the solidarity of a social entity. The religious outlook of the primitive church was in many respects so similar to that of Jewish faith and piety that ^{it was impossible} to be in the realm of the one without being to a large degree within the orbit of the other.

Many years were to elapse before the church became sufficiently aware of itself over against Judaism, i.e. as a distinct and separate community of salvation such as we are able to distinguish in the epistles of Paul. But at its primitive stage it is scarcely possible to distinguish it from its background in many ways. "Christianity had its roots in Judaism, and to the Jewish influence it owed more incomparably more than to any other,"** although this judgment needs qualification inasmuch as Judaism is a later form of the faith of the Hebrews as reflected in the Old Testament and did not rest too securely on the prophets and their inward emphasis. It is the religion of Israel as the experiential basis of the contemporary

*"The Sciences and Philosophy," 1928, p.257. **E.F.Scott, "The Gospel and its Tributaries," 1928, p.23.

religious background that is significant for the primitive church.

A. THE INHERITANCE.

A long religious history, the earlier phases of which were encircled by the mists of myth and legend, lay behind the primitive church. Israel looked back to Abraham as its great ancestor blessed by God; descent from the patriarch was the sure guarantee of being incorporated within the chosen people, and it was taken so literally that even John the Baptist warned his hearers that the connection may not always hold good (Mt iii.9). The significant figure of Moses looms up from the past as he led the tribes away from bondage in Egypt, a deliverance to which subsequent ages looked back as the classic episode of God's intervention in redemption. Around his name there was gathered in the course of a long development what is called the "Torah;" taking its start from an original deposit of commandments laid down at Sinai, it gradually attached to itself numerous precepts and statutes as Israel's religious experience unfolded during the ages. On the basis of the Sinai covenant Moses unified a number of Semitic tribes into the beginnings of a nation, the basis of the unity being the common belief in the tribal God, Yahweh. The subsequent religious history of Israel is the story of the purifying of this belief as the tribes settled down in Palestine, conscious of themselves as a nation chosen by Yahweh. The significant personality here is David, whose gifts and prowess brought about national unification under his sovereignty, and

who acquired by conquest the mountain citadel Jerusalem, where Israel was destined to place its national shrine. Future ages, disillusioned by civil strife and political vicissitudes were to look back on the reigns of David and his illustrious son Solomon as the golden age of Israel. This age was idealized in the spirit of utopian phantasy which forgot its barbarism and limitations and ^{was} ultimately used ~~it~~ as the symbol of the ideal divine sovereignty for which the earnest expectation of the nation yearned. At the same time, aspiration centred on the desire for a deliverer from contemporary troubles, a desire which came to the front during the Exile in Babylon. This ~~delivered~~ ^{deliverance} was usually conceived to spring from the Davidic dynasty, which went back to the king whose rule meant such prosperity and happiness for the nation.

Thus the germs of two ideas destined to come to full expression in the outlook of the primitive church, are seen in their initial activity in the religious experience of Israel. These ideas are the Kingdom of God and the advent of the Messianic Redeemer.

The prophets were the most potent spiritual educators of their nation. Amidst the world-shaking rivalries that existed between the respective ancient empires of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, with Palestine as a sort of buffer state with the complex political conditions thereby occasioned, the prophets sought to guide their people along the lines of obedience to the will of God. This caused them to be the moral critics of both state and nation with their familiar and constant affirmations of coming disaster as due to the divine judgment upon ^{the nation's} ~~their~~ apostasy and failure in discerning

the religious implications of contemporary events.

On the other hand, the prophets represent a type of religious experience which makes them the true antecedents of the religion of Jesus, whether expressed in himself or in the faith of the Christian preachers. The final stage of Israel's faith issued in the enthronement of Torah. The exilic and post-exilic leaders of Israel rewrote and restated the ancient history, traditions and law codes,* and the question as to the nature of Israel's true religion and its essential requirements began to find its answer in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah along the lines of closer devotion to precept and statute. Later developments brought out the answer more fully as the Torah, together with the traditions that grew out of its interpretation,** received so exalted a position that there was "created the illusion which was to last for centuries that the religion of Israel began with a Law."*** Historical and critical investigation of the Old Testament within more recent times, however, has exploded this idealization, replacing it by a more specific understanding of the historical facts and the psychological probabilities. Israel's religion is now seen, in the course of a long development to be a gradual purification from the primitive tribal faith in a tribal deity with whose name was associated a deliverance from Egypt and with whom a covenant was made. The

*cf. the 'P' elements in the Pentateuch and the post-exilic rewriting of the history in I and II Samuel as we have it in I and II Chronicles

**cf. τὰν κερύβειον τ. κερύβειον Mt. xv. 2. For an account of the literature embodying these traditions, cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit. pp. 125-216

***W. Sanday, "The Oracles of God," 1891, p. 155.

experience of God was gradually enlarged until the view of God inherent in the idealized Torah came to expression in three distinct values: (1) God's personality could not be expressed in any material form, yet was limited by localization to the Holy of Holies; (2) God came to be viewed as the divine sovereign of heaven and earth, and was thus the One God, yet with the limitation that only a selected nation could be regarded as His people; (3) God's moral majesty came to be seen in its fuller meaning, yet that moral character was looked on still as ^{of} the God who placed ritual requirements on the same high level as the moral demands of His holiness.* The significance of these limitations to the progress of Israel's faith will be seen at a later stage.**

The prophets were the spiritual mediators of these far-reaching developments of Israel's growth in experience of God. They were the true spiritual discoverers; the limitations that still hampered the national religious outlook were there in spite of all that the prophets did to remove them. The growing legal emphasis, however, was to become too much for prophetic religion, and Israel's piety

*The large non-moral element of Divine revelation in the Law, ^{is} due to survivals from tribal and pre-prophetic usages **which** "are all placed on the same level of authority as the moral elements" (H.W. Robinson, "The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament," 1913, p. 42. C.G. Montefiore writes **of** "the drawback or misfortune of such a code was its equal accentuation of the ceremonial and the moral" (Hibbert Lectures, 1892, p. 478). This significant fact is not to be turned by the view that "the majority of the purity laws applied only to priests, or to laymen who had occasion to enter the temple" (I. Abrahams, "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels," 2nd. Series, 1924, p. 200), for even this is a confession that to be ceremonially pure is on the same high level as moral excellence. Circumcision was one of these hyper-rational and non-moral elements rightfully placed by Paul among the non-essentials.

began to centre entirely in the Law.* The Maccabean revolt intensified the Jewish Law on its uncompromising side still further.

But it should not be assumed that Hebrew religion became a system of legal ^{petrification} petrification. Along with the legal transformation there existed the piety expressed in many psalms which sing the praise of hearts whose experience of God and whose joy in following the requirements of His Law became very real factors in the creative spiritual life of both individuals and the nation as a whole. We are reminded that if there was a development of the sacrificial system in a form not known before, this was due to an increasing awareness of sinfulness with a corresponding growth in the need and means of expiation.** It is important to notice this sense of sin so increasingly accentuated in the religious background of the primitive church experience, for here we have a valuable corrective to the modern tendency to discover the origins of Christian salvation in Greek religious experience as seen in the Mystery Religions. The Jewish background supplies the needful categories for interpreting the death of Christ and his redeeming work in connection with sin.

While on the one hand prophetic religious experience tapered off into the enhancement of legalism, on the other hand it was transformed

*"With the Second Isaiah the golden age of Hebrew religion comes to an end. Prophecy dwindles in quality after the return from captivity, and is gradually transformed into apocalyptic. Legalism is more and more in the ascendant" (A.S. Peake in "The People and the Book," 1925, p288).
 **Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, "Hebrew Religion," pp296-9) details these sacrifices and reveals the sense of sin they were intended to expiate:
 "Whatever the causes...during the post-exilic period a deeper sense of sin prevailed. And nothing witnesses to this so clearly as the development of the sacrificial system."

into apocalyptic. "Like the Persians who remembered Cyrus as a Father, Cambyses as a master, Darius as a tradesman, the Hebrews... cherished the memory of David as the symbol of a glorious past, and the highest embodiment of their hopes for a happier future."* Here is the start for the apocalyptic ideas of a later period, along with the scion of David who is to rule in God's name when the expected divine government appeared, this being the germinal idea of the future conception of Messiah's person and office.**

The 'Servant' passages need comment here,*** in view of the primitive church apologetic used to account for the otherwise inexplicable suffering and death of Jesus Messiah.**** Despite G.A.Smith's pleading,‡ it is very doubtful whether the Suffering Servant foreshadowed Messiah; the chief difficulty in any such identification lies in the synthesis assumed of the ideas 'Messiah' and 'suffering.' It is by no means certain "that there were already traces in Hebrew prophecy of a suffering Messiah,"‡‡ Isa vii. with the 'Immanuel' sign to Ahaz cannot be adduced, for the connection of suffering with 'Immanuel' is obscure. It is doubtful, ^{moreover} however,

*A.Robertson, "Regnum Dei," New Edn. 1908, p.17. **In Isa.ix.6f. the ruler portrayed is of the Davidic dynasty and he is dignified by several titles which serve to demonstrate the uniqueness of the prince to be set over the kingdom of God's righteousness. So in Isa.xi.1-5 the Davidic descent is stressed and the character of the ruler depicted in some detail. Cf. G.B.Gray's note in his Commentary on Isaiah, ICC, Vol. I. 1912, p.218, and H.W.Robinson, op.cit. pp.200f. Both these scholars stress the fact that the emphasis in these passages is on the government to be exercised by the ruler, rather than on anything he himself may do to bring the desired rule into being. ***Isa.xii.1-4, xlix.1-6, l.4-9, especially lii.13-liii.12. ****cf. Acts iii.13, 26, viii.32-5, I Pet.i.19, ii.22f. iii.18. ‡"The Book of Isaiah," Vol. II. chs. xvi-xx. ‡‡ibid. p.278.

whether this passage is Messianic at all.* There is no doctrine of a Messiah who suffers to be found anywhere in the Old Testament, and even "up to the time of Jesus, the Jews did not expect their Messiah to die. For them, as for Peter,** that would have been almost a contradiction in terms."*** The very fact that the necessity of Messiah's death had to be so constantly stressed, not only in the primitive church but in Paul's teaching to his fellow Jews,**** is a sure indication that the synthesis 'Messiah' and 'suffering' was an innovation in Jewish thought.

It is better, therefore, to keep the Messianic idea or the germs of it in the Old Testament, distinct from the place of suffering in the Servant of God. The former took its rise from national aspirations for the return of the glories of the Davidic age, the latter emerging from prophetic insight into the place of suffering in the divine purpose.† "Though the passages (i.e. those which speak of the Servant) have a close bearing on Christ's Messianic work, they were certainly not regarded by the Jews as Messianic before the time of our Lord. In the Talmud the Suffering Servant is sometimes regarded as equivalent to Messiah suffering with His people; and Justin (Dial. Trypho, 68f) makes his Jewish interlocutor accept the doctrine of the Suffering Messiah. But this does not point to a general Jewish belief, nor is there any trace of the latter in the Gospels."‡

*J. Skinner, Commentary on Isaiah, Cam. B. Vol. I. Revised Edn. 1915, p. 67.
 Mk. viii. 32f. and see pp. 153, 185-187. *W. D. Mackenzie, in ERE, Vol. VII. 1914, p. 514. ****Cf. I Cor. xv. 8, Gal. iii. 13. †H. Schultz sums up the ‡J. A. MacCulloch, art. "ESCHATOLOGY" V. p. 377b.

significance of the 'suffering servant' idea as follows. "This figure was of supreme importance for the whole development of the Old Testament religion...When Israel was first brought face to face with the idea that suffering might fall upon a saint without being deserved as a punishment, it was only after a hard struggle and many a bitter trial that it succeeded in making this thought its own. The whole Book of Job proves how distressing, how wellnigh unbearable, this idea was at first considered. Still more powerfully must the traditional views of Israel have been changed by the prolonged experience of such special suffering on the part of the very best among them. And suffering, due to God's gracious will and mysterious counsel, borne vicariously by the guiltless as an atonement for the people, which finds deliverance on account of its connection with the suffering servant of God, - such suffering must cast a new light...The greater the emphasis laid upon the office of the servant of Jehovah, upon his call to do the work of God upon earth, the more significant did the figure of the suffering righteous man necessarily become. For it was thus made clear that the innermost secret of successful work for the kingdom of God is self-sacrificing suffering, vicarious self-surrender. When the picture of the servant of Jehovah became embodied to the eye of the prophets, in an ideal person, it was in the figure of a prophet labouring faithfully, not only by word and deed to build up the kingdom of God, but by loving surrender of his own person, by vicarious suffering, to make atonement for the people" ("Old Testament Theology," Eng. Tr. 1898, Vol. I. pp 919f.).

The significance of this 'suffering' element in the religious inheritance of the primitive church which sprang from faith in a Messiah who suffered and died, cannot be overestimated. For the early believers were not strange to the religious value of suffering to make atonement, and once the necessity of Messiah's death was grasped, the step was inevitable to view that death as having some potent bearing on sin and forgiveness (cf. pp. 376ff.).

With regard to the possibility of foreign cultural and religious influences which may have entered into the Jewish inheritance, little need be said here. Cultural contacts with Egypt there may have been, but the closely knit life of the tribes in bondage, and later the national consciousness struggling amidst its Canaanite environment

precluded any wholesale appropriation of Egyptian influences. The moral guidance of the prophets provided the guarantee that Israel's faith should not be lost amidst the syncretism of the pagan culture and religion of the diverse peoples that dwelt in the same land or surrounded it on its borders. The exile in Babylon was probably the most potential of possible alien influences, for the exiles came into contact with Babylonian culture at a time when the national consciousness was far removed from the primitiveness of the tribal outlook. Moreover, the protracted stay in the alien empire gave cultural influences an opportunity of operating unconsciously on the outlook of the exiles, while those who preferred to stay altogether instead of returning to Palestine came under greater dominance of Babylonian and Persian ideas and culture, all of which in return reacted upon their religious experience, and through this may have been transmitted to the people who had returned to their native land. The possibility that Israel found the sources for her apocalyptic outlook here needs to be kept in mind.

Such questions as to whether the figure of the servant of the Lord found its origin outside Israel's piety can only be settled within the sphere of comparative archaeology, oriental thought-forms as seen in religion, and the relation of Israel's own life and faith thereto. To quote one example, "the servant of Yahweh who is described in the songs...is, in the highest sense, a figure of the Deliverer. He is, speaking in "Babylonian," a figure of Tammuz embellished by the prophet." Such is the theory of A.T. Jeremias

formulated from his study of oriental analogies,* while such scholars as Zimmern,** Gunkel,*** and later, Gressmann,**** also look for the 'servant's' origin amid the widely influential religious ideas of the Near East. The individual reference of the 'servant' in Israel's outlook, is by no means established,‡ while Jeremias' view is inadequate in view of the fact that the expected deliverer is not to be equated with the suffering servant. Clemen, with his unique knowledge of the non-Jewish sources of the Christian faith, rejects the conclusions of this school of critics.‡‡

We may therefore conclude from our summary of the inheritance to which the primitive church became heir, that it was characteristically Jewish. From the religious experience of Israel there emerged certain specific ideas and concepts which moulded the psychological approach to the new faith which came into being around the personality of Jesus. The inheritance carried with it more than psychology and theology; it provided a religious experience of God and the soul which within its limitations, proved to be a noteworthy and fitting cradle for the new faith.

B. THE RELIGIOUS ENVIRONMENT.

The Judaism of the days of Jesus and amidst which the primitive ^{church} came to its birth had moved on beyond the confines of the simple ~~limit~~

*"The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East," Eng.Tr.1911, Vol II.p.278,cf.Vol I.p.100. **"Keilinschriften und Bibel nach ihrem religionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhang," 1903,pp.384ff. ***Zum religionsgeschichtliche Verständnis des Neues Testaments," 1903,p.78. ****"Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie," 1905,pp321f ‡cf.J.Skinner's discussion,op.cit.Vol II.pp263-270. ‡‡op.cit.pp149f.

limits foreshadowed by Ezra and Nehemiah. At the same time, that ultimate consensus of Rabbinic opinion as to the real content and essence of Judaism, and known as Rabbinic Judaism, was not reached for some two centuries or so after the life of Jesus. Hillel and Shammai were still hotly controverting one another in their respective schools as to what Judaism was, as the Christian era came into being. The conquests of Alexander, the Hellenistic upheaval in Palestine through Antiochus and his successors, and finally the supremacy of the Romans, all enlarged and disturbed Israel's religion with the increasing contacts that resulted. The syncretism of the age did not leave the Jews alone as there mixed with the older Hebrew ideas those of Babylonian cosmology, of Persian eschatology, with the developments in good and evil spirits, and the infiltration of the wider ideas of the Hellenistic world. This is not to say that Israel borrowed widely from these sources, but the contacts of the races through the expanding trade and commerce of the world opened up innumerable points of approach among the peoples of the Roman Empire, and the Jews were not isolated from such possibilities.

We must therefore expect to discern developments from the simpler faith of the old religion. We now come across Pharisees, scribes, Sadducees, we hear of the Essenes, we become aware of 'traditions' that have become associated with the law, of political Messianism, of angels and demons, of apocalyptic in a developed form, of synagogues everywhere. These are only a few of the newer elements that now confront us in the environment of the primitive

church as seen in contemporary Judaism.

But if this environment be a development upon the older faith of the inheritance of Israel, it must not be regarded as representing exactly the religion portrayed in the later rabbinic writings of the Talmud, edited during the long period of A.D.200-500.

It is necessary to consider this point in some detail. The religion of the Talmud does not stand for the faith of the people as a whole in the time of Jesus; it represents one section of the Jews, viz.that of the scribes and Pharisees, or rather, the successors of the scribes and Pharisees of the gospels. Further, the Rabbinism reflected in the later literature was edited as Christianity began to come into opposition with the Jews, ~~and~~ which resulted in the separation of the two in the second century. There was inevitable sharpening of divergence, not only on the Christian side, but also on the Rabbinic. In view of these elements it is more than likely that the Rabbinic Judaism of 300-500 A.D. was not quite the same as the scribal and Pharisaic Judaism in which Paul was trained. C.G. Montefiore does not consider this chronological gap too serious a difficulty as he passes quite smoothly from the Rabbinism of the later period to the first Christian generation in order to show that Paul was no pure Rabbinic Jew; "either the Rabbinic Judaism of 50 AD was not the Rabbinic Judaism of 500 or 300 (AD), or Paul at the time of his conversion was no pure Rabbinic Jew."* Mr.Montefiore inclines to the latter part of the dilemma he so succinctly states, but it is

*"Judaism and St.Paul,"1914,p.68.

just possible that the former part has a real enough measure of truth in it to suggest that the rabbinic idealization of the later centuries may represent differences from the Judaism of the time of Jesus as this in turn portrays differences from the simpler positions of the faith of Israel as represented by Ezra and Nehemiah.*

*The researches of Strack-Billerbeck ("Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud, u.s.w. (1922), and "Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutert aus Talmud, u.s.w. (1924), G.F. Moore ("Judaism" 1927), and C.G. Montefiore (Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings, "1930), have shed a flood of light on New Testament interpretation by reason of the numerous parallels found in the Talmud to the sayings in the Gospels, and which are quoted in cumulative fulness by these writers. All these new facts are a corrective to the former attitude when Judaism was overdrawn in unfavourable terms when compared with the religion of the Christian church.

At the same time, the tendency now is to go too far the other way. "The conviction that Jesus was Himself native to the outlook of Jewry has become so general that the problem nowadays is rather how so typical a Judaism ever developed into a distinct and world-wide religion. He was Himself a child of the synagogue who absorbed and appreciated the best of contemporary Rabbinism; He fastened upon aspects of religion which are not indeed original to Him but in Him were freed from less elevated ideals; He focussed the sublime teaching of Isaiah and Micah, the doctrines of the Shecinah and the Bath Qol into a single system; His purpose was not to destroy the law but to fulfil it, and His mission only contemplated the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Such is the familiar argument" (C.E. Raven, "Jesus and the Gospel of Love," 1931 p.245). Cf. a typical conclusion along this line, "The work and teaching of Jesus comes out of the main stream of Jewish development," with the added feature that Jesus intensified the ethical demands of Judaism and freed it from peculiar ethnic characteristics, Branscomb ("Jesus and the Law of Moses," 1930 pp.270f).

The idealization of Judaism in the later Rabbinic outlook should be given its full weight. In a lengthy review of G.F. Moore's "Judaism," Dobschütz says: "Es mag sein, dass die früheren Darstellungen, indem sie viele unbedeutende Einzelheiten in den Vordergrund stellten, Zerrbilder des Judentums geboten haben und das wir bei Moore eine richtige Korrektur finden. Aber ich kann nicht umhin, den Eindruck, den ich gewonnen habe, dahin zu formulieren, dass Moore nun nach der anderen Seite hin einseitig wird und ein Idealbild zeichnet, das auch nicht

zutritt" ("Das Judentum der Zeit Jesu in neuer Beleuchtung" in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1929, I. p. 131). Moore reveals a subtle tendency to take Rabbinic Judaism in its higher moods as indicative of the religious quality of the literature as a whole. For example, he gives full weight to Midrashim as the higher exegesis of scripture, but where a subject appears which hints of limitations in religious and ethical outlook such as the chastisement divinely sent to women dying in childbirth for neglecting three obligations exclusive to them, or children dying for the sins of their parents as divine retribution, he turns the edge of the inevitable criticism by the remark, that "most of the opinions recorded are mere midrash, which is not to be taken more seriously than it was meant" (op.cit. Vol II. p. 249). But why are not these to be taken as seriously authoritative expression of Rabbinic teaching as the noble passages, e.g. on the Father in heaven? Here we have an illustration of the idealization of Judaism which glosses over the more fantastic and absurd elements in the Rabbinical writings, and the whole taken together as the characterization of Judaism. "It seems characteristic of the Rabbinical tradition that it should put together...the ridiculous and the sublime without seeing the incongruity" (A.C. Headlam, "The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ," 1923, p. 82), and in any true estimation of the religion portrayed the higher and the lower features should be taken together. Rabbinism seems to have perpetuated the same mixture in the old faith of Israel in placing primitive ritual survivals and high moral requirements on the same level.

The use of parallels, further, carries with it certain handicaps. All the Rabbinic parallels to the Gospels are much later than the gospels, if the Rabbinic literature is any guide. First of all, they prove nothing in the way of dependence, while the possibility is open that Rabbinism may have been influenced by the spreading Christian faith. Secondly, if the Rabbis taught very much what Jesus did, and Jesus be likened to a typical Rabbi, how was it that the new faith which broke away from the national restrictions and became a gospel of world salvation centred around Jesus and not, e.g. round Hillel or Shammai? Thirdly, if Jesus was a product of embryonic Rabbinism, then why did he leave out so much that Rabbinism considered essential? The Rabbis are tested not only by what Jesus may be supposed to have taught on parallel lines to their doctrine, but by what he omitted. If Jesus drew on the Rabbis for some of his teaching on the mount (Mt. v), how much did he leave out from their writings, or what was afterwards gathered up in the Talmud? Finally, the contact of Rabbinism with the Christian faith as this went out into the ancient world, may have led the former to read back into the Law and the Traditions some of the distinctive religious experience and outlook of the Christian faith, much after the manner of Philo, who when confronted by intellectual challenge of Hellenism to the traditional Jewish

religion read back into the patriarchs and Moses many of the tenets of the wisdom of the Greeks and made Moses the true founder of Greek philosophy (cf. W. Fairweather, op. cit. pp. 174-179).

If the Rabbinism of 200-500 AD be not regarded as the typical religious expression of the Judaism of Jesus' age, where are we to look for this? The Gospels mention Pharisees who along with the scribes formed a religious brotherhood into which "they would admit only such as pledged themselves...to live in accordance with their fixed rules of piety, avoiding contact with the Am Ha-arez and sinners, and especially to observe the Levitical laws of purity at their meals."* With such exclusiveness, it is strange that Dr. Kohler goes on to state that the Pharisees represented the bulk of the law-observing Jews.** W. R. Arnold seems to place the Pharisees rightly: they form "a small minority superlatively embodying a certain tendency of thought and practice in the Judaism of Jesus' day but neither officially nor unofficially in control of the situation."*** Jesus' own remarks to them but illustrated the fact that they could be opposed or gainsaid or even criticised, whether in public or in private. Further there seem to have been degrees of Pharisaism according to whether more or less rigid forms of tradition were followed.**** They did not form a hard and fast society such as did the Essenes with constitution, bye-laws, or specific articles of faith.‡ The Sadducees, again, were made up from the Jerusalem nobility, and while mainly in control of the external religious affairs of the nation, they were not typical of the Judaism of Jesus'

* "The Origins of Synagogue and Church," K. Kohler, p. 109. ** ibid p. 110.
 *** "The Relation of Primitive Christianity to Jewish Thought and Teaching," Harv. Theol. Review, Vol XXIII, July, 1930, p. 169. **** Acts xxvi. 5.
 ‡ This closed religious corporation had little influence in Judaism.

time, or any time for that matter.

We are therefore left with the great mass of the people, who in a general way looked up to the religious leaders and regarded their theories with respect while making little pretence to follow their traditions. These were the 'am ha-aretz', the ordinary folk of the land. "We see around humble family hearths, simple men sincerely faithful to the precepts of the law, sighing after better times, and looking for a new Elias, whose powerful word should change the spirit of the nation, still rent by contending passions and rebellious against God."* These common folk were less meticulous about 'traditions;' they nourished their piety on the simpler requirements of the Covenant and the devotion of the psalms, and for them, the synagogue, rather than the temple, ~~the~~ Old Testament writings rather than the elaborate Pharisaic interpretation of it, were the norm and inspiration. Zacharias and his wife, both righteous before God (Lk i.6), Mary, the Jewish maiden who found favour in God's sight (Lk.i.28), and her betrothed who was devout and righteous (Mt i.19), Symeon waiting for the hope of Israel and Anna serving God day and night (Lk ii.34,36f), such were the types of the more lowly piety. Both in Galilee and Judaea there must have been many who frequented the synagogues, fed their aspirations on prophets and psalms, and awaited the redemption of Israel when he who was to appear should come.** Jesus came from this element of the population, and so did most of his disciples.

*E.Reuss,"History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age,"Eng.Tr. 1872,Vol I.p.110. **Lk xxiv.21,cf.i.68,ii.38,Acts i.6.

Galilee, however, seems to have been a province notorious for its patriotic fervour which sometimes found expression in a militant Messianism. Pontius Pilate had found them^{Galileans} sufficiently troublesome to discover some pretext for getting rid of a number of them by a massacre during a feast at Jerusalem (Lk xiii.1). One Messianic claimant had revealed himself with results catastrophic both to himself and the excited multitudes that clamoured around him (Acts v. 37). It is significant that the fatal rebellion which resulted in the overthrow of the holy city and the ruin of its temple had some of its origin, if Josephus is to be trusted, in the activity of John of Gischala, who, fleeing from his condemned Galilean town, reached Jerusalem. There, with the enthusiasm of many other Galileans who had also found their way into the city, he stirred up the Messianic nationalism which had such fearsome consequences (De Bell.J.III.1,2).

An appraisal of the religious environment of Jesus' day cannot be rightly made without some effort to understand the place and power of apocalyptic in the outlook of the Jews, especially in view of its significance for the emergence of the primitive church and its religious development. The Old Testament provided many of the germinal conceptions,* but the movement as such had its real origins in the period of trial preceding the Maccabaeen revolt, when the Book of Daniel was written to fortify the faithful in view of the impending persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes.** The important literary and

*For a detailed review of these, cf. R.H. Charles, "Eschatology," 1899, chs. I-IV. **Cf. W. Fairweather, "The Background of the Gospels," 3rd. Edn. 1920, pp. 95ff. 221. cf. "The apocalypses are the fruit of the new impulse given to Judaism by the Maccabaeen struggle," pp. 219f.

theological movement in Judaism thus begun, reached its climax in the Book of Revelation which encouraged the Christians in Asia Minor to stand firm in the coming persecution resulting from their refusal to engage in Caesar worship. Amidst this development there emerged the Christian church.

There is no need to resort to the psychology of phantasy and day dreaming with its principle of compensation creative of symbols and pictures to account for the power and prevalence of apocalyptic. We may point to the hardships of the community under Antiochus, or with Klausner,* admit the force of disillusion that came to Israel after the exile, but none of these circumstances warrant the conclusion that "the average religious mind...could only find refuge from insanity in fantasy,"** or that "Jewish fantasy, in the dire crisis of the national religious life when the first apocalypses were written, took the form of visions of supernatural and immortal triumph."***

(1) If Freud be our guide here, we find that phantasy is defined by contrast with actual reality, possessing "psychical reality, and we

*Commenting on the hopes raised by Deutero-Isaiah, Klausner says, "But what was the actual fact? Slavery to foreign governments, wars, tumults and torrents of blood. Instead of all nations being subject to Judah, Judah was subject to the nations. Instead of the "riches of the Gentiles," godless Rome exacted taxes and tribute. Instead of "kings being her nursing fathers," there comes Pompey and his army. Instead of the Gentiles "bowing down with their faces to the ground" and "licking the dust of their feet," comes a petty Roman official with unlimited power over Judaea. Instead of Messiah the son of David, comes Herod the Edomite" (Jesus of Nazareth, Eng. Tr. 1927, pp. 169f).

L. Dougall and C.W. Emmet, "The Lord of Thought," 1922, p. 14. *ibid. p. 15.

gradually come to understand that in the world of neurosis psychological reality is the determining factor."* Phantasy is of the realm of psychological reality over against actual reality, and plays an influential part in symptom-formation in neurosis.** Freud views the origin of phantasy-making as lying in the experiences of childhood, ~~and so~~ that the child simply reproduces in his individual experiences the true experiences of the human race as a whole in its prehistoric experiences.*** Phantasy enshrouds the history of childhood much as every race "weaves myths about its forgotten early history."**** Psychologically then, we should expect the Jews, to save themselves from insanity under duress of persecution; to go back to the past history of their race, and find compensation for present tribulation in the ethnic and national epics of long ago. On the contrary, we find the essence of apocalyptic to be a future consummation, with an unshakable conviction of ultimate triumph. If phantasy weaves its pictures around the future in day dreaming or building castles in the air, such phenomena are but on the surface, and apocalyptic is too deep rooted to be regarded in these categories, besides being more specifically consciously motivated and indulged in, whereas true phantasy belongs to the derivative of the unconscious mind.

(2) The idea that apocalyptic originated in phantasy implies that it was the production of individual and collective subconscious

*"Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis," Eng. Tr. 1922, p. 309.
 ibid. pp. 310-12. *ibid, p. 311. ****ibid. p. 308. Cf. J. H. Hadfield, "Psychology and Morals," 1923, p. 53; we are not here thinking of day-dreams, which are phantasies "in their most conscious phase" (Hadfield, ibid, p. 53), but those which result from the subconscious or unconscious life.

neurosis. The idea is that the painful experience of Israel would tend to be repressed and forgotten, until it was buried deep within the subconscious mind, and compensation found by visions of victory and triumph, the very reverse of the actual facts. The more stern the experience of actuality, the more phantastic the compensating pictures of victory. But in view of the continual disillusion and subjection, since except for the brief interlude of Judas Maccabaeus and his brethren, victory was never known, there would come a psychological breakdown altogether, leaving Israel a broken people seeking reality in phantasy and still more phantasy. This, however, is not Israel as history brings it to us, for there was no such breakdown, since Israel kept its faith in God at a high level all through, and this kept at a high pitch the morale of the people.

(3) Not to the delusions of phantasy-making as compensatory of evil must we look for the explanation of the rise and power of apocalyptic. Religious experience of an intense order, motivated by faith in God, is a surer basis for the true appraisal of this element in Judaism which passed over into the primitive church. Such faith, carrying with it the worship of the divine holiness, and devotion to precept and commandment, led the people to the certainty that God never failed them in their need, and that if He did, it would be because of their own sin and infidelity.

(4) The phrase of George Tyrrell, viz. "the truth value of visions" is more to the purpose than relying on the explanation of phantasy

*"Christianity at the Cross-Roads," 1909, p. 105.

with its associations of illusion and neurosis. We may allow, of course for an element of unwholesomeness in apocalyptic insofar as it may tend to drift away from human and historic conditions, or as luxuriant imagination is allowed to be in control irrespective of true religious insight and reality, but it is more probable that the psychology of apocalyptic will explore its subject along the line of the psychology of vision with its-subjective-objective medium of truth discovery, and the possibilities it possesses as a channel of revelation for the human spirit.*

(5) Apocalyptic vision with its picture thinking, its fervent symbolism and luxuriant imagery, finds its real significance in the religious experience of which these outward signs are no more than the varied, rich colourings of their external dress. It lies not in its visionary-ecstatic form, but in its religious content, in its moral and spiritual import.** We have further to allow for the probability that much of the luxuriant symbolism is no more than purely literary device and embellishment, much as a poet will adorn his verses with a wealth of a decorative imagery. We have to think back to the religious convictions which all these symbols and images seek to interpret. It may be largely true that the Old Testament prophets were preachers of righteousness only, and that the predict-

*cf. pp. 8, 12, 388 ff.

**Fairweather, op.cit. p. 253. "Every movement of consciousness is from the implicit and vague to the explicit and distinct. It unfolds itself in more definite feelings, impulses, images and even concepts. When the movement is sudden and strong, the image is sudden and strong. Its abruptness and force seem to detach it from the subjective series and so to throw it into the objective" (Tyrrell, op.cit. p. 107).

ive element is in the dim background at the most, yet "the ultimate test of prophecy was its conformity with actual history."* Now in actual fact many of the prophetic promises made to Israel were never actually fulfilled. The non-fulfilment set up a new problem for religious faith, and some attempt had to be made to solve it. Hence the new method was to make new prophecies of the apocalyptic sort, which, although prophetic, differed from the older prophecies in that they aimed at reconciling the golden promises of the future with the evils of the actual present.**

The acutest problem for Israel's religious experience based on prophecy was, as R.H.Charles points out, the failure of the consummation of the Messianic Kingdom.*** Other non-fulfilment was as nought before this disappointment at the heart of God's people. Jeremiah's prophecy of the restoration of Israel, blessed with the Messianic Kingdom and its Prince (xxv.11,xxix.10,cf.xxiv.5f.xxiii.5f.), Ezekiel with his elaborate reconstruction (xl-xlviii), the predictions of Haggai and Zechariah that the building of the temple would usher in the Kingdom (Hag.i.8,ii.6-9,20-23.Zech.iii.7-10,vi.12f.cf.iv.9), all ^{had been} _^

*H.W.Robinson,op.cit.p.119. **This process of reconciling and reinterpreting prophecies which did not materialize is of course found in the Old Testament. Ezekiel,e.g.reinterprets the predictions of Jeremiah (i.15,v.15,vi.22,x.22,xxv.9) and Zephaniah (i.10ff), that Judah would be invaded from the north; this foe never showed itself, and the prophecies were never fulfilled. So Ezekiel restates them by saying that 'Gog'(i.e.a mighty company) will one day invade Jerusalem from the north (xxxviii.8,16), and declares that this is the foe which the earlier prophets foretold (ver.17). Cf.Fairweather, op.cit.Note 30,pp.402f.and R.H.Charles,op.cit.pp.168-70. The predictive element in prophecy was undoubtedly of the essence of prophecy, and created many problems for the Israelites. Cf.E.Bevan,"Hellenism and Christianity,"1921,pp.211,215-220. ***op.cit.p.171.

uttered in vain. The Kingdom had not come as yet. This disappointment had to be continually reinterpreted. The Books of Daniel (168 BC) and Enoch lxxxiii-xc (161 BC) take up the strain of disappointment and reinterpret the older prophecies in thoroughgoing apocalyptic manner, pronouncing the imminence of the Kingdom in view of time calculations based on the 'seventy weeks' of Jeremiah prophecy of the years.* Once more the Kingdom tarried and the years pass by until we reach the age of Jesus and the primitive church, and still the kingdom had not arrived. Henceforth the primitive church was to enter upon this hope in an enthusiasm inspired by the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus.

The religious environment of the primitive church was highly coloured with ^{the} vivid apocalyptic hopes of contemporary Judaism. While it is by no means clear how far such influence potently swayed the religion of contemporary religion, it seems against the facts as we know them to say that, "the apocalyptic writings lie for the most part outside the line of the purest Jewish development and often present but the fringe or excrescence, and not the real substance of the dominating religious thought. The fact that the originals of those which were written in Hebrew or Aramaic are nearly all lost, partly show that they had no deep hold on the people, or were off the beaten track of the official religion."** (1) There is the obvious exception

*Dan ix.2,24; Jer.xxv.11f.xxix.12. **C.G.Montefiore, "The Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews," 1892, p.467. (Hibbert Lectures). Much the same position is maintained in this Jewish scholar's ~~article~~ "Contemporary Jewish Religion," in Peake's Commentary, 1920, pp.618, col i.624, col ii.

of the Book of Daniel which found its way ultimately into the Old Testament Canon, and as an apocalyptic document exercised great influence. Apocalyptic to this extent is recognized by official Judaism. (2) The argument from language is unconvincing, for the mere fact of the apocalyptic writings being translated into other languages is a tribute to their importance and influence. Such translations would be needed for Jews of the Diaspora and would disseminate apocalyptic influence everywhere among the Hellenistic Jews. Further, the disappearance of the Hebrew or Aramaic originals (excepting Daniel) is not sufficient evidence that these had no hold over the people any more than the disappearance of the original Aramaic tradition underlying the gospels proves that such tradition had no hold on the primitive church. As the gospels were ultimately written in Greek to meet the wider needs of the growing church, so the apocalyptic translations may well have been made to supply a much wider demand for them. (3) If apocalyptic be no more than on the fringe of Judaism, how are we to account for its presence in the outlook of Jesus and the primitive church?* Both Jesus and his disciples belonged to no particular school, but came mostly from Galilee. Further, if Jesus be regarded as a typical rabbi, how explain the apocalyptic in his teaching save through the Pharisaic piety which was destined, in the course of the years, to become **Rabbinism?**

When we consider the probabilities of the matter the likelihood

*For this, cf. below, pp. 177 f. 255 ff

is that no intelligent Jew could have been unaware of the apocalyptic writings or the ideas they disseminated everywhere. It was not simply ~~for~~ the love of the bizarre that called forth the ^{interest} ~~interest~~. Every pious Jew loved to meditate on the divine justice and the divine power to guarantee that justice which is assumed in the apocalypses. They obtained so strong a hold that the great Rabbis ultimately felt it incumbent to rid the orthodox Jewish religion of all belief in a supernatural catastrophe and its accompanying eschatological beliefs, much as the Council of Nicaea had to enforce its orthodoxy against the heresy of Arius which had grown sufficiently formidable to need so drastic a step. Would it have been necessary to proceed to such exclusion if what was to be excluded had not become dangerously influential, as they supposed?*

Therefore we have good reasons for thinking that there was a strong apocalyptic element in the religious environment of Judaism, which with its unsettled and undetermined condition, had no means of withstanding its influence as yet, since the formal unity of the Rabbinism of later centuries had not yet come into being. It is not unlikely that Galilee, if not the actual home of apocalyptic, provided

*Cf. T. Walker, "The Teaching of Jesus and the Teaching of His Age," 1923, p. 31. R. T. Herford says, "It is beyond question that these writings were widely read and extremely popular. If they had been only obscure productions, meeting no real or even imaginary want, they would not have been translated into other languages as they were" ("The Pharisees," 1924, p. 178). "Though the... literature has been deliberately excluded from official recognition and authority by the Rabbis, it is none the less important for the study and elucidation of Judaism" (Oesterley and Box, "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 2nd. Ed. 1911, p. 44), and we may add, for the religious experience of the primitive church which had this element also amid its environment.

a suitable milieu for the spread of the ideas. (1) The piety was nourished on the reading of the scriptures and an obedience to the law, but the law as the Old Testament stated it rather than in the casuist interpretations of the Traditions which the Galileans were content to leave to the scribes and Pharisees. (2) The general attitude of these and other leaders at the centre towards Galilee was not free from contempt, and this suggests that Galilee was no centre of what developed afterwards into Rabbinic Judaism; that the Pharisaic rule of greater strictness in the observance of law and tradition looked askance at the simpler piety of the common people; (cf. Jn vii.52).*

*Lest the attitude of the fourth gospel be taken as a partisan statement made at a time when there was hostility between the Jews and the expanding church, we may cite a saying ascribed to Jochanan ben Zaccai (Jerus. Shabbath, 15d.), a pupil of Hillel, and therefore a contemporary of Jesus. "Galilee, Galilee, thou hatest the law, therefore thou shalt yet find employment among robbers." Or the statement which Rabbi Dosa ben Harchinas is reputed to have made; "morning sleep, and midday wine, and children's talk, and sitting in the meeting houses of the vulgar, drive a man out of the world" (Pirke Aboth, iii.15, trans. by R.T. Herford in "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament," ed. Charles, Vol II. p701). This rendering should not hide from us the fact that the "meeting houses" were the synagogues, and the "vulgar" the 'am ha-eretz; the ordinary people defined by Herford in a note on Pirke Aboth ii.6 as denoting "all who for whatever reason did not seek to conform their lives and actions to the Torah" (ibid. p.695); i.e. the Torah which included the law and the many traditions which developed in time into Rabbinic Judaism and its orthodoxy. But as we have seen, these common people were devoted to the law, but were less interested in Pharisaic theories of what the law implied in the traditions (p.84). Was there not anything after all in the charge of Jesus about adding "burdens heavy to be borne (Lk xi.46)?"

(3) It is not unreasonable to deduce that the "vulgar" afforded in themselves good material for the spread of apocalyptic hopes,

especially in Galilee, where on the whole "the influence of the temple cult, of the priests who attended it...must have been remote and slight; that the absorbing study of the law was less felt; and that there was room for a freer and more imaginative religious development."* Here again, in the disciples and eyewitnesses of Jesus' life, we have the fertile soil for the primitive church provided in the religious experience and outlook of such people, and these empirical conditions need to be discerned as clearly as possible in the religious environment of the church.

The religious ideas in apocalyptic which have significance for the primitive church may be briefly reviewed.

(1) There is the expectation of the Kingdom of God with its roots in the prophetic conceptions of a divine kingdom to be set up on earth under the direct rule of God.** The members of this redeemed community were the righteous of the chosen people alive at its advent,*** but in the outlook of prophets whose vision was of a higher and wider order, the Gentiles were to be included, through repentance,**** and grouped around the righteous Israelites. The blessings of the divine age were spiritually conceived,‡ but expectations of material good were not absent.‡‡ The kingdom was everlasting as to its time factor,‡‡‡ "Every subsequent development of this

*Headlam, op.cit.p.118. **Isa ii.2f.iv.2f.5,xxiv.23,xl.3,lx.19, lxxv.17f. Zeph.iii.17f. Zech.ii.11. ***Ezek.xxi.25f.xxv.xxxv.Isa.xxxiv. Hag.i.2,Zech.i.18. ****Jer.iii.17,iv.1f.xii.16,xvi.19,Mic.iv.1f. Zech.ii.11. †Isa ii.2,xi.9,xxxv.10,Jer.xxxi.31f.Ezek.xxxvi.26,Zeph.iii.13. ‡‡Amos ix.13f. Isa.xxx.19,23f. xxxv.1f.7,Ezek.xxxiv.14,16,27,xxxvi.18,30,35. ‡‡‡Jer.x.10,Mic.iv.7.

conception, till it is reborn in Christianity, is due to apocalyptic literature."*

(a) The everlasting kingdom is established on earth following the divine judgment, at which the mountains shake and the earth is torn asunder, while God comes to Mount Sinai to execute judgment with myriads of His holy ones (En.i.). God sits on a throne to deliver judgment (En.xc.20), the scene^{to} the new Jerusalem on earth (En.xc.29). The judgments are unfavourable to the undeserving (cf. En.x.6,xiii,xxi.lf.xxvii.2,xc.26 T.S.vi.6,T.L.iii.2f.Sib.Or.iii.356-560); for the deserving, the righteous, both the living and the dead raised to life, there is to be a blissful life on an earth that has been cleansed, with many material blessings, long life, and the enjoyment of God's presence, while they shall never sin any more (En.x.17-xi.2). The risen righteous become like Messiah (En.xc.33ff.).

This sensuous conception of the kingdom, however, ^{is absent} in the Enochic Parables (En.xxxvii-lxxi). Here, heaven and earth are transformed for the righteous (En.xlv.4f. cf.the idea of heaven as a dwelling-place for the righteous).

As for the Gentiles, those who are left after the judgment become righteous and are found among those who praise and worship God (En.x.21); these have an opportunity to repent (En.l.2), the surviving are converted, and make spontaneous submission to Israel, so that Israel becomes the channel of the redemption of the Gentiles (En.xc.30-34). The sensuous kingdom set up on earth therefore finds

*R.H.Charles,"Between the Old and New Testaments,"1914,p.49.

a place for the worthy Gentiles, according to the noble universalism of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the author being, unlike ^{him} ~~he~~ who wrote Jubilees and taught that there was no hope for them (xv.31, cf. xxx.7-17), a true son of the larger-hearted prophets, boldly proclaiming the salvation of the Gentiles.* Here once more Israel is the means of bringing salvation to the Gentiles.

(b) The Kingdom on earth but of temporary duration is another conception found in apocalyptic, following on the sensuous conception which had somewhat discordant and incongruous elements, being at once earthly and yet of heaven, sensuous and yet offering spiritual experience for its participators, being the direct offspring of the prophetic germinal ideas.

The temporary kingdom has its classic exposition in Enoch xci-civ.** The kingdom actually emerges in the eighth world week, and the sinners are handed over to the righteous for destruction (En.xci.12, cf. 12-17, xciii, for the apocalypse of Weeks). The righteous ~~acquir~~ acquire houses and a temple is built (En.xci.13). The righteous judgment is revealed to the world in the ninth week, the tenth week sees the great Judgment; earth and heaven depart and a new heaven appears (En.xci.15-17). The righteous arise from their sleep (En.xci.10, xcii.3, ciii.4) while the wicked are thrown into Sheol and there confined evermore, thus bringing in the doctrine of hell (En.ciii.7f. cf. xcvi.3). The Book of Jubilees*** has the usual 'messianic woes'

*T.L.iv.4, viii.14, ii.11; T.S.vi.5; T.N.viii.3; T.Ash.vii.3; T.D.vi.7; T.J.xxv.5; T.B.ix.2, x.5. God understands all men, T.N.ii.5, and the law given to lighten every man, T.L.xiv.4. **134-94 BC. cf. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," ed. Charles, pp.171 (Vol II). ***135-96 BC. ibid. p.6.

prior to the coming of the kingdom; heaven and earth are gradually renewed conditionally upon man's nature being spiritually transformed (i.26,29;xxiii.13f.iv.26). But it is not clear whether the kingdom is eternal (i.26) or terminates with the Great Judgment (xxiii.30). The same uncertainty appears in the Psalms of Solomon, with its strong Messianic hope and its personal Messiah. The temporal kingdom is further seen in the Assumption of Moses, but even more clearly in the Apocalypse of Baruch (AD 50-70).* Here the kingdom is for the time being (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), enduring until "the world of corruption" is at an end (xl.3,lxxiii.1), and is sensuous in idea (xxix.4f). Messiah returns to heaven (xxx.1) and "the consummation of the times" reaches its climax in the Day of Judgment (xxx.3,lix.8, liv.15,21).

(c) At this point the idea of the hereafter appears and we reach the kingdom not of this world. Both the optimistic whose temporal kingdom leads on to eternal life for the righteous after the Judgment in the "new heaven," and the pessimistic who abandon the hope of a Messianic Kingdom at all on earth, at least in some quarters, reach this conception which is really "that of a Hereafter on the earth, so much so that after some modification it is resolved into a Hereafter proper."** The Apocalypse of Baruch is the best representative of the view which gives up the world as hopeless (xx.2,xxiii.7,xxv); a world is to appear which shall not die (xxxii.

*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. Charles, Vol. II. p.470. **T. Walker, op.cit. pp.99f.

●,xlvi.50,li.3).

(d) There was also that type of kingdom the conception of which was temporal and endeavoured to estimate its exact duration. Both Daniel and Enoch lxxxiii-xc base their calculations upon the seventy years which Jeremiah prophesied would elapse before God's rule would be established (Jer.xxv.12). The Book of the Secrets of Enoch develops the millenium theory afterwards to become so popular; the world was created in six days, each day being a thousand years on the basis of Psalm xc.4; there follows the seventh or Sabbath day's rest, also of a thousand years' duration, i.e.the temporal kingdom, now viewed as a Millenⁿium. Then follows the Day of Judgment, the righteous passing to their finalreward in Paradise, the wicked being cast into hell. Thus begins the eighth day of eternal blessedness when time should be no more (xxxiii.1.cf.xxv-xxxii).

Such were some of the ideas concerning the kingdom of God more or less contemporary with Jesus and the first believers in the primitive church. This sketch reveals diversity of outlook, but makes the strong eschatological setting of the kingdom clear, for apart from its eschatological associations, the conception of the kingdom as Jesus and his disciples knew it, cannot be understood.* All through we must keep in mind the intense nationalist consciousness inherent in the conception of the future golden age, with its political ideal of liberation from foreign rule as far as outer affairs were concerned, with the desired ideal for the inner life of the people in their religious and moral regeneration. This, of

*cf pp. 177-181

course, easily runs into the more specific eschatological outlook; the two aspects "run into each other and blend like the overlapping edges of two clouds."*

(2) E.Kautsch**issues a caution against confusing the personal Messiah with the broader conception of 'the Messianic era,' and taking predictions as Messianic where no personal Messiah is mentioned nor even assumed, although the reference to the expected kingdom is more or less explicit. In many prophets where the advent of the Day of the Lord is awaited, such as in Amos, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Joel, the Messiah finds no place, neither does he appear in the book of Daniel, nor in other apocalyptic writings such as Isa.xxiv-xxvii, nor in prophecies such as Isa.lx-lxii, lxxv-lxxvi. This same surprising characteristic is revealed in the non-canonical literature; no Messiah is found amid the eschatological expectations in Enoch (certain parts), the Secrets of Enoch, the Books of the Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, the First Book of Baruch, the Assumption of Moses, and the Book of Wisdom.

In the remaining literature the references to Messiah himself are surprisingly scanty. He appears with the kingdom, but is no more than a figure-head in Enoch lxxxiii-xc. In the Enochic Parables, however, (xxxvii-lxxi) we come across a sequence of ideas which are most significant. The personal Messiah appears, but not as a scion of earth, not even of the idealized Davidic dynasty. He is a supernatural being. Messiah is the "Anointed" one, i.e. 'the Christ,' (xlviii.10,

*Moore, op.cit. Vol.II.p324. **HDB, Vol.V.p.694, Col.ii.

lii.4); a title which had hitherto been applied to patriarchs (Ps.cv. 12,15), priests (Exod.xxix.7,xxx.30), prophets (unfrequent, but cf. Elisha's appointment, I Kgs.xix.15f.), kings (of Saul, I Sam.x.1, of David, xvi.13, of Cyrus, Israel's expected deliverer from exile, Isa. xlv.1), Israel as the appointed nation of God's purpose (Ps.cv.6, Hab.iii.13), is ascribed for the first time to Messiah, and in his ideal, superhuman dignity in association with the advent of the divine kingdom. The title therefore comes to be associated with supernatural attributes. The Messiah, again, is the "Righteous" one (En.xxxviii.2,liii.6), here a specifically Messianic designation, indicating a leading characteristic of the supernatural Messiah's nature, a significant title in view of its application to the exalted Jesus by the primitive church (Acts iii.14,vii.52). Further, the Messiah is the "Elect" one (En.xl.5,xlv.3f.xlix.2,4,li.3,5), the first appearance of such a title as applied to Messiah, and important for the church (Lk.ix.35,xxii.35). Finally, the Messiah is "the Son of Man" (En.xlvi.2f.xlviii.2,lxii.9,14,lxiii.11,etc), a distinct personal designation of the Messiah.* The demonstrative occurs in all these Enochic references except lxii.7, and the variants 'this' and 'that' Son of Man are due to the Ethiopic translator who renders consistently the Greek article by these terms as well as by the mere definite article itself.* The references therefore all point to the

*The Ethiopic is the extant version from which our knowledge is mainly derived of this section, and the Greek version from which the Ethiopic is made is itself a translation from either Hebrew or Aramaic. Cf. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," ed. Charles, Vol. II. pp173ff Cf. Charles' notes on En.xlvi.2, ibid.p.214. The linguistic factor tells against the view that the title means no more than 'man.'

personal Messiah as having among his distinctive titles that of "The Son of Man."*

The Messiah is viewed elsewhere as a descendant from Levi, and therefore comes of priestly stock, in fact he is a priest (T.R.vi.7-12, T.L.viii.14, T.J.xxiv.1ff.). Here he is not the superhuman being of the Enochic Parables, but a warrior against Israel's national enemies, Beliar, and the powers of wickedness (T.R.vi.12, xviii.12, T.D.v.10). He is free from sin (T.J.xxiv.1), and has power over evil spirits (T.L.xviii.12). High ethical qualities such as meekness and righteousness are ascribed to him (T.J.xxiv.1); he is to be the mediator for the Gentiles (T.L.viii.14). This is the characteristic conception of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.**

The Davidic Messiah appears in the Psalms of Solomon(xviif.); this human deliverer receives special power and endowments from God, being a "righteous" king and "taught of God"(xvii.35), "pure from sin" (xvii.41), and purging Jerusalem from sin (xvii.33). The ungodly nations are to be destroyed at his word (xvii.27), the remainder to be subject to him (xvii.31f.34,38). He is "the Anointed," i.e. "the Christ," (xvii.36, xviii.6,8), but in the human sense only. He is "a holy Prince" (Sib.Or.iii.49), to reign over the whole earth. The Levitical Messiah appears again in the "Fragment of a Zadokite Work."*** A "teacher of righteousness" has already appeared (i.7), and Messiah

*The linguistic data of the demonstratives in this title move Dalman to the desperate step of regarding the title references as interpolations, but his reasoning is inadequate ("The Words of Jesus," Eng.Tr. 1909, pp.289f). ***The Davidic Messiah appears in T.J.xxiv.5f. and perhaps in T.N.iv.5. ***R.H.Charles places this just prior to the Christian era ("Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" Vol.II. pp.787f.).

is on the point of coming to complete what his forerunner is announcing (ii.10,viii.2,ix.10,29,xv.4,xviii.8).

Amidst these sporadic associations concerning Messiah's personality we are able to discern two strains of thought. There is the "human" conception of Messiah as the wholly righteous representative of God's purpose. The scene of operations is in this world and age, with the sensuous conception of the kingdom in view. Strictly subordinate to God, his primary duty is to achieve for Israel political supremacy over all nations; hence a period of wars heralds his coming, but the result will be a reign of universal peace. The second series of ideas turns upon Messiah as "suprahuman" or "heavenly" in essence, a divine personality who ~~emerges~~ from his pre-existent state, no one knows how. He seems to be even, "supra-angelic", higher than the angels, and almost on an equality with God Himself. Things are to become as wicked as they may be, when the heavenly Messiah will intervene himself; at the close of the age he will set up the Judgment, and at this will act directly for God.

It should be carefully noted that there are not two Messiahs expected, but it is useful to discriminate between these two forms of the common hope; even then we must allow for some fluidity in the conceptions, for sometimes superhuman qualities are discerned in the human Messiah, and human traits may feature the heavenly.

In all these apocalyptic references to Messiah there is no association of his personality with the experience of suffering. This is what we expect in view of the regal character and function, ^{ascribed} ~~ascribed~~

of Messiah, whether human or suprahuman. Obviously, suffering would be regarded as being out of place in a being so majestic and princely.

There was also a prevalent belief that the immediate precursor of Messiah's appearance was Elijah **returning** as the forerunner (Mal. iii.23), while the Gospels afford evidence of a similar conception (Mk i.2,viii.28).*

The religious experience inherent in such Messianic expectations is vital for the primitive church. What is essential is not found in the attempt "to make a picture out of the dissected puzzle of prophecy or in the eschatological nightmares of the apocalypses, but...in the idea that the history of the world is a plan of God, and in the faith that He will carry it out to the end." "The value of the rest lay solely in that it helped men to give reality to their faith through an imaginative presentation."** It is true that world history and its desired consummation were looked at through Jewish prerogative, that the new world was to be divinely ordered politically, nationally and religiously in the interests of the Jews, with a Jew (the human messiah) as the vicegerent of God. But the cardinal expectation that history has its divine significance is a religious

*G.F.Moore quotes a Rabbinical saying that "unless Israel repented, they will not be delivered; and Israel never repents except out of tribulations and oppression and exile and want of a living. Israel will not make the great repentance until Elijah comes," and thinks the idea is older than the date of the Rabbinical writing concerned. Of course the idea is much older. The Gospels prove that in the religious background they unwittingly portray (op.cit.Vol.II.pp.358f).
**Moore,op.cit.Vol.II.p.323.

discovery motivated by moral insight which found its greatest expression in the emergence of the primitive church.

(3) The apocalyptic environment bequeathed to the primitive church certain ideas of resurrection, more advanced than what is given in the Old Testament conception which presents "a slow hesitating development."* This slowness of development was due to the very gradual disentanglement of the individual religious experience from the collective unit of the nation conceived as a religious entity. In Isa.xxvi.1-19, individual and national resurrection are seen side by side, the latter expressing itself in the setting up of the divine kingdom, the former denoting the righteous dead who were to rise to the bliss of the new age.** Some centuries later we have in Dan.xii.2 the view that the wicked rise as well as the righteous, and this resurrection ushers in the kingdom. The resurrection has thus become a feature of the eschatological scheme.

This eschatological resurrection conception,*** is the norm for the apocalyptic writers as a whole. The righteous alone rise (En.lxxxiii-xc), but such of the wicked ^{as} who did not receive their retribution in life are also raised (En.xxii). The resurrection in view is conceived as being spiritual in form, somewhat akin to that

*E.R.Bernard, HDB, Vol.IV.p.231,col.2. **cf. I.K.Cheyne, "Introduction to the Book of Isaiah," 1895, p.158. ***i.e.as the distinct from the more spiritual form of the resurrection in Isa.xxvi. But it should also be noted that the stories of the passing of Elijah (II Kgs.ii.11) and the raising of the dead children by Elijah and Elisha respectively (I Kgs.xvii.17ff.II Kgs.iv.32ff.) hint at the notion of resurrection being within the purview of Israel.

of Isa.xxvi., but in every case of resurrection, however it be conceived, the righteous rise to share in the Messianic kingdom.

During the first century before Jesus there occurs a decided development. The purely spiritual resurrection is still found (En. xci-civ), but a bodily resurrection is announced in clear terms. One of the sufferers under the persecution of Antiochus was told to put out his tongue;"he did so at once, stretched forth his hands courageously, with the noble words, 'These I had from heaven; for His name's sake I count them naught; from Him I hope to get them back again"(II Macc.vii.11. cf.xiv.46).* The earth gives up the body as Sheol and Abaddon surrender the soul (En.li.1), and the united body and soul are judged in their oneness. Yet with all the implications of this bodily resurrection, the risen **body** is really a transfigured one, a body of light, i.e.for the righteous (En.lxii. 15f)**

The bodily resurrection is given up in the Book of Jubilees, and is replaced by the expectation that the souls of the righteous will enjoy a blessed immortality after death (xxiii.31), a view found elsewhere (En.xci-civ).

In general, it may be said that those who held to the sensuous view of the kingdom believed in the bodily resurrection. The more spiritual ideas of the kingdom carried with them corresponding

*J.Moffatt's translation in "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," ed.Charles, Vol.I.p.141). **"The righteous..shall have risen from the earth... and they shall have been clothed with garments of glory," ibid.Vol.II. p.228.R.H.Charles' translation.

spiritual forms of the resurrection hope. "Originally, the Resurrection of the Just was simply a reincarnation to a new life on a glorified earth. But later it experienced the development which culminated in the sublime doctrine of St. Paul."*

In which of these forms did the primitive church believers construe the resurrection of Jesus, or in what combinations of such forms? To people whose conception of the kingdom caused them to believe on the **bodily** resurrection, the resurrection of Jesus afforded no difficulty at all. But how far was this spiritually interpreted, or even received?***

(4) Angels figure very largely in the religious environment of the primitive church. They are conceived as being inhabitants of the spirit world, and potent in their influence on human life in their capacity of messengers of the divine. We are here faced ^{not} so much with the 'angel of Yahweh' in the Old Testament, and which describes a simple theophany, of Yahweh Himself in some form that could be apprehended by human eyes,***but with the development of a multitude of supernatural beings, probably non-ethical in character, which formed the court of God. The imposing celestial hierarchy, which meets us in apocalyptic, may have grown into Israel's faith through Persian influence, as Fairweather supposes;† but allowance

*J.H. Leckie, "The World to Come and Final Destiny," 1918, p. 68. Cf. T. Walker, op. cit. p. 329. **cf. pp. 200f. ***cf. A.B. Davidson in HDB, Vol. I, p. 94. ****Since they act as Yahweh's messengers either of salvation or destruction, cf. Gen. xix. xxxii. 1; II Sam. xxiv. II Kgs. xix. 35. †"Development of Doctrine in the Apocryphal Period," in HDB, p. 287.

should be made for the probability that it may be no more than a parallel growth on Old Testament lines due to the development of apocalyptic ideas. The beasts of the older mythology are now replaced by celestial beings who have a human form.* We are faced with fiery troops of great archangels, incorporeal forces, dominions, cherubim and seraphim, thrones, and many-eyed ones (Secrets of Enoch, xx.1). There is the 'angel of the Presence' (Tob.xii.15, Jub.i.27, ii.2, T.J.xxv.2); the nations have their guardian angels (Dan.x.13, 20f); others are the 'Watchers' (Secr.En.xviii.1, En.xii.4, Dan.iv.13, 17). Some angels have individual names such as Michael (En.xx.5, xl.9), Gabriel (En.xx.7, xl.9), and Raphael (En.xx.3, xl.9, Tob.xii.15), with others such as Uriel, Raguel, Saraquel and Remiel (En.xx), each with their distinctive sphere of authority.

Religious experience regarded these celestials as mediators or messengers of God to human life, or they may act as messengers from man to God (T.D.vi.2, cf. Tob.xii.12).

We meet this atmosphere in the outlook of Jesus and the primitive church. God utilizes angels as His messengers to men, as in dreams (Mt.i.20, ii.13, 19), or in vision (Lk.ii.9, xxiv.23, Jn.xx.12, Acts x.3-in this last case the angel is described by Cornelius as a man in shining raiment, ver.30). They are regarded as undertaking specific missions the effect of which were supernaturally looked on as being brought about, such as announcing Jesus' birth (Lk.ii.9), ministering to Jesus in the desert (Mk.i.13), opening a prison door

*cf. Secr.En.xviii.1, where the angels are of human appearance.

(Acts v.19,xii.7f.),etc. Jesus declares that twelve legions of them are at his disposal if he needed them, thus showing how realistically he shared in the outlook of his contemporaries (Mt.xxvi.53). They accompany the coming of Messiah, being reapers at the end of all things (Mt.xiii.39,41,49), or sent on beforehand to herald his way (Mt.xxiv.31,Mk.xiii.27,Lk.ix.52).

The individual has his guardian angel (Mt.xviii.10,Acts xii.15) and this conception first appears in Jubilees (xxxv.17) revealing a further stage in the apocalyptic emphasis on the individual (pp.372f.). In the next life the risen are as the angels, neither marrying nor giving in marriage (Mk.xii.25,Lk.xxii.30), while Peter's voice makes the people within think it is the voice of his angel, i.e.of his departed personality (Acts xii.15,cf.xxiii.8f.).

(5) Since the primitive church and its experience of redeeming power centred in Jesus turned frequently upon redemption from servitude to evil spirits, it is necessary to notice the place that the conception of demons held in its religious environment. The belief implied is bound up with the apocalyptic development which we have reviewed. A great change came over the Jewish faith after the Exile as God was conceived to be more and more transcendent, using hosts of angels as His mediators and messengers; in the same way God seemed the more removed from evil and human suffering and sin came to be accounted for as being due to sinister agencies also of a spiritual order. The settled pessimism and deeprooted despair of better things than the prevalent impotency and political servitude

encouraged the belief in evil spirits as responsible for such sorrows, since only by divine intervention could their power be broken. Thus the experiential link between the conquest of the demons and the advent of the divine kingdom began to be forged in the prevailing faith.

We are amidst a sort of practical dualism based not on the syllogisms of a philosophic thought, but on the perplexed findings of religious experience which knew the source of goodness of such worth that the surrounding evils could be ascribed only to the intervention of power hostile to that goodness. But faith discerned that the ultimate victory would be with God.

The demons may be fallen angels (En xix.1) who are defiling mankind and leading them astray. Or angelic 'Watchers' who came down to earth to instruct men to do justice and uprightness (Jub.iv.15), and who fell from their dignity by lusting after the daughters of men (iv.22, cf. v.1-9). Children were born of these unions, the giants, from whose souls went forth spirits which were evil, and called demons (v.7,9). These demons lead men astray, as Noah's sons complain (Jub.x.2), or as prayer for protection from them implies (Jub.x.3). To corrupt, lead astray, and finally destroy the wicked is the one purpose of the evil spirits (x.8). At their head is the prince of the demons, Mastema, or Satan (x.8f). The work of moral ruin will go on until Mastema receives judgment prior to the kingdom (Jub.x.8), or till the kingdom actually appears in the triumph of God when Mastema's power, and likewise that of his myrmidons, will be no more

(Jub.xxiii.29).

Demons are especially concerned with inciting men to sin (En. lxix.4,6), but they may vex them with diseases of all kinds (Jub.x. 12). They charge men before God with the very misdoings which they themselves have tempted them to do (En.xl.7), or they punish men in various ways (En.liii.3). They have large control of the air which is conceived to be the abode of spirits, good and evil alike (En.xxix. 5). The demons and their demon king rule the world as it is (Mar.Is. ii.4. Asc.Is.x.29,En.liv.6), and are responsible for human experience of death being inflicted (Wisd.ii.24,Tob.iii.8,En.lxix.11).

But these evil powers have a limit set to their baneful activities; the kingdom may come at any time and with this consummation the demons are destroyed (Jub.xvi.1).

In such a setting do we find demonology in the experience of the contemporaries and within the purview of the primitive church. The plague of demon-possession hangs over everywhere.* The host of heaven had Israel in servitude according to Stephen (Acts vii.42); The whole world is thought of as 'lying in the evil one'(I Jn.v.19). Into such a world of need came Jesus with his news of the victorious kingdom, and the result of his message in the Christian church.

One experiential principle that comes out clearly from the mazes of angelology and demonology is the conviction that human life whether viewed as 'personality' or as 'self' was readily accessible to the invasive influences of what we today would call 'supernatural'

*For this cf. pp. 284f.

whether these be good or evil, angelic or demonic. Here we have the point of departure for the experience of the Holy Spirit so pronounced in the primitive church. There was no distinction made between the 'natural' and the 'supernatural' such as more modern Western thought has made and the transition from 'ruach' (wind) to 'ruach' as the windlike energy of good or evil spirits was easily made. The term 'spirit', taking its start from the wind that blows, receives an 'inspirational' content, where the Spirit of Yahweh is responsible for some abnormal "phenomenon of human conduct or character, or occasionally some other energy or activity"* (Jdg.xiv. 6, I Sam.xvi.15, Isa.xi.2). The term also stands for the principle of life, and is therefore not dissimilar in idea from the 'breath-soul' which 'nephesh' denotes (II Kgs.i.13), and which may include the psychical aspect of human consciousness (Job.xvi.5, cf. Deut.xii. 15). The 'spirit' in human personality, i.e. that which makes a man a living soul is 'holy spirit' lent as it were for the period of human life, to be returned unspoiled (Test.XII.Patr.App.I.10,9). Elsewhere it is complained that men have defiled their 'holy spirit,' i.e.the holy spirit entrusted to them in their life (T.Z.vii.12, cf. viii.20, and closely allied is the prayer that in God's people there would be created 'holy spirit' (Jub.i.21,23). The idea hinted at is that which makes the Spirit of God identical with the spirit in man, but such a coalescence really suggests no more than the close empirical connection between the two, the latter being accessible to the

*H.W.Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," in "The People and the Book," ed. Peake, p.359.

former.

Hence, on the whole, the divine energy known as 'holy spirit' was operative upon and through human personality.* What was more, it was the abnormal in human life that prompted the conclusion that it was the Spirit that was responsible. The usual and the normal needed no accounting for along these lines, but Joseph's extraordinary power of dream-interpretation caused Pharoah to sum him up as "a man in whom the Spirit of God is" (Gen.xli.38). So Daniel stands out among the learned of the court so uniquely that he is accounted for as having the spirit of the holy gods in him (Dan.iv.8f.). Unusual craftsmanship (Exod,xxi.3f), abnormal enhancement of physical strength (Jdg.xiii.25,xiv.6,xv.14), success in war (Jdg.iii.10) especially after many barren years of oppression, are all due to the invasive energy of the Spirit. Saul is to become 'another man', i.e. above the ordinary, when the Spirit comes on him; the same power causes the non-ethical frenzy of the same man in an abnormal state of mind (I Sam.x.6,10-12). The Spirit withdrew from Saul as it goes into David (I Sam.xvi.13f). This power causes conduct that baffles calculation (I Kgs.xviii.7ff), frustrates purposes which thus work out in a way not intended (Num.xxii 4,6. cf. I Sam.xix.20-24).

The 'Spirit' enters into the prophets and accounts for their abnormal condition and power (Ezek.ii.2,3ff. iii.12,14.viii.3,xi.1,5,

*"Der Geist wirkt auf den Menschen und durch den Menschen," Gunkel in "Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes," 1909, Dritte Aufl. p.5. A few exceptions are Gen.i.6, Job xxvi.13, Ps.civ.30 Wisd.i.7, I En.lx.14f.16-21, lxxv.5, possibly Mt.i.18, Lk.i.34f with a physical situation brought about by the Spirit.

24); visions, dreams and the like are symptoms of the same control (Joel ii.28f, cf. I En.lxx.2). Abnormality in matters such as wisdom and understanding is ascribed to the same source (II Chr. xv.1. Neh.ix.20). Of Israel's coming deliverer it is said that the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, for there is no other way of accounting for his remarkable wisdom, etc. (Isa.xi.2).* The Creator plants His sweet Spirit to guide mortals (Sib.Frag.i.5,6), while Ezra prays for inspiration to ~~restore~~ the scriptures by saying "send into me the holy Spirit (IV Ez.xiv.22, which reflects a belief held for many years, viz. that the care for the Scriptures was due to the Spirit in those who wrote them). Extraordinary wisdom and ability would be needed for this work, and the Spirit's indwelling would guarantee this. Messiah derives his extraordinary dignity and power from the same indwelling (En.xlix.3, cf. lxii.2), for abnormal power must be in a superhuman Messiah to equip him for his superhuman task.

It is by his activities as apprehended in human experience that Messiah will be recognized; the extraordinary evidences of his power and authority as he comes in the judgment will be due to the Spirit in him. Jesus made this connection as he read the scripture in the synagogue at Nazareth and proceeded to astound ~~his~~ hearers by applying ^{to himself} the words of Isa.lxi.1ff, beginning with "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me..." Indeed this was the only way of accounting for the uniqueness by those who saw and heard (cf. Lk.iv.1).

There is thus a definite empirical connection between the Spirit and the coming Kingdom. Messiah's powers are inspired by the Spirit

* cf pp 237-239.

to enable him to bring in the kingdom, which in itself was the supreme abnormal and extraordinary thing for which Israel awaited. Insofar as the kingdom was connected with Messiah, its advent would be due to the Spirit energy which inspired the Redeemer; insofar as the kingdom was conceived apart from Messiah bringing it into being, the Spirit was the energy which produced the effects in human life that made its advent inevitable, or was the actual moving energy which brought it about at last.

In religious experience the connection of the divine energy known as the Spirit of God is thus vitally made with the expectation of the new age. The two aspects were indissolubly bound up one with the other.

This deduction from the religious phenomena we have investigated receives further light in that nothing is more striking than the fact that the normal, matter-of-fact life is not connected with the activity of the Spirit. "Der gewöhnliche Wandel des einzelnen Israeliten oder Juden wird nicht vom Geiste abgeleitet. Frömmigkeit und Sittlichkeit als solche gelten also nicht für pneumatisch."* The instances cited in connection with the exhibition of wisdom, etc. as evidencing the Spirit may seem to be exceptions to this principle,** but these ethical characteristics appeared abnormal and unique when placed alongside the usual conduct and character of men. In the Book of Sirach, which treats almost entirely of normal conduct and

*H. Gunkel, op.cit.p.9. **viz. II Cor.xv.1, Neh.ix.20, Isa.xi.2, En.xlix.3, cf.p.114, to which we may add Isa.xxviii.6, xxxii.15ff.lxi.1ff.Deut.xxxiv.9, Ezek.xxxvi.27, Wisd.ix.17, T.L.ii.3, T.J.xx.2, En.lxii.2.

ordinary living, there is no reference to the Spirit of God as the creative cause of this manner of life. The time had not yet come when another great Jew was to undertake the formulation of the energy of the divine Spirit as the dynamic power behind the normal conduct of the Christian believer. This discoverer was Paul, and the primitive church came between the discoveries of his own religious experience in Christ and the circle of religious experience we are investigating.

We therefore carry forward to the study of the religious life of the primitive church several significant experiential data with regard to human appropriation of the energy of the Spirit of God. (1) The Spirit is approached by way of living experience rather than by any system of teaching which is nowhere found in Jewish literature.* (2) The Spirit's operation is known almost exclusively through human experience as the divine energy invades and dominates human personality. (3) The presence of the Spirit is detected by specific phenomena in human life, or symptoms which call attention to the irresistible urge responsible for such effects. (4) The phenomena, symptoms, or effects are of an abnormal and extraordinary character; the unique behaviour or manifestation leads to the

*Pfleiderer's phrase, 'traditionelle Lehre' as applied to the Spirit (Paulinismus, 1873, p. 202) is misleading and unhistorical, for there was no such thing in Israel's early religious purview, nor in Judaism, nor in the primitive church. H. Gunkel's approach is more true to the facts. "Wir haben es in der Urgemeinde garnicht mit einer Lehre vom heiligen Geiste und seinen Wirkungen zu tun...sondern es handelt sich dabei um ganz concrete, allen in die Augen fallende Tatsachen...und die man ohne weitere Ueberlegung unmittelbar als geistesgewirkt empfand," op.cit.p.4. The primitive church inherited this from Israel.

explanation that it is due to the Spirit. (5) The ordinary conduct of men, the ethical or religious as such, were not ascribed to the Spirit's activity in human personality. (6) The Spirit was the active agency in the creation of human life, sometimes being regarded as the reason for the existence of the human spirit. Here we see a close relationship with the human spirit which is thus easily accessible to the invasive energy of the divine Spirit. (7) The Spirit was conceived to ^{be} the energy operative in Messiah's personality, whether it was the human or suprahuman Messiah that was in view, equipping him with the extraordinary powers and authority necessary for his office. (8) The Spirit was the divine power behind the advent of the kingdom.

The term 'corporate personality'* as applied to the social solidarity of Israel as a religious unit, although not free from objection, denotes phenomena of religious experience which are central to the nation's faith. It is difficult to conceive a group as possessing personality, while the word 'corporate' would be better replaced by 'social.' 'Social personality' is open to the objection that it is still too easy to associate with the group the characteristics we discern in individual personality.

The distinctive feature of a group such as Israel is 'solidarity,' and the phenomena presented are better described as 'social solidarity.' The lack of any ideas of personal resurrection or any

*H.W. Robinson, "The Christian Doctrine of Man," 2nd. Edn. 1913, pp. 27-30.

individual life after death points to a defective awareness of individuality. "Whether in relation to man or to God, the individual person was conceived and treated as merged in the larger group of family or clan or nation."* The nation as a whole was the religious unit. The breach of taboo, committed by Achan, is punished by the death not only of the culprit, but of all his family and possessions (Josh.vii.24), for the whole family is regarded as one unit. There was no thought of doing injustice to the innocent members of the family. The whole was implicated in the sin of the head.** The sins of the fathers being visited upon the children is the logic of the social solidarity of the nation. The basis of the Mosaic covenant (Exod.xix.5f.Deut.xxvi.17f) is that God chooses the people in their solidarity as the nation set apart for Himself from all other nations.*** "In gratitude to Yahweh, who had delivered them by His servant, perhaps in extraordinary circumstances and through dangers happily overcome, they entered by a solemn covenant into a federation which was ratified in the name of the mighty God of Kadesh and Sinai."**** The social solidarity of the relationship between Israel and Yahweh was never really broken even despite the growth of individualism in later times. It was individualism within the limits of the social-religious unit that marked the 'new covenant' of Jeremiah (Jer.xxxi.31f), and we need to be cautious against

*H.W.Robinson, op.cit.p.27. **cf.the seven sons of Rizpah(II Sam. xxi.1-14) for a further illustration of the ancient principle of religion, to which Israel was no exception, viz."the solidarity of the gods and their worshippers as part of one organic society,"W.R.x Smith,op.cit.p.30. ***W.M.Scott,"The Christian Covenant,"1912,p8. ****Loisy,"The Religion of Israel,"Eng.Tr.1910,p.106.

reading universalism into these words of Jeremiah; such individualism as there is does not touch individualism as such apart from Israelite limits.*

Human personality consists of 'body' and 'soul' or 'spirit.' In the few cases where R.H.Charles detects apparent trichotomy, where 'soul' is not identified with 'spirit',** "it may be agreed that these writers have not, in their thought, entered the period of the apocalyptists."*** The Book of Wisdom with the influence of Greek ideas in it, is independent of Greek influence as far as its Hebrew psychology is concerned, though it diverges in that "it assumes the existence of the soul before birth."**** But the Hebrew notion of personality as 'body and soul' or 'body and spirit' persists in apocalyptic without any suggestions of Greek dualism which sets the soul over against the body in an ethical struggle.

As the idea of resurrection and immortality gained ground, the moral individualism grew more prominent. The assumption of individual retribution for transgressors implies that moral personality is being ascribed to the individual member of God's people. Men enter the portals of the next world not as a social or national unit, but one by one, though the corporate character of the experience of the Messianic Kingdom still remains practically untouched by any advances along the line of moral and religious individualism. Yet the tendency towards the recognition of the individual ^{was} ~~were~~ none the less signifi-

*cf.H.F.Hamilton, op.cit.Vol.I.p.70. **"Eschatology,"pp.194,232. cf. Fairweather,op.cit.p.291,col.1,"there seems to be no distinction made between נשמה and רוח." ***T.Walker,op.cit.p.185. ****S.Holmes in "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,"ed.Charles,Vol.I.p.531.

-cant of the liberating influence of the belief in personal resurrection.

We have surveyed the experiential inheritance and religious environment of the primitive church. From this amalgam of religious life and faith, with its many-sided developments there emerged the primitive church, with its distinctive inspiration, of course, in the life and personality of Jesus. Much of the phenomena that meets us in the primitive church religious experience receive clearer interpretation from so rich and dynamic a background. In fact, apart from this inheritance and environment such religious experience remains inexplicable.

CHAPTER III

THE INITIAL CONTACTS AND IMPRESSIONS.

When Jesus Christ entered into the stream of human life and affairs men of various kinds came into personal contact with him. Many were the impressions received of him. From all these innumerable contacts, impression and experiences, especially as all of them went forward to a vital consummation, there emerged in due time the primitive church.

Our immediate enquiry, therefore, is with these initial contacts, impressions and experiences, as Jesus made his personal impact upon those who saw and heard. Our approach is along the line of what the various eyewitnesses made of him rather than what He was making of them, although the latter feature, of course, cannot be dissociated from the former except at the cost of the phenomena of personality and their inter-relations with other personalities.

A. THE CROWDS.

What did the ordinary people of Galilee make of Jesus of Nazareth as they heard him in their synagogues or saw him in the act of healing some unfortunate sufferer? The Gospel of Mark introduces us at once into an atmosphere of the intensest astonishment at his teaching. The reason given for the amazement is that Jesus' teaching was with authority, unlike that of the scribes

(Mk.i.22).^{*} The collective wonder rises to a climax when in the midst of the congregation Jesus heals a man with an unclean spirit as the people asked who was this who issued his commands to evil spirits and they obeyed him (i.27). The cure was also impressive from the manner in which it was accomplished; Jewish exorcists could cast out evil spirits by magical formulae, but here was the simple, direct command to the demon possessed. The result of the incident was that the awestruck and amazed eye-witnesses spread abroad his fame everywhere through Galilee (i.26,cf.Lk.iv.37).

Doubtless this incident was but typical of what was taking place as Jesus toured the villages of Galilee. Luke gives what appears to be a summary impression that was getting about as a result of the initial activities of Jesus: *καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ* (iv.14), the general effect being the rise of a reputation of unique import, *δοξαζόμενος ἐπὶ πάντων* (iv.15).^{*}

^{*}There was a specific freshness about Jesus' words, and the people were quick to catch the new accents. "Sie bezeugt sich hier durch das innere Wesen seiner Lehre" (Wellhausen, "Das Evangelium Marci," 1909, p.10). The Gospel of Matthew concludes the Sermon on the Mount with the record of the astonishment of those who heard, but in this case it is an editorial comment; yet such a comment reflects the general impression which Jesus made by his words. The story of his rejection at Nazareth (Lk.iv.16-30; Mk.vi.1-6, Mt.xiii.52-58 place it later) is no exception to this, for apart from the natural prejudices of those among whom Jesus was brought up, we are told that he refused to gratify their curiosity as to his power, the reports of which had reached them from Capernaum (Lk.iv.23).

We obtain another glimpse into the growing excitement when the disciples seek Jesus out in a desert place and announce that all men are looking out for him (Mk.i.37). The crowds had realized the material benefits such as he was able to afford them through his powers and thus "the quest was prompted by very mixed motives."* This is only illustrative of the ~~sort~~^{sort} of thing that must have often happened, as is further shown by the summaries of Jesus' activities among the people, and which point to the tremendous impression he was making everywhere he went (Mt.iv.24f.). Jesus uses the occasions of healing for teaching as well (Lk.vi.17), although many were inspired to come to him simply for the healing he bestowed (Mk.iii.8). A further summary^{of} healing acts calls up the suggestion that Jesus is fulfilling the scripture with its reference to the one who bore griefs and carried sorrows (Mt.viii.17, cf. Isa. liii.4); while this may be no more than the comment of the evangelist, the words might well occur to the recipients of his healing. In any case the crowds would not thereby be influenced to look on Jesus as the Messiah because of this, since the idea of suffering did not go with that of "Messiah"***.

The stilling of the storm causes men as a whole (cf. ~~cf. pp. 74f.~~) to marvel, while Mark mentions a breathless awe which held the minds of those who saw what he was doing (iv.41, cf. Lk. viii.25b); the crowds throng him as he wends his way to the house of Jairus, and the miracle there produces the familiar effect of

*H. B. Swete, "The Gospel according to St. Mark," 3rd. Ed. 1920, p. 27.
 **cf. pp. 74f. 103f.

his growing fame and the popular enthusiasm of the crowds.

"What manner of man is this?" sums up the excited wonder of the people. Again and again, in the purest astonishment they exclaim, "Who is this?" There seems to be little doubt that it was Jesus as Healer that moved the crowds in the first place. His fame as a wonder-worker impels them to pursue Jesus into the lonely places around the Lake of Galilee, thus frustrating his desire for private retreat. When Jesus was daring enough to set aside the traditional requirements of Sabbath observance in the interests of healing (e.g. Mk.iii.2ff.), we may be sure that while the rigidly orthodox would resent it, the ordinary people would wonder all the more.*

We must, however, recognize that the new accents of his teaching were arousing interest and astonishment. His fellow-townsmen marvelled at the words of grace that fell from his lips (Lk.iv.22). For there were many people who ^{belonged} ~~belong~~ to the pious type of Israel's faith which was the real strength of the nation,** in whose minds there would lodge many a saying or parable, who caught the new spiritual emphasis and inner significance of what Jesus was saying,

*There were serious limitations with which Jesus had to reckon as far as the influence of his miracles was concerned. The healings in themselves did not lead to the results Jesus had in mind during his ministry, viz. repentance in view of the coming divine kingdom. Chorazin and Capernaum, for example, were unresponsive to the mighty works that he had wrought there, and they are compared unfavourably with the Gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon, the inhabitants of which would long ago have repented had similar miracles taken place there. **Cf. p.84 for the characterization of these people.

and who made the contrast between his words and the formal ~~pronoun~~ pronouncements of the scribes and Pharisees with their continual reference to the letter of law and tradition. Such people were to become fruitful for the propagation of the church.

Enthusiasm for the miracles, enthusiasm of a quieter sort for his teaching, experience of benefits both spiritual and material, although these may not have been sharply distinguished, such are the avenues along which the crowds found their impressions and experiences of Jesus. The more specific spiritual and moral elements, however, were received only in germ; at the moment the germs were hidden, scarcely apprehended or understood, but in the light of what occurred in due time, they were to shoot forth in fruitful ways in the primitive church experience. The more popular enthusiasm was ablaze, and contained elements productive of the greatest danger, for Galilee was notorious for its patriotic Messianic fervour,* and even already "in the first chapter of Mark the atmosphere is electric."** No one knew more than did Jesus that Galilean ~~Messianism~~ ^{might} ~~may~~ perilously seek to place him at the head of a nationalist movement with religious-political aims in view. Great care was needed in treading the pathways of his mission if he were not to become identified with seditious rebellion. The Fourth Gospel echoes this peril in the strong determination of the crowd to take Jesus by force and make him king (vi.15). A multitude going into the wilderness ~~was~~

*For this aspect cf. p.85. **J.A. Findlay, "Jesus as They Saw Him," 1920, p.54).

after a leader was precisely the situation usually associated with a Messianic claimant and may have led to Galilean hopes of kingship. The probability is that here we have Johannine tradition at work on some original incident of popular Messianic fervour centring around Jesus who withdrew from such a threatening situation to the lonely hillsides.* The subsequent seeking out of Jesus by the crowds reveals their unspiritual desires and worldly motives, as Jesus reminds them (Jn.vi.25f.); "Jesus lässt sich auf ihre Frage nach einem etwaigen Wunder nicht ein, sondern hält ihnen sofort das ungeistliche Motiv ihres Suchens vor."** Amidst the conflation and confusions of the discourse,*** there is historical and psychological probability in the unfavourable reaction from the refusal of Jesus to place himself at the head of the people (Jn.vi.66), a reaction which is represented in the Synoptic tradition in the demand for a sign from heaven ^{and} is followed by a discourse to the disciples on bread as in John (Mk.viii.8.10f.cf.Jn.vi.30,32ff.).

The Fourth Gospel presents us with the impressions derived of Jesus mainly in Jerusalem. With such a growing record of fame, it is just what we expect when we read that at Jerusalem Jesus was much in demand (Jn vii.11). The Galileans who came up to the

*There is no need to suppose that John derived his story from the narrative of the temptation dealing with the kingdoms of the world (Mt.iv.8-10,Lk.iv.5-8), still less to suppose that the 'hill' (Jn.vi.8) means the 'mountain' of the temptation (Mt.iv.8). No doubt Jesus would have been reminded of this temptation; indeed, some such incident may have furnished Jesus with the opportunity to tell his disciples about that temptation. **H.J.Holtzmann, "Evangelium des Johannes," H-C zum N.T.IV.1, dritte Aufl.1908,p.140.

*** Cf. G.H.C. Macgregor, pp.cit.pp.124-26.

holy city would spread abroad his fame and be on the lookout for him. Opinions about Jesus were varied: he was a good man, but others thought he was no more than a deceiver (Jn.vii.12); there is surprise at his wisdom since he was of the common unlearned people (vii.15)cf.Lk.ii.47,iv.22); he was truly a prophet, while it was thought that he was even the Messiah (vii.40f.), but this last idea causes doubt in view of his Galilean connections, and a division of opinion arises (Jn.vii.41ff.cf.vi.14), and we are reminded of the disciples' references to what people thought of Jesus, all of which turn on the idea that he was some returned prophet (Mk.viii.28).

It is here that perhaps we obtain the clue to the impressions the crowds were receiving. Jesus was one of the prophets, a herald of the coming kingdom of God. Indeed, he had opened his ministry with the call to repent in view of the imminent kingdom (Mk.i.15) i.e. as the herald of the kingdom. His power over demons was eloquent for apocalyptically prepared minds of his authority as a forerunner of Messiah.* It was very apparent therefore that there was some vital connection between Jesus and the kingdom. The people were saying that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, while others said he was Elijah, the expected forerunner of the Messianic kingdom(cf.Mk.vi.14f.).** When taken along with the disciples' reports on what the people supposed Jesus to be (Mk.viii.28), we have some insight into what the crowds were making

*cf.pp.110f.

**cf.p.104.

of Jesus. John the Baptist's perplexed enquiry as to whether he were the coming one or ~~were they~~ ^{they were} to look for another (Lk.vii.19) refers to the herald of the kingdom. Since it was the exception apparently to associate the Kingdom with a Messiah,*the probabilities are that ideas of the imminence of the kingdom were set up by the announcing herald. In any case Messiah figures more specifically in ruling the kingdom. The recognition of the status of Jesus by the demoniacs as something more significant than the herald of the kingdom causes Jesus to command them to be silent (Mk.i.24,34,iii.11,v.7), and at the very least it is evidence of the immense personal impression Jesus was making of commanding goodness, and the demoniacs would be more than ordinarily suggestible. The apparent studied reserve with regard to his conscious uniqueness and acceptance in himself of Messiahship,** really signified that as yet he did not want the uniqueness in himself to be too readily manifest lest it should inflame the wrong sort of Messianic hopes of the kingdom. It was easy enough for the populace to desire to take one so possessed with power as their political-religious leader, as the Fourth Gospel points out, though its author may be reading back specific conceptions of Jesus as Messiah.

The Triumphal Entry receives its interpretation within the same series of empirical impressions, for the crowds are acclaiming the herald of the kingdom. The acclamation of the populace of Jesus as 'son of David,' which points to their recognition that

*On this point cf.p.100. **Mk.i.25,34,43f.45,iii.12,iv.12,etc.

he is Messiah is, however, not decisive. Apart from two instances which are Synoptic parallels to a Matthaean reference,* the title is found in Matthew only. This gospel never fails to make use of anything that will commend Jesus as Messiah to the Jews.** Again, if Luke has changed the Marcan ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλευσα (Mk.xi.10) into ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεύς (Lk.xix.38), it is due to his wider universal sympathies for the Gentiles. The scriptural quotation, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," comes from a psalm which welcomes the pilgrim who comes up to the holy city for the feast (Ps.cxviii.26,LXX), and ^{is} ~~are~~ not a description of Messiah. Had the Entry been definitely a triumphant Messianic one, the Romans would have taken instant action and the high priest would have had some definite evidence as to the claim of Jesus to be Messiah. Further, Pilate would not afterwards have taken the claim that Jesus was "King of the Jews" so lightly (Mk.xv.2,12,26).

What we have is the enthusiasm of the crowds, including many ardent Galilean patriots, acclaiming the herald of the coming kingdom, a new Elijah who was come to restore all things. A simple journey up to Jerusalem in which Jesus make a symbolic use of riding on an ass's back,*** is seized upon by the enthusiasts, and Jesus may have been more or less impelled to journey amid the applauding hosannas of the populace. ^{****} The situation was somewhat

*Mt.xx.30f.Mk.x.47f.Lk.xviii.38f. **Mt.xv.22,xxi.9,15,cf.i.1,xii.23. ***So at least Matthew xxi.5 quoting Zech.ix.9 as the prophecy fulfilled, but this may be one more instance of the Matthaean desire to commend Jesus as Messiah to the Jews. ****cf.T.Llynfi Davies, "Was Jesus Compelled by the Crowd to enter Jerusalem?" Exp.Times,Aug.1931,pp.526f.

compromising for Jesus, for "the very fact of a wonder-working prophet approaching the capital with an enthusiastic following could not but suggest...that He was aiming at becoming a popular hero who might use His power to incite the thousands of Passover pilgrims to rebellion."* Certainly it was the national form of the divine kingdom, the sensuous one with its admixture of the material and the spiritual,** that the people had in mind. As, however, the anticlimax of arrest and trial before the authorities takes place, leading on to the trial before Pilate, the crowds, enraged at their disappointment in Jesus, terrorized the Roman governor ^{into} ~~in~~ handing over Jesus to crucifixion although he had found no reason of death in him (Mk.xv.12-15). Meanwhile it had spread abroad that Jesus had even claimed to be Messiah himself, and as he hung on the cross, a most un~~M~~essianic position for Messiah to be in, the disappointed Galileans hurled abuse at him (Mt.xxvii.40).***

B. THE REACTIONS OF THE JEWISH AUTHORITIES.

It was not long before Jesus of Nazareth attracted the attention of Israel's religious guides and authorities. Scribes

*A.H.McNeile,"The Gospel according to St.Matthew,"1915,p.297.
 cf.pp.96f.99. *The Fourth Gospel probably preserves some genuine reminiscences in the discussion about Messiah as Jesus announces his own death to the people. Since Messiah lives for ever, how could the 'Son of Man' be conceived to die? This ~~S~~on of ~~M~~an must be some other figure, they suppose, and who can he be? (Jn.xii.32-34). It may be that the answer to the tribute question (Mk.xii.14-17) must have been very disappointing to Galilean patriots, but the final proof for the people that Jesus was for them no more than a spurious pretender lay in the facts of his suffering and death.

consider he is blaspheming since he assures the paralytic that his sins are forgiven (Mk.ii.7), and Luke suggests how widespread is the observation of Jesus by the leaders in that there were "Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting near, and who had come from every village of Galilee, Judaea, and Jerusalem" (v.17). Pharisees find fault with the disciples for an infringement of the Sabbath law (Mk.ii.24), and an unfavourable impression results as Jesus sets aside the too scrupulous observance of the law, in the interests of humanity (Mk.iii.2). This leads to the conviction that Jesus is dangerous to the accepted religion, and the leaders think of how they might silence Jesus (Mk.iii.6) while Luke tells us that they were mad with him and began to take thought what they might do about him (vi.11). The cumulative effect of the impressions of blasphemy (Mk.ii.7), legal requirements set aside as secondary to the real issues of religion (Lk.v.33-35), friendship with the outcasts from the law (Mk.ii.16, etc.), the more liberal attitude to Sabbath observance (Mk.ii.27, iii.1)* causes specially selected scribes and Pharisees to be sent into Galilee to show up Jesus as a mere charlatan, and to discredit him in the eyes of the populace (Mk.iii.22, cf. vii.1). They hint, and even declare openly that Jesus derives his arts from Beelzebub, the prince of the demons (Mk.iii.22); they attack Jesus on the ground that his

*The force of this is not to be turned aside by the quotation of a Rabbinic parallel of a much later date, viz. "the Sabbath is handed over to you, not you to the Sabbath," (Kohler, op.cit. p.222) when Rabbinism had to answer the criticism of Pharisaic over-literalness by Jesus, and through him, by the church.

disciples do not walk according to the tradition of the elders (Mk. vii.5). His reply penetrates to the springs of inner religion, and calling the crowd to him he makes his position clear in "the beautiful words he spoke against the Pharisees who blamed him for it (sc. 'eating with unwashed hands') about what really defiles."*

At last Jesus retires to the borders of Tyre and Sidon (Mk.vii 24); no doubt the Pharisees thought they had completely discredited him. But he returns by a circuitous route to the Lake of Galilee (Mk.vii.31). Once more the Pharisees attack him; this time they ask for a sign, knowing from their observation of Jesus that this was the last thing he would give, and that such a refusal would lower his popularity with the unthinking multitudes (Mk.viii.11)** They aim at using the patriotic fervour of the Galileans and at the same time trade on his own desire to refrain from stirring up any such premature hopes. Jesus was therefore forced to come a little more into the open with regard to his uniqueness and sense of Messiahship (Mt.xii.39-42,xvi.1-4), while it influenced his decision to challenge the religious authorities right at the citadel of the national faith (Lk.ix.51, and there to bring to its climax His mission along the lines foreshadowed by the temptation in the wilderness (Mt.iv.1-11,Lk.iv.1-12).

The authorities were frankly alarmed by the situation that developed when it was rumoured about that Jesus was in Jerusalem. The Triumphal Entry makes them seek to restrain the rising tide by

*Kohler, op.cit.p.223.

**cf. pp. 12ff

a direct appeal to Jesus (Lk.xix.39), and later, when the 'hosannas' were still ringing within the temple confines (Mt.xxi.15f.). Well might they fear, for the whole city was in an uproar (Mt.xxi.10f.). The Fourth Gospel supports this electric atmosphere (Jn.xii.19), although another element has entered here in the raising of Lazarus, an incident, however, ^{which} we have no alternative but to regard as unhistorical.* A new verbal offensive aimed to entrap Jesus into making statements which might be used as evidence against him culminates in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, the point of which was that just as the conspiring husbandmen killed the son whom they knew had greater right and authority than they, so the Jewish authorities, seeking to kill Jesus, thereby acknowledge his higher right and authority.**

We cannot go with Lietzmann in regarding the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin as unhistorical,*** nor accept Kohler's view that Jesus was condemned to death by the Romans as a Galilean pretender.**** The efforts to prove that Jesus was guilty of blasphemy against the temple provided an issue which the Sanhedrin were fully competent to investigate.‡ This, rather than the claim to be Messiah, seems to have been the specific ground of accusation

*For a discussion of the difficulties arising here cf. H.J. Holtzmann, op.cit. pp. 213-15, E.F. Scott, "The Fourth Gospel," 1920, pp. 37f. W.F. Howard, op.cit. pp. 194f. G.H.C. Macgregor, op.cit. pp. 253f. See also for a very full statement, A.E. Garvie, op.cit. pp. 124ff., whose solution in the domain of belief does not decide for the historicity of the narrative. **A.T. Cadoux, "The Parables of Jesus," 1931, p. 42. ***"Bemerkungen zum Prozess Jesu," in ZNW. Vol. XXXI. 1932, pp. 78-84. ****op.cit. pp. 226f. 231. ‡cf. M. Dibelius, "Das historische Problem der Leidensgeschichte," in ZNW. 1931, Vol. XXX. pp. 198f.

(Mk.xiv.58,cf.xv.29), and only when the evidence appeared inconsistent did the highpriest resort to the charge of claiming to be Messiah, and regarding Jesus' confession thus extorted as blasphemy (Mk.xiv.61f.64), but what actual law was here blasphemed has never been pointed out. The possibility is therefore left open that the claim to Messiahship was extorted in order to make Pilate ratify the sentence of death,* while the Sanhedrin was already satisfied that Jesus deserved death. Dr.Kohler's judgment which throws the responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus upon the Romans fails to appreciate the specific probabilities of religious experience, on the grounds of which alone the upholders of the law and the traditions would conceive it their bounden duty to silence once for all one who "made himself the mediator between God his Father and the rest of mankind."**

The authorities were undoubtedly impressed by the uniqueness of Jesus. The very effort to discredit Jesus by suggesting that he exercised his power over demons "by the prince of the demons" is unwitting testimony to something 'numinous' in their impression of Jesus. There must be something truly remarkable and potent in a man's personality to suggest 'supernatural' authority behind him, unless the charge that he is in league with Satan is ~~not~~ to be purely ridiculous. It is to be noted that they made no attempt to slander Jesus on moral grounds. The very trap set for Jesus in the tribute question implied absolute confidence on their part

*As Wellhausen points out,op.cit.p.125.

**Kohler,op.cit.p.230.

that Jesus would at all costs speak the truth.

The uniqueness of Jesus was felt by the scribes and Pharisees in another way. The question whether Jesus taught anything essentially different from what the law did receives varying replies, but the mere fact that Jesus is seen so clearly to be up alongside the law on, at least, an equal footing with it in religious authority, is a distinction that fell to no scribe, Pharisee, or Rabbi. This fact impressed the religious leaders to such an extent that they saw in the uniqueness of Jesus a danger to the law and the traditions. Yet Jesus produced this impression while being essentially loyal to Judaism. The authorities reacted to him unfavourably. "The whole point of the scathing denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees is that they are not true to the religion they profess and their own better knowledge."* Here Jesus was felt to be in the same line of prophetic enthusiasm for which Israel's leaders in prophecy had the price to pay in suffering, calumny and even death at the hands of the nation in the past.**

*G.F.Moore, op.cit.Vol.I.p.183.

**Far from declaring Israel's faith to be obsolete, Jesus came to fulfil it, i.e.lead to its adequate expression by going to the spiritual roots of life and experience of God. If the Gospel was to Jesus "the Essence of Judaism"(W.R. Arnold,op.cit.p.162), it was Judaism not as a system of ordinances, but as a living faith and religious experience. These roots lay, for Jesus, within his own consciousness of uniqueness, as the Son of God. If we start from this point to show up the difference between him and the recognized religious authorities, such consciousness must have ~~take~~ rise through his being aware that there were differences between himself and others, the experienced contrasts being of a spiritual and ethical order. This conclusion was probably reached only after prolonged

reflection and finally accepted at his baptism. There followed from this consciousness of his sonship and uniqueness the further conclusion that the true good for others meant their own receiving of his unique knowledge of and fellowship with God. "No man knoweth the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him." The way for others must therefore be his own way, i.e. through experience of his spiritual and ethical uniqueness, and the difference between such and their own, or any other way they knew such as the ordinances of Judaism. It was on these spiritual and ethical differentia that Jesus challenged and fought the religious authorities, both in Galilee and finally in Jerusalem as he focussed his own distinctive knowledge of God against the letter of the law which viewed God through traditional precept and observance. This was the essence of the struggle with the authorities, and the latter were not slow to perceive the crucial nature of Jesus' challenge. From their contacts with him and experience of him they realized that "either Jesus or the Jewish Law, as a body of ordinances, had to be reduced to a secondary place as the organ of the divine will" (Bartlet and Carlyle, "Christianity in History," 1917, p.36). The answer of the religious authorities to this dilemma was the crucifixion of Jesus, and thus their outlook materially helped the primitive church to emerge in its due time.

C. THE PUBLICANS AND THE SINNERS.

"Here we touch upon a principle which became the very 'leitmotif' of Jesus' activities, raising him above both Pharisean and Essene teachers. The latter blamed him for associating with sinners, publicans, non-observants of the Law, the untaught and unchaste women, all of whom they avoided in order not to be contaminated by their contact. He, on the contrary, made it his maxim that they that are well are in no need of the physician, but they that are sick; and I am not come to call the righteous but the sinners to repentance."*

*Kohler, op.cit.p.220.

modern Jewish Rabbi illustrates the outcast condition of these classes, as far as religious hope was concerned.

Like Lucius,* the Jews classed the taxgatherers along with whoremongers and sinners. All over the Roman Empire they were held in reprobation,** but in Palestine the cause of their obloquy was not simply that they were given to dishonest extortion; they were the agents of the hated foreign Gentile power of Rome. Jews on custom-house duty were betraying the Jewish theocracy, and postponing the fulfilment of the Messianic hope.*** Hence they ranked among the 'sinners', and were outcast from the Jewish theocracy. The 'sinners' included Gentiles (Gal.ii.15), heretics, (Jn.ix.16,24f.31), non-Pharisees such as Sadducees, or "the wealthy governmental party,"**** Hellenizing Jews,‡ "Many of the men thus branded in Capernaum were probably guilty of no worse offence than abstaining from the official piety of the Pharisees, or followed proscribed occupations, or were of Gentile extraction, or merely consorted with Gentiles."‡‡ We have to reckon with a considerable Jewish element who were not careful to observe the whole of the Mosaic ritual conventions, because from practical life it was ~~i-~~

*Menipp.par.11. **cf.Plutarch,"De Curiosit."par.7, Iamblichus' satire in"Suidas",under τελαωνας, Chrysos.in"Matt".xxxii. ***cf. A. Edersheim,"Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah,"7th.Edn.1892,Vol.I. pp.514-18, Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Christ,"2nd. Edn. I.ii.66-71, A.H.McNeile,op.cit.comment on Mt.v.46,p.72. ****G.B.Gray in "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,"ed.Charles,op.cit. Vol.II.p.629,and cf.Ps.Sol.ii.38f.iii.11,13,iv.9,27,xii.8,xv.9-14, xvii.6. †I Macc.ii.44,48, "renegade Israelites," as Oesterley describes them, cf."Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,"op.cit.Vol.I.p.74. ‡‡Swete,op.cit.p.40.

impossible to do so in many trades and occupations, especially when these involved contacts with Gentiles. The law as Pharisaically interpreted was unobservable by large numbers of the people except at the cost of their livelihood, and Judaism was therefore being made impossible save for the privileged Jew. The 'sinners' further included people of immoral lives (Lk.vii.37, Jn.viii.1ff), although those who were aware of breaking the law probably did so with a bad conscience which made them feel immoral.*

The nature of Jesus' fellowship with the publicans and sinners is shown in the title by which he came to be known, viz. 'friend of publicans and sinners' (Mt.xi.19, Lk.vii.34). What did these people make of Jesus as he fraternized with them? Their experience of him has to be interpreted in the light of their exclusion from the normal Jewish religious experience. Being in a state of excommunication, there was nothing but judgment with the deserved fate waiting for the Gentiles as far as the God of Israel's faith was concerned. The Mosaic requirements were therefore not for them, consequently the personality of Jesus coupled with his distinctive appeal to the inner spirit of religion would impress them. They would grasp this inner significance all the more firmly in that they were less bounded

*cf. the agraphon which Codex Bezae has at Lk.vi.4; "on the same day, seeing one working on the sabbath, he said unto him: Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed: but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and a transgressor of the law," To the man without inner insight who cared for the law, such an action would make him feel he had done an immoral thing.

by law and tradition. The conventional Jew might assert that God did not hear 'sinners,' but through their contact with Jesus and his uniqueness in knowledge of God they discovered that the Judaism from which they were shut out was by no means the only nor the final revelation about God. They found out that there was joy in heaven over one sinner that turned to God, and this was tantamount to saying that God did hear sinners. This worked out in accordance with the two broad types of 'sinners' we have discerned. The 'sinners' who were proscribed because of occupation, or were of Gentile extraction, or who refused to follow Pharisaic traditionalism, welcomed Jesus as one who spoke with authority and not as the scribes, and followed Jesus to the very heart of his message. They were among those who 'glorified the God of Israel' (Mt.xv.31), for this was a specific way of referring to God on the part of Gentiles, as the wonderful works of Jesus were seen. To many of these thoughtful minds, much of Jesus' teaching would come with moral and spiritual stimulus and open their thoughts to possibilities of intercourse with the God from whom they were supposed to be excluded, possibilities such as they had never imagined before.* Their thoughts of the divine kingdom were cast in a far less nationalist mould. We never hear that they required any sign to attest Jesus' authority. They drew near unto Jesus, 'to

*That these 'sinners' were susceptible to religious stimulus is seen in the fact that some taxgatherers came under the influence of John the Baptist who gave them advice as to salvation (Lk.iii.12f); some of them must have responded to his call since there is some evidence that they were baptized by John (Lk.vii.29).

hear him'(Lk.xv.1), for his words sufficiently attested his authority and power in their minds. On the other hand those who sinned in a moral sense became influenced unto better living; taxgatherers notorious for their exactions became honest men at their personal contact with Jesus (cf.Lk.xix.8), harlots were encouraged to hope for salvation and urged to 'sin no more,' while their accusers were put to shame at the realistic moralism of Jesus which pierced into their own lustful thoughts and desires (Jn.viii.1-11).* These sinners found salvation in their contacts with Jesus, since they gained from him the way of life. In their friendship and fellowship with Jesus God came into their lives.

In the 'publicans and sinners' Jesus comes into direct touch with definite Gentile elements. The fact that they were outcasts as far as Israel was concerned places them along with the Gentiles, but many were probably of Gentile extraction and had never been within the Jewish theocracy. The ethically lapsed, such as unchaste women, were "chiefly foreigners,"** i.e.Gentiles; hence the Jewish refusal to associate with them lay not merely in the fear of unholy desires being roused, but the strong racial

*This passage is probably an interpolation giving a genuine fragment of Synoptic tradition. Holtzmann (op.cit.p.172) places it after Mk.xii.13-17, i.e.during the events immediately preceding the death of Jesus. In the Ferrar group of minuscules (13,69, 124,346) it appears after Lk.xxi.38 (cf.textual notes ad loc. and on Jn.vii.53-viii.11 in A.Souter, "Novum Testamentum Graece," 1910). In view of Luke's sympathetic presentation of Jesus' relation with the delinquents and the fallen, the story may well have originally stood in Luke. Cf.H.J.Cadbury, "A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship," Harv.Theol.Rev.Vol.X.1917, pp.237-44. **I.Abrahams, op.cit. Series I.p.57.

sentiments of the Jew would be defiled by contact of any sort with anything Gentile. The sin of the 'sinners' was not simply moral, but racial. Jesus was not seeking to make proselytes of them, but he was showing his nation its neglected duty to be a light to the Gentiles.* These ostracised elements were children of the Father whom he was revealing, and their response proved that exclusion from the Jewish theocracy was no guarantee that they were shut off from fellowship with God.

The significance of such extra-Jewish religious experience stimulated by these impressions and contacts of which Jesus was the centre is, that it points to the specific Gentile side of Christian experience in its very ~~very~~ origins in the life of Jesus and his fellowship with Gentile elements. In view of the struggle that arose over the universal witness of the primitive church** it is essential to discern clearly the definite Gentile groups with which Jesus was personally connected. Among such he was able to speak untrammelled by Jewish opposition. At such times he could open out and declare his mind to an audience that would not misunderstand him. From this source must have come many recollections of the deeper significance of what Jesus said and did. When Jesus was crucified they mourned, not because of frustrated Messianic hopes,*** but for the beloved teacher and friend whose unique goodness had brought God to them.

*On this subject see pp. 151 ff 337 ff**cf. pp. 381 ff
 ***as did the disciples; cf. pp. 190 f

Some of them may well have been among those who received experiences of Jesus' resurrection, and in the primitive church became the nucleus of the more liberal side with which Stephen was associated.

D. THE WORKS AND THE WORDS.

Jesus made his impacts upon those who saw and heard through what he did and what he said. Of the works his miracles were, of course, highly significant and strongly arresting in their impression made. Of the words the parables present the most significant elements in the teaching of Jesus. We turn to investigate the religious experience inherent in these two aspects of what men saw and heard when Jesus was in their midst.

Miraculous activities were characteristic of Jesus' mission.* Whatever be the modern attitude to miracle, the essential fact is that if the gospels are to be trusted, the eyewitnesses were in no doubt about the wonders they beheld. Did the miracles represent certain experiences received of the power of Jesus, or are they the figments of imagination, or again, the result of legendary growth around some distinctive nucleus of experience?

The experience of the healing miracles has received some illumination through modern psychology which has helped to make a little clearer the possibilities of diagnosis in them, while the hints afforded as to diagnosis suggest the lines along which the

*cf. pp. 122, 126, 131f.

healing processes may have worked.* This modern illumination, however, has serious limitations.

(1) Functional nervous disease is chiefly the object of psychological attack, that ~~which~~ involves a failure of nervous energy, as in the case of a man with paralysis,** whereas in the Gospels we have organic disease as the object of Jesus in his healing activity. The cures wrought at a distance, too, bring in a new type.*** (2) The direct response of the afflicted to the healing activity of Jesus stands out in the boldest contrast to the prolonged interviews and efforts at reassociation, characteristic of psychological treatment.

William McDougall illustrates this in the many studies of cases he analyses in his "Outline of Abnormal Psychology" (1926). For example, he details the case of a young gipsy labourer whose left hand was caught in some mechanism, and he was dragged violently up into the air, being suspended for some time by his left arm. On release the left fore limb "was in a condition of complete flaccid paralysis and total anaesthesia." For a year he remained in this condition, various efforts to cure him having failed. He then passed into McDougall's care, and the psychologist treated him accordingly. "With the failure of every such attempt at treatment, the patient's conviction that the arm was permanently useless had become more firmly established ...He seemed to be much depressed by his paralysis and the prospect of diminished economic efficiency through life... It was only through a course of education, persuasion, and suggestion (waking and hypnotic) and encouragement continued over some weeks that the cure was effected. The essential step was to shake and undermine his fixed belief in the permanent nature of the paralysis" (pp.242ff).

If we view this example, which is so typical of psychological

*cf. J.H. Hadfield, op.cit. McDougall, op.cit. E.R. Micklem, "The New Psychology and the Healing Miracles of the New Testament," G. Stanley Hall, "Jesus, the Christ, in the Light of Psychology," 1921, Vol. II. pp. 592-676. **Hadfield, op.cit. pl. ***cf. leprosy (Mk. i. 29ff) and the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt. viii. 5ff.).

method, alongside the healing of the man with a withered hand (Mk.iii.1-6), the direct command of Jesus, 'Stretch forth thy hand'(ver.5), and the immediate result in healing, we become aware of healing on a different level. (3) The tendency of psychological investigation of the miracles is towards an interpretation which barely falls short of pure allegorization, the miracles being, as it were, parables which have found concrete embodiment. In the Synoptics they are a materialization of the truth perceived in Jesus, and to understand them we have to use psychological insight to get beneath the materializations to what they embody. Thus miracle becomes a spiritual fact having its inner symbolic significance.* The Fourth Gospel has seized the symbolic meaning of the miracles it narrates, as seen in the turning of the water into wine (Jn.ii.1-10) and the resurrection of Lazarus (Jn.xi.1ff).** The chief difficulty of such a view is to decide where the actual ends and the symbolic begins. It further reduces what were definite acts to pictorial illustrations of abstract spiritual principles; it fails to account for the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, or else the empirical contacts with him are etherealized in a cloud of spiritual idealisms.

*G.Stanley Hall is representative as a psychologist of this viewpoint. "To the synoptists, the miracles had become far more than postulates. Indeed, they grew to be the most actual and literal of events. They petrified, embalmed, buried the very spirit of Jesus in these crass materializations...Thus the synoptists were in a sense undertakers, and the miracles are holy sarcophagi in which the most vital of all truths have been laid away,"op.cit.p.673f.
 **ibid.pp.647-52,631-39. cf.E.F.Scott,op.cit.pp.20,37,165,250.

What we have to do with is the impact of the personality of Jesus on the suffering and the diseased. When all allowance is made for later tendencies to magnify what Jesus did, in the light of ~~his~~^{the} exalted status conceived to be his by the primitive church, or for the accretion of legendary elements, or for the motives which led the evangelists to select, omit, or modify the tradition on which they rest, we are faced with a group of impressionable data experienced of one who possessed unique powers.

If we may glance at one or two types of miracle with a view to discerning the experience which those healed had of Jesus, we see the personal impact of Jesus, for example, in the simple case of Peter's wife's mother with her fever. Whatever the exact nature of the illness, we note that Jesus came to see her, took her by the hand (Mk.i.31) or touched her hand (Mt.viii.15), and rebuked the fever (Lk.iv.39), the result being that she was rid of the fever. If the cure be unintentional, it demonstrates the healing potency of Jesus in that the mere going in to see how she was restored her to health. If it be true that many people, and especially housekeepers, have risen to the occasion as hostess to distinguished people, and while doing so have forgotten their illness,* this does not minimize the fact that the influence of Jesus and experience of him caused this particular cure.

The healing of leprosy reveals once more that the determining factor is the potency of Jesus' personality (Mk.i.40-44, Mt.viii.2-4

*Hall, op.cit.p.603.

Lk.v.12-14). In this instance the leper's words, "if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," reveal the widespread impression the healing powers of Jesus were producing. The association of religious ideas with leprosy centre around the conviction that it was an unholy thing and therefore a sign of ^{the} displeasure of God. Such divine displeasure was due to sin, therefore the connection of leprosy with sin adds significance to the cure since this was at the same time proof that God had forgiven the sin involved. Such religious ideas are implied in the command to the healed leper to show himself to the priest and present his offering (Mk. i.44, cf. Lev. xiv. 2-32). Forgiveness of sins would be associated with Jesus in every cure he made of leprosy.

The phenomena of demon possession confronted Jesus at every turn of his ministry. "It is clear that Jesus conceived the demons as organized into an evil kingdom hostile to the Kingdom of God,* and this is what we expect in view of the fact that Jesus shared as a Jew in the religious environment of his age.** The minions of Beelzebub were indeed dreaded. The demons seized, tore, choked their victims, made them cry out in agony, roll about and foam at the mouth.*** The demons ^{clung} ~~cling~~ tenaciously to their human abode, for otherwise they must wander hither and thither, inhabit unclean beasts, haunt tombs or deserts (Mk.v.5,13,Lk.xi.24), and

*T.W.Manson, "The Teaching of Jesus," 1931, p.165, and cf. Mk.iii.23-27, Lk.xi.17-23, and above, p.110. **cf. pp.109-111 above. ***Mk.i.26, v.9, ix.18,26, xv.22, Lk.viii.2, ix.42, xi.14,26, cf. the force of *συνεστράφη* "convulsed," in Lk.ix.42.

they ^{preferred} ~~prefer~~ to torture human victims without mercy.* Jesus' achievements in this domain are one of his chief trophies and most potent suggestions to the world, and there is something here which the most inexorable criticism must leave essentially intact.**

The demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk.i.23-26) reveals characteristic features. The demoniac was in a condition of heightened 'numinous' suggestibility,*** and openly recognizes the unique status of Jesus come to destroy demons with his power in bringing the divine kingdom (Mk.i.24).**** Jesus commands the demon to come out of its victim (i.25). As though unwilling, yet recognizing that obedience to the potency of Jesus was inevitable, the demon leaves the man, and in so doing 'tears' him (i.26). The congregation in the synagogue react to this exhibition in a mood of the profoundest amazement (i.27).

We have to keep in mind the 'objective' character these evil spirits had both for the victims and for the people in general. For them it was no question of psychological condition. An unclean spirit had entered the man and he was under its control. The man plus the demon were one unit, a demoniac. Recognizing in his suggestible condition that Jesus was not simply the 'herald' but the potent personality who would bring in that kingdom which meant the destruction of evil spirits, the demoniac cried out in

*cf. the list of epithets in the summaries of healing activity; δαιμονιζομένους (Mk.i.32), βασάνοις συνεχουμένους, δαιμονιζομένους, κ. σεληνιαζομένους (Mt.iv.24). **Hall, op.cit.Vol.II.p.619).
 cf.pp.128,134. *cf.pp.110f.127.

protest. Objectively the congregation saw two potencies confronting one another; at this crucial moment all believed that Jesus as the 'herald' of the kingdom stood face to face with a representative of the prince of the demons. The casting out of the demon attested objectively the announcement of Jesus that the kingdom was at hand. Demon-possession in all its believed objectivity confronted Jesus with its terrifying moods and experiences, only to discover that experience of him and contact with him resulted in mental fetters being broken, multiple personality unified, the enslaved, dormant self awakened to new life and health, the captive imagination set free, fixed ideas broken, and diseased will released from its chains, and all the cognate ills which modern psychotherapy has made more familiar.

The religious experience implied in the miracles, therefore, reveals their attestation of the divine kingdom being heralded by Jesus. The impression they cause is that there is something 'numinous' in Jesus, some vital connection with that kingdom that could not be gainsaid. Even the very heightening of the miraculous or any subsequent allegorization of the wonderful works attests the uniqueness the onlookers felt about Jesus. Probably in every case of healing or casting out demons it was the power of his impressive personality; demoniacs abnormally suggestible as they undoubtedly were, at the same time were therefore abnormally capable of receiving naïve, direct impressions. Jesus stood before all such discerned as One more impressive for good than Beelzebub was for evil, and evidences a tremendously

impressive personality of commanding goodness, and connects with the expectation of the divine kingdom to come in the banishing of the myrmidons of evil.

We select the parables as characteristic of the words of Jesus. We are here less in the realm of action, and more in that of instruction and inspiration through preaching. Religious teaching may awaken the religious consciousness as wonder-working is not always capable of doing. The importance of the parable as reflecting the ideas of Jesus should not overshadow the parallel fact that "it depends for its effectiveness on the responsiveness of those to whom it is addressed."* This at once disposes of the primitive church inference reflected in Mark's gospel that Jesus spoke in parables to prevent his teaching from being understood save by the inner circle who sympathized with him.**

*T.W.Manson, op.cit.p.66.

**The locus classicus is, of course, Mk.iv.^{11f}

καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἀλλοίοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνονται (ver11) ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκοῦωσιν

καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν(ver12), the ἵνα denoting 'in order that.' But in the widening constructions of the Koine ἵνα may=δοτεῖν its force (cf.J.H.Moulton, op.cit.pp.208f), and thus signify 'with the result that.' As the Marcan text stands, however, with ἵνα having its usual force, the meaning is that Jesus spoke in parables to veil the truth from the multitudes. It may be that we have here the comment of the evangelist (Cadoux,op.cit.p.16), but the difficulty remains as to where the words of Jesus end and comment begins; in any case the evangelist, or the tradition he uses, regards the words as being uttered by Jesus. The difficulty has arisen probably through the transition of the tradition from the original Aramaic to Greek. Manson quotes the Targum on Isa.vi.9f., the scriptural words Jesus is set forth as saying, and points out that the

7 in 77077 is an Aramaic particle which may introduce either a relative or a final clause (cf. too W.B. Stevenson, "Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic," 1924, p. 22); hence this particle translated into Greek may become *ei* or *iva*. Probably the loosening tendencies of the Koine is the best explanation; *iva* has become *iste*. But we have still to reckon with the reference to the disciples seeking the meaning in private, with Jesus' reply that unto them the mystery of the kingdom is revealed, while to those who do not know, parables are given (Mk. iv. 10f.); the esoteric nature of parabolic teaching is thus stamped on the gospel tradition. This aspect is probably to be accounted for by the likelihood that the primitive church in the course of its recollections may have lost the significance of the parables, regarding them as mystifying and needing explanation. The disciples never really grasped the meaning of the kingdom of God as Jesus set it forth, and as many parables aimed at bringing this out, mystification was due to the fact that the disciples did not mean by 'kingdom' what Jesus did (cf. pp. 180f.). The explanation of the parable of the tares is a case in point where a later interpretation of the primitive church has obscured the meaning of the parable.*

Jesus intended his truth to go beyond the immediate circle of his own friends (Mk. iv. 9, 'who hath ears to hear, let him hear'). We take the view, therefore, that Jesus taught the people with the intention of bringing light to their minds. The parables thus become viewed as a spur to the development of religious insight, evoking a faith that lives in the hearers, and thus for them becoming modes of religious experience.**

The central subject of the parables is the divine kingdom which Jesus heralds in his preaching. We first select a small

*In the preservation of parables not understood we are able to discern a reflection of reverence for Jesus' words. **The parables presuppose a fairly quick intelligence in those who were listening. They rank with the Greek and the Elizabethan drama as evidence of unusually high understanding in the generation that listened to them.

group of parabolic sayings, viz. Salt and its Savour (Mk. ix. 50, Mt. v. 13, Lk. xiv. 34f), the Light under a Bushel (Mk. iv. 21, Mt. v. 15, Lk. xi. 33), the City on a Hill (Mt. v. 14). If addressed to disciples only (Mk) the words are esoteric counsel to them as uniquely selected as the salt of the earth; if to the crowds, as is more likely (Mt. Lk.), the sayings refer to the mission of Israel to the whole world. The listening Jews and Galileans caught the new accents in the teaching about the kingdom, as these urged that the chosen people were to function for all the nations, and impart their soul power and religious experience to savour the world as salt has power to give taste to whatever is salted, or light to shed its beams abroad, or the city which can be seen from a far distance. The absurdity of a light being kept to itself instead of lighting up the whole house is no more than the nation which would keep its faith all to itself, thus literally placing its light under a bushel. The audience would be in no doubt as to the identification of the city set on a hill, for Jerusalem was high up on the mountains, journeying up to which the pilgrims chanted their songs of ascents (Pss. cxx-cxxxiv). That City which ought to let the nation's light so shine that it may be seen of all men had become notorious for its exclusiveness and the placing of barriers between Jews and the rest of mankind. Thus it is not fulfilling its duty in the sight of God, and restricts the outlook upon the divine kingdom.

Parables such as the Children crying in the Market-place (Mt.

xi.16-19,Lk.vii.31-35), the Mustard Seed (Mk.iv.30-32,Mt.xiii.31f. Lk.xiii.18f), the Leaven (Mt.xiii.33,Lk.xiii.20f), the Unfruitful Fig Tree (Lk.xiii.6-9), the Wedding Feast (Mt.xxii.1-10,with which may be taken the Great Feast of Lk.xiv.16-24), may be viewed as attempts to enlarge the religious experience of the Jews, and deepening their consciousness as God's people with a mission to the world in the kingdom of God.

A.T.Cadoux (op.cit.) questions the interpretation which the evangelists attach to the parable of the children in the market-place on the ground that we can hardly think that Jesus criticised his generation as a whole of calumniating John in saying that John had a devil, for the verdict was the other way, John being a popular personality (Mt.xxi.26). Luke, however, precedes the story by saying that while the people and the taxgatherers had received the baptism of John, the Pharisees and the scribes did not accept it. It was quite likely that the latter were able to regard John as being animated by a demon since they did not shrink from ascribing the good works of Jesus to the power of the prince of the demons (Mk.iii.22,cf.p.131). The generation to which Jesus referred included Pharisees and scribes as well as publicans and sinners (Lk.vii.29f.), and thus the parable becomes intelligible. Those who piped and wailed are the Jews, especially characterized in their leaders. The other children who failed to respond are the publicans and the sinners, i.e.the Gentiles (cf.pp.137,140f), who refused to accede to Jewish requirements before they could enter the kingdom of God. The piping and the wailing of the Jews made no impression on the Gentiles, and the Jews refused to change their tune, or play at another game. The parable is thus seen to be a serious effort made by Jesus to awaken his generation of fellow-Jews to their world mission to the Gentiles.

Parables such as the Mustard Seed and the Leaven both suggest the expansion of the kingdom of God to a size out of all proportion to the tiny seed or the small amount of leaven which energized the large quantity of meal. This is the usual interpretation,

coupled with the idea of the germinal life actually at work through the preaching of Jesus and his disciples.* But there is the added feature as to what the crowds were making of this teaching here. If Jesus was aiming at individual character,** certainly the crowds would interpret these parables in a corporate manner, and think of the corporate community to be blessed with the advent of the divine kingdom, and they would limit that community to Israel, while non-Jews would either be destroyed or placed in subjection to Israel. The Mustard Seed with the figure of the birds nesting among the branches would find point in the Old Testament symbol of the tree and its branches as emblematic of a mighty kingdom that gave shelter for the nations of the world,*** and there is a Messianic reference which suggests the restoration of Jerusalem and David's dynasty.**** The Leaven need not point to the contrast with the Mustard Seed of an intensive character of the kingdom over against the extensive;‡ it carries on the same thought of the kingdom as an influence until it has leavened the whole world of the nations, and with these ideas Jesus is endeavouring to enlarge the religious consciousness of the Jews. The Unfruitful Fig Tree would be

*McNeile, op.cit. on Mt.xiii.32,p.198. **As,e.g.Dougall and Emmet think; "the Kingdom in the heart would be like a grain of mustard seed..." op.cit.p.205. ***cf.Ezek.xxxi.6,12. Dan.iv.12-14,21f. ****cf.Ezek.xvii.22-24, and H.A.Redpath,"The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel,"WC.1907,ad loc.pp.84f. The phrase 'fowl of every wing' points to the new cedar tree which grows from the tender twig as embracing all nations, a remarkable conception to Ezekiel's usual exclusive view of Israel's position and privilege. ‡Edersheim,op.cit.Vol.I.p.593.

heard by those who had ears to hear with accents of warning to Judaism. There was much to be said for the owner of the vineyard's ^{contention} that it was unnecessary for an unfruitful tree to encumber the ground (Lk.xiii.7). The gardener pleads for another chance; the tree shall be dug around. So in Israel there is a regrettable barrenness, but the Jews are to have a further opportunity of doing their spiritual duty by the Gentiles, yet the time was urgent.*^{In} The Great Supper, ~~whose~~ the self-excuse of those invited in the first place, finally places them beyond the possibility of being present (Lk.xiv.24). The very position of religious privilege enjoyed by the Jews made them self-sufficing and exclusive, and calling for repentance which not being forthcoming, will cause Messiah to call in the unprivileged, i.e.the Gentiles.

These parables and parabolic sayings aim at enlargening the religious consciousness of the Jews as touching the coming kingdom of God. Many hearers would not understand his allusions for it never dawned on many Jews or Galileans that God had any purpose for the Gentiles. But some hearkened and responded, else we would never ^{have} had these parables preserved. Taxgatherers and sinners and Gentiles were doubtless among those who listened, and these would be quick to catch the newer accents and perceive the wider horizons. It may well be, indeed, that we owe the preservation of many parables to such non-Jewish elements. At least the

*cf.Joel i.7 for the fig tree as an emblem of Israel, and on the interpretation suggested cf.Edersheim,op.cit.Vol.II.pp.246-8, and A.T.Cadoux,op.cit.pp.85-6.

wider horizons found an anchor in their freer outlook and formed the spiritual elements which later were to free the primitive church from its narrower self-consciousness.*

The imminence of the kingdom as Jesus preached and taught it produced a series of parables designed to evoke the sense of religious crisis within their experience. The real difficulty here lay in the nationalist elements in the audiences, and the danger of enthusiasms arising from false ideas of the kingdom. Indeed, the idea that parables were used for obscuring truth,** may have arisen from the use of them to say what was dangerous to say otherwise. Yet it was essential that Jesus bring his nation to a sense of redemptive crisis in a different zone from that of nationalist hopes of overthrowing Rome, viz. a crisis to awaken the Jews to a conviction of their true destiny.

That is why elements of judgment appear in some of the parables. As examples of these we suggest parabolic sayings such as The New Patch on the Old Garment and the New Wine in the Old Wineskins (Mk.ii.21f.Mt.ix.16f.Lk.v.36-38), the Divided Kingdom or House (Mk.iii.24-26,Mt.xii.25-28,Lk.xi.17-20), the Strong Man Armed (Mk.iii.27,Mt.xii.29,Lk.xi.21)—it is significant that all these are spoken to the Pharisees as the nation's leaders—The Blind leading the Blind (Mt.xv.14,Lk.vi.39), the Master returning from a Marriage Feast (Lk.xii.35-38), the Faithful and Unfaithful Stewards (Lk.xii.42-46), the Shut Door (Lk.xiii.24-30)—addressed

*pp.141f. and pp. 383f.

**Of.Mk.iv.12 and pp.149f.

to the disciples—The Rejected Stone (Mk.xii.10f.cf.Ps.cxviii.22f). These 'judgment' elements arise from the crisis resulting from the imminence of the kingdom, the reaction to which will constitute the judgment 'ipso facto,' favourable or unfavourable.

In the case of the New Patch and the New Wine, Matthew links them on to the previous encounter with the disciples of the Baptist (cf.the enclitic $\delta\epsilon$), suggesting that Jesus' disciples could not, with their new faith, live on the old garment of the Baptist's outlook. This connection, however, is missing in Mark, while Luke prefaces the two parables with a new beginning (v.36). They originally stood in a different context from that suggested by Matthew. "Unter dem alten Kleide und dem alten Schlauch lässt sich kaum etwas anders verstehn als die Form des Judentums" (Wellhausen, op.cit.p.19). Judaism is becoming threadbare; the imminent crisis will show that the old cannot be patched. It is, of course, Judaism with its system of ordinances and traditional inferences from the law of Moses which Jesus has in mind. The Wineskins carry on the same thought, but with the added idea of the new religious experience having a new spirit which cannot be contained in the old vessels, for it would ruin the skins and spill itself in loss. The appropriate new forms must be there to receive the new ferment. "Und ferner fällt auf, dass er die Schaffung einer Neuen Form für notwendig erklärt, während er tatsächlich in dieser Beziehung Alles der Gemeinde nach seinem Tode überlassen hat" (Wellhausen, op.cit.p.19). Here we receive hints that in view of the possible inadequacy of Judaism, a new community may emerge as the outcome of the crisis due to the imminence of the kingdom.

The Divided Kingdom or House illustrates the sense of crisis from another angle. If the demon cures were due to Satan, the kingdom of which he had the power would be divided against itself, evil being undone by evil. The demon cures however indicated that the source of demonic power was itself being overthrown by the judgment and power that heralded the kingdom. The Strong Man Armed points in the same direction with the additional fact ^{that} the exorcisms
^

so far as the demonic prince was concerned with them, showed that he had met his match. The crisis further shows up the inadequacy of the Jewish leaders in the face of it as The Blind leading the Blind saying shows. Those who are being led are expected to be in a more backward state of enlightenment, but the crisis of the kingdom will reveal that the leaders are as blind as the led, with the hint that enlightened leaders will be needed by the new enlightened citizens of the kingdom. The series of Lukan parables, viz. The Master returning from a Marriage Feast, The Faithful and Unfaithful Stewards, and The Shut Door, urges upon the more confidential circle of his disciples the duty of watchfulness and alert expectancy to serve the returning master with his kingdom. Judgment is implied in the approval of the master if faithful and condemnation if vigilance fails.

The Rejected Stone hints at the way in which the crisis will work out. It has in mind the Jewish religious leaders who were planning to overthrow Jesus,* who nevertheless would discover that what they had rejected would rise supreme. The crisis would bring forth a new community based on the higher authority of the kingdom as seen in the personality of Jesus. Matthew's version gives us possible hints as to the nature of this new community. It defines the 'others' to whom the vineyard will be handed over in trust for the owner, as those who will deliver the expected crops of fruit in their due season (xxi.41); after bringing in the reference to the

*It follows on the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, and cf. p. 133.

Rejected Stone Jesus informs the Jewish leaders that the kingdom will be taken away from them and given to a people worthy of the trust, just as the vineyard was handed over to others more fitted to discharge their duty (Mt.xxi.43). In planning for the death of Jesus the leaders were unwittingly paving the way to the emergence of the new community of the kingdom, and in this sense the crisis would form a judgment on the Jews and their leaders, and at the same time constitute the conditions from which the new community would come into being.

It is not historical to regard these hints of a new community as referring to the Christian Church, not at this early stage. It is not difficult to read back the later discoveries of the primitive church or later into these hints. We are here amidst the faint glimmerings of a newly awakening religious consciousness, and at the moment neither the disciples nor the crowds were clear as to what might take place. Indeed, they were too likely to construe what Jesus was saying in terms of popular apocalyptic. This tendency to read back later ideas of the primitive church into the simpler rudiments of religious experience is responsible for the narrower reference to the Rejected Stone as symbolizing the official rejection of Jesus' Messiahship, and to regard this idea which is found in the Acts (iv.10-12) as the reproduction by the disciples after Pentecost of what they then thought expressed their Master's original idea (cf. Swete, op.cit.on Mk.xii.10). But apart from the fact that Jesus was condemned before the Sanhedrin less on any claim to Messiahship than is supposed (cf.pp.133f.), the Acts' reference is motivated by the new experience of the Risen Christ. For these reasons it is unsafe to interpret the Rejected Stone as a parable of the rejection of the Messiahship of Jesus.

We have therefore the presentation of a crisis that is wellnigh upon the people in the imminence of the kingdom of God, and hints that the crisis will cause to emerge a community whose religious experience will have a wider reference than was the case in the

conventional Judaism of Jesus' day.

The kingdom of God as Jesus conceived and taught it had a uniquely spiritual and ethical quality. There are parabolic sayings which go right to the heart of the individual. Among these are The Mote and the Beam (Mt.vii.3,Lk.vi.41f), a vivid warning against judging others, a fault which could be carried to absurd lengths. The Good and the Bad Trees (Mt.vii.16-20, Lk.vi.43f) with its figurative imagery suggesting that human conduct reveals the spirit's quality within; God's truth will reproduce itself through personality and this will reveal if a man's life is of God or not. The Houses on the Rock and the Sand (Mt.vii.24-27,Lk.vi.47-49) applies to all who hear the words of Jesus, but differentiates through those who act seriously on the spiritual affirmations recognized in the soul through the teaching of Jesus, and those whose affirmations of soul do not rise to expression in personality and action, and thus leaves them unstable. To renounce the vision of reality is to build on the sand and be at the mercy of the storm. The vivid manner in which Jesus atomizes the crowds into thinking and individually responsible beings is further shown by such parables as The Tower Builder (Lk.xiv.28-30) and the King going to War (Lk.xiv.31f), the point of which is the importance of sitting down and facing carefully the cost involved in following Jesus and meeting his demands, the cost being in terms of the ethical and spiritual requirements of discipleship, even if these lead to sundering the dearest of

home ties (ver.26). The renunciation reveals those who are living in the kingdom of God even already, where human life "is reformed on a new plane."* The cost involved will find its unlimited compensations on this higher plane of family kinship with Jesus on its spiritual side (Mk.x.29f). In this sense the "hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands," is tantamount to a parable of family kinship with Jesus in the life of the kingdom, the connecting tie being the doing of the will of God as constituting kinship (mk.iii.35).

It is clear that Jesus is aiming at accomplishing his wider purpose for his nation by winning the individuals composing the nation to the higher and more responsible outlook. "The standard of this individualism is wholly self-contained, determined simply by its own sense of what which will further its consecration to God. It is bound to go all lengths in obedience to the demands of the Gospel."** The demands are as it were superhuman, and the parable concerned is useful by way of suggesting them rather than defining them in detail. The result is to initiate the processes of religious summons in the soul of the hearer. All through the appeal is religious, to the religious experience of the individual hearer, leaving what is said to take root and bring forth in its time.

*E.Hoskyns and N.Davey, "The Riddle of the New Testament," 1931, p201.

**E.Troeltsch, "The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches," Eng. Tr. 1931, Vol. I. p.55.

The words of Jesus seem to aim at the growth of spiritually creative personality into which he inserted the germ, leaving its power of propagating life to bring about the creative personalities who shall be the material for the imminent kingdom. The more Jesus sees the inadequacy of Judaism for its task of bringing light to the world, the more he seeks to create the right type of religious experience in his hearers. This takes place from personal contact with his life and words.

Several parables stress this aspect, viz. What Defiles a Man (Mk.vii.14f), The Lost Sheep, The Lost Coin, and The Prodigal Son (Lk.xv.3-7,8-10,11-32), The Pharisee and the Publican (Lk.xviii.9-14), The Good Samaritan (Lk.x.30-37). Defilement meant a very serious thing for the Jew since it unfitted him for fellowship with God, but with his emphasis on the ritual as equivalent to the moral in divine worth he did not perceive that "the merely external cannot defile a man's spiritual nature," nor that "the converse of the principle" was "that the merely external cannot purify."* The parabolic saying, What Defiles a Man, makes clear the distinction between the moral and the merely ritual by pointing to the real sources of moral defilement in a man's spirit, and which issue in conduct that is unworthy and injurious.** The Lost

*Swete, op.cit. p.150. **The issue is significant in view of the subsequent struggle of the primitive church to widen its self-consciousness as illustrated by Peter's experience on the housetop, and the incident with Cornelius. See pp. 249f. 394f.

Sheep, Coin and Prodigal Son show that the divine salvation, inheritance in the kingdom of God, is a matter of individual repentance and turning to God in faith (Lk.xv.7,10). Even those who are outcast from orthodox Judaism or the morally unholy may thus enter the kingdom on equal terms with the Jews. Moral individualism is here clearly expressed in the individual aspect of forgiveness presented. The Pharisee and the Publican illustrates the despising by the religious leaders of the vulgar and the outcast,* ^{who were} and therefore ~~were~~ disloyal to the Levitical law of loving one's neighbour as oneself (Lev.xix.18), while the catalogue of excellencies stands out in contrast to the manner and spirit of the sinner who knows himself so well that he does not judge others, but seeks by repentance the forgiveness of God. The Good Samaritan reveals the compassion of true goodness; a fellow-man in need affords an opportunity for love which does not enquire what minimum must be attained if eternal life is to be reached. Creative personality asks not what are the limits to religious experience and its promptings, but what are the opportunities afforded for the expression of such personality. What we have to do with in all these parables is the experience of God being expressed on the one hand in repentance and trust, and on the other, in love and service for others. From religious experience so intensely individual rises religious experience that by implication is intensely universal, for ~~there~~ are no

*cf.pp.94,136,140f.

limits to the 'neighbour' idea.

The various parables, when viewed from the side of religious experience, reveal a 'Weltanschauung' with a strong apocalyptic background, the central feature of which is the kingdom of God, the imminence of which Jesus is proclaiming. There is a vivid sense of crisis, for the chosen nation will itself be on trial, and ~~there are~~ possibilities are that its religious outlook and faith will be too narrowly conceived for Israel to be considered worthy of the kingdom. Even now there are hints that another community is being prepared, and its experience and vision will be all the wider and deeper because there is passing over to those who are unwittingly being prepared for their future witness something of the creative spiritual consciousness of Jesus ^{which is} ~~and was~~ already finding response in living faith. The creative experience did not germinate in many who heard simply because they stopped at the enjoyment of the story, or else the seed fell by the wayside, or among stony places, or among the thorns. The Parable of the Sower (Mk.iv.1ff) is really a parable which explains the parables both in their spiritual and creative intention and in the types of reaction in the minds and hearts of the hearers. But many kept these sayings in their heart, pondered them in reflective thought, and as they did so, the religious experience began to take root, and in due time it became fitting material for the primitive church.

But the parables further show us that Jesus filled in the characteristic Jewish 'Weltanschauung' with unique spiritual and ethical quality. That was why the kingdom could not be regarded as having racial or nationalist barriers, and therefore embraced the Gentiles. That was why, moreover, the individual was helped to feel his responsibility in these crucial matters.

E. THE EMPIRICAL RESPONSE OF THE DISCIPLES.

What were the disciples making of their Master as they received their personal impressions and ^{set} setting up the personal contacts which consciously and unconsciously were impregnating their lives with Jesus? It is a commonplace of psychology that personality reacts on personality. Socrates so impressed his disciples that they reacted to his teaching by setting it down as they apprehended it.* In the case of Jesus we have at the very minimum a Jewish religious teacher of unique force and power which were more contagious and far-reaching in effect than the recipients at the time were realizing. The receptivity, however, of the personal influence and instruction is largely conditioned by the capacity to take in what is coming over from the master mind, whether force of personality or the actual teaching being given. Such intake may be at its lowest quality, and the teacher has the initial task of enlarging the receiving power of his hearers. This preliminary process was needed in respect of the

*cf. The Republic of Plato and the Memorabilia of Xenophon.

men of simple Galilean stock and religious piety who accompanied Jesus on his tours (Mk.i.38) with whom he conversed as they with him (Mk.ix.9-13), who were eyewitnesses of his works and hearers of his words (cf.Mk.viii.14-21), who misunderstood and were at latent cross-purposes with him when he spoke of his forthcoming agony at Jerusalem (Mk.ix.32), and who were overjoyed at the resurrection experience (Lk.xxiv.32,52). Through their friendship with this unique teacher they were constantly driven by the force of his personality to ask what manner of man was this in their midst, and at the same time were equally impelled to attempt some answer; failing to do so, they ~~were~~ ^{had} perforce to let him answer as time and his spiritual power unfolded and expanded their own spiritual energies until these began to admit him within their growing life.

We therefore discover a twofold aspect in their experience of Jesus. First, there was the positive side, the actual 'plus' to their religious experience as their contacts and impressions increased in quality and as deepening insight enabled them to interpret Jesus more significantly. Then we have the negative aspect, the 'minus' quantity, that which should have been there had they reacted appropriately to their Master, but through ignorance, misunderstanding or failure to take in, was lacking in them, ~~and~~ ^{such being} due to the limitations of mental and spiritual categories in which they thought and felt and experienced their normal religious life. But we should avoid too arbitrary a

division of the two aspects, for while failing on the conscious cognitive sides of their outlook, the disciples were subconsciously building better than they knew.

Jesus was more than a religious teacher. He was in himself the bearer of a new way of life, and he sought to communicate this to his disciples, and so to grow their spiritual life that they would express the divine purpose after he was removed from their midst. The feature for recognition at the moment is the action of unique religious personality in its creative vitality on the experience of the disciples, keeping in view at the same time its conditioning by their capacity to grow and take in.

The disciples we have chiefly in mind are those designated as the 'Twelve,'* but there were others almost of equal significance, who in some cases knew the mind of Jesus more intimately.** We seem to detect an inner circle of three, or perhaps four disciples.***These may have been more receptive than the rest of the Twelve, or they may have formed in the first place a small group of personal companions which afterwards in church tradition was expanded into the 'Twelve.' We hear too of a larger group sent out by Jesus to preach the kingdom and to cast out demons (Lk.x.lff), a group of seventy, but this number may be due to the working of Luke's Gentile mind, or a relic of association with the

*Cf. the name lists in Mk.iii.16-19, Mt.x.2-4, Lk.vi.14-16. On the number and the significance of the Twelve in the primitive church see pp. 295-297, 520-3**Cf. the Beloved Disciple whose intimate understanding of the mind of Jesus inspired a corpus of evangelic tradition which finally grew into the fourth gospel, and who was not one of the Twelve. ***Peter, James, John, with possibly Andrew, Mk.v.37, ix.2, xiii.3.

seventy books of the Septuagint, but more likely he has preserved a strand of genuine tradition which points to the fact that Jesus had a larger following of disciples than twelve. We come across women disciples also.

If the statement that there were women disciples conveys little information, we are yet faced with the vital personal impact which could bring a woman of shameful life to repentance (Lk.vii.37f.47-50), cast demons out of a Mary Magdalene (Lk.viii.2), and be on terms of intimate friendship with Martha and Mary of Bethany (Lk.x.38ff). Women shared in the revelation of the resurrection experiences (Mt.xxviii.1,9,Lk.xxiv.10), and were found within the inner circle of prayer and expectation leading to the experience of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts i.14), and probably shared in the Spirit's outpouring (Acts ii.1ff.).

The first contact of Jesus with his disciples may have been in their call to follow him (Mk.i.16-20). Simon and Andrew his brother, James and John, Zebedee's sons are engaged in their trade of fishing when they are summoned to leave their nets and come after him. But was the personality so potent that he was able to induce men to leave all at a moment's notice without any previous acquaintance or experience of him? Without deciding whether this was possible or impossible, it seems more natural to view the call as preceded by previous personal intercourse.

The Lukan story suggests this (v.1-11), for the informal way in which Jesus made use of Simon's boat as a point of vantage whence to speak to the crowds, implies some terms of friendship between the two. The Fourth Gospel is more emphatic with its story of the meeting of Jesus with Andrew and Peter in Judaea where the Baptist was preaching (i.35-42). Further, they find their way to Jesus' side because the Baptist has pointed Jesus out as the Messiah, the Lamb of God; two of John's disciples, hearing what their master was saying sought out Jesus; as a result of the evening's conversation with him they become convinced that Jesus is the Messiah (i.41). Andrew found his brother Simon and

are brought him to Jesus, who thereupon received him as a disciple. This recognition of Jesus as Messiah seems premature in view of the discovery only slowly made until at Caesarea Philippi the climax of confession is reached (Mk.viii.30). There is probably a reading back of later discovery into the early contacts in the Fourth Gospel, since Jesus was seen to be no more than the 'herald' of the kingdom, a view which the disciples shared with the crowds until they, by closer contact, made the discovery that he was no mere herald, but the Messiah himself (cf. pp.127f., 172-174).

What seems to have happened is that some Galileans, stirred by the reports of John's preaching and heralding of the kingdom in Judaea, left their occupation for the time being* and made the journey southwards to join the crowds gathering round the Baptist. Several of them became disciples of John (Jn.i.37). It is even likely that Jesus himself was moved in the same way, and that his own baptism at the hands of John was the seal of the unique self-consciousness that had slowly come to the birth in him (Mk.i.11).** Some of the Galileans may well have come into personal contact with Jesus in a more intimate way (Jn.i.37-42), and deserted John for Jesus. Thereafter they all travelled back to Galilee (Jn.i.43) and resumed their occupations for the time being. Jesus chose his own moment and called them to come after him (Mk.i.17,20)***. However this may be it is psychologically

*There would be little use in carrying on with the occupations if the prophet on Jordan's banks was right about the Kingdom at hand, so they would feel. **Cf. pp.135f.). ***The penitent action of Peter in urging ^{Jesus} Peter to depart from him, a sinful man (Lk.v.8) is rather spoiled by the comment of the evangelist that the reason for Peter's words was amazement due to the miracle of the draught of fish (v.4-7). Yet the contact with Jesus in the miracle may have had a moral rebound on him. It is difficult, however, to avoid the connection of Peter's self-abasement with an act of wonder-working, although it is true that the connection is due to the tradition.

difficult to feel that there was no previous contact with Jesus.* In any case the disciples who gathered round Jesus seem to have been mainly Galileans, with a 'Weltanschauung' cast in the apocalyptic mould characteristic of such people.** One came from the ranks of the outcasts, Matthew the taxgatherer,*** and Jesus was no stranger to these people. One of the circle was actually of the patriotic party who looked for the kingdom in the overthrow of Rome.

This one was Simon the Zealot, whose outlook should not be toned down to ^{that of} a mere religious zealot, i.e. a Jew zealous for the Law. The Pharisees were zealous for the law as were none others, but they would have objected to being called Zealots, in view of their political patriotisms and apocalyptic enthusiasms (cf. Jos. Ant. XVIII. i. 1, 6, BJ. II. viii. 1). We cannot go with Swete, therefore, in regarding Simon the Zealot as one who received his characteristic epithet because he was "a scrupulous adherent to the forms of the Law" (op. cit. on Mk. iii. 18, cf. too McNeile, op. cit. on Mt. x. 4), nor with Dalman in his emending of the text to avoid the direct suggestion that among the disciples of Jesus there was such an enthusiast revolutionary (op. cit. p. 50). It seems better to accept the plain meaning of ὁ Καναναῖος as a member of a sect or party (Schurer, op. cit. I. ii. 80 f. II. ii. 19), and that Simon was a recruit from among the nationalist enthusiasts of Galilee. Here was one explanation of the misunderstanding of Jesus on the part of the disciples when he spoke of his forthcoming death (Mk. ix. 32).

In due course the church was to interpret the significance of Jesus by the aid of categories which hitherto had been applied only to God Himself. **** At the same time the church came to be more definitely organized with Jesus as the exalted Head, and the twelve

*We have here an instance of how the Fourth Gospel is able to throw light on the Synoptic narratives, for ^{Mark's} genuine historical reminiscence, due probably to the Beloved Disciple, who may have been the other of the two who heard John and followed Jesus (i. 40). **cf. p. 85. ***or Levi, Mk. ii. 14. ****cf. Phil. ii. 9 f. Col. i. 13-19.

companions of Jesus were elevated into an apostolic collegium.* But it cannot be maintained that the disciples had any such exalted position when with Jesus, nor that they perceived in him from the first what the church came to discern. We have to allow for growth in their intake. Along with the crowds they saw in Jesus the 'herald' of the divine kingdom. They too wondered what manner of man this was in their midst. They too were amazed at his miracles, and like the crowds, they may have drawn erroneous inferences from what they saw. They may have felt disappointment at the refusal of Jesus to place himself at the head of the patriotic movement to make him king,** but unlike many others, they stood by him in spite of this, for they felt there was something more in Jesus than had yet been discerned (Jn.vi.68f.). Even in the early stages of their fellowship the personality of Jesus created an awareness in them that he was different from anyone else they had known or of whom they had heard, since their experience of him was so unlike anything they had hitherto had, or had heard of anyone else having.

An intimate relationship grew up between Master and disciples. He was known in their homes (Mk.i.29), they shared together in the meals,*** observed the 'Kiddush' together, whether of the approaching sabbath week by week, or of some important festival

*Cf. pp. 296, 620-23. **Cf. p. 126. ***Mk.i.31, "and she ministered unto them." Lk.viii.3, reading ἀβροῖς, with B, D, and the Old Latin and Old Syriac. Mk.viii.14. cf. Jn.iv.31. The two disciples who were not of the twelve recognized Jesus again by the way he blessed the bread in the house at Emmaus, thus revealing his familiar ways with them (Lk.xxiv.30f.).

such as that of Pentecost or Passover. The last meal Jesus had with them was the scene of a Kiddush celebration for the Passover (Jn.xiii.1f.).* The disciples accompanied him mostly wherever he went (Mk.i.21,36ff.ii.15,23,iii.7,v.1ff.31,vi.1,31,45-51,etc). There are intimate talks in private (Mk.iv.10,34,vi.30f.vii.17, Mt.xiii.36,etc), in which Jesus could open up the more significant spiritual and ethical aspects of what he was preaching and teaching in public, although it does not follow that they understood all at once the bearing of his words.

At the same time their cognitive approach to the law and the traditions was undergoing modification. There is evidence of their growth in their plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath (Mk. ii.23-28), the disregarding of the Jewish ritual in washing hands prior to a meal (Mk.vii.1-5), and it would seem that the disciples were growing beyond the letter of the law. Yet it may be they were only following a less strict tradition.** But when such incidents are taken with the 'Corban' saying which led on to the enunciation of the spiritual principle that things cannot defile persons, who "can only be defiled by themselves, by acting irreligiously,"*** and the inner criticism of the traditions as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount,**** we may conclude that

*For the occasion and the significance of this farewell meal, cf. pp.425-444 This is a further instance of greater historical accuracy in the Fourth Gospel than is sometimes supposed; cf.pp. 429-30 **Cf.pp.83f. E.g.Büchler (Der galiläische Am-ha Ares,1906, ch.iv) and C.G.Montefiore (Hibbert Lectures,op.cit.p.476) have shown that most of the purity laws apply to priests, or to laymen entering the temple. ***Montefiore, "The Synoptic Gospels," 1910, Vol.I.p.169. ****Mt.v-vii, especially v.21-48.

the contact with Jesus was making the disciples less legally minded. The process went on more intensively in some than in others, and the way was being prepared for the experience of the Transfiguration where in vision the disciples apprehended the superiority of their Master both to the Law and the prophets, in that he fulfilled both, and in so doing caught up Israel's religion into a new and higher synthesis.

Being sent out on a preaching tour, the disciples return in joy that even the demons are subject to them (Lk.x.17). Thus the same powers of healing begin to show themselves in the disciples of Jesus as were seen in the Master himself. Jesus had to remind them of the deeper aspects of their preaching of the kingdom, since they were taking the evidence of the demons as too literally fulfilling the hopes of the kingdom as they conceived it(Lk.x.20).

From all the influences which were radiating from the personality of Jesus, his commanding goodness, his power over the demons, his fellowship with the Father God and the revelation of the Father to his hearers, his preaching, teaching, healings, the intimacy of the fellowship between him and the disciples, there resulted the conviction that Jesus was no mere 'herald' of the kingdom, but Messiah himself(Mk.viii.29, Mt.xvi.16,Lk.ix.20). This conviction was gradually formed in the minds of the disciples and found expression in Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi. The insight of Peter is not

limited to the mere guessing of some Messianic secret by recognizing in Jesus the conventionally familiar features of the Messiah so ardently expected, or identifying him with the current apocalyptic type. The uniqueness of the confession lay in that it was "a synthesis, an Act of Faith indeed, for it was giving a substance to something that had never been seen before."* A Messiah who lived among men was, of course, a familiar conception insofar as he was looked for to spring from some kingly dynasty or priestly corporation such as the Davidic or Levitical types of human Messiah respectively foreshadowed;** but one who was nurtured in lowly circumstances, who went about doing good and gathering disciples like a prophet or teacher, was hitherto unheard of in Jewish expectation. To this extent Peter had cut himself adrift from the popular apocalyptic ideas, and such an advance in insight was due to his fellowship with Jesus. Peter probably spoke for the disciples as well as for himself, and there is no doubt that they all looked on Jesus as the expected Messiah. As their experience of Jesus grew from day to day, it came to them that the more ordinary terms such as 'Master,' 'Teacher,' 'Prophet,' 'Herald,' did not adequately convey the uniqueness they apprehended more and more in Jesus. They were thus influenced to apply to him the highest category, save that of God***, of which their religious experience was capable, and they thus

*F.C.Burkitt, "Christian Beginnings," op.cit.pp.28f. **Cf.pp.102f.

***Jewish monotheism would be reluctant to infringe the divine sovereignty by ascribing divinity to Messiah.

confessed Jesus as Messiah, the Lord's Anointed.*

The application of this unique category to Jesus carried with it an implied superiority both to the law and the prophets.** This was realized in the experience of the disciples rather in a subconscious way, for consciously they had not had time to perceive the force of the title they had ascribed to Jesus. Even now, they would have consciously shrunk from placing Jesus before Moses. But the significance of their discovery realized itself in a vision they had shortly after the confession. Jesus had retreated to some hillside to pray,*** and while he was praying the three disciples who had accompanied him saw him transfigured (Lk.viii.28f.). An experience of mystic vision which came to the three onlookers, where the truths seized by their subconscious mind and only dimly perceived by the conscious cognitive side of their personality, came for the moment to the surface in vivid symbolism, is what we have in the Transfiguration as far as the empirical content is concerned. The subjective preparation in the influence of Jesus and his uniqueness, the confession of him as Messiah with the implied superiority of Jesus to Moses and Elijah as representative of the law and the prophets, objectified itself in the vision of Jesus talking with

*Cf.pp.100f. **i.e.in the sense of fulfilment: the prophets pointed to Messiah, while the consummation of the Jewish theocracy in the kingdom ruled over by Messiah carried with it the ideal fulfilment of the law. "Jesus had produced such a unique impression upon their minds and souls, that a unique term was needed to give expression to their thought of Him" (H.T.Andrews,"The Christ of Apostolic Faith,"1929,p.80). ***The Lukan narrative brings the spiritual atmosphere of the Transfiguration experience out clearly.

them. The subconscious nature of the experience needs emphasis in that the announcement of Jesus' suffering and death which followed on the confession that he was Messiah (Mk.viii.31) came as a great shock to their conscious conceptions of what Messiah was in status and power. To suffer and die was the very last thing expected of Messiah.* When this is given its full weight, together with Luke's information that Jesus and Moses and Elōjah were conversing about the forthcoming suffering and death at Jerusalem (ix.31), we are faced with the fact that what was on its conscious cognitive side a source of misunderstanding and disappointment,** was truth which in their deeper subconscious mind was intuitively grasped, and which expressed itself for the moment in exalted vision while Jesus was praying. This truth so discerned was that Jesus the Messiah would express the divine purpose through suffering and death, and this would bring out the true glory in him.*** Nobody had ever heard of a Messiah who was going to bring in the divine Kingdom through death, but the spiritual significance of what Jesus was to do came to its right place in the vision experience of Peter and his friends. All this Messianic significance became clear to the disciples as they made their contacts with the resurrected Christ, but at the moment was only realized subconsciously.**** As the disciples

*Cf. pp. 104, 130, 182f, 433f. The disciples were children of their religious environment in this respect. **Cf. pp. 176f. ***Symbolized by the light and the transfigured face of Jesus. ****This fact is probably what influences Wellhausen to regard the Transfiguration as a post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to the three disciples (op. cit. p. 71).

descended from the hillside with Jesus they seek to clarify what they have just experienced as they converse with Jesus (Mk.viii. 9-13), but their conscious outlook has come back to its own again as is shown by their inability to apprehend what Jesus was saying about the resurrection, for this implied once more the suffering and death as its prior condition.

No sooner had the disciples applied to Jesus the highest category of which their religious outlook was capable than we find the 'minus' elements of their empirical contacts with Jesus coming forth. The highest flight of insight they had yet made was to be accompanied by its counterpart in the lower range of their conventional Jewish stock of Messianic ideas. Although they had shown a certain progress in the quality of their Messianic conception,* they tended to view Jesus and their expectations of him in ways drawn from the common stock of ideas shared with their contemporaries. They did not perceive the kind of Messiah Jesus was in himself. We return to this subject,**but meanwhile point this fact out as one element in what may be designated the Great Misunderstanding concerning Jesus for which the disciples were responsible, and which fastened the literal eschatological expectations on the primitive church.*** The Great Misunderstanding was the effect of the thoroughgoing application of apocalyptic literalism to the nature and function of Messiah as identified with Jesus on the part of disciples mainly drawn from Galileans with their

*Cf. p. 179.

***cf pp. 355-358, 370-373

**Cf. pp. 181-88

characteristic eschatological outlook. This fact is not essentially modified by the recognition of the real truth inherent in all apocalyptic forms, images and expectations, viz. the vindication of God's righteousness in the history of the world, the conviction that the divine goodness is finally to triumph over evil.* But we are face to face with the racial psychology of the disciples as their inherited and environmental 'Weltanschauung' could make them act in no other way than they did until the spiritual release of subsequent events and discoveries centring around the resurrected and exalted Jesus began the process of liberation from the limitations of such an outlook.

If we are to do justice to the influence of current apocalyptic it is necessary to keep clear the two aspects involved. (1) There is the apocalyptic of which Jesus himself made use as a child of his age and a son of his race, in view of which he would inherit eschatological modes of thinking about the divine purpose. While this leaves open the possibility that Jesus viewed his mission in such ways it recognizes the fact that within the apocalyptic series of thought-forms and images he may have used there was unique ethical and religious content.**

*Cf. pp. 88f.

**Cf. p. 164. Since Schweitzer's famous discussion ("The Quest of the Historical Jesus," 1910, chs. XV - XX) there has been interminable discussion as to how far Jesus viewed his mission in terms of apocalyptic thought, and it cannot be said as yet that the problem is satisfactorily solved. The discussions usually reveal either the tendency to give the apocalyptic influence its fullest vogue, with the distinctive ethic of Jesus reduced to no more than a mere 'interimsethik,' or else the apocalyptic is explained away

in the interests of the ethical. Schweitzer himself is the most significant example of the former approach, while perhaps C.W. Emmet is typical of the latter (cf. his article "Is the Teaching of Jesus an Interimethik?" in the "Expositor," Vol. VIII.4, and his book, "The Eschatological Question in the Gospels," 1911, ch. i-vi). The pressure of the apocalyptic facts however has made it more difficult to deny the influence of apocalyptic thought-forms in Jesus' outlook; on psychological grounds we expect, if he was truly a human being as well as divine, that he will be found thinking in characteristic terms of the divine purpose as his contemporaries did; the originality of Jesus lay not in that he overrode the usual thought-forms and conceptions by using a distinct series peculiar to himself, but in the unique religious and moral content with which he enriched the religious experience which lay at the heart of apocalyptic when viewed as a product of fervent faith in the divine righteousness and goodness. One instance of Jesus' uniqueness here lies in the way he applied the significance of suffering to his self-consciousness as Messiah. The nearest his contemporaries would reach to this was the Danielic triumph of the saints in the kingdom after their sufferings; even if the connotation of the disputed phrase 'The Son of Man' mean no more than this (Manson, op.cit. pp. 10, 11~~6~~); Jesus, at the very minimum, could be regarded as sharing himself in the sufferings of the saints as the prelude to the Messianic triumph, but when as Messiah, he said that suffering and death was for him the **necessary** way to Messianic triumph, he filled out both spiritually and ethically the Messianic idea by combining with it the idea of redemptive suffering as the way of the divine will.

We have to allow in the gospels for what Dobschütz defines as illustrations of "alteration by intrusion of eschatology" (Mt. vii. 21, Mt. xiii. 24-30, 47-50, Mk. xiii), and "eschatological utterances of Jesus being transfigured into historical predictions" (as Mt. xxiii. 37-39, and Luke's forecast of the fall of Jerusalem, xxi. 20. cf. "The Eschatology of the Gospels," pp. 80-90, 91-94). Such modifications, intrusions and alterations would find one source in the tendency of the disciples to construe what Jesus said in terms of literal apocalyptic, and another in the eschatological outlook of the primitive church with its influence on the growing tradition. But when allowance has been fully made for these extraneous influences we are faced with unquestioned apocalyptic elements in the outlook of Jesus. The Kingdom of God, the category of Messiah, the expectation of a coming crisis, are integral to the eschatological 'Weltanschauung' of Jesus. It is not sufficient to regard these essential ideas as purely prophetic, for they received their real development from the process of

reinterpreting unfulfilled prophecy which is the essence of the psychology of apocalyptic (cf. pp. 90f.). If we view the gospel apocalyptic as a whole, allowing for intrusions or accretions, the feature for recognition is that Jesus inevitably characterized much of what he had to say by the use of eschatological thought forms. Indeed, apart from the precise religious content of his message, he would never have been really intelligible to his hearers unless he had made contact with them in these familiar modes of thought. Where Jesus uniquely transcended them, such as in his ascription of suffering to Messiah, he found a lack of response due to a failure to understand.

(2) We have therefore to reckon also with the thoroughgoing eschatological outlook of the disciples who would inevitably interpret the events of his life and the revelation of God in his words and works in terms of apocalyptic, even where there was no such association in the mind of Jesus. Eschatology was the point of contact between Jesus and his disciples as he revealed his integral message of the divine kingdom and its imminence, or led them to discern in his personality the expected Messiah. But unlike him, the disciples lived too much within the literalism of apocalyptic and therefore did not penetrate to the inner religious reality which was the substance of the thought-forms Jesus was constrained to use.

It was highly significant of the impression Jesus made, that the disciples were led to place him as the dominating figure in their eschatological scheme of events. It points to the uniqueness of the impact Jesus was bringing to bear upon them. Jesus may have fulfilled the prophets, as the primitive church came to see, but it is still further true that even now for the disciples Jesus fulfilled all apocalyptic. This accounts for the heightened

tension revealed in the gospels following the confession of Caesarea Philippi. The disciples felt their expectations now quickened, that the crisis was very near. But their vision of the true significance of Jesus was clouded by two obsessions that contributed towards their misunderstanding of him.

(1) ~~The~~ ideas of the Kingdom of God were not his. On the whole the sensuous form of the kingdom with more or less ~~of~~ specific nationalist elements, summed up their outlook; *the kingdom on earth with God reigning in the person of a triumphant Messiah, with Israel rescued from its inferior world status and placed on high with the Gentiles either in subjection or destroyed, a kingdom theocratic it is true, but not therefore necessarily spiritual, such were the hopes in view. We need not deny the presence of real spiritual elements, for the highly developed religious experience of the Jewish faith looked on the New Age as a time when righteousness, peace and joy would be at a high expression, as well as the more definitely materialistic blessings.** Yet all these privileges were reserved for Jews alone, or such of the Gentiles as submitted and became Jews, although this was not always admitted by Jews;*** the kingdom as a spiritual community of citizens who found their place irrespective of physical descent as sons of Abraham, or whether they had submitted to the hyper-rational and non-moral requirement such as circumcision, was foreign to the characteristic Jewish outlook in which the disciples shared.

*Cf. pp. 96f. 130. **Cf. pp. 95-97. ***Cf. pp. 96f.

This is the religious background of the disciples in their approach to the divine kingdom. Though they were disciples of Jesus, they were still characteristic sons of Abraham. Even amid the surprise of the resurrection of Jesus they still held to the old literalistic apocalyptic.* For Jesus the religious content of the divine kingdom was a spiritual order based on God's Fatherhood, the Divine Love, redemption of men from sin to the life of the kingdom, not merely to be regarded as ceremonial defilement or ritual sin, fellowship with God irrespective of status or race, Jew or Gentile. In this way the kingdom could be regarded as an experience already present, and its consummation to be looked for as the Messiah triumphant through suffering brought in the reign of God. The disciples gained but the smallest glimmer of this spiritual and moral majesty at the time. Their apprehension of what Jesus taught about the kingdom came through the conventional, limited forms of the ordinary Jewish apocalyptic conception of the sensuous kingdom.

(2) The Great Misunderstanding comes out more clearly in the preconceived ideas with which the disciples viewed Jesus as their confessed Messiah. Amidst the current sporadic and semi-fluid ideas concerning Messiah, it may be said the 'human' Messiah was at the heart of the disciples' outlook, although we should leave

*Cf. Acts i.6 which reveals a crudity of expectation of the kingdom and shows the conventional inadequacy of their conceptions. See pp. 355-359

room for the more elevated 'suprahuman' ideas entering in to a certain extent and blending with the former conception.* But this latter element would be present only in the ideal; the disciples were more prone to regard Messiah as a human being invested with superhuman power. Had not Jesus revealed his superhuman power to them in such activities as the casting out of demons? And was not this fact one guarantee that when the right moment came Jesus would strike his blow for the kingdom?

Ideas of glory, power,** dignity, elevation, royalty, and the like were the preponderating elements in their conception of Messiah, and these ideas would be associated in their minds with Jesus as the Messiah they had come to recognize. They placed him in the centre of the apocalyptic picture and looked on him as the Messianic hero of the apocalyptic drama. Already they felt his authority.*** Such a one would choose his time, and they awaited with impatience the great day, and were anxious only about the positions they would occupy when he brought in the kingdom(Mk.x.37). All these ideas were implicit in the great confession, 'Thou art the Messiah.'

It was at this point of confession that Jesus announced the way he was to fulfil his Messiahship, viz. through suffering and death (Mk.viii.31). The reaction of the startled disciples is illustrated in Peter's attempt to controvert any such idea in his Master's

*Cf. p. 103. **i.e. the power of a warrior king overcoming Israel's enemies, p. 102. ***i.e. over the demons, over the powers of nature (Mk. iv. 39), and over the minds of his contemporaries (cf. pp. 121f. 124).

mind (Mk.viii.32). The sharp retort of Jesus, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" (ibid.32) is not personal to Peter, but is explained by the fact that his disciple had become for the moment the unwitting instrument of temptation to use the worldly way of achieving his Messiahship, and associates this incident with the experience of the temptation in the wilderness.* Peter's remonstrance was perfectly reasonable on his own Jewish presuppositions, for to suffer and die was the very last thing they expected of Messiah.** The expostulation was the expression of an honest, but bewildered mind, which simply could not understand that the Jesus he had identified as Messiah was destined to be a suffering Messiah, and he was but expressing what the other disciples felt as well as his own difficulty. As time went on Jesus found it necessary to repeat his intimation of suffering as the way of fulfilment for him, as though he were aware of their latent opposition, and each time they fail to understand.*** At

*Mt.iv.8-10,Lk.iv.5-8. On such an occasion there was a good opportunity to narrate this experience to the disciples, but cf. note on p.126. **Not only was a suffering Messiah unintelligible to a Jew, but it was also a contradiction in terms, since the apocalyptic Messiah had as his special office the vindication of the oppressed and innocently suffering people of God; it was his part to reverse the world order in which the righteous thus suffer. ***These repetitions may of course come from different sources and all relate to the same occasion, but the likelihood is that Jesus would repeat more than once his warning as to the suffering, if only to impress the novel idea. Cf. Mk.ix.30-32,x.32 for the repetitions. ****When the primitive church looked back on these failures to understand the suffering and death of Jesus as foreshadowed by him, facts which could be rightly evaluated in the light of the resurrection triumph, a theory was formulated that the truth was hidden from the disciples and that was why they failed to perceive the significance of what Jesus was saying. Luke has preserved this theory (ix.45,xviii.34).

all events, in the latter part of his ministry he seems to leave the disciples eventually alone, as far as this matter is concerned, willing to let his influence and action bear fruit in its time.*

The last supper that Jesus and his disciples had together (Mk.xiv.22-25, Jn.xiii.1f.) was the scene of the observance of the Kiddûsh for the approaching Passover, during which the cup was passed round accompanied with the pledge that Jesus would drink no more of it until he passed it round with them at the Messianic banquet. The disciples understood this eschatological reference, but when the bread was passed round with the reference to Jesus' forthcoming body broken in death for them, there was present once more the old perplexity and failure to discern the significance of what Jesus intended.** When they all went out into the night after the supper, Jesus said that they would all be 'scandalized' by him (Mk.xiv.27), and that very night too (Mt.xxvi.31).

It is beside the mark to make this a pure prophecy of what was to happen that night. Psychologically it would have been the worst thing for Jesus ~~to do~~ to announce to his disciples, for he would have thereby set in motion the suggestive processes that would result in the panic when the critical moment arrived. The statement is rather indicative of a state of mind which Jesus saw in them, for the occasion of stumbling lay in their failure to understand what was imminent in Jesus' suffering. In effect, they were already in the psychological state which would make them

*There is evidence of aloofness on the part of Jesus, as e.g. in his walking alone (Mk.ix.33f.x.32), while the disciples no longer talk freely to him (Mk.ix.10,32,34). **On the religious experience involved in the last supper cf.pp. 431-44.

fall away. They had not yet grown sufficiently in their experience of Jesus to view the trial before him with the sympathetic understanding needed if they were to be of help in standing firmly by their Messiah. He knew that he must go to the Cross alone; let them return to Galilee, and he would meet them there after his Messianic triumph in resurrection. They could do no other at the moment than be offended in him. But even these intimations of resurrection (Mk. xiii.31, ix.31, x.32), of which we have an example in the incident we are reviewing (Mk. xiv.28), would be meaningless to the disciples in view of the perplexity caused by the announcement of the death (cf. also p.130, note), for if it turned out that their Master did after all go to the cross, they would be scandalized beyond measure. It may be, however, that the reference to the resurrection here is an insertion in view of xvi.7. The Fayyum Gospel-Fragment omits it, but it is not certain that this fragment belongs to the gospel (cf. M.R. James, op.cit. p.25).

In Gethsemane Peter, James and John are spectators of the agony and the spiritual struggle of Jesus prior to his arrest.* That they were impressed is not to be doubted, but the incidence of their slumber points to the length of the vigil, and may also find an explanation in that, not understanding the need that Messiah should so act, they gave the matter up and hoped that it would not turn out in so tragic a way after all. In the weakness of the flesh they slept. Luke records that they were sleeping 'for sorrow' (xxii.45), but the sorrow was not akin to that of Jesus; it was no more than the sorrow of disappointment that Jesus should think it necessary that he should suffer to bring in the kingdom. After his final struggle Jesus went forward to the cross, and there seems to be a touch of disappoint-

*Luke indicates that all the disciples were present in Gethsemane (xxii.39); probably all were not far away, but the more intimate would be nearer at hand to keep the vigil with Jesus.

ment on his part in the disciples who were latently at cross-purposes with him, showing as they did no appreciation of what the imminent crisis implied (Mk. xiv. 37f.).

This 'minus' in their experience of Jesus is significantly illustrated in the actions of two disciples, viz. Judas Iscariot and Simon Peter.

Judas betrayed Jesus to the authorities (Mk. xiv. 10f. 43). It is perhaps significant that in Mark's list of the apostles (iii. 18f.) Simon the Canaanite or Zealot and Judas Iscariot are the last pair mentioned, and the only two who have descriptive additions, as if they were strange men to be found among the intimate companions of Jesus. Yet the words of Jesus, 'one of you shall betray me,' and the answers elicited, 'Is it I?' (Mk. xiv. 18f.) seem to suggest how near the rest of the disciples stood to Judas. However this may be, the motives of Judas' action have been the subject of much discussion. The historicity of the story has been denied in view of the difficulty of supposing a traitor to have been found in the apostolic circle (T.K. Cheyne, Enc. Bi. Vol. II. col. 2628). Again, Judas has been held to have generated a fierce hatred as a result of his hostility to Jesus (A. Plummer, HDB, Vol. II. pp. 796, col. ii. 797, col. i.). The difficulty would be eased if we refrain from the unhistorical view of the twelve at this time as a sort of apostolic collegium on the lines of how they came to be viewed in the development of the church (cf. pp. 170, 520f.). If our view of the misunderstanding of Jesus by the disciples be valid, it is by no means inconceivable that one of them should hand Jesus over to the authorities. Judas shared in the confession that Jesus was Messiah, and experienced along with the rest the subsequent disillusionment regarding the nature of the Messiah's purpose in suffering and death. He took Jesus at his word, helped him to his predicted death, and at the moment was doubtlessly convinced that he had done the right thing. The motive would thus be that, in Judas' view, Jesus was no Messiah after all, and this may have been conjoined with the further motive of revenge as Judas realized that Jesus was not a Messiah in the usually accepted sense.

The denial of Jesus by Simon Peter lights up the same psychology of disillusionment among the disciples. Following the suggestion of Jesus that they should leave him (cf. pp. 184f.), Peter declares that whatever others may do, he intended to stand by Jesus to the last (Mk. xiv. 29). But in the hour of testing, he failed to make good his words,

(Mk.xiv.66-72). The denial is sometimes interpreted as being the action of one too weak to make good his boast, or that Peter was the creature of impulse who was unable to carry out his original intention. But the explanation goes deeper down to the roots of his experience of Jesus. The assertion that he would stand by Jesus was probably prompted by the conviction that even yet, despite the talk of suffering and death, Jesus would fulfil his Messiahship in the way they all longed to see. When Jesus was arrested, the disciples fled (Mk.xiv.50), save Peter, who still dimly remembered his promise. But the logic of facts was too much for him. Jesus had allowed himself to come into the humiliating and un-Messianic position of being on trial as a blasphemer (cf.pp.138f.). He was therefore no Messiah after all. Peter therefore disowned Jesus to those who reminded him that he was a follower of the Nazarene. How could he own such a one as Messiah? He had confessed that Jesus was Messiah; now, he retracted the confession in view of what to him were facts that absolutely denied that Jesus could in any way be Messiah.

Other indications point to the failure of the disciples to perceive the import of what Jesus said and did. Rivalry with ensuing discord had to be exposed, the rivalry being about who would receive the greatest honour in the coming kingdom (Mk.ix.33-37). Disciples forbid a man to do good in the name of Jesus since he did not belong to their company, and have to be reminded that they had no exclusive monopoly of his name and power (Mk.ix.38-40). Disciples wish to call down fire upon inhospitable Samaritans, and call forth the rebuke of Jesus for showing such vindictiveness (Lk.ix.54f). The sons of Zebedee ask for the chief places in the coming kingdom, and the other disciples are incensed at what they suppose to be an attempt to get before them; Jesus contrasts their spirit with his own life of service and sacrifice (Mk.x.35-45).

At the moment of their desertion (Mk.xiv.50) the disciples felt that Jesus was no longer authoritative for them. For the moment the Master had lost his authority over his disciples, since he was no more than a discredited Messiah for them. The hopes of the kingdom had crumbled into the dust. Gone were all the visions of glory. The disappointed and disillusioned men were left to their own thoughts, while Jesus went to the cross.

Perhaps the root cause of their failure lay in the tendency which they shared with their fellow-Jews, to look at the letter of the kingdom instead of the spirit. They endeavoured to fit in their experience of Jesus with a too literal interpretation of prophecies, and especially in those reinterpretations of unfulfilled prophecy known as apocalyptic. "They were indeed godly men, who had already shown the sincerity of their piety by forsaking all for their Master's sake. But at the time of their call they were exceedingly ignorant, narrow-minded, superstitious, full of Jewish prejudices, misconceptions and animosities. They had much to unlearn of what was bad, as well as much to learn of what was good, and they were slow both to learn and to unlearn. Old beliefs already in possession of their minds made the communication of new religious ideas a difficult task. Men of good honest heart, the soil of their spiritual nature was fitted to produce an abundant harvest: but it was stiff, and needed much laborious tillage before it would yield its fruit."*

*A.B. Bruce, "The Training of the Twelve," 1871 p.14.

CHAPTER IV THE EMPIRICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION

What was happening in the minds of the eyewitnesses during the silent period between the crucifixion of Jesus and their experience of his resurrection?

The crowds went upon their way to celebrate the Feast of the Passover. The apocalyptic enthusiasms that they had centred on Jesus had evaporated with their apprehension of his significance as that of no more than a discredited Messianic pretender. Yet, as the excitement died down, not a few would recall the attractive goodness of Jesus; some still remembered the healing received from him, and many echoes of his words would linger in their minds. More rarely, there were a few here and there who dimly discerned the impelling power of his uniqueness and greatness, and in such cases the influence of his personality remained with the individuals concerned. They could not shake him off from their minds. In some undefined manner they glimpsed that what he had stood for ought to triumph as only unique goodness should, although as things stood, he had gone down in utter defeat. The religious leaders of the nation no doubt felt 'justified' as they went back to temple or synagogue or home. The troublesome Galilean was crucified and no more would be heard of him. The publicans and

sinners, and the many Gentile friends of Jesus among them, were in a state of real grief. Apocalyptic hopes were of less concern to them, but they knew the change that Jesus had made in their lives, how they who were once without religious hope had received through his friendship a new experience of God. It seemed hard that death should have the final word with one whose spiritual impact on them had been pregnant with such life for them. Did they wait and wonder if anything further would be heard of him?

We are more specifically concerned with the disciples, those who numbered among themselves not only the twelve, but others such as the beloved disciples who were intimately concerned with Jesus. Already the one who had differed from the rest in acting on the sense of disillusionment he had experienced in Jesus and had betrayed him to the authorities, had realized the profound mistake he had made; remorse had so overwhelmed him that he was driven to put an end to his own life (Mt.xxvii.3-5). Such a reaction suggests the possibility that other disciples were beginning to wonder whether they were not mistaken **in judging** Jesus to be a discredited Messiah; ^{whether} ~~that~~ after all there was more in the circumstances that faced them than they understood.

We have to reckon with the creative power of Jesus on their lives, as this was germinating within their subconscious mind, so that even while he was with them they were subconsciously taking in what on the conscious levels they were not apprehending.* On the

*As their experience of the transfiguration shows. Cf.pp.174-176.

other hand there was the opposition to this inner creative activity set up by their consciously accepted Jewish scheme of life and outlook,* which in the death of their recognized Messiah on the cross, had led them to feel that some tragic mistake had been made, and which made it seem impossible that Jesus was in fact what they had discerned him to be. This was the conflict raging within them; the disappointed hopes and the shattered dreams over against the creative impacts of Jesus in the upper reaches of their inner experience.

Unwittingly, the suffering and the death of Jesus were reinforcing the germinal processes that were taking place in the lives of the disciples. The self-abandon with which Jesus went to his cross, although it seemed to them to be a tragic mistake, and the collapse of all their apocalyptic hopes, could not but impress them on the side of their spiritual apperceptions. Could death be the end of Jesus after all? Even when their conscious reasoning said 'yes,' and all the reinforcement of their Jewish faith and outlook together with the practical assent of commonsense had concurred with this cognitive conclusion, there still remained "the unfading vision of Him who had gone straitened, tempted, alone, forsaken, but faithful to the last, to do the Will of the Father."** There was more yet to come. The darkness was very dark, but there was some undefined sense that something was to happen, they knew not what. Did they feel with any of the

*Cf. pp. 176ff. ** N. Talbot, "The Mind of the Disciples," 1914, p²⁸.

intensity of Job that through the darkness of their Master's death with the shattering of all their most ardent hopes there would come a vindication of his personality and that he would know it? Could each member of the circle of disciples dumbly feel that despite the contrary circumstances, "I know that my Redeemer liveth?" (Job xix.25).

Not that the disciples were aware of any such train of ideas in a clear and definite form. With little data to go on for any precise understanding of what was going on in their minds, there must of necessity ~~be~~ some speculation as to the thought processes and ideas that were in conflict. On the whole we are justified in following the hints afforded by their positive and negative impressions of Jesus during his life and of the contribution of their characteristic Jewish outlook and faith in assisting or hindering the new creative influence upon them. That they were in a state of pure bewilderment is undoubted; on the conscious plane they did not know what to make of the cross since Jesus had uniquely impressed them to ~~own~~ ^{place} him ⁱⁿ by the highest category possible to them. The very inhibitions, however, caused by the momentary shock to their conscious mind, may well have given free play to the subconscious apprehension of the significance of Jesus and their expectations in him. Withheld by the very bewilderment from clear conclusions on the normal level of mental activity, the subconscious levels were the scene of creative activity.

No more is suggested in this tentative discussion on the psychological condition of the disciples during this silent period than ^{that} they were unknowingly being prepared to receive the experience of the resurrection of Jesus. The impelling force of his personality had them in its grip. They could not shake him off, even though, as the facts indicated, he lay in his grave. Their trust in him, the growing conviction that somehow he might be right after all and that his truth would be vindicated in himself, the uniqueness and the commanding goodness that had impressed them so deeply, these were the spiritual constituents that were gathering force. That personality and its influence had invaded them consciously and subconsciously; his death had created a feud, as it were, between the conscious presuppositions and the subconscious realizations of Jesus' uniqueness. The conscious thought was insisting, 'Jesus cannot be Messiah, because he was crucified; the subconscious was all the more deeply moved by his death to retain and allow to germinate all the honour and significance already accorded to him. In the end the impelling power of Jesus won the day. The creative life in the subconscious won through to victory when the moment of psychological relief came and brought deliverance from the mental torment. Contradictions received their solution, misunderstandings gave place to understanding and discernment, the tangled skeins were unravelled, the parts coalesced in their experience as it blossomed forth into glorious meaning and unified itself

in a complete whole. The first hour of relief coincided with the first hour of the resurrection experience.*

While this interpretation of the situation does not mean that the disciples kept all together, for it was well within the bounds of probability that some of them went back to Galilee, the likelihood is that for the most part they hovered near the scene of their Master's death. In any case the feast of the Passover was still in being, and they would mix with their fellow Galileans as pilgrims to the temple. This view accepts the words of Jesus about their scattering as sheep without a shepherd as indicative of their relationship to his personality, rather than of any geographical change of place. The 'flight' was from Gethsemane, but not necessarily to Galilee. Peter, at least, hovered around the trial scene, and his influence on the others has to be considered; the beloved disciple was known to be in Jerusalem. We accept the standpoint, therefore, that the disciples remained in Jerusalem and that the flight was merely one of panic, momentary in its character, from the sudden disaster of the arrest (cf. J. Weiss, op. cit. p. 12; for the view that the disciples fled to Galilee, the truth dawning on their minds amid the quiet scenes there and resulting in their assembling at Jerusalem, cf. Weizsäcker, "The Apostolic Age," Vol. I. Eng. Tr. 1894, pp. 1-4).

What was it the eyewitnesses experienced here? Jesus had convinced his followers that the cross was not the last word, and that he had triumphed. They had no doubt whatever that the Jesus they knew "was alive again, that some of them had seen him alive, and that it was therefore worth while going on hoping and believing that he would return again in glory."** It is customary to say that 'something' happened, but what that something was is not easy to define. What were the modes of apprehension or thought-forms in which the disciples received their new conviction? ~~Was~~

*The victory of the subconscious creative activity gave to the consciousness the task of discovering the meaning of a crucified Messiah; cf. Acts ii. 23, iii. 18, and pp. 376 ff. 457. **op. cit. p. 50.

Was it the actual body of him they had accompanied in Galilee, so that it was as if the death of Jesus had never taken place? Was the experience construed in vision as an 'appearance,' with a discerned body more suitably expressive of eternal dignity than the one laid in the tomb? Or were the disciples no more than victims of hallucination, resulting from their highly strung condition, being especially influenced by the semi-hysteria of the women who found not the body in the tomb?

If the actual physical body of Jesus be not the mode by which the disciples became conscious that he was alive, it does not follow they were the victims of hallucination. Such an assumption rides too roughshod over the potential power of revelation through vision, where the profounder levels of personality are quickened by some objective influence.* It is not sufficient to describe the physical resurrection as objective, and any other mode of viewing the resurrection as merely subjective; even so-called objective knowledge requires a real contribution of the subjective elements in the 'knowing' person before it becomes knowledge, and even then does not outreach the experience of the knowing mind, as Kant showed.** Thus what may erroneously be dismissed as pure subjectivism may have some real objective contribution in some causal element. On the hypothesis of ignored reality that may be repressed, there may be circumstances which might well motive the breaking out of the reality into consciousness, and the resulting

*Cf. pp. 174 f. ***"Critique of Pure Reason."

vision stands apart from the truth which has become objectified. We return to this aspect, but meanwhile note in passing that the alternatives are not necessarily the physical resurrection or the experience of hallucination.

The evidence of the gospels is conflicting and gives no consistent aspect of what was the mode of apprehension of the resurrection; this is assumed throughout. (1) There is what purports to be references to the experience of the physical resurrection. Under these we have the 'empty tomb' from which is inferred that Jesus was risen with the actual body nailed to the cross (Mk.xvi.4-6, Mt.xxviii.2,6, cf.11-15 with the suggestion of the authorities that the body had been stolen, Lk.xxiv.2f. Jn.xx.1-10. Cf. also the Gospel of Peter, xiii.55-57). In the actual appearances of Jesus we have what presuppose actual bodily references as e.g. the appearance to the disciples who were able to "take hold of his feet" (Mt.xxviii.9). In his speech at Pentecost Peter refers to the raising up of Messiah 'according to the flesh' (Acts ii.30), which however refers not to the actual resurrection, but to the physical descent from David (cf. Lk.i.32,69, Rom.i.3). Even if the *κατὰ σάρκα* qualifies the resurrection reference, the words are probably a later addition to bring the prophecy into line with the prevailing belief in the bodily resurrection at a later stage of the Apostolic Age. The textual attestation of the phrase *κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστῆσθαι τὸν Χριστόν* is inferior and marks an addition of a later age; it is found in D* P 614 and most minuscules together with the Harkleian Syriac. The Revised Version rightly omits it. Peter therefore is no witness to the resurrection *κατὰ σάρκα*.

(2) We have, further, appearances which do not suggest the physical presence of Jesus, as e.g. to the disciples on the mountain in Galilee (Mt.xxviii.16-20). The fact of Jesus speaking ~~is~~ not necessarily imply that he was physically present with his pre-crucifixion body, for the experience of vision is not impervious to voices entering as one of its elements, as the prophets show (Isa.vi.8). Moreover if it had been the Jesus as he was actually in Galilee some would not have doubted (cf. ver.17f.). The spurious ending of Mark tells us that Jesus appeared to two disciples as they were walking, "in another form" (*ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ* xvi.12), as though the experience were analogous to that of the Transfiguration (cf. pp.174-6). That this Marcan ending is spurious as a whole does not preclude the possibility that here we have some genuine fragment of reminiscence embodied.

(3) Other appearances are a mixture of (1) and (2), the material and the non-material, the physical and the spiritual. The walk to Emmaeus (Lk.xxiv.13ff. of which Mk.xvi.12 may be a variant) shows Jesus walking, talking, going into a house to spend the evening, sitting at table and eating food (vv.15,17,25-27,29f). These apparently physical characteristics lead on to features which suggest that the risen personality of Jesus was independent of the physical; the moment the disciples recognized him, he vanished from their view (ver.31). Of the same order is the appearance as the two disciples are reporting their experience at Emmaeus. He suddenly stood in their midst, presumably not entering in naturally by the door, since the disciples are terrified for they supposed that it was a spirit (Lk.xxiv.36ff). Here the non-material elements are found along with the material, for Jesus invites the disciples to behold his hands and feet, to handle him and see that he is not spirit but flesh and bones (vv.39f.). In their presence he eats, to show that he is real (vv.42f). In John, Mary mistakes the risen Jesus for the gardener and asks where Jesus has been laid; recognition did not come until Jesus spoke, and the familiar tone in the voice was the factor of recognition (xx.15f). Even if the material element be allowed here, which is doubtful, since the voice may have been equally real in vision (and Mary's failure of recognition suggests that it was not the familiar Jesus of pre-crucifixion present), the request of Jesus 'Touch me not,' is suggestive that Mary was aware of the incorporeality of the appearance before her. Jesus enters through closed doors, and this independence of the physical is accompanied by physical demonstration of his reality (Jn.xx.19f.). The scepticism of Thomas causes a repetition of the same phenomena (xx.26-29).

We have to distinguish the psychological outlook of the eye-witnesses from that of our modern standpoint with its sharply drawn distinctions between subjective and objective, natural and supernatural, and the more recent emphasis on the conscious and subconscious mind, with differences again such as the physical and the spiritual, the physical and the psychical, the psychical and the spiritual. It is necessary to endeavour to place ourselves alongside the standpoint of the disciples, with their

psychological inheritance, their mental dispositions and spiritual powers of apprehension, and appraise their own thought-forms and mental categories in which they experienced the resurrection and interpreted what they experienced. When we do this we are able to sort out several important features.

(a) A mixture of physical and psychical elements in the same experience is by no means foreign to the psychology of the disciples. The point is not whether Jesus appeared in a physical or a psychical form at the moment, but that such experience^{as} they had of him resulted from phenomena which they were quite able to interpret at one time in a physical, and at another, in a psychical way, and yet at other times in a mixture or blurring of both, and see nothing inconsistent in what they were doing. Therefore what we have to do with in the gospels is an experience everywhere assumed, but which is being interpreted and explained, with possibilities allowed for in the way of later intrusions drawn from the standpoint of the growing church.*

(b) For the Jew (or Galilean) the body meant personality, i.e. the man as a whole.** Not man simply in his physical aspect, but the impression of the life as a whole in all its features, moods, with all that made a man just that one man sorted out from others, this was the significance of 'body'. The significance of this is that there could have been no resurrection experience for the

*The later desire to stress the actuality of Jesus' resurrection may have stamped the tradition with many physical features put forward as 'proofs'. **Cf.p.119.

disciples without the 'body,' i.e. the personality of Jesus as a whole, the sum of all they had seen and received in him as they had known him in life, that which made Jesus still Jesus. Since they did not make the familiar distinction of the physical and the psychical or spiritual in the sharply defined way more familiar to us, it would not occur to them to make sure whether it was the same physical body of Jesus as they had formerly known. It was a case of the recognition of Jesus as Jesus, of the fulness of the personality that went to make up Jesus, the Jesus as the personal entity. That is why the physical details such as pander to the desire for physical proof,* are not unreasonably suspect as being due to the later apologetic of the church influencing the gospel tradition.

(c) The prevailing ideas of personality as being accessible to outside influences such as we should designate supernatural,** suggest that the vision of angels which accompanied the discovery at the tomb was not due to legendary embellishment.*** Given the current angelology, the inner creative workings of the seed sown by Jesus in which the women shared as his disciples, we can under-

*Especially Jesus' eating of food to demonstrate his actuality, Lk.xxiv.41f. **pp.107-111,112,116. ***Cf.the young man sitting within the sepulchre clothed in a long white garment who spoke to the women about Jesus being risen (Mk.xvi.5f.), the angel who sat on the stone rolled away from the tomb with countenance bright as lightning and his raiment white as snow (Mt.xxviii.2f.), the two men in shining raiment (Lk.xxiv.4). The women had evidently reported back to the disciples that they had seen "a vision of angels" saying that Jesus was alive, but they themselves had not seen Jesus (Lk.xxiv.23). In John, two angels in white sit within the empty tomb, one at the head, the other at the feet of where Jesus had been (Jn.xx.12f.), and converse with Mary.

stand that angelic visions were elements in the resurrection experience. The gospel narratives are therefore shot through and through with visionary experience, at least as far as the angels are concerned.

(d) Prevailing ideas of resurrection show some variety, and need to be taken into account.* There was the resurrection of the body conception, an essentially eschatological idea, when with the advent of the Messianic kingdom the righteous dead rise and share with the living the blessedness of the New Age. This view is the product of the earthly and material view of the kingdom. Again there was a very definite rejection of the bodily resurrection, ^{which} ~~and~~ represented a purer type of apocalyptic expectation, the Kingdom and the Messiah being viewed along more spiritual lines with the heightening of the resurrection hope to a more spiritual conception until the righteous become as the angels in heaven. ~~In~~ a further type which finds literary expression prior to the fall of Jerusalem,** and which is later than the primitive church,*** the righteous rise with the bodies exactly as they were committed to the tomb, to facilitate recognition, but thereafter the bodies will be transformed and made like to the angels as befitting a spiritual existence of unending duration.

~~In~~ which of these thought-forms did the eyewitnesses place

*pp.105-7. **II Baruch xlix.2-li.and cf.p.98 for date. ***A further development of this is found in Josephus who states that the Pharisees held that the righteous rise in a body wholly different from the present material one (ἐτερον σῶμα B.J.ii.8,14).

their experience of the resurrection of Jesus? The material resurrection would fit in with their material, sensuous views of the kingdom and the Messiah.* In this case their interpretations would need correction in the same sense as their ideas of the kingdom. Until their ideas became less material, the conclusion is unavoidable that the bodily resurrection would be their mode of apprehension that Jesus was alive. At the same time we must allow for the educative power of their subconscious awakening, for the deeper apprehension of the significance of Jesus in his triumph which now they were experiencing, and with the transfiguration as our guide, ^{we may suppose} they would view the risen Jesus in a body transformed, worthy to be announced by the angels of whose order of being he now was. This brings in the mixture of the non-material with the material thought-forms.

We conclude therefore that the mode of apprehension for the eyewitnesses was that his body was conceived as having left the tomb, but had appeared to them transformed, like unto the angels, a body such as some of them had a sight of at the transfiguration. This was why they failed to recognize Jesus on several occasions, when recognition came only because of some intensely personal action such as breaking the bread, or when he spoke in the familiar tones ~~of his voice~~. It explains also the non-material phenomena such as the passing through closed doors, appearing in another form. Amidst all, it was the personality of Jesus they received

back in resurrection, ^{as they} ~~and~~ interpreted the experience in thought-forms material, spiritual, or a mixture of both, according to the progress they were severally making from the material idea of the kingdom to the spiritual.

This conclusion is concerned only with the mental categories in which the disciples received the experience, since it is an entirely different question as to what actually happened to bring the resurrection conviction to them. What was the essence of the religious experience of the eyewitnesses here? Did the primitive church arise from the effect produced by an amazing piece of wonder-working such as the resuscitation of a dead body that was already beginning to decay in its tomb? Such a marvel is in itself devoid of the ethical and spiritual power so vital to the formation of the church, and constitutes just the very sort of sign which Jesus himself deprecated as attesting his power and authority.* This is the difficulty of the purely physical resuscitation, and its force cannot be turned by the assumption that there is no alternative to it but hallucination. The edge of the physical resuscitation is sometimes blunted by the view that Jesus appeared in his transformed body, i.e. the raised physical body transformed or transfigured into the heavenly, but such an assumption seems to be due to the desire to soften the crudity of the literal corporeal resurrection by grafting on to it the heavenly body.** It should be noted that where the bodily

*Cf. p.122 note, 132. **After the manner of II Bar. xlix. 2-li.

resuscitation is most stressed in the gospels (Lk.xxiv.36-43)cf. Jn.xxi.5,12f.), it is a body that needs food. This food question has to be faced by the view which insists on the bodily resurrection, and if the body be the transfigured corporeal one, why is the food necessary, and is it in turn glorified?

It is not the desire to eliminate the supernatural from the revelation in Jesus that moves the reverent criticism of the experience, as is sometimes assumed in those who find the purely corporeal resurrection inadequate to account for the facts concerned. It is question of evidence and the probabilities of the case judged by the understanding of the disciples' mentality and growth in the creative life Jesus had begun in them, and is not to be decided by dogma motivated by one or another school of metaphysics. Even the gospels themselves are by no means clear whether it is a corporeal resurrection or not.

The religious experience of the disciples contributes some data for the elucidation of what happened. Instead of viewing the resurrection experience as a new departure which lifted up the despairing disciples, on our view of the experience of the silent days following the cross we have seen that the disciples were being unconsciously prepared for the climax. All that Jesus meant to them, the impact of his personality in his fellowship with them was such that even in his death they were convinced that somehow they were not done with their remarkable friend. It was this feeling that caused them to remain in Jerusalem, watchful for

what might even yet happen in vindication. All that they had experienced in Jesus, observed in him from day to day, his hold upon their inner life, and his creative force in them silently working, becomes the groundwork of the resurrection experiences they had of Jesus. Such was the religious preparation in the subconsciousness of the disciples, such was the power of the creative personality which Jesus had sown in them that it began to take root and grow, until the resurrection experience came as the inevitable conclusion to a prepared state of heart and mind, which, as such, made such an experience not only possible, but even inevitable.

It is not at all remarkable that we have no mention of an appearance of Jesus to anyone hostile to him such as the scribes and Pharisees were. Paul was hostile, but the appearance to him came at the moment when his spiritual struggle ended in victory for the new faith, the influence of which itself had provoked the conflict (cf. pp. 44-46, 250f.). The Gospel to the Hebrews in a fragment preserved by Jerome, (De Illustr. 2) relates that Jesus gave his shroud to the servant of the highpriest. This implies that the servant saw the resurrection before any disciple. While some weight may be given to the evidence of this gospel (cf. pp. 65f.), ~~but~~ this instance comes under similar criticism as the other corporeal aspects of the resurrection. While recognizing that the argument from silence is not necessarily convincing, the likelihood is that no appearance was possible to anyone unprepared to receive such an experience.

The way lies open, therefore, for a more worthy consideration of the resurrection experience as fundamentally an experience of the intensest vision.

It is at this point we deal with Paul's experience and evidence. He is our earliest and best evidence both as to the

primitive church evidence for the resurrection and for the nature of the resurrection experience itself.

In I Cor.xv.5-8 Paul gives a list of resurrection appearances which he claims to have received from the primitive church (cf.p.32 and ver.3). He states that Jesus appeared (1) to Peter,(2) to the twelve, (3) to more than five hundred all at one time, (4) to James, (5) to all the apostles, and (6) to himself. The insistence of the authority for this evidence coming not from himself but from the primitive church tradition, and the fact of I Corinthians being much earlier in date than the earliest of the Synoptics, shows that Paul's evidence is really of greater value historically than even what we have in the gospels. The identification of these appearances with what we have in the gospels is a matter of the greatest difficulty, if such is exegetically possible (cf.E.Fuchs, "Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi und der Anfang der Kirche," in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, Dritte Folge,LI Band Heft i/ii 1932,pp.16f. who thinks they all have a representative character. The first appearance to Peter fulfilled the words of Jesus (Mt. xvi.18f.), but this distinction is at once qualified in that Christ appeared to the twelve together. This corresponds to the situation during Jesus' life. The 500 had an appearance, and Christ's relation is here representative of the promised Messianic community. The fourth appearance, i.e.to James, is the most obscure in significance, but taken with the one that follows, it may be seen that although the apostolic circle was closed, James is included among all the apostles, i.e. James plus the twelve, the twelve representative of the new Messianic Israel. Für Paulus bedeutete es zweifellos die Erfüllung der Abrahamverheissung"(ibid.p.17) i.e. of faith, not under law (Rom. iv.16-18. If there were such definite ideas underlying the primitive church tradition, it would imply that the original facts were being placed in some order with a view to bringing out the significance of the new faith for believers. In that case the sporadic testimony of the gospels may appear to be the better witness. But it is doubtful whether as yet such clear cut ideas had moulded the list of appearances in the primitive church which Paul is quoting.

What is significant for our purpose is that Paul seemed to have no doubt that the experience of the resurrection which befell himself was precisely the same kind of appearance which

was experienced by the other eyewitnesses enumerated in the list. The formula in every case is the same ("he appeared unto..." εφωρη with the dative). He assumes as the tradition sets it forth, that the common experience in all the manifestations, including his own, was of the same nature, viz. vision or revelation (δραστη II Cor. xii. 1). It is at this point that Paul shows himself to be our best witness as to the nature of the experience of the resurrection appearances.

The accounts of Paul's conversion* make it clear that a vision of the risen Christ came to him on the way to Damascus, accompanied with the bright light and clear voice of visionary experience. Later on he wrote, "I have seen the Lord" (I Cor. ix. 1), and in our list of appearances already discussed, "he appeared to me also" (I Cor. xv. 8), both referring back to the conversion experience. The import of these statements is that Paul had most certainly and really seen the risen Jesus and further, as Weiss points out, "the Christ who appeared was the glorified, exalted Christ in all his heavenly dignity and majesty. Paul's companions saw nothing (Acts ix. 7); the experience was exclusive to himself alone. There seems little doubt that this resurrection experience was a vision, in which his spiritual struggle found its solution. The suppressed reactions to the growing influence of Christ conflicted strongly with the strongly entrenched Jewish culture and Pharisaic religious

*Acts ix. 3ff. xxii. 6ff. xxvi. 12ff. **op. cit. p. 19, "ich habe ihn als den Himmlischen, als den Erhöhten, im Glanze der göttlichen Herrlichkeit geschaut," cf. II Cor. iv. 6.

experience which were responsible for the suppressed convictions, but the creative power of the latter broke forth into conscious triumph and mastered the unwilling Paul in a vision of the risen Messiah, ~~and~~ which was so provocative of change that Paul was turned from a persecutor into an enthusiastic convert destined to become the apostle to the Gentiles.

When we take this experience along with his discussion of the resurrection body (I Cor.xv.35ff.), we discover that he is in line with the current Pharisaic belief in the spiritual resurrection which was characteristic of "the cultured Pharisees in the century immediately preceding the Christian era," and a view which "was of a truly spiritual nature."* The argument from the grain of corn which must die before it can be quickened (I Cor.xv.36-38) reveals that in the apostle's mind the death of the body is the sine qua non of the new spiritual life which the resurrection foreshadows. While the new grain is not different from the old that dies, it is actually distinct, and Paul stresses this essential distinction between the old and the new, that which dies and that which comes to new life. The old is the natural body, the new a spiritual body befitting the new existence; the two bodies are unconnected except insofar as they are the successive organs of the spirit in both the material and the spiritual worlds. Far from being identical in any respect, the physical body had to be destroyed in death before the spiritual body could be forthcoming.

*R.H.Charles, "Eschatology," p.295. Cf. above, p.106.

In the light of these mental categories drawn from his religious experience and discoveries, we are able to discern still further his apprehension of the resurrection of Jesus and the appearance to himself as wholly of a spiritual order. In his discussion on the natural and spiritual body, the body sown in corruption, and the body put on in glory, there is no suggestion that he is not, and every presumption that he is, including both himself and his readers along with Jesus. It was the exalted Jesus in his 'spiritual' body who appeared to him on the way to Damascus; not the earthly body sown in dishonour, but the one raised in glory; not the one sown in weakness, but the one raised in power; not the natural body, but the spiritual body; not the body of the earth, earthy, but that which is of heaven, the heavenly (I Cor.xv.43-48).

These are the categories which Paul used to apprehend the experience of the resurrected Christ, and which he assumed in the case of the eyewitnesses mentioned in his list of appearances. We have to allow for differences in the content of what was seen, inasmuch as the disciples saw the resurrected Jesus in thought-forms and vision elements drawn from characteristics of Jesus as he had lived and moved about with them in earthly fellowship, whereas Paul's vision was of the exalted, heavenly Messiah. To the former, Jesus was the 'human' Messiah triumphant in resurrection and exalted to the right hand of God, soon to come and bring in the divine kingdom; to Paul, Jesus was the 'suprahuman' or

heavenly Messiah.* This distinction safeguards reading too much of Paul's spiritual conceptions into the minds of the disciples, but it does not militate against their experience of resurrection appearances being regarded as vision, while the empirical evidence of Paul throws light on the nature of the experiences as they came to the disciples, and which he received in detail from the primitive church tradition.

A conflict was set up within the inner being of the disciples. It was due to convictions about the significance of Jesus against which all their conscious religious experience and outlook was in revolt. The beginnings of creative personality were at work within them, and the growth was more and more asserting itself as the influence of Jesus matured in their lives. All that he was to them, all that he had meant to them, was rapidly coming up to the surface, and this despite the suppression which the outward facts of crucifixion and apparent overthrow of all their Messianic hopes, along with the sum total of their intellectual conceptions and religious environment, were responsible for. The whole time series was against any suggestion that Jesus had triumphed. Jesus was dead and done with, as it were. Yet the conviction that everyone was wrong, that circumstances were wrong, that Jesus was after all Messiah and was surely to triumph, that all he had said and done and lived and predicted would surely come to fruition, could no longer be prevented from breaking down all inhibitions, and the result was a series of visions of Christ risen and triumphant, and

* Cf. pp. 100f. 103f.

his truth prevailing in them at last.

The immediate cause may have been a report which reached the disciples of the finding of an empty tomb by some women who had gone thither with spices to embalm the dead body of Jesus, and who had stated that they "had seen a vision of angels which said that he was alive" (Lk.xxiv.22f). There seems to have been some doubt as to what the women actually found or actually did see, but the various stories leave us with the impression that they made some significant discovery and saw something which was interpreted in various ways by the disciples at the time.*

The experience of the women may have taken its start by their coming to the wrong place and mistaking an empty tomb for the one they were seeking (Gardner-Smith, op.cit.pp. 192f), or Joseph may have removed the body which had been hurriedly buried in his own tomb for the Sabbath, to its own sepulchre at the close of the Sabbath (Mackinnon, op.cit. p.292). The Johannine testimony reveals Mary being convinced that the body had been extracted (Jn.xx.2,13,15), while the two angels do not disabuse her of the conviction (vv.12f.). On the other hand the Synoptics along with John stress the visionary character of the women's experience by the angelic visions which they narrate, so that given the women strained by grief and the contemporary angelology in which they shared we may find the starting point of the disciples' resurrection experiences in the report circulated by the women at the tomb. Such an approach also implies that the empty tomb may be accounted for on the lines suggested by the Johannine story, viz.the extraction of the body; or in the dawn, with their over-strained condition, they may have mistaken the tomb, and, coming across an empty one in the garden, may have taken it for the tomb of Jesus; being thus nonplussed and distraught, their own inner spiritual conflict found its solution in the vision of angelic appearances with the message that Jesus was alive, and confirmed afterwards by an appearance to them. Thus their own conflict found relief in the wonderful assurance of Jesus' triumph despite all which had suggested the contrary in crucifixion.

*For the variation in the narratives, cf.p199.

We conclude therefore, that the resurrection experiences were the inevitable flowering of the seed sown by Jesus in his creative impact upon the disciples. They are not the sudden beginning of a new experience, but the crown of the religious experience they had had of Jesus, and unknowingly were still receiving of him. The significance of Jesus, suppressed by their conscious mentality, proves in itself to be the needful correction of mere subjectivity, since it was the deeper truth in him which came finally into the foreground of their inner life. Their conscious subjectivity would have prevented this emergence had it not been overcome by spiritual dynamic of a more potent order. The objective corrective power of vision has already been illustrated by the transfiguration experience, where the conscious misunderstanding and failure to grasp what Jesus had signified to them, was objectively corrected by a vision which liberated for the time being the deeper apprehension of his significance in the subconscious mind. Abundant illustration of the same fact is afforded in the Old Testament, where the prophets find their way to divine reality through vision which released their deeper mental and spiritual broodings. To say that vision is no more than delusion is to make most of the religious message of the prophets nothing but delusion; both the calls of Isaiah (vi.1ff.) and Jeremiah (i.4-10) would be no more than hallucination, to say nothing of Ezekiel (i-ii), Hosea (i.1), Amos (i.1),* and the rest.

*of. "the words of Amos...which he SAW concerning Israel..."

In all these the cause of the visions was the overmastering urge of divine truth which broke down all conscious resistance,* and produced experiences of vision where the voice of God was heard, attended in some cases with various kinds of symbolic pictures. ** The effect was a conscious grasp of divine truth which urged them to announce what was the will of God to men, moved to the prediction of the future with an extraordinary sureness that seems always to accompany truth attained through vision.

These considerations apply equally to the resurrection experiences received by the disciples, and supply the answer to the view that the vision hypothesis reduces the rising again of Jesus to mere subjective delusion. Spiritual experience cannot delude, when men are faithful to it. The spiritual potency of Jesus, who in his last earthly moment committed his spirit into the hands of his Father (Lk.xxiii.46) was able to present him in his glorified state to disciples whom he himself had creatively prepared to receive the revelations of his triumph over death, and from the empirical data of their visions we are able to discern their vivid apprehension that he was alive and that therefore the fact of his triumph was assured. This religious experience enshrined in the resurrection visions, and interpreted along these lines, is seen to stand clearly and surely in its solidity as a permanent datum of the gospel concerning Jesus Christ, by the side of which

*cf. the resistance of the religious unworthiness in Isaiah (vi.5) and the hesitancy of Jeremiah on the score of his youth (i.6).

**For the place of vision in the primitive church see pp. 248-251,

the more doubtful elements such as the empty tomb and the inconsistent evidence of the gospels appear of a secondary order.

The objective correction of the subjective supposition that Jesus had failed and that the Messianic hopes were lost lay in a restoration of their faith,*together with the emergence of a new series of apocalyptic enthusiasms which themselves were to find gradual correction as the primitive church came into being and proceeded to make one discovery after another.** We return to this aspect as we deal with the Ascension,*** but meanwhile we wish to point out that already the widening of the coming kingdom to include the Gentiles was being brought home to the disciples through resurrection visions.

The real difficulty of accepting the universal charge of Jesus to the disciples to go and preach the gospel unto all the nations (Mt.xxviii.19,cf.Lk.xxiv.47) is the hesitancy of the parochial spirit of the Jerusalem church in fulfilling its Christ-given duty towards the Gentiles. From conclusions we reach elsewhere (cf.pp.370 ff.) the primitive church was slow to accept its mission, and this is incredible if the disciples received a direct charge from Jesus to this effect. The leaders of the trend towards Gentile freedom in the gospel were not found among the twelve, for the apparent exception of Peter only proves the rule(cf.pp.394-96). The leader of the ferment seems to have been Stephen and the character of his preaching is seen in that he is brought to his death on a charge of super-nationalism (cf.pp.387-90). His colleagues among the Seven seem to have been of his more liberal spirit, and in the persecution following Stephen's death it is they, not the apostles, who are forced away from Jerusalem, with the result that they carried their gospel with them and founded churches among more specifically Gentile communities. The worldwide intent of Jesus was growing steadily in the mind of one section of the primitive church and at last found its powerful apostle in Paul. But the twelve and many others seemed to have remained nationalistic.

*cf. Mackinnon, op.cit. p.295. **Cf. pp.355 ff. ***Cf. p.216.

There is the further difficulty that later religious findings of the apostolic church were read back to the first beginnings. The author of the twofold work, Luke-Acts sets out the gospel facts destined, as he saw them, for the whole world, beginning at Jerusalem, then on to Judaea, Samaria and the uttermost parts of the earth, until it became a power in Rome ~~it~~ itself (Acts i.8, cf. Lk. xxiv.48). While in actual history this was the course of events, it is by no means at all certain that the conscious missionary motive was there at the outset designing such a development. In this sense the charge of Jesus to world evangelization may be no more than making him ~~as~~ the mouth-piece of the later findings (cf. pp.7f.12), as the implications of the gospel were more and more discerned and acted upon.

Despite the possibilities of a later standpoint influencing the narratives, there is something to be said for the likelihood that the universal aspect of the kingdom and the call to go out to all the world of men with the gospel reached the disciples by way of a resurrection appearance in vision. Although their conscious mind was constructed upon the narrower basis of apocalyptic hopes heightened now beyond measure by the experienced triumph of Jesus, it may be that just as subconsciously they had grasped the significance of Jesus' uniqueness, so they were growing in the spiritual quality of the kingdom, with a corresponding apprehension of the more exalted purpose of Christ with his kingdom and its supreme range over men, Jew and Gentile. The preservation of so many parables reflecting the supernatural content of the divine kingdom they set forth shows that the primitive church had some sense of this aspect of the kingdom, hesitant though the ~~the~~ believers were in following through its implications. There were therefore psychological elements in the experience of the eyewitnesses which predisposed them to receive a

revelation of the ultimate world purpose of Jesus, even if it was to be a long time before they really and consciously grasped and followed out the force of what they received.

If this tentative suggestion be not unreasonable, it may be that the explanation of more developed elements in the primitive church experience appearing at an earlier stage than their historical unfolding, will lie less along the line of a reading back of later ideas into the earliest stages, but more along that of revelation of spiritual truth and reality by way of vision, although it does not follow that the vision and audition were acted upon; here and there some reflective mind may have retained them; ~~and~~ to such ^{an} eyewitnesses may be due some of the recollections of what Jesus said and did in his resurrection revelations, ~~may have been~~ ^{thus} preserved for the gospel tradition.

At all events the weeks subsequent to the initial resurrection appearance seem to have been a period of visionary experience. According to Paul's testimony, Jesus was seen by more than five hundred people at one time (I Cor.xv.6), who may well have seen Jesus somewhere in Galilee;* friends of Jesus among the crowds, members of his family,** publicans and sinners, disciples who had returned to Galilee, who renewed their fellowship with

*cf. J. Weiss, op.cit. p.18, "Es wären also vielleicht die galiläischen Anhänger Jesu gewesen, vielleicht darunter solche, die ~~ihn~~ ^{ihnen} vor dem Festen beim Feste feierlich in Jerusalem eingeholt hatten (Jn.xi.55,xii.12f.), daneben vielleicht solche, die nicht zum Feste in Jerusalem gewesen waren." **For the tradition of the resurrection appearance to James the brother of Jesus, see "The Gospel to the Hebrews," quoted Jerome, op.cit. and cf. pp.65f.204).

Jesus in the resurrection experiences. The wealth of appearances is hinted at in the opening words of Acts (i.3).*

The experience of the Ascension is not altogether accounted for by the primitive expectation of his return from heaven implying that he must have returned thither before he could come back to earth, and so having small claim to be historical.** It is true that pre-Copernican ideas of the universe were in the field with the conception of the flat earth, the heavens high above, but if the ascension was a vision experience it would be construed in a series of such ideas, and Jesus would be seen to go right up into the sky. J.F.Bethune-Baker seems nearer the empirical probabilities: "the Ascension was the disciples' interpretation of the cessation of the Appearances and the special character of one of them."*** The Ascension should be construed as a resurrection appearance, and thus placed within the empirical series in which we viewed the risen appearances of Jesus. We may modify Dr.Bethune-Baker's view in looking at the Ascension less as a cessation of appearances, and more as the prelude to the ardently desired consummation of all things with the return of Messiah(Acts i.11).

In concluding our discussion as to the nature of the resurrection experience it has been found necessary to set forth some

*Cf. the 'many sure signs,' πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις. cf. Wisd. v.4, xix.13, III Macc. iii.24, and for papyri illustrations of this meaning cf. MM, VGT. ad loc. **Gardner-Smith, op.cit. pp.76-80 ***"The Faith of the Apostles' Creed," 1918, p.133.

decision as to what we are to think of the resurrection; especially is this to be stressed in view of the primitive church which arose from empirical conditions directly arising from the disciples' experience of the risen Jesus. While it is a question of historical evidence, there is more involved. An answer has to be found that will satisfy the soul of the enquirer into these fundamental issues. We have decided that, as the facts stand, ~~that~~ the best way of accounting for them is along the lines of vision and audition. At the same time we would make it clear that this view of the resurrection is one which also best satisfies the soul, since we are not driven to dependence on a mere sign to attest the truth of the triumphant presence of the risen Jesus, and thus far we are in line with the attitude and spirit of Jesus himself. If the Son of God passed from his earthly life to the presence of the Father, what is significant is that he had created the spiritual conditions which enabled his disciples to receive direct evidence from the other side of death that the one they had known in life was all and more than he had claimed to be and that they had discerned in him. The vision experience is also in line with the best religious experience of the long line of prophets with their direct awareness of God, and also of the best issues involved in apocalyptic with its presentation and conviction that the world was in the hands of God. The extraordinary sureness which was so characteristic of the true prophet or apocalyptic seer finds its complement in the remarkable

certainty with which the disciples grasped the fact that Jesus was risen. Such extraordinary sureness seems always to be an accompaniment of truth that is attained through vision, whether of prophet or mystic or of the resurrection of Jesus. Such sureness seems to be deeper down than the memory of a sense impression of Jesus risen from the dead. Indeed the very diversity of the details of the apparent sense impressions in the gospel narratives suggests that on the plane of sense the eye-witnesses were not consistently agreed as to what had taken place, as they endeavoured to interpret their experience. The extraordinary sureness of the truth received through vision is probably due to the fact that the vision experience is a record of a conclusion to which the whole personality has been influenced to reach through the pressure of impressions and influences that have come to bear upon the personality, whereas a sense impression is an introduction to new experience.

The creative contacts of Jesus upon his disciples thus reached their culmination in the resurrection experience received through vision. The old objection to the vision hypothesis, viz. that the disciples were not expecting it is set aside by the facts of their preparation for what came, as we have seen. The old alternative, viz. either the resuscitated body or hallucination is seen to be misleading, since the psychology of vision is helping us to appraise the value of vision experience as leading to the attainment of truth.

The authority of Jesus, temporarily lost as it had seemed, was not only restored for the disciples, but discerned in a more potent manner than hitherto they had realized. All doubt that he was indeed God's chosen Messiah was removed for ever. The ascension vision was their registering of the conviction that Jesus had been exalted, and before long he would return in the same way as he had been seen to depart, i.e. in his wellknown, recognizable personality (Acts i.11). Filled with this hope, now intensified beyond measure, they left the scene of the last resurrection appearance, the ascension, and repaired to Jerusalem, gathering enthusiastic eyewitnesses as they went, until some one hundred and twenty people are found there in a state of glowing certainty that the exalted Jesus would immediately return in power, and they were eager to share in his triumph as he descended the pinnacle of the temple.* Deep joy, expressive of the heightened anticipations, was their mood, and they were continually in the temple, praising God (Lk.xxiv.52f.), not simply because they were pious Jews, but like the aged Symeon they expected their Messiah to return there, and they desired to be there to meet him as he came (Lk.ii.28f.). It was in such an atmosphere of vivid expectation that almost without being aware of it, the tremendous uprush of life which we call the experience of Pentecost came upon them.

* Cf. Mt. iv. 5-7, Lk. iv. 9-12, Mal. iii. 1. Cf. too the Messianic Pledge in the eschatological cup of the last supper, pp. 184, 422f. and see also pp. 435ff. and form of their manner.

CHAPTER V

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE SPIRIT

The Christian Church took its rise as the people of God as the fulfilment of the Old Testament promise, the specific beginning resting on the basic experience of the resurrection of Jesus.* Another view is that the Church came into being as the result of the defection of Israel as the ecclesia of God now found with the Gentiles; here too the significance of the resurrection as the starting off point for the church is stressed.** The vital consequence of the re-appearance of Jesus was that for the disciples Jesus had vindicated himself in triumph, and that meant that their supreme faith in him was overwhelmingly confirmed.***

The resurrection experience is therefore the vitally creative fact for the beginning of the church. As a result of it we have seen a body of enthusiastic, expectant men and women gathered together in Jerusalem to await for what was to come. ~~It~~ one of their gatherings at which the ~~Middûsh~~ celebration for Pentecost

*K.L.Schmidt, "Die Kirche des Urchristentums," in Festgabe für A.Deissmann z.60.Geburtstag, 1927, S.258-319, has a full exposition of this view. **For the presentation of this view of the church's origin see E.Peterson, "Die Kirche," 1929. ***E.Fuchs, op.cit.p.19, "Eben dies (sc.folgt), dass der Herr Jesus Christus bezeugt und d.h.wieder, dass ~~der~~ Glaube bezeugt werden kann." cf.also Gardner Smith, op.cit.pp.174f."the disciples founded the Church because they believed that Jesus was alive...because He had appeared to them and spoken to them and they had recognized the voice and form of their Master."

may have been held* the believers became aware that some new experience had come upon them with certain abnormal accompaniments such as the sound of a rushing wind which seemed to fill the house, and tongues of fire as it were which separated asunder; at the same time they found themselves talking in strange speech. The conclusion that they reached was that they were filled with 'holy spirit'(Acts ii.1-4).

The abnormal features belong entirely to the thought-forms in which the experience was received. They are parts of the psychological mechanisms involved. Minds accustomed to the idea of the Spirit of God as a wind-like energy which invaded human beings would be quite capable of audition involving the sound as of a rushing wind. The vivid inner experience had results on the system of sensation^{such} as to produce vivid auditory phenomena. The 'fire' forms the visual element in the experience; and while it "was an early and natural symbol of the energy and glory of the divine,"** it probably pointed to the Messianic Judgment of which the believers were so aware as imminent (Mt.iii. 11,Lk.iii.16,cf.Mal.iii.2f.). Yet we have to allow for the possibility that the 'fire' denotes that the Pentecost phenomena were psychologically determined on the physical^{side} rather than on the symbolic, being a vivid sensation of light, and a common feature in abnormal religious experience. There is not^a hint of burning or heat; the phenomenon seems to have been no more than the

*Cf. pp. 226f. 425, 483f. **J.V. Bartlet, "Acts," CB ad loc.

▲ sensory effect of the flame of light due to religious stress.*

It is not sufficient to regard the abnormal elements as merely metaphorical (H.T.Andrews, "The Acts of the Apostles," WNT, 1908, ad loc), or symbolical (R.B.Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles," 2nd. Edn. WC. 1904, p. 18). We have to consider (1) Symbolic elements in the original experience, as e.g. the 'fire' metaphorical of the fire of the imminent judgment, although these may well have arisen from the over-stimulus of the sensory apparatus through powerful religious impetus; (2) Symbolic meanings read into the original experience by the historian, as in the 'speaking with tongues' the onlookers are made to express astonishment at hearing every language represented by them (Acts ii. 6). But too much symbolism is seen by many modern interpreters, as e.g. when Luke is supposed to have been influenced by the Jewish story preserved by Philo (De Decal. 9, 11), which relates that when the law was given at Sinai, God's voice assumed the shape of a flame of fire which divided itself into seventy languages (E.F.Scott, "The Beginnings of the Church," op.cit. pp. 60f). The superficial resemblance of this legend to the story of Pentecost is too slender a basis on which to understand the latter, while such over-symbolism tends to obscure the facts of what happened, rather than to explain them.

The abnormal effects were due to the heightening of the sensations under the stimulus of some tremendous spiritual experience; the sound was as if of wind, and the tongues of fire as if resembling the actual thing (Acts ii. 2f). Behind the extraordinary auditory and visual phenomena was a corresponding objective reality as we have seen in the case of the transfiguration and resurrection appearances. That reality was experience of the invasive Spirit coming upon minds prepared after the traditional manner of antecedent experience of the Spirit.**

As the narrative of Pentecost stands we are given the impression that the phenomena described as λαλεῖν ἑτέροις γλώσσαις refers to foreign dialects and languages. The missionary motive which at

*Cf. pp. 229f.

** cf. p. 227.

a later stage was seen to be behind the gospel for the Gentiles seems to have influenced the narrative here, although such influence should not be overrated. What has happened is that Luke has misinterpreted the facts (or the tradition on which he relies is responsible) by assuming an actual endowment of miraculous linguistic powers for those to whom had come the experience of the Spirit, such powers being supposedly necessary for preaching the gospel to the world. It is impossible to conclude that any such endowment was the case.

Greek was the general medium of linguistic exchange in the ancient world (cf. p. 49), and thus the endowment was not needed. The speech of Peter that follows (Acts ii. 14ff.) makes no reference to any linguistic miracle, but replies to the charge of intoxication which had been made by some who had heard the extraordinary speaking (Acts ii. 15). If "the tale is told so as to suggest missionary effort in strange tones and dialects" (Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 91), the authors of the tale have overlooked the strange obtuseness of the Twelve to the duty of preaching to the Gentiles, a fact all the more remarkable if they were equipped with the power to speak foreign languages for this particular purpose. The linguistic endowment failed in the case of Saul and Barnabas who did not understand the speech of the Lycaonians, for they did not fathom what these people intended until they saw the paraphernalia for sacrifice to themselves being brought forward (Acts xiv. 8ff.). It is moreover, unlikely that speaking in foreign tongues would have provoked the charge of intoxication (Acts ii. 13), while if Acts iv. 31 be a doublet of this incident, we find no reference there to the endowment. According to Papias, Peter had Mark as an interpreter (Eus. H. E. iii. 39, ἐμμενερῆς. cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. iii. 1, 1. and 'interpretes' in *ibid.* 10, 6).

What we have to do with in the 'speaking with tongues' is an inspired form of speech which seems to have been fairly widespread in the church for the first twenty years of its existence. Peter's Jewish friends in the house of Cornelius were astonished that

the Spirit had been poured out on the Gentiles, a fact attested for them because the Gentiles were speaking with tongues (Acts x.46). Peter justified his baptism of Cornelius on the ground that the Spirit had fallen on Cornelius and his friends even as ~~it~~ had upon the believers at Pentecost in the beginning (Acts xi. 15). For Peter, at least, the speech phenomena of Pentecost were similar to what took place at the house of the Gentile centurion. The Spirit came to the believers at Ephesus as Paul baptizes them in the name of the Lord Jesus, the attestation again being that they began to speak in tongues (Acts xix.6). Paul refers to the glossolalia as if they were a usual feature of Christian worship (I Cor.xiv.2ff.), just as 'prophesying' was. While prophesying may edify both him who speaks and ~~they~~ who listen, he who speaks with a tongue edifies only himself (I Cor.xiv.3f.). The tongue-speech therefore needs someone to interpret it for the sake of the listeners (ver.27). Because of the unintelligibility involved Paul would rather utter a few words intelligibly than speak at great length in a tongue (ver.19); in the same way he regards prayer which needs to be made with understanding (ver.15)*.

The tongue-speech seems therefore to have been a form of inspired utterance that was characterized by unintelligibility. Uncontrollable religious aspirations and emotions induced a mood of ecstatic excitement which found its outlet in ejaculatory

*"Purely emotional or inarticulate ejaculations were apt^{so} to get the upper hand as to sacrifice all intelligibility" (J.V.Bartlet, "The Apostolic Age," 1911, p.12).

sounds which conveyed no meaning to those who heard. The primitive church and the later Pauline church received new visions of God and His purpose, new truths and powers were breaking in upon the believers, new religious experiences were frequent, as the tides of the new faith swept in and out. Men found the usual channels of verbal expression quite inadequate to express what they were experiencing.*

We have, however, more than intense emotion breaking out into articulate speech. There was meaning in the glossolalia at least for the speaker, who is expressing to God the praise and worship in his own soul (I Cor.xiv.2), under the new power of the Spirit he experiences. The people who so experienced the Spirit in this way were religiously nurtured and were familiar with a whole range of religious phraseology attached to their previous religious life and experience. When the new experience of the primitive church came to its believers, it demanded new expression and for the time could find it only in unmeaning vocables.** Paul and others tried to reshape and recondition the old forms of speech and thought to fit into the new experience,*** but not always satisfactorily, for there were heights and depths of religious experience that found expression only in "unspeakable words"(II Cor.xii.11); there were

*"A man's mind is full of something which he wishes to express in words, and instinctively he makes the effort of speech, but the words that come are nothing but a series of arbitrary sounds that only resemble words"(E.F.Scott, op.cit.p.101). ***"The new religious experience did in fact create a new language of its own, one of more immediate speech with God in ecstatic prayer"(Bartlet,op.cit. p.12,note 1). ***Cf.pp.36-44,46-51.

direct experiences of God through the Spirit's indwelling which could be expressed only "with groanings that cannot be uttered" (Rom.viii.26). Words can at the best ~~can~~ adequately express only what is fully conscious, and since what is conscious is by no means the whole personality, especially where religious ferment is present, inarticulate babblings have their rightful place and thus receive their explanation.

We have little hesitation in declaring for this interpretation of the tongue-speech as being applicable to the phenomena of Pentecost. We know that prior to this event the believers were given much to prayer together (Acts i.14). There were also the throbbing expectations centring on the risen Jesus, their watching for his return, with all that these involved by way of the advent of the divine kingdom. Even as they ~~were~~^{are} praying his very personality may be on the point of coming through the closed doors, saying, "Peace be with you" (Lk.xxiv.36). In such an atmosphere we become aware of depths of ~~suppressed~~ spiritual excitement and ferment.

On one of these occasions ~~in~~ which they gathered for prayer, the Pentecost experience of the Spirit came upon them. C.Anderson Scott's picturesque phrase, 'The Uprush of Life,'* serves at least to denote that aspect of the new experience which represented the rising to their climax^{of} all the hopes, the prayers, the aspirations, the impressions and experiences of Jesus, centred in Jesus and

*The Fellowship of the Spirit,"1921,title of ch.iii.

motived by Jesus, beginning from the initial contacts and impressions in Galilee, following through to their experiences of him risen from the dead. Behind the now conscious elements of the resurrection experience and the eager anticipations of Messiah's parousia which that resurrection foreshadowed, there was the dynamic effect of the character and death of Jesus creative in the subconscious of a directed mass of emotion which had to find its outlet. The suppressed excitements and quickening spiritual powers could no longer be kept in check. Pentecost found the believers overwhelmed in the floodtide of the new experience which they accounted for as being "filled with holy spirit." (Acts ii.4). Traditional images and associations due to their normal religious psychology came to the forefront of consciousness in the windlike noise and the tongues like fire, while the effort to express what they were receiving resulted in the outbreak of ecstatic, inarticulate speech. The normal channels of personality were for the moment too restricted and too inadequate to receive the heights and depths of the new experience, the apprehension of which had to be made through what was abnormal. Thus what on the one hand seems to be no more than psychological abnormality, on the other hand is seen to be the inevitable psychological accompaniments of the gathering up in spiritual power and faith ^{of} what had hitherto been seen and apprehended in the personality of Jesus.

The conclusion reached in the minds of the believers that their

experience was due to the Spirit was reached through the mental categories of their traditional Jewish psychology. The abnormal effects were for their minds 'symptoms' denoting his indwelling. They reasoned back from the effects to the cause and realized that they were filled with the Spirit who had invaded and possessed their spirit. The higher incursion had taken place. The same energy operative of Messiah's function would bring in the kingdom.* Thus their present experience seemed to confirm the fact that their vivid expectations were soon to be realized.

What emerges from the Pentecost experience is a group of men and women unified ~~into a group~~ by a vital experience of Jesus and of the Spirit who animated him and them.** "What was holding them together was a common attitude of mind and will to Him who had been known as Jesus of Nazareth." The abnormal phenomena should not obscure this essential empirical content by regarding them as hysterics or due to pathological disturbances. They were the inevitable accompaniments of the experience and we should have strong reason to suspect the genuineness of the experience and its narration if such were not there. At the minimum we have "shiftings of character to higher levels"*** in the believers, but at its maximum the Pentecost experience lifted them up to a Christ consciousness that sent them forth to make history of such meaning that the world has never since escaped from the effects of its turning point in the emergence of the Christian Church. The

*Cf. pp. 112-117. **Cf. pp. 294-304 ***William James, "The Varieties of Religious Experience," 32nd Impression, 1920, p. 257.

windlike noise is lost in the dim distance, the tongues like as of fire extinguished, and the ecstatic speech no longer heard, for they are only the accidentals of the experience. They have no permanent place, while their significance is infinitesimal for the amazing results that sprang from Pentecost. Paul had to warn his churches against mistaking the accidentals for the real content of the Christian experience (I Cor.xiv). What stands out clearly is the turning point of a new spiritual experience which gathered round the personality of the risen Jesus in all the entwined emotions, loyalties, and self-surrender of the believers who went out to their contemporaries with the urgent message about Jesus the Messiah.

Religious history affords us ~~with~~ many analogies which throw light on the nature of the Pentecost experience.

The spiritual atmosphere in George Fox's Journal illustrates this. "...it was opened unto me by the eternal light and power and I saw clearly therein that all was done, and to be done, in and by Christ...Then after this, there did a pure FIRE appear in me: then I saw HOW HE SATE AS A REFINER'S FIRE..."(pp.9f.in the Tercentenary Text, ed.N. Penny,Everyman Library). Fox attended a large meeting, and "the Lord opened my mouth...and the power of the Lord was over them all."(p.11). "I SAW the harvest white, and the seed of God lying thick in the ground, as ever did wheat that was sown outwardly...The Lord's POWER BRAKE FORTH, and I had great openings and prophecies"(p.12). "I SAW there was a great crack to go throughout the earth, and a great smoke to go as the crack went; and that after the crack there should be a great shaking: this was the earth in people's hearts, which was to be shaken before the seed of God was raised out of the earth. And it was so; for the Lord's POWER began to SHAKE them.."(p.13). "I was moved to pray, and the Lord's power was so great that the house seemed to be shaken"(p.13). Again and again we read that "the Lord's power brake through"(p.15),"wrought mightily," and "was wonderfully manifested"(pp.15ff.). People came together "and wait to feel the Lord's power and spirit in themselves"(p.45). An experience at Carlisle is the most vivid instance: as Fox spoke, "the power of the Lord was

dreadful amongst them in the steeplehouse, so that the people trembled and shook, and they thought the steeplehouse shook; and some of them feared it would fall down on their heads" (p.87).

We have to keep in mind that Fox may be subconsciously reproducing the Pentecost conditions; cf. "when I had done, some..said it was now as in the days of the apostles, when the house was shaken where they were" (p.13). Yet even so light would be thrown on the nature of what was being reproduced, with all the visionary and auditory phenomena involved. These elements are not merely symbolic for Fox, but result from the vivid potency of his religious experience. If his Journal reveals him to have "an unstable psychic constitution" (op.cit.p.x.Intro.by Rufus Jones, and cf.W.C.Middleton, "The Denunciations of George Fox Viewed Psychologically," Journal of Religion, XI.Oct.1931, pp.589ff.), the religious life he possessed was far from disintegrating in effect, for "he has the distinction of being the founder of a religious sect which has for two centuries and a half continued the mystical type which he initiated" as he pursued "his practical attempt to revive 'primitive Christianity'" (Rufus Jones, "Studies in Mystical Religion," 1923, pp.482f.).

It may be said that Pentecost reveals a similar "unstable psychic constitution" in the experiencing disciples, but as in the case of Fox, it is more likely that the overwhelming nature of the new religious experience proved too much for the normal mental mechanisms, and thus sensory phenomena of an abnormal order are revealed. The psychologically abnormal is not simply that which has to be taken into account and explained on psychological lines, and then revealing the something more which is found still remaining, but may be viewed as the necessary means by which the spiritual thing comes to be. A vision or an audition due to abnormal sensory stimulus from within, and that marks a stage in the disintegration of personality, must have something quite different as its centre from vision or audition that makes and apparently is itself the means to greater integration; the former may be no more than merely pathological in origin, but the latter, as in the case of Pentecost, Fox, and the other examples we go on to discuss, has obvious claims to be considered as authentic tidings and affects of the spiritual essence of the universe, i.e. divine reality, since it contains that which makes for deeper integration of personality.

David Brainerd unwittingly affords a medium link for understanding what happens in the stress of religious experience. "As I was walking in a thick dark grove, unspeakable glory seemed to open to the view and apprehension of my soul. I do not mean any external brightness, for I saw no such thing; nor do I intend any imagination of a body of light, somewhere

away in the third heavens, or anything of that nature; but it was a new inward apprehension or view that I had of God, such as I never had before, nor anything which had the least resemblance to it" (Diary and Journal, Vol. I. 1902, p. 22). The medium link lies in the distinction that Brainerd makes between the unspeakable glory he saw and yet did not see. This effort to semi-rationalize a vivid religious experience is a sort of halfway house between the realisms of Pentecost and the modern rationalizings of extraordinary religious phenomena. But in the overwhelming sense of God's power and presence Brainerd stands with the believers at Pentecost, although they would not have made any such distinction as he did.

William James quotes fully the conversion crisis that overwhelmed the spiritual life of President Finney, and from his account we select the following extract. "As I turned and was about to take a seat by the fire, I received a mighty baptism of the Holy Ghost. Without any expectation of it, without ever having the thought in my mind that there was any such thing for me, without any recollection that I had ever heard the thing mentioned by any person in the world, the Holy Spirit descended upon me in a manner that seemed to go through me, body and soul. I could feel the impression, like a wave of electricity, going through and through me... It seemed like the very breath of God. I can recollect distinctly that it seemed to fan me, like immense wings" (op. cit. p. 255). Here, unlike the case of Fox, there was no attempt to reproduce the primitive church conditions: here, unlike the Pentecost believers, there was no expectation of anything imminent in the nature of a crisis. Yet the atmosphere of the Pentecost experience is present, with its quasi-sensation as the abnormal accompaniments on the physical side of an extraordinary spiritual experience construed as the coming down of the Holy Spirit.

Speaking of Montanus, Eusebius writes, ἐνθα παρὰ τινα τῶν νεοπίστων πρῶτος Μοντανὸν τοῦνομα... πνευματοφορηθῆναι τε καὶ ἀφνιδῶς ἐν κατοχῇ... παρεκτάσει γενόμενον, ἐνθουσιᾶν, ἀρξασθαι τε λαλεῖν καὶ ξενοφωνεῖν (H. E. v. 16). H. J. Lawlor states that "the 'ecstasy' of Montanus was a kind of ~~madness~~, deliberately induced" (ERE. Vol. VIII. art. 'Montanism' p. 828). If so, then this does not help us to understand the nature of the Pentecost experience. But possibly Lawlor does not appraise justly the real nature of Montanus' religious experience as a reaction from the growing conservatism of the Church. The remedy for this conservatism was in the outpouring of the Spirit, from which Montanus sincerely believed there would descend as real and vivid a power upon them as the church received in the experience of Pentecost. Hence

the ecstasy of Montanus and his followers resulted from their common association of ideas with the Spirit, the symptom of whose activity was conceived to be some form of ecstasy, an idea by no means dead in the church, despite Paul's warning against it (I Cor.xiv.and cf.H.M.Gwatkin, "Early Church History,"2nd.Edn.1912,Vol.II.pp.80f.). The association, too, of the vivid expectation of the parousia of Christ which was characteristic of Montanism, along with the ecstatic experience of the Spirit, further strengthens the backward reference to the primitive church where the immediate conclusion drawn by the believers from their experience of the Spirit at Pentecost was that Jesus would appear almost immediately (cf.pp.239f.). Thus one of the ancient church movements of the second century throws light on the experiential atmosphere of Pentecost and the primitive church.

The Camisards of France reveal an intensified religious experience due to the fierce pressure of persecution. During the rising in the seventeenth century many of the Protestants of Languedoc went into an ecstasy which infected people of all ages. "They heard supernatural voices. They spoke with tongues. Children of the tenderest years were the subjects of the most extraordinary manifestations. Quite uneducated persons gave utterance when "seized by the Spirit" to prophecies in the purest French"(C.Anderson Scott,ERE.Vol.III.art.'Camisards' p.176). Here again we are in the Pentecostal religious atmosphere.

The Irvingite movement is another illustration of the same experience. Alexander Scott, Irving's assistant, in defending himself on a charge of heresy before the London Presbytery, insisted that the Spirit's remarkable gifts as manifested at Pentecost and in the apostolic church were a permanent possession of the church, withheld because of the unfaithfulness of Christian believers. A further development in the movement occurred when one of the Rev McLeod's parishioners became an incurable invalid, and spiritual manifestations appeared in her of such a nature as to make her friends claim them as a reappearance of the tongues spoken in the apostolic church. Other psychical phenomena were reported, and Erskine, after thorough investigation, decided for their genuineness. "They may, perhaps, be classed and judged with similar manifestations in other parts of Christendom. Irving, predisposed alike by character and antecedents, at once accepted them as a baptism of the Holy Spirit and fire"(J.G.Simpson,ERE.Vol.VII.p.424).

"In 1910 I was present at a religious meeting in Chicago in which the brethren and especially the sisters spoke in

tongues, but in these cases the speaking was almost invariably confined to exclamations more or less long" (J.B.Pratt, "The Religious Consciousness," 1923, p.187). "In fact the practice of speaking with tongues is probably to be found in some part of the United States nearly all the time" (ibid. p.186).

Professor C.Anderson Scott quotes from the 'Church Times' for June 26th.1914, a reference to an oecumenical conference of the Salvation Army "at which were present representatives of nations even more numerous and more heterogeneous than those tabulated in Acts ii. A report of one of the meetings contains the following striking sentence: "Each time the theme (the saving love of God in Christ) was touched upon, it brought forth from the pent-up feelings of the vast assembly a sort of half sigh of appreciation. Yet many in the audience knew no English, but they felt that the one great truth to them was being announced at this particular moment. Indians, Chinese, Canadians, Peruvians, Swedes, all of them gave the deep emotional response." Professor Scott goes on to make the comment that "it would not be difficult to believe that when the speaker on that occasion had finished, representatives of these various races would be found saying, "We heard him speaking in our tongue the mighty works of God" ("What Happened at Pentecost," in "The Spirit," ed.B.H.Streeter, 1919, p.129). There is the possibility that the onlookers at Pentecost, although Greek was the common linguistic medium, may have caught the spiritual strains of the speaking with tongues so that it seemed to every one that the disciples were speaking in the several languages. But there is a striking difference between the oecumenical conference and Pentecost; the former consisted of a polyglot audience 'en rapport' spiritually and psychologically with the theme and the wider sympathies of the movement under whose banner they were all gathered together: in the latter case we have a surprised body of polyglot people who suddenly come across the believers speaking in the languages the onlookers represented, as Luke reports. This difference tells against Luke's interpretation of the speaking with tongues; there was no psychological unity of experience, no spiritual sympathy between the polyglot pilgrims and the disciples speaking.

John Woolman once spoke to Indians, and finding the interpreters not of much use, decided to speak without them in English, with the result that "I believe the Holy Ghost wrought on some hearts to edification where all the words were not understood" (Journal, June 19, 1762). Here is a case of intensified religious witness where the highly charged religious emotions were better conveyed by uninterpreted English than through imperfect interpreters. The emotions responsible for the

tongue-speech in the primitive church, though unintelligible to the reason, may nevertheless have conveyed some impression of divine reality in the religious emotion responsible.

One example of abnormal religious phenomena may be given from non-Christian religious experience. The Chaitanyite Revival in India in the earlier half of the sixteenth century centred around the personality of Chaitanya, who, receiving the stimulus of a heightened religious experience, became an apostle of Krishna-Bhakti. This brought about a revival which wrought deeply on the religious life of the people of Bengal. "He sang and chanted Krishna's name for hours together till he became delirious with Bhakti... The revival which Chaitanya set on foot inspired countless lives of devotion and won converts from every class of society" (A.C. Underwood, "Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian," 1925, p. 56). Here the heightening of the emotions under religious stress, and the intensification of the abnormal in human personality that resulted therefrom, remind us of the Pentecost experience.

There is no doubt that the powerful suggestion derived from the experience of Pentecost is a part of the mental mechanism in operation in all the instances that may be cited from Christian religious experience throughout the ages to illustrate the nature of the Pentecost phenomena. But J.B. Pratt seems to miss the inner relationship of the symptoms of the experience to the underlying reason for them, when he explains that "when one is sure from the intensity of one's feelings that the Holy Ghost is within one, it comes into one's head to express one's emotions by speaking in an unknown tongue" (op. cit. p. 184). Those who are thus worked up in emotional tension do not pause to ask themselves if the intensity of their feelings warrants the conclusion that the Holy Spirit has possession of them. Nor thereupon does a cognitive process supervene and give the 'possessed' the idea that since they are possessed with the Spirit, therefore they ought to break out into unknown tongues, for this assumes a chain of reasoning which the excited mood would not allow. What suggestion there is must be along the lines of Pentecost, viz. the breaking out into unknown tongues or the experience of heightened sensory images, simply because the mechanisms of the ordinary speech and sense responses are too inadequate for use under the religious stress. Further, the extraordinary religious experience is in being before any likeness to that of Pentecost can be suggested. While the abnormal forms may be suggested by the experience of the primitive church, yet, so far as they are the genuine indices of the spiritual power at work in those who manifest them, they are the genuine psychological

accompaniments of real enhanced religious experience as inspired by the Spirit in the sense of Pentecost, so that while many of these manifestations may be suggested by Pentecost and the primitive church, that very suggestion makes them analogous to the Pentecost experience and therefore helps in the appraisal of the atmosphere of that momentous occasion.

We should not ^{overlook,} further, the influence of the group. An individual experience such as that of President Finney is one thing, but a company of such individuals under the same religious stress introduces an element which is in itself a powerful means of heightening the suggestibility of the whole gathering. The mutual 'continuing instant in prayer' of the believers in the Upper Room (Acts i.14) acted and reacted on one another as individuals, and led up to Pentecost. Fox's experience at Carlisle (cf. pp. 229f.) where all the people trembled and thought that the church was shaken is a case of heightened suggestibility due to the interaction of individual and group emotion. The same with the Salvation Army conference mentioned by Professor Scott. In the same way the Camisards infected one another and crowd psychology came in to reinforce the spirit of resistance to persecution by the intense religious experience which produced abnormal accompaniments. When an overpowering emotion sweeps a religious group, there is an excess of feeling over the more rational element in human personality, and people catch fire more quickly by vivid emotional contact than in the cooler temperature of considered reason. Thus in a New York meeting the whole gathering was set aflame by the emotional contagion of a speaker who exclaimed, "Brethren, I feel--I feel--I feel--I feel--I feel--I can't tell you how I feel, but O, I feel! I feel!" (reported by Professor Coe, "The Spiritual Life," 1909, p. 215). Here the speaker fails to give expression to his strong emotion in words, and is thrown back on ejaculatory phrases which are taken up and echoed round and round the suggestible crowd until the whole gathering breaks forth into what appears to be ecstatic speech.

A psychology not dissimilar in contagious intensity is seen in the Pentecost prayer preparation and its climax in the outpouring of the Spirit. In the Upper Room each took fire from each and the whole group became religiously and psychologically infected by the personal experience of the individuals. After their experiences of Jesus risen from the dead, the same Jesus they had known 'in the days of his flesh,' and overwhelmingly certain that he was soon to return and bring in the kingdom, they had returned to Jerusalem to await the promise of the power which should descend upon them (Acts i.8). The crisis was at hand. The days went by and each influenced the other in earnest expectation, which

increased the more they met and talked about it, encouraged one another in joyful hope, prayed continually, everyone in a state of preparedness and likemindedness, and all moulded by high suggestibility of the great expectations they held in common into an experientially prepared crowd ready for what was to come. The fulfilment happened. The big thing happened. The clouds of heaven, as it were, burst upon them, illumination lit up the whole mind and spirit, many of the limiting inhibitions (cf. pp. 292f.) which bound them to their religious antecedents were done away, as in heart, mind and will the believers were surrendered entirely to the Spirit's presence. Tides of emotion swept over them and resulted in psychologically abnormal experiences and elements which have led some scholars to see in them only mythical accretions, but which were rather the historical indices of a religious experience which produced in its new loyalties centring round Jesus results unique and life-changing.

If we ask what was the power actually experienced at Pentecost we may reply, 'The Holy Spirit,' as Acts explains. If, however, we push the question further back, it becomes 'Who or What is the Holy Spirit?' This opens up vistas of theological inference and philosophical speculation the chief characteristic of which is the very vagueness and nebulosity which a vista suggests. The Christian Church with its formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity, has ~~little~~ little real understanding of what it means by The Holy Spirit.* When we seek to evaluate the experience of the Spirit at Pentecost, we have to keep before us Gunkel's caution against looking for any systematic teaching about the Spirit in the primitive church. Since the coming of the Spirit was so vitally connected with what the believers had experienced of Jesus in his resurrection and exaltation it is necessary to ask if Jesus gave any teaching to the

*"We seem to be without the historic landmarks by which the student of Christology or of the doctrine of Justification can orientate himself" (H.W. Robinson, "The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit," 1928, p.2).

disciples about the Spirit. The answer is that there is very little teaching.* But there is the more important empirical approach to be considered. Those who saw and heard Jesus, and who were astonished and amazed at words and works would have no hesitation in looking on Jesus as the channel of the Spirit's activity; the extraordinary nature, the unique power of Jesus would lead them to postulate the same underlying power as made the contemporaries of Joseph and Elijah regard them as men in whom the Spirit of the Lord was (cf.pp.113f.). Jesus was extraordinary. All he did and said were extraordinary. All was because in him was the Spirit of God. When the disciples expressed their impressions of his uniqueness by confessing him as Messiah (cf.pp.172f.) there would be no doubt in their minds as to the vital connection of the Spirit with Jesus. The fact of Jesus being Messiah was the same as saying that in him operated the divine Spirit, through whose power Messiah would bring in the kingdom (cf.pp114f.).

As the eyewitnesses looked on Jesus, all that he said and did, all that they hoped in him, was charged with the activity of the Spirit of God. His uniqueness produced a perpetual impression of extraordinary power.** Therefore we are not surprised to discover strata of interpretation in the narratives

*For a discussion of what teaching there is, cf. Appendix II pp. 514-16, and for the teaching in the Fourth Gospel, cf.p.239.

**"Anyone who wishes to know the New Testament connotation of "Spirit" must use his concordance also for the term "power", which is its chief content" (H.W.Robinson, op.cit.p.128).

which are due to the compilers of the tradition and the eye-witnesses whose impressions form the basis of that tradition, explaining Jesus in terms of the spirit's activity. While Jesus may well have related his own experience of the Spirit's descent upon himself at his baptism*, yet the Spirit's coming upon him was for his disciples the key that fitted the lock which opened up for them his uniqueness.** In a similar way the birth of Jesus is ascribed to a physical generation by the Spirit in the womb of Mary the Galilean virgin (Mt.i.18-20); the unique life, the unique personality, all the products of the Spirit, must therefore be conceived as having a unique beginning, this being due also to the Spirit.*** Luke refers to Jesus being full of the Holy Spirit as he returned from the wilderness after the temptation into Galilee (iv.14).****

Thus we have right within the gospels the explanation of the uniqueness of Jesus as due to the power of the Spirit. A record which seems at the first glance to have little reference to the Spirit is from this point of view seen to be shot through and through with the Spirit's power and activity within the personality of Jesus, such being perceived and explained by those who beheld. In view of these empirical conclusions there was no special need that Jesus should "give His disciples ~~the~~

*On this cf. Appendix II pp.515f. **The baptism with the Spirit's descent was "the Divine explanation of the marvellous personality and deeds of Jesus" (D.S.Cairns, "The Faith That Rebels," 5th. Edn. 1938, p.96). ***Luke brings out better the 'power' aspect (1.35). ****Cf. Appendix II. pp.515f. for Jesus' possible teaching here.

some such preparatory teaching about the gift of the Holy Spirit as is conveyed in His last discourses before His passion according to St. John."* But the references to the Spirit in these discourses have more the colour of the later doctrine of which Paul is the mediator; the centre of gravity here is the risen and glorified Lord whose presence on earth is now ^{replaced} ~~substituted~~ by the Paraclete (Jn. xiv. 16f. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13f.). For the primitive church there was no idea of the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost to compensate for the going away of Jesus. The working of the facts points in a different direction. From the very beginning of Jesus' ministry, sundry groups of eyewitnesses reacted to Him, and they all regarded Jesus in his uniqueness as the channel of the Spirit's dynamic.** As his life passes on through the Cross to resurrection and exaltation, all is conceived as being due to the power of the Spirit. The very expectation of his return bringing in the kingdom is likewise to be motivated by the same Spirit's power. The same divine power which was in Jesus had come upon the believers at Pentecost; it was inter-related with Jesus and had been made possible for them by Jesus. The Pentecost experience cannot be understood nor accounted for apart from the life and activity of Jesus.

The Pentecost experience resulted in the determined witness of a group or community, to the life, death and resurrec-

*C. Gore, "The Holy Spirit and the Church," 1924, p. 111. **The scribes are the exception, for they ascribed his power to the prince of the demons (cf. p. 131).

tion of Jesus. They did not go forth to tell others about the Spirit who had come on them. Their theme was Jesus the Messiah, who would make his advent immediately with the divine kingdom. Their experience of the Spirit is mentioned to prove from Joel's prophecy* that the Spirit's coming indicated that the 'last days' of Messianic foreshadowing had come. The Spirit's coming and the believers' experience of his power was the sign that Jesus Messiah now in exaltation had fulfilled his promise and had sent the Spirit as a pledge of his imminent return (Acts ii.33).

As the community grows we see the presence of marvellous works attesting the activity of the Spirit in control. Believers pray that God will cause signs and wonders to be done that they who persecute may be convinced of the truth of Jesus the Messiah (Acts iv.30, cf. 27-29); the prayer is ratified by the coming of the attesting Spirit in such power ^{that} it seemed ^{as if} ~~that~~ the very house was shaken.** The attesting Spirit becomes active, for the signs and wonders continue (Acts v.12) through the apostles; ^{they} form the inevitable accompaniments of the missionary activity of Barnabas and Paul (Acts xiv.3), and miracles are wrought by God with Paul as the human medium (Acts xix.11). Paul gains such a reputation for healing since articles of clothing touched by his body when carried to the

*ii.28f. quoted Acts ii.17ff. **This may be a doublet of the Pentecost story (i.e. Acts ii.1-4=iv.31, cf. p.23, cf. Fox on pp.229f.) but this experience is probably typical of what went on.

sick and demon-possessed bring healing (Acts xix.12). In the same way the shadow of Peter's body passing by, falls on the sick, and brings healing marvels (Acts v.15). Peter heals a lame man as he and John go up to the temple (Acts iii.1-7), the cure being attributed not to his own power, but to the power of God which had raised up Jesus, i.e. the Spirit (Acts iii.12ff.). The same dynamic was active within Stephen and attested itself in great signs and wonders (Acts vi.8); Philip aroused instant attention in Samaria in a similar way, the 'signs' being the casting out of unclean spirits, and the healing of palsied and lame people (Acts viii.6-8); Simon Magus is amazed at the preacher's power to work such miracles and he desired to possess the Spirit which would enable him to accomplish such wonders (ibid. ver. 18f.), so that by laying his hands on others the Spirit might be bestowed.

We may therefore conclude ~~that~~ such healings as among the signs and wonders that everywhere accompanied the preaching of the good news of Jesus, were regarded as the active work of the divine Spirit indwelling those who performed the cures. We are not surprised to find 'healings', 'gifts of healings', enumerated along with other manifestations of the Spirit, in the list of the gifts of the Spirit as given by Paul (I Cor. xii.9, cf. 28, 30). The primitive community looked back to the signs and wonders, i.e. chiefly the healing activities of Jesus as due to God's power approving his ministry (Acts

ii.22).* The attesting power is further defined when Jesus is set forth as one endowed with the Spirit, i.e. with power, the result of which was the doing good, the healing and deliverance brought by him (Acts x.38). The activity of Jesus in life, death and resurrection and exaltation is set forth as being attested by the Spirit (Acts v.32), as well as by the eyewitnesses of all these doings who had seen enough to warrant the inference that the Spirit was the power which resided in Jesus. When we connect these findings of the primitive community with what has been observed in the miracles of Jesus** from the standpoint of religious experience, we reach the principle that while in psychological analysis the miracles may be due to therapeutic powers of an extraordinary order, from the standpoint of religious experience they are evidence of the control and operation of the Spirit residing in personality, whether that of Jesus or of the Christ-conscious believers. All was due to the power of God designated as the Spirit. The 'why could not we cast it (sc.the demon) out?' (Mk.ix.28) of the halting days before the great clarification of the disciples' experience had taken place, now turns into the confident command, 'in the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, walk!' (Acts iii.6), 'Aeneas, Jesus Christ healeth thee!' (Acts ix.34), 'stand upright on thy feet' (Acts xiv.9.cf.ix.40,xvi.18).

*A similar hint is seen in the remark of Nicodemus that no one could do the works of Jesus except God were with him" (Jn.iii.2).

**Cf.pp.145-9.

This is the 'faith' atmosphere that meets us within the primitive community, the faith of believers in their power to heal by virtue of the presence in them of the Spirit.

This healing atmosphere of the primitive church as resulting from religious impetus through faith and in the Spirit's power may be abundantly illustrated in subsequent Christian history.

The Venerable Bede relates how Bishop John of Beverley healed a man that was dumb. "The bishop caused this young man to be brought, and a little cottage to be made for him within the enclosure of the dwelling...When one week of Lent was over, the next Sunday he caused the poor man to come in to him, and ordered him to put his tongue out of his mouth and show it him; then laying hold of his chin, he made the sign of the cross on his tongue, directing him to draw it back into his mouth and to speak. "Pronounce some word," said he; "say yea." The youth's tongue was immediately loosed, and he said what he was ordered. The bishop, then pronouncing the names of the letters, directed him to say A; he did so, and afterwards B, which he also did. When he had named all the letters after the bishop, the latter proceeded to put syllables and words to him, which being also repeated by him, he commanded him to utter whole sentences, and he did it. Nor did he cease all that day and the next night, as long as he could keep awake...to talk something...which he could never do before" ("The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation," Bk.V.ch. ii. Everyman Library, pp.225f.). But as in the case of modern psychological cures (cf.pp.143f.) where the direct method of Jesus stands out in sheer contrast to the prolonged interviews needful for psychotherapy, so the long procedure of Bishop John stands out as far below the spiritual power of the primitive church with its direct healing method with its 'rise up and walk,' (Acts iii.6 A.V.), or 'arise, and make thy bed'(ix.34). For other instances of healing by Bishop John, cf. Bede Bk.V.chs.iii-vi.

Bernard of Clairvaux (AD 1091-1153) became very famous for his abundant healings through the power of religion. J.Cotter Morison describes, among many other cures, how he healed Canon John of St.Saturninus' Church, Toulouse. Quoting the eyewitness who saw it, Morison relates that John had been in bed seven months and was expected to die. "His legs were so shrunken that they were scarcely larger than a child's arms." His fellow canons

at last could tolerate him no longer and they thrust him out into the village near by. Bernard came to the district, and Canon John, hearing this amidst his pitiful distress, implored to be taken to him. The eyewitness continues: "six men, therefore, carrying him as he lay in bed, brought him into a room close to that in which we were lodged. The abbot heard him confess his sins, and listened to his entreaties to be restored to health. Bernard mentally prayed to God: "Behold, O Lord, they seek for a sign, and our words avail nothing, unless they be confirmed with signs following." He then blessed him and left the chamber, and so did we all. In that very hour the sick man arose from his couch, and running after Bernard, kissed his feet with a devotion which cannot be imagined by anyone who did not see it" ("Life and Times of St. Bernard," 1868, p. 460). Here we seem to get nearer the direct, 'rise, take up thy bed, and walk' stage of healing through religious stimulus. The healing atmosphere that surrounds Bernard reminds us of, and throws light upon, any of the believers' activities in the primitive church. "The cures were so many that those who saw them were not able to give them in detail... In one day Bernard healed nine blind people, ten deaf or dumb, eighteen who were lame or paralysed... At Schaffhausen, the number of wonders grew... On Friday they came to Constance... The people with a thousand shouts of 'Kyrie eleison! Christ uns gnade!' ran to meet him, glorifying Jesus Christ" (M. Ratisbonne, "Histoire de S. Bernard," 1843, Vol. II, p. 210). Morison sums the cures up by saying that "the halt, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb were brought from all parts to be touched by Bernard. The patient was presented to him, whereupon he made the sign of the Cross over the part affected, and the cure was perfect" (op. cit. p. 422).

Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) was renowned for his healings. There was a leper in a hospital "so impatient, and so intolerable, and so wayward, that everyone believed... that he was possessed by the devil, since he reviled with words and blows so shamefully whomsoever waited on him... St. Francis, knowing through revelation that the leper was possessed by an evil spirit, went and placed himself in prayer, and prayed to God devoutly for him." Then deciding to attend the leper himself he "at once let water be boiled, and many odoriferous herbs... and began to wash him... and, through a divine miracle, wherever St. Francis touched with his holy hands, the leprosy departed and the flesh remained perfectly healed." And even as the flesh began to heal, so the soul began to heal" ("The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi," Eng. Tr. Wm. Collinge, ch. XXV. Here the use of prayer in connection with healing comes to the forefront, and illustrates the same habit ~~in~~

in the primitive church where prayer often formed the religious atmosphere wherein the cure took place (Acts ix. 40). Yet, as Sabatier points out so pertinently, "he believed that he could work miracles, and he willed to do so," but "miracle-working occupies in his life an entirely secondary place" ("Life of St. Francis of Assisi," Eng. Tr. 1894, p. 192), and this places him alongside the primitive church believers in their healing powers, since these seemed to be the outflow of the Spirit residing in them rather than wrought for their own reflected glory upon themselves.

The famous story of Luther's prayer over the sick Melancthon with the resulting cure reminds us that the Reformation showed similar healing activities accompanying the new spirit of the gospel released by the new religious upheaval. Melancthon lay ill, the sickness being probably brought on through his distress at the compromising effect of his own and Luther's action in the matter of the bigamy of Philip of Hesse (cf. T. M. Lindsay, "The History of the Reformation," Vol. I. 2nd. Edn. 1908, pp. 380f.). Luther visited him and found him apparently on the point of death, disfigured, knowing no one, neither eating nor drinking. Luther turned to the window and poured out his heart in prayer to God. He came back to the bed, gave Philip his hand and bid him be of good courage, that he would not die, for the Lord who could smite could also heal again. The turn came to Melancthon, and gradually he came back to health and strength (cf. Seckendoff, "Ausführliche Historie des Lutherthums," 1714, III. p. 1882).

George Fox illustrates the healing accompaniments of a vitalized religious experience motivated by the Spirit, as well as the abnormal psychic features already mentioned (cf. pp. 229f.).

Richard Myer "had been long lame of one of his arms. I was moved of the Lord to say unto him, amongst all the people, "Prophet Myer, stand up on thy legs!"...and he stood up, and stretched out his arm that had been lame a long time and said, "Be it known unto you, all people, that this day I am healed." Later he confessed at a meeting at Swarthmoor how the Lord had healed him" (Journal, op. cit. pp. 81f.).

Two instances of the restoration of mad people to their right mind are recorded. "After I came out of Carlisle prison I went into the Abbey Chamber, and there came in a mad woman that sometimes was very desperate. And she fell down of her knees and cried, "Put off your hats, for grace, grace hangs round thy neck." And so the Lord's power ran through her that she was sensible of her condition, and after came and confessed it..." "And I came to another

place in Cumberland, where a man's wife was distracted and very desperate, attempting at times to kill her children and her husband. But I was moved of the Lord God to speak to her, and she kneeled down...And the Lord's power wrought through her and she went home well"(Fox,op.cit.p.92). The demon-possessed atmosphere of the primitive church is here, although the thought-forms have changed after the interval of many centuries, and among people of different racial and psychological inheritance. Yet the analogy is useful. We receive the impression that a spiritual power which is called the Lord's power is operative as in the primitive church, the human channel being as it were a mere instrument for the divine Spirit to use in healing activity.

One day Fox called at a house in Hawkshead, where a boy of eleven years of age was still being rocked in his cradle. He had grown to almost twice the size he should be for his age. Ordering him to be washed, for he was very dirty, when the boy was brought back to him, "I was moved of the Lord to lay my hands upon him and speak to him." Fox went away, and three years afterwards he called again at the house as he was passing by. The mother urged him to alight from his horse: "oh, stay," she said, "and have a meeting at our house, for all the country is convinced by the great miracle that was done by thee upon my son." "After you were gone we came home and found our son playing in the streets." Fox comments on this, "and this was about three years after she told me of it, and he was grown to be a straight, full youth then."(op.cit.p.93).

"I came to Twy-Cross...There was in that town a great man, that had long lain sick and was given up by his physicians... I went up to him in his chamber, and spake the word of life to him, and was moved to pray by him; and the Lord was entreated, and restored him to health"(Fox,op.cit.p.29.).

In these ways the leader of a great spiritual movement reveals a personality of intense spiritual power, the outflow of which is the healing of the sick. Thus Fox sheds light on the religious atmosphere of power in the primitive church as motivated by the Spirit, for this was what Fox meant by the power of the Lord.

The Evangelical Revival connected with John Wesley produced a great religious upheaval which was attended by healing activities. "I was desired to visit one who had been eminently pious, but had now been confined to her bed for several months, and was utterly unable to raise herself up. She desired us to pray, that the chain might be broken. A few of us prayed in faith. Presently she rose up, dressed herself, came down stairs, and I believe had not any farther complaint"(Journal of John Wesley, Oct.16th.1778). Here the 'faith' element in the experience is brought forward,

faith not only on the part of the sufferer, but in the one through whose prayer the cure was effected.

Father John of Cronstadt (1829-1908) was continually thronged by crowds for his healing power. His book, "My Life in Christ," (Eng.Tr.1897) has many instances of his powers in this way, and remind us of the atmosphere of the primitive church where the preachers expressed the outflow of their personality in such ways. One case is given in the preface to the book of a cure brought about by prayer at a distance. Two children in Moscow fell ill of diphtheria and the illness developed so rapidly that the doctors decided to resort to an operation on the trachea. The parents in their despair lost faith in human aid and sent a telegram to Father John, beseeching his prayers. The telegram reached him at the time when he was observing early Liturgy, "and, as he usually does, immediately after reading the telegram, he addressed his earnest prayer to God. Meanwhile, what was happening in Moscow?...already at nine o'clock a.m. (at the very time of Father's John's prayers in Cronstadt, some 500 miles away) the doctor who remained on duty noticed an improvement, which progressed as rapidly as the illness had previously developed." No operation was necessary and the children recovered in three to four days ("Father John," Translator's preface, p.ix.).

These instances of religious healing serve to suggest the atmosphere of the primitive church in its healing activity in the Spirit's power. The decisive, spontaneous healings of the primitive believers stand out in contrast to the more involved healings of later Christian history and modern psychotherapy, and the reason for this is their personal connection with the living personality of Jesus the religious power generated by their contacts with him, and with the experience of the same Spirit operative in him as in them, they share in the healing outflow of the new religious life.

In their work of helping and healing, the primitive church preachers show that they have entered into their Master's awareness of the devastating effects of fear and dread upon both body and mind. They carried with them a gospel of the kingdom and of Messiah's return which issued on one side in their calming and healing of demoniacs, and overflowed on another side

in healing the sick, as it had done in Jesus. They may have been tempted to magnify the 'sign' element in them, but we have to remember the close connection of these signs with ideas of the kingdom's imminence, and it was only after a long development that the love which prompted the miracles was itself a sign that the divine kingdom had actually come.

But in all these activities the Spirit was the energising power. We miss the whole significance of the primitive church experience unless we regard it as a community motivated in all its activities by the control of the Spirit which had been given in such measure at Pentecost, and Harnack points^{out} the empirical bearings here when he connects the healings with the Spirit's activity: "Sick persons are brought and healed by the missionaries, or by brethren who have been but recently awakened; wild paroxysms of terror before God's presence are also soothed, and in the name of Jesus demons are cast out."*

Visions and dreams are interpreted as symptoms of the Spirit's presence in those who experience these things. The outpouring of the Spirit was to result in the young men seeing visions and the old men dreaming dreams (Acts ii.17f.).** Peter's trance (Acts x.9ff.) gives the subconscious convictions about the universal mission of Jesus their opportunity to come to the surface unhindered by the conscious Jewish prejudices against

*"Mission and Expansion of Christianity," 2nd. Edn. 1908, Vol. I. Eng. Tr. p. 201. **Quoting Joel ii. 28f. cf. p. 240.

admitting Gentiles into divine favour save through circumcision.

The psychological character of the case here is the best answer that can be given to those who are still inclined to be critical as to the historical trustworthiness of the story, although the case for the genuineness of the incident can be put convincingly (cf. B.H. Streeter, *op. cit.* p. 546). Against the active will of the primitive church leaders in Jerusalem the question as to the admission of the Gentiles into the new community could not be avoided much longer. The crucial element involved in this struggle of the church consciousness of the church was that the Jewish law viewed all non-Jews as unclean and unworthy of the divine favour unless they became proselytes, and though the community of the Messiah, the ~~believers~~ were still Israel in its sense of privilege. Peter's deeper spiritual problem lay deep down in the subconscious, and went back to the days following his confession of Jesus as Messiah, and which found a momentary solution in the transfiguration experience with its perceived superiority of Jesus to Moses and Elijah as representative of Israel. Peter shared too in the appearance of the risen Jesus where in vision the universal mission of the gospel was received (cf. pp. 174f. 214f.). Filled with passion for winning men to repentance in view of the coming kingdom, if any thought of Gentiles came to his mind it would be suppressed by his characteristic Jewish attitude towards them. The law decreed those whom he would save for the kingdom among the Gentiles regarded as unclean and therefore unable to be saved unless they became legally pure.

With this background the symbolism of Peter's trance on the housetop becomes significant. He is hungry, but the meal is still in course of being prepared (Acts x.10). He glides almost imperceptibly into a condition of trance in which he is invited to kill and eat of the 'common and unclean' animals before him (*ibid.* 12f.), a visionary element physically based on his own actual hunger. The refusal to eat is because of the uncleanness of the food offered in the trance (ver. 13). Here is symbolized the conflict between the rising subconscious conviction that the unclean Gentiles have the right to belong to the community of Messiah, and the inhibiting Jewish customs which taboo this, and on the level of consciousness try to check the deeper intuitions of truth. The deeper urges ultimately prevail; audition comes to the aid of vision in the voice of God commanding Peter not to regard as common and unclean what God has made clean (ver. 15). The symbolism here is that Peter had allowed his conviction that the Gentiles were acceptable to God to prevail and that his duty was to obey the call to take the

gospel to the world irrespective of Jews or Gentiles. The 'ship' (σκάφος) and the 'sail' (δοῦνη Acts x.11) are elements in the vision derived from the physical noting in subconsciousness of a ship out on the blue waters of the sea, visible from the housetop at the seaport of Joppa (Acts ix.43,x.5,9), suggesting the strange, foreign lands where Gentiles predominated and ruled. Was the ship with its sail standing out to sea emblematic of the gospel standing out on the course to lead it to the many lands abroad, in the apostle's mind in trance?

The truth thus clarified for Peter in trance, where all conscious cognitive influences were at rest, since the trance was the solution to the conflict within him, was that the Gentiles were on the same religious footing as the Jews, and therefore fit objects of the saving truth of Jesus Messiah, and ~~for~~ ^{of} the operation of the Spirit, without needing the legal cleansing such as the law demanded. God had cleansed them, so that without further requirements they could believe on the Lord Jesus (cf. B.H. Streeter, "Reality," 1927, pp. 329f.).

The Spirit is the impulsive power here, for in Jewish psychology, dreams and visions were ascribed to such activity,* while the inner monition that makes Peter descend from the housetop to meet the men sent by Cornelius is described as 'the Spirit saith' (Acts x.19).

Stephen's dying hour is visited with a vision of the glory of God and the exalted Jesus, the inspiration of it being the Spirit (Acts vii.55), and the martyr had been famed as one in whom the Spirit abode (Acts vi.8).** In the case of Paul's vision on the way to Damascus we observe the removal of the inhibitions which had chained him to his inherited religious outlook, and which were in conflict with the deeper impressions

*Cf. pp. 113f. **"It was in the fervour and love which sprang from this abiding state that he was now enabled to turn his soul from men to heaven, and with rapt gaze see, as it were, God's very glory" (J.V. Bartlet, "Acts," ad loc vii.55). "When Isaiah was being sawn asunder...his lips spake with the Holy Spirit until he was sawn in twain" (Martyrdom of Isaiah, v.14).

being produced by all he knew and discerned of Jesus.* The vision marks the end of the spiritual conflict and the victory of the subconscious impressions of Christ. The shock of his defeat consciously apprehended as yet more than its implied subconscious victory makes Paul temporarily blind (Acts ix.8f.).^{**} Here again, truth is received only at the cost of the pressure of abnormal experiences; the reserves of personality are strained beyond normal endurance; the collapse of the conscious inhibitions is at the same time the breaking in of the new convictions and powers. The Spirit is not expressly mentioned as the prime mover here, but on typical Jewish principles of the Spirit as the motivation of abnormal phenomena in human personality the inference is justified that the conversion of Paul would be looked on as due to the Spirit's activity, as his subsequent stress on the experience of the Spirit reveals.^{***} The Spirit gives the impulse to Ananias to bring healing and comfort to the stricken Paul (Acts ix.10ff.).

The intense spiritual ferment which results in visions, trances, dreams, and the like, such as the primitive church with its experience of the Spirit illustrates, may be found elsewhere.

One of Origen's catechumens, Basilides, became a Christian by reason of the appearance to him in a dream of Potamiaena, a martyr to whom he had rendered kindness as she went on her way to martyrdom. Her appearance fortified him so that he too did not hesitate to offer himself up (Eus.H.E.VI.5). The heightened tension and spiritual abandon characteristic of persecution with its train of martyrdoms form fruitful soil for visionary accompaniments of religious experience.

*Cf. pp.44-46, 206f. **A functional nervous phenomenon: the shock had inhibited the normal functional activity of sight. ***pp.274-279

Monica, the mother of Augustine, frequently had dreams and visions which purported to be the means of divine revelation. To safeguard her son from the dissolute ways of debauchery, she prayed every day for a vision in which God would reveal something to guide her in arranging for him a suitable marriage, but Augustine tells us that God heeded not. Indeed she had what he describes as phantasy which resulted from the activity of the human mind alone. His mother had no confidence in these merely human visions or dreams: she could even detect, through a certain taste which she could never explain in words, whether she was experiencing a genuine divine revelation in her vision, or merely dream images resulting from her own mind (Augustine's "Confessions," VI.23). We are therefore reminded that true religious experience has the power to discern the dreams and visions it produces, whether these be of God or not. Just as there was need in the primitive church for an interpretation of 'tongue-speech', or discerning of spirits, so the interpretation and the discerning would apply to the experiences of vision and dream, and such discernment would be the work of the Spirit. While there is no direct reference here to concrete instances of this in the primitive church, Paul supplies a hint in his dictum that spiritual things are discerned spiritually (I Cor.ii.14), while in the catalogue of the gifts of the Spirit he places 'discernment of spirits' (διακρίσεις πνευμάτων I Cor.xii.10), i.e. powers of discriminating between inspirations, "the gift of discerning in various cases whether extraordinary spiritual manifestations were from above or not; they might be purely natural, though strange, or they might be diabolical" (Robertson and Plummer, op.cit.p.267, and cf. below p.281. Cf. p.224f). Such a gift was available in the primitive church.

B.H.Streeter cites a dream of St.Francis of Assisi which illustrates the comforting power that sometimes comes ~~through~~ through vision. Francis had steadfastly entreated the Cardinal to further his business with Pope Innocent III. The Pope granted the request and blessed the new order. "One night when he (Francis) was gone to sleep he seemed to be walking along a road by the side of which stood a very lofty tree. That tree was fair and strong, exceeding thick and high. And it came to pass that as he came near to it, and stood beneath it, wondering at its beauty and height, he himself grew to such a height that he touched the top of the tree, and taking it in his hand, very easily bowed it to the ground. And so indeed it was done; since the Lord Innocent, the highest and loftiest tree in the world, bowed himself so graciously to his will and petition" (Streeter, ^{REALITY} cites this from Thomas Celano's Lives of St.Francis, "p.325f). This is of course a dream where the symbolism has been clearly explicit in conscious life prior to the dream, but

the confirmation by revelation is useful to observe.

St. Patrick of Ireland had a vision which reminds us of Paul's experience in which the man of Macedonia called to him to come over to Europe (Acts xvi.9). Having escaped from slavery to his native Gaul, there came to him the call to return to Ireland where he had been a slave to render service of another order. "In the dead of night, I saw a man coming to me as if from Ireland, whose name was Victorinus, and who bore countless letters. And he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of it, which contained the words: 'The voice of the Irish.' And while I was repeating the words of this beginning, I thought I heard the voice of those who were near the wood Foclut, which is nigh to the western sea; and they cried thus: 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come and live among us henceforth.' And I was greatly pricked in heart and could read no more" ("Confessions" quoted from Rufus Jones, op.cit. p.115).

As we might expect from the intensity of his religious experience which as we have seen was accompanied by Pentecostal psychic phenomena and healing powers, George Fox had his visions. "I was wrapped up, in a rapture, in the Lord's power" (op.cit.p.15). "I saw, through the immediate opening of the invisible Spirit, the blood of Christ. And I cried out among them, and said, Do ye not see the blood of Christ?...for I saw it...how it came into the heart" (op.cit.p.14). The occasion of the vision was a discourse on the blood of Christ, which doubtless caused diversity of opinion, and Fox was quick to express his overwhelming sureness in the vision. Receiving his call to go out into the world and preach he says, "when I came, in the Lord's mighty power, with the word of life into the world, the world swelled, and made a noise like the great raging waves of the sea" (op.cit.p.20). To visual and auditory phenomena we find another sensation abnormally intensified: "I was come up in spirit through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new; and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter" (op.cit.p.17). Here the sense of smell is stimulated as sight and hearing are in religious vision.

The more recent visions of Sadhu Sundar Singh illustrate the nature of vision inspired by Christian experience of a heightened and intense kind. They are of special interest in that many of them help to suggest the atmosphere of apocalyptic so characteristic of the primitive church. The

Sadhu's visions are of Heaven, The Resurrection of the Body, the Last Judgment and Hell. "The Third Heaven is Heaven proper, as it might be styled. To this all righteous people will ultimately attain; but it is granted to a certain few, of whom the Sadhu is privileged to be one, to make short visits there during their earthly life. "I understood," said the Sadhu, "what St. Paul meant when he said, 'Whether in the body or out of the body I know not,' because when I found myself there I seemed to have a body with form and shape, but all made, as it were, of light. But when I touched it...I felt nothing. This is what St. Paul speaks of as a spiritual body." ("The Sadhu," B.H. Streeter and A.J. Appasamy, 1923, p. 117). The Sadhu sank himself into such apocalyptic experiences that he has reproduced their nature in his own visions.

The Sadhu was given to gliding into a trance. "While in the state of ecstasy, which sometimes lasts for several hours, he loses all perception of the external world; and he has no sense of the lapse of time, "there is no past and no future; everything is present" (ibid. pp. 133f.). Such savours more of the pure mystic type of religious experience, but it illustrates the absence of the 'time' element in religious vision as e.g. in reter's trance on the house-top in that a mealtime with its physical hunger is lost sight of.

The apocalyptists were given to visions (cf. pp. 86-90), and much in their writings is no more than the multiplication of scenic visionary details or literary device (cf. p. 89). They were given to thinking in pictures and as most of the thinking was on religious issues arising from religious experience the picture thinking resulted in visions with a wealth of images, symbols and picture forms, involving types of religious autism such as ecstasy, trance, dream. The primitive community entered largely into this empirical environment (cf. pp. 179f. 182. 355ff), and the earliest believers thought through their new experiences in pictures. This carried with it the corollary that vision, trance, and the like must have occupied a large place in the primitive church, and far from the visionary elements suggesting the untrustworthiness of the setting in Acts, they unwittingly indicate a greater degree of reliability than is sometimes supposed, since had they not been found there we should have had to consider whether a later outlook had not purged the record in the interests of more formal logical statement. Nor does the presence of the visionary elements take away from the unique worth of the new religious experience which is prompting the elements. "It is necessary to realize that image and vision do within limits represent a

perfectly genuine way of doing things, which is inevitable for deeply spiritual selves of a certain type; and that it is neither good psychology nor good Christianity, lightly to dismiss as superstition or hysteria the pictured world of symbol." (Evelyn Underhill, "The Life of the Spirit and the Life of Today," 1922, p. 101). But not only where souls are of the appropriate mystic type, but where men are caught up in religious experience of the unique order such as were the primitive church believers with all its urge and demand for expression in its sheer dynamic vitality, there is inevitable abnormal accompaniments in trance and vision.

When we have accounted on psychological principles for the visionary phenomena we are still faced with the 'something other;' the profound comprehension of truth, and the sureness with which this truth is received as divine truth (cf. p. 218) still remains. "If we bear in mind that Truth is quite a different thing from the particular psychological mechanism by which it is apprehended, and also that any revelation of the Divine must be conditioned by the mental outlook, culture and general experience of the recipient, we shall not be inclined to deny that Visions may be a genuine revelation of truth" (Streeter and Appasamy, op. cit. pp. 114f.). This principle guides us through the maze of the visionary atmosphere of the primitive church until the religious truth involved, the permanent truth elements, are seen apart from the psychological wrappings, and these truth elements centre round the contacts and impressions of Jesus in life and beyond death, and the apprehension of divine reality as summed up and evidenced in the dynamic and activity of the divine Spirit.

We are therefore guarded against the tendency in the New Psychology to regard these phenomena as due to pathological or neurological disturbances. Even if this were true, we have still to answer the question as to what power it was that in the first place caused the disturbance. Further both pathological and neurological disturbances result in the disintegration of the personality affected: "neurotic disorder is the expression of disintegration or failure of integration of the personality or of character" (McDougall, op. cit. p. 54). The psychologist and the psychiatrist are mainly preoccupied, from the nature of their empirical and theoretical spheres, with abnormal cases presenting psychopathological phenomena involving "all degrees of dissociation, ranging from cases of complete or approximate mental unity down through greater and greater degrees of dissociation, until at last we find several fairly independent and fairly unified separate "personalities"

or "complexes" functioning in one body, or until even these are disintegrated into more elementary groups of psychic states, each narrower, less unified, and less stable than the last" (J.B.Pratt, op.cit. p.57). Thus when the psychologist turns to the phenomena of religious experience, especially where these assume abnormal character, the abnormalities become the object of his investigation, and in the light of his conclusions drawn from his practical experience of psychotherapy or his study of the abnormal factors which such reveals, he explains the abnormal phenomena of religious ferment as "Hallucinatory or pseudo-hallucinatory luminous phenomena" (W.James, op.cit. p.251), and begins to search about for the pathological or neurological disturbances responsible. By a failure to attend to the significant fact that in many cases the religious experience with its visions, etc. produces a unification of personality or character, the New Psychology misses the fact that abnormal conditions may in themselves be the evidence of the integration of personality through the experience received in visionary accompaniments and thought-forms. When one thinks habitually of visions and the like in terms of disintegration, a habit due to experience of so many instances where psychological abnormality is due to psychopathological disturbance, it is difficult to reach out to the truth that the abnormality may be motivated from a power centre in the mind making for integration or greater integration than that already in being within the personality, instead of being induced by pathological or neurological maladaptation (cf.p.230).

This is the inner truth of the primitive church experience of the Spirit with its many abnormal features of vision, audition, trance, dream, healings, ~~trance, dream,~~ and the like. All these empirical phenomena had for their centre spiritual experience which made for the greater integration of personality. In the case of Peter's vision on the housetop, things were not going right between his conscious and subconscious life, the former suppressing sympathy with Gentiles, and the latter with the ^{overriding} ~~apparent~~ lordship of Jesus over all men, forcing its way. The vision was due to the victory of the wider sympathies and expressed Peter's integration in a unity that sent him to baptize the Gentile Cornelius. Paul's vision brought an inner unity which integrated his hitherto divided personality. The resurrection visions indicated the triumph of the integrating powers centring in Jesus and the disciples' experience of him. The same integrating effects are seen and illustrate therefore the primitive church experience in the historical examples

of Fox, Brainerd, Finney, Monica, St. Francis, St. Patrick, The Sadhu, in corporate movements such as Montanism and the Camisards, etc. Several other examples, more personal to the writer of this thesis, are quoted in Appendix III pp. 516-518. For a discussion of the theory of integration and disintegration as applied to personality and to the problems of consciousness, cf. McDougall, op.cit. pp. 537-556.

Our conclusions as to the integrating power of the primitive church visions do not overlook the fact that hallucination may enter into the visionary accompaniments of religious experience. The Old Testament prophets recognized this; there were 'false' prophets whose visions and auditions were recognized as not coming from God (Jer. xiv. 14f. "they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought... therefore thus saith the Lord... I sent them not..."). The test lay in an integration of life which enabled the prophet to predict, but which passed into the apprehension of truth and knowledge of the divine mind and will. Jeremiah regards the false prophets as victims of hallucination because he sees the disintegrating results on city and nation to accrue from following out their counsels.

The summing up of the primitive church experience in these aspects may be done in ^{the} words in which William James sums up his discussions of the abnormal in religious experience: "To the medical mind these ecstasies signify nothing but suggested and imitated hypnoid states, on an intellectual basis of superstition, and a corporeal one of degeneration and hysteria. Undoubtedly these pathological conditions have existed in many and possibly in all the cases, but that fact tells us nothing about the value for knowledge of the consciousness which they induce. To pass a spiritual judgment upon these states, we must not content ourselves with superficial medical talk, but inquire into their fruits for life" (op.cit. p. 413). This is the ultimate test for the primitive church experience, the worth of which was abundantly illustrated in the integration of a number of disciples who went forth boldly to preach Jesus Christ, carried healing with them, and won many for the kingdom: in the emergence of the Christian church and its age-long witness, in the active energy of the Spirit whose fruits were 'love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control' (Gal. v. 22), while the very spiritual integration of life for believers produced in them a quality of living and character which in itself seemed abnormal when placed alongside the average pagan life of the ancient world (cf. pp. 275f.).

Angels are sometimes conceived as the medium in dreams or visions through which the divine revelation is received. An angel is seen in the dream of Cornelius, whom he calls 'Lord' (Acts x.3f.). This angel commands the centurion to send for Peter, but the impulse given to the apostle to go with the men is from the Spirit (Acts x.20). 'Angel,' 'the Spirit,' and 'God', seem to be ways of expressing the same experience, viz. of the divine interventions in human life. An 'angel of the Lord' opens the prison doors (Acts v.19) and again, with psychic accompaniments such as a light and a voice (xii.7). Peter would have no doubt that the release was due to the inspired activity of the Spirit. An angel instructs Philip to go to Gaza (Acts viii.26), but as the Ethiopian's chariot approaches it is the Spirit who impels Philip to converse with the eunuch (ver.29ff.) and it is the Spirit who snatches Philip away (ver.39),* again suggesting that 'angel' and 'Spirit' are not clearly defined.

The connection of the 'angel of the Lord' with the Spirit finds an explanatory link in the idea of angels as ministering spirits (Ps.civ.4, Heb.i.14,cf.ver.7), while elsewhere the angels are definite equated with the spirits that wait on God,** whether

*as the Spirit caused Elijah's movements to be uncertain (I Kgs. xviii.12,cf.p.113). The Spirit here seems to exercise a semi-physical function (cf.Ezek.iii.12-14,viii.3,xi.24). The movement of the 'mighty wind' with all its suddenness, analogous to the dynamic invasive activity of the Spirit, would account for this way of referring to the Spirit. **In an apocalyptic account of creation we read that on the first day God created "all the spirits which serve before him--the angels of the presence, and the angels of sanctification, and the angels of the spirit of fire, of the spirit of the winds, etc." (Jub.ii.2).

of the superior order that attend the divine presence, or the inferior order controlling natural phenomena.

By the time the primitive church was emerging the angels seem to be gliding into the unifying conception of the Spirit as the power behind them, of which the angels, insofar as they remained distinctive, were symptomatic of the Spirit's presence and activity. As the demons tended to be brought under the aegis of an arch spirit or prince, and as their malevolent power was really symptomatic of the evil energy that inspired their doings, so the Spirit of God came to be regarded as the prevailing dynamic behind the angels. There is no evidence that the Spirit was identified with any archangel such as Gabriel or Michael;*indeed, Gabriel is the messenger of the Spirit's overshadowing of Mary (Lk.i.26,35).

*The Spirit is actually identified with Gabriel in the Koran(cf. Sura II.81: cf.J.M.Rodwell's comment ad loc. in his Translation of the Koran,1909,p.346). The identification is not explained from the common stock of Semitic ideas in which Mohammed shared, nor through his contact with the Jewish colonies round Mecca (cf. D.S.Margoliouth,"Mohammedanism," New Edn.Wms.and Norgate,p.44), still less from any Christian sects resident in Arabia. The identification is probably a purposed rejection, in the mind of Mohammed, of the divinity of the Spirit as set forth by the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, in view of his rejection of Christianity along with other faiths. "The Holy Spirit stands for Gabriel in the Holy Quran. The Divinity of the Holy Spirit is an innovation of the Christians. The Jews never thought of it as a Divine person, nor did Jesus Christ himself"(Muhammad Ali,"Translation of the Holy Quran"(without Arabic Text),1928, p.17, on Ch.2,ver.87). But where in Jewish or Christian thought is the Spirit identified with Gabriel? It is possible,however, that the identification rose from a confusion between Gabriel announcing the conception of Jesus in Mary's womb, and the Spirit overshadowing the virgin (Lk.i.26,35), which may have associated the two in the mind of Mohammed, or in the thought of the time which influenced Mohammed.

Certain physical marvels further characterized the operation of the Spirit in the primitive church. The snatching away of Philip (Acts viii.39), the marvellous opening of the prison doors (ibid v.19,xii.7), the 'angel' being the 'symptom' of the Spirit's operation. As the historian sets forth the case, the sudden deaths of Ananias and Sapphira are a retribution for their offence against the Spirit, and the Spirit is the prime cause of them (Acts v.3-5,9), although the explicit drawing out of the offence in the case of Sapphira and which was implicit in Ananias, is probably due to the later editing of the narrative to bring Sapphira's death into line with that of Ananias. Whether any explicit reference of the Spirit's retributing activity has been omitted by the later viewpoint cannot be stated, but from the standpoint of those present and active in the scene the deaths were due to the Spirit whose power was operative in the words of the Spirit-possessed Peter.* As to what actually happened it is not easy to say. The principle 'post hoc propter hoc' doubtless dominated the standpoint of the eyewitnesses; Peter's words of rebuke for deceit, conceived as Spirit-inspired, then the deaths. But in actuality the deaths, if such there were, probably had no connection with Peter nor the Spirit conceived to speak through him, but followed on the revelation

*Cf. Gunkel, op.cit.p.49, "eine Lüge gegen den Pneumatophoren Petrus eine Lüge gegen den heiligen Geist ist, und den Apostel erproben den Geist des Herrn erproben heisst."

of their deceit in the presence of the community.*

The death of Herod Agrippa is related from the standpoint of similar ideas, and the narrator is probably reflecting the primitive church circle of ideas. What actually happened was that the king died as a result of some disease that reached its fatal climax at that moment, but while Josephus makes Agrippa interpret the omens of his coming death as a judgment on himself for the impious worship of his flatterers (Ant.XIX,viii.2) the primitive church standpoint is that an angel interposed and smote him fatally (Acts xii.23). In the light of the unifying Spirit behind the angels the primitive church interpreted this timely removal of a persecutor (ibid.ver.1-3) as the activity of the Spirit whose community was thus being attacked.

Marvellous physical effects accompany experiences of great religious stress.

The Journal of John Wesley cites many instances of abnormal emotional disturbance with extraordinary physical repercussions. "...a young man was suddenly seized with a violent trembling all over, and in a few minutes, the sorrows of his heart being enlarged, sunk down to the ground" (Journal, 21st. Apr. 1739). As Wesley was preaching to a great concourse at Newgate he besought God to bear witness to His power; "immediately one, and another, and another sunk to the earth: they dropped on every side as thunderstruck. One of them cried aloud. We besought God in her behalf, and he turned her heaviness into joy. A second being in the same agony, we called upon God for her also; and He spoke peace to her soul." "One was so wounded by the sword of the Spirit, that you would have imagined she could not live a moment" (25th. Apr. 1739). A physician

*There is nothing incredible in deaths caused by shock at such a solemn exposure of deceit" (Bartlet, "Apostolic Age," p.24 note).

was present at a subsequent meeting thinking "there might be fraud...Today one whom he had known many years ...broke out 'into strong cries and tears.' He could hardly believe his own eyes and ears. He went and stood close to her, and observed every symptom, till great drops of sweat ran down her face, and all her bones shook. He then knew not what to think, being clearly convinced it was not fraud, nor yet any natural disorder. But when both her soul and body were healed in a moment, he acknowledged the finger of God"(29th.Apr.1739). "At another meeting I was interrupted by the cries of one who was pricked at the heart, and strongly groaned for pardon and peace...Another person dropped down.. A little boy near him was seized in the same manner. A young man who stood up behind, fixed his eyes on him, and sunk down himself as one dead; but soon began to roar out, and beat himself against the ground, so that six men could scarcely hold him"(20th.May 1739).

These striking physical accompaniments of strong conviction of sin, afford some parallel to what might have been the case with Ananias and Sapphira whose emotional terror reacted on them so forcibly. For other illustrations see entries 2nd.May, 22nd.23rd.June, 1st.July, 7th. July, 3rd.Sept.1739. These instances illustrate (1) the principle that where the people are psychologically critical, strong religious emotion may work out in striking physical ways: (2) The danger inherent in these phenomena is seen in the ~~failure~~ of religious experience to discern that the Spirit is not in the jerks and the convulsions. Wesley had to utter a warning about this. "I told them, they were not to judge of the spirit whereby anyone spoke, either by appearances, or by common report, or by their own inward feelings: no, nor by any dreams, visions, or revelations, supposed to be made to their souls; any more than by their tears, or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies. I warned them, all these were, in themselves, of a doubtful, disputable nature; they might be from God, and they might not..."(22nd.June 1739).

For other illustrations of the physically abnormal accompaniments of Davenport, "Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals" 1906, Ch.ix. Cf. too Appendix IV pp.519f.

In all the expressions of the Spirit's energy so far reviewed we have been dealing with the abnormal elements since these were the prevailing ones within our purview. In each case we came finally to a religious 'ultimate', which was common

to all. This 'ultimate' is the 'beyond element' in religious experience,* or the 'numinous' element.** The primitive church designated it by 'holy spirit.'

Certain ^{important} ~~minor~~ inspirations are ascribed to the operation of the Spirit. (1) Foretelling some future event such as the prediction of Agabus that a great famine was coming (Acts xi.28) or that Paul would be bound (ibid.xxi.11); (2) The Spirit guides the church's choice of a successor to Judas by its control of the required lot (ibid.i.15ff.): (3) the Spirit was the pen in the hands of those who wrote the sacred scriptures (ibid.i.16, iv.25,xxviii.25,I Pet.i.11, IV Ezra xiv.22): (4) the Spirit inspires the extension of the church to the Gentiles (Acts x.19f. 45-47. xi.11f.15,17, xv.8,9,12,cf.Rom.xv.16): (5) the Spirit directs the decisions of men as seen in Paul's purpose to go to Jerusalem, although the result would be arrest (Acts xix.21,xx.22); attempts to dissuade him are due to the Spirit (ibid.xxi.4), for those who sought to turn Paul aside were as equally convinced that they were inspired, even as he, on his part, knew that the Spirit moved his choice: (6) the Spirit fortifies those in trial on behalf of Christ (Acts iv.8,cf.Mk.xiii.11,and Appendix II pp544f.) and see iv.32).

The spiritual release of the experience of the Spirit is discerned in what we may regard as more normal channels of

*As C.J.Flower calls it,cf."The Psychology of Religion,"1927,pp.55, 138, esp.142,152,al passim. **R.Otto's conception,"The Idea of the Holy," Eng.Tr.Chs.ix-xii.
(1913)

operation. But even here we have religious experience of a unique quality altogether, so that its expression in more specific spiritual and ethical ways is extraordinary and unique in every way. Such expression therefore was due to the Spirit's activity in human personality.

The Spirit thus energizes extraordinary qualities of character and ability such as (1) Wisdom. The qualifications for election to important office are to be "full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (Acts vi.3); the Seven are to be men of distinction and unique ability and special spiritual fervour, and the Spirit is the source of such demands above the average.* The Spirit operated so powerfully in Stephen that none could withstand his wisdom (Acts vi.10). Barnabas was renowned as being "full of the Holy Spirit and of faith, thus accounting for the grace and faith which so characterized him (Acts xi.24). In the same way Christian personality derived its power from the Spirit, and it stood ^{so far} above the ordinary level of the world's wisdom or common-sense as to call for a supernatural cause.**

(2) The Spirit is active in the supernatural guidance of the primitive church, which was thus inspired to set apart Saul and Barnabas for "the work whereunto I have called them," the Spirit being personalized as "I". The "work" is the preaching

*Cf. Gen. xli.38, Exod. xxxi.3f. and p.113. **Cf. Gunkel, op.cit. p. 23, "wenn Weisheit vom Geiste abgeleitet wird, so ist es eine solche, wie sie nur wenigen Christen eignet... Eine solche ausserordentliche, unwiderstehliche Weisheit, welche so ihre Ueberlegenheit über die gewöhnliche weltliche Weisheit zeigt, kann nicht selbst aus dieser Welt stammen. Sie kann nur Wirkung des Geistes sein.

to the Gentiles, and the decision involved such unique courage and insight, such an overthrow of Jewish prejudice, that the guidance could only be given from the supernatural order in the Spirit (Acts xiii.2f.). At the Council of Jerusalem the decision reached was regarded as something that seemed good to the Spirit, i.e.had the Spirit's attestation (Acts xv.28).

(3) The place of Prayer in the primitive church reveals direct control of the Spirit. The preparation for the climax of Pentecost lay in sustained prayer (Acts i.14), and at one of the prayer gatherings the Spirit was felt to descend upon them in the creative fulness (Acts ii.1-4). The initiates into the new community of the Spirit are instructed in the 'prayers'(Acts ii. 42), while the believers resorted habitually to the temple, and though this may have the eschatological motive of expecting to meet there the returned Messiah,* the prayer experience would be also vitally inherent in them as they did so (ver.46). Peter and John go up to the temple to pray (ibid.iii.1) and the state of mind and heart induced by such purpose formed a fitting condition for the spiritual release of therapeutic-power for the healing of a lame man (ver.6). The authorities arrest them as they preach to the people within the temple courts (Acts iv.1-3), and on their release, the community received their account of what had taken place (ver.23). The gathering became a prayer meeting in which

*Cf.p.219. The believers not only went to the temple to pray, but they apparently used such occasions as opportunities to tell their fellow Jews who resorted thither about Jesus Messiah and their expectations of the kingdom in him: cf.Peter's speech within the temple precincts (Acts iii.12-26).

the central petition is that God will not let his work be hindered by such threatenings, and that they ^{may} might be empowered to speak the word with boldness (ver.24-29). The ratification of the prayer is a repetition of the Pentecost experience (ver. 31)* where the prayer results in a quickening by the Spirit, and may be said to be due to the inspiration of the Spirit. The witness of the apostles included that of prayer as well as of preaching (Acts vi.4), and illustrates the central place of prayer within the Spirit controlled community. After the election of the Seven, the apostles pray over them and lay their hands upon them (Acts vi.6).

VIII. *Conf.* There is little doubt that the essential thing in the laying on of hands was prayer, the rite being, as it were, an acted prayer. Peter and John pray over the new believers at Samaria, and lay their hands on them (Acts ~~xiv.f~~), the petition of the prayer being that the Spirit would be given them.

The connection of the laying on of hands with the giving of the Spirit is not at all clear in the primitive church. (1) The Spirit is received from the baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts ii.38) without reference to laying on of hands. (2) The Spirit is received first, and his presence is sufficiently attested so as to warrant baptism into the new community (Acts x.44-48, xi.15-17). (3) The Spirit is given after prayer over the ones receiving the power, the prayer being intercession that God may give the Spirit; there is a laying on of hands, and then the gift is bestowed (Acts vi.6). (4) The Spirit is received after baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus, the laying on of hands following and then the gift, with no reference to the prayer, but since prayer formed a significant element in the baptismal experience, the probability is that prayer supplied the experiential link between the believer and his reception of the Spirit.

It is clear therefore that there was no definite place given to the laying on of hands in the primitive church. Where minds were attuned to the quasi-physical view of the Spirit, the laying on of hands would impart a strong stimulus by way of suggestion. For the relationship of the baptismal experience to the giving of the Spirit, cf.

Stephen, in his hour of death is possessed by the Spirit and shows it by praying (Acts vii.59). Peter prays as the preliminary to the restoring of Dorcas (Acts ix.40); in the course of praying on a housetop in Joppa Peter received the vision which was to educate his sympathies to include the Gentiles in the work of saving grace (Acts ~~x~~.9). The believers pray for Peter as he is in prison (Acts xii.5) and as the miraculously released apostle returns to the house of John Mark's mother the occupants were in prayer (ver.12). Prayer is the central experience which calls out the inspiration of the Spirit to set aside Barnabas and Saul for the witness to the Gentiles (Acts xii.2f.). The 'breaking of bread' had prayer as ^{its} ~~their~~ important feature.*

At the centre of the prayers would be found the earnest petition that God would send the Kingdom in the return of Messiah: 'Marana tha'(I Cor.xvi.22).** "Schon in der palästinischen Urgemeinde hatte man zu dem zur Rechten des ~~Vaters~~ Vaters thronenden Herrn kurze Gebetsaufg~~abe~~ ("Komm, Herr Jesu!") emporgesandt, die sehr frühe in die gottesdienstliche Liturgie eindringen."*** The Spirit who inspired the prayer aspirations and at the same time was the guarantee that the hopes would be fulfilled, since the Spirit was the moving power behind the

*On this rite cf. pp. 423f. 444f. **A eucharistic prayer in the Didache (x) has this primitive Aramaic phrase; cf. pp. 73.
 ***F. Heiler, "Das Gebet," 5. Aufl. 1923, p. 240, and cf. p. 454, "fleht die älteste christliche Gemeinde um die baldige Erfüllung ihrer brennenden Sehnsucht, um die Parusie des Kyrios und die Vollendung."

kingdom and in Messiah.* While much of their prayer activity would follow normal Jewish lines, the personal influence of Jesus in his life developed this side of the primitive church experience.

The eyewitnesses were amazed when, amidst the clamour of the crowds Jesus was missing, and they came across him praying in some secluded retreat (Mk.i.35f.). Again and again it was noticed how Jesus withdrew from what were supposed to be great opportunities, into deserted places to pray (Lk.v.16,Mt.xiv.23). On one occasion-probably typical of his habits-Jesus "continued all night in prayer to God" (Mk.vi.46,Lk.vi.12). Luke rightly states that Jesus went up a mountain to pray, and while he was praying, he was transfigured (ix.28f.). He was given to praying when only his disciples were with him (Lk.ix.18), and they were once so impressed that when he had finished his prayer, one asked him to teach them to pray (Lk.xi.1). Luke alone mentions that Jesus was praying during his baptism(iii.21), but the experience of prayer is implied in that of baptism. Jesus responded to the disciples' request that he would teach them to pray by giving them a prayer which the church came to denote as 'The Lord's Prayer' (Lk.xi.2-4,cf.Mt.vi.9-13). Jesus prays in Gethsemane, and counsels his disciples ^{to pray themselves} against temptation by praying (Mk.xiv.32-9).
 28); they were to pray in private. They were to pray for those who ill-used them (Mt.v.44,Lk.vi.28); they were to pray in private and avoid the ostentation of scribes and Pharisees who loved to make long prayers in public places (Mt.vi.5f.). They were to make a habit of prayer (Lk.xviii.1), while parables such as those of the Friend at Midnight (Lk.xi.5-8), the Unjust Judge (Lk.xviii.2-8), the Pharisee and the Publican (ibid. 9-14) encouraged his hearers in the spirit and persistency of prayer. Jesus encouraged them in view of the imminent crisis of the kingdom by urging them to prayer as the best way of being prepared (Mk.xiii.33,Lk.xxi.36).
 Such prayer power reacted in turn on the disciples and believers when the new religious experience of the Spirit set free their inner aspirations, and laid the foundations of the church on that vital fellowship of the soul with God known as prayer. It was prayer vitalized by the Spirit, but with its empirical roots in what had been received from Jesus.

The 'power' aspect of prayer within the primitive church life is well illustrated by the famous watchnight service of John Wesley which proved to be the turning-point in his movement. He and some sixty others were praying through the night hours. "About three in the morning, as we were continuing instant in prayer, the power of God came mightily upon us, insomuch that many cried out for exceeding joy, and many fell to the ground. As soon as we were recovered a little from that awe and amazement at the presence of his Majesty, we broke out with one ~~voice~~ "We praise thee, O God; we acknowledge thee to be the Lord" (Journal, 1st. Jan. 1739). The most startling success began to attend the Wesley revival after this meeting. In the same way the new endowment of spiritual power was made accessible to the primitive believers by their potency in prayer, and from Pentecost they went forth to declare their faith with wonderful results.

(4) The Spirit was attested in the overwhelming joy which possessed the primitive church.* The believers knew 'gladness of heart' (Acts ii.46). The radiance of their lives found expression on its Godward side in 'praising God,' as the ground of their overwhelming confidence, and on the manward side people took notice of their joy and love, and looked on them with favour (Acts ii.47), so that many were caught by the joyous contagion and added daily to the new community. The apostles leave their persecutors rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for Christ's name (Acts v. 41)** Insofar as believers endured reproach for Christ's name they experienced all the greater joy in being permitted so to witness.*** As Stephen goes to his death, the radiant joy inspires him (Acts vii.55f.). There was rejoicing in Samaria

*Or what C. Anderson Scott describes as "the conquering new-born joy" ("The Fellowship of the Spirit," p.13). **Cf. too Mt. v.12, Rom. v.3. ***cf. I Pet. iv.13f.16. This epistle throws back some light on the primitive church, cf. pp.52f.

over Philip's visit, but the joy was motivated by gratitude for healings wrought, and lacks the pure spiritual quality of the characteristic radiance (Acts viii.8). The Ethiopian goes on his way after being baptized in the name of Christ (ibid.39). The church at Jerusalem rejoices over Peter's testimony concerning the Gentiles (Acts xi.18), while Gentiles themselves share in the new-born joy of the gospel experience (Acts xiii.46,48, 52). Barnabas rejoices over the evidence of the Spirit's power at Antioch (Acts xi.23). "Nur wer diese Grundempfindung sieghafter, jubelnder Freudigkeit und Zuversicht mitgeföhlt hat, versteht das Urchristentum."* Paul connects the prevailing joy with the Spirit (I Thess.i.6), but the Spirit as the source of the joy was implied from the very beginning, since the new life prompting it was due to the Spirit's power, and indeed, it finds its place in the later enumeration of the 'fruits of the Spirit' (Gal.v.22).**

"The most characteristic of all the elements of the conversion crisis...is the ecstasy of happiness produced" (W.James, op.cit.p.254). One or two instances from religious experience lighting up this feature in the primitive church life may be given. President Finney's conversion (cf.231) through the Spirit's power, resulted in an overwhelming sense of happiness. "No words can express the wonderful love that was shed abroad in my heart. I wept aloud with joy and love; and I do not know but I should say I literally bellowed out the unutterable gushings of my heart. These waves came over me, and over me, and over me, one after the other, until I recollect I cried out, 'I shall die if these waves continue to pass over me.' (cited in W.James, op.cit.p.255). A friend came in to see Finney amidst all this violent emotional expression of the joy that held him, and said, "Are you in pain?" "I gathered myself up as best as I could, and

*J.Weiss, Urchristentum, p.29. **Cf. p.257.

replied, 'No, but so happy that I cannot live.'" (cited W. James, op. cit. p. 256).

The Cornish evangelist known as Billy Bray is a most significant study of the new-born joy of the converted soul. In a friend's house he exhorted those there to praise the Lord. Speaking of himself, he said, "I can't help praising the Lord. As I go along the street I lift up one foot, and it seems to say 'Glory!' and I lift up the other, and it seems to say 'Amen;' and so they keep on like that all the time I am walking" ("The King's Son" F. W. Bourne, 1891, p. 43). "I feel I'd make the very poker and tongues sing Hallelujah!" he said on another occasion (ibid. p. 43).

The Journals of Brainerd, Woolman, Fox, and Wesley are impregnated on every page with the radiance not only of their own religious rejoicings, but with the joy of the many whose lives they and their gospel touched. Non-Christian religions know of the presence of joy through conversion (cf. Underwood, op. cit. pp. 155-62).

Courage of an extraordinary order was a further symptom of the Spirit's presence. If we compare the Peter who disowned Jesus Messiah (cf. pp. 186f.) with the courageous exponent of the same Messiahship of Jesus, ^{who} and boldly urges the truth of the necessity of Messiah suffering from the Old Testament,* we may see the change that had taken place through the new religious experience (Acts ii. 14, 22-24, 36). Peter finds how true it is that in the time of trial the Spirit would give words to speak, as Jesus had said (Acts iv. 8-12, cf. Mk. xiii. 11, cf. p. 514). The prayer gathering to which Peter reports the threatening attitude petition God that notwithstanding, it might be given to his servants to speak with boldness (Acts iv. 29). The subsequent attestation of the divine approval so inspires the believers that

*Boldness was required in advocating the need of Messiah suffering in an environment that knew no such doctrine (cf. pp. 74-76, 103f.). Cf. Acts ii. 22-28 quoting Ps. xvi. 8-11, and the suffering Servant references in Acts iii. 13ff. 26.

boldness becomes, as it were, their second nature as they preach the word (ver.31).

Such superb courage arose from the supreme confidence of the believers ~~from~~ⁱⁿ the Spirit that controlled the new community in all its manifold life and witness.

(6) But in view of the overwhelming task needing extraordinary strength, the Spirit brought 'comfort' to the growing church (Acts ix.31, and the experience of such comfort, or strength, was due to the inner activity of the Spirit.

(7) The Spirit also inspired the 'faith' of the community amidst its witness, its difficulties, its persecution at the hands of the hostile Jews (Acts iv.13,31). The unique faith evidenced itself in the remarkable signs and wonders which everywhere attested the operation of the Spirit. The extraordinary sureness of the believers in the return of Jesus with the divine kingdom is in itself Spirit-inspired faith in the Spirit-power which would bring these eagerly awaited events to fruition (Acts iii.20). The remarkable wisdom of Stephen resulting from being possessed by the Spirit is equalled by his fullness of faith also motivated by the Spirit (Acts vi.5). Barnabas too is renowned for his faith, the sign of the Spirit within him (Acts xi.24).

Here once more we have the activity of an extraordinary influence, something not of the earth, revealing itself in the existence of remarkable faith as surely as in the other ~~instances~~ instances.

We have investigated the primitive church experience of the Spirit expressed in the extraordinary happenings that characterize it. We have extended the category of the extraordinary to include the more specific spiritual and moral qualities which were showing themselves in such remarkable intensity and vigour. All the manifestations of the Spirit in human personality, whether physical, psychical, spiritual or ethical, are the evidences of the activity of an extraordinary, irresistible invading power which 'came upon' the believers, 'filled' them, 'poured out' upon them, 'fell' upon them.* Empirically viewed, the Spirit 'speaks' to the possessed ones, crystallizes into some physical form, 'dwells in' them as the occupant of a building, 'snatches up,' blocks the way, 'leads out', 'gives utterance.'** In every case the Spirit is the invading power that dominates human personality under its control. The specific 'spiritual' or 'moral' powers*** conferred on the believers appear in themselves so extraordinary, so remarkably pronounced and vital over against the normal expression of the ordinary life, that these too are ascribed to the invasion of the same potent, amazing power. It is not a question of any believer so endowed making up his mind to be bold, joyful, have wisdom, give himself to prayer, or be a man of faith, any more than he decided to have visions, speak in tongues, perform acts

*Acts ii.4,33, iv.8,31, vi.5, x.44, xi.15. **Acts viii.29, x.19, xi.12, Mk.i.10, I Cor.iii.16, vi.19, Eph.ii.21f. Acts viii.39, xvi.6. ***Such as Wisdom, Guidance, Prayer, Joy, Courage, Comfort, Faith.

of healing. The Spirit invades the personality, hence the outstanding wisdom, guidance, prayer, joy, courage, comfort, and faith; hence the visions, the ecstasy, the healings, the various marvels; all in themselves being the outflow from human lives in whom operates the Spirit.*

The primitive church has therefore laid the foundation for the later developments of the spiritual and ethical sides of the Spirit's activity in human life. The personal contacts with the living Jesus in which the primitive church was rooted had their potent religious and moral implications which were not realized at first. But these synthesized with the empirical activity of the Spirit in the lives of the believers and began to produce lives that already stood out in marked contrast to the average character of the ordinary man. Paul drew out these implications in their rich content and force, not only as centring in Christ, but as the activity of the Spirit. He was helped in his task by his own moral struggle with the impotency of the law and the final satisfaction in the sufficiency of Christ.** In solving his own inner conflict of sin, the moral categories concerned became clear and enabled him to transfer his empirical discoveries to his experience of, and thought on, the Spirit. The primitive church had not yet had time to sort out the accidental from the abiding, but nevertheless the foundation for the later

*"Die übernatürliche Kraft Gottes, welche im Menschen und durch den Menschen Wunder wirkt" (Gunkel, op.cit.p.23). **Cf.pp.44-46, 206f. Cf.the revealing passage,Rom.vii.7-25.

discoveries is already laid, as the primitive church brought forth the first-fruits of the Spirit (Rom.viii.23).

Paul himself was a Spirit-possessed personality. A vision, inspired by the Spirit, brought him into the church (Acts ix.3ff.). As a member of the Spirit-controlled community, there were seen in him the characteristic symptoms of the Spirit's operation: ^{vii.}Photisms, auditions, glossolalia, ability to work signs and wonders, including healings, visions and revelations (Acts ix.3, II Cor.xii.1,2-4, I Cor.xiv.18, Acts xiv.3, xix.11f. xvi.9,xviii.9, Gal.i.12, ii.2, Eph.iii.3). As a preacher he was aware of the Spirit's inspiration which enabled him to clothe his gospel with the appropriate speech (I Cor.ii.4). The Spirit endows him with wisdom required above the ordinary wisdom of the world (I Cor.ii.6f.10); he knows of the Spirit's guidance for the Church in its progress and decisions (Eph.ii.18ff.iii.5, iv.3), the Spirit as the dynamic in the prayer experience, and indeed doing the praying (Rom.viii.26f. Eph.vi.18), while Spirit inspired joy is the keynote of his life (Rom.xiv.17, I Thess.i.6). Paul was a man of extraordinary boldness and courage (Eph vi.10,19f. iii.12, Acts ix.27, xiii.46), and from the same Spirit receives strengthening comfort (II Cor.i.3f.).

In his experience of the Spirit as the invading energy controlling all his life in its many sided expression and activity, Paul stands on the same empirical grounds as the primitive church. He has, however, drawn out the spiritual and ethical implications of the Spirit's power, and in so doing has brought the normal life and activity of the Christian believer within the 'symptoms' of the Spirit's operation. Yet even in this development of the view that the normal character of the Christian is as much due to the energy of the Spirit as visions, glossolalia and the like are, Paul is only bringing forward what was found within the primitive church outlook, since from the earliest years the normal joyous, courageous life of the believer, with its wisdom, faith, insight, prayer tone, and

awareness of divine guidance, with all the accompaniments of a salvation experienced in Christ and the expectations centring in him, manifested a standard of conduct and fruitfulness of the Spirit in him which showed up decidedly extraordinary and abnormal in every way when compared with the average pagan standard of living so wellknown amid the circles wherein Paul moved. The apostle's contribution along this line was simply to draw out what this abnormal standard of the church implied, viz. that what was considered to be so outstanding was after all the normal, everyday life and conduct of people who were under the control of the Spirit. Indeed, from the Christian viewpoint what came to be abnormal was any lapse from the high Spirit-standard.

Paul's faith centres in what Deissmann calls a Christocentric mysticism.* The Living Spiritual Christ "is about him on all sides, dwells in him, speaks to him, speaks in and through him...a reality and power of the present, an 'energy' whose life-giving power is daily made perfect in him."** Viewed, however, from the side of his Spirit-possessed personality, Paul's Christocentric mysticism is mystical experience of the Spirit; "Paul's gospel was grounded in an immediate, personal experience of the Divine Being, who impinged upon him, invaded him, and became the inward principle and spirit of his very soul and self"***

*"St. Paul," Eng. Tr. pp. 23, 123. "The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of St. Paul," pp. 190, 193. **Deissmann, "St. Paul," p. 123f. *
 ***Rufus Jones, op. cit. p. 9, cf. Eph. iii. 16.

This empirical identity is mediated in several strata of religious experience. We have experience of 'justification' in Christ and of 'justification' in the Spirit (Gal.ii.17, I Cor. vi.11); there is 'speaking' in Christ and 'speaking' in the Spirit (II Cor.ii.17, I Cor.xii.3); Christ 'dwells' in the heart and the Spirit 'dwells' in human personality (Eph.iii.17, Rom.viii.9,cf.I Cor.iii.16, vi.19, II Tim.i.14): the church is 'one body' in Christ and 'one body' in the Spirit (Rom. xii.5, I Cor.xii.13,cf.Eph.ii.21f.); the church is a 'fellowship' of Jesus Christ and a 'fellowship' of the Spirit (I Cor.i.9, II Cor. xiii.13, cf.Phil.ii.1). Experiential constituents due both to Christ and to the Spirit alike are, 'joy' (Phil.iii.1, Rom.xiv. 17), 'peace' (Phil.iv.7, Rom.xiv.17), 'witness'(Eph.iv.17, Rom. ix.1), 'faith'(Gal.iii.26, I Cor.xii.9), 'sanctification'(I Cor. i.2, Rom.xv.16), 'righteousness'(II Cor.v.21, Rom.xiv.17).

There is a strong mystical tone in these Pauline conceptions which seems 'prima facie' to be a new element introduced by Paul, and has led to the assumption that Paul is influenced here by the Mystery Religions.* There is no doubt that the apostle has developed a strong mystical view of experience in Christ, especially in connection with the sacraments,** but he has only followed through to their consummation the empirical elements which were inherent in the primitive church. He has transferred his empirical and environmental ideas of Spirit-possession, ideas

*Cf. pp.49-51.

**Cf. pp.39-42.

he shared with the believers of the primitive church, to his awareness of the presence and activity in him of the Living Christ. "That a person could be in, or have, or be possessed by a spirit was a common belief among both Jews and Gentiles, and this idea Paul applied to Christ."* This empirical process finds its culmination in the identity of Christ with the Spirit (II Cor.iii.17).**

Paul is drawing out what is implicit in the primitive church experience with its concrete, personal awareness of the Spirit's presence and activity in both individuals and in the whole community, and its gradual empirical discoveries of the awareness of Christ, and in so doing he has been helped by the environmental idea of the Spirit as invading and possessing human life. But already in the primitive church experience ~~there~~ there was a growing awareness of the presence of Jesus,*** but what was as yet holding up the influence of a more intimate and mystical sense of Christ's presence was the concrete expectation of his return in glory from the exalted height to which he had ^{been} raised through his resurrection. Further, there were empirical links between the believers' experience of the Spirit and that of Christ. The coming of the Spirit upon them is connected with Jesus, who himself received the promise of the Spirit from the Father, and had bestowed the gift on them as the pledge of

*W.H.P.Hatch, "The Pauline Idea of Faith," in Harvard Theological Studies, II. p.41. **ὁ δὲ ἅγιος πνεῦμα ἐστίν.

***Cf. below, Ch.XI. "The Influence of Jesus," pp. 450-459.

the coming kingdom (Acts ii.33).* Already in the primitive community the experience of the Spirit was the earnest of Messiah's presence among them, soon to be concretely realized. Every evidence of the Spirit's activity was thus associated with Jesus, the Jesus they had known in life, the Jesus triumphant in resurrection, and now exalted to the right hand of God, soon to consummate the work begun by the Spirit. In this way experience of the Spirit caused Jesus to impinge on, move in, and witness through the believers. As the eschatological hope began to fade, so did the truth of Christ's presence come more to prevail.**

Paul is therefore dependent to a large extent upon the primitive church experience of the Spirit and of Christ. From this creative source there was much begun in him which he was draw out in such greater fulness. The empirical constituents of his Christocentric mysticism are found more in the Spirit-possession of the earlier church, and less ^{derived} ~~derived~~ from pagan sources such as the Mysteries. As in the case of the increasing ethical emphasis, so Paul is here bringing to bear the later reflection of the church experience, with the addition of his own unique empirical discovery.

In the nature of things, under the overwhelming sense of spiritual power which came upon the first believers, the enthusiastic character of the Spirit's manifestation was very prominent within the primitive church. This gives no warrant

*Cf. pp. 43, 114f. 117.

** Cf. pp. 457f.

for assuming that the ethical experience of the Spirit was absent in the earlier period, or that the Spirit was only perceived in the physically and psychologically abnormal. The 'marvellous' as such is still in evidence among the Pauline churches, but guarding words are pointing out that these are not necessarily the signs of the Spirit, or the dangers of excess; understanding and intelligence are equally indices of the Spirit's presence (I Cor.xiv).

The 'mystic' or 'numinous' nature of the primitive church experience of the Spirit is revealed in the close relationship between experience of the Spirit and experience of demon-possession. The extraordinary words and deeds of Jesus, while accounted for by the indwelling in him of the Spirit, also drew out the conclusion that he had an unclean spirit (Mk.iii.30), or that he was inspired by the prince of the demons (Mk.iii.22, Mt.ix.34). There must have been a similarity of 'symptoms' in Spirit or demon-possession, or else the criticism of the scribes and Pharisees would reveal them as victims of unspeakable folly, a charge that cannot be made of them.* John the Baptist was regarded as being possessed by the Spirit from the time he was in his mother's womb (Lk.i.15), but some Jews ascribed his words and activity to the operation in him of a demon (Mt.xi.18, Lk.vii.33). The Fourth Gospel reveals the same ideas when the Jews are portrayed as saying to Jesus

*Cf.p.134.

'Thou hast a demon'(vii.20), 'say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?'(viii.48), or summing him up, 'he has a demon and is mad'(x.20).* While phenomena inspired by the Spirit may be taken as resulting from demonic indwelling, so what was really of the demons was sometimes misread as coming from the Spirit.** Prophets may be taken as Spirit inspired whereas they are only false deceivers, i.e.inspired by demons (Mt.xxiv.11,24). The 'discerning of spirits' (I Cor.xii.10) seems to point to this specific danger; "there is always need of proving that which is spoken under spiritual influence, because a lying spirit, sent by the devil, can also inspire man and deceive the church."*** The similarities between the respective phenomena would easily influence the unthinking and the undiscerning into ascribing to the Spirit what in reality was ^{due to nothing} ~~no~~ more than ~~due to~~ demonic agency.

(1) Human personality is the scene of activity for the Spirit and the demons alike, the noteworthy exception to this being the entrance of the spirits into the swine at Gadara (Mk. v.13). (2) As the Holy Spirit is sometimes regarded as the principle of life in human personality,**** so there is a

*It is beside the point to regard these ascriptions as no more than vilifying insult. **For similarity of phenomena ascribed at one time to the Spirit and at another to demonic agency cf. Judg.xvi.14, "The Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and the ropes on his arms became as flax burnt with fire, and his bands dropped from his hands" and Mk.vi.4, "he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder, and the fetters broken in pieces;" here it is demon power that is responsible. ***B.Weiss, "Biblical Theology of the New Testament," Eng.Tr.Vol.1., 1882, p.304. ****Cf.p.112.

parallel idea which connects this with evil spirits (En.xv.8f. 11). (3) Human personality becomes for the time being the habitation of either the Spirit or the evil spirit (I Cor.vi. 19, Lk.xi.24-26). This indwelling is brought out by a similarity of phraseology used to express the experience, viz. ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ (Mt.xii.28), ἐν πνεύματι ἁκαθάρτου (Mk.i.23).

(4) Human personality is the passive recipient of the activity of the numinous energy, whether the Spirit or demons. The Spirit speaks, the human organs of speech are the medium;* so also it is the indwelling demon that speaks through the lips of the demon-possessed.** The Spirit active in man causes him to cry out, 'Abba, Father!'^{***} while the demonic power causes its victim to shriek out in startling cries.**** The Spirit irresistibly impels men to action apparently independent of their own willing: Paul's way is hindered (Acts xvi.6,8) and he is impelled across to Macedonia (Acts xvi.10); Jesus is 'driven forth' into the wilderness (Mk.i.12).‡ Similar irresistible urges are the result of being possessed with demons; the demon 'seizes and holds' its victim'(Lk.viii.29)‡‡ or drives him out

*II Chr.xx.14,Mt.x.20,Lk.xii.12,Acts ii.4,iv.8,vi.10,xiii.9f. xxi.11,Rom.viii.15,Gal.iv.6). **Mk.i.34,iii.11f.v.7-10,12, Acts xvi.17f.xix.15. This aspect is illustrated from a negative side. Where the demon-possessed does not speak (Mk.ix.17,25) it is the demon in him that is silent. ***Rom.viii.15,Gal.iv.6. Cf.Enoch lxxi.11,"and I cried out...with the Spirit of power." ****Mk.i. 26,iii.11,v.5,7,Lk.iv.33,41,ix.39,Acts viii.7,xvi.17. Cf.the concrete expressions used of the demon,viz. κράζειν,ἀνακράζειν, κραυγάζειν,βοᾶν,φωνῆ μεγάλη. †Cf.the force of ἐκβάλλει here. ‡Cf.force of συνακραίνει, the 'perfective' of ἀκραίνω here in its pluperfect ἀνακραίνε, "as the perfective of ἀκραίνω denotes not the temporary paroxysm, but the establishment of a permanent hold"(J.H.Moulton,op.cit.p.113.

from human habitation (Lk.viii.29), the propulsion being not unlike to the boat impelled by the oars, or forced out to sea by the wind in its sails (Mk.vi.48,Jn.vi.19). Or the victim was flung into convulsions*or irresistibly impelled to throw himself upon the ground and dash himself about.** As the Spirit 'binds' Paul and gives him no choice but to go to Jerusalem (Acts xx.22), so the demon 'binds' its victim who becomes a passive instrument with which the demon may do as it likes (Lk.xiii.16). (5) Possession by the Spirit resulted in marvels of the physical order*** while a demon-possessed man could break the chains with which his fellows bound him (Mk.v.4), or overcome seven men at once (Acts xix.16). (6) As ecstatic conduct was a sign of the Spirit's presence so the other side to this in demon-possession was being 'beside oneself,' i.e. 'mad'(Mk.v.3-5,Acts xxvi.24).† (7) As the Spirit conferred superhuman wisdom and insight, so demon-possession was sensitive to personal ~~al~~ qualities analogous to the effects of the Spirit. This is why the demon-possessed discerned the significance of Jesus while normal people saw in him only a herald of the kingdom.‡‡

*Mk.ix.18, Lk.ix.39, cf.the force of $\sigma\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$. **Mk.ix.18, Lk.ix.42, cf. $\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$. ***Cf.pp.260f. †Cf.Mk.v.18 where the cure of the demoniac results in him being 'in his right mind. Here again the results of inspiration by the Spirit were likely to be looked on as due to demon-possession. The point of Paul's warnings about ecstatic tongue-speech was that strangers who came to worship might conclude the speaker to be insane (I Cor. xiv.23,cf.p.224). The family of Jesus seek to restrain him since they believe he is beside himself, i.e.possessed by a demon, a conclusion the scribes are quick to seize upon as they ascribe his power over demons to the prince of the demons (Mk. iii.21f.31). ‡Cf.pp.128,147f. Mk.i.24,34, iii.11f. v.7, Mt. viii.29, Acts xvi.16f. xix.15; cf.James iii.15,

These resemblances between experience of the Spirit and of demon-possession are accounted for by the psychology of a religious experience which viewed both Spirit and demon-possession as an invasion, in each kind, of a supernatural, overpowering energy into human personality either for good or ill. As man believed himself to be possessed by the Spirit, so a similar conviction held him at other times that he was demon-possessed. Both Spirit and demons were recognized by similar symptoms of what was extraordinary and abnormal.

We are faced with more than merely belief in demons. We may grant that "the forms and phases in which insanity manifests itself always depend upon the general state of culture and the ideas current in the social environment, so that whenever the religious life is in a state of agitation, and a firm belief prevails in the sinister activity of evil spirits, 'demon-possession' still breaks out sporadically" (Harnack, op.cit.p.125). But what we have to consider is religious experience which presented phenomena about which no doubt existed that demons were the cause, while the actual existence of demons under the rule of their prince was taken as axiomatic (cf.pp.110f.146f.), and all in open enmity with God and the Spirit of God.

In the demoniac of Gadara (Mk.v.3-5, Lk.viii.27,29) we have the typical case of an insane man in the grip of mental disease. He is dominated by supernatural power which enables him to perform extraordinary actions which would have been impossible to his normal life. In the case of the dumb demoniac (Mk.ix.17,25), a deep, silent melancholy has descended upon the victim, and under the settled depression the personality was helpless. Some supernatural power, utterly foreign to him, has taken possession.

The **madness** is accompanied by physical afflictions which baffle understanding, the origin of which none could account for, the healing of which was beyond human skill. The whole man was out of himself, and demons were in full charge, fearsome strange powers. The only way to account for the baffling phenomena was that sinister supernatural

power had invaded the personality and had made complete identity with it. All was summed up in the brief but fearsome phrase ἔχει κναιθρα ἀκθαστρον (cf. Mk. i.23, Acts viii.7).

The primitive church was faced with the painful and aggressive problem of human need, and it rose to the height of its opportunity armed as it was with a counteracting power for good in the energy of the Spirit of God. The proximity of the believers to the personality of Jesus quickened their own Spirit-possessed powers in dealing with demon-possession. Just as demons could take hold of human personality, so they could be expelled, provided one had a power which would prove too much for the sinister invader. The Spirit of God was regarded as just the very power that could master the demons. Those whom the Spirit possessed carried with them the very spiritual energy which was able to bring healing to the mental and physical torture of the demon-possessed by casting out the demon and substituting for it the mightier force of the Spirit. In the very substitution itself the act of healing took place, for human personality could not be possessed at one and the same time by the Spirit and by a demon, and the demonic had to give way as the Spirit entered and in pure incompatibility expelled it.*

*With the heightened insight resulting from demon-possession, the controlling demon was aware that in the approach of Jesus it was faced with one in whom was operative the Spirit. Thus the cry that he would spare them even before Jesus had uttered one word (Mk. i.24), and cf. 'art thou come to destroy us?' which points to the uniqueness of Jesus and the imminent Kingdom perceived by the demoniac, cf. pp. 110f. 127, 147, but from another side is apprehensive of the Spirit power confronting it.

The disciples as possessed by the Spirit embodied in themselves the supernatural power able to expel the demons from human personality and replace their malevolent activity with the Spirit's creating life. The change that had to be made was from the experience denoted by the words, *δαίμονιον ἔχει*, or, *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει*, to the happier state *πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν*, from the insanity resulting from a demoniacal state to the 'right mind' which the Spirit could bring, from demon-possession to Spirit-possession. The victory of the Spirit was over another supernatural power, and the issue was supernaturally conditioned. The demonic power could not withstand the Spirit of God and had to give way.

As in the experience of the Spirit, so the demon-possession brings us to a 'something beyond', a 'numinous', an ultimate which defies analysis. We only push the mystery further back when we reach the limits of the psychological and historical approach, and leap beyond them to postulate, as did the Jews, a Satan as the prince or overlord of demons. But for the primitive church there was no dualism in the sense of two supernatural entities of good and evil in opposition, for the Spirit of God proved victorious over the myrmidons of the demonic power. Indeed the final triumph of the Spirit was at hand; at any moment Christ would return bringing the divine kingdom, all alike motivated by the impulsion of the Spirit.

These similarities between experience of the Spirit and of evil spirits are not superficial or accidental. There are

vital connecting links. For one thing, both series of empirical phenomena were at one time ascribed to the activity of God. Indeed the religious inheritance and to some extent the environment of the primitive church showed this fact very clearly.

God sends an evil spirit which influences the men of Shechem to act treacherously with Abimelech (Jdg.ix.23); an evil spirit conceived to come from God causes Saul to prophesy, and incites him to attempt David's life (I Sam. xviii.10), and the story is repeated (I Sam.xix.9). In the same way God was supposed to send a 'lying' spirit into prophets that they might give deceitful counsel to the people (I Kgs.xxii.23), and indeed God himself could be that very lying spirit (ibid.ver.22). The repetition of this idea in Chronicles shows that at the much later date the revisers of Israel's history and traditions held much the same view since they allowed the explanation to stand (II Chr.xviii.20-23). The Levites pray God and call to mind how God gave his 'good' spirit to instruct the people in the wilderness (Neh.ix.20), and does this suggest that God could give an 'evil' spirit if he wished?(cf.Ps.cxliii.10). A 'perverse' spirit is sent upon the Egyptians by the Lord (Isa.xix.14).

But with the exalted transcendence of God which became prominent after the Exile, the tendency was to cease the reference of evil spirits back to God (cf.pp.109-11), until in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs we have a whole series of evil spirits responsible for the moral catastrophes of men. The 'spirit of deceit'(T.S.vi.6, T.L. xviii.12), the 'spirit of desire'(T.Jud.xvi.1), the 'spirit of envy'(T.S.iii.1,iv.7), the 'spirit of fighting'(T.R.iii.4), the 'spirit of filthy lucre'(T.Jud.xvi.1), the 'spirit of fornication'(T.R.iii.3, cf.Hos.iv.12,v.4), the 'spirit of hatred'(T.G.i.9), the 'spirit of injustice'(T.R.iii.6), the 'spirit of insatiableness'(T.R.iii.3), the 'spirit of jealousy'(T.Jud.xiii.3,cf.Num.v.14,30), the 'spirit of lust'(T.Jud.xvi.1), the 'spirit of lying'(T.R.iii.5,cf. I Kgs.xxii.20ff, but unlike this O.T.instance, the lying spirit is not ascribed to God), the 'spirit of obsequiousness'(T.R.iii.4), the 'spirit of pride'(T.R.iii.4), the 'spirit of profligacy'(T.Jud.xvi.1), the 'spirit of sleep'(T.R.iii.1,cf.Isa.xxix.10), the 'spirit of vainglory'(T.D.i.6), the 'spirit of wickedness'(T.D.v.6, cf.T.S.v.1, T.N. ii.2). These very delinquencies are themselves abnormal and since they cannot be ascribed to God, demonic invading powers are postulated to account for their effects.

We seem here to discern hints of the divorce of the two spheres of operation, viz. of the evil spirits from the divine Spirit, although both supernatural powers may use the same methods of invasion and set up abnormal results. At the same time as the evil spirits are being dissociated from the divine source, there is a parallel movement which tends to move the experience of the divine spirit from association with demonic effects. The links in this movement are 'the spirit of wisdom' (Exod.xxviii.3, Isa.xi.2), the 'faithful spirit' (Prov.xi.13), the 'spirit of humility' (Prov.xvi.19), an 'excellent spirit' (Prov.xvii.27, Dan.v.12), the 'spirit of judgment' (Isa.iv.4), the 'spirit of understanding' (Isa.xi.2), the 'spirit of might' (ibid), 'the spirit of knowledge' (ibid), a 'new spirit' (Ezek.xi.19), the 'spirit of grace' (Zech.xii.10), the 'spirit of supplication' (ibid). This process continues through to the second and first centuries B.C. As the demons are sorted out with their demonic source, so the projections towards experience of the Spirit are clarified as to their source in God. Thus we have the 'spirit of faith' (En.lxi.11), the 'spirit of wisdom' (En.lxi.11, Ps.Sol.xviii.8), the 'spirit of patience' (En.lxi.11), the 'spirit of mercy' (ibid), the 'spirit of judgment' (ibid), the 'spirit of peace' (ibid), the 'spirit of goodness' (ibid), the 'spirit of insight' (En.xlix.3), the 'spirit of life' (En.lxi.7), the 'spirit of power' (En.lxxi.11), the 'spirit of understanding' (En.xlix.3, T.L.ii.3, xviii.7), the 'spirit of might' (En.xlix.3), the 'spirit of truth' (T.Jud.xx.1,5, cf.Jn.xiv.17,xv.26,xvi.13), the 'spirit of sanctification' (T.L.xviii.7).

We therefore discern a vital link in the associations which were ultimately to dissociate the experience of the Spirit and of demons. The culmination of the Spirit's presence was found in activities and qualities which could come only from the possession by the Spirit of God. Symptoms such as deceit, lying, desire, envy, fighting, filthy lucre, fornication, hatred, injustice, insatiableness, jealousy, lust, pride, profligacy, stupor, wickedness, came to be divorced in idea from the divine activity, since the nature of their activities could only warrant a demonic origin.* "By their fruits ye shall know

*Cf.pp.110f.

them." This was the ultimate principle in religious experience which sorted out what manifestations were of the Spirit and what were of the demons.

Therefore amid the many similarities between the two kinds of spirit experience, there are vital differences which are still more clearly discerned. (1) The activities of the demons are utterly injurious to human life. Demon-possession 'grievously vexes' (Mt.xv.22), brings the horrors of lunacy (Mt.xvii.15), and brings untold misery to its victims.* But possession by the Spirit brings blessing and joy,** resulting in restoration and healing, results which if pursued by demons, would disintegrate Satan's dominion through his own evil myrmidons (Mk.iii.24ff.).*** No demon ever opened the eyes of the blind, but divine power can (Jn.ix.33, x.21). (2) Demon-possession results in the disintegration of personality (Mk.v.2ff.9); the Spirit's indwelling unified human life.**** (3) Demon-possession is unclean and unholy, appertaining to the dominion of evil, but the divine Spirit is the 'Holy Spirit' whose manifestations are holy, separate unto the divine purpose, and come to be discerned as the inspiration of all that is good and creative in human life. (4) The demon-possessed dread the presence of Jesus for they know he has the power to cast the evil spirit out and render it harmless. But it is the

*For a description of such evils cf.110,146f.284f. **Cf.pp.264-272. ***Cf.pp.156f. ****Cf.Paul's life integrated through his conversion, and the integrating effects of Peter's vision, pp.249f.251,256f. Also Mary Magdalene, from whom seven demons were cast out,Lk.viii.2. †Cf.p.285 note.

Spirit that possesses Jesus and enables him to strike terror into evil spirits. (5) The demons are hostile, in their ways and evil deeds, to the rule of God. Pagan deities are called idols (Ps.xcvi.5) and become identified with demons.* Idol worshippers are worshippers of demons, therefore they, as the demonic objects of their homage, stand out over against the divine kingdom. But the Spirit is recognized as the active power in the divine rule and kingdom, and is thus set over against the pagan deities identified with demons.** (6) Demons are thought of as the spirits of evil men (Sib.Or.III.723) or ~~are~~ ^{as} the spirits that influence the wicked actions of evil men (Gen.vi.2,4,En.xv.8f.11f.xvi.1,xx.6)^{***}, but the Spirit is never thought of as inspiring wickedness and evil. (7) Demons induce a psychological atmosphere of terror, hysterical paroxysms, delusions and insanity; those who are possessed by the Spirit carry with them an atmosphere of peace, harmony, trust, and joy.****The response to the Spirit's activity here among those who behold the beneficent symptoms in human life are praise to God for bestowing such power on men (Mt.ix.8,Lk.vii.16). (8) The demons are active in the name and in the virtue of the power of

*Cf. Deut.xxxii.17, Ps.cvi.37, an identification made frequently in apocalyptic writings, cf. En.xix.1f.xcix.7 (the sources of Tertullian's exposition of the same truth, 'De Idol.'iv.), T.Jud. xxiii.1, T.N.iii.3). For the identification in the New Testament cf. I Cor.x.20f. Apoc.ix.20. **Jub.i.11, cf. ver.23. ***"For they which are called demons are the spirits of wicked men," Josephus, Bell.Jud.VII.6,3. Cf. the evil spirits of the giants springing from the union of the fallen angels with the daughters of men (Gen.vi.2,4. En.xv.8f. etc.). Cf. the latter reference to these spirits afflicting, oppressing, rising up against men. ****Cf. Pp.269f.

Satan (Mk.iii.23-7), but the Spirit is felt to be not only direct from God but even the very power and energy of God, so that even the very mention of the name of God or of Christ evokes that divine power.* Those who confess the name of Christ are divinely inspired, and thus every believer is an organ for the Spirit's energy and operation. To cry 'Jesus is anathema' is indicative of demonic inspiration;** to name him as 'Lord' is due to the Spirit. (9) Demon-possession is evidence of the power of evil forcing its victim away from God, but the Spirit in human life enables a man to cry unto God as Father; indeed, it is the Spirit's voice itself which actually cries out in this way, using as the instrument the voice of the believer (Rom.v.5, Gal.iv.6). (10) The demons inspire the false preachers and teachers and can make them appear as angels of light after the manner of their overlord (II Cor.xi.14f. cf.ver.13). False prophets misuse the name of God, and believers are misled into supposing that they speak in the Spirit.*** These false impulses and inspirations betray the demonic agents of Satan. On the other hand the true apostles, prophets and teachers, as their words reveal, are inspired by the Spirit.

*I Cor.xii.1-3, cf. Rom.ix.3, I Jn.iv.2f. **This cry may have been shouted by fanatical Jews in the synagogues and may have reminded the inexperienced Corinthians Christians of "the shrieks of frenzied worshippers of Dionysus and the Corybantes" (Robertson and Plummer, op.cit. on I Cor xii.3), this misleading them into supposing that the shouts were Spirit-inspired. Such cannot be of the Spirit, the implication being that demonic agency was the source. ***Mt.vii.15,24, xi.24, Mk.xiii.22, Lk.vi.26, Acts xiii.6, and cf. Deut.xiii.1-3, Jer.xiv.14, xxiii.16.

From the experiential data provided by the similarities and differences of the twofold order of spirit-possession, vix. possession **by** the Spirit and possession by demonic agency, there stands out the empirical test as to the symptoms operative of the one or the other. This test is 'By their fruits ye shall know them'(Mt.vii.16). The advance made in this clarification from more primitive times is seen in the standpoint of **Jospphus** which probably reflects not simply that of his own time but sums up what Jews had discerned for several generations before. Josephus ~~describes~~ describes the ecstasy which came on Saul after the withdrawal of the divine favour ~~was~~ of a demoniacal nature, the Spirit of God having left him, and thus exposed him to the invasion of demons(Ant.vi.8,2). What in former times was put down to an evil spirit operated by God is now seen to be due to demonic source'per se'. The Didache is reflecting one primitive church idea at least when it says, "not every one that speaks in the Spirit is a prophet, but only if he has the ways of the Lord. By their ways therefore the false prophet and the true shall be known"(xi.8), the 'ways' being 'the'symptoms' the possessed one reveals.

In the primitive church the energies of the Spirit ^{WERE} ~~was~~ so manifest that it was a community possessed from first to last by the Spirit. Within the sphere of human personality the Spirit worked and resulted in extraordinary phenomena which themselves were the 'fruits' of the indwelling life energy. With an

experiential and psychological inheritance of Spirit-possession, and cradled within an environment richly potent in creative religious life, together with the creative personality of the uniquely Spirit-possessed Jesus of Nazareth in his impacts upon the believers, endowed the primitive church with extraordinary potentiality for the operation of the Spirit. From this standpoint many of the perplexing phases of the life and experience of the believers find their unification when regarded as expressions of the activity of the indwelling Spirit of God. Everything found its central inspiration in the experience of the invading, superhuman, and divine power known as the Spirit of God. The kingdom that was ardently awaited was guaranteed by the fact of the manifest operation of the new divine power in such fulness. "Those earliest believers were lifted above the world of the present and felt that they bore their part in a supernatural order. They constituted the new community, in which the Spirit moved like a mighty rushing wind."*

*E.F.Scott, "The Beginnings of the Church," p.83.

CHAPTER VI

THE EMERGENCE OF THE CHURCH

In the previous chapter we became aware of a community of men and women held together by a common mind and loyalty to Jesus the Messiah, and active in its witness and deeds through the inspiration of the Spirit of God operative in religious experience. There was no ecclesiastical organization such as afterwards came to be known as the Christian Church in evidence as yet, at least not immediately following Pentecost.* All we have in the early chapters of Acts is what Burkitt describes as "detached vignettes"** of a community under the control of the Spirit, and throbbing with loyalty and vivid expectation of a divine consummation centring around the exalted Jesus who had been known on earth, and who had renewed his contacts with them in the resurrection experience.

The Spirit-possessed group was gathered, in the first place from the various circles of eyewitnesses which had known Jesus in his life. We meet with such a group prior to the Pentecost outpouring of the Spirit. It included some one hundred and twenty persons at least (Acts i.13f.), and there were probably many others of whom at the most we obtain no more

*Cf. C. Anderson Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," in "The Spirit" ed. Streeter, pp. 133f. **"Christian Beginnings," p. 99.

than stray hints.* "We need not be surprised that so many devoted adherents were now gathered at Jerusalem awaiting 'the promise of the Father.'**

In this pre-Pentecostal period, however, we find, as the record stands, that an action is forthcoming on the part of the community which implies a degree of self-consciousness as a community beyond what we naturally expect at this stage. The number of the Twelve is made up, and ~~Matthias~~^{Matthias} is chosen by lot to fill the place of Judas the betrayer (Acts i.21-6). The fact that the making up of the apostolic collegium precedes the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost is significant, for if the Twelve occupied the official position at this time, a position ascribed to them at least by the Church of a later age, it is obvious that their distinct authority was not due to the endowment of the Spirit. The Western Text actually represents Peter, not the community, as himself putting forward the two candidates for the apostleship.*** Are we in the presence of later church theory, not only in ^{an}the official enhancement of Peter, but in the whole story of the election of a successor to Judas? The problem is not merely one of ecclesiastical theory and organization, but whether at this

*The five hundred brethren to whom came a resurrection appearance (I Cor.xv.6) may have been an assemblage in Galilee, but it is more likely that they were the expectant Messianic community in Jerusalem. Cf.E.Fuchs, op.cit.pp.16f. and cf.above,p.205.

J.V.Bartlet,"Acts" CB.p.131. *D* Old-lat.Aug. "It does not seem to be a case of accidental variation, and the Western Text is remarkably like some forms of later ecclesiastical elections" ("The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol.V.1933,p.52. ed.Foakes-Jackson and Lake.)

stage there was any 'ecclesia' to be expressed in organization. Was the community distinctive enough in its self-consciousness as to warrant such a collegium, or is the collegium the reading back of later theory into the tradition, and therefore has to be discounted as far as the primitive church is concerned?

We have seen the nature of the relationship between Jesus and his disciples. Jesus seems to have chosen twelve from among those who followed him. If we may shortly indicate conclusions at which we arrive elsewhere, the number 'twelve' was probably influenced by the eschatological aspect of the disciples' functions. They were personal attendants of Jesus, and he sent them out to preach the imminence of the kingdom, and to cast out demons, a sure sign the kingdom was at hand (Mk.iii. 14f.). Jesus chose twelve as a parabolic declaration that his message of the kingdom concerned Israel as a whole. Their future status as assessors at the judgment brings out their corporate eschatological function explicitly (Mt.xix.28).** The significance of 'twelve' lies not in ecclesiastical selection but in apocalyptic association, as far as Jesus and the primitive church were concerned. In the course of later church development away from Judaism to the Gentile character it came to have, the number lost its parabolic meaning, yet the number as such retained its place and other meanings had to be found for it.

The 'Twelve' became a sort of 'shadow' cabinet of ecclesiastical

*Cf. Appendix V, pp. 520-23. **"Even ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Cf. Lk.xxii.30, and pp.169f.

government, the beginnings of which were showing themselves in the latter decades of the Apostolic Age. These later meanings are taken up by the Lucan-Acts tradition, and the Twelve have now become an apostolic collegium, while the effort has been made, though not convincingly, to weld the Twelve and 'apostles' into one and the same unit.

The election of ^{Matthias}~~Matthias~~, if historical, was due to the desire to complete the number in view of the imminent kingdom, that the assessors may be ready for their eschatological duty in judging Israel. This is the empirical probability underlying the story. The expectant community were sufficiently aware of themselves as a community who were going to make history in the advent of Messiah.

On this community, self-conscious of its Messianic significance, came the experience of the Spirit (Acts ii.1-4). Peter became the spokesman of the group, and in his speech invested the new phenomena with characteristic eschatological significance and related it all definitely with Jesus in life, crucifixion, resurrection and exaltation.* The coming of the Spirit, as Joel's prophecy reminded his hearers, was the sign that the 'last days' had arrived. The 'day of the Lord' was imminent in the advent of the divine kingdom. Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews had crucified in the purpose of God, had risen from the dead; he had been exalted to the right hand of God, and as the

*Acts ii.1.3f.14,17-21,22-24,31-33,36.

divinely designated Messiah was soon to appear; meanwhile he had sent the Spirit as the pledge of his coming. The time was urgent; the hearers are urged to repent of their apostasy in rejecting Jesus, ^{and} receive him as Messiah and the Spirit would be given to them as the earnest that they would enter the coming kingdom forgiven and saved (Acts ii.37-40).

If this speech of Peter be regarded as a summary of what the primitive church felt in their self-consciousness, or, what would indicate such self-consciousness if this preaching were typical of the sort of message the primitive church preachers were wont to give, the value of the speech is not thereby lessened as an index of how the community was regarding itself in its relation to Jesus.* We are confronted by a quickened group, agog with vivid eschatological expectations centring in the personality of him whom they had known as Jesus of Nazareth. Israel's hope was on the eve of fulfilment, and the believers were aware of themselves as the community to which the Messiah would return.

* Cf. A.C. McGiffert, "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age," 1897, p.62; J.V. Bartlet, "The Apostolic Age," p.14; J. Weiss, "Das Urchristentum," p.29; H.J. Holtzmann H-C zum N.T. Vol.I.1889, pp. 332-4, for expositions of the ideas in Peter's speech. H.J. Cadbury is too cautious about relying on the genuineness of the speeches in Acts because of their primitive Christology: "there is danger of arguing in a circle, since our ideas of early Christianity, with which the speeches in Acts are said to conform so exactly, are derived in large part from those very speeches" ("The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. V. pp.416f.). But, as Bartlet remarks, "Peter's speech is full of traditional Messianic conceptions" (op.cit.p.14), and we can check these with what is known to have existed in the religious environment of Judaism (cf. pp.95f.99, 102-5, 114f.176f.).

The community is further aware at this early stage of its self-consciousness that its awareness of salvation is to include all Israel (Acts ii.36). The burden of the earliest preaching is that "the acceptance of Jesus as Lord and Christ is an essential condition of the salvation of Israel."^{*} The small group of witnesses had begun to make its appeal to the nation at large. Their experience of the Spirit and their burning conviction that the kingdom was imminent, that even as they left their prayer meeting or gathering their returned Messiah might meet them on the threshold, inspired them to share their discoveries with the people of Israel, and warn them to repentance, urging their acceptance of Jesus Messiah before it was too late (Acts ii. 38). The sin of Israel lies in their rejection of Jesus; the sin is national apostasy as well as ^{the} individual guilt implied (Acts ii.23,iii.13-15,vii.52). Let the nation accept Jesus in true contrition and there will be remission for what had been done.

These ideas were proclaimed on many occasions; other preachers beside Peter gave similar expression to the recent discoveries of their new experience of the Spirit. The community began to grow numerically, although the three thousand converts mentioned as being made through Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost is probably a statement of progress during an initial period of active witness rather than a specific invasion of the

*James Mackinnon, "The Gospel in the Early Church," 1933, p.14.

group on one occasion (Acts ii.41). We learn immediately of the spiritual routine that was followed by the new converts (Acts ii.42)*, and some time must have elapsed to develop a group consciousness that has become^{so} distinctively aware of itself as to possess a more or less authoritative corpus of teaching,** knows itself as a fellowship^{***} which finds itself expressed in a rite known as the 'breaking of bread,'^{****} and in the prayers which centred the aspirations upon the immediate return of the exalted Messiah in the divine kingdom.†

The unification of the Messianic community is further encouraged by the organizing of its practical needs on a basis of what has been described as 'Communism.' (Acts ii.44-47, cf. iv. 32, 34f.). We discuss the nature of this phenomenon elsewhere,‡‡ but meanwhile we notice that the community is sufficiently homogeneous as to feel responsibility for its individual members, and ^{recognizes} ~~implies~~ that the individuals have a sacred duty in this way to the collective body.

So far therefore we are able to discern a Messianic community with fairly clear marks of self-consciousness. The number of the Twelve is made up so that the Messianic leaders may be ready to cooperate with Jesus on his return; the Spirit is received as the dynamic pledge of the imminence of the kingdom. The call was urgent: it concerned the whole of Israel. The new community

* ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. **On this teaching cf. pp. 325-53. ***Cf. pp. 324-326. ****Cf. pp. 423f. †Cf. pp. 267f. ‡‡Cf. pp. 312-317.

grows apace: time passes and we discover it has its specific teaching, group fellowship, its rites*, and its devotions Messianically coloured. It has organized its practical life in a sort of communism.

But the self-consciousness of the community is growing in further directions. The suffering of their Messiah came to be seen in its real significance. The conscious level of the new experience of the believers had to find a reason for what had long been subconsciously apprehended.** It was necessary that Messiah should suffer in the purpose of God (Lk.xxiv.26, Acts ii.23), while the sacred writings of Israel abundantly proved this (Lk.xxiv.27, Acts iii.18). Jesus had fulfilled the divine purpose in the Suffering Servant (Acts viii.35, cf. iii.13-16).*** The significance of the death of Christ, however, ^{was} ~~were~~ not entirely viewed as eschatological in intent. Paul says that he received from the primitive church tradition the fact that Christ died for sins according to the Scriptures (I Co xv.5);**** in some measure already there were redemptive aspects being discerned, while remission from sin which had been incurred in rejecting Jesus Messiah carried with it forgiveness of sins and salvation from the coming Messianic judgment. All such aspects, however dimly perceived, would be connected with Christ's death on the Cross as the essential prelude to his

*i.e.including baptism, if it can be established that baptism was a feature of the primitive church practice: cf.pp.413-415

Cf.pp.174-6, 191f.194. *Cf.pp.377-379, 451 ****On the redemptive aspects of salvation for the primitive church cf.pp.374-380.

Messianic glory and the vivid expectations which this had aroused. Yet it has to be recognized that the deeper aspects of Messiah's suffering were discerned only in embryo; the salvation experience remains at the moment primarily eschatological in character.

The group consciousness is further sharpened and intensified by the persecuting activity of the Jewish rulers (Acts iv. 3,5ff.); the return of the arrested leaders is heralded by intensive corporate prayer which consolidates and deepens the faith and determination of the believers to speak the word given to them courageously (Acts iv.23-31). Further official repressive activities are of no avail (Acts v.27-40), for the apostles rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer in the name of the Messiah soon to appear. No opportunity was lost either in the temple or at home to preach and teach about Jesus the Messiah (Acts v.41ff.). We may infer from this sequence of events a heightening and deepening of the primitive community as the group conscious of itself as the heir of Messianic salvation.

So the community developed itself in its witness, its life, and its simple organization. Without any previous hint of what was to come we are suddenly introduced to a fairly conscious Hellenistic or Gentile element, and a religious ferment that has gathered round the name of Stephen (Acts vi.5,8-10,11f.). The primitive church has already within its own borders an element which was ultimately to outgrow the specific Jewish character of the community and its message. Whether the 'Ἑλληνισταί' (Acts vi.1

are Hellenistic Jews, or Gentile proselytes, or Gentiles as such without Jewish qualifications of any kind,* at the minimum we discover a more liberal influence which was to have far reaching repercussions on the primitive church.**

The more thorough persecution that followed the death of Stephen, led by Saul (Acts vii.58,viii.1,3) gave a tremendous impetus to the influence of the primitive community, in that the dispersed believers carried their gospel with them. Samaria and Syria receive visits from the dispersed evangelists (Acts viii.4-8,ix.2,19),^{and} the response in the former place inspires the community at Jerusalem to send two representatives to investigate what had happened (Acts viii.14-17,25). The new Samaritan elements indicate some further widening of the self-consciousness of the primitive community since Jews had no dealings with Samaritans (Jn.iv.9,viii.48).*** But the results of the dispersion went much further. The missionaries went to Phoenicia, Cyprus and significantly enough in the light of later events, to Antioch in Syria (Acts xi.19); they preached unto the Jews as a rule, but Hellenistic Jews in large numbers would receive for the first time the message of salvation. As these received the message, their cultural sympathies with Hellenism would enter in subconsciously and influence the group awareness in a Gentile direction. Hence the inevitable step of preaching the news of Christ to Gentiles was taken when missionaries from

*For a discussion on the 'Hellenists' cf. Appendix VI. pp. 523-525.

Cf. pp. 385-394 *Cf. also Ezra iv.3,10,Sir.1.25f.Mt.x.5, Lk.ix.53.

Cyprus and Cyrene preach to Gentiles at Antioch (Acts xi.20).*

It is not sufficient to see here that "Antioch is dealt with on the same system as the Church in Caesarea," the story being told "so as to lead up to the fact that Christianity was preached to Gentiles, and that on consideration the Church at Jerusalem accepted the situation."**What we are concerned with is the outflow of the new experience which, apart from literary motives or other motives detected or assumed in the narrator, is revealing signs of breaking through the earlier and more confined limits imposed on it through its Judaic environment, and taking its own deeper and broader course, ~~and~~ is able to include semi-Gentile and even fully Gentile elements within its appeal and influence.

We begin to meet many small communities here and there and which are known as 'ecclesiai.' Thus the self-consciousness of the primitive church in unfolding in the direction taken by many individual ecclesia groups, each with their respect for the mother church at Jerusalem, but as yet too concerned with the new spiritual vitality that had come to them to formulate any idea of their relationship to the church or community as a whole. We are dealing not with formal organization, but with the creative power of a religious experience centred in Jesus Christ which is better expressed and regarded under categories of life rather than in the formal definitions of Roman law courts which

*For the problem of the Gentiles cf. pp. 397 ff. **Lake and Cadbury, Comm. on Acts, in "The Beginnings of Christianity," Vol. IV. p. 127.

influenced the ancient church theories of organization. If we speak of an organism at this primitive stage to which ~~is~~ are related many smaller organisms, where are we to look for the main organism of which the others are offshoots? The community at Jerusalem? But it cannot be affirmed that the Jerusalem community was missionary or self propagative in any way, at least as far as the Gentiles was concerned.

We find the real explanation for the creative propagation of the new religious experience further back than the Jerusalem community. It originated in the personal impact Jesus made upon those who received their impressions of him and made vital contact with him in life. These eyewitnesses and others taught by them are the channels of ~~the~~ creative activity of the experienced Spirit, and they are heightened by the awareness of the Kingdom and its nearness, together with Jesus the Messiah's return. The spiritual elements centring in Jesus and the Spirit were the lifegiving powers which began to produce, of their own appeal and volition, the many ecclesia communities. The seed fell hither and thither as the preachers scattered abroad the gospel. The seed took root, and communities of believers begin to show themselves. We discern the beginnings of an onward advance of a message and an experienced salvation which by its very nature proves capable of being appropriated independently of Jewish tradition and requirements. The many local synagogues soon proved too restricted to contain the new groups, especially as the Gentiles came into them. New independent communities, called

ecclesiai, separate from the synagogue, and mainly Gentile in their adherents, begin to spring up in the cities, the towns and villages of the ancient world.

Such are the beginnings of the self-consciousness of the primitive church; they afford us hints of the experiential questions that were to arise and call for solution. To these questions and problems we return at a later stage.

The names by which the members of the primitive community called themselves indicate the character of the church consciousness by revealing various ways in which the believers looked upon themselves. For example, we meet with a more or less unified group the members of which are aware of themselves as 'disciples' over against those who were not in that category, viz. the Jews whose enmity had crucified Jesus. We read that the number of the 'disciples' was growing rapidly (Acts vi.1), until they could be described as a 'multitude' (ibid. ver. 2). Day by day many were being saved (Acts ii. 47), many heard the message of Christ and believed (Acts iv. 4), and believers were entering the community, great numbers of both sexes (Acts v. 14). The new community of disciples was thriving and extending its influence rapidly. We hear of 'disciples' at Damascus (Acts ix. 1f.); Saul has become aware of the 'disciples of the Lord' as a distinct group centred on Jesus the Nazarene, and a group which was becoming so prominent that it had to be extirpated by persecution. On his arrival at Damascus, a shattered, temporary-

ly blinded, broken down would-be persecutor, ^{he is visited by} a disciple there-
~~is~~ sent to bring comfort and healing (Acts ix.10); i.e. a member
of the church, as he would be called at a later stage of church
development. The converted Saul stays awhile with the community
at Damascus, i.e. the disciples (Acts ix.19). Arrived back in
Jerusalem he desired to be attached to the disciples there, i.e.
to join the Messianic community in the holy city (Acts ix.26).

The new community is found in Joppa, and is known as 'the
disciples' (Acts ix.36,38): the community at Antioch consists of
'the disciples' who came to receive for the first time the
name which was ultimately to prevail as designating ^{those} ~~one~~ who
believed in Christ, viz. Christians (Acts xi.26). As Paul
pursued his missionary journeys we hear of the emergence every-
where of groups of 'disciples' (Acts xiii.52, xiv.20, 22, 28, xviii.
23). Peter, pleading for a liberal policy before the Council of
Jerusalem, urged that no unnecessary burden should be placed on
'the disciples,' i.e. the Gentile section of the primitive
community (Acts xv.10). 'The disciples' in Achaea, i.e. the
community there, are urged to receive Apollos and encourage him
(Acts xviii.27); Paul comes across a small group of 'disciples'
at Ephesus that had not yet experienced the Spirit (Acts xix.1,
7). The hostility of the Jews moves Paul to separate 'the
disciples' from the synagogue (Acts xix.2), a significant hint
of what must have been common in the developing primitive
community. The members of the community, 'the disciples,' refuse

to let Paul hazard his life (Acts xix.30) in a tumult at Ephesus; when the apostle decided to go to Macedonia he called 'the disciples' together to bid them farewell (Acts xx.1). So also we hear of the communities at Troas, Tyre and Caesarea under their description, 'the disciples'(Acts xx.7,xxi.4,16).

One fact results from the recognition of 'the disciples' as a primitive designation for 'church'; the primitive church was spreading rapidly and extensively. Where 'the disciples' were, there was the Messianic community or the church, as it came to be called, i.e.the local church, although even to denote the community at large, the phrase was used (Acts xi.26). If Luke is editing his material to show how the church as a definite organization was intended from the beginning for the whole world, it is curious he omits using the term where it would have so fittingly come in. Instead, he constantly refers to the local communities as 'the disciples.' It seems as if Luke is maintaining a fidelity to the facts of primitive tradition in that he retains this elementary mode of referring to the groups as 'disciples,' despite his natural inclination to substitute the more ecclesiastical term.

Paul never refers to the community as 'the disciples' in his letters. But the apostle developed his own definite idea of the ecclesia, and reached out in his thought to the 'church' of which the 'churches' were expressive, the 'church' not only of world-wide but of cosmic significance and consciousness. The

self-consciousness of the church received an inspired exaltation at the hands of Paul,* while at the same time the development is due to the implications of the universal scope of the salvation as set forth by Jesus, and as the 'twelve' received it subconsciously in vision.** At least by the time of Paul's creative activity the term 'the disciples' had begun to fade away into the background.

In referring to themselves as 'the disciples' the believers reveal their vague awareness of their relationship to the community as a community, and show that the supreme fact that counted was rather their personal relationship to Christ. The consciousness of relationship to Jesus preceded the consciousness of their relationship to the community or church as such. Over against the Jews the believers in Jesus the Messiah were aware of their specific connection with him. Many of them had been actual eyewitnesses of Jesus in his life, his works and words; they had received from him impressions and experiences which even now were maturing into conscious recognition of his distinctive place and power. While the Cross seemed momentarily to destroy the relationship, it was renewed in a still more vital and spiritual form with the experience of the risen Lord. Henceforth the disciples were definitely in personal relationship to one who was the exalted Messiah, soon to come back to them in power and glory.

*Cf. pp. 37-39.

**Cf. pp. 151-5, 160f. 214f.

It is this awareness of a vital and personal relationship to Jesus the Messiah that lies behind the frequent reference of the Messianic community to itself as 'the disciples.' The converts who had never known Jesus in the flesh were brought into the same vital connection with Christ and became aware of his presence as inspiring reality in their lives.*

While the believers expressed their intimate relation to Christ in their consciousness that they were his disciples, they demonstrated the intimate connection between themselves by the word 'brethren.' The word designated their fellow members of the Jewish theocracy,** but did not, of course, extend to those who were not of Israel's chosen community. Within the primitive church, however, the word ^{not only is the word used} ~~is used not only~~ of a Jew who has entered the new Messianic community in referring to a fellow Jew whether within the new community or not,*** but Gentiles are designated 'brethren,'**** while the word is also used of the mutual relations of Gentile believers (Acts xxii.5,xxviii.21). Paul's letters further reveal the use of the term as denoting believers in Christ with no distinction between Jew and Gentile, for all members of the church are described as 'brethren;'[†] distinction of sex is not allowed to interfere with the concep-

*For further delineation of the relationship to Christ especially as seen in the rite of baptism, cf.pp. 413 ff. and cf.pp. 421-422. **Cf.Ps.xlix.7,1.20,Isa.xli.6,Jer.xxxiv.14,Ezek.xxxiii.30, Mic.vii.2,Zech.vii.9,Mal.ii.10, and cf.Mt.v.22-24,47,vii.3-5. ***Acts ii.29,iii.17,22,vii.2,ix.17,xiii.28. ****Acts xv.1,23, 32f. Ver.23 illustrates the use of 'brethren' by Jewish believers to designate Gentile believers. †Rom.i.13,vii.1,I Cor.i.10f Gal.i.11,Eph.vi.23,Phil.i.12,Col.i.2,I Thess.ii.1.

-tion of brotherhood;* similar considerations apply to slaves,** while there is no place for Greek snobbery in the growing Gentile communities (Rom.i.14,Col.iii.11).

This experience of brotherhood is much more than mere sentimental humanitarianism, for its foundations are laid in the new kinship, spiritually conditioned, foreshadowed by Jesus (Mk.iii.35). It was more than the mere grouping of men together around the name of some great leader or teacher in the pursuit of some apprehended ideal inspired by the leader's personality; there was more in the experience than the spirit of love and mutual helpfulness elevated to a high degree that the scattered communities struggling amidst a pagan and even hostile world developed in order to weather the storms of outer circumstances.

In the first place, at the very centre of the new experience of brotherhood was the eyewitnesses' awareness that their fellowship was grounded in their experience of Jesus in the flesh; their contacts with Jesus had impressed upon them what may be termed the 'Communism of Love,'*** which came to be so characteristic of the life of the primitive community. The place of love in the teaching of Jesus, exemplified by his own many acts of love, his own vigorous protests against religious exclusivism,****combined to set up an intimate fellowship of

*Rom.xvi.1,15, I Cor.vii.15,ix.5, I Tim.v.2. **I Cor.vii.21f. xii.13,Gal.iii.28,Eph.vi.8. ***E.Troeltsch, op.cit.Vol.I.p.63. ****As in the Parable of the Good Samaritan,Lk.x.25-37. Cf. too pp.161f.

love, religiously inspired, and which was the bond of union between him and those who followed him, and was to be the unifying spirit among the followers themselves.

In the second place, these principles, derived at first-hand from Jesus, became translated to a growing extent when a visible community gravitating around his name came into being. The primitive church proceeded to try out in practical life and organization their Master's spirit of love and their own experience of that love as observed in him and in his own dealings with men. His love to them had evoked their love for him and for their fellow-men which his own example of love had induced in their ~~own~~ life and spirit. Without this experiential basis, the atmosphere of brotherhood within the consciousness of the primitive church cannot be understood in its vital nature. Thus there was fostered that love of the brethren which is so conspicuous in the primitive church.* Believers have purged their souls in their obedience to the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, and are urged to love one another fervently from the heart (I Pet.i.22).

In the third place, the new believers represented in their experience a new society, the divine kingdom yet to be consummated but even now at hand with them. The eyewitnesses had learned from Jesus, and through them the new converts made the same discovery, that they were to prepare for the coming of the king-

*Cf. the 'brotherly love' ($\phi\lambda\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$) of Rom.xii.10, I Thess.iv.9, Heb.xiii.1.

dom by moulding their lives together 'en rapport' with the fundamental purpose of that kingdom. The old order was soon to give way to the higher divine order, in which the doing of God's will confer on the believers the status of belonging to the spiritual family of the Christ. The new order demands a new spirit and ~~the renunciation of~~ the old and human relationships are to be transfigured on a new level.* The convert did not simply attach himself to a new organization; he became a member of the new family the kinship of which was not physical descent as with the Jews or in ordinary human life, but ~~which~~ was determined by moral and spiritual affinities and likenesses to Christ. The primitive church tried to give visible expression to this inner family idea in its realization that all its members were brethren.

These ideas were not fully realized nor followed through on the conscious levels of the believers' thought and outlook, but they were inherent in their religious experience and proved to be quickening motives of their enthusiasm and their witness. The 'brotherhood' emphasis comes to vivid practical expression in their "having all things in common," distributing to everyone from the common store as each had need (Acts ii.44f.iv.32,34-6).

The writer who "has been called the socialist among the evangelists" (Cadbury, "Making of Luke-Acts," p.260) has had his narrative of the 'communism' called in question. Much is made of the way he portrays Jesus' care for the delinquent classes, his sympathy with the poor, and his emphasis on the duty of those who have wealth towards

*Cf. p.160.

those who have it not. It is therefore not unnatural that the 'communism' of the primitive church is sometimes viewed as an idealizing of what Luke had to say on the practical life of the new community.

We may allow for the possibility of idealization in the process of handing down tradition, since it is customary in all ages to idealize the past: to some extent Weiss is justified when he says, "aber selbst diese Schilderung trägt den Stempel der Idealisierung an der Stirn" (Das Urchristentum, p.49). But the noticeable 'social' emphasis in Luke's writings is not to be regarded merely as due to some predilection of his own, or ~~that he is~~ his simply shaping his narrative with a view to bringing out the 'socialist' aspect of Jesus words. But why does Luke cease to put forth his social theories in the later chapters of Acts? An author does not usually follow a favourite line of thought and then suddenly discontinue it. The answer probably is that the social emphasis is not due so much to the author as to his fidelity in following the facts of the tradition of which he makes use. The so-called 'communism' is not due to the fact that Luke had a theory of what ideally the primitive church ought to have done, but that the 'having all things in common' was the practical working out of the 'brotherhood' emphasis in the religious experience of the primitive church.

The fact that none were under obligation to sell all their possessions and contribute what these realized to the common store (Acts v.4) has led to the assumption that what we have in the 'communism' is no more than the customary charity and generosity of the Jews repeated in the life of the primitive church;* but the 'charity' conception loses sight of the fundamental point that the believers were caught within the enthusiasm of a religious experience which produced a spiritual detachment where material things were concerned, and at the same time was an expression of the 'brotherhood' aspect of their

*Cf. "The Communism of Acts," by K.Lake in "The Beginnings of Christianity," ed.Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol.V.pp.148f.

common spiritual life.* Further, the thoroughgoing nature of this communism, voluntary though it was,** is shown in the desire of Ananias and Sapphira to be thought to give all, although in actual fact they did not give all (Acts v.2-4,8f.).

The communism should not be understood, of course, in the modern connotation of the word. There does not seem to have been a common purse; we find that distribution was made ^{to} each according as anyone had need (Acts iv.35), and with this statement we must keep in mind the practical ministrations elsewhere mentioned, where only widows are spoken of as being recipients (Acts vi.1). There was apparently no pooling of wages, but probably those who could earn nothing and had no one to earn for them were maintained from a fund which was provided by the proceeds of property realized by the more wealthy members, and ^{***}no doubt included gifts made from time to time by those who were able to earn money in various ways. The real new thing was the consumption of capital for the common need in this way.

We are not concerned with the precise sociological implications of this communism;**** from the standpoint of religious experience it symbolized the inner attitude of the church

*Cf. Acts iv.32, τοῦ δὲ πλῆθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία. **We need assume no formal or binding regulation in the matter; the particular instances mentioned (e.g. the wealthy liberality of Barnabas, Acts iv.36f.) probably indicate the voluntary nature of the sacrifice influenced by the spirit of spiritual brotherhood. We are in an atmosphere of the free community of the Spirit, not of a formal organization with 'ex cathedra' powers of impelling such giving. ***E.g. Barnabas and Ananias. ****For such implications see Troeltsch, op.cit. Vol. I. pp. 82f.

consciousness as made up of individuals who were aware **that** they stood as 'brethren' to one another.

The religious significance of the communism was already prepared for in the place of renunciation in the lives of the eyewitnesses who had made their contacts and impressions with Jesus. The Galilean disciples left all willingly to follow Jesus (Mk.x.28), Simon Peter left his house, the boat and the nets (Mk.i.18-20), Levi renounced his livelihood at the custom office in Capernaum (Mk.ii.14). Others made similar renunciations, as the seventy who were sent out show (Lk.x.lff.). A man seeking eternal life is told by Jesus to sell all that he has, give it to the poor, and ~~to~~ follow Jesus (Mk.x.21). One prelude to the spirit of the communism of the primitive church is discovered when Jesus urges his listeners to sell their possessions and give alms (Lk.xii.33).^{*} The religious motive behind such renunciation is that detachment from the possessions and the rewards of the world is the best condition of freedom to pursue the life of the kingdom of God to which Jesus leads.

The primitive church communism rests ~~on~~ this spiritual motive in renunciation. There was a detachment from worldly possessions inspired by love of the brethren and by the intense desire to be ready for the life of the new order in the divine kingdom soon to come. Indeed, allowance is necessary for the operation of the vivid eschatological expectations as influencing the desire to have all things in common. It was only a matter of days, or at the most, of weeks before the old order

and the old way of life were to terminate, and the believers could prepare for their Lord's coming in no better way than to share the earthly goods ~~with one another~~ meanwhile with their brethren, and ~~all could~~ await the new order to be inaugurated in the power of detachment from the old and the vanishing, and be free from worldly distraction of any sort. But the eschatological motives here do not account for the communism as such. There was definite spiritual renunciation concerned, and its positive alliance with brotherhood engendered by the power of love in the spiritual kinship with their Master. That the experiment broke down ultimately does not ~~account for~~ ^{imply} any failure in the spirit of love and brotherhood, for probably the non-appearance of the eschatological kingdom together with the rapid extension of the church was responsible for this. But as an early expression of the spirit of the community as a society preparing for the advent of the Kingdom and the return of Jesus the Messiah, the communistic experiment is eloquent.

The members of the primitive community were aware of themselves as 'friends' ($\phi\lambda\omicron\tau\iota$). Paul is allowed to go ashore at Sidon to visit his friends (Acts xxvii.3). Harnack rightly refuses to see in this a reference to personal friends of the apostle, and regards it as denoting Christians in general.*

*"Mission and Expansion," op.cit.p.421.

Harnack also notes the significance of friendship in the Greek schools of philosophy, of which Aristotle is the most notable example. The intimate contact of Socrates with his pupils who were at the same time his friends is another illustration. If Luke has imbibed Greek culture, "with his classical culture" he "has permitted himself this once to use the classical designation" of the church fellowship,* and this once only.

Yet the designation is by no means unnatural when viewed from the Jewish environment in which the primitive church took its origin: Jesus calls the disciples his friends (Lk.xii.4), he contrasts them as 'friends' in contrast with 'slaves' (Jn.xv. 14f.). Abraham was known as the friend of God.** In the same way the primitive church believers stood in the same relation to God as did Abraham. The friendship with God into which they had been brought so vitally by their experience of Jesus, is what is denoted, but in practice 'brethren' expressed more concretely their awareness of communal life in divine kinship as brethren with God as the Father. The spiritual kinship includes the experience of friendship with God and that is why we hear so little of the term 'friends' to describe the believers.

The primitive church was also referred to collectively as 'the believers.'*** The simple πιστός is rare, and is qualified by the object of belief, viz.'the Lord'(Acts xvi.15). The

*op.cit.p.421; cf.also J.Moffatt,"Love in the New Testament," 1929,p.47. **II Chr.xx.7,Isa.xli.8, Wisd.Sol.vii.27,Jas.ii.23.
*** πιστοί, or οἱ πιστεύοντες, οἱ πιστεύσαντες, or πιστευότες.

participial references give the content of the belief in many instances: they that heard the word believed (it), i.e. the message centring around Jesus, the coming kingdom, and forgiveness in his name; or the object of belief is the gospel as preached by someone such as Philip (Acts viii.12), the contents of the preaching being the imminent kingdom and the central place of Jesus as Messiah. Or the object of belief is that Jesus the Messiah is the Son of God (Acts viii.37), but there is some textual uncertainty about this reference.* Forgiveness of sins results to those who believe in Jesus (Acts x.43), or the belief implies a definite change of life in conversion and surrender to Christ (Acts xi.21). The believer is brought into a status of acceptance before God which the law could not effect nor bring the peace of heart which such acceptance carried with it (Acts xiii.39ff.), a theme to be developed later by Paul. Believers entered upon eternal life (Acts xiii.48).

Attempts were continually being made to enforce circumcision and Jewish status upon believers as essential (Acts xv.5), but these broke down since it was proved beyond doubt that non-Jews could become believers and experience all that believing in Christ signified (Acts xv.7, cf. x.20). It was the grace of Jesus Christ that brought salvation to believers (Acts xv.11). The believers were given to great rejoicing (Acts ii.44,46, cf.

*This verse is omitted entirely by 'Aleph' A B C 33 614 and the majority of the cursives, with Lat. (vg.) Syr. (vg. hl.) Egy. Eth.

xvi.34, I Pet.i.6,8).

The self-consciousness of the community is revealed in the description of its members as 'the believers.' The community is seen to be definitely Christ-conscious in its central loyalty and devotion to Jesus Christ. As Harnack summarizes the matter, the believers "felt that the decisive and cardinal thing in their religion was the message which had made them what they were, a message which was nothing else than the preaching of the one God, of his son Jesus Christ, and of the life to come."* We need to modify the connotation of 'life to come' to indicate the fact that this was the life of the new age to be ushered in by Jesus the Messiah.**

Another way in which the primitive community is described, and which is strongly indicative of the religious experience underlying it is that its members are οἱ σωζόμενοι (Acts ii.47). This participle is rare, but the few instances we have suggest a semi-technical term to denote a specific element in the religious experience of the church. Someone asks Jesus the question, εἰ δάτιγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; (Lk.xiii.23), where we expect σώζονται: Paul contrasts οἱ σωζόμενοι with its opposite οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι (I Cor.i.18,II Cor.ii.15). It seems forced to give

*op.cit.p.404. **We should further note that πιστις is used in what appears to be a materializing sense as if the abstract term was denoting some concrete thing: cf.Acts vi.7,xiii.8, xiv.22,xvi.5 where πιστις is used without any qualifying genitive, and seems to denote the primitive community conscious of its characteristic spirit of faith. But in the first three references, the article may have no more than a context reference, i.e.'his faith'(xiii.8),'their faith'(Acts xv.9).

a purely passive meaning to the participle, 'those who are being saved,' as if the salvation experience indicated is one of destiny alone: the middle force should also be noticed, implying initiative on the part of the believer in taking the step which was to save him from the perverse generation (Acts ii.40).* To believe is to imply the initiative of the soul in repentance and acceptance of the gospel of the kingdom. The present tense should not limit the meaning of the participle to a process of salvation: while there is no satisfactory parallel in translation as we have in οἱ ἀπολλόμενοι, 'the perishing,' the force of οἱ σωζόμενοι is probably intended to denote those who are on the way to salvation in the sense that οἱ ἀπολλόμενοι indicates those on the way to perdition. The eschatological consummation of the kingdom of God is yet in the future, but may be realized in experience any moment, and the salvation is thought of as being, by anticipation, already present.**

The religious experience implied in οἱ σωζόμενοι is the confident anticipation of being among the 'saved' in the coming crisis of the kingdom which Messiah will bring. Thus the 'saved' will pass on to the life of the new age and order. The primitive community is thus conscious of itself as the nucleus of those

*Note the passive form in Acts ii.40 of σώθητε which usually has the meaning, 'save yourselves.' **J.Weiss calls attention to the fact that such present participles as σωζόμενοι are found especially in eschatological predictions (Kommentar, ed. Meyer, on I Cor.i.18). It is better, however, to avoid regarding these 'presents' as 'timeless' in view of the strong anticipatory elements so pronounced in eschatological expectations.

who anticipate this saved condition, guaranteed for them by the presence and operation of the Spirit as the 'earnest' of what was to follow in its time.*

The believers were further aware of themselves as 'the saints.'** This mode of self-designation, however, while common in Paul's epistles, is rare in Acts, but it is not therefore necessary to infer that it was a later term due to the more developed consciousness of the church as being the Chosen People of God. The primitive believers were, in the first place, Jews, and they would not find it strange to refer to themselves in their membership of the Messianic community as 'the saints.'*** The name thus reveals that the community in its eschatological hopes was conscious of partaking in the future glory and was separate unto that Kingdom and the Messiah through whose advent the kingdom was to be realized. The Godward reference of the term, i.e. being holy or separate unto Him was not lacking in the primitive church (I Pet. i. 15f. cf. Isa. vi. 3). The ethical side of the consciousness of being the holy ones of the kingdom was also implied.**** Further, since the experience of demon-possession was due to a state of uncleanness in the sense of being in ^{the} control of an evil spirit, the very power to cast out demons was indicative of the holy nature of their calling in the Holy Spirit that operated through them.

*For the nature of the experience of salvation cf. pp. 370-380.
 cf. ἁγιοί Acts ix. 13, 32, 41, xxvi. 10. *The members of the Messianic kingdom are 'saints' (Ps. xxxiv. 9, Isa. iv. 3, Dan. vii. 18, 22, Tob. viii. 15, LXX. cf. En. xxxviii. 4, xlvi. 1. cf. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. II. p. 891. ****Cf. Lev. xi. 44, Exod. xix. 6.

Some collective terms applied to the primitive community by outside observers such as Nazarenes (Acts xxiv.5) or Galileans (Acts i.11,ii.7), while unimportant, show how the new community is connected in the eyes of the world with Jesus of Nazareth of Galilee. But the term 'Christians' (Acts xi. 26,xxvi.28,I Pet.iv.16) shows how the new movement had become centred round Jesus the Messiah whose followers were claiming exalted status and power for their Lord. If the term originated as a nickname, it proves the truth of the proverb that 'many a truth is spoken in jest,' for no fitter name could have been coined. Probably the name arose not from the believers nor from the unbelieving Jews, but from the observant pagans who were noticing how the new faith had surrounded one who was referred to by his disciples as the Christ.*

The names we have discussed are no more than indices of a self-consciousness of the primitive church which was assuming many and various expressions. The names were not consciously selected, for spontaneity was the characteristic of the new religious experience. The terms are as yet in no more than a fluid stage. There is no final terminology. The very indefiniteness and multiplication of the designations is suggestive of the formative years of the primitive church experience. The variety and informality of expression is natural at this stage and reveals the empirical character of whatever church conscious-

*cf.Harnack,op.cit.p.411.

-ness there existed.

We have already discerned the beginnings of self-consciousness in the primitive church as a group or community motivated by the Spirit and with Jesus the expected Messiah as the centre of their religious experience.* Soon we discover that the church is aware of itself as 'The Fellowship.'** Possibly we have here a semi-technical term for the new group that emerged from Pentecost,*** being "the earliest, and in some respects the most characteristic form which this self-consciousness took, is enshrined in the name 'The Fellowship,' which was given to the community from the first."**** The interests of later ecclesiastical theory were the cause of the mistranslation of τῆ διδασχῆ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῆ κοινωνίας "the apostles' teaching and fellowship" (Acts ii.42);‡ the correct rendering is, of course, "the teaching of the apostles and the Fellowship". The relation of the apostles to the community was too fluid and undefined for them to be regarded as the basis of authority for the Fellowship in so clear a sense.‡‡

*Cf. pp. 297-302. **ἡ κοινωνία, Acts ii.42. ***Thus C. Anderson Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," in "The Spirit," ed. Streeten, pp. 136f. ****C. Anderson Scott, "The Fellowship of the Spirit," op. cit. p. 69. On the other hand, Harnack does not deem the name of sufficient importance to be mentioned among the names by which the Christians were known (op. cit. pp. 399ff.), while H. J. Cadbury dismisses any such suggestion as denoting the Messianic community with a wave of the hand ("The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. V. pp. 389f.). †R. V. and A. V. (the latter reads 'doctrine' for the more simple 'teaching') and cf. C. F. Nolloth, op. cit. pp. 427f., for the view of the church implied by the mistranslation. ††Cf. pp. 166f. and second footnote on p. 166. Cf. Appendix V. pp. 522f.

The experiential origins of The Fellowship go back to the circle of friends formed by Jesus and his disciples; such a circle constituted a 'Chabûrah,'* an Aramaic term "in current use to describe a group of companions or partners, sharers in a common life."** The unifying bond was usually religious.*** They observed together the weekly meal which afforded the opportunity for the celebration of Kiddûsh, and the last supper was the Kiddûsh for the forthcoming Passover.**** It was during the observance of the Kiddûsh for Pentecost that the Spirit fell upon the believers; the 'Chabûrah' was still in being, Jesus and his friends. If this theory be justified then the 'Chabûrah' meets us under its Greek name ἡ κοινωρία.

Whether the name κοινωρία was used to denote the community or not, is secondary. What is more significant is the mutual religious experience centred in loyalty to Christ which worked out vitally in fellowship, as the corporate expression of the spiritual attitude of the believers towards one another as 'brethren'. We come across the corporate word 'brotherhood' only once (I Pet.ii.17);‡ but there was no need for the term since 'Fellowship' expressed this idea with the added notion of the corporate attitude to Jesus. 'The Fellowship' stood for

*From 'Chāber,' a 'comrade', 'companion', or 'friend': cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy," 1925, pp.167, 172. **C. Anderson Scott, "Christianity according to St. Paul," 1927, p.160. ***Oesterley, *ibid.* p.167, "there was a distinctly religious atmosphere about these gatherings; religious topics were of paramount interest to the Jews, hence the subjects of conversation on these occasions were of a religious character." ****Cf. pp.184, 444-448 ‡ τὴν ἀδελφότητα.

the community of spirit of those who were aware of being fellow-heirs of salvation, and who rejoiced together and praised God together, who found themselves caught up into a higher spirit of unity on a common basis of love whereon "all human relations were transfigured, raised to a new power of dignity and sweetness."* They were aware of their oneness in fellowship as they waited for the return of their Lord. The 'communism' was the spontaneous expression of the power and spirit of the fellowship** Their sense of 'togetherness' was very real.***

We have seen that the community was in complete control of the Spirit. All its activities, abnormal or normal, all its ecstasy, healings, visions, trances, dreams, physical marvels, its preaching, its courage, its guidance, its prayer, its faith, etc. were symptoms that the Spirit was in control of the inspired community. The community was thus the 'Fellowship of the Spirit, ruled by the Spirit, shot through and through with the Spirit's presence and power. The recognition of this experiential factor decides for the interpretation of the phrases in which Paul at a later stage summed up the community as "The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit" (II Cor. xiii. 13),**** "a Fellowship of the Spirit" (Phil. ii. 1).# The community is the Fellowship called into being and inspired by the Spirit. The famous dictum of Lietzmann that no dexterity in exegesis is able

*J.V. Bartlet, "The Apostolic Age," op.cit. p. 464. **Cf. pp. 316f.
 ***Cf. συνοθυσάδεν Acts i. 14, ii. 46, iv. 24, v. 12, xv. 25, and ἐπι τὸ αὐτὸ Acts ii. 1; cf. the καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία of Acts iv. 32.
 **** ἡ κοινωμία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. † τῆς κοινωμίας τοῦ Πνεύματος.

to afford certainty as to the exact meaning of ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγ. Πν. ,* lends colour to Menzies' alternative meanings for the phrase as "the participation in the Holy Spirit coming from God or from Christ, which all believers have...or the fellowship with one another into which the Spirit brings them, or the intercourse with the Holy Spirit which all Christians enjoy."** The second of these alternatives is the one that best fits the experiential facts of the Fellowship, added to which is the awareness that the Spirit is the animating power behind that fellowship, uniting them into a oneness, the very existence of which is yet one more evidence that the Spirit is in control of the community.

Paul takes his start from the primitive church as the Fellowship of the Spirit and draws out the implications in the light of his own experiential discoveries. The community is a fellowship of Christ, i.e.the Fellowship belonging to, and named after Christ,*** but implying further an awareness of being in fellowship with Christ as in the case of the Spirit (ICor i.9). Paul joins κοινωνία with his favourite metaphor for the church, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and speaks of the Fellowship of the Body of Christ (I Cor.x.16), or a Fellowship of the Blood of Christ (ibid.). We are not concerned here with the sacramentarian controversies that have gathered around this famous passage;

*Handbuch zum N.T./1907 ad loc. **op.cit.p.107. ***"The Fellowship of the Spirit," p.71.(C.Anderson Scott).

at all events the original fellowship experience is at the very centre of the religious experience implied in the *κοινωνία* of the Body or the Blood of Christ, for the very communion or participation assumes the existence of a common fellowship both with Christ and among the members attached by their mutual loyalty and devotion to Christ.

The community as the Fellowship of Christ was, of course, no new discovery of Paul, for the primitive church was intensely Christ-conscious and Christocentric. The reference on the part of the believers to their community as 'the disciples,' with the central place of the Christ whose disciples they all were, the awareness of the Messianic community as being prepared for the return of Christ in the kingdom, are indications of the strong Christ consciousness of the community.

We turn to consider the self-consciousness of the community as expressed by the name which was to prevail over all other designations, viz. 'Ecclesia.' Harnack regards the use of this word to describe the new community as "a masterly stroke."* It was already an accepted name by the time Paul began to write his epistles. 'Ecclesia' denotes the local church (I Cor. i. 2); in the plural 'ecclesiae' it refers to the church or churches of a district or region (Gal. i. 2, 22. I Cor. xvi. 19, II Cor. viii. 1); it may signify the actual congregation assembled in worship (I Cor. xiv. 19, 23); it may denote the church

**op. cit.* p. 407.

as a whole (I Cor.x.32,xii.28,Eph.i.22,iii.10,21 etc.).[▲]

The term must have been in use prior to Paul, who refers to his former persecution of the ecclesia (Gal.i.13,I Cor.xv.9). The term is found in Acts (v.11,viii.1,3,etc.), and save for one possible exception,*the reference is to the local church. In view of the motive of Luke in setting forward the universal significance of the church, it is noteworthy that he has not reached thus far with the word 'ecclesia,' which has to await Paul's thinking before it is given its universal and cosmic content.** We are however in the atmosphere of the empirical in religious life, where men are in the presence of the extraordinary and not knowing exactly what to do with it, or think about it. The Gentiles were not admitted until after a long struggle. The propagating power of the new experience resulted in an ecclesia here, and an ecclesia there, and there was no time as yet for thinking out the implications, such as these were, still less to reach out to the unifying principle of the universal church of which the local churches were the visible expression. Even the exalted theorizing about the church reflected in the Pauline Epistles is more probably the thinking of the apostle himself than the prevailing opinion of the churches to whom he writes.

At the same time there was an experiential unity among

*Acts ix.31, 'the church throughout the whole of Judaea and Galilee and Samaria;' even here there is localizing to two or three provinces; moreover, in the Old Latin MSS reads the plural 'churches' along with the majority of later MSS, and thus there is uncertainty as to the text. **cf.pp.37-39.

the ecclesiai as they multiplied in the message of the preachers scattered abroad. This unity was the experience of a common life and witness based on devotion to Jesus Christ and centred in the expectation of his advent with the divine kingdom. It was the dynamic inherent in the gospel message which caused the ecclesiai to come into being, and it was only after a long process that the conception of the church for the whole world, the church idea, the 'ding an sich' came to the forefront of the church consciousness. The ardent expectation that Messiah would return at any moment and bring the new order together with the limitation in the church consciousness that the gospel was for Israel and the Jews only, were effective hindrances to any apprehension of the church in ideal, or as inclusive of all men irrespective of nation, race or status.

What specific religious experience was covered by this term 'ecclesia?' There was the designation already discussed, viz. 'The Fellowship,' and why did not this term suffice? Evidently 'ecclesia' expressed religious elements which 'koinonia' did not. The latter did not cover the experiential connection with and relationship to the People of God as seen in Israel; the former title brought this into the forefront of the church consciousness.

The Septuagint usually renders the Hebrew 'qāhāl' (קָהָל) by ἐκκλησία. The general meaning of qāhāl is 'assembly, convocation, or congregation.' The remnant of Israel are to be gathered together, and as a great company they will return (Jer. xxxi. 8). But there are more specialized uses which group themselves together.

First, the qāhāl was the assembly especially convened or conceived in thought. The dying Jacob warns against the doings of Simeon and Levi; the rest of his sons are not to enter their assembly (Gen.xlix.6). The assembly may be convoked that wickedness may be openly exposed (Prov.xxvi.26). Or the qāhāl may be a gathering for war; Moab is affrighted at the assembly of Israel that was marching against them (Num.xxii.4,cf.Jdg.xx.2,xxi.5, 8, I Sam.xvii.47,Ezek.xvi.40,etc.), or again, there is the massed assembly of the nations united for the attack on Babylon which would result in the liberation of the exiles of Israel (Jer.1.9,cf.Ezek.xxxviii.4). The qāhāl again may be the company of exiles returning to their native land (Jer.xxxi.8,cf.Ezra ii.64=Neh.vii.66). The convocation of Israel may come together to hear the word of the Lord at Horeb (Deut.v.19,ix.10,xviii.16), or to decide what is to be done to Jeremiah for prophesying disaster and exile (Jer.xxvi.17), or to supplicate the Lord in the presence of danger (II Chr.xx.5), to make a great sacrifice (II Chr.xxx.25), to listen to the plan of Nehemiah's reforms and to confirm what he proposed (Neh.v.13), to hold a special fast (Joel ii.16), or to praise the Lord for His goodness (Ps.cvii.32).

Second, the qāhāl is the specifically organized community, self-conscious as the assembly of the Lord (Num.xvi.3,cf.xx.4). These two references are from P, the symbol of the priestly rewriting of the nation's traditions, and thus express a later stage in Israel's self-consciousness. The prophets have mediated this high conception, for Micah speaks of the congregation of the Lord (qāhāl) (Micah ii.5). We hear of 'Israel, the congregation (qāhāl) of the Lord (I Chr.xxviii.8); the qāhāl is an organized people into which one may enter or from which one may be excommunicated (Deut.xxiii.2-4,9); no Ammonite or Moabite is allowed membership within the community (qāhāl) of Israel (Neh. xiii.1, cf.Lam.i.10). The conception of Israel as an organized theocracy is seen in an intensified form where qāhāl is used along with 'ēdhāh' (אָדָה) to denote "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel" (Exod.xii.6, Num. xiv.5). The restored community after the exile is referred to as the qāhāl in Jerusalem (Ezra x.12,14,Neh. viii.2,17).

The use of qāhāl thus reveals the presence of an assembly or congregation of the people of Israel gathered together in the name of the Lord. More specifically we view a people corporately aware of its status as the chosen people of Yahweh, suitably organized on its ritual side in the community's approach to God in temple,

priests, sacrifices, etc. On the Godward side, in the approach of Yahweh to His community we have the seer, the prophet and the wise man revealing the will of God to the people. The soul of the people expressed itself in psalm and praise and worship; there was the observance of the precepts and statutes of the law. We are in the presence of an organized theocratic community, the basis of which was the original covenant relationship wherein Yahweh became the people's God and Israel the chosen people of Yahweh. The qāhāl was the unit before God; in virtue of the individual's membership of the qāhāl he had the right to approach God (cf.pp.117f.).

The Septuagint carries forward these ideas into the word ἐκκλησία. Israel is gathered in assembly for some purpose, the idea of being 'called' or 'summoned' under divine authority to express the divine will for the community. It is doubtful whether the ideal unity of Israel as being before God, though not necessarily assembled, is indicated by ἐκκλησία or its Hebrew equivalent,* for as F.J.A.Hort points out, there is another term, 'ēdhāh, which "is properly, when applied to Israel, the society itself, formed by the children of Israel or their representative heads, whether assembled or not assembled."**

'Ēdhāh (עדת) signifies a company assembled by appointment, or acting in a concerted manner as a body (cf. Brown, Driver and Briggs, "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament," 1907, p.417, col.1); e.g. two hundred and fifty representatives of the assembly come together to remonstrate with Moses (Num.xvi.2). Moses speaks unto the 'ēdhāh of Israel specifically assembled for the purpose that he may address the people (Exod.xii.3). The usage indicated is found many times.

The more special usages of the word are (1) to denote certain companies as e.g. the congregation of Ēl, a

*As R.Sohm thinks ("Kirchenrecht, 1892, p.16, quoted by A.J. Mason in "The Early History of the Church and the Ministry," 1918, p.6.

**"The Christian Ecclesia," 1914, p.4.

company of angels (Ps.lxxxii.1), the congregation of peoples (Ps.vii.7), of the righteous (Ps.i.5). Job refers to his devastated circle of dependents as 'my company' (יָקָרָאֲדָבָרֶיךָ xvi.7). The company may be evil, a congregation of evil-doers (Ps.xxii.16), a company under some leader such as the congregation of Korah (Num.xxvi.9,xxvii.3,cf.xvi.5f. 11,16) or the company of Abiram (Ps.cvi.17). (2) 'Ēdhāh is used of the gathering of animals (Ps.lxviii.30(31), or of a swarm of bees (Jdg.xiv.8). (3) Elsewhere 'ēdhāh is used of Israel, as the whole gathering of the people (Hos.vii.12); of the whole congregation gathered in the presence of Solomon before the ark (I Kgs.viii.5=II Chr.v.6), the assembly at Shechem which elected Jeroboam as king of Israel (I Kgs.xii.20), the congregation in its more ideal unity to which Jeremiah speaks (vi.18), the congregation of the restored community (Jer.xxx.20,cf.Ps.lxxiv.2), the technical sense of the community of the Exodus, and the congregation of Israel identified with this community as such, especially as the congregation of Yahweh (Num.xxvii.17,xxxii.16,Josh.xxii.16f.); or as the congregation of Israel (Exod.xii.3,6,Lev.iv.13,Num.xvi.9,xxxii.4,Josh.xxii.18,20); or referred to as the congregation of the children of Israel (Exod.xvi.1f.9f. Lev.xvi.5,xix.2,Num.i.2,53,etc.); or the congregation without qualifying description (Lev.viii.4,etc.). It was an organized congregation with princes (Exod.xvi.22,Num.iv.34,xvi.2,Josh.ix.15,18), or with elders (Lev.iv.15).

The emphasis in 'ēdhāh is one of appointing, as its connection with the verb יָקָרָא shows, especially in its Niphal form with its reflexive use of meeting at an appointed place such as Yahweh meeting Moses at the Tent of 'Meeting' (Exod.xxix.42f.xxx.36); or at the throne of the Kappōreth (Exod.xxv.22,xxx.6); or in the sense of meeting by appointment (Amos iii.3,Job. ii.11); or again, to gather, to assemble together by appointment, as kings do for a campaign (Josh.xi.5,Ps.xlviii.5); or of the appointed gathering of the congregation unto Moses by the express appointment of Jehovah (Num.x.4); or to the door of the Tent of Meeting (Num.x.3), or unto Solomon (I Kgs.viii.5=II Chr.v.6). This short analysis helps to bear out Hort's conclusion that 'ēdhāh is "derived from a root y'dh used in the Niphal in the sense of gathering together, especially gathering together by appointment or agreement" (op.cit.p.4).

The Septuagint renders this word as it does qāhāl in the earlier books of the Pentateuch, by συναγωγά. 'Ēdhāh is very rare in the later Old Testament literature, as is noticeable in

in the references we have discussed; it is absent from the Books of Chronicles except in one extract from the Books of Kings; it occurs for the congregation of Israel no more than two or three times in the prophets and the psalms. The same paucity of reference is observed in prophets and psalms for qāhāl, but in the late books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles the references are numerous.

It would seem therefore that qāhāl came to be the usual word to denote the congregation of Israel in the later period of Israel's history, leading up to the Christian era. While 'ēdhāh takes on the shade of meaning ^{of} ~~in~~ the congregation assembling by appointment, qāhāl has the more precise connotation of assembling by 'calling' or 'summoning.' This hint would help on the use of ἐκκλησία to translate qāhāl, since the Greek word stood in secular usage for the calling forth or summoning the Greek citizens by means of the herald's trumpet to the assembly of the city.* This aspect needs to be stressed to avoid reading into the Christian use of ecclesia the notion that the word "means a people or number of individual men 'called out' of the world or mankind."** Such an idea may have been characteristic of the church of the apostolic age or even later still, but the idea is foreign to the self-consciousness of the primitive church. The sense of being

*Cf. Num. x. 2-6 for the summoning of the assembly of Israel by similar means. **Hort, op. cit. p. 5, and cf. Cadbury in "The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. V. p. 387, n. 7.

'called out' to form a New Israel could hardly have arisen until it became apparent that the old Israel finally rejected the call of Christ.* Not yet did the disciples feel themselves called out from an apostate Israel to form a new Israel. They were too concerned with announcing the imminent kingdom to their nation, hoping to win Israel away from its rejection of Jesus.**

In adopting the name 'ecclesia' or its Aramaic equivalent, the primitive community showed its self-consciousness as being vitally connected with and belonging to the earlier Ecclesia of Israel, the Chosen People. It was aware of its social solidarity with the People of God; in its communal life and witness it showed itself in its wholeness to be within the larger unit of Israel which it was seeking to win for the coming salvation. The believers were not aware of themselves as being apart from their fellow-Jews nor standing apart as a distinct unity over against Judaism. They worshipped in the Temple, or if away from Jerusalem pursued their customary worship at the synagogue,***
~~1895~~ She Law, observed the feasts, hallowed the Sabbaths, and in all worshipped the same God of Israel, and in fact were typical Jews of their day.****

One factor, however, placed the members of the Ecclesia on a different basis from the rest of the Jewish theocracy, a division which was to be the ultimate cause of the detachment

*Paul certainly felt this possibility of rejection, but it does not seem to have been present to the Palestinian church. **Cf. pp. 299f. ***Cf. Oesterley, op. cit. pp. 95f. ****Cf. p. 84.

of the church from Israel. For the Ecclesia the centre of faith and salvation was Jesus whom many disciples had known in the days of his flesh, whom the Jews had caused to be crucified, who had appeared after death in resurrection, and now in exaltation was soon to descend with the Messianic Kingdom. Israel as a whole, in the person of its leaders, looked on Jesus of Nazareth as a crucified pretender, and by the very action of putting him to death disowned any claim he had to Messiahship.* The Ecclesia was the community within Israel which accepted the salvation promised by Jesus and therefore was aware of itself as the Messianic community.

It is to misinterpret the facts, however, to infer that the primitive church was aware of itself as the New Israel, for there was no sense of separateness over against the old apostate nation. The essential thing about the Ecclesia was its sense of belonging to Israel, with its mission to Israel, but with no thought of being apart from Israel. The weakness of the 'New Israel' theory is that it fails to allow to the full the sense of oneness with Israel which the primitive church possessed. The primitive church experience continues the older religion of Israel in its truer form. Jesus did not criticize the scribes and Pharisees because they were Jews, but

*"The one great outstanding difference between the apostles and the other Jews is that the former believe that the Messiah had already come and had won forgiveness for His people by His death on the cross" (H. F. Hamilton, "The People of God," op. cit. Vol. II. p. 24). **As developed by Harnack, op. cit. pp. 240f. and Hamilton, op. cit. pp. 24-39.

for their failure to live up to what they knew was the best in their faith and religious experience. The disciples likewise did not condemn Israel, nor did they detract from the prized privilege of solidarity within the ancient People of God. What they were concerned with in the light of their religious experience as a community of the Spirit was that Israel was not living up to what it knew to be the highest and the best, that the nation was in need of redemption.* The disciples directed their message of Jesus to this end, viz. to make Israel what they felt it ought to become in the purpose of God as Jesus had revealed it.

The aim of Jesus was to win Israel to redemption in view of the imminent kingdom of God (Mk.i.15). He used every opportunity of reiterating his gospel of salvation in the synagogues (Mk.vi.1-6). This was the motive behind his desire to preach in the villages and towns of Galilee (Mk.i.38f.); his wonderful works, especially in casting out demons, were signs that the great deliverance was at hand. In his words, especially as illustrated from the religious conceptions in the parables, Jesus sought to awaken Israel from its narrowly nationalistic conceptions of God, and in so doing, to liberate its faith for the world, and equip the Jews for their God-intended mission to the Gentiles.** The vivid sense of crisis accentuated by the

*The prophets had indicated again and again the faithlessness of Israel to its true ideals: cf. the rebukes of Amos (iv.4ff.v.1ff) the pleading of Hosea (ii.10ff.vi.1ff.), the denunciations of Isaiah (i.2ff.), the despair of Jeremiah (xliv.1ff.). **Cf.pp. 151-4, 155-8.

words of Jesus indicated urgency in the matter. Would Israel use its opportunity in the advent of the kingdom with hatred to the Gentiles,* or would it follow the nobler universalism of Jeremiah, Deutero-Isaiah and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?*** Jesus goes much further than these noble visionaries of redemption through Israel in that he sought to free his people from secondary matters such as circumcision and the ritual matters which were placed on a level with the weightier matters of the law.

But only an Israel redeemed could be a "light to lighten the Gentiles." Jesus sought to convert his nation to a higher acceptance of the will of God for the people. In the light of this consideration we are able to approach the apparently insoluble problem of the so-called particularistic and universalistic passages in the Gospel of Matthew. The former are illustrated by the words of Jesus "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"(xv.24), or the instruction of Jesus to the disciples, "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans"(x.5), or again in words which this gospel places in the mouth of Jesus, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come,"(x.23), thus implying the restriction of the mission to Israel. On the other hand there are sayings of a world-embracing character, such as, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the

*As in Jubilees, cf.p.97.

**Cf.p.97.

world for a witness to all the Gentiles"(xxiv.14), the freedom from Jewish legality implied in the discussion on the Sabbath, especially in the added words, "If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless"(xii.7), and in the closing charge to the disciples, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations (Gentiles)"(xxviii.19).

The solution to these inconsistent presentations does not lie along the lines of a Judaistic recension,* nor in the personal idiosyncrasies of the author rather than in the literary strata of the gospel,** but ~~rather~~ in the sensitive religious insight of a writer, or the tradition he has carefully preserved, who had discerned that before Israel could be worthy of redeeming the Gentiles, it must itself be redeemed. Therefore the appeal is first to Israel, and the duty of the disciples is to preach the gospel to their nation at the outset. The wider field of conquest awaited them, but Israel must first be won for its mission.

Thus in the spirit of Jesus the primitive church, aware that like their Master it was one with Israel, sought to awaken the nation to its opportunity in the kingdom of God. But not at once did the disciples realize the wider universal implications: ^{or for} such apprehension of the place of Gentiles in the community

*As Schmiedel thinks, Enc.Bi.Vol.II.cols.1842f.1870. **James Moffatt, "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament," op.cit.p.255.

as there may have been took the form of salvation through Israel, i.e. through submission to Israel in circumcision.

It is in the light of the ideas of redemption through an Israel redeemed that we have to view the two passages in the First Gospel where Jesus is represented as using the word 'ecclesia', or its Aramaic equivalent. The one reference is no more than a hint of Jewish procedure in respect of offenders, who may be excommunicated from the congregation of Yahweh (xviii. 17, Deut. xxiii. 2-4, 9), and to refer this to the Christian church is to read back into the gospel tradition the practice of later ecclesiastical theory.* But ecclesia occurs in the Matthaean story of the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, following which Jesus commends the disciple and says "on this rock will I build my ecclesia." (xvi. 16). Since Jesus probably spoke Aramaic and we do not know what the Aramaic equivalent was for ecclesia, or if we may infer it, we do not know its linguistic history and meaning, we do not know what Jesus actually said. Yet Hort's suggestion cannot be very far from the mark, that, if we substitute 'Israel' for 'ecclesia' here, and read "on this rock will I build my Israel," we have an approximate impression of what the sentence probably indicated to the listening disciples.**

It is sometimes assumed that at the point Jesus broke off from Judaism and authorized his own ecclesia or Israel. A.H. McNeile stresses the point that Jesus "had just ended His public

*It may be an instance of later church theory fastening itself on the tradition. **op.cit.pp.10f.

ministry in Galilee, had taken the disciples a long journey alone, and was about to go to Jerusalem with the avowed intention of being killed; no moment was more suitable for preparing His followers to become a new body, isolated both from the masses and from the civil and religious authorities."* Such a judgment, however, assumes a breach between Israel and the primitive church which was absent from the self-consciousness of the church, and this would be all the more remarkable if the disciples had received such an idea from Jesus. Why did the primitive church only slowly awaken to its world-wide mission as a new and distinct organization if this direct setting up of a community distinct from Israel by Jesus were the historical and empirical nature of the case? If Jesus had intended to set up a new and distinct community in the 'my Israel' it is remarkable that the primitive church knew nothing of it. This difficulty lends force to the suggestion that even in this passage we have the reading back of later church theory, especially with its heightening of Peter's authority. It is true, as Goguel reminds us, that "the text of Matthew is certainly secondary to that of Mark."**

At the same time, the reference to 'my Israel' may be looked ^{at}

*op.cit.pp.241f. The definite break between Jesus and Judaism is sometimes placed earlier still. Cf.F.C.Burkitt, who deduces from Mk.iii.6, "from that moment begins the separate existence of the embryo Church" ("The Gospel History and Its Transmission," 2nd.Edn. 1907, pp.80f.). A.C.Headlam goes further than this and regards the incident in the synagogue as "the beginning of the organization of the Christian Church" (op.cit.p.200). But the church did not in point of history and experience actually exist as yet, still less can we speak of its organization beginning.

** "The life of Jesus," Eng.Tr. 1933, p.379.

from the angle of Jesus' mission to redeem Israel, ^{as implying} that Israel might rise to its call to redeem the world for the kingdom of God. Jesus had made his decision to go to Jerusalem. He had opened his attack first in Galilee, but his efforts were not succeeding because of the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees whose prestige centred in the holy city. He decided to go to the central shrine of Israel's faith and there challenge the whole nation in the persons of its accredited dignitaries and representatives. Would they respond to the call? He foresaw trouble and suffering, but the challenge of his own death might prove just the very thing needed to arouse the nation. But already he had gathered closer around himself some disciples on whom, after his death, the mission for winning Israel to its true faith, must devolve. These men must be his emissaries to Israel. Reinforced by his resurrection they would go on with the mission he had begun and which he was to entrust to them. In this way 'my Israel' was **to be achieved**, i.e. Israel redeemed and entered upon its mission of redemption for the world of the Gentiles. Through Peter and the disciples the true Israel would come to its birth. Not any distinct entity from the nation, but Israel itself, redeemed and won for the highest purposes of the imminent divine kingdom, is the 'my Israel,' or 'my ecclesia' in the mind of Jesus.

This company of disciples was all-important for the future redemption of Israel. Only in a very limited sense were they a

trained and prepared company. They did not understand why Jesus should die, and yet no one knew more than did Jesus that the shock and penetrating influence of his death was necessary for his disciples, and through them, for the hope of Israel's salvation.* Jesus saw that some central change, some inward re-alignment, only to be brought about by his death, was needed before his disciples would really understand the significance of Israel's salvation. Almost all he could do for them at this stage was to prepare them, even without ^{their being} ~~them~~ consciously aware of the preparation,** so that they should not miss the redemptive significance of his mission. When the crisis of crucifixion came and along with this what the disciples remembered of his character and spirit, it would bring its own light on the practical problems that would arise as they went forth with their mission to Israel. Had Jesus forecast these later problems for them confusion would have been overwhelmingly added to minds already confused by his references to his own death. Therefore Jesus had to leave so much to subsequent initiative and discovery. That he did so shows his own confidence in the effectiveness of the salvation which he was bringing through them to the world of men. As events turned out the new community arose from these eyewitnesses, ^{as did also} ~~and~~ the work of summoning Israel to repentance in view of the imminent redemption in the Kingdom. In this sense Peter and his colleagues may be viewed as experientially founding the ecclesia. At a later stage it came to be seen that Israel

*cf.pp.182-7.

**cf.pp.191-3.

was persistently apostate from the salvation offered it, and through it, to the world, by Jesus and through him, by the community that arose on the basis of his influence. The ecclesia then began to pursue its own distinctive course, and in the course of time Israel came to be sundered from the Church of Christ; the former continued in its own way; the latter went forward to be the light unto the Gentiles.

But this development was not found in the primitive church which was a community within Israel appealing specifically to the nation to repent and accept the salvation that centred in the personality of the exalted Jesus. Only dimly was any duty of appealing to the Gentiles perceived.

By contrast with the synagogue, which was the normal local centre for worship for the Jews, and therefore was a passive element in Israel's cultus, and indeed ^{in that of} ~~for~~ the primitive church, the ecclesia was the growing community prepared for the coming kingdom. While the name marked the sense of continuity with Israel, it indicated a self-consciousness as the nucleus of the divine kingdom, entrusted with the salvation which was to redeem Israel. This gave the believers a distinctiveness among themselves; they organized their own life, and began to frame their own teaching; ^{they engaged in} specific acts such as the 'breaking of bread' and worked out their ideas accordingly. They proved to be their own executive under the guidance of the Spirit. The ecclesia appointed special officers to deal with the daily ministrations;*

*Acts vi.5.

another ecclesia in Antioch set apart Barnabas and Saul for the mission to the Gentiles (Acts xiii.1-3). Each ecclesia planned its life accordingly and was led by the Spirit to make its decisions. Representatives were sent from Jerusalem to confirm what was being done (Acts viii.14-17); these were not always apostles, for Barnabas was sent to Antioch (Acts xi.22-24). The local church did not always treat authoritatively what the emissaries from Jerusalem laid down; in fact it was not afraid of standing out in opposition and going on its own way (Acts xv.1f.). With the advance of the Gentile mission Jerusalem's authority for the ecclesiae diminishes into a mere respectful concern for the mother church in her need during times of famine (Acts xi.29f).

The ecclesia began to show its distinctiveness not only in that it accepted Jesus Christ while the nation as a whole rejected him, but in that its members were obviously following a way of life which was not quite the same as the Jewish way. Indeed, the new community came to be known at a fairly early date as 'The Way.'* Strack-Billerbeck make the suggestion that the Rabbinic 'derek' (דֶּרֶךְ) is often used to denote 'customs,'** and in this title we have a reference to the primitive church following a series of customs, practices, or ways, resulting in a manner of life so as to call attention to it as 'The Way.'

The primitive church seems therefore to have had a way of

*¹ 1866, Acts ix.2, xix.9, 23, xxii.4, xxiv.14, 22, to which we should add two references which have defining genitives, τοῦ Κεφίου xviii.25, τοῦ Θεοῦ, xviii.26. **op.cit.II.p.690.

life which demonstrated its practical side in the life and character of the believers.* It may have included what was embraced in 'continuing instant in the apostles' teaching' (Acts ii.42), the 'way' being rooted in what the eyewitnesses had seen and heard in their personal contact with Jesus. But we must not assume this teaching to be a definite corpus of doctrine.** Much time was needed before any teaching of a very definite nature was forthcoming. The variant words of the Lord's Prayer (Mt.vi. 9-13, Lk.xi.2-4), the divergencies in the setting and words of the Last Supper,*** the fluidity of the teaching such as is indicated by the differing recensions of the Beatitudes (Mt.v.1-12, Lk.vi.29-33), and the teaching in the Sermon on the Mount generally, reveal the absence of anything like fixity or even definiteness in the teaching, still less was there what we should designate as systematic teaching or doctrine.

We are in the presence of religious experience with its eager spontaneous faith and expectation centred in Christ, and the semi-vagueness in teaching is due to the very nature of the new movement in its untried, unformulated condition of new life uprushing,

The image of life as a Way is indeed worldwide (cf. the Tao in the Taoism of China which signifies way, or the 'Methodist' which points to a way)...But it was especially dear to both the earlier and later Judaism; appears in the Gospels; and was evidently a favourite title for their new life among the early Jewish Christians" (J.V. Bartlet, op.cit. p.251). **It is a wellknown fact that towards the close of the first century candidates for baptism were systematically catechised in the general outlines of Christian faith and moral problems, but it should not be supposed that such precision was in force in the primitive church. The method was one of trial and error for many years. *Mk.xiv.22-25, Mt.xxvi. 28-29, Lk.xxii.14-20; cf. I Cor.xi.23-26 and pp. 426-428.

which had not yet given way to the more reflective mood needed for precise formulation and stereotyped teaching.

This general consideration makes it almost impossible to accept the Epistle of James and the Didache as authorities for the conditions of the new 'Way' that was characteristic of the primitive church. With regard to the epistle, we have seen reason for hesitating to use it for giving light on the earliest period of the church.* With regard to the Didache, it may be argued that the apostles drew up some formal catechism which may be the original source of the 'Two Ways' section (i-vi), a catechism which became the standard of the church and left its influence on the New Testament.** There may well be elements which reflect the primitive church experience,*** but it is probably that the apostles' teaching would have a more direct character as befitting their personal contact with Jesus, and personal remembrance of his way and words, in which not only the apostles, but many others, were sharers from personal experience.

There was teaching based on all the recollections that came forward from time to time, as the words and commands of Jesus were transmitted. Moral instruction was already given in the

*Cf. p. 53. Despite the weighty analysis of Bartlet (op.cit. pp. 233-50), and the suggestive discussion of G.H. Rendall (op.cit. pp. 41-95), the later atmosphere of the Apostolic Age, with its more formal and less direct character, cannot be gainsaid.

Cf. p. 67. The Jewish tone of the 'Two-Ways' document is accounted for equally from Jewish religious experience as by reference to Judaeo-Christian experience. *As in the eucharistic prayers, cf. pp. 447f.

synagogues, and the new converts would not cease attendance there, albeit, what they learned there would receive a new interpretation in the light of what they were learning about Jesus through the apostles' teaching. The primitive church instruction centred around Jesus as the eyewitnesses shared their impressions and contacts with the converts; Jesus' death would be taught as necessary by reference to scripture and to his own words about his suffering. The resurrection experiences would be carefully passed on, together with what was meant in the coming of the Spirit as related to the kingdom of God. The maxims of Jesus such as we have in the Sermon on the Mount, and especially in the parables, ~~especially~~ ^{particularly} as these had reference to the imminent crisis, were taught, although here we have to reckon with the experiential limitations of the apostolic teachers who could only reveal the inner meanings of what Jesus said as these came to be apprehended. Sometimes the wrong constructions were placed on his words,* or misleading interpretations given of parables.**

Here we begin to touch the experiential basis of the gospel tradition which grew into the Synoptic gospels.*** Some of the recollections of the words of Jesus came at last to be embodied in Q, a hypothetical corpus of sayings generally admitted to be older than Mark's gospel.**** Q probably represents the sort of

*As in the reason for speaking in parables (Mk.iv.12), cf. pp. 149f.
 **of the interpretation of the Parable of the Tares (Mt.xiii.37-43).
 Cf. pp. 8-10. *Cf. pp. 15-17.

teaching that was being given with regard to the way of Jesus. A process had begun out of the necessities of the new experience, of gathering up the sayings of Jesus as these came back to the memory and were confirmed by the evidence of other eyewitnesses. These sayings were grouped in some convenient manner enabling them to be easily remembered by the converts, and in Q we have specimens of the sort of teaching that was in use.

Thus the contents of Q help us to discern something of the nature of the 'Way', as the teaching impressed its significant characteristics on the mind and life of the believers.* The Way is a condition of blessing resulting from the exhibition of personal characteristics such as being poor, or mourning, or hungry, or enduring reproach for Christ's sake; these passed easily into the more specific spiritual meaning as poor in spirit, hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc.** The Beatitudes reveal the personal characteristics expected in those about to inherit the coming kingdom. The spirit of the 'Golden Rule',^{***} love for others to include even the hostile,^{****} counsels as to charitable impressions of others[†], the importance of recognizing that the quality of life was shown by its fruits,[‡] all pointed to the distinctive qualification for being saved to the divine kingdom, viz. the doing of the will of the Father.‡‡ Labourers are

*The following discussion on the contents of Q is based on Harnack's analysis and reconstruction, "The Sayings of Jesus," op. cit. pp.127-146. **Mt.v.1-4,6,11f. cf.Lk.vi.17,20-23. Matthew's spiritualizing may be the more original, for Luke's social emphasis has to be taken into account, cf.pp.313f. ***Mt.vii.12, Lk.vi.31, cf.negative form in Did.i. ****Mt.v.44-48, Lk.vi.27f. †Mt.vii.1-5, Lk.vi.37f.41f. ‡Mt.vii.16-18, xii.33, Lk.vi.43f. ‡‡Mt.vii.21,24-7, Lk.vi.46-9.

required to work for the divine vineyard, and the call to service would be a feature of the 'Way' (Mt.ix.37f.Lk.x.2); instances would be cited from Jesus' own life of the way he went about doing good (cf.Mt.vii.28,viii.5-10,13,Lk.vii.1-10). There were injunctions to be simple and bold in approaching the mercy and love of God revealed as the Father (Mt.vii.7-11,Lk.xi.9-13), with illustration of the spirit in which believers were to pray (Mt.vi.9-13,Lk.xi.2-4). The believer's life was to be like as the lamp that illuminated the house at night-time, but the lamp must burn true, i.e.the inner life of the believer must be single-minded and trustworthy (Mt.v.15,Lk.xi.33,Mt.vi.22f.Lk.xi.34f.).

Many references were made to the imminent crisis of judgment and the kingdom: everything was to be uncovered and brought out into the open (Mt.x.26f.Lk.xii.2f.); the believers were to be unafraid when the crisis came, for the divine care would be over them (Mt.x.28-31,Lk.xii.4-7) let them be faithful to their hope in the Messiah before men, and he would acknowledge them in the great day before the Father (Mt.x.32,Lk.xii.8). Believers are not to be led astray by false Messianic claimants, for when Jesus came there would be no doubt about him (Mt.xxiv.26-28,Lk.xvii.23f) and his advent would be too sudden to admit of doubt (cf.also Mt.xxiv.37-41,Lk.xvii.26f.34f.), therefore the converts were taught the duty of watchfulness for the kingdom daily awaited (Mt.xxiv.43-51,Lk.xii.39f.42-46). Parables had their place in the teaching (Mt.xiii.31-33,Lk.xiii.18-21, cf.Mt.xi.16-19,Lk.vii.31-

35). The believers learned that the family of the kingdom had paramount claims which superseded even those of the ordinary family life (Mt.x.37,Lk.xiv.26,Mt.x.34-36,Lk.xii.51,53); they learned not to be over-anxious about temporal needs, for God was able to attend to these; their treasure was not in earthly goods, but in the riches of the coming kingdom of heaven (Mt.vi.25-33, Lk.xii.22-31,Mt.vi.19-21,Lk.xii.33f.).*

As they were apprehending the words and life of their Master the believers received the joy and vision which came through their eyes seeing what they were taught to see, and their ears hearing what was imparted to them. Hence they knew they were seeing and hearing things which even prophets and great ones never saw and heard (Mt.xiii.16f.Lk.x.23f.), and shared in the experience of being blessed as they awaited with ardent expectation the return of the exalted Jesus (Mt.xiii.16f.Lk.x.23b.24), or were encouraged to carry their cross and follow him who had carried his before them (Mt.x.38,Lk.xiv.27), as they sought the wanderer as Jesus had done (Mt.xviii.12f.Lk.xv.4-7), or discovered that they could not serve two masters, and so declared for the loyalty to God over against the mammon worship so soon to perish (Mt.vi.24,Lk.xvi.13). They learned to count their life as nothing so that they could serve their Master, and in so doing discovered a fuller and more vital life they had not hitherto conceived to be possible for them (Mt.x.39,Lk.xvii.33); they knew that though heaven and earth

*Such sayings would receive point in the 'communism' of the church.

should pass away in the imminent consummation, their Master's words would not pass away (Mt.v.18,Lk.xvi.17). They came to understand that the divine promises to Israel were for them in their new status of being redeemed to the coming kingdom, but that many of the conventional leaders of official Judaism were running the risk of being left outside, salvation ^{being} missed at the last by their unreadiness (Mt.viii.11f.Lk.xiii.28f.).

These were some of the distinctive principles of life and outlook as seen in the ecclesia following the 'Way' of Christ. They were first taught by Jesus to his disciples, and through them were imparted to the converts who identified themselves with the community and received the apostles' teaching about the Way. The motive of the teaching was to shape the outlook of the converts after the pattern of the coming inheritance in the new order soon to be inaugurated, to conform inwardly the lives of the believers to the life and spirit of the kingdom of which the ecclesia was the embryo community.

Such an approach seems to fit the religious experience of the primitive church in its growth and expression as a new 'Way' better than the later idea which took root in the church of the Apostolic Age, viz. the idea of Christianity as a new 'law', which made Jesus a greater Moses and the legislator for the new community. Jesus' teaching was a series of binding enactments, according to such a theory, on a different scale from that of the Mosaic code, yet none the less a code, an idea encouraged by Matthew's grouping of the Sayings into a Sermon on the Mount (v-vii) given expression to also in the Epistle of James and in the Didache. Beside the direct, vivid sayings of Q or its precursors, the moralities of James or the conventional Jewish precepts of the Didache, lack life and vividness, and do not spontaneously express the vital power and spirit that was animating the new community. This difference is

the reason why in the last resort we feel little confidence in using these two documents to interpret the religious experience of the primitive church. For the religious experience is one thing, but that experience reduced to a sort of code analogous to that of Judaism is a pale shadow of the real thing. This is not to say that what we have in James and the Didache is in any way contradictory to the findings of the primitive church. But the very experience of the ecclesia rested on an intimate vital connection with Jesus through the impressions and experiences of the eyewitnesses, whose information and instruction, as we have seen, went back directly to Jesus. Over against this living, vital religious connection, the secondary and even tertiary atmosphere of the later moralistic writings stands out in sufficient contrast to afford little confidence in their authority for the primitive church.

The new religious experience was no law, but a new 'Way,' the way of citizenship in the coming divine order. It was grounded in an ethical discipline which went directly back to Jesus. As far as they had already apprehended the way marked out by Jesus, the new community endeavoured to obey the will of God, the believers conforming themselves inwardly and outwardly to what God required of them. It was this growth in ethical realities that saved the primitive community from being no more than a band of apocalyptic visionaries, and going back to its roots in Jesus, saved the new faith from vanishing as the eschatological expectations were unfulfilled. We see the central place of the spiritual and ethical emphasis in the First Epistle of Peter. Through the apocalyptic hopes to which the believers had been begotten by the resurrection of Jesus, and their expectation of the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled reserved in heaven and to be revealed in the last days, they are seen to be

as "children of obedience," forsaking the older and conforming to the holy way, loving one another as fellow-believers who have shared in the divine re-creation of their lives (i.3-5,14-16,22f). The new community is "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people of God's own possession," and they are to follow the way which would reveal "the excellencies of the one" who had called them "out of darkness into his wonderful light"(ii.9). Allowing for the influence of later ideas and development of thought upon the early facts, we are carried back to the experiential atmosphere of the primitive church where the enthusiasm for the apocalyptic consummation was controlled by a deepening moral discipline which, when the literal eschatological hopes began to fail and therefore to fade away, the believers found themselves possessing the higher righteousness they had received from Jesus. The goal came to be seen less in the external consummation and more in a life of perfect fellowship with God. And this higher way thus revealed proved able to lead the believers past the danger of disappointment at the failure of the apocalyptic hopes. Only as these faded and the time forms of apocalyptic vanished, and in so vanishing removed one of the hindrances to fuller understanding, did the ecclesia become conscious of what after all was the true spiritual and ethical revelation inherent in Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER VII

THE INFLUENCE OF APOCALYPTIC UPON THE
FAITH AND HOPE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

The primitive church was cradled within a vivid atmosphere of apocalyptic vision and expectation. We have seen how the crowds in Galilee and Jerusalem looked on Jesus as the 'herald' of the kingdom of heaven.* We have traced the apocalyptic influences in the approach of the disciples to Jesus, and how these led them to interpret much of what he did and said in an apocalyptic sense; we have seen how this very influence was responsible for the Great Misunderstanding of Jesus' suffering and death.**

The tendency to literalize Messiah and Kingdom was carried forward to the primitive community by the disciples. For the moment the death of Jesus received its interpretation within the apocalyptic scheme, being divinely foreordained that Messiah should suffer and die as the necessary prelude to his exaltation (Acts ii.23,33). The resurrection experience mediated for the disciples the assured triumph of Jesus after all the disappointment of the Cross (Lk.xxiv.19-21,Acts iv.10f).

The expectation that the divine kingdom was to be ushered in is largely responsible for the gathering of the believers in Jerusalem. They resorted to the temple not only because they

*Cf.pp.127-130.

**Cf.pp.176-188.

were pious Jews; it was from the pinnacle that they would see Messiah return.* The experience of Pentecost is interpreted in apocalyptic categories; a prophecy of Joel connects this with the 'last days'(Acts ii.17ff.); the crucified Jesus of Nazareth ^{is} ~~was~~ now seen to be the divinely appointed Messiah to return with the divine kingdom at any moment, the Spirit's outpouring being an 'earnest' of the nearness of this apocalyptic climax (Acts ii.33,39). The Messiahship of Jesus is fearlessly asserted before the authorities of Israel (Acts iv. 10-12,v.30-32). The very signs and wonders that were being reproduced in the primitive community** indicated the imminence of the new order. The 'communistic' experiment was also helped by the thought of the coming crisis.***

The apocalyptic character of the new community was even perceived by the rulers of Israel's religious life. Gamaliel advised his fellow-councillors in the light of previous experience of Messianic claimants (Acts v.34-39).

Paul ^{was} ~~is~~ doing no more than handing on primitive church eschatology when he preached the end of all things through Jesus of Nazareth who was none other than Israel's exalted and awaited Messiah (I Thess.i.10,ii.12). But the delaying of Messiah's coming had raised the question of those who had died and their place in the parousia, and Paul answered ~~the~~ anxious inquiry from current apocalyptic notions of the resurrection

*Cf.pp.219,265. **Cf.pp.240-43,247f. ***Cf.pp.316f.

of the righteous in the kingdom.* The eschatological hopes were taken so literally as to induce the wrong attitude to life, and Paul had to write a further epistle to counsel common-sense, at the same time pointing out that certain events had first to take place before Christ came.** Another writer akin to the outlook of the primitive community refers to the living hope of "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven..." (I Pet.i.3f.), an undoubted reference to the advent of the divine kingdom. A salvation was prepared, and it was to be revealed in the day of crisis (I Pet.i.4); believers were therefore to endure the testing of their faith in patience, in view of the consummation sought after by the prophets and foretold in Messiah's sufferings, that was to come in all the glories of the kingdom (I Pet. i.7,10f). The end of all things is at hand (I Pet.iv.7).

The believers in the primitive church were therefore aware of themselves as heirs of the new kingdom about to be inaugurated; they were the Spirit-possessed community prepared to receive the Messianic glory. They looked daily for the tremendous crisis to consummate, and they pictured it more or less

*I Thess.iv.15f. We also meet with the familiar themes such as the time of Messiah's advent being unknown; it comes as a thief in the night; many will be taken unawares, while the faithful watchers find their glorious recompense (I Thess.v.1-8,cf.Acts i.7; II Thess.ii.2,cf.Mt.xxiv.43;Lk.xvii.24,xxi.34, Mk.xiii.36, Mt.xxiv.42). **II Thess.ii.1-10,cf.iii.10-12; i.e.'the man of sin,' 'the son of perdition,' 'the man of lawlessness', etc. have all to be revealed before the parousia takes place; here we have elements we do not meet with in the primitive church.

imaginatively as their minds subconsciously drew upon the current apocalyptic environment. The old order was to be destroyed; the new order would emerge with Christ's return. The magnificent confidence of such expectations reveals an atmosphere of joyous, overcoming faith sweeping the believers onward with the irresistible on-rush of a tidal wave.

We see therefore that the 'sensuous' conception of the kingdom was uppermost in the apocalyptic consciousness of the primitive church.* This conception was the basis of the latent cross-purposes at which the disciples found themselves with Jesus.** The experiential issue had to be worked out in the faith of the primitive church, but there was at hand the reinforcement of a new life and a new power, and already there had begun the necessary assimilation of the truth as subconsciously apprehended by the disciples. The surprise of the resurrection experiences went hand in hand with the inspiration of the Spirit, to quicken the insight of the believers into what Jesus had said and done. It was only a matter of time before these spiritually and ethically educative processes brought the conscious life into line with the discoveries of the subconscious.***

There was one feature in Jesus' teaching about the kingdom which was destined to be of the most potent significance for the spiritual growth of the primitive church. Along with his

*Cf. pp. 96f. 130, 180f. **Cf. pp. 179-82, 184-87. ***Cf. pp. 174-76, 214f.

announcements of the kingdom as imminent and future, there was the aspect of the kingdom as actually present, operative in the world of men already. Like the leaven fermenting in the meal, so even now the kingdom is at work; the seed may be growing secretly, but it is actually growing here and now; already as the mustard seed, the kingdom is already present in its minute beginnings.* The kingdom was even now "among you."** The casting out of demons is declared by Jesus to be the sign that the kingdom has already come with its power (Mk.xii.28); it is announced as being present in its efficacious and redeeming activity (Mt.xi.3).

While the primitive church had no difficulty in accepting the thought of the kingdom as future, to transfer some of this ardent expectation to the thought of the kingdom as actually present involved a discipline of understanding and insight that was far harder to achieve than the mere indulging in eschatological extravaganza. But the educative process had begun almost unknowingly to the believers. The church had a grand awareness of its place in the divine order of things, and slowly, but surely, their religious discoveries and deepening insight into the mind of Christ and his words were moving them forward to possess the kingdom as present even while they awaited with bated breath the eschatological consummation. The limitations set by apocalyptic enthusiasm caused the process to work only slowly, in view of preoccupation with a future crisis.

*Mt.xiii.33, Mk.iv.26-29,30-32.

But even now the believers were breaking away from the old order and taking their stand on the new; already they were claiming their heavenly citizenship. The old order was in decay and the crisis of the new ~~may~~^{might} come at any time, but the church was already rejoicing in its awareness in present experience of being the community which was to take full possession of the kingdom, while even now receiving their present foretaste with gladness and overcoming confidence.

The experiential synthesis of the future and present aspects of the kingdom of God was only reached after a long development, but it was finally attained as the church went on with its empirical discoveries. Briefly stated, the synthesis achieved was this: the apocalyptic hope failed in the non-fulfilment of the desired consummation; as the failure came to be apparent, so did the present possession of the kingdom come to be more vitally perceived and stressed in the growing church; the apocalyptic hope itself was transmuted into the gold of the ~~expectation~~^{expectation} of life in the "kingdom not of this world," as the idea of the 'sensuous' kingdom faded and revealed the vision of the Hereafter more clearly. At the one end of the scale we have the literal apocalyptic hope; at the other there is the consciousness of citizenship in the divine kingdom as experience of eternal life in the midst of time.*

*Cf. Jn. iii. 15f. 36, v. 24, vi. 40, 47, 54, I Jn. v. 12f. This is the Johannine substitute for the eschatological kingdom.

In this experiential development the primitive church takes its definite place, first as the community awaiting the eschatological consummation with the return of Christ with its appeal to Israel to repent in view of the coming crisis. As the consummation was more and more delayed the community became all the more aware of its present experience of the kingdom as being possessed here and now in the world. As this discovery came to be made, the church emerges from the community as the divine community for this world, with a growing awareness of its mission to the whole of mankind, whether Jew or Gentile.

We proceed to discuss more fully what we have summarily stated.

(a) The church came into being out of the experience of a grand failure, viz. the non-fulfilment of the apocalyptic expectation in the return of Christ in the kingdom. With the postponement of the expected crisis it may have been reasonably possible that the Messianic community would have crumbled away. On the contrary, however, the fading of the literal thought-forms and expectations made all the more possible the coming to the forefront of the deeper significance of Jesus' words and works. The inner aspects of the kingdom, and the deeper apprehension of the personality of Jesus in its more specific spiritual and ethical worth came forward, as the believers grew in their apprehension of their Master's qualitative 'Way' of life.

(b) The fading of the eschatological hope of the kingdom resulted in the growing experience of the kingdom as a present possession. The community of the future kingdom grew into the ecclesia conscious of itself as entering into possession of the divine kingdom already in being. The primitive church gradually entered on its calling as the divinely appointed body of Christ existing in the world and for the redemption of the world. This consciousness did not embrace simply sociological aspects such as were necessarily involved in the germinal outlook of Jesus as reflected in his teaching, and in the vital principles of fellowship, love, brotherhood, etc. which the primitive church was enunciating from the centre of its own religious faith and experience. For the kingdom was being apprehended by the church as the spiritual, suprahuman order already in the midst, resulting in an essentially spiritual experience which the believers wished to share with all men, and which proved to be sufficiently potent in its religious dynamic to reach out far beyond the racial and religious limits of Israel.

Along with this process there went the growth in the experience of salvation, which emphasised in the first place as eschatological, i.e. salvation to the imminent kingdom, came to be experienced as the higher salvation inherent in the life and the new righteousness which Jesus revealed. As the hope of eschatological salvation waned, so did the more precise

moral and spiritual salvation enter into the life of the believers as actual experience of divine redemption mediated by Jesus in virtue of his 'Way'.*

(c) The advancement of these spiritually educative processes, inherent from the first in Jesus, helped forward the transmutation of the future eschatological kingdom so ardently awaited, into a consummation of a more specifically spiritual character. The more spiritual became the apprehension of the kingdom of God, the more spiritual did the believers conceive its consummation to be. The desired literal crisis of the 'sensuous' kingdom began to be transmuted into the hope of eternal life in the heavens. On the one hand the growing awareness of the kingdom as already present in the world, destined through the witness of the ecclesia to change mankind in its potency of present redemption in Jesus Christ, came to be, on the other hand the kingdom not of this world, having its centre of gravity in the unseen and the eternal; insofar as the kingdom was present in the world it was representative of the unseen order, and was experienced as eternal life amidst the time series of earthly life. The hope of life in the hereafter comes out in fuller strength as the literal eschatological expectation fades away. The development has been prepared to some extent by current transitions from the idea of the 'sensuous' kingdom to the higher spiritual conception, but whereas current apocalyptic, ^{in so far} insofar as it made

* Cf. pp. 345-354.

such a transition, ~~did so~~ mainly conceived the world as hopeless, and in the despair of pessimism transferred the desired consummation to the eternal life in the heavens,* the world was the scene of redemptive activity for the Christian believer.

It may be that the large influx of Gentiles into the church accentuated the hope of eternal life, but in the main the new development goes back to the personal impacts with Jesus both in his life and especially in the disciples' experience of him risen from the dead. But the Gentiles were not unacquainted with hopes of immortality; they were less concerned with eschatological consummation, and they were a potent means of moving the primitive church away from its preoccupation with apocalyptic enthusiasms to the more significant apprehension of eternal life. Stephen in his death prayed the Lord Jesus would receive his spirit (Acts vii.59), and while this may be interpreted in terms of Jewish religion and outlook (Ps.xxxi.5,cf.Lk.xxiii.46), it is also possible that the Gentile outlook of the martyr turned his prayer into aspiration for life eternal with Jesus who had gone before him. We have also to notice the influence of Paul in changing the primitive church literalness in apocalyptic to experience of eternal life both now and especially as the crown of the believer's pilgrimage(I Cor.xv.35ff.42-50,II Cor.v.1-8,iv.16-18

*Cf.Baruch xx.2,xxiii.7,xxv. and cf.pp.98f.

But right from the first, the primitive church believers by reason of their vital contact with Jesus, and their experience of his resurrection appearances, were set on the way to a more wonderful consummation of their faith and hope than they had dreamed of, viz. to the climax of their salvation in eternal life in the unseen. At last the literal kingdom fades into the background as it comes to be seen more clearly in "the Ecclesia triumphant and glorified and in manifest communion with the saints in heaven."*

(d) The whole series of eschatological concepts involved, viz. the kingdom, the Messiah, the Last Days, the signs and portents, the Judgment apparatus, angels, archangels, demons, Messianic woes, the temporal kingdom, Davidic or Levitical descent of Messiah, etc. are seen to be of the experiential framework of the primitive church experience, the thought-forms in which the vital movement centring in Jesus clad itself, and accidental to the people among whom the new experience came to birth, with all their inherited and environmental influences germane to them. While it is true that terms such as 'Messiah' and 'Kingdom' had historical and spiritual significance which lifted them away from their purely catastrophic and literal character in popular expectation,** the literal emphasis was uppermost in the mind of the disciples and led them to misunderstand the nature of Jesus and his mission. While the deeper

*J.H. Leckie, op.cit. p.64.

**As in the mind of Jesus, cf. pp.180f.

and the higher salvation was offered by Jesus, the vital experience he brought had necessarily to be received and interpreted by the believers along lines native to themselves, and which thus showed up all the limitations of their own conceptions.

The catastrophic apocalyptic forms therefore were the psychological thought-forms wherein Jesus' work of salvation was first historically expressed both in his disciples and in the primitive church. But the essential spiritual convictions they enshrined, the confidence in God and his goodness, especially as these were revealed in Jesus, are the vital matters. In the literal forms the apocalyptic faded away, and as the church was liberated from the literal framework derived from apocalyptic, it revealed more potently the permanent hopes of the human spirit as fed by the mind and spirit of Jesus and as symbolic of the eternal realities that lie at the heart of Christian experience of the Christ. The church thus came to offer the new life which, in believing Jesus, men came to have in his name.

(e) At the same time, from another angle, the literalness of the eschatological hopes exercised an influence in a distinctively positive and powerful way for the primitive church. It had the advantage that it provided an immediate freedom from common-sense considerations that might otherwise have proved an effective hindrance to the operation of the new experience.

The very realism of the apocalyptic expectations in the confidence that the end of all things was at hand, gave no room for binding safeguards such as prudence, common-sense provision for practical needs, caution in view of the tested customs of life, and compromise in order to live the life of the world while cherishing in the heart the inspired call of the higher experience. If there were eschatological exaggerations, these at least gave inspired courage and determination to follow where the call of their exalted Messiah led them.

The Christian church emerged from the primitive community as a "throw-back" from the failure of eschatological hopes. This "throw-back" was into the world of men and affairs. With the postponement of the parousia and the gradual loosening of the literal expectation of consummation from above, the community was thrown back, as it were, into the world of human sin and suffering to concentrate on its divine mission as the bearer of good news of salvation now present in the very existence here and now of the divine kingdom as an experience to be shared, and all centring in Jesus Christ. The experience of present salvation brought ~~salvation and~~ quickened life in Christ's name, opened up new avenues of approach to the heart of God, and operated as a spiritual resurrection in a world religiously bankrupt ~~and~~ which longed for vital redemption.

The whole apocalyptic movement was founded upon the experiential conviction that good was powerless in the world.

The primitive church rested on similar foundations, but as the many communities sprang up ~~hither~~ ^{here} and ~~thither~~ ^{there}, the new faith generated by Jesus Christ gave the believers an experience of Jesus which convinced them of the power of good to overcome the evil and the sin in the world after all. Though they did not realize it, the pessimism of the powerlessness of goodness in the world was literally exploded by the spirit and presence of Christ. As the truth of this began to come to the surface, it inevitably weakened the pessimism underlying the apocalyptic outlook, and gave a present experience of joy and power and abounding life that made the postponement of the parousia more than tolerable. It is significant that there is little evidence if any, of disappointment because of the non-fulfilment of the apocalyptic hopes. The community came to be ultimately preoccupied with its present joy and abounding life, its present victories over evil.

Even more intimately, because more spiritually conditioned, Jesus Christ became the vital centre of the church's faith and love, as he came to be apprehended as the Christ, who though conceived to be departed into heaven, yet was present with the believers, and would be with them, even to the end (Mt.xxviii.20). We deal with this experiential aspect elsewhere,* but it is mentioned here to show how very ~~real~~ ^{really} Christ was coming to be experienced in the midst as the believers met for worship, conference, prayer, etc.

*Cf. pp. 452-454.

The chronological aspects of the church cannot be traced; this is due not only to the paucity of the records, but because of the nature of evolution in religious experience. The whole development was a question of spiritual growth motivated by the dynamic of Jesus of Nazareth in the first place, and thereafter, by the contact with his presence and power as the living Christ. And growth knows no specific dates. There are parallelisms where the old and the new run together in equal strength, and the empirical tendency was for the new to gain at the expense of the old until it finally came to win the victory. First, the community, arising from the vital contacts with Jesus in life and in resurrection; then the more specific primitive church begins to emerge from the fading of the eschatological hopes, ~~and~~ rising to a more vital experience of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION

An overwhelming awareness of salvation characterized the religious experience of the primitive church. The 'Last Days' had arrived (Acts ii.17); the great deliverance for which prophets and apocalyptists had looked was at last on the eve of fulfilment. The eagerness with which the salvation is awaited, as well as the character of it, is revealed in the question which the narrative ^{reports} ~~purports~~ to have been asked by the disciples as to whether Jesus was not going to restore the kingdom at this time to Israel (Acts i.6). The salvation experience was thus of an eschatological character. On its positive side the believers were being made ready for the glorious life as citizens of the new kingdom; this expectation of life in the new order they shared with one another as they urged its call upon Israel. On its negative side, the salvation experience meant deliverance and acquittal in the Judgment about to come upon the world as the prelude to the establishing of the divine kingdom, a note also strikingly heard as the believers urge their fellow-Jews to save themselves from the generation about to be judged (Acts ii.40) by a true repentance to result in remission of sins (ibid. ver.38).

So far it is in this sense that Jesus is experienced as the Saviour of the new community. Through him the desired

consummation is to be effected, since as the divinely designated Messiah he will shortly appear in judgment and usher in the new order of God (Acts ii.36,iii.20f.). Jesus is the Author of the life which the kingdom will bring, and the Saviour to the kingdom of all those who repent (Acts iii.15,v.31); at the same time he is the Saviour from the judgment, and through him alone can such deliverance be attained (Acts x.42,iv.12). Faith is therefore an indispensable element in the saving activity of Jesus as the believers viewed it both in his power to save from the imminent judgment and to bring to them the new life (Acts ii.41,iv.4,v.20).

Following the traditional conceptions of Israel's oneness as a people before God,* the unit of salvation is the new community which individuals are urged to join and so enter the kingdom in virtue of their identification with it.** At the same time the apocalyptic development had sharpened the moral responsibility of the individual;*** eschatological expectation carries with it personal privileges and responsibilities, and a more distinctive place must be left for the greater significance of the individual believer than was customary in Israel's outlook. The method of the primitive church preaching was to encourage the hearers to enter the Messianic community by reminding them of the unpleasant consequences of having individually to face the coming judgment. Further, had Jesus

*Cf.pp.117-19. **Cf.pp.324ff.for the group consciousness of the primitive church. ***Cf.pp.119f.

come in the first place in power and kingly glory to save the people after the manner of conventional theory of Messiah's office,* Jesus might have won the whole nation to an acceptance of himself as Israel's Messianic redeemer, but such loyalty and acceptance would have had no basis in moral and spiritual values. For only on these fundamentals could the true vocation of Jesus rest, and only those ^{whose} hearts were prepared by moral and spiritual insight were able to discern the reflection of the true divine glory in Jesus as he accomplished the divine purpose. Thus individual religious experience comes to the fore inasmuch as each individual believer had to make a definite moral choice in accepting Jesus who was so unlike what the ordinary national conceptions of Messiah supposed him to be. The recognition that Jesus had reached this dignity through his suffering was a fact that had to be ethically and spiritually apprehended. Jesus' Messianic status was accepted as an act of moral choice. The appeal to conscience, made so forcibly on the basis of the national apostasy in crucifying the designated Messiah, was aimed at arousing the moral and spiritual sensibilities of the individual in view of the imminent crisis, that the Jews might repent of the apostasy before it came, and such a change could be effected only through individual conversion.

The conversion process awakened the sense that the individual Jew was deeply implicated in the national rejection of Jesus, and as this was realized, remorse of an intense character ensued

*Cf. pp. 100-104.

(Acts ii.37). The next step was to repent for the individual share in the national sin which lay in that state of heart and mind reflecting the pride and stubbornness of Israel in rejecting the ways of God and resisting the influence of the Spirit (Acts ii.38, cf. vii.51ff.). Such repentance carried with it an entire change of mind with regard to Jesus; where he had been rejected, now he was recognized and accepted, and the acceptance included faith in Jesus as Messiah and allegiance to him. Such recognition was not ^{made} by the apostate nation as a whole, but by individuals who refused to be associated any longer with the national sin.

This salvation included further the moral experience of submission to Jesus the Messiah. The apostles' teaching tended to bring forward this aspect in the recognition of the moral and spiritual requirements of Jesus as these were gradually apprehended in deepening insight. A personal relationship to Jesus resulted from such obedience, and those who confessed Jesus were his 'disciples.' In turn they came to experience the power of the Spirit in their lives. The individual convert became aware that he was numbered in the community of salvation.*

Such moral and spiritual elements began the transition from

*Flowing from assurance of acceptance with God through forgiveness of sins, on the ground of union with the Holy Servant of the Lord, whose death was now, in the light of the Resurrection, felt to have atoning significance...came a deep sense of unity with other souls in this sacred bond of common salvation; and from both came a great and purifying joy" (Bartlet and Carlyle, "Christianity in History," pp.92f.).

the salvation experience eschatologically conditioned, to the experience of salvation in its own spiritual right as centred in Jesus Christ. The fading of the eschatological hope as such encouraged the awareness of salvation as present experience just as the life of the divine kingdom came to be received as a possession here and now. The enjoyment of salvation in the possession of the kingdom already present, with its consummation to be made in the receiving of eternal life by the believer, reacted vitally upon the ethical responsibility of living for the present life in a manner worthy of one who belonged to Jesus Christ.

The connection of the death of Jesus with the salvation experience in the primitive church is somewhat obscure, and probably such obscurity reflects the fact that as yet the believers had not reached any definite conception with regard to it. At the same time, since for them the death of Jesus was the divinely appointed purpose ^{of} ~~for~~ his Messiahship, it becomes intimately connected with the hope of redemption in the coming kingdom. Because Jesus followed the divinely ordered way of suffering, the divine kingdom was brought within reach of the believers, in view of the imminent crisis.

With the growth of the salvation experience from the eschatological into an experience already present to be possessed, the redemptive aspects of Jesus' death came forward within the purview. Jesus' own statements about his forthcoming death were

gradually recollected and increasing understood in the light of the present discoveries and affirmations of religious experience.

There seems little doubt that Jesus regarded his coming death as having redemptive significance, and that this has been apprehended by the eyewitnesses whose impressions and recollections are preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. The Temptation reveals Jesus' choice of the divine way, involving the rejection of the usual expectation of Messiah as a Warrior Prince (cf. p.102) to raise up Israel to political and worldwide preeminence at the expense of the Gentiles. It is not clear, however, whether the Temptation choices foreshadowed the alternative to the conventional method of fulfilling the Messianic office, viz. Jesus' suffering and death. Yet the significant fact comes forth in the choice of Jesus to fulfil his vocation entirely in terms of what God willed, whatever this meant. Wrede's insistence that the significance of the saying about the bridegroom being taken away (Mk.ii.20) being a prophecy of Jesus' suffering and death, and not a mere foreboding that such may befall him is probably the right interpretation of what Jesus said, and implies that we must regard it probable that Jesus had come to be convinced that the divine will would lead him this way ("Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien," 1901, p.19).

After Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus openly declares the necessity of his death (Mk.viii.31), and went on to insist on the need of losing one's life to save it (Mk.viii.35-37). His intense mood as he awaits the development of events to lead to his death is seen when on the journey to Jerusalem he says, "I came to cast fire on the earth...I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished" (Lk.xii.49-53). The sons of Zebedee are promised that they shall share in the baptism with which he was to be baptized in his death (Mk.x.38-41).

The famous passage about the Son of Man giving his life a ransom for many (Mk.x.45) is spoken to draw a contrast between the self-seeking glory of James and John at the expense of others (ibid.vers 35-45). Jesus is to give his life for others. Again, "the death of Jesus did for his followers what he had hoped it would do for his people-it freed them from the binding prestige of the religious authorities which was holding them back from his truth, and their hearts were reborn by the power of love known and felt in his death" (A.T.Cadoux, "A New Orthodoxy of Jesus and Personality," 1934). But further, if the death of Jesus

was conceived in his mind to be the divinely willed prelude to the kingdom's advent, then by dying, Jesus was giving himself on behalf of the many who would be won to the kingdom, and in this sense there is redemptive significance attached to the saying we are discussing. In the Farewell Supper, the cup is passed round as the pledge of the coming kingdom (Lk.xxii.17f.), followed by the broken bread as foreshadowing the death of Jesus as necessary to the fulfilment of the pledge of the cup (Lk. xxii.19, and cf.pp.431-435).

The answer to the question, How does Christ's death avail to redeem from sin, is not given us directly, and we are left to make inferences as to this, as far as the primitive church is concerned. Paul's thought on this matter reveals some considerable developments in the light of the growing reflection on the facts of the Christian experience (cf.pp.42-44). The 'ransom' passage already discussed, does not carry with it here the later thought on Christ's death. It simply means in the gospel that Jesus' death will be a means of liberating many, and leaves it at that. His whole life was one of saving activity, and the death is the culmination of this life of self-giving on behalf of the many. We have therefore to interpret the death in terms of the spirit of the life; in the death Jesus was associated with blessing and redeeming others, in view of these aspects of his activity in life. Whatever was perceived to have redemptive significance in his life, would be similarly ascribed to his death.

The primitive church reached the conclusion that Jesus had died because it was divinely ruled that he should do so in order to bring in the day of the Lord. The suffering and death was felt to be redemptive ^{in so far} ~~insofar~~ as it was the means of winning the kingdom of God for the believers who responded to the call to Israel to repent of their apostasy in crucifying Messiah.* In this sense the suffering and death are viewed as having

*"There was one solitary aspect under which, for the time, it was indispensably necessary that they should regard the death of Christ (i.e.the Jews). It was their immediate duty to repent of this crime, and to confess its enormity" (R.W.Dale, "The Atonement," 5th.Edn.1876,p.113).

redemptive significance in an eschatological sense. Yet there were deeper aspects involved, even if not as yet clearly discerned. If Paul is to be trusted the death of Jesus was connected with the forgiveness of sins in the tradition he had received from the primitive church (I Cor.xv.3). Even the recognition that the death was the working out of a divine purpose caused it to be viewed in a deeper light than as the mere result of human wickedness (Acts iv.27f.). Remission ~~from~~^{of} the sin of rejecting Christ would carry with it forgiveness of the sin and salvation from judgment and redemption to the new life of the kingdom; as these blessings were increasingly morally and spiritually apprehended in religious experience the more specific redemptive aspects of Christ's suffering came to be perceived. The primitive church further interpreted the death of Christ in the light of the suffering servant of Isaiah, and in so doing came to apply to it the sacrificial ideas inherent in the servant poems.* Jesus, like the servant, endured suffering in the divine purpose because of Israel's transgressions; thus the offering is made of the suffering servant as a guilt offering, as he bore the sins of many and bringing acquittal to many.** But the fact that the sacrificial suffering of the servant is viewed in the first place through prophetic eyes makes it highly probable that the offering for sin is of a moral, rather than of a penal character, for the prophets were persistent

*Especially Isa.lii.13-liii.12. **Acts viii.35,cf.iii.13-16,and Lk.xxii.37.

critics of the sacrificial cultus.*

How far the primitive church carried on the prophetic conception of the suffering as having moral character cannot be estimated in view of the paucity of data required for any accurate judgment. Yet the eschatological approach to the death of Jesus implied inner moral significance since at the least the purpose of God in the divine kingdom was being carried forward to its fulfilment. In any case there are no grounds for concluding that the primitive church looked on the suffering of Christ as in any way penal. There is no hint of any such idea in the references to the servant passages (Acts iii.13, iv.27, 30, viii.32f.); in the most direct reference, viz. in the conversation between Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii.32f.cf.34f.), the point made clear is the ~~the~~ endurance and innocence of the servant and his final vindication.** The likelihood is that such moral aspects would be assigned to Jesus' suffering and death, although the narrative gives us no clue to the actual manner in which Philip illustrated the death of Jesus by the suffering servant.*** Further, it would involve too great a strain upon their religious outlook to apply ideas of atonement to Jesus; the primitive church believers were thorough

*Isa.i.10ff.Jer.vi.20,Hos.viii.13,Amos v.21-23,Mic.vi.6f.

**W.Beyschlag,"New Testament Theology,"Eng.Tr.1896,pp.312f.

***That Philip did not draw on other points save the patience, innocence, and exaltation of the servant "is really beyond the power of Beyschlag or anyone else to prove"(J.K.Mozley,"The Doctrine of the Atonement,"1915,p.63), but this line of argument may illustrate the opposite pole of the issue,viz.that there was anything else other than such allusions is beyond Mozley's power or anyone else's to prove.

-going Jews, faithful to the law which prescribed the requirements for all atoning offerings for sin, culminating in the annual entrance of the highpriest into the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement; to view Jesus as providing atonement for sin in his death was too violent a departure from the characteristic Jewish loyalty and outlook of the primitive church. It was recognized as a matter of common knowledge that suffering had atoning value and could atone for guilt,* but it was another thing altogether to add to the prescribed ritual of the law the death of Jesus as a further means of atonement for sin. It was ~~only~~ as the church broke away from Judaism that such ideas came to attach themselves to the cross of Christ.

The believers were therefore aware that in some way the death of Jesus was associated with forgiveness of sin. The experience of the divine forgiveness resulted from repentance in view of being implicated in the national guilt of rejecting Messiah, and this experience went along with an act of faith in and submission to the Messiah who had been crucified. It was recognized that Jesus had offered himself up in the service of others that in his death the fulfilment of the kingdom ~~may~~^{might} be assured. Thus far a vicarious element in Jesus' suffering is discerned by the primitive church.

All through the controversy with the Judaizers, especially

*Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, "Lehrbuch der Neuen Testaments Theologie," i. §.79, quoted by J. K. Mozley, op.cit. p.63.

as seen in the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul assumes a belief which is held by him and them in common, viz. that there is a redemptive significance in Christ's death. He does not charge his opponents with denying the saving elements in the crucifixion; he indicts them on the ground of their insistence on secondary matters such as circumcision, thus making the saving value of the cross as of none effect in that salvation could not be experienced apart from circumcision. However far such redemptive significance was discerned by the primitive church there is no means of detecting; we have the very definitely eschatological aspects of redemption to the fore, but as the eschatology tended to lessen in its influence, and the kingdom came to be received as an object of present possession, the place of Jesus' suffering came to be more clearly seen for its specifically moral worth in the purpose of God. We are amidst a vital religious experience that was expressing itself in countless spontaneous ways; the primitive church had not yet time to formulate any theory of the connection of Jesus' death with forgiveness of sin; it rejoiced that through that divinely purposed death the kingdom with its salvation was brought nigh unto those that believed.

The world of the Gentiles, even in its own day, among other things, found within the religious culture of the primitive church.

All these factors produced in the church the conventional attitude towards the Gentiles. Further, the apocalyptic hopes

CHAPTER IX

THE WIDENING HORIZON AND THE
ISSUE OF THE GENTILES

From the very outset there were powerful influences which kept the primitive church safely anchored within the haven of the Jewish faith and outlook. First, there was the consciousness that the new community was one with Israel, that its message of salvation was to Israel.* Second, the disciples carried into the new life of the primitive church their traditional Jewish conceptions, preconceptions and ideas. The new experience was cradled within Jewish faith and religious experience; racially, psychologically, and religiously the disciples were Jewish to the core. Third, the Jewish environment from which the community emerged ensured that the new faith would be shot through and through with the religious ideas of Judaism; there could be no salvation apart from circumcision and incorporation within the age-long People of God, fidelity to the law was axiomatic, and the sense of privilege as belonging to the chosen race of God over against the world of the Gentiles, such ideas were, among others, found within the religious outlook of the primitive church.

All these factors produced in the church the conventional attitude towards the Gentiles. Further, the apocalyptic hopes

*Cf. pp. 336f.

in which the church was cradled held out nothing but judgment for the Gentiles.* Even the nobler universalism of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs was subject to the same limiting influence as operated in the case of Jeremiah's broad outlook, viz. there was to be salvation for the Gentiles, but only by the royal way of submission to Israel.

Yet the door was by no means irrevocably closed to the non-Jews as far as the primitive community was concerned. The influence of Jesus, especially in his intimate contacts with the Gentile elements such as were found among the publicans and sinners,** would help towards a more sympathetic understanding of the Gentile position. There were the new accents in the teaching of Jesus which sought to influence the Jewish nation to realize its worldwide mission as a light to lighten the Gentiles,*** and the disciples would have caught these notes. Indeed the disciples seemed to have subconsciously apprehended from Jesus that the gospel was for the whole world of the Gentiles.**** But while admitting that Gentiles might be saved, what had not yet been fought out was whether the way of salvation for non-Jews signified essentially submission to the old traditional Israel in circumcision, i.e. by becoming a Jew in order to receive the blessings of the Messianic community centred in Jesus Christ. Would the Gentiles first have to be

*Cf. pp. 96f. **Cf. pp. 136-142. ***Cf. pp. 151ff.

****Cf. pp. 213-15.

incorporated into Israel before they could become members of the primitive church? Or were they eligible for admission in their own right, without reference to the traditional requirements of the Jewish faith?

In addition to the liberating influence of Jesus, there were other factors which tended to loosen the bonds which tethered the church to Judaism. Among the new converts there would be found many numbered among the outcast elements such as publicans and sinners. No doubt there were only outcasts in many instances in the eyes of the Pharisees, but even so the experience of ostracism would make them less susceptible to the strict demands of the law. For these the question of incorporation within Israel did not count for very much, and they would be found among the more liberalizing section of the new community. The Gentile elements among them would be all the more liberal in their attitude, while there is no reason for supposing that in the religious enthusiasm of the earliest period of the church questions were asked as to whether the incomers were Jew or Gentile. A further factor was the presence of Hellenistic Jews in the ecclesia. These Jews were conversant with the more liberal outlook of the larger world of the Diaspora; while this did not signify any loosening of their devotion to Judaism, the wider influences would nevertheless operate subconsciously among them.* Then we have also the Hellenists

*Of the liberalizing thought of Philo and the Book of Wisdom.

who were proselytes to the Jewish faith by circumcision who by no means shed their Gentile psychology even if this operated subconsciously in their outlook and thought. Any such Gentile proselytes who entered the primitive church were bound to influence the cultivation of the wider attitude. Along with these Gentile converts to Judaism we have the influential class of Gentile God-fearers who, while admiring much of spiritual worth in Israel's piety, refused to take the rite of circumcision which would have incorporated them within the People of God. Such people, however, ^{were} ~~to~~ able to accept all that was truly spiritual in Israel's religion without feeling too scrupulously exact in their devotion to parts of the law that did not appeal to them.* This fringe of non-Jews, of whom there would be many in Jerusalem, provided splendid material for making converts to the primitive church. Thus did Gentile prominence begin to leaven the outlook of the church.

What was perhaps the greatest factor in ultimately securing the admission of the Gentiles as such into the new community was the discovery that non-Jews were capable of receiving the new experience of the Spirit without being admitted into the Jewish theocracy by circumcision.** This testimony of spiritual

*"Such converts were called religious persons ('these who worship, or revere, God, οἱ φοβούμενοι, οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν'), and although in a strict sense outside the pale of Judaism, undoubtedly expected to share with Jews by birth the favour of the God they had adopted, and were encouraged in their hope by their Jewish teachers" (G.F. Moore, op. cit. vol. I. pp. 323f.). **As in the case of Cornelius, cf. Acts x. 44ff. and pp. 394-396.

experience was ultimately to prove inexorable in its logic.

The stage was therefore being set for the experiential struggle between the exclusive and the extensive conceptions of the scope of the church consciousness. The more liberal elements come to the ~~first~~^{first} light in what seems to be a sudden appearance of a Hellenist section in the primitive church, a section which included Hellenistic Jews, Gentile proselytes to Judaism, God-fearers, and probably some outcast elements such as the publicans and sinners.* This section was obviously of some size since it was possible for complaint to be made that its side of the church was not being looked after in the matter of the daily ministrations (Acts vi.1). Seven men are therefore appointed to attend to the needs of this section (Acts vi.2-6).

This dissension probably had deeper roots than is implied in the surface disagreement over a matter of practical administration, a difficulty which is accounted for most likely by the communistic experiment. When the Seven were appointed did the Twelve cease the service of ministrations? Yes, as far as the Hellenistic widows were concerned, but it does not follow that they did not still continue to have oversight of the Jewish section of the administration. When the Twelve declare that it was not right that they should imperil the preaching of the gospel by preoccupation with the more practical duties (Acts vi. 2), what they probably meant was that, as matters stood, the

duty of attending to the practical ministrations for both sides

* cf pp. 136ff

of the church was too much for them to carry out, except at the cost of their preaching witness. In their effort to administer the whole community the Hellenist side of the church had not been cared for as it should have been, hence the complaint. The appointment of the Seven saved the situation and ensured better arrangements being made; the Twelve were able to go on with their preaching and praying, and to take oversight of the more practical work as far as the Jewish section of the church was concerned; this left the Seven free to minister unto the Hellenists, but this did not mean that they were necessarily confined to the daily ministrations (Acts vi.1). For we find that Stephen works signs and wonders among the people, and that he is preaching in the Hellenistic synagogues (Acts vi.8f.).

What seems to have taken place is a division of spheres of activity rather than one of duties. The Twelve attended to the Palestinian side, while the Seven took charge of similar duties for the Hellenist section. The Twelve were nominally in charge of the whole community; but in actual practice the task was too large for them to carry out with any satisfaction. Therefore the Palestinian majority remained as it was under the care of the Twelve; the Hellenists came under the care of their own leaders who had been duly appointed by the whole primitive church.

If our conclusions are valid, we are able to discern two distinctive types of religious outlook within the new community.

There was the characteristic Jewish type, and the freer semi-Gentile type. The latter type while loyal to the Jewish faith and devout upholders of the law and the temple, yet had a freer approach in their loyalty than was the case with the Jews of Judaea where Pharisaic rigidity was so influential. The wider contacts of the Hellenists made them subconsciously receptive of truth as they found themselves reading fresh meanings into the tenets and statutes of Israel's law in their desire to interpret it afresh for the edification of the larger world from which they were drawn. A spirit of religious speculation as to the possibilities of the new faith centred in Jesus would possess this section of the church.

The nature of the freer interpretation of Judaism promoted by the Hellenist reception of the religious experience of the primitive church may be discovered to some extent from the speech of Stephen before the Sanhedrim (Acts vii.1-53).

The narrative here is not free from confusion. There is, on the one hand, the formal trial before the council (Acts vi.15,vii.1), but on the other hand Stephen was the victim of the mob's fury as it took the law into its own hands (Acts vii.54,57-59). Again, while the council could decree the sentence of death, the decision had to be ratified by the Roman civil power. But no such sentence, still less any ratification of it, is mentioned in Acts. Probably the best explanation we have of the incident so confusedly set forward is that the council had set in motion an investigation of charges that had been brought against Stephen, and that during it a popular tumult arose ^{in which} ~~and~~ ^{was done} Stephen ~~was done~~ to death, the council having no difficulty in conniving at it.

Further, the charge formulated against Stephen is not clearly stated. On the one hand false witnesses are brought forward to testify that Stephen had uttered

blasphemous words (Acts vi.11) against Moses and against God. On the other hand the charge comes to be that he frequently used to speak blasphemy against "this holy place and the law" (Acts vi.13), the blasphemy being defined as "we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered to us" (Acts vi.13). In both charges blasphemy against the law is mentioned, but in the second charge, hostility to the temple and its ritual is brought forward.

Stephen seems therefore to have been brought to trial for blasphemy against the temple and the law. His speech sets out his loyalty to the law and reverence for the traditional history of his nation, and the accredited leaders are sternly rebuked for their disloyalty in not living up to that law and the religion contained in the history; such disloyalty reaches its climax in their rejection of God's Messiah foretold in the prophets (Acts vii.51f.). This attitude may be regarded as Stephen's reply to the charge of blasphemy against the law. It was his accusers who were blaspheming the law by their own failure to live up to its best spirit and ideal. As for the alleged charge that Stephen blasphemed the temple, neither the ark nor the tabernacle, ^{nor} and later, the temple, was any guarantee that God was present with His favour and blessing, since the heaven was His real throne and dwelling-place, (Acts vii.49), along with the temple not made with hands (ver.48). The externals of worship are useless without the contrite heart which is God's true abode. There was no temple cultus or sacrifice during the sojourn in the wilderness (Acts vii.42f.). It was his accusers who were blaspheming the temple by their failure to live up to the

heaven-sent ordinances in being disloyal to the divine requirements, a disobedience culminating in the crucifixion at their hands of Jesus the Messiah; in view of such a perverse spirit the temple was no guarantee of God's favour.

Yet the speech is a strange one for a man on trial before the Sanhedrim, and the possibility is that there was no formal trial at all, but that Stephen was hounded to death by an infuriated mob.* In this case there would be no speech for the defence, and Stephen's speech may be no more than a specimen of the sort of arguments he used to employ as he disputed with the Hellenist Jews in the synagogues. Viewed from such an angle the speech becomes very suggestive for the freer attitude of the semi-Gentile element in the primitive church. It is in the old prophetic style, a sort of religious philosophy of Israel's history. Stephen carries the case for the divine claims further back than Moses—the historical limit for the law's authority—to Abraham (Acts vii.1b.-8,17), in the style of Paul (cf. Rom. iv.1ff.), and as does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (v.1-6, vii.1-9, xi.8-19). The Pauline approach to the Christian experience through Abraham is thus seen to be anticipated in the primitive church, in the widening approach to the law on the part of the Hellenist side of the church. But even Moses, the revered authority for the sacred law, was treated unworthily by the people (Acts vii.7, 24-29, 35f. 39-41), and thus Israel was disloyal to what it professed in its

*A similar fate nearly befel Jesus at Nazareth (Lk. iv. 28f.).

allegiance to Moses; the people not only treated him evilly, but they steadily refused to obey the law which Moses gave them (Acts vii.38f.). The prophets were continually taking Israel to task for seeking refuge from obedience to the weightier matters of the law in meticulous observance of the prescribed ritual (Acts vii.42f.). The whole of Israel's record was one long story of apostasy from God and failure to live up to the requirements of the very law they claimed to reverence and observe.

What we are able to discern in the obscurity of the narrative is that among the Hellenist wing of the primitive church there was taking place a reaction from traditional Jewish religious observances and practice suggestive of the spirit of the approach of Jesus to the same Jewish tradition. It was finding its powerful exponent in the personality of Stephen whose speech rings with the tones of "the aggressive critic of the perverse religious spirit of his race, which lives in his persecutors."* Stephen reveals in his words an apprehension of a more spiritual understanding and experience of the law, and his freer attitude to Judaism which this encouraged was not only in the spirit of the great prophets, but suggests that the new faith in Jesus was producing its own distinctive approach after the manner of Jesus himself.

As McGiffert points out, there is no reference in the

*Mackinnon, op.cit.p.29. Cf.on the reaction, Harnack,"Mission and Expansion,"op.cit.p.50.

speech of Stephen to the calling of the Gentiles any more than to the setting aside of the law.* But with the more spiritual emphasis, it is not difficult to see that the more spiritual character of the faith centred in Jesus would be increasingly discerned, the inner meanings of what Jesus taught would be uncovered; as this process gathered momentum it reacted against the more formal Judaism just as Judaism was beginning to react against the new community. Minds given to reflection and religious speculation, with no thought of disloyalty to the law and Israel's traditional faith, began to perceive in the words and ethic of Jesus a leavening quality the germs of which they found in the great prophets.

There was no hint of any freer attitude to the law on the part of the Twelve, at least so far as the duty to the Gentiles may have caused more spiritual interpretation of the traditional faith. We know that their contact with Jesus was making them less legally minded;** we seem to discern a new freedom from the tyranny of official prestige of the acknowledged expounders of the law and the traditions as we see in their defiance of the command to refrain from preaching Jesus (Acts iv.18-21,v.28-32,40-42). Yet there was no move made by them in the direction of universalism. Peter's action in admitting Cornelius into the community of the Spirit evoked strong protest from his fellow apostles (Acts xi.1-3). In view of Jesus'

*op.cit.pp.85f.

**cf pp.171f.

attitude to the Gentiles and the duty of Israel to win them for the kingdom of God, it is striking that so little of his teaching on this matter showed results in their activity. For the movement towards the larger duty begins with Stephen and the ferment associated with his name, being prepared for by the fact that Stephen and his colleagues were beginning to face up to the higher ethic of Jesus with its protest against the moral and spiritual requirements of the law being placed on the same footing as the ritual elements, with the implication that circumcision was by no means necessary to salvation.

A religious ferment seems to have risen, and it was due to a reaction towards the deeper spirit of the ethic of Jesus with its implied more spiritual approach to the older faith of Israel, and accompanied with a further reaction from the traditional Judaism of the time. The beginnings here outlined, if the inspiring spiritual ferment behind them took its course, could have no other ultimate result than the emancipation of the primitive church from the secondary fetters which chained it to the older ways, with the corollary in the admission of Gentiles to equal status and privileges with the Jews in the coming Messianic kingdom.

This is the experiential significance of the religious ferment that gathered around Stephen. That something inimical to the traditional faith was implied, if mistakenly so, is seen in the persecution that followed his martyrdom, a persecution instigated by the religious leaders of the nation. The subse-

-quent dispersion of the preachers seems to have affected only the Hellenistic side of the church, since the Twelve appear to have remained unmolested in Jerusalem. But the scattering of these Hellenists proved unwittingly to be the very means of initiating the actual inclusion of Gentiles within the church. They carried the gospel with them, taking care to avoid the approach incurred in the persecution, viz. disloyalty to the law, by preaching only to Jews (Acts xi.19). The inevitable, however, happened. Converts made at Cyprus and Cyrene overleapt the barriers and preached the gospel direct to Gentiles in Antioch,* and there is no reason for supposing that this was an isolated instance. The Gentiles were receiving their opportunity to show themselves capable of reacting favourably to the new religious experience in Jesus Christ, and their response justified the action of the preachers who courageously took the message to them (Acts xi.21).

Was it Stephen's preaching in the synagogue that started the sequence of doubts and fears in the mind of Paul as touching the law? He seems to have been among the instigators of the charge against him, and certainly was at the head of the subsequent persecution of the Hellenistic Christians. The great spiritual change which turned him from the antagonist to the protagonist of the church occurred as he neared Damascus whither he was going intent on rooting out believers in Jesus from the synagogue

*Acts xi.20, where Ἑλλήνας is the right reading; cf. pp. 303f. and Appendix vi. pp. 523f.

there. At least it may be said that the Stephenite ferment proved to be unwittingly the quickening of Paul's inner conflict, which was shortly to come to its crisis.

The story of the conversion of Cornelius has been subject to much criticism,* but for our purpose enough is clear to show that a Gentile was able to receive the new life and spirit of the Messianic community, and to show in his actions that the Spirit had descended upon him (Acts x.1,44ff.). Peter was the apostle directly concerned, and recently he had reached a unification of his thought in a vision on a housetop in Joppa.** The apostle had at last realized in his conscious thought what had hitherto been received only subconsciously, viz.that the gospel was for Gentiles as well as Jews, and they needed no circumcision to take their place among those who were being saved to the coming kingdom.*** His action was afterwards challenged by the church leaders in Jerusalem, the basis of their criticism being that Peter had gone in to men uncircumcised and had had table fellowship with them (Acts xi.2f.). But in defending himself, the apostle says nothing about the charge of eating with ^{the} uncircumcised, but confines his reply to detailing the circumstances which led him to admit Gentiles into the Messianic community, as if this had been the gravamen of the charge.

Has Luke here telescoped together two charges, giving in

*For a comprehensive discussion of the critical problems raised by this narrative, cf McGiffert's analysis, op.cit.pp.101-106.

Cf.pp.248-250. *Cf.pp.214f.249.

the one case the eating with uncircumcised people, and in the other the actual admission of the Gentiles to the Messianic community without circumcision? Were there after all two principles to be established, two controversies settled, before the horizons of the church consciousness widened into universalism? Was the admission of Gentiles one thing, and the terms of social and religious fellowship with them a further matter to be settled?

The Jerusalem leaders react to Peter's account of the Spirit's attestation in Cornelius and his friends who in speaking in tongues betrayed the Spirit's presence in them (Acts x. 44, 46) by a mood of astonished gladness that God could give repentance unto life to the Gentiles (Acts xi. 18). Evidently that such was possible had not come within the ambit of their outlook, or the example of Jesus' own contacts with the Gentile elements among publicans and sinners had been lost sight of. They therefore accepted the 'fait accompli' without further question. In any case it seems to have been no more than an isolated instance at the moment. There was no thought of sponsoring missionary activity among the Gentiles as a result of this incident. Certainly it was recognized that non-Jews were proved capable of receiving the new experience centring in Jesus Christ and the Spirit, but this Gentile type of religious experience would be regarded as of a distinctly inferior and less perfect order. It was still inherent in the Jerusalem outlook that the Gentile convert would feel the religious

preéminence of the Jewish type of religion, after the manner of the God-fearers who while sharing in the blessings of the Jewish religion were only on the fringe since they would not take the rite of incorporation, viz. circumcision. From the God-fearers it often occurred that proselytes to Judaism were made, so it may have been felt in the primitive church that while the Gentiles could become members of the Messianic community it ^{might} ~~may~~ be that in time these very Gentiles would find their way into member-ship of the traditional Israel with which the church felt its continuity and oneness. Thus the admission of Gentiles would be for them no more than a half-way stage to their final apprehension of the benefits of salvation through their subsequent incorporation into the chosen people of God by becoming sons of Abraham through circumcision.

Certainly the admission of Gentiles into the primitive church did not signify that the Jewish convert could feel that he had the right ~~to~~ treat the traditional law of Israel as of little binding force. Peter's action in eating with the uncircumcised was a breach of loyalty to the law.

Thus the receiving of Cornelius and his friends points to no more than a very limited widening of the church's herizon. Indeed, it illustrates at the same time the tremendous influence the traditional faith of Israel exercised in the outlook of the Messianic community.

When we turn from the isolated instance of Cornelius to the

rapid spread of the primitive ecclesia following the dispersion of the Hellenist preachers after the death of Stephen, we see it advancing from strength to strength. Finally we meet with a church at Antioch, a church which in the first place began with the preaching of the gospel directly to Gentiles (Acts xi. 20). The significance of this church at Antioch is the emergence of an ecclesia distinctively Gentile in character and which would bring to bear upon the new experience thought forms and religious ideas other than the distinctively Jewish ones. The new faith did not mean for them that circumcision was necessary to salvation. The new religious experience they shared came into its own right, unhampered by the swaddling bands of Judaism. The very rise of the new term, 'Christian^s' to describe the believers at Antioch was, as Harnack points out, "itself a proof that the new community in Antioch stood out in bold relief from Judaism."*

Therefore at Antioch there began a distinctive and independent development of the self-consciousness of the primitive church. The new experience could now be termed the 'Christian' experience, irrespective of its Judaistic origins. It took root and brought forth fruit in virtue of its own creative power as derived directly from the life and activity of Jesus Christ, and all without reference to Jewish religion save in its use of the categories and thought-forms wherein Jesus himself had

*op.cit.Vol.I.p.54.

taught and in which his disciples had preserved and interpreted their impressions, contacts and recollections of him. At Antioch the Christian experience would be received and interpreted along the freer lines of the Gentile outlook, which in its power to grasp a spiritual religion, would be all the more able to do so in view of the fact that their apprehension was not bound by the fixity of a legal religion such as Judaism with its detailed law and tradition.

Here we come upon the real beginnings of the widening horizon of the primitive church in its universal expansion. For the religious experience of the primitive church, by a fortuitous chain of circumstances going back to the religious ferment that arose around Stephen, found itself being uprooted from its Judaistic beginnings, and had begun to grow in the virgin soil of purely Gentile religious experience. Not the Twelve or their successors in Jerusalem were responsible for this widening of the church consciousness, for despite their personal proximity to Jesus, they seemed unable in the end to take the lead as far as the wider mission to the world was concerned. They played their part nobly in the more restricted circle of their appeal to their nation, Israel; through their fervent courage and witness the primitive church came into being. Vitally concerned in winning Israel to its duty of repentance in view of the advent of the kingdom of God, their eyes were not lifted up to behold the need of the Gentiles. Their traditional Jewish inheritance

proved to be an effective hindrance to their appreciation of the truth of Jesus that Israel was to be redeemed in order that through the redeemed people, the Gentiles might be won for the divine kingdom.*

It was left to the less trammelled Hellenist section of the Jerusalem ecclesia to begin the wider mission. Stephen and his colleagues are the real founders of the Gentile expansion of the church consciousness. From the ferment set up the church was spread abroad and the first Gentile church to interpret its call to be a light to lighten the Gentiles sprang up at Antioch. From this church there was sent forth the distinctive missionary witness to Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 1-3). The Jerusalem church sent Barnabas to investigate what was happening at Antioch, and once more, as in the case of Cornelius, the leaders of the mother church were forced to consent to the spiritual logic of events. "Christianity had an expansive power which was too strong for the bonds that they had put upon it, and it burst these bonds, we may say, of itself."** For the new experience was not deliberately sent forth to the Gentiles: it just went out to them and proved its spiritual validity at once among its new adherents, apart from any Jewish legal sanctions or traditional authority of any kind. The Gentiles came to feel that they were of the People of God, but they had no Judaic authority for it. Nor was any such authority necessary, for of its own uniqueness and creative vitality the new faith centred in Jesus

* Cf. pp. 337 ff.

** McGiffert, *op. cit.* p. 112.

Christ was able to bring redemption to the Gentiles, and set them in the way to the kingdom of God.

Among the sayings of Jesus we have the significant one for our present discussion, "the earth bringeth forth fruit of itself" (Mk. iv. 26-29). In this parable we have Jesus' recognition of the way in which the fruits of the earth came, and ~~expressed~~ ^{the production of} the principle of spiritual development therefrom. What he found resulting from others' work he looked for as the result of his own. He did not devise programmes nor plan out the progress of the church; he sowed the seed and left it to bring forth its own fruit in due season.

Did Jesus realize that persecution would be an effective aid to the growth of the seed sown? Certainly his own effort to arouse Israel would bring suffering and death, as he saw, and he knew that his disciples would fare little better than their Lord (Mt. ~~xv. 24f.~~). Evangelism in Israel would lead to persecution, and persecution would result in the spreading and repudiation of nationalistic limits, since it was the nationalistic spirit of Israel that inspired the persecution.

If these be valid hints of Jesus' method and expectation it may thus be emphasized that he meant his followers to feel their way by learning from their mistakes, their experience and their guidance by the Spirit, and that no other way, i.e. the way of religious experience in its growth by acceptance and rejection, was possible.

The development among the Gentiles was taking place even while the original disciples and believers were content with pouring the new wine into the old traditional wineskins, with sewing on the new cloth to threadbare garments of their Jewish prejudices and observances, still unable to realize that the new experience could be anything else than a facet of their Jewish faith. This is the situation we confront in the primitive church.

The rapid advance of the Gentile church at Antioch, having

its own distinctive missionary call and success, while meeting with the formal approval of the Jerusalem apostles, seems at last to have caused considerable alarm in the Jerusalem community. It is strange that there should have arisen this alarm, in view of the recognition of Cornelius as a Gentile convert.* It is not necessary, however, to suppose that the primitive church at Jerusalem was of one mind, nor that the Jewish-Christian believers as a whole would endorse the action of Peter in admitting Cornelius. Further, some time had now elapsed since this incident, and there had been a phenomenal growth in Gentile accessions in Antioch and elsewhere, following the missionary activity of Paul (Acts xiii-xiv), and all this growth had been without reference to Jewish requirements such as the necessity of circumcision to salvation, or even without much reference to the legal code associated with Moses. On the other hand, the numbers of Jews attracted to the new faith would also increase, and not only in Jerusalem and Judaea, but in the wider Diaspora of the world. Such elements might easily observe the accessions of Gentiles to the religious privileges usually associated with Israel, and much pressure would be brought upon the Jerusalem church, as indeed on the Gentile churches themselves, to be insistent upon Jewish requirements.

*This apparent incongruity has caused the formulation of the theory that Peter's reception of Cornelius is considerably antedated by Luke (Weizsäcker, op.cit. Vol. I. pp. 211f.).

A Jewish-Christian's attitude to the Gentile expansion reflected, by implication, ~~one's~~^{his} fidelity or infidelity to the law of Moses; the greater the zest with which the law was observed, the greater the alarm at the growth of the Gentile churches. We have further to keep in mind that in the period we have in review, there were various strata of conviction as seen in attitudes "reaching from Peter, through James, down to the Judaizers who came to say, 'Except ye be circumcised after the Mosaic usage, ye cannot inherit salvation at all.'"

It is not difficult therefore to foreshadow the rise of an influential body within the primitive church inspired with the conviction that a halt must be called to the admission of the Gentiles, and that there should be a return to the true basis of the new faith, viz. a basis which brought in Moses as well as Jesus, and placed the two personalities on the same level.

Hence the arrival at Antioch of emissaries claiming to be sent by the official church at Jerusalem and demanding that circumcision be enforced as the condition of membership within the ecclesia. The consternation that resulted may be well imagined (Acts xv.1); after much discussion Paul was requested by the church to go to Jerusalem to arrange the matter with the apostles there.** The Council of Jerusalem followed, the

*J.V. Bartlet, "Apostolic Age," op.cit.p.63. **Acts xv.2, not inconsistent with Paul's own conviction that he went up by "revelation" (Gal.ii.2). The inner conviction of Paul coincided with the church's decision to send him as its deputation, or it may well be Paul's way of referring to a church decision of the sort described in Acts xiii.2. In either case it does not invalidate the church's appointment, as McGiffert supposes (op.cit. p.194,n.1).

critical discussions as to the historicity of which are unending.

The most recent discussion of the questions involved is Kirsopp Lake's comprehensive note ("The Beginnings of Christianity," Vol.V.pp.195-212). Lightfoot's statement is still the best for the view that Acts xv.=Gal.ii (cf. his "Epistle to the Galatians," 7th.Edn.1881,pp.123-128). F.C.Burkitt is a recent exponent of the view that Acts xi.30=Gal.ii.1-10 ("Christian Beginnings,"pp.116ff.), while the third possibility, viz.that Acts xi.30 and xv. both describe the visit to which Gal.ii.refers, and have come from different sources is Lake's present view (op. cit.p.202; here Lake has abandoned his former view that the second alternative is to be preferred, cf.his "Earlier Epistles of St.Paul,"pp.48-60). A fourth alternative has met with scanty acceptance, which places Acts xv after Gal.ii.,the latter being based on a private discussion which Paul, going to Jerusalem for the purpose had with the church leaders, and on the result of which is based his rebuke of Peter (so J.V.Bartlet,op.cit. pp.59f. cf.his whole discussion, pp.52-63,81-91).

Our standpoint is the third alternative, viz.that Acts xi.30 and xv. are independent accounts of the same visit to Jerusalem, and that this visit is also the one to which Paul refers in Gal.ii.1-10. This hypothesis best accounts for the facts, and is less free from difficulty. It is quite conceivable that Luke is using two independent accounts of the journey which were found among his sources, and since each account presents a diverse ~~setting~~ setting Luke may well have taken them for two distinct visits to Jerusalem; Gal.ii.by no means precludes a twofold purpose in the visit to Jerusalem, for in recalling the scene Paul mentions how he was requested to remember the poor, and adds, "which very thing I was zealous to do"(Gal.ii.10). This did not refer to the great collection which he took with him on his final visit to the holy city (Acts xxiv.17,Rom.xv.25-28,I Cor. xvi.1-5,II Cor.viii.1-4,ix.1,2,12), but is more likely to have been a reference back to the offering he took with him when he went to Jerusalem over the Gentile question, and which Luke has recorded in a separate account.

Amidst the obscurity of the whole question the general issue is fairly clear both in Acts and in Galatians. The admission of the Gentiles was conceded to be legitimate by the apostles, ~~and~~

elders, and indeed by the whole council save for the stricter Pharisaic element which seems to have been overruled (Acts xv. 4,6,22-26,Gal.ii.6-9). The recognition of Paul and Barnabas as entrusted by God with the mission to the Gentiles is sealed by giving them the right hand of fellowship.* This again did not commit the Jerusalem church to any mission among the Gentiles; it implied no abrogation of the law as far as Jewish Christians were concerned, nor ^{did it} supplant the gospel of the primitive church, i.e.a gospel still cradled in the swaddling bands of its Jewish birth, with its Jewish faith, in which circumcision was as obligatory as belief in Jesus.

The council decision was the recognition of a distinct field, viz.that of the Gentiles. The division of witness into that to the circumcised and that to the uncircumcised was one of spheres of activity as we had in the case of the appointment of the Seven. There was a distinct message for the Gentiles; there was the original, superior gospel for the true heirs of salvation, viz.the Jewish Christians, on whom was the charge to observe the law. While the apostles would not interfere with the Gentiles, it also implied that Paul was not given the right to go to Jews and proclaim liberty from the bondage of the law in the name of Christ, and Paul seems to have recognized this compact.

The mission to the Gentiles was therefore recognized as

*Gal.ii.9; Acts xv.does not mention it, but the relationship seems implied in the church's decision,cf.ver.25f.

valid, but the problem of inter-communion between the two sections of the church does not seem to have been really settled at the council. Peter was taken to task for having social fellowship through eating a meal, with uncircumcised (Acts, xi.3) and at the behest of the Judaizers he withdrew from table fellowship with the Gentile Christians at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11f.), and thereby influenced others who had been liberally disposed to the Gentiles, to withdraw from them also (ibid. 13f.). The Jewish issue was one of obedience to the law and traditions which forbade eating with Gentiles.

There was no inter-communion therefore between the Jewish and Gentile sides of the primitive church. In the Antioch church some Jews had thrown off their over-scrupulousness and were fraternizing on an equal footing with Gentile members of the church; this did not signify that they had abrogated the law as such, but they were definitely disregarding the particular precept which forbade fellowship with uncircumcised people. On a visit to Antioch, Peter, who had already fraternized with Gentiles at Caesarea (Acts x. 48, xi. 3), joined in table fellowship with the Gentiles also (Gal. ii. 12f.), but on representations made by Judaizers from Jerusalem, he and the other Jews withdrew from fellowship with the uncircumcised (Gal. ii. 11-13). Paul's strong criticism of his action in withdrawal was not dictated by the inconsistency in Peter's conduct, but by the deeper reason that Peter had thereby signified to the Gentiles that if they desired fellowship with him and with the Jewish-

Christian side of the church, i.e. the original church, as it were, they must conform to the Jewish faith in circumcision. By his own action Peter was preaching the gospel of circumcision to those of the uncircumcision, and therefore was violating the agreement reached and ratified at the council of Jerusalem. If Paul was entrusted with the Gentile mission, and refrained from influencing Jewish believers ^{to depart} from their loyalty to the law, here was Peter invading Antioch and by an eloquent action ~~was~~ plainly indicating that Gentiles must conform to Judaism if they wished to enter into the highest fellowship of the church.

The experiential issue here raised is of great significance. It carries further forward the problem of the church consciousness from the simple recognition that the Gentiles were capable of receiving the new experience in the gospel, to the more practical issue of intercommunion of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. Such an issue became crucial when the two sections were side by side in one church such as we have at Antioch. Had the Judaizers from Jerusalem not interfered there is little doubt that the believers would have felt their way, in the spirit of their Lord, to the solution of their problem of intercommunion; but it was the distinction of these representatives from Jerusalem, by now under the rule of James the Lord's brother, to insist on the rigid observance of legal requirements, and thereby attempting to restrict the liberty of the Gentiles since these were conceived to be out of fellowship with the real and original primitive church. Paul drew out the

essential issue when he roundly declared that the methods of the Judaizers made the Jewish law rather than Christ the basis of the justification experience for the church, and thus made the death of Jesus a vain thing, because, on the Judaizers' own principles, it was not necessary (Gal.ii.21).

The decision to recognize the validity of the Gentile mission taken at the council of Jerusalem was forwarded to the church at Antioch by means of an epistle (Acts xv.23-29). This epistle contains a list of 'abstinences' required from the Gentile Christians (ibid.ver.29).

It is sometimes supposed that the decree was promulgated at a second conference at Jerusalem where the terms on which Gentiles should be admitted into the church, or even received in fellowship with Jewish-Christians, were settled (cf.Harnack, op.cit.p.60, McGiffert, op.cit. pp.211-216, Weizsäcker, op.cit.vol.I.pp.185ff.). In ~~this~~ this case the report of the decree was telescoped into the narrative of the first council of Jerusalem by an author whom we have noticed is inclined to fuse two accounts into one (cf.pp.394f.).

F.C.Burkitt suggests that the Book of Revelation bears witness to the existence of such a decree among the Gentile churches: Rev.ii.24 says, "I put on you no other burden" (βάρος), with which we may compare Acts xv. 28, "it seemed good to the holy Spirit and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." (βάρος occurs here also). In Rev.ii.20 we are told that 'Jezebel' is teaching the Christians at Thya-tira to commit fornication and to eat things offered to idols (πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα), these two items being the most important details in the Decree in Acts (xv.29, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων...καὶ πορνείας). Burkitt concludes that Revelation refers to the Decree of Acts in the two instances discussed although the author did not probably derive his knowledge of it from Acts, but from his knowledge that such a decree existed among the Gentile churches of Asia (op.cit.pp.113f.). If Burkitt is justified in his inferences here, we have a testimony to the existence of the Decree apart from Acts, and ~~to the~~ fact that the historian is to be trusted in his account.

On the whole the case against the historical nature of the decree of the Jerusalem ^{Conference} has not been made out in any manner that may be described as convincing. We take the standpoint that the decree belongs to one and the same Jerusalem conference (Acts xv.=Gal.ii.1-10). It seems a more natural view of the facts than to postulate a second council called together as a result of the troubles at Antioch caused by the Judaizers. This view is strengthened as we follow through the meaning of the requirements made of the Gentiles.

Was it a food law or a moral code that was required of the Gentiles? Variant readings reveal the perplexity of a subsequent age in the understanding of the decree. Πνικτῶν ("strangled things") is read by Aleph* A* B C 81, 614, Ege. etc. while it is omitted entirely by D Lat.Iren.lat. Cypr. and the 'Western' authorities in general, and these same MSS add after πορνείας the Golden Rule in its negative form, as the Didache (ch.i). The effect of the omission of "strangled things" and the insertion of the Golden Rule is to turn what was probably in the first place a food law into a moral code, in which case εἰδωλοθύτων connotes "idolatry in general," instead of its ritualistic "things offered to idols," αἵματος becomes 'murder' instead of 'blood' in the ritual sense, and πορνείας 'all breaches of the seventh commandment' instead of intercourse with idolatrous rites and ceremonies.

Since the moral law of the church was set forth in the teaching of Jesus,* and ~~that~~ the difficulty about the Gentiles was not their moral response but their ritual or ceremonial status (circumcised they could become Jews), it seems more likely that the requirements of the decree would be directed to the ritual or ceremonial status of the Gentiles in their state of uncircumcision. The decree would be of a ritual character as suggested by a food law to be observed by them. There may be moral obligation inherent in the decree, but in the main it is ritual in character. What we have is not to be regarded as

*Cf. pp. 347ff.

the minimum conditions laid down as a basis of intercommunion between the Jewish and Gentile elements in the church. There was little thought of inter-fellowship or intercommunion as far as the church of Jerusalem and the Judaizers were concerned. The church was content to recognize the 'fait accompli' of the Gentile mission and expansion, but it was not prepared to fraternize on a basis of religious quality and fellowship with the Gentile communities. It wished them well, but was not prepared to give up its own consciousness of having the superior faith. What the food law or ritual decree sent down to Antioch signified was specific ritual requirements to be placed upon the Gentiles in order that they ~~may~~^{might} not offend the Jews or cause any Jewish Christian to stumble if unwittingly he found himself in table fellowship. At the same time the decree was an implicit assertion of the higher faith and greater authority of the Jerusalem church under the care of James the Lord's brother. Where Jewish Christians were prepared to forgo their scruples in the matter and mix with the Gentiles the food law if observed carefully, would unwittingly promote a basis of intercommunion, but even so, this was not willed by the church in Jerusalem, and it certainly did not express the true universal character of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Here we must leave the problem of the church consciousness as it was influenced by the admission of the Gentiles. Nothing is really settled, because the primitive church never really

came to any definite conclusions about its duty towards the evangelization of the world, at least so far as its Judaic and more primitive section was concerned. Although the Gentile mission was confirmed at Jerusalem, a long struggle was still to take place between the Judaizers and the apostle to the Gentiles, as the former followed Paul about and sought to annul his message of salvation in Christ alone, with their insistence on the necessity for ^{circumcision} ~~salvation~~. Not until the Gentile elements became the dominant power in the church did the idea of the Christian salvation depending on circumcision and obedience to the law and the traditions of Judaism die a natural death as far as the church was concerned.

But this development belongs to the second half of the Apostolic Age, and lies beyond our purview, and finally the church catholic, long emancipated from its Jewish limiting influences, began to regard the Jews as heretics, placing them upon her roll of heretics when in A.D. 180 "the heretics turned their former judges into heretics."*

* Harnack: *op. cit.* p63.

CHAPTER X

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE
PRIMITIVE CHURCH AS EXPRESSED
IN ORDINANCES

In the primitive church we discover three viewpoints with regard to the ordinance of baptism, assuming for the moment that we can speak of the rite as a definitely required ordinance of the Church. First, there was the baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus, ~~but~~ which did not in itself confer the gift of the Spirit which was given only after the apostles, or in later times, their successors duly appointed and ordained, had laid their hands on the recipient. This was the view that finally came to prevail in the Ancient Catholic Church. The converts in Samaria had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, but did not actually receive the Spirit until after a visit of two apostles who prayed over them and laid their hands upon them (Acts viii.4-8,16f.). Here the experiences of baptism and of receiving the Spirit are two distinct facts in the life of the new convert to the community.

Second, there was baptism in water which resulted in the possession of the Spirit only if the baptism was in the name of the Lord Jesus. The believers in Ephesus had been baptised, but without any experience of the Spirit since the baptism was ~~that~~ ^{that} of John the Baptist, not in the name of Jesus (Acts xix.1-7). Paul baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus and they

received the Spirit as he laid his hands on them, here regarded as no more than a part of the ceremony of baptism, a sort of natural climax, being not the apostolic mediation of the Spirit as in the first viewpoint mentioned, for Paul was not a member of the official apostolic collegium. Three experiences are combined together here; there was the baptism in water, baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus, and receiving the Spirit as a result of this baptism.

Third, we meet with the baptism of the Spirit given to the members of the Messianic community over against the mere baptism in water associated with the name of John the Baptist. The risen Jesus is made to declare that John baptized with water, but very soon the disciples would be baptized with the Holy Spirit (Acts i.5).* Peter's defence of his action regarding Cornelius turns on the idea of the Spirit baptism which fell upon the centurion and his friends, ^{after which,} ~~and~~ could anyone, ^{he asks,} reasonably withhold the baptism of water, i.e. the mere water rite associated with John the Baptist?(Acts xi.15f.). Here the baptism with water meant admitting formally the Spirit-possessed Gentiles to the new community the Spirit controlled.

In the first viewpoint, viz. the apostolic laying on of hands conferred ^{ing} the Spirit, we are amid conceptions which lead us to the frontiers of the catholic thought and practice of the second century, when the idea of the apostolic collegium was

*Cf. John the Baptist and the same contrast in Mk.i.8.

taking shape and influencing the tradition. The second view with the intrinsic connection between baptism and the gift of the Spirit is also probably due to the association between the two—since possessing the Spirit often led on to taking the formal step of joining the community in baptism—becoming developed into the working theory and practice of the church of the later half of the Apostolic Age.* The third viewpoint, viz. that there was originally no intrinsic connection between the experience of baptism and the experience of the Spirit, follows the idea that the receiving of the Spirit was itself a baptism in contrast with the baptism in water characteristic of John the Baptist. The two experiences were undoubtedly originally separate and had no necessary connection with one another.

The teaching of the Catholic Church is that ^{baptism} belongs to the very beginnings in that it was instituted by Jesus, but the influence of ~~Mystery-religion~~ ideas is at work here in ascribing a sacrament to the direct institution of the head of the cult. If, however, any attention is to be paid to the evidence of the Synoptics, we cannot regard Jesus as being the founder of the baptismal rite for the church. There is no mention of baptism in Mark, Q, or Luke. The Matthaean reference to baptizing the nations as commanded by Jesus (xxviii.19) is exposed to textual uncertainties which raise the question whether this verse belongs to the true text at all (Cf. "The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. I. 1920, pp. 335f. Cf. also Allen's Commentary on St. Matthew, ICC, ad loc p. 307 for evidence from Eusebius that

*E. G. Paul brings the gift of the Spirit and its results in human life into intimate relation with the experience of baptism (I Cor. vi. 11, xii. 13); the Fourth Gospel indicates that the two elements 'water' and 'the Spirit' are in close conjunction (iii. 5, cf. I Jn. v. 8).

the 'baptizing them in the name of the Father...' may not be authentic). Apart from this textual possibility we have the historical difficulty that if Jesus uttered this command to baptize the nations, it is remarkable that the Twelve made no attempt worth speaking of to obey his injunction (cf. pp. 213f. 381ff.). Jesus was in contact with John the Baptist and received baptism at his hands (cf. M. Goguel, op. cit. pp. 269f.), but there is no evidence that Jesus baptized his own disciples as far as the Synoptics are concerned, while any inconsistency as to this in the Fourth Gospel (Jn. iii. 22, iv. 1 where Jesus does baptize, and iv. 2 where he does not baptize) is not conclusive one way or the other as far as the institution of baptism for his disciples is concerned. Jesus' teaching about the Spirit is unconnected with any such rite. "It may be accepted as certain that the rite of baptism was not instituted by Jesus. In view of the importance that was attached to it at a later time, some account of its origin would undoubtedly have been included in the Gospel history if there had been anything in the work of Jesus which might be so interpreted" (E. F. Scott, "The Beginnings of the Church," p. 164).

The baptism of John was evidently the outstanding fact in the Baptist's message, at least from the point of view of Jesus (Mk. xi. 30), and therefore contained with it a uniqueness which made Jesus designate John as the greatest among men born of woman (Mt. xi. 11). Now the only one certain thing we can ascertain about baptism in Judaic usage was that over and above the practice of circumcision, etc. it was the specific rite for admitting Gentile proselytes into Judaism (cf. "The Beginnings of Christianity" ed. Jackson and Lake, Vol. I. pp. 342f. and Vol. V. art. xi. by Silva New, pp. 123 ff.). John was thus using for Jews a rite that was usually used by Jews for Gentiles, thus suggesting that the national privilege and the Mosaic paraphernalia were insufficient for the imminent crisis of the kingdom John was preaching (Mk. i. 4, 7f.); 'think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father' (Mt. iii. 9), for this was useless without a change of heart and life. And since John's message was based on apocalyptic expectations and urgency (Mt. iii. 2, 7, 10-12), the baptism of John would be the admission from Israel as it was at present to the Israel that was to be in the Kingdom that was on the point of coming.

If this was so, John's baptism would indeed be a very bold gesture; we can understand Jesus' willingness to receive such baptism, and the significance of his own baptism for Jesus. No wonder Jesus appreciated John if our interpretation be adequate.

Possibly it was the connection of John's baptism with apocalyptic urgency that suggested and endeared the rite to the primitive community of the disciples of Christ. Those who were baptized, confessing their sins were marked, as it were, for the kingdom, the rest being for the Destroyer.

The Jewish acceptance of Gentile proselytes by baptism possibly influenced the use of the rite for the admission of Gentiles into the primitive church, and this usage would readily coalesce with the apocalyptic series of ideas in baptism as outlined above.

If apocalyptic expectation and urgency influenced the rise of baptism to admit ^{converts} into the Messianic community, and if this be taken with the eschatological significance of the gift of the Spirit in the primitive church, we have a parallel series of experiential ideas which would tend to draw together, so that two experiences which were originally separate found themselves being ^{more and more closely} ~~closer and closer~~ associated. At the same time the act of being baptized often coincided with a very sacred religious experience for the convert, whereby he had broken with his sinful past and submitted to Christ. Such a moment was an inspired one; the heightened religious emotion may well have broken out into tongue-speech, the evidence of the Spirit's presence. Or it ^{might} ~~may~~ break out in vision or in one or another of the many ways in which the Spirit's activity was discerned. The coincidence of all such phenomena with the baptismal experience brought this alongside the experience of the receiving of the Spirit. As with their Master the very intensity of their baptismal experience led them to feel as if the very heavens were opening and the Spirit of God descending upon them.

The baptized convert passed into the Spirit-controlled community, and thus he shared in the new power and the new life inspired by the Spirit. Baptism came to be the open door into inspiration by the Spirit, thus associating still more closely baptism with the Spirit. In the course of time the two came to be felt as being intrinsically connected; in the primitive church experience the baptism with water was the following up of the baptism with the Spirit, but these experiential connections were forgotten and became ultimately formulated into the distinctive doctrine which taught that the gift of the Spirit was conditional upon baptism, and which was later woven with the doctrine of the apostolic collegium which made the gift of the Spirit follow the laying on of hands.

What is the experiential significance of being baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus?"* Explanation is sometimes sought in the light of analogies afforded by the papyri and inscriptions as these reflect the social and religious life of the Graeco-Roman world. For instance, an inscription belonging to the beginning of the Imperial period has the significant statement, γενομένης δὲ τῆς ἀνῆς τῶν προγεγραμμένων τοῖς κτηματώναις εἰς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα (CIG.ii.No.2693e), which

*The Greek prepositions vary: we have ^(ἐπὶ) ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (Acts ii.38) εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (Acts viii.16). No stress can be laid on the alternating prepositions ἐν and εἰς in connection with this formula. "There are many NT passages where a real distinction.. is impossible to draw without excessive subtlety" (J.H.Moulton, op.cit.p.63); probably the oldest form is βαπτίζεῖν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα; if so, the encroachment of ἐν in the Koine has caused the formula to be varied to ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι.

Deissmann translates, "after the sale of the afore-mentioned objects had been concluded with the ἑτηματῶναι εἰς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (Zeus) ὄνομα,"*i.e. the purchasers representing the real purchaser who is the Deity. From this analogy Deissmann concludes that "just as, in the Inscription, 'to buy into the name of God' means 'to buy so that the article bought belongs to God,' so also the idea underlying...'to baptize into the name of the Lord'...is that baptism...constitutes the belonging to God."**

The cumulative effect of the papyri witness shows that in the ancient world generally a name stood for the person that bore it, and that in the case of divine beings a mysterious virtue was assigned to the god's name, so that he who invoked it was brought into a personal relationship with the god. "It is this assumption of the power of a name which must be emphasized at the beginning of any intelligible treatment of its place in the theory and practice of early Christianity."*** The familiar argument develops that "in the name" or "into the name" of Jesus goes back to magical ideas that have filtered through from the wider custom of the ancient world or from very ancient beliefs. The virtue attributed to the deity's name meant that he who called upon it could rely upon its help and protection, thus involving a personal relationship with the deity conceived to be on guard. As Deissmann puts it, those who pronounce the name of Jesus over the person receiving baptism are the acting purchasers for the real purchaser, Jesus, whose name receives a

*Bible Studies, op.cit.p.147. **ibid. ***Silva New, op.cit. p.123.

virtue able to possess and protect the one baptized.*

The diffuse ideas of the ancient world will, however, not account for the significance of "the name" in baptism as far as the primitive church is concerned, for the reaction here is to a much more confined area of thought and practice than is implied in the wider diffusion of the world's life. The primitive church was giving expression to the vital religious experience which centred round Jesus and brought the new community into being. The ancient world's formulae for baptism or the use of a deity's name had no knowledge of the deity walking the earth in human incarnation, making disciples, and inspiring the formation of any community called by the name of the deity. But the primitive church had the inspired remembrance and contact with the personality of the Jesus into whose name they baptized the new converts. They had known him in person and in life. When the church was divorced from the living Jesus and thrown upon an abstract Christ construed in Greek philosophical categories, or tended to become an ancient world cult with Christ the centre of it, magical or mystery ideas undoubtedly began to fasten upon the original Christian facts as Christianity tended to become the dominant mystery religion. But it is another thing to transfer such accretions in ideas to the primitive church where the dominant conception was personal connection with a Christ who was remembered as having lived, with whom the believers had had personal contacts and ^{of whom they had} received many personal impressions. ~~of him.~~

*Cf. Heitmüller as the typical exponent of this 'ex opere operato' view. "Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus," p. 14 (1903).

For the primitive church was reacting not to a Christ myth, but to a personal creator in Jesus, and ^{making use not of} ~~involved no~~ incantations or cabalistic signs, but personal loyalty to a historic personality, in whose name the believers had come together as the Messianic community.

Further the vocabulary, ideas and practices of the primitive church were drawn not from the eclecticism of the Graeco-Roman world, but from the faith in which it was cradled, viz. Judaism and the Old Testament. Hence magical papyri are not authoritative for the primitive church use of 'the name' of Jesus in the sense that the Old Testament is, and it is to this source we should turn to discover the experiential implications of 'the Name' for the primitive church.

Sometimes a man's name often was assumed to denote the sort of man he was (I Sam.xxv.25). The name was the token of ownership, as "Goliath, his name," (I Sam.xvii.4, i.e.the name which sorted Goliath out from everybody else); Joab urges David to go against Rabbah lest he himself capture the city and it come to be called by his name, instead of David's (II Sam.xii.28), i.e.belong to him; seven women will petition a man that they might take his name and avoid reproach, i.e.belong to him (Isa iv.1). The Israelites call themselves by the name of the holy city, i.e.they belong to that city (Isa.xlviii.2). When a man represents another he speaks in the name of that one; ten young men greet Nabal in David's name and speak to him as representing David, i.e."in the name of David" (I Sam xxv.5,9); Jezebel sends letters 'in the name of Ahab' i.e.representing Ahab as she arranges the murder of Naboth (I Kgs.xxi.8, cf.Esther iii.12, "in the name of king Ahasuerus," etc.). The ideas here are that something is done or said in the name of someone, so that it is as if that someone were actually doing or saying the thing himself.

The 'name' designates God himself. Men began 'to call on the name of the Lord' (Gen.iv.26, Ps.cxvi.17, Zeph.iii.9.

Zech.xiii.9), i.e. to call on the Lord. Abram builds an altar and called 'upon the name of the Lord,' (Gen. xiii.8, cf. xiii.4, xxi.33), i.e. worshipping the Lord. The 'name' comes almost to designate the place of worship itself (Exod.xx.24, 'in every place where I cause my name to be remembered, Deut.xii.5, 'the place where the Lord...shall choose...to put his name there.'). At last the place of worship is a house 'for my name' (II Sam.vii.13, I Kgs.v.5, vi.12, viii.19, I Chr.xxii.10, xxviii.6). For the sake of the name, i.e. of the Lord, the stranger will come from far to the temple (I Kgs.viii.41, cf. Isa.lx.9). People are to seek his name, i.e. seek God (Ps.lxxxiii.16). In these instances 'the name of the Lord'=the Lord.

The name of the Lord also denotes possession or ownership; the house called by his name is the house which God owns (Jer.vii.10). When anyone takes on himself the divine name it means for that person that he belongs to God, that God owns him (Jer.xv.16); Israel as a nation is the possession of the Lord by whose name they are called (Deut.xxviii.10, Jer.xiv.9, Amos ix.12, Isa.lxiii.19, II Chr.vii.14, Dan.ix.18, cf. Eph.iii.15); the ark is called by the name of the Lord (II Sam.vi.2=I Chr.xiii.6), so is the Temple (I Kgs.viii.43=II Chr.vi.33, Jer.vii.10f.14, 30), as also is the holy city (Jer.xxv.29, Dan.ix.18), while the city and the people are conjoined in the ownership of the Lord indicated by being called by his name, as in the case of the ark, the temple and the holy city itself (Dan.ix.19).

The 'name' as representative of God is illustrated by Moses who speaks to Pharaoh 'in thy name', i.e. represents God (Exod.v.23); David confronts Goliath 'in the name of the Lord of Hosts,' i.e. as God's representative (I Sam.xvii.45), and blesses the people as representing God (II Sam.vi.18, cf. II Kgs.ii.24). It is as if the Lord himself were doing the action or saying the words which others are doing or saying as representative of him. The idea grows until the 'name' denotes the embodiment of the revealed character of the Lord (Exod.xxxiv.14, Isa.lvii.15, Ps.v.11, cxix.32), while the 'name' shows signs of becoming ineffable (Lev.xxiv.11, cf. Exod.iii.14f.).

We leave to a later stage of our investigation as to what the primitive church thought in ascribing Lordship to Jesus. But in the light of the Old Testament ideas that gather round the use of the 'name' we may discern something of the experiential

significance of baptism into the name of Jesus Christ.

First, 'into the name of Jesus' was another way of saying 'into Jesus', i.e. Jesus himself. The convert was aware that he was being brought into a close personal relation with Jesus. The intimate mystical 'being-in-Christ' which characterized Paul's doctrine of being baptized unto Christ* is not found in the primitive church, yet the baptismal relationship with Jesus into whose name the convert was being baptized set up a personal connection with Jesus. Second, the one who administered the baptismal rite was regarded as the representative of Christ into whose name he was baptizing the new convert. It was as if the Messiah himself were leading in the redeemed believer, and leading him away from the perverse generation soon to be the object of the divine judgment. The very authority for baptizing anyone was none other than the Messiah represented in the one who performed the ceremony. Third, the new convert was aware in his baptism of coming ^{into} under the possession of Messiah; being baptized 'into the name of Jesus' signified that henceforth Jesus owned his life, that Messiah's ownership called his servant to submit and obey. Fourth, since the new community belonged to Jesus the Messiah, everyone who came under the ownership of Jesus came 'ipso facto' within the ownership of the new community; the new convert was therefore conscious that at his baptism he was entering the redeemed community of

*Cf. pp. 39f.

Messiah, that he belonged to it, and shared in its life, its experience of the Spirit, its call, its claims to his loyalty and obedience.

Just as being called by the name of the Lord formed the ground of the Israelites' conviction that they were the Lord's people and possession, so the new believers in the primitive church knew that they were Messiah's people and possession. Here the Semitic and the Hellenistic viewpoints coincide, for Deissmann has made it clear that in baptism the convert was aware of being taken into possession $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau.\delta\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$. *The Gentile converts shared in very much the same sort of religious experience in baptism as the more specific Jewish converts, but we would insist that the primitive church received and interpreted its baptismal experience in the light of a religious background drawn from the Old Testament, in which the sense of being possessed by deity was by no means strange. It did not need Hellenistic experiences to bring into Christianity the idea of being taken possession of by the Lord; it was already there in the native soil.

Thus the new believer in baptism passed through to the new Messianic community, ^{standing} ~~stood~~ henceforth for everything that properly belonged to Christ, all ~~for~~ which the community represented in the coming kingdom of God, becoming incorporated within the new community of salvation.

*** *** *** *** *** *** ***

*Cf. pp. 417f.

What religious experience is implied in the 'breaking of bread?' (Acts ii.42,46). The second reference (ver.46) mentions that this was done 'at home.' Was this an expression of the community on its Christian side in contrast to the previously mentioned gatherings in the temple (ver.46) which were expressive of the Jewish character of the community?* But it is doubtful if the earliest believers were sufficiently self-conscious as a community over against Judaism to feel a contrast implied by this view; at this stage their designation as 'Christian' is anachronistic. Whatever of 'cultus' may be implied by the gathering in temple and the breaking of bread at home, we may be sure that there was 'continuum' rather than 'contrast' in respect of them. The temple was a very likely place whereⁱⁿ Messiah ~~may~~^{might} be revealed, and the 'breaking of bread' would continue the eschatological expectation in view of the heightened awareness of Messiah's imminent return.** It is true that "there is nothing in the text here to suggest eschatological expectations,"*** but the whole ^{'milieu'} ~~milieu~~ was strongly eschatological, whether in the temple or at home, breaking the bread.**** The 'joy' that is so characteristic here (Acts ii.46) has in it the simple joyousness and happy fellowship that bound the believers together in spiritual unity,† but it had a basis rooted in the eschatological expectations, just as the 'brotherhood' experience of the primitive church was based

*As W.O.E.Oesterley thinks, op.cit.p.96. **Cf.pp.219,265,356, Mal.iii.1; cf.E.F.Scott,"The Beginnings of the Church,"p.21.
 G.H.C.Macgregor,"Eucharistic Origins,"1928,p.121. *Cf.ch. VII.pp.355-369. †Joy was a 'symptom' of the Spirit's presence, pp.269f.

on a fellowship inspired by the hourly awaited return of Messiah.* If the cup was shared at the 'breaking of bread' the eschatological element is specifically introduced,** but no mention that it is brought in is found in Acts. The distributive sense of 'in separate houses' (donatim) is to be preferred;*** the collective group of believers gathered within the temple precincts for worship, hoping to see Messiah descend into their midst, breaks up into its smaller fellowship units in the various houses which were the scene of the assembling of the various circles of friends (or Chabûrôth).‡ The 'breaking of bread' connects itself with the probability of the continuance in the Messianic community of the social and quasi-religious practice illustrated in the meal-fellowship of Jesus and his disciples.‡‡ This community of the primitive believers viewed from one angle is a unified fellowship, and from another becomes a series of 'chabûrôth,' and therefore more suited to a home than a public place of worship. Since the last Supper of Jesus was only a special occasion of this common social practice, its commemoration in the primitive church first began in these home circles where the 'breaking of bread' took place.

*Cf. pp. 297-302, 324, 328. **i.e. the 'eschatological' cup, cf. pp. 431-433. ***With Lietzmann, "H-C zum N.T." ad loc. Acts ii.46 (I. p.336). For a discussion on the exegetical alternatives offered for the phrase κατ' οἴκων cf. "The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. IV.1933, p.29. ****The natural explanation of the resort to the temple, viz. because they were pious Jews is of course to be given its fullest weight, but there is probably the conviction that Messiah would return to the most sacred place the Jews knew, in the spirit of Malachi's prophecy (iii.1). ‡Cf. p.325. ‡‡Cf. p.325.

We have had occasion to notice the Jewish practice of gathering for meals with a religious aim in view (cf. pp. 170f. 184, 318, 325). The religious significance ^{attached to} placed on the many feasts in Judaism reveals that the meal may partake of a religious character. In private houses ~~a~~ social, quasi-religious meals used to be of weekly occurrence, and were arranged by "small groups or societies of friends" (Oesterley, op. cit. p. 167). This meal was prior to the beginning of the Sabbath, when it was interrupted as the Sabbath was about to commence. This habit carried with it the hallowing of the Sabbath, the ceremony being known as the Kiddûsh which was the actual sanctification of the Sabbath as this began (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 2nd. Edn. 1911, pp. 374 374ff.). The sanctification ceremony in the first place was known as the 'Kedûshah', and he who presided at it uttered a benediction over it for the 'sanctification of the day' (Kedûshath ha-yôm). At a later stage, in early post-Christian times, both meal and ceremony were transferred to the synagogue, and the ceremony is then known as 'Kiddûsh', an intensive form of the earlier name (Oesterley, 'The Jewish Background of the Jewish Liturgy,' p. 170), and at this time the cup and the bread are both spoken of, as well as the blessing over each, but there is no reason for doubting that this was done in the earlier ceremonies in the Jewish home, which were the original ceremonies.

Originally the meal preceded the sanctification ceremony for the Sabbath, although in later times the ceremony preceded the meal (cf. Oesterley and Box, op. cit. for an account of the later custom, pp. 374f. and cf. too I. Abrahams, ERE, Vol. X. under 'Sabbath (Jewish)' p. 891). An example of the original order is cited by Oesterley from the Tosephta to the Mishnah tractate 'Berakhôth' (v. 1); several Rabbis were reclining at the meal being partaken of as the Sabbath draws near; at the appropriate moment R. Simeon said to R. Jose, "Let us leave off (our meal) for the Sabbath"... and a reference follows to the cup over which the sanctification is said ('Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy,' pp. 170f.).

The meal with the following Kiddûsh ceremony took place on the eve of the great festivals as well as on the Sabbath; each festival had its special Kiddûsh, which included the remembrance for the Sabbath as the holy day of days.

The Kiddûsh custom was therefore one with which Jesus and his disciples were perfectly familiar.

Was the 'breaking of bread' rooted in this Kiddûsh custom?

The reference to this as daily (Acts ii.46) may of course refer to the ordinary family meals which, in turn, may have taken on certain solemn characteristics reminiscent of the Kiddûsh, the farewell meal of Jesus with its pledge of the coming Kingdom,* and ardent expectations of redemption, in view of the imminent advent of Messiah. These meals provided each week the one which heralded the approach of the Sabbath with the Kiddûsh ceremony, and all that was observed was shot through and through with the remembrances of Jesus.

It is necessary at this stage to consider the farewell meal which Jesus had with his disciples in the upper room, since no understanding of its observance in the primitive church is possible unless the character of the last Supper can be appraised. Especially is this so because the earliest believers included disciples who had been at that farewell meal with Jesus, while the immediate contact many of them had had with Jesus in the flesh invested their observance of the last Supper with a significance that was all the more important inasmuch as it was personal to them and to the Jesus they had known personally.

The evidence for the farewell meal is fragmentary and by no means consistent. From the narratives we can detect two streams of tradition which have found embodiment in (1) Mark-Matthew, and (2) Luke-Paul.

Mark's account (xiv.22-26) has the following: καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν

*Cf. pp. 431-433, 441, 446.

αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβθετεξ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῶ ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Matthew's account (xxvi.26-30) has slight variations only from Mark's, whose simple statement ἔπιον ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες is turned into a direct injunction πῖτε ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες and the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is added to define the purpose of the shedding of blood under the new covenant (Mt.xxvi.27f.), an addition more likely to be added to than omitted from Mark. The βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ becomes the βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς (Mt.xxvi.29), a more personal detail which does not affect^{uδ} the general narrative. Thus Mark and Matthew stand together in a common tradition about the last meal. In the course of the meal, Jesus took bread, blessed, and distributed it around, saying, 'Take, eat, this is my body;' then, taking the cup, giving thanks, he passed it round desiring them to drink, and they all did drink of the cup. Jesus then said that the cup was his blood of the new covenant, shed for many, and declared that the next time he drank of the cup would be in the divine kingdom.

The Luke-Paul tradition (Lk.xxii.15-20, I Cor.x.16,21, xi.23-26), offers alternative ideas. Two cups are passed round in Luke's story, and in between is offered the bread; the saying about drinking the cup in the divine kingdom follows the first cup, and prior to the distribution of the bread. The dispensing of the second cup follows that of the bread, and Luke's words follow closely the narrative of I Cor.xi.24f., the most noticeable feature being the injunction to eat and drink in remembrance of Jesus, cf. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Lk.xxii.19); Paul's account supplies the similar injunction to commemorate Jesus in the cup (I Cor.xi.25).

But there is very good textual authority for omitting Lk.xxii.19b.20, i.e. the section which corresponds so closely with Paul's narrative, I Cor.xi.24b.25, for the Codex Bezae and the Old Latin texts omit it. Further, the Old Latin MSS b and e also diverge in the arrangement of what is left after the excision; verse 16 is followed by 10a, after which come verses 17,18,21. The Old-Syriac (sin and cur) has this arrangement also. Zahn accepts this arrangement as the true text, i.e. with the omission ~~left out~~ ("Einleitung", ii.357ff.); Westcott and Hort excise 19b and 20, but not the rearranged order of b and e, as a Western non-interpolation (cf. "The New Testament in the Original Greek," 1895, ad loc. and pp.492, 515; for the full discussion cf. their "Introduction" 3rd.Edn. 1896, Vol.II.), while scholars such as Nestle follow them ("Textual Criticism of the Greek Testament," Eng.Tr.1901,

pp.276f.). Blass would also omit ver.19a and eliminate all reference to the bread, leaving only the one cup, but there is no MS authority for so doing (in his edition of Luke,1897, quoted by F.G.Kenyon in "Textual Criticism of the New Testament,"2nd.Edn.1912,pp.341,349).

On the other hand the evidence for the retention of Lk.xxii.19b.20 is very strong, for nearly all the great Greek versions support **the** reading; there is force in the suggestion that to excise 19b leaves 19a in the air (cf.Macgregor,op.cit.p.54). If it was Luke's desire to assimilate the farewell meal to the Passover, the presence of two cups is not out of place (E.F.Scott,op.cit.p.207), although four cups were usually dispensed at this (cf.Oesterley and Box,op.cit.pp.389-93).

But whether **vx**.19b.20 be accepted or rejected as the insertion of a scribe desirous of harmonizing Luke's account to that of Paul, we still have Luke's independent witness to the dispensing of the cup prior to the distribution of the bread. This feature places Luke over against the Mark-Matthew account. If the omission of 19b is accepted, Luke does not testify to the injunction to 'do this in remembrance of me.' If however we retain the words, Luke joins Paul in witnessing to this injunction, over against Mark-Matthew which says nothing about any such requirement.

Paul's account is claimed to be derived from the primitive church (I Cor.xi.23,cf.pp.31f.), and is in substance very much as the Lukan account (xxii.19f.); Paul adds the injunction 'do this in remembrance of me' to the cup as well as the bread, Luke having it only for the bread. The first cup mentioned by Luke, and the eschatological reference to drinking of the vine which the three Synoptics contain, find no place in Paul's narrative here; but elsewhere he mentions the cup prior to the bread, and implying that the order is by no means settled (I Cor.x.16,21); at the same time the eschatological reference is not missing in I Cor.xi.23ff, especially ver.26.

There seems to be confusion in the narratives as to the exact place of the dispensing of the cup. Did this precede the distribution of the bread? This was the order if the last meal had been followed by the Kiddûsh ceremony, since at this the cup usually came first.* But a further question has to be discussed, for if

*Oesterley and Box,op.cit.pp.374ff.

the farewell supper became the scene of the Kiddûsh, it must have been the Kiddûsh for the coming Passover; but the usual interpretation of the available evidence is that Jesus celebrated the Passover itself with the disciples at this last supper.

The Synoptics make it clear that it was the actual Passover meal; cf. 'on the first day of the unleavened bread, when they were to sacrifice the paschal lamb' (Mk.xiv.12), or the disciples' query, as to where they were to make ready the passover (Mt.xxvi.17, Mk.xiv.12), or again, 'the day of the unleavened bread came, on which it was necessary to offer up the passover (Lk.xxii.7,15). On this evidence, the farewell meal of Jesus was the actual observance of the Passover. On the other hand the Fourth Gospel definitely dates the meal on the evening before the actual Passover (xiii.1ff.29, xviii.28, xix.14, 31, 42), i.e. the farewell meal was held with the Passover meal still in the near future, that Jesus died on the day still known as the 'Preparation of the Passover,' on the evening of which the Passover feast would begin with the eating of the paschal lamb.

We are in the presence of two traditions (cf. M. Goguel, "The Life of Jesus," 1934, pp.429ff.). Indeed, the Synoptics are not consistent altogether in their viewpoint: Mark (xiv.12) places the meal on the first day of the unleavened bread, 'when they were killing the passover;' Matthew with his closer knowledge of Jewish custom omits this last detail, but agrees with Luke in placing "the incident on the day on which, at 6 p.m. Nisan 14 began, so that the Last Supper coincides with the eating of the Passover" (McNeile, op.cit. p.377 on Mt.xxvi.17, cf. Lk.xxii.7). It is precarious to infer inconsistency 'after two days was the Passover and the unleavened bread' (xiv.1), for this may have been spoken a day prior to the injunction to the disciples to make ready. Further, while the desire to eat the passover before he suffered (Lk.xxii.15) may have indicated Jesus' regret that it was not to be fulfilled in view of his coming death, the interpretation may well be that in the very meal Jesus' desire was fulfilled and the words express his satisfaction that he was able to eat the passover before he died; therefore there is no inconsistency here.

We have to choose between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. Attempts to harmonize only bring more confusion, as Goguel points out (op.cit. pp.432f. criticising recent attempts by Chwolson and Billerbeck). The Johannine scheme and date is to be preferred beyond reasonable doubt. (1) If

the meal was to be made ready for the first day of the unleavened bread, as the Synoptics record, the disciples would scarcely have had time to make the arrangements on the same day as instructed, viz. Nisan 14. (2) Although the farewell meal is definitely indicated by the Synoptics as the Passover meal, the details we expect to see are entirely missing; there is no reference to the roasted paschal lamb; the bread passed round is *ἄζυρος* whereas we should have expected *ἄζυμα* if unleavened bread was passed round. The hymn sung does not necessarily point to the Passover (Mk.xiv.26), for the singing of an Hallel is not peculiar to the Passover celebrations. (3) Although the authorities had planned to arrest Jesus before the festival (Mk.xiv.2), it seems that, according to the Synoptics, they accomplished their purpose on the day of the Passover, an inconceivable proceeding involving such breaches of the law as carrying arms (Mk.xiv.47), buying spices (Mk.xvi.1), arrival of Simon of Cyrene from the country (Mk.xv.21), buying linen (Mk.xv.46), and above all the trial and execution of Jesus on the sacred day. (4) Joseph buried the dead body of Jesus at once, because it was Friday afternoon, the hour when the Sabbath began being near (Mk.xv.56).

All these points lead us to decide for the Johannine idea that the farewell meal was not the Passover celebration; it was the social meal partaken of prior to the day of the Passover, and as this drew nigh, the Kiddûsh for the Passover was observed by Jesus and his friends. This hallowing ceremony, according to the Fourth Gospel, and which would be known as the Passover Kiddûsh, occurred on Nisan 14, i.e. 6 p.m. Thursday to 6 p.m. Friday; i.e. on the Thursday afternoon prior to 6 p.m. Jesus and the disciples met for the weekly social meal, and as Nisan 14 approached, i.e. 6 p.m. on the same day as we reckon it, the Passover Kiddûsh was observed, and this came to be regarded as the first institution of the Eucharist.

The difficulty that Friday was the usual day for observing Kiddûsh as the Sabbath approached at 6 p.m. is met by the fact that in this year the Sabbath day coincided with the first day of the Passover Feast; on such occasions, according to ancient Jewish law, the Feast superseded the Sabbath" (Oesterley, "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy" p.175, referring to Pesachim vi.1ff. as authority for the above rule). Thus the usual meal could not take place on the Friday afternoon, for even then the paschal lambs were being slain within the temple precincts; the Passover was to take place at 6 p.m. that day when normally the Sabbath came in, and hence the Sabbath Kiddûsh. Therefore the meal was held on the Thursday afternoon; at 6 p.m. began the day

of Preparation, and the Passover Kiddûsh was observed as this came in; the day of Preparation really inaugurated the Feast of Passover, although it was not reckoned as the first day of Passover officially; yet since the lambs were sacrificed (Exod.xii.2,6) on that day, it really began the feast (on the whole subject cf. Oesterley, op.cit. pp. 158-179, Goguel, op.cit. pp. 429-451, Macgregor, op.cit. pp. 33-49).

Jesus, therefore, celebrated the Passover Kiddûsh during a farewell meal he had with his disciples. It followed the usual procedure of Kiddûsh ceremonies he and they had frequently observed together, but there was an added solemnity about this celebration in view of the heightened Messianic hopes that even now possessed the disciples, although they were bewildered at the thought of the coming death, a mood we have yet to discuss.*

During this Kiddûsh celebration Jesus passed round wine and bread, and in doing so, connected the symbolism with his own personal mission and intention, with specific reference to his forthcoming death, the necessity of which was undoubtedly clear in his own mind as the divinely appointed way for him to tread, in the light of which he himself performed his actions and uttered his significant words.** But what were the disciples making of all this? The purely Kiddûsh aspect caused them no difficulty, for the religious significance of both the Sabbath and the Passover was built up into their faith and piety;*** they were at one in

*Cf. pp. 433 f. **For a full statement of Jesus' thought in the Last Supper, cf. Macgregor, op.cit. pp. 76-110. ***Cf. Ezek. xx. 5, 'Hallow My Sabbaths... a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them,' cf. also Exod. xxxi. 13, 17. The Sabbath to some extent marked Israel off from the rest of mankind (Jub. ii. 19, 31), and marked off the separation of itself from other days, hence the Sabbath is 'holy' (cf. Jub. ii. 32 for the idea of Israel's separateness focussed on the Sabbath itself as a separate day.

their trust ⁱⁿ of the God who had chosen Israel, and were steeped in the lore of Israel's redemption from Egypt, ^{which} ~~as~~ the Passover also emphasised; the Kiddúsh celebration suggested the divine choice of the celebrants as numbered in Israel, and among the heirs of Israel's redemption. These ^{constituent} ~~constitutive~~ elements of religious experience were present at the farewell meal with Jesus, and formed the basic experiential deposit into which anything new would be received, and either accepted, rejected, or modified for the time being, in accordance with the consistency or otherwise of the new with the ingrained religious consciousness already deeply laid down.

If we take the cup first, as on the Kiddúsh theory of the Last Supper this is the probable order, Jesus pronounced the usual blessing on it,** and thereafter declared that the next time he would drink it would be in the kingdom of God (Lk.xxii.18,Mk.xiv.25,Mt.xxvi.29). The disciples perceived what Jesus meant in that the Kingdom of God was at hand with its glory. They were familiar with the idea of the Messianic kingdom as a divine or Messianic banquet; sayings from prophets, psalmists, apocalyptists would be present to their minds as Jesus made this declaration.*** Jesus'

*Following Luke xxii.17f. Paul in I Cor.x.16,21,and Did.ix. **Oesterley's translation of this is as follows:- "Blessed art Thou,O Lord our God,King Eternal,who createst the fruit of the vine. Blessed art Thou,O Lord our God,King Eternal,who hast chosen us from all peoples,and hast exalted us above all tongues, and has sanctified us by Thy commandments. And Thou hast given us in love, O Lord our God, Sabbaths for rest,and appointed times for gladness, festivals and seasons for joy: this Sabbath day and this feast of Unleavened Bread...."op.cit.p.81. ***Isa.xxv.6,lv.1f.lxv.13,Ps.xxiii.5,lxxviii.19,Test.Lev.xviii.11,En.xxiv.4,xxv.4f. cf.Dalman "Words"op.cit.pp.110ff.

earlier references to the joys of the coming age as a banquet* justify the inference that "the conception of an actual repast for the pious was already an old-established idea,"** while "different minds would treat the symbol with varying degrees of material literalism or of spiritual understanding."*** But in the main the literal idea of the kingdom, and thus of the Messianic banquet in store, was the prevailing influence at the moment. The next Kiddûsh they would celebrate with their Master would be in the literal Messianic kingdom on the verge of appearing. And when Jesus went on to say that he had appointed a kingdom as his Father had appointed for him, that they ^{might} ~~may~~ eat and drink at his table in his kingdom (Lk.xxii.29f.cf.Mt.xix.28), the disciples had no doubt that the kingdom was no longer to be delayed, and soon they all would be partaking of the Messianic banquet.

But there was the recurrent uneasiness about what Jesus said of his forthcoming death, and this came to the fore once again when Jesus broke the bread, ^{distributing} ~~distributed~~ it with the words, 'This is my body.' Whatever the subapostolic and ancient church made of this, whether mystery religion influences brought in ideas of eating the god, and thus the broken bread signifying the body of Jesus eaten in sacrament, the disciples in the upper room at the last supper looked on this with no such thought. As Gore points out, "sacramentalism was not a characteristic of the Jews. The Jews regarded their sacred rites as divine commands...They

*Mt.xxii.1-14,xxv.1ff. Lk.xiv.15. **Dalman,op.cit.p.111. ***A.H. McNeile,op.cit.ad loc.Mt.viii.11,p.105.

were circumcised because it had been so sommanded, that they might remain within the covenant, into which as Jews they were born. They offered sacrifices because they were the divinely appointed means for maintaining or renewing their good relations with Jehovah. But they did not regard them as instruments of spiritual grace."*

The action of Jesus was a piece of profound symbolism, which taken together with the solemn words, 'This is my body,' denoted his approaching death as necessary to the Messianic banquet at which he and his friends were shortly to be present. It signified his body to be broken into its many fragments, the sharing round of the bread following the usual Kiddûsh custom of partaking of the bread that had been blessed.** This was how the disciples would interpret the symbolism before them, especially when due regard is paid to the significance of the eschatological cup that had just been passed round. In the very raising of their hopes of the kingdom, the latent cross-purposes with Jesus in view of his emphasis on his coming death reasserted themselves.*** The new religious material was still finding no resting-place in their conscious outlook as Jews who could not reconcile Messiahship with suffering.**** Was there going to be the separation after all, in suffering and death as Jesus had several times mentioned? Did

*"The Holy Spirit and the Church," 1924, p.92. **The blessing over the bread at the Kiddûsh ceremony was "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth" (I. Abrahams' rendering, ERE Vol. x. op. cit. p. 891). The symbolism of Jesus' action is not that of broken fragments coming together into the unity of the loaf, and expressing the unity of the company in fellowship, a conception influenced too much by the Didache (cf. pp. 44-7f.). ***Cf. pp. 181-6. ****Cf. pp. 74-76, 103f.

the giving of himself for the blessing of many mean that he was going to die? His testimony to the need for sacrifice exemplified both in his life and words must have impressed them again and again, but was it necessary that he should go to such sacrificial lengths as to suffer death? Yet here was the bread spoken of as if to say 'This stands for my forthcoming sacrifice in my body being broken for you in my death.'

This sacrificial symbolism was further heightened by the solemn associations of the passover the Kiddûsh for which they were celebrating. Ideas of redemption were to the fore, in view of the divine intervention in the history of Israel in the deliverance from Egypt. The disciples were aware that the paschal lamb was substituted for the firstlings and firstfruits which by right belonged to Yahweh.* Were such sacrificial ideas associated with the forthcoming death of Jesus? If so, the very absurdity of the situation would only be the more consciously apparent to the disciples, if Jesus was to be the Messiah to bring in the divine kingdom just pledged in the cup that had been dispensed, for the suffering could not be conceived to be necessary for the bringing in of the Messianic banquet.

So far we have viewed the Last Supper along the familiar lines of the Kiddûsh observance where the cup came first, and then was followed by the distribution of the bread. But as our records stand, the cup was dispensed also after the bread, and is given a covenantal significance. Here the traditions are unanimous in

^{xvii. 29f}

*Exod. xiii. 11-13, ~~xxiii. 19~~. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 19f.

that both the Mark-Matthew and the Luke-Paul streams mention a cup with which was instituted the new covenant in Jesus' blood. Nothing would be simpler than to accept this specific element in the farewell meal, and yet no part is so beset with difficulties and uncertainties which are so formidable as to cause considerable hesitation in accepting it as authentic. The covenantal idea does not appear where the cup precedes the bread, as in Luke, but the third gospel brings in the covenant cup after the breaking of the bread. Are the two cups in Luke, together with the variants in the text here indicative of the uncertainty which the church of Luke's age had in respect of the original procedure and significance of the farewell supper?

If we accept the covenantal reference of the cup following the bread, we have to inquire what was implied in the words 'this is my blood of the new covenant' (Mk.xiv.24).

We may set aside the idea of διαθήκη as meaning here 'testament,' as if the cup stood for the last bequest of Jesus, the testament he delivered to his friends before his death, i.e. in the sense of the institution of the meal to be observed in future 'in remembrance of me.' For the Messianic hope which so possessed the disciples precluded any thought of commemoration of his name as here suggested. Further, the prospective suffering and death were raising doubts as to whether Jesus was the Messiah after all, and if these doubts triumphed there would be no incentive to remember one who had brought such disillusion. Certainly the disciples did not look on it as a testament.

The διαθήκη would at once arouse echoes of what Moses said in the institution of the covenant associated with his name (Exod.xxiv.8), and if Jesus referred to a new covenant in his blood, it would refer to a new covenant set up by his death. We are not simply in the presence of the setting up of mutual conditions of alliance in a 'brotherhood, as Réville thinks ("Les Origines de l'eucharistie,"

1898, cf. pp. 143ff.), although the shared cup was itself an implied covenant of fellowship. While the original idea in 'covenant' may have been that of a religious contract between the Deity and his worshippers, this aspect passes out of sight as the awareness of the divine sovereignty comes to the fore, and the conception centres round the God who deals with men through His gracious purpose, placing them within a certain relation to Himself rather than by means of mutual agreement to be allies. This divine grace is well illustrated in Jeremiah's famous covenant passage (xxxi. 31ff.).

Jeremiah's words may well have been in the mind of Jesus, especially in view of its intensely spiritual character. He was convinced that through his death men were to be brought into a new relation with God, in view of the advent of the divine kingdom which that death was to prelude. The Kingdom of God was yet to come, yet God was already in some sense the ruler; where He was not yet king in was in the human heart which did not fulfil the terms of Jeremiah's covenant, 'Know the Lord.' The one spiritual essential to effect the human heart to acknowledge God was a better knowledge of God, for if men knew Him truly and experienced Him as He was, they would enthrone Him in their hearts. Jesus had this unique knowledge and experience of God; he viewed his coming death as his endeavour to bring to men this unique knowledge of the Father as he knew him, and looked to his death to accomplish in this matter what his teaching had failed to do. Thus, in the giving of his body, and in the covenantal reference of his blood, this new knowledge of God was to be set up for mankind. Jesus may have drawn an analogy between his death as inaugurating this new covenant relationship and the ancient covenant set up with its sacrifice.

But we have still to reckon with the disciples lack of comprehension as to the significance of Jesus' forthcoming death. This would tend to destroy for their minds any covenantal reference in the cup, since they could see no meaning in Messiah suffering and dying. Whatever may have been in the mind of Jesus as to the new covenant he conceived himself to be inaugurating in his death, there was no immediate apprehension of any such covenant in the mind of the disciples.

We have, however, to recognize that there are serious difficulties in the way of accepting the authenticity of the 'covenantal cup'. (1) It is precisely at this point that our evidence is at its deepest confusion, as the Lukan variants reveal; the tradition on which he relies reveals a state of uncertainty as to the place and the number of the cups; Luke has two cups, Mark-Matthew have one; if the shorter text of Luke be accepted, we obtain the order, cup, bread, and this is found in the reverse order in Mark-Matthew. Further, on the Lukan shorter text, the Third Gospel mentions an eschatological cup only, while Mark-Matthew combine the idea of the covenant with that of the eschatological pledge in the cup. (2) The difficulty caused by the variation in the order of the cup presents an almost insoluble character. If the order of Mark-Matthew-I Cor xi.23-25 be accepted, i.e. with the cup following the bread, how are we to account for the order of Luke-I Cor.x. 16,21-Did.ix, where the cup precedes the bread? And if the Lukan text be received as it stands, how account for the two cups? The Kiddûsh cup may have been so normal a matter that the former tradition may not have deemed it of sufficient importance to mention it, and so placed the eschatological reference to the next drinking of the cup in the Messianic Kingdom along with the covenantal reference (Mk.xiv.24f.). On the other hand, if we prefer the Lukan-I Cor x.-Did.ix. tradition we have still to account for the Mark-Matthew arrangement with its covenantal

reference.

Possibly the Mark-Matthew tradition has come under the influence of Paul's thought about the Cross and the death of Christ as a sacrifice. The conjunction of the Last Supper with the death of Christ as now seen in retrospect has been closely effected in Paul's account of the Supper; the cup is now 'the new covenant in my blood', showing that the church was emphasizing the covenantal aspect by the time he wrote, and indeed prior to his writing, since he is claiming to hand down what he had received from the primitive church; this aspect, conjoined with the setting forth^{of} the breaking of the bread as the sacrificial denoting of Christ's body given up in death (I Cor.xi.24,25), shows how the church soon began to discern a distinctively covenant reference to the death of Christ. This approach may well have moulded the growing tradition from which came the gospels, which in turn reflected these ideas in stressing the covenantal aspect of the cup at the Last Supper. But even in the Pauline tradition the cup appears to have come first sometimes (I Cor.x.16,21), although here the covenant idea is strongly to the fore.

If we may venture on a tentative suggestion as to the way the 'covenant' cup developed from the original 'eschatological' cup, we would view the process somewhat along these lines. (a) The Messianic forecast as touching the drinking of the vine in the Kingdom of God ("until I drink it new in the Kingdom of God") would easily call up Jeremiah's idea of the new covenant as setting

forth the conditions of the new Kingdom. There may have been something said in reference to this covenant over the 'eschatological' cup that pointed in this direction. (b) While Réville is not justified in unduly stressing the covenant idea as instituting the new 'brotherhood'* he points most justifiably to the reality of the fellowship heightened by the words and actions of Jesus in the Last Supper, for the cup that was distributed and shared was itself an implied covenant of fellowship, and in the period following the resurrection of Jesus and the emergence of the new Messianic community, the 'fellowship' aspect would be seen to have been set up in the last Supper. (c) Jesus placed his death between the present order and the new state of life to be brought in by the Kingdom of God ("I will no more drink of the vine until I drink it new in the Kingdom, etc."), ^{and} helped to connect his death with the new fellowship of the Spirit, and suggest the offering of his blood as 'my blood of the new covenant.' (d) This reference in the distribution of the bread was probably due to the assimilation of this item in the observance to the covenantal reference in the passing round of the cup, since this was placed eventually after the breaking of the bread. While the cup had originally the character of an eschatological pledge,** we should also allow for some germinal 'covenant' ideas possibly inherent in the whole setting of the scene, as affording some experiential basis for the later development of the 'covenant' cup as seen in Mark-Matthew and in Paul.

*op.cit.pp.143ff. Cf.above,pp.436f. **Macgregor,op.cit.pp.72f.

We may now venture to state our view of the character of the Last Supper. It followed the Kiddûsh ceremony, with the added solemnity of the imminent Kingdom and the death of Jesus as necessary to the inauguration of the new order. As the Day of Preparation for the Passover drew near, the Kiddûsh celebration took place at the farewell meal. The cup was first dispensed, and was interpreted in an eschatological sense.* Something was said or implied which laid a subconscious basis for later observance of the Supper as the memorial of the new covenant setting up the new Kingdom of God, and thus the eschatological cup came to take on a 'covenant' character. This 'covenant' character is revealed in the later gospel strata of the Mark-Matthew tradition. But the reference of the 'blood' shed as denoting the death of Christ was unnecessary since in Jewish psychology 'body' denoted both 'flesh' and 'blood'** and the covenant parallelism of the cup would be tautologous as the 'body' already covered any reference to the shedding of Jesus' blood.*** Such 'covenant' germs as were inherent in the Last Supper are implied in the distribution of the bread with the words, 'This is my body.' Therefore the second cup, or the 'covenant',^{cup} was unlikely, if the participators were Jews, and ~~or~~ even if the cup followed the bread instead of preceding it,

*"The eschatological interpretation enables us to reconstruct more exactly the 'milieu' amid which the words of Jesus were spoken at the Supper, even if it does not exhaust their reference" (J.H. Srawley, ERE, Vol. V. 1912, p. 542, col. i.). **Cf. pp. 119, 198f. ***The Fourth Gospel has sorted out these respective elements of 'flesh' and 'blood' in its so-called eucharistic references (vi. 54), thus betraying its Hellenistic character.

it would still be 'eschatological' in character.

Throughout the whole ceremony the reference was to the coming Kingdom of God, and the place of Jesus' death in relation to it. The latter element was received with consternation by the disciples, but when the death came to be viewed in the different light which the resurrection of Jesus shed, as the community of Messiah came into being, that death began to be interpreted along the lines of divine necessity leading finally to its 'covenant' significance for the divine Kingdom. These ideas in turn influenced the observance of the Last Supper in the primitive church and brought the specific 'covenant' aspect of this more within the purview, until it found its place in the growing tradition of the **Life** of Jesus.

If the eschatological character of the Last Supper be accepted, the likelihood is that Jesus gave no express injunction to 'do this in remembrance of me.' The Mark-Matthew tradition is silent on this, and Luke mentions it only in connection with the bread; and this reference is found only in the longer text which is omitted by good authorities (Lk.xxii.19b). Paul is the only straightforward witness to such an injunction; he mentions it in reference to both the bread and the cup, although it is likely that the cup has been assimilated to what was required in reference to the bread. New Paul claims to have received his tradition from what had gone before him (I Cor.xi.23). It is difficult to discern where tradition ends and Paul's comments or paraphrase enters, as, for example, in the words "for as often as ye eat

this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," where it is not certain if we have here the tradition or Paul's own comment.

It is not possible, however, to regard Paul's account in reference to the injunction to 'this do in remembrance of me' as conclusive evidence that Jesus himself laid down such a requirement. Had such an injunction been forthcoming, it is almost inconceivable that the Marcan tradition would have omitted it, for the silence does not by any means ^{indicate} that the commemoration requirement must be implied.* Further, the eschatological 'milieu' of the Supper tells against any suggestion that the rite was to be repeated in remembrance of Jesus, for the next cup the disciples were to share with Jesus was to be at the Messianic banquet (Mt. xxvi.29).** What would be the purpose of an injunction to observe the Supper again and again in remembrance of Jesus, if he and his friends were so soon to sit down together at the Messianic banquet? The procedure at the Supper indicates a series of actions wrought once for all during some significant moments by way of a farewell assurance that the separation of Jesus through death was to be no more than temporary, together with a convincing pledge of Jesus' imminent triumph. The sharing of the eschatological cup would be thus construed by the disciples, even though they did not understand the need of Jesus' death as symbolised by the broken

*As Gore supposes, op.cit.p.55. **"In the very act of dispensing the Supper he (Jesus) declared his belief that the consummation was near and that he would presently drink the new wine in the Kingdom of God" (E.F.Scott, op.cit.p.220).

bread. Yet both assurance and pledge were there, and the significance attached to them became clear in the experience of the resurrection appearances to the disciples.

But there were experiential conditions which were to ensure that the rite be repeated again and again, until it seemed as if Jesus himself had made this very requirement. The resurrection supervened, and the second Kiddûsh celebration took place with the triumphant awareness that Jesus was risen. In the joy of this triumph of Jesus his death took on a new meaning, and the solemnities of the Last Supper received a new enlightenment. The weekly Sabbaths were heralded by the usual ceremony of Kiddûsh, the cup dispensed and the bread distributed with the usual blessings but with the added personal and vital association with the Last Supper of Jesus. This Kiddûsh celebration became invested with all the wealth of new religious experience centring in the risen Jesus and the eschatological expectations thus heightened. As they passed round the cup and the bread it may have almost seemed as if Jesus were once again with them, or that his very footfall were being heard on the threshold of the room in which the believers were.

In this way the observance of the Last Supper began to find its way as the spontaneous expression of the new dynamic faith in Jesus, coupled as it was with their Jewish religious ideas as associated with the Kiddûsh to which the observance now became attached. Resurrection experiences of Jesus may well have come to them even as the cup was being blessed and once more, as Jesus

appeared in the midst, he and his friends would celebrate the Kiddûsh together; i.e. visions of him would be interwoven with the celebrations. The very intensity of the new life would make it quite possible for the Kiddûsh ceremony to become a matter of daily observance for the time being, since any day the Kingdom might be inaugurated.

In the light of these ideas the 'breaking of bread' was probably the weekly Kiddûsh observance centring upon the assurance and pledge of the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper. But the new joy was also carried into the ordinary meals of the home life, and believers would be reminded at every ^{return} ~~turn~~ of their meals of the significance of the breaking of bread and sharing the cup as touching the Kingdom to come at any moment.* At all events no observance of Kiddûsh among the believers could henceforth be unrelated to that Last Supper which confirmed their awareness of being the heirs to the kingdom. The germs of the covenant significance of what had there transpired began to shoot up as gradually the Last Supper, and so their spontaneous observance of it, became for them the covenant or the charter of their new status as the community of the Kingdom. While the

*"But it was about the family board, where brethren in the household of faith were welcomed with sacred joy, that the fellowship ...reached its crown. Here the housefather, reverently taking the creatures of the heavenly father's bounty, blessed with words of thanksgiving, and distributed among the company in remembrance of Him whose return was at first daily expected. Then did hearts burn and eyes fill with tears of love and joy. For was it not the Lord's Supper that they kept?" (Bartlet, op.cit.p.465).

Kingdom was still strictly in the future, it became theirs even in the present by confident anticipation. The believers felt themselves to be children already of the new family of God, as if the Kingdom were already operative among them. It seemed as if Jesus were present in their gatherings showing his wounded hands and side.

Thus the 'breaking of bread' began to take on the form of a celebration of Christ's words and actions in the Last Supper until he should come in the glory of the final consummation. Imperceptibly the observance came to assume the vital authority that it had been so commanded by Jesus whom the believers were holding in throbbing remembrance until their expectations of his return were realized at last. The basis of it all lay in what the disciples had seen and heard at the Last Supper, and through them the primitive church kept it in remembrance as the pledge of the believers' citizenship in the coming Kingdom. In remembrance of the Jesus soon to return they joyfully met together, and it seemed as if it was none other than Jesus himself who had enjoined the celebration, so intimately was he related to what they were doing.

The solemn symbolism of the broken bread as signifying Jesus' death came to its rightful place in the comprehension of the believers. It stood now for the sacrifice of Jesus in his death, now seen to be the divinely appointed way. They saw how Jesus had been about to give up his life for the Kingdom, how in very truth he was a ransom for many since through his death he inaugurated the new order of things into which many would enter and take their

place. The symbolism of the broken bread was now seen to be tantamount to apportioning the believers a place in the Kingdom to be ushered in through his sacrifice. And now, as they broke the bread and awaited his return, they felt that they could claim their place in the new community of which he was the vital centre.

The Didache sheds light on the nature of the primitive church observance of the Lord's Supper. While the later atmosphere of this writing seems undoubted,* there is a primitive church strain in the eucharistic prayers (Did.ixf.). The cup precedes the bread, and over each the appropriate prayer is said.** From the prayers it seems that the 'cup' was an eschatological one; the reference to the the holy vine of David" recalls a series of concepts which the primitive church would have no difficulty in looking on eschatologically,*** and probably refers to the impending consummation. Along with the broken bread, the cup symbolizes the Messianic banquet; there is also the thought of sharing in the life of the coming Kingdom, and ^{it} is therefore the expression of a fellowship based on a common expectation of salvation consummated through the advent of the divine Kingdom in the power of "Jesus thy Servant." While the broken bread scattered over

*Cf.pp.67,347,352f. **The prayer over the cup was, "We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever." Over the broken bread the prayer was, "We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered over the hills and having been gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom, for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever."

***Such as 'the root of Jesse', 'the Son of David.'

the hills may be expressive of the common brotherhood of believers who by this time had spread to distant lands, the underlying idea is still eschatological, the ingathering of the kingdom and its consummated life of which the bread was the symbol.

The Didache therefore points to the primitive nature of the observance of the Lord's Supper as this was carried out in the primitive community, despite its post-Pauline date.* The conceptions revealed are more primitive than what we find in Paul. The striking nature of the parallels between the Didache prayers and the Kiddûsh blessings points to the coalescence of the two sets of prayers and blessings in the primitive church observance of the Lord's Supper.

As the gospel was carried further afield and the new communities were formed the observance of the Lord's Supper found its way into the Gentile churches. The dominant original ideas began to weaken, and entrance was afforded for ideas and interpretations of the ritual which were quite foreign to the atmosphere of the Last Supper. The Gentile world began to graft on to the observance ideas and practices drawn from the wider pagan world with its magical ideas, its mystery cults, although there is little evidence that such seriously affected the new faith during the Apostolic Age.**

Within the orbit of the primitive church even as this embraced Gentile churches, the observance probably retained for

*One seems to discover here some sheltered geological deposit where relics of earlier forms of life are preserved. Macgregor, op. cit. p. 148. ** cf. pp. 48-51

the most part its primitive character. There is, however, surprisingly little reference to the observance in the Acts of the Apostles, or for that matter in Paul's epistles. Was the controversy over Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles (Gal.ii. 11ff.) connected with such an observance? If so, Paul's severe criticism turned on the point that Peter had showed that the sacred rite was only for Jewish Christians, and without circumcision there could be no validity attached to the Lord's Supper. But the occasion may well have been one of ordinary table fellowship, and there is no evidence available for deciding the matter. We hear, too, of a celebration at Troas (Acts xx.7-12) in connection with a solemn religious assembly,* which took place in the evening. The ceremony is called the 'breaking of bread' and was enacted at some point after the accident to Eutychus (ibid. 9-11). No information is forthcoming as to the nature of the celebration here.

Despite the silence of Acts, the summary reference to the 'breaking of bread' (Acts ii.42) indicates that the ceremony was becoming habitual in the primitive church. We may therefore conclude that the Last Supper was being regularly observed wherever the church was being established.**

*Cf. the 'many lights' ver. 8, and the time notice, 'on the first day of the week,' ver. 7, suggestive of a special gathering for public worship. **It will be noticed that no reference has been made to the observance of the Last Supper as a 'love-feast' or 'Agape. This is due to the fact that the evidence nowhere lends support to any such idea. The gatherings were much more significant than expressions of brotherly love; the fullest allowance must be made for the eschatological 'milieu' in which the observances were held. Only in Jude 12, is the love-feast mentioned, and this is a very late reference. The love-feast belongs to the second century.

CHAPTER XI

THE INFLUENCE OF JESUS

The religious experience of the primitive church had its roots amid the contacts men made with the historical Jesus. We have already investigated these contacts as made by the crowds, by the religious authorities, by the publicans and sinners, and with special reference to the smaller circle of disciples who had left all and followed him.* In the closer contacts these men had in their daily friendship with Jesus, an experience of him was being continually apprehended, and subconsciously they were being prepared under his dominating influence for their future work of leading the primitive community. What came after the resurrection in the religious upheaval which produced the new community took place because of what had happened before in the impressions and experiences men had of Jesus in his life.

The logic of the final resurrection appearance known as the Ascension was the apprehension of Jesus now in his exalted status as the Messiah sitting at the right hand of God, soon to return to bless the awaiting community that had now come into being. Such Messianic exaltation was at first viewed along the usual crude literalistic lines,** but there ~~was~~^{was} emerging a series of positive factors which influenced a more spiritual awareness of Jesus' new

*Cf. pp. 121-42, 164-88. **As in the literalist manner in which the disciples looked on Jesus' Messiahship after they had recognized him as Messiah, cf. pp. 181ff.

exalted status.

(1) Once the significance of Jesus' death was grasped in its connection with the Messianic Kingdom, and its necessity thereto correspondingly felt and gloried in, the way was opened for the more definitely spiritual elements in Jesus' personality and status to emerge. The way of suffering, deliberately chosen and pursued in obedience to the divine will, is at the very least an intense expression of spiritual vitality and power, and one that began to be appraised by the primitive community as we see in the application to Jesus of the categories of Israel's traditional suffering servant.* Even apart from any significance concerned, the disciples' experience of the crucifixion of one whom they loved and revered must have had a tremendous emotional effect upon them; to their understanding the Cross had been a stumbling-block but there must have been a great reinforcement in the emotional elements of their moral and spiritual experience of Jesus. When the meaning of the suffering received new light after the resurrection, the now enlightened understanding no longer kept back the subconscious emotional apprehensions of Jesus; these came forward and contributed their power to the growing spiritual perceptions which henceforth were increasingly to find their place in the believers' interpretation of Jesus.

(2) The exaltation of Jesus opened up the Godward significance of him whom the disciples had known and experienced as Jesus

*Isa.lii.13-liii.12; cf.pp.74f.

of Nazareth. No one could be conceived to be at the right hand of God's transcendent presence without reflecting that ineffability and spiritual majesty.* The Jesus they knew was now a partaker of the divine presence as a spiritual being,** having reached that status through spiritual means such as suffering, sacrifice, and obedience to the divine will. From their own experience of Jesus the believers had been led to place him at God's right hand, the place of honour with God, even before the angels and the archangels, and therefore having close intimacy with God. The intensely spiritual manner in which the Jews conceived God led the believers to postulate similar spiritual character and being to the Jesus who had been exalted to the place of honour near the divine presence. The traditional and literal expectations of his descent still held sway, and at any time the believers expected his 'sensuous' return to the world in judgment. But there were now present in the religious experience of the believers dynamic spiritual elements which as these emerged began to reveal the God-ward character of Jesus' personality, and the more specifically spiritual approach to him received a new

*Cf. further, pp. 460-466 **Current Messianic expectation, of course, implied the heavenly majesty of Messiah in some of its forms, especially in reference to the 'suprahuman' type, or the type which was a syncretism of both the suprahuman and the human (cf. pp. 101, 103). But a different circle of religious experience is involved in the unique apprehension of a Messiah who had been intimately known as a man, and who had given rise to a series of impressions and experiences by sheer force of his uniqueness and commanding goodness, such as to cause the eyewitnesses to apply the highest category they could to define him, and later to make the tremendous inference that he was exalted to the right hand of God.

emphasis in their experience, with the more inward reference of his life and all that his life had meant to them.

The primitive community was therefore vividly conscious of the fact that Jesus had been exalted to the right hand of God.* On the other hand the ~~the~~ ~~believers~~ undergo religious experiences and on the basis of them reach common conclusions which lead them to the joyful recognition that Jesus is present with them amid their gatherings, their Kiddush celebrations with the observance of the Last Supper, their worship in synagogue and temple, and in all the many-sided forms assumed by the new life experienced. There is not the direct reference to this awareness of Jesus' presence in the midst ~~as~~ ^{that} we have in regard to the conviction of his exalted status. On the surface it certainly appears that the believers looked on Jesus as a being in transcendent aloofness. At the same time, however, hints are not wanting of the central place present experience of Jesus had in the fellowship, so that while regarded as exalted at the right hand of God, he was felt to be near in his spiritual presence.

(1) The organic connection which the disciples had with the Jesus they had known in the flesh cannot be regarded as ~~missing~~ as they became aware that he had gone up into heaven. The sense of his presence did not evaporate with the experience of the Ascension. As in the dark days between the Cross and the Resurrection when the disciples could not escape the awareness that he who was crucified was still unaccountably present to them,**

*Lk.xxiv.51, Acts i.9,11,ii.23,25-28,36,iii.13,20f. iv.10,vii.55, and cf.pp.219,240,297f. **Cf.pp.193f.

so even when they felt him to be exalted, the impelling power of his personality was still in them. The mood of personal joyous devotion to Jesus still continued and even grew from strength to strength as they remembered his ways and words, his suffering and death, as they recounted all these facts to one another and to the growing number of converts. Jesus was indeed at the very centre of their devotion; in some real sense, even if they were not able to define it, it seemed to them that Jesus was near to them, even if removed to the right hand of God in exalted glory.

(2) The sense of personal contact with Jesus was further reinforced in the baptismal experience which admitted the converts to the new community of salvation. The personal surrender to Jesus, the submission to his influence, the faith evoked and the expectation of salvation to the coming kingdom, brought Jesus near to the hearts of the believers. All these experiential factors were focussed to one sharp point in baptism: the one who underwent the rite became aware that now he belonged to Jesus, while the one who administered it 'in the name of the Lord Jesus' was aware of being his deputy. Nay it seemed as if it were Jesus himself who was there administering the baptism, and actually receiving his new devotee into the community awaiting the consummation of their redemption. Further, ~~in~~ the celebrations of the Last Supper in its association with the divine blessing and presence in the Kiddush celebration had Jesus at the centre of the faith and piety expressed; God was the overshadowing divine presence worshipped and blessed in reverent piety, while the

Jesus exalted at His right hand was also felt to be near. For the observance was so organically associated with the personal Jesus and all that the eyewitnesses had seen in him, that it was not difficult for them to feel that he was there again breaking the bread or dispensing the Kiddûsh cup. The force of spiritual suggestion has to be recognized in view of the intimacy of the ceremony associated so personally with Jesus. The wine suggested the imminence of his return with the Kingdom, the bread reminded them of his sacrifice in death in order to ensure the triumph of the divine reign. The believers were aware in very truth that Jesus was near them, and even in the midst, as they celebrated the Last Supper.

(3) The awareness of Jesus' presence was further encouraged by the experience of the Spirit in the primitive community. The coming of the Spirit was definitely connected with Jesus, who had bestowed the gift upon them (Acts ii.33). All that Jesus was both in life, and in his expected return, was viewed as the inspiration of the Spirit,*and in turn, as the Spirit inspired the healings, visions, and the variegated expression of the life of the new community, Jesus would be brought to mind. Far from the Spirit being the substitute for Jesus^{on his} departure to heaven, the Spirit suggested Jesus in all the phases of the inspired activity of the believers. The Spirit was the earnest of Jesus' presence in the midst as well as the pledge of the final triumph of the consummation of the Kingdom.

*Cf. pp. 237-239.

(4) The most potent of the influences which mediated the presence of Jesus in the community lay in his very exaltation at the right hand of God. It was not a matter of being placed in a high position in the heavenly hierarchy; Jesus was in the place of honour by God's side.* Now it is true that the multiplication of intermediary beings in pre-Christian Judaism seemed to make the divine Majesty very remote from human life.** Yet the simple faith and piety of devout people made it possible for them to feel that God was very near. If it were true that no one could look on the face of God and live (Exod.xxxiii.20), or if the remote Deity of the temple cultus ~~which~~ permitted the high-priest to enter into the ineffable presence ^{only} once a year (Exod.xxx.10, cf. Lev.xvi.Heb.ix.7), it was also true that there was ^{no} escape from His presence (Ps.cxxxix.7ff.). Pious souls were aware that while Yahweh dwelt in the high and lofty place, He had his abode also in the humble and contrite heart (Isa.lvii.15). In awe Israel regarded the name of God as blasphemy to pronounce, but the inward apprehension of the divine presence was the corollary to a faith at once intensely spiritual in its awareness of communion with God, even as it placed God so far away. The devout worshipper came to temple and synagogue to seek God and moreover to find Him.

Now in so far as the primitive church became conscious of the exalted dignity of Jesus, there went along with the conception the sense of his distance in aloof grandeur. At the same time

*Cf.pp.451f.

**Cf.pp.107-109.

this very exaltation carried with it an awareness of Jesus for the believers that he was not therefore limited in his approach to them, nor was the way barred from their approach to him. The thought of Jesus at the right hand of God led sooner or later to there being ascribed to him some of the characteristic ways of God with His people. Indeed we find that Peter himself has in one instance transferred the typically divine quality of grace to Jesus (Acts xv.11). As the believers felt that they were well-pleasing to God, the proof of which was the attestation of the Spirit in their midst, so they were aware that they were well-pleasing to him who was now the exalted Messiah; they were able to heal in his name, ^{and to} represent him at the reception of new converts in baptism made members of his community. Nay, it seemed as if he were there in their own persons and they ministered and witnessed to him.

(5) The transition of the awareness of Jesus as exalted Messiah to the consciousness of him as present with his disciples was also influenced by the parallel movements in the experience of the Kingdom and of salvation. The Kingdom, though strictly future, came to be discerned as an object of present possession, as the hope of its apocalyptic consummation began to fade into the background, the final consummation being transmuted into expectation of eternal life in the kingdom not of this world.* Corresponding to this change, there was a similar development in the

*Cf. pp. 359-365.

experience of salvation, which in the first place was mainly connected with the coming of the Kingdom, and was therefore mainly eschatological in character. This, in turn, is transmuted into the experience of salvation as a present possession with its final expression in the glory of eternal life.* In the same way the experience of Jesus received by the community underwent a change, for the Jesus who was the exalted Messiah came to be the centre of present experience of the Kingdom and of salvation. The Jesus at God's right hand comes to be the Jesus of the "Lo! I am with you always" (Mt.xxviii.20). As the apocalyptic hope of Jesus' return lessened its hold, it gave way to the sense that Jesus was with them as the object of definite spiritual experience, and as the believers looked back, they made the discovery that he had been with them all through the new life of the community. The consummation of their experience of Jesus was transmuted into the hope of the complete union with him in the eternal life of the eternal kingdom not of this world. Thus did the eschatological Messiah in exaltation come to be for the believers the Christ of their experience, and experiential data are provided for the understanding of the connection between the Jesus of history, the Jesus whom many of the believers had actually known in life, with the presence of Christ in spiritual experience.

It is not suggested that the primitive church reached out fully and finally to these experiential conclusions, but the

*Cf. pp. 370-374.

processes that were to issue ultimately to the perception of these religious truths were definitely at work in the religious experience and discovery of the primitive church. By virtue of their power the church of Paul and of the Fourth Gospel was to attain to the clearer vision of the mystic presence of Christ, but already the foundation was being well laid before Paul's constructive thought and experience came to work on the life and outlook of the church.

From another experiential approach the awareness of the presence of Jesus appeared to be a specific quality of a more general sense of the presence of God, the specific quality being found in the unusual vividness and effectiveness the believers had discerned in Jesus. What they knew of Jesus made them aware of divine activity being present in a vivid and powerful way, spiritually energizing in unparalleled ways. The experience of God that went with apocalyptic expectation was one of the God afar off, but who would one day, the day of the Lord, be powerful and triumphant here and now. But in so far as what the believers discovered in Jesus as the object of present experience gave them an experience of God powerful and triumphant in the present, such awareness of present divine energy helped to take the force out of apocalyptic expectation, and with it the hope in the eschatological Christ as the Messiah of apocalyptic consummation. Just so far as they experienced the power of God through Jesus, the Christ of present experience would come to be the significant fact of their religious life.

We have finally to interpret the minds of the primitive church believers as to the divine or semi-divine honours they were led to ascribe to Jesus, together with the reaction of such ascriptions on their own faith and religious experience.

Once the identification of Jesus as the exalted Messiah was made, it was inevitable that the categories in which the Jewish mind conceived Messiah's personality and office were applied to Jesus. This does not mean that Jesus was merged into the figure of the suprahuman Messiah, since he had lived as a man in their midst and was even now known as Jesus of Nazareth (Acts ii.22). Yet the church was aware that this human Jesus had been raised to heavenly glory as Messiah, and encouragement would be therefore forthcoming to apply to him the categories relevant to the suprahuman Messiah. Indeed, these provided the highest thought-forms available for the expression of the dignity of Jesus as they had discovered it in their own experience.

Jesus is the Messiah, the Anointed one, signifying the divine appointment (Acts ii.36, iv.27), the emphasis being on the ordination of Jesus by God for his solemn office (cf. also Acts ii.22, x.38, iii.20), and this idea is found in the use of the word "Christ;" even when the original Messianic significance of the title faded as the Gentiles came into the church, this sense of divine appointment in his heavenly status still remained. Amidst purely Jewish Christian circles, however, the original Messianic idea is always retained, and its full

significance was known only in such circles.* Jesus the Messiah is further known as the Righteous one (Acts iii.14,vii.52,xxii.14),** the Elect one (cf.Lk.ix.35,xxiii.35),*** which refers to Jesus as chosen by God for Messianic dignity and office, and as the Son of Man (Acts vii.56).****

If therefore we have instances of the ascriptions of Messianic titles to the exalted Jesus, there is reasonable probability that other apocalyptic ascriptions would be applied to his Messianic status.

Of these ascriptions we may mention (1) Jesus the Messiah and the Judge of the world.‡ He is regarded as the Judge of the quick and the dead (Acts x.42,I Pet.iv.5). According to the gospel tradition, Jesus had appointed twelve disciples to the office of judging the twelve tribes of Israel,‡‡ when the Son of Man should sit on the throne of his glory, i.e. in his capacity as Messianic Judge(Mt.xix.28,cf.Lk.xxii.30). In the outlook of the primitive church the function of Jesus as Judge in the

*"The term Christ, when used alone, is always used distinctly as a Jewish title." "The term Christ, whether used alone or in combination with Jesus, never occurs except in relation to a Jewish environment"(C.Ryder Smith, "The Names Christ and Jesus in the Acts,"Expos.Times,1907-8,pp.45f.). "...change of thought and language came when Christianity passed from Jewish to Gentile life: Jesus came to be interpreted metaphysically rather than historically, so that his self-chosen title was reduced to a surname, and Jesus the Christ became Jesus Christ"(A.T.Cadoux, op. cit.p.158). **Cf.p.101. ***Though there is no direct reference in Acts here, the Lukan references may possibly be a reading back into the gospels the Messianic ideas as applied to Jesus, and thus express the thought of the primitive church in this way. Cf. p. 101. ****Cf.p.101. The distinctive personal title of Messiah. (101 ‡As judge Messiah has the needful righteousness (En.xxxviii.2, xxxix.6,liii.6), the needful wisdom (En.xlix.1,3,li.3),and power (En.xlix.3,lxii.6). ‡‡Cf.pp.169f.296.

Messianic Kingdom in much emphasized. The speech of Peter at Pentecost resounds the themes of impending judgment (Acts ii. 34f.38-40), as the appeal for repentance shows. The eschatological 'milieu' of the primitive community reveals strong judgment tones.

Indeed, the possibility has to be faced that here we have an illustration of the influence of primitive church reflection upon the growing gospel tradition,* and that the presentation of Jesus as Judge with the series of concepts involved** ^{is} ~~are~~ due not to Jesus himself, but rather to the application to his person and office^{of} the functions of the Messiah of apocalyptic coming to judgment, especially as seen in ideas of the Messianic Kingdom***

It is strikingly noticeable that in Mark the references of Jesus to judgment are entirely absent. The possible exception refers to the censure of Jesus upon the scribes who for their hypocritical conduct will receive the greater condemnation(xii.40). But this is a moral judgment and has no reference to eschatological judgment, nor does Jesus conceive himself to be the judge. The Marcan references to Gehenna are no more than conventional (ix. 43,45,47), and Gehenna plays little part in apocalyptic conceptions, being (a) a place of corporal and spiritual punishment in the presence of the righteous (En.xxvii.2f. xc.26f.Ass.Mos.x.10) and (b) a place of spiritual punishment only (En.xcviii.3,cf.ciii.8). The 'little apocalypse' (xiii) has no hint of Jesus as judge; apart from the reference to the gathering in of the elect, there is nothing in it that can be construed as judgment (xiii.27).

On the other hand there is emphasis on the judgment function of Jesus both in Matthew and in Luke. The striking contrast between their reports of the Baptist's preaching and Mark's is significant: the additions to Mark are (1) the reference to John's hearers as a 'generation of vipers' and the ironical reference to their fleeing from the wrath to come; not even being children of Abraham is any guarantee of salvation; even now the axe is laid at the root of the tree (cf.Mt.iii.7-10=Lk.iii.7-9): (2)

*Cf.pp.8,12.

**Cf.p.102.

***Cf.pp.96f.

the amplification of the coming Messiah in his rôle of judge with the fan in his hand to purge thoroughly the threshing-floor, gathering the wheat into the garner, and burning the chaff in fire that cannot be quenched (Mt.iii.12=Lk.iii.17). Again, the eschatological emphasis on judgment is seen in the reference to the only sign that an evil generation shall receive, viz.the sign of the prophet Jonah (Mt.xii.38f.41f.=Lk.xi.16,29-32), in the 'woes' pronounced over Chorazin and Bethsaida for their failure to repent in view of the coming crisis of the Kingdom (Mt.xi.21-23=Lk.x.13-15), or the judgment on the careless slave who fails to notice the return of his lord implying judgment on the heedless generation when Messiah comes unexpectedly to judgment (Mt.xxiv.43-51,Lk.xii.39f.42-46). Many will unexpectedly find themselves left outside the divine favour at the Messianic judgment, and there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Mt.viii.11f.=Lk.xiii.28f.), while dire doom awaits the infidelity of Jerusalem (Mt.xxiii.37-39=Lk.xiii.34f.).

It is remarkable that these eschatological pictures of judgment are absent from Mark. The cumulative effect of the references, mainly from 'Q' is to present us with the Jesus coming to eschatological judgment along the familiar apocalyptic lines. This aspect seems to have received a remarkable emphasis as the sayings of Jesus were recollected in a vivid atmosphere of apocalyptic expectation such as characterized the primitive church. Matthew again is noted for its pessimistic features which reminds us of the pessimism of the apocalyptic outlook on a world conceived as utterly evil. The reiteration of the direful nature of future punishment, the repetition of the doleful phrases 'eternal fire,' 'outer darkness,' 'weeping and gnashing of teeth,' 'many are called but few chosen,' all reveal the sombre colouring of the apocalyptic background against which the life and words of Jesus are placed. This colouring is not so marked in Luke (cf. H.G.Wood, "The Parting of the Roads," 1912, pp.160ff.), for in this gospel there are more joyous notes altogether.

There is therefore a strong possibility that the words of Jesus have, in the course of their formation into tradition, been given a 'judgment' emphasis in the eschatological sense in a way they were never originally intended to bear. This does not mean that Jesus never referred to judgment issues, but these were more concerned with the specifically moral and spiritual aspects of

human conduct and life. There are inner moral elements in apocalyptic judgment, but these are enclosed within a picture series which tend to obscure the more specific moral elements. But it is less with the eschatological judgment and more with the moral and the spiritual sides that Jesus is concerned.

(2) Jesus the Messiah was the Revealer of all things, especially as touching the hidden worlds of righteousness and sin.* The disciples remembered that Jesus had warned them that there was nothing hidden that should not be revealed, nothing secret that should not be brought to the light (Mk.iv.22). In Mark the meaning probably is the revealing of truth concealed by some parable; so also in Luke (viii.17) but elsewhere in Luke the reference is to the coming to light of a man's real nature concealed by hypocrisy (xii.2). In Matthew (x.26) the meaning is that the disciples sent out by Jesus are to be revealers of the great things which in turn Jesus has revealed to them. The experience implied in the parables centres round the function of Jesus as Revealer of the invisible worlds of righteousness and sin, inasmuch as these portray the significant facts of the divine purpose as revealing the divine will, as determinative of the truth of the Kingdom of God. The world of righteousness was the awaited kingdom when righteousness would prevail, and the righteous be revealed; the world of sin would emerge from its hiding-place with the Messianic summons to judgment, the wheat and the tares would at last be sorted out (Mt.xiii)

*En.xlvi.3,xlix.2,4.

24-30).

Here again we may have another hint that the primitive church ^{is} reading typical Messianic conceptions into the function of Jesus, or emphasizing this aspect of his office as Messiah, although it does not follow that Jesus himself was not influenced by this idea of Messiah in current apocalyptic.

(3) Jesus as Messiah was regarded further as being the quickener of the dead,* another aspect of the Messianic function as contemporary thought viewed it. We have already referred to the various modes in which the resurrection was conceived;** the prevailing idea for the primitive church was that all dead Israelites are to arise,***and once more the worlds of righteousness and sin are to be sorted out and brought to the light with blessing for the righteous and retribution for the evil; such revealing included the dead at their resurrection, as well as those who were alive at the advent of Messiah. Those in the primitive community who died before the coming of the Kingdom would be raised up.**** The hopes of the believers were thus not to be limited by death, and Jesus the Messiah was regarded as being responsible for them until the time came when he would bring them alive with him.

(4) Jesus the Messiah was regarded as the Vindicator of the righteous, another typical function of Messiah.● The righteous

to

*Cf. En. 115.1, 116.5). **Cf. pp. 105-107, 200. ***Dan. xii. 2, En. i-xxxvi. (except xxii. 13), xxxvii-lxx. lxxiii-xc. II Macc. vii. 9. and cf. p. 200. ****Cf. I Cor. xv. 23ff. I Thess. iv. 16, cf. II Thess. ii. 1. †Cf. En. xxxix. 7, xlvi. 4, 7, li. 5, liii. 6, lxii. 7f. 14f.

are those who are to be saved, and are already being saved by anticipation, to the Kingdom of God.* In none other than Jesus the Messiah was salvation to be hoped for (Acts iv.12); he was the Vindicator of his people in the Messianic community, as he upholds, champions, and rewards their fidelity.

(5) Jesus as the Messiah was invested with preëxistence, an idea derived from apocalyptic.** The Jesus whom the disciples had known on earth, now elevated to God's right hand, was now seen to be the preëxistent heavenly being familiar to their minds. The preëxistence was not yet fully developed as applied to the significance of Jesus' person; it was for Paul to make clearer what was involved. There is no need to rely on the thought of the Graeco-Roman world with its ideas of deification to account for the ascription of preëxistence to Jesus, for the Jewish environment against which the primitive church stood had within itself the needful categories and circle of ideas which made it inevitable that Jesus the Messiah would be regarded as preëxistent as a glorified heavenly being.

This brings us to the point at which we may consider the

*Cf. pp. 320-322.

** "Yea, before the sun and the signs were created,
Before the stars of the heaven were made,
His name was named before the Lord of Spirits." (En.xlviii.3.)

"And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before Him,
Before the creation of the world and for evermore." (En.xlviii.6.)

"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 to the elect." (En.lxii.7.)

influence of Jesus which led the believers, out of their experience of him, to designate him as 'Lord,' the name which became "the common appellation of Jesus Christ among His followers."*

The name was evidently applied to Jesus at a very early stage of the community's development (Acts ii.36, iv.33, vii.59, cf. Lk. xxiv.34). The Septuagint renders "Yahweh" by 'the Lord' (ὁ Κύριος), therefore the Greek-speaking Jews who used it were hardly likely to transfer the title from the Septuagint to Jesus, since the strong monotheistic character of their faith would discourage any infringement of the sovereign being of Yahweh. The ascription must therefore have been made either by Gentile Christians whose sense of monotheism was not so intense as in the case of the Jew, or else Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jews unfamiliar with the Septuagint began the usage through the application of an Aramaic word of dignity which did not infringe upon the divine status of God.

The preservation of such a word, viz. "Maranatha" points to the source of the ascription of Lordship to Jesus in the Jerusalem Messianic community. The word appears in its Graecised form in one of Paul's epistles (I Cor. xvi.22) and points to the primitive church usage taken over by the apostle. The Didache also has the word (x.6) in reference to Christ, and thus reveals one of the primitive church ^{strains} ~~stains~~ which characterize this document. Thus the name was applied to Jesus at least as early as the period when

*C. Anderson Scott, "The Fellowship of the Spirit," op. cit. p. 58.

the gospel tradition was being put together in its original Aramaic.

The credit for the designation of Jesus as Lord has been given to the Gentile Christians. In the Graeco-Roman world κύριος was commonly used to indicate respect in addressing a person not unlike our use of the word 'sir,' or the complimentary 'Mr.' This usage had its roots in the position that men had of commanding obedience and ownership of other persons who were in a position of slavery, κύριος being the correlate of δούλος as denoting possession or absolute obligation of obedience. The Roman Emperor could receive the exalted designation 'Dominus et Deus.' The devotees of Attis, Osiris, and the like designated the mythical hero of his mystery cult as 'Lord.'

The papyri illustrate all these uses in a prolific way. A son writes to his father and calls him κύριε; Ἐπιμαχῶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ πλεῖστα χαίρειν; "To Epimachus his father and lord heartiest greetings" (BGU 423, lines 1f. cf. line 11 κύριε μου πατῆρ, "my lord father"). For the Roman Emperor designated as κύριος cf. Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, "(in the 7th. year) of Tiberius Claudius Caesar the Lord" (P.Oxy. 37, line 6). For the reference to the mythical hero of a religious cult, cf. εἰς κλῆτρην τοῦ κυρίου Σαρὰπιδος, "at the table of the Lord Serapis" (P.Oxy. 523, lines 2f.). For further illustrations cf. Moulton and Milligan, VGT under κύριος.

The supernatural reference of the term is probably only secondary, and the Gentile Christians may quite naturally have applied it to Jesus without any necessarily divine implications. It may have been used by them simply to sort out his distinctive standing without any thought of placing him as 'God' or among the gods.* At the same time the objects of adoration, whether

*We know today what "the Lord" means in divine significance, but this leads no one to mistake the House of Lords for a divine pantheon.

Emperor or cult heroes or heroines, are worshipped as if there were supernatural significance about them, especially in the religious reference of cult divinities characterized by Paul as the 'lords many' (κύριοι πολλοί I Cor.viii.5). To these the name 'Lord' was ascribed in adoration, and since the experience of redemption was central to the devotees of these cults, the deified hero concerned was thought of as the redeemer who brought the desired salvation.

There are striking likenesses here to the Christian outlook on redemption centred in Jesus the Lord bringing salvation to those who believed, i.e.to his devotees.* It is therefore not surprising that the analogies have misled much modern thought into the supposition that the new faith centring in Christ adopted one of the names, viz.κύριοι from the older cults prevailing at the time. Bousset, for example, thinks that the term came in through the Hellenist-Christian community of Antioch and elsewhere, reflecting in idea Jesus the God-man or deified-man of the Hellenistic world of religious experience.**

The theory comes to grief on the simple fact which our discussion on the significance of Jesus' exaltation has attempted to make clear,*** viz.that the primitive church had no need to go to the cults of the ancient world for a title significant ^{of} ~~the~~ supernatural dignity and status. The believers had within

*Cf.Deissmann,"Light from the Ancient East,"4th.Edn.Eng.Tr.1927, p.349, Bousset,"Kurios Christos,"1913,p.111, F.J.Foakes Jackson and K.Lake,"The Beginnings of Christianity," Vol.I.pp.410-412, for discussions on these analogies. **op.cit. pp.111ff. ***For a penetrating criticism of Bousset's standpoint cf.A.E.J. Rawlinson,"The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ,"1926,pp.92f. 231f.

their Jewish religious consciousness pregnant suggestions and categories of exaltation which enabled ^{them} to give fitting expression to the Messianic dignity and exalted status of Jesus at the right hand of God, without having to borrow their lofty categories from the table of Serapis. The primitive church had already at its hand in its 'milieu' of Messiahship the very thought processes to lead it to denote the status of Jesus as the deepening insight called out for such designation, and such ideas had the advantage of being native to the soil from which the church took its rise.

The probability is that Jesus was regarded as Lord as a natural result of his exalted dignity as Messiah since this carried with it associations of sovereignty ^{and} grandeur _x in a supernatural sense of belonging to the heavenly. A.E.J. Rawlinson reminds us that we must find the earliest ideas of Christ ~~as~~ entertained by the primitive community in 'Q' and in the speeches of the earliest chapters of Acts.* Accepting Harnack's reconstruction of 'Q' as a working basis** we find that κύριος is used some sixteen times,*** and of these only three fall to be noted as far as they may refer to Jesus. (1) Jesus makes use of a quotation from Deut.vi.16 in rebutting the voice of temptation, but it is not even necessary even to contemplate that by "tempt the Lord thy God" Jesus was referring to himself (Mt.iv.7

*In "Foundations" ed.B.H.Streeter,1913,p.152. **As we have already done elsewhere, cf.p.349. ***Mt.iv.7,10=Lk.iv.12,8 (twice),Mt.x.24f.=Lk.vi.40(twice),Mt.vii.21,cf.Lk.vi.46(twice), Mt.viii.6,8=Lk.vii.6(Mt.twice),Mt.ix.38=Lk.x.2, Mt.xi.25=Lk.x.21,Mt.xxiv.45-50=Lk.xii.42-46(four times),Mt.xxiii.39=Lk.xiii.35,Mt.vi.24=Lk.xvi.13.

=Lk.iv.12). (2) In Mt.vii.21 Jesus says "not everyone that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of God," with which the saying in Luke should be compared, "why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"(vi.46). Jesus probably used of himself some honorific title of address where the gospel has the Greek $\kappa\upsilon\omicron\rho\iota\epsilon$. Whatever the Aramaic word was* it probably denoted the sort of supremacy that called for obedience. Therefore the address, 'Lord, Lord,' would not be more here than a slightly heightened translation of the Aramaic designation. (3) Mt.xxiii.39 (=Lk.xiii.35) is again a scriptural quotation (Ps.cxviii.26) made by Jesus as he refers to himself as the one coming in the name of the Lord; here the reference is really to God.

The earliest deposit of the gospel tradition reveals the use of 'Lord' as implying no more than a honorific title suggestive of some heightening in view of the transition from the Aramaic word to the Greek $\kappa\upsilon\omicron\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

"At first the title רַבִּי רַבִּי used in speaking to and of Jesus, was no more than the respectful designation of the Teacher on the part of the disciples. As soon as Jesus had entered into His state of kingly majesty, it became among His followers an acknowledgment of sovereignty."** In making such an affirmation of his uniqueness the primitive church showed its personal connection with their Messianic sovereign. It was his community by

*Dalman gives רַבִּי , op.cit.p.324,328; cf.the original in Dan.ii.47, iv.16. **Dalman, ibid.p.329.

his own right and possession; he claimed the obedience and entire submission of the believers, while they on their part claimed through him citizenship of the redeemed in the divine Kingdom. When the new convert had pronounced over him the name 'Lord' and confessed 'Jesus is Lord,' it signified that in being received into the Messianic community he had brought himself under the requirements of submission and obedience to him to whom belonged the community.

The primitive church was intensely Christ-conscious. Organically as the believers were connected with Jesus in life by a wealth of impressions, contacts and experiences gained at first-hand, they passed into fellowship with him, the Christ of exaltation. They ascribed to him the well-known Messianic categories, and thus enhanced in their experience of him the sense of his heavenly dignity and power. At the same time they became vividly aware how near he was to them. Expecting his return at any time, they felt his quickening presence close to their hearts. But there was more than the merely conventional ascriptions of Messianic dignity and function to him. "Through intercourse and teaching He had come to have for them a religious significance, indefinable, perhaps, but of inestimable value. Through contact and companionship with Him their conception of God had been so enriched that it might be said to be changed, their relation to Him changed from that of "servants" to that of "sons." And they had tried, when challenged by Himself, to put

this experience into historical form by recognizing Him as "the Messiah!"* These spiritual aspects received greater emphasis through the new experience which formed the believers into an awaiting, joyful community bearing Christ's name, heightened by the awareness of ~~his~~^{the} exaltation to which he was now raised at the right hand of God.

"At the centre of their present joy and expectancy was the thought of Messiah Himself. Marana tha, "Our Lord, come" was their keynote; and as they dwelt on it, their hearts burned within them, fellowship rose to ecstasy, and His presence became so **spiritually** real, that His returning footsteps often seemed at the very door. The thrill of such hours is felt in the ejaculatory petitions of the Didache; "Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David...Marana tha."**

*C. Anderson Scott, op.cit.p.55, and cf.above pp.172-174.

**Bartlet and Carlyle, op.cit. p.49.

CHAPTER XII

THE CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER

Sabatier has defined for us the method of investigation we have endeavoured to pursue in our study of the primitive church. "The proper object of theology," he writes, "is the study of the religious phenomenon in general and the Christian phenomenon in particular; this is that section of reality which it is the duty of theology to study and make known to others. For however mysterious may be their first cause, and however complex may appear their manifestation, religious phenomena are psychological facts, which everyone discovers first in himself and then in the past. Theology therefore has two sources—psychology and history—and their union must constitute its entire method of observation, direct and indirect."*

We have attempted to approach the origins of the Christian church by the empirical method. We might have approached our subject through the theological analysis or synthesis of ideas and principles, and as detached observers, have watched the play and interplay of these religious ideas with no reference to the religious experience from which they were evolved, much as the 'behaviourist' in psychology will study the animal or the human

*"The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit," Eng.Tr.1910,p.348.

being without reference to the inner psychological activities or life experience of the observed subject in conscious or sub-conscious mental activity. The result would have been to erect an artificial structure of abstractions and concepts, interesting enough to the pursuit and love of analysis, and acquiring strange shapes in any attempted synthesis. If we follow such a method with the historical approach, we obtain a detached, analytic expression of the origins of the church, but shorn of the 'living' element which in the first instance made possible Church history and Christian theology.

A recent illustration of this approach is afforded by the volumes on "The Beginnings of Christianity" which F.J.Foakes Jackson and K.Lake have edited.* No one would suspect from these thorough researches that there had been any such phenomenon as religious experience, any more than one could glean from the psychological studies of J.B.Watson** that man had any mind to be psychologically observed, or from Professor Leuba's studies of religion*** that man, the unit which reveals religious experience and its phenomena, had anything to be religious with, and so can dispense with it.**** The Behaviourist studies mind by eliminating it: Foakes-Jackson and Lake and their learned collaborators would seem to have studied church beginnings by eliminating the very vitality and experience that began

*5 Volumes, one of which deals with the text of Acts, issued at various intervals between 1920-33, and referred to now and then in our investigation. **"Behaviour," 1914, "Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviourist," 1919. ***"A Psychological Study of Religion," 1912. ****"God or Man," 1934.

Christianity. Their standpoint is that Christianity "appears not a single religion but a complex of many, justified in claiming the name of Christianity by reason of the thread of historic continuity which runs through and connects its component parts...For, like all religions when studied critically, Christianity is a process, not a result."* What physiological processes are to the Behaviourists as accounting for the exhibition of phenomena that can be strictly called psychological, so historical processes appear to be the organic reasons for the display of the religious phenomena classified by the critical historian under the one heading "Christianity."

But what originally starts the historical process or processes viewed as Christianity? The answer of our discussion is the religious experience of the primitive church. Religious data furnished in religious experience are the fundamental ultimates either for the historian or the theologian. If the church historian objects that he is concerned only with the historical processes at work, we reply that empirical or psychological facts show themselves within the time process, and as components in the life of those who experienced come within the purview of historical investigation, otherwise historical analysis evaporates the quickening religious facts, and becomes devoid of the life element which in the first place produced the phenomena and the processes which history dissects.

The recognition of the need for psychological and empirical

*op.cit.Vol.I.p.265.

investigation to go along with the historical saves from such inadequate judgments of the beginnings of Christianity as "a synthesis between Judaism and the Graeco-Oriental thought of the Empire."* For our investigation has called attention to the religious experience centring in and around Jesus the Christ, an experience rooted in the living Jesus and men's impressions of him. Why did not the Judaism associated with the teaching of John the Baptist as it found its way into Asia Minor (Acts xix. 1-4) where it had the opportunity of reaching a synthesis with Graeco-Oriental thought produce such a synthesis as Christianity is supposed to be? There is, moreover, the fusion of Jewish and Graeco-Roman thought in the philosophy of Philo whose full knowledge of both sides encouraged him to formulate a synthesis which would win the religious allegiance of Jew and Greek, and the noble effort failed. A new philosophy was produced, but no new religion was forthcoming. For all synthetic attempts based on intellectual concepts fail to achieve religious power. The modern historico-critical method reduces Christianity in its beginnings to a series of fundamental ideas sifted out by all the finesse of analysis; it then discovers many ~~analogous~~ ideas by the same processes of analysis in the Graeco-Oriental world of thought; these parallels are synthesized and an amalgam of intellectual concepts results which is designated Christianity. Thus the Christian religion is emptied of the very distinctiveness which caused the rise of the new faith, viz. the power of

*Foakes Jackson and Lake, op.cit. p.266.

religious experience inspired by contact with the personality of Jesus.

The empirical method we have pursued is therefore a much needed corrective to such a partial interpretation of Christian beginnings. To return to Philo, who, on the historico-critical principles we have criticized ought 'a priori' to have been the founder of a new religion, we find that an ancient world philosophical synthesis grew around his teaching, but no religious movement. A new religion grew round the name of Jesus of Nazareth, who inspired the birth of a new community vitalized by a powerful religious experience centred in him. Both Philo and Jesus had disciples, but those of Jesus took fire and went out to preach an experienced gospel received by contact with him.

We may follow the course of the river quite easily in its lower reaches where the stream has become broad and deep, but the story of that river is not told by these expansive aspects or the widening estuary. The upper reaches have to be explored, hidden springs discovered, tiny rivulets followed from their sources until they join the main stream which goes on its winding way until it becomes a wide and deep ^{stretch} ~~surface~~ of water on which the ships of all nations may ply to and fro carrying the treasures of the earth within their hulls. It is uncertain and hazardous work to get among the springs in the mountain fastnesses and remoteness, yet these are the explanation of

the river viewed from the standpoint of origins.

In terms of religious poetry the Christian church as a product of religious experience has its springs high among the eternal hills. Passing from the symbolism of the springs at which we find Jesus Christ and his power to the field of historical reality, we discover that "into the stream of passing generations there entered just then (sc.the beginning of the Christian era), there was seen for about thirty years, Someone who has been ever since the great problem. He was not among those who, while they were here, wrote down words which men may still read. He wrote nothing. All we know of what He was, of what He said, is from the memories of His friends. But what was written in those memories was of such a sort that the world has never since been able to escape from the personal force which grasped it through that reflection."*

This is why we had to investigate the various impressions Jesus made upon his contemporaries, for from those impressions, contacts and experiences which men received of him emerged the new community which gave birth to the Christian church.

The crowds were astonished and men exclaimed in awe, "What manner of man is this?" The rising enthusiasm for him became dangerous, since false Messianic hopes were likely to centre around him. Yet there was a quieter regard elsewhere for the words of grace that flowed from his lips, and found a worthy response in the hearts of those who rejoiced in the love and

*Edwyn Bevan, "Hellenism and Christianity," 1921, p.63. Cf. above, pp. 8f.

reverence of God and humbly awaited the redemption of Israel in the Kingdom of God.

The religious authorities, however, watched Jesus with increasing anxiety, and ~~seek~~^{sought} to reduce his growing popularity by endeavouring to force his hand on the matter of Galilean nationalist patriotism (cf.p.132). Jesus decided to challenge them at Jerusalem, and the authorities assist unwittingly in the very thing they ~~are~~^{were} most anxious to avoid, viz.the accomplishment of Jesus' mission as Messiah-Redeemer, who trod his way through to the Cross and on to the triumph in the Resurrection, thus calling into being the Messianic community of salvation.

Then there were the taxgatherers and the sinners, outcast from the religious faith and hope of Israel, with whom Jesus made his contacts. What a store of memories and impressions they were able to share with their fellow believers in the primitive church! Did they not recall again and again how Jesus of Nazareth had sought them out and made friends with them? Did they not rejoice at the redemption he brought to them, as a physician might visit and heal the sick, and make them feel that they belonged to God, even if God's people had excommunicated them? Thus the very 'raison d'etre' of his mission became clear, viz. to seek and save those who were lost. Here Jesus made contact with Hellenist elements in the persons of Gentiles, many of whom were of irreproachable life, yet outcast from Israel since they could not claim "we have Abraham

to our father." Such elements provided good material for the spread of the Messianic community after the resurrection, and they brought with them a religious outlook of a freer order, since they were not bound to observe the laws and the traditions of Judaism.

The works of Jesus as seen in his miracles, the wonder of the cures, and the manner of them, combined with the actual experience of being made whole in such unexpected ways, ^{and} served to heighten the wonder of the impressions Jesus was making as he moved among men. In his power over the demons we see his spiritual potency for good confronting the insidious power of Beelzebub and his minions the evil spirits, as if the power of the kingdom of God were already overcoming its opposing agency in the cures of Jesus, thus providing a foretaste of the revealing of the invisible worlds of righteousness and sin which found a place at the heart of apocalyptic expectation of what Messiah would do. The overpowering of the demons was for the eyewitnesses the sure sign that the new order of righteousness was at hand. But in all these experiences the personality of Jesus and his unique power and goodness shone forth in all his grace and healing love.

The words of Jesus are illustrated in his parables, for eyewitnesses were more likely to remember imagery and symbolic picture than more formal teaching. Not to hide, but to reveal his truth did Jesus thus speak, although the primitive church **imposed** his meaning to be apprehended only by those who were in

sympathy with his outlook. But sympathy was not sufficient in itself. The disciples and others misunderstood much of his teaching because they meant by the Kingdom of God something different from what Jesus did. In the light of later experience the primitive church was able to see more clearly where hitherto there had not been understanding. As the parables were recalled the tendency was to interpret them as if they were spoken to the primitive church instead of to the Jews and Galileans to whom they had originally been uttered. Thus we find impressions of Jesus' teaching commingled with later interpretation in the light of subsequent events and developments. The inner significance of the parables lay in that Jesus was seeking to arouse the Jews to realize their mission to the Gentiles. The sense of religious crisis inherent ^{in them} betokened the imminence of the Kingdom but popular interpretation narrowed ~~any~~ such crisis to that pride of nation which ardently desired to see the Gentiles at the feet of conquering Israel. The crisis Jesus had in mind was the religious one of awakening the Jews to their religious call as the bearers of a way of light and salvation to the world. Ethical values are therefore found at the heart of his teaching for those who had ears to hear; there were some who heard and appropriated the truth of Jesus, and to them we owe these ethical elements in the impressions Jesus left upon them.

All through the ministry of Jesus his personal disciples were making what they could of him. The positive elements of their experience of Jesus were fitting them for leadership in

the new community, for these men, from their association with Jesus were in the best position to transmit many significant impressions and experiences, and the fact that so much of the spiritual uniqueness of Jesus has come through the gospels witnesses to the positive and creative influence Jesus was exercising upon their minds and hearts. What they apprehended of him demanded at last the application to him of the highest category that was available for their minds, viz. the Messiah, although they came to grief as to the nature of his Messiahship as they did in their too literal view of the divine kingdom. While subconsciously the seed was taking root, on their conscious levels the disciples were at latent cross-purposes with their Master in the matter of his declared suffering and death. They hovered near as the steps of Jesus led him from the Last Supper with them to his agony in Gethsemane, to his trial and death. During the dark period that immediately succeeded the Cross the experiential conflict between what subconsciously they had been taking in and the conscious processes that were at the moment inhibiting the emergence of the deeper discoveries into life and action was on the point of being resolved. Thus the disciples were being prepared to receive the experience of the resurrection of Jesus which from this experiential approach may be viewed as the crystallizing of the hidden psychological and empirical impressions in objective appearances of the risen Jesus. The seed sown by Jesus had come to its flower in their experience, and the resurrection became creatively vital to the

emergence of the primitive church. The eyewitnesses had no doubt that the Jesus they now saw was the one they had known so well in life, and this conviction is significantly central to the outlook and inspiration they received ~~and~~ in ~~the~~ virtue of which they founded the new community.

Enthused all the more in proportion to the despair that had possessed them during the tragedy of the Cross, the band of believers awaited in a mood of vivid expectancy for what was to happen. The final resurrection appearance, known as the Ascension of Jesus, was felt to be the prelude to the advent of the Kingdom of God. They spent the time in prayer and in thoughtful recollection of all that Jesus had said and done, they gathered in their Kiddûsh celebrations and placed him at the forefront of their thoughts and devotion, keeping him in remembrance as they passed round the eschatological cup and the broken bread. In this way the observance of the Lord's Supper began to come into existence before the church did. On one of these hallowed Kiddûsh occasions, the believers were gathered together in view of the Feast of Pentecost that was now approaching;* again Jesus was at the centre of their ardent expectation and faith as they pledged themselves once more to the Kingdom that was so imminent. In the course possibly of passing round the cup and breaking the bread, or more likely in the profound mood that succeeded the actual celebration, they became aware that strange things were taking place among them.

*Cf. Acts ii.15, where it is implied that Pentecost was only just beginning.

It seemed as if the whole place were filled with the sound as of a rushing wind, and they felt as if the very house itself were shaking at its foundations. Visionary phenomena like tongues of fire were seen. The believers found themselves breaking out into ecstatic speech. All these phenomena indicated that an overwhelming religious experience had come to them, and at once they explained it as the coming of the Spirit upon them.

This experience was interpreted as the sign that Jesus had kept his promise of sending the Spirit (Acts i.4f.8), and that almost immediately he would be with them again in the divine Kingdom he was to inaugurate. The believers then went forth to declare to their fellow-Jews their experiential discoveries with regard to the assured redemption in the Kingdom, and urged them to repent of their sins that would otherwise bring them to judgment. Jesus of Nazareth was now the declared Messiah; although the Jews had crucified him, God had designated him as the Messiah whose function was to bring in the Kingdom. His death was now seen to be due to the will of God, and necessary for the fulfilment of his Messianic vocation.

In response to such preaching about Jesus of Nazareth now the Messiah, there began the accessions of converts to share in the experiential discoveries and affirmations that had been made. We cannot speak strictly of any founding of the church; a community emerged from the enthusiastic welter of hopes and expectations that were centred in the exalted Jesus, and this community

claimed to be the new Messianic people of the coming Kingdom, owning allegiance and devotion to Jesus the Messiah. These believers, conscious of themselves as disciples, began to realize their intense personal relationship to Jesus, the connection being no aloof one, but vital and creative in their lives and in the group experience of the community. A new group datum had shown itself in the emergence of a community based on loyalty and devotion to Jesus, with the growing awareness of the 'fellowship', and expressed in a 'communism of love,' in the sharing of personal possessions, by the designation of the believers as 'brethren', and the new converts became aware that they had indeed joined a brotherhood, with an intimacy of fellowship far beyond anything they had hitherto realized.

This new fellowship was controlled by the Spirit in all its manifold activities and witness to Jesus the Messiah. The Spirit was the power that inspired the witness, the preaching, the religious experience in all its intensity and reality, the healings, the visions, gave the needful wisdom, created a joyous atmosphere, guaranteed the divine guidance and inspired their prayers, ^{and brought about} ~~together with~~ the heightening of character and the development of moral and spiritual insight.

The community was moreover on its way to the closer realization of its specific collective consciousness as the community of the coming Kingdom, and soon began to refer to itself as the 'ecclesia,' the name destined to be the permanent expression of the consciousness implied. The name associated ~~the~~

the community in organic relationship with Israel, the people of God, but in the primitive church^{it} does not involve ideas of a New Israel in any sense of being separate from Israel. The primitive church did not conceive itself as standing apart from, nor even in contrast with, the Jewish theocracy. The differentia lay in the attitude to Jesus the Messiah, for while Israel rejected him, the ecclesia accepted him. The believers earnestly desired that their fellow-Jews should also accept his claims. Through their organic connection with Jesus the Messiah the believers were convinced that they were the heirs of the Kingdom, and sought to convert their fellow-Jews that they ^{might} ~~may~~ share in the salvation promised through Jesus. The deeper postulates inherent in Jesus' desire to redeem his people that Israel in turn might redeem the world were, however, scarcely apprehended. It is only by a chain of fortuitous circumstances consequent upon persecution that drove the preachers further afield than Judaea and Jerusalem under the pressure of the Spirit to proclaim the truth of the gospel, and this in turn led to definite evangelization of Gentiles. Once this process had begun, the Gentile converts themselves entered upon the wider mission to the world of men, and the Christian experience came to the world in virtue of its own distinctive quality as a way of life centring in Jesus Christ.

Yet the larger and deeper postulates were there from the beginning in the religious experience of the primitive church. Sooner or later they were bound to reveal themselves and break

through the hindrances of the Jewish religious environment. The very spiritual creative activity inherent in the new faith made it inevitable that the church would be driven forth to accomplish the wider vision of salvation as inspired by Jesus. The new experience was a way of life which made its appeal wherever the desire to live it manifested itself, irrespective of Jewish privilege of Gentile paganism, of Greek pride or the barbarian's inferior status, ^{and} knowing no distinction of sex. All were to be one in Jesus the Messiah.

The apocalyptic 'milieu' in which the new community took its rise was inevitable in view of the experiential and psychological inheritance it received from Judaism. But as the literal hope of Messiah's return began to fade, the community became aware of its present possession of the kingdom and became conscious of itself as the church entrusted with the mission of salvation for the world of men. In the same way the consciousness of salvation turned less on its eschatological significance, and came to be enjoyed as salvation here and now in Jesus Christ. Jesus himself, though felt to be exalted to the right hand of God, came to be experienced as present in the midst of the community. The desired consummation came to be less apocalyptically viewed and more along the lines of inheriting the Kingdom not of this world; salvation in its final and fullest sense came to be eternal life. Complete union with Christ in eternal life began to replace in desire the idea of his return on the clouds of heaven as Messiah.

As the apocalyptic forms and categories, literally conceived, began to fade, the church, far from fading away with them, came increasingly to be aware of the greater spiritual realities of the eternal truth which was inherent in these forms since their religious content was given its uniqueness by the personality of Jesus the Messiah. The fading of the temporary and the accidental revealed the inner^{ly} spiritual glory.

We have now to discuss the intrinsic worth of the religious experience of the primitive church. What was set in motion so long ago still continues among the peoples of almost every land on the earth's surface. If salvation is possible today in Christ's name as it was in the primitive church, there must obviously be something of intrinsic value in the religious experience of the gospel so far-reaching in time and in the extent of the world's surface.

The religious experience enshrined in the Old Testament had already tested the ways of God with men, as the Creator, Sustainer, and Maintainer of the world over which He rules. The essence of the divine rule was the revelation of a purpose at once gracious and morally holy. His power and majesty induce the reaction of awe and wonder in men, yet He is not aloof from them, but graciously draws men to Him in trust and love until a fellowship or communion is set up in virtue of which He gives Himself to seeking man. The moral emphasis worked into Israel's faith by the prophets did not hesitate to set forth suffering ~~as~~

as having its place in the divine ways with men, whether the suffering be viewed as merited for sin, whether as a purifying discipline for the refining of holy character as silver is refined in the furnace, whether in the service of disinterestedness in faith towards God irrespective of prosperity or adversity, or finally as sacrifice, an offering of life for the blessing of many.

These experiential discoveries and affirmations of the best religious development of Israel passed forthwith into the outlook of the primitive church, but with all the wealth of discovery and affirmation bequeathed to the believers through the personality of Jesus. We have seen how Jesus was concerned less with the abrogation of Israel's faith, and more with encouraging the Jews to live up to the best and highest already revealed to them. Jesus liberated what in Judaism were limitations and lower associations. The God who was conceived as being inexpressible by images, since His holy spiritual being inhibited any such idea, ^{who} ~~yet~~ ^{yet} could be localized in the one place, the Holy of Holies, was set forth by Jesus as being unconfined to any one place. Through Jesus this liberating of God's accessibility passed finally into the primitive church. The limitation which beset the Jewish view of the divine sovereignty over the earth, and yet limited His gracious contact to one chosen race was doomed to disappear in the ^{pronouncement} ~~reinforcement~~ by Jesus that salvation was for all men. The primitive church embraced this truth apparently only unwillingly; it had to be

driven out into the open by the Spirit, as the scattered preachers took the gospel with them, and passed on the new experience to the Gentiles, who themselves saw to the larger developments. Jesus further gave the spiritual death-blow to the Jewish conception of God which viewed Him as requiring ritual obedience ^{equally with} ~~as equal to~~ moral, making circumcision, for example, as much a necessity to salvation as living a holy life. The ethical emphasis on the nature of God passed into the primitive church through the apostles' teaching on the 'Way.' (cf. pp. 349ff.).

The later church doctrine that Jesus died on the Cross for the sins of men had its experiential roots in the actual Cross and its significance in revealing Jesus suffering and dying that blessing **might** redound for the many in the coming of the Kingdom. The self-surrender to God's will which was consciously and willingly made was in its essence an offering for others, a personal sacrifice in death that the way to the Kingdom might be opened up. Through the eschatological categories we are able to discern the truth that Jesus suffered and died to fulfil the divine purpose, and that he died thus as a sacrificial offering for men. The sacrifice is not, of course, to be construed along the lines of propitiation such as Israel's sin-offerings or as in the Greek Tragedies where human victims willingly offer themselves for sacrifice as propitiation to the gods when the fatal necessity ^{arises} ~~arose~~,* but that blessing may ensue because of his

*Cf. Euripides' plays, "Iphigenia in Aulis," and "Hecuba."

sacrifice in the divinely willed way of bringing in the Kingdom which was to confer the blessing of redemption. The intrinsic worth of the primitive church experience here is that it seized on this fundamental experiential fact in the death of Christ and bequeathed it to the church of later ages to develop and interpret it further. Thus the primitive church laid the foundations for the evangelic experience which the future years were to apprehend in the light of deepening insight and knowledge.

The vision of the Kingdom of God was another abiding feature of the religious experience of the primitive church. It was creatively influential in the self-consciousness of the believers as the community of the Kingdom, and the community cannot be explained apart from the vision of the Kingdom which reacted on men and formed them into a Messianic fellowship waiting to welcome the return of their exalted Messiah. The contact with Jesus was the guarantee that the moral aspect of the divine sovereignty would ultimately prevail, for with the decay of the eschatological hope came the Kingdom as a matter of present moral and spiritual experience. This conception has found its permanent place in the Christian church.

Perhaps the most significant illustration of the abiding worth of the primitive church experience lay in its intense devotion to Jesus. Thereby the believers saved the associations that had gathered around him from decaying, or at least prevented the transformation of the Jesus of history into a Christ-cult

of the Graeco-Oriental world. If the intrinsic personal connection had been severed, or the original impressions and experiences the eyewitnesses had of him had been allowed to disappear, and with them the organic connection of the experiences of his resurrection, the probabilities are that the Christian faith would have degenerated into some mystic cult, and have suffered the eclipse of the cults of the ancient world generally. For these did not last. We know of them only through scattered allusions in ancient literature. The faith centring in Jesus had lived on through the centuries. The primitive church, gathering from the enlarging store of profound memories quickened by their new experience in Christ and the Spirit, evolved the evangelic tradition, and evolved it from its own experience of trial and error. Their continual discoveries and affirmations aided their appreciation of the various sayings and doings of Jesus as these were put together, enabling them to sort out the worthiest and the highest, rejecting the needless and the unimportant, and reducing unwittingly the legendary to a minimum. For the primitive church believers were too near to the historic Jesus for legend to have much place in their tradition. Thus the primitive church transferred to the church of the centuries the essential groundwork of the evangelic tradition about Jesus and made possible the growth of the gospels as we have them.

The intrinsic worth ^{of the primitive church experience} is seen once more when we see that the primitive church experience was the foundation on which

Paul laid his own thought structure. The church of his age ~~and~~ which he so powerfully influenced and built up is organically related to what went before it in the primitive church. Much of what may seem to be the original creative work of the apostle to the Gentiles is seen to have its roots in what preceded him in faith and practice. When the primitive church is investigated in its own right and authority, instead of being regarded as a stepping-stone to the Pauline church, we discover that it is in itself the reason for what follows.

The psychological evaluation of the religious experience of the primitive church raises several important points which bear on the intrinsic worth of that experience.

First, there are the abnormal elements which we have fully discussed in our investigation of the experience of the Spirit. Can religious experience characterized by such luxuriant abnormality preserve anything of intrinsic worth? Our reply is decidedly in the affirmative.

(1) The abnormal elements belong to the thought-forms with which the new religious experience was clothed, and their presence as such is no criterion as to the value of the experience they express. The visionary elements, for example, belong to the psychological powers involved and raised to the 'nth' degree by the extraordinary stimulus of unique religious exaltation, but the vital religious realities concerned are another matter. We are still left with the causal religious experience

which in the first instance gave rise to the abnormal psychology, and the phenomena associated with it. (2) We have to allow for the influence of the apocalyptic inheritance with its wealth of visionary elements, dreams, trances, ecstasy and vivid pictorial symbolism which provided the 'milieu' through which a genuine way of attaining to truth was provided. (3) It is to go beyond the authority of the empirical facts to dismiss the abnormal elements as no more than phenomena to be explained pathologically, for such a superficial judgment overlooks the religious inheritance and psychology of the believers, and misses the significance of the overwhelming religious energy that had entered into their lives. It further fails to appreciate the fact that while the pathologically conditioned abnormal psychology produces disintegration of personality, the abnormal experience of the primitive church believers resulted in the integration of personality. (4) Even if pathological elements are discernible and are needed to elucidate the phenomena as psychology seeks to evaluate the visionary and abnormal, none of these things are able to afford any criteria as to the ultimate value of the religious experience which threw up the abnormal phenomena being evaluated.

Whenever a great religious upheaval takes place there is an abundance of psychical and even physical marvels. Human experience of divine reality as found in the primitive church was psychologically conditioned by the characteristic racial and religious outlook native to those who received the experience.

The approaches of divine reality would of necessity find their way through the native ideas, thought-forms, conceptions and mental categories given to the believers by their Jewish religious inheritance, and would be apprehended in a manner quite natural to the recipients who unlike more recent generations of human beings made no sharp distinction between 'natural' and 'supernatural', 'physical' and 'spiritual', 'physical' and 'psychical', 'psychical' and 'spiritual.' Within the psycho-physical manifestations lies the tremendous experience of the spiritual dynamic which Jesus Christ had mediated of divine reality, and which brought the church into being.

The abnormal elements therefore are not the significant data in the new experience. The emergence of the church from a creative religious experience inspired by Jesus the Christ is the abiding phenomenon.

The second point raised by psychological evaluation is that the religious experience in its inner validity and truth, the 'ding an sich', needs to be differentiated from the thought-forms in which it finds expression or through which it is interpreted by those who have the experience. For example, the eschatological categories and thought-forms lost their meaning as the Christian generations succeeded one another. The literal Messiah exalted at the right hand of God making the literal descent again to earth with all the panoply of heavenly might and power as he brought in the Kingdom with its final salvation, is couched in thought-forms which have long since ceased to be

permanently intelligible or useful. But their religious and moral content, as filled in by experience of Jesus the Christ, the religious experience which came to birth under such propulsion, the specifically Christian experience centred in Jesus, all this is the permanent contribution of the primitive church and handed down to successive Christian generations. Or again, the thought-forms and symbols in which the Pentecost experience of the Spirit was received,* need to be distinguished from the vital religious content of the experience of the Spirit in the new life that had come upon the believers. Thus we have to distinguish between the accidental categories of thought ^{and} ~~from~~ the inner religious reality with which the thought-forms are concerned, that reality being that men were now living a new life hitherto undreamt of, that this life centred in Christ, and that this new life had brought its recipients together in his name, into a union with him and with themselves, and fashioned them step by step into the church which is his body.

Third, the religious experience of the primitive church from the standpoint of individual psychology began and continued within "the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men,** moved by the impact of Jesus upon individual lives, in the impressions he made upon the eyewitnesses, or ^{as he} entered vitally into the consciousness of believers and claimed their allegiance. For each new convert there was that personal quickening

*e.g. the noise as of the wind, the cloven tongues as of fire, etc.

**William James, op. cit. p. 31.

within the conscious life which made him aware of the power of Jesus. Thus the religious experience of the primitive church took its rise in personal experience of the influence and power of Jesus the Christ.

At the same time, however, we are confronted at the outset with a growing group experience, a collective religious consciousness of a community relationship to Christ and the coming Kingdom. The explanation for this group emergence is empirical also. (1) There was the organic union with Israel as the chosen group unit of the divine grace and favour, and as we have seen, the primitive church never had one thought that it was any other than belonging to Israel and its corporate status before God. (2) Since man is a social being, the religious experience of individuals is bound to find expression in a social way. The findings of anthropological science on this matter are that the tribal, i.e. the social, expression of religion precedes the experience of the individual member of the social unit,* but MacDougall, from the standpoint of social psychology, having stated fully the case for a social consciousness over and above that of the individuals who make up the society, criticizes it to such effect as to leave no doubt that the theory is unsubstantiated, and that the social unit need mean no more than a convenient collective form of reference.** Probably, too, to speak about the group idea in the primitive church is a useful way of referring to the empirical discovery that the individual believer was aware of belonging to the new

*Cf. R.R. Marett, "The Threshold of Religion," 1909, pp. 155-169.

**"The Group Mind," 2nd. Edn. 1927, pp. 30-39.

Messianic community, formed part of it, shared in its privileges, and in the influence of the larger group found his own experience enriched by the social discoveries of the corporate body.

Further, the primitive church as a distinct group was more than the sum of the experience of its individual members, for the sharing of individual and common discoveries and affirmations concerning the ways of Christ heightened the consciousness of all as each inspired the other, and out of the loyalty and devotion of the many emerged the self-consciousness of the church as the community of salvation.

Fourth, it is necessary to evaluate the religious experience of the primitive church in the light of the recent conclusions reached by the New Psychology. For example, the herd instinct is regarded as being responsible for the church's existence. By applying the principles of projection and rationalization the church's conception of the Divine love is due to the need of comfort-appealing especially to the great majority of the depressed masses-and since men feel the need of a herd leader for humanity God is projected from the social mind to conserve the values useful to the welfare of the herd; this projection, in turn, becomes regarded as a supreme supernatural deity.* Or again, Jung develops the mythical theory about Jesus from his psychological principles. Jesus is the mythical hero of a cult, gathering up the life expressed in the changes of nature and the seasons, in the processes of birth and death, in the activity of the instincts

*A.G.Tansley is typical of this viewpoint, cf. his book, "The New Psychology," 1920, p.159.

of the psyche; notwithstanding the higher aspects which Jung sees in Jesus when compared with other cult heroes, he belongs essentially to the same category. Jesus becomes a mythical personification of the life force or urge for his devotees, just as the hero of the typical cult is. Unconscious processes are symbolized in all that Jesus is claimed to represent, and all that is seen in him is the result of the working of ^{the} unconscious processes of those who have thus projected the workings of their mind upon the shadow figure. In reality ~~he is~~ a personal symbolizing of the libido.*

Our investigation ^{shows the inadequacy of such} ~~places such interpretations in their~~ ^{interpretations} ~~inadequacy~~ since they reveal an ignorance of history together with a lack of awareness of the realities of religious experience. They come to grief on the fact of the historicity of Jesus** which few critics are now willing, in face of the sure evidence established by modern scholarship, to deny. Still more do all such attempts overlook the historical discoveries of the primitive church in its personal contacts with Jesus. The realities of life are ignored in the supposition that the tested and tried affirmations of Christian experience in their higher moral and spiritual values are the products of phantasy and mythical faith. If the historico-critical approach to the origins of the Christian church, by its very absorption with historical processes, misses the fundamental facts of the religious

*Cf. his "Psychological Types," 1924, p. 70f., cf. ch. vii. **For a recent criticism of theories that Jesus is unhistorical cf. Goguel, "Jesus of Nazareth," Eng. Tr. 1926 chs. i-ii. and "The Life of Jesus" Eng. Tr. 1933, pp. 61-69.

experience through its failure to think in terms of the empirical as well as in those of the historical, so the purely psychological method, weaving its chain of psychical symbols out of the unconscious mind, by failing to enter into the historical side of the emergence of the church, loses its way amidst a maze of psychological conclusions aloof from historical reality.

If we construe the libido from the wider standpoint of Jung who regards it as the primitive life urge inherent in all living things, we may take the conception of Jesus as symbolizing unconscious processes in the sense "that He is the utterance of that deep-lying life that fills all things, and is the secret of all beauty and movement in the world. Further, if we are prepared to believe that this life in all its manifestations is an utterance of God in the world, or the outgoing of the Divine life and energy into the world...we may arrive along this line at a conception of Jesus that has some measure of adequacy."* Dr. Hughes points out, however, that Jung would not be willing to consider this position—nor does the New Psychology as a whole, we may add, lead this way—and then goes on to say that "we can never reach a conception that is fully adequate to the demands of Christian experience...or to the findings of the individual Christian consciousness, so long as we remain in the realm of the life force on the purely physical side, and of the instinctive urges derived therefrom. This life in the world, in which we share

*T.Hywel Hughes, "The New Psychology and Religious Experience," 1933, pp. 315f.

...carries within it more than the merely physical aspect, for it has issued in or produced such facts as the appreciation of beauty and the understanding of truth. More still, it has yielded a moral consciousness which lives in the light of ideals and grows by the concentration and effort of the will to achieve these ideals...If, then, we take the real meaning of Jesus to lie in the moral and spiritual realm...we may consider Him to be the utterance, on the plane of history, of the moral and spiritual nature of God, the expression to the world of that in God which is the ground and reason of the moral consciousness in man."*

In the light of this conclusion as to the preeminent impact of Jesus as revealer of the perfect life of goodness and love as these have their being in the Divine nature, we may place the significance of the primitive church whose members were the first to seize on the empirical value of their impressions of Jesus in his life, and thereafter in their fellowship with him as the exalted Christ. Not merely in the stream of human life did the church emerge, in the sense of being the product of the stream's flow, any more than Jesus is accounted for by his racial antecedents as a Jew, but by the impact of the moral and spiritual 'ultimate,' the power of God revealed in His purpose as manifesting His grace and love as never before so intensely apprehended. The primitive church found itself faced with the 'ultimate' of Divine reality in a way that even the Jewish faith previously embraced,

and still was adhered to, had never opened up. The believers explained it all by saying that the Spirit was in possession of them. In the power of the Spirit they grew as a community awaiting the Kingdom of which the Spirit was the pledge, that is, they had become aware of the action of God is using them, that this power was none other than the direct impact of God in all His revelation made through Jesus upon their hearts and lives. God was the pledge that His own Kingdom would come.

The primitive church experience is a challenge to the mood of thought which the New Psychology has engendered in our times, with its elimination of the supernatural 'ultimate' from human experience. Just as sin has become no more than physical and psychological ^{maladaptation} ~~maladaptation~~, so the forces for man's salvation are regarded as lying within man himself, and the urges for moral and spiritual progress ^{as being} found only in the instincts and unconscious powers of the mind. For that experience took its start and derived its sustained inspiration from the believers' vivid awareness that God had come to them in Jesus the Christ as the earnest of their redemption. They found their call not in the personification of their instinctive urges and unconscious energies, but in the experience of the 'ultimate' of Divine reality as expressed in Jesus. Within their experience they had discovered the power of God unto salvation, in the inspiration of which they went forth to ~~preach~~ ^{proclaim} their gospel to all who would hear. In so doing the primitive church began the witness of the Christian community as the organized spiritual community of redemption for the world in the

grace and love of God as revealed in Jesus.

For it was an experienced gospel with which the primitive community was concerned as they set it on its agelong course in the world of human life. Combined with the Jewish religious environment which included its wealth of apocalyptic vision and traditional faith and practice was the experiential recognition and awareness that the Jesus they had known on earth was the risen and exalted Christ at God's right hand. The apocalyptic categories in the primitive church are not original at all in themselves. "What is new in the Primitive Gospel is the centring of it all in a historic personality and the linking it up with the life and mind of the historic Jesus."* In so doing the believers were animated by their organic relation to the original experiential elements derived from the personality of Jesus. And Jesus himself, as Deissmann aptly remarks, is "the epoch-making thing."** Jesus' personality, animated with his own force of experience and knowledge of God, came over directly into the primitive church experience, which took its rise first and last ^{from} ~~on~~ personal conviction about Jesus as he had been discovered in his earthly life and in what he had become to faith in his exaltation. This is the unique content of the religious experience of the primitive church.

Little wonder, then, the joyous religious experience, for the first years at least, was for the believers one long feast of Pentecost, a prolonged day of power with the manifold manifesta-

*Mackinnon, op.cit. p.31. **"The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul," 1923, p.149.

tion of the Spirit's presence in signs and wonders, when joy was irrefragable, when unquenchable faith went hand in hand with a tremendous enthusiasm in witness and well-doing, accompanied with a communism of love expressed in self-denying devotion and benevolence, as the dynamic experience of an undimmed faith in Jesus their exalted friend and Messiah carried the believers onward through "the radiant spring morning of the Church."*And if the literal apocalyptic hopes did begin to fade, the religious horizons were enlarged in more specifically moral and spiritual directions, and the real dynamic of the Spirit-inspired life had revealed in itself "that the new life had been given to men in Christ himself and that fellowship with him was the true fulfilment of the kingdom of God."**

Our investigation of the religious experience of the primitive church suggests possible modifications in the usual estimate of church origins.

(1) The period we have reviewed ought not to be regarded by church historians as the mere prelude to the larger movement of the Apostolic Age and thereafter. It has the right to be reviewed in its own distinctive contribution and authority. For the discoveries and affirmations of the primitive church are in themselves the foundations of what the church came to be in after generations.

(2) The impact of the historical Jesus does not need to be so sharply divided from the emergence of the Christian Church,

as is sometimes assumed to be necessary. The disciples carried forward to the primitive church the religious experience which was given its birth by Jesus in his contacts with men on earth. The Cross of Jesus, while momentarily a cause of stumbling to minds unable to reconcile Messianic dignity with suffering, came to be seen as the necessary prelude to the exaltation of Jesus; far from the Cross giving a new turn to events or arresting the work begun by him, it impelled the disciples along to the experiences of his resurrection, and thereby to found the new Messianic community. The assumption that the Christian movement was separated in its beginnings from Jesus in the interpretation of the Cross as a disaster which submerged his personality, leaving only his name to indicate a new system or society which he had never contemplated, needs to be revised in view of the organic connection of the primitive church experience with the historical Jesus who in the first place set in motion the empirical processes which resulted in the emergence of the community of the new age, and ultimately ^{of} the Christian Church.

(3) The apocalyptic 'milieu' of the primitive church life needs fuller consideration as a dynamic factor in the emergence of the church than has hitherto been given. We are faced with no unnoticed religious group fighting for a foothold amidst an unsympathetic environment, but with a community inspired by a vivid awareness of itself as the new community of the imminent divine Kingdom. The ~~unbounding~~ ^{unbounded} confidence that they were making history, that a great destiny awaited the believers, that even

now the Spirit-energy of the Divine power was already active among them, is the essence of the apocalyptic hopes amid which the church rose to the surface. The correlate to this conviction is that even in the very beginnings of the church there was a community into which men needed to become incorporated as members through confession of Christ's name and Lordship before they could share in the coming blessing of the Divine redemption in the Kingdom.

(4) In view of the tendency of the historico-critical school and its method of approach to church origins to see in the primitive church no more than a Jewish sect, and the real Christian movement to be an amalgam of the findings of this sect with the wider world of Graeco-Oriental thought, it is necessary to urge with insistence that at no time was the church a minor Jewish movement. From one standpoint the believers remained faithful to the requirements of the Jewish law, and to all intents and purposes they were loyal members of the Jewish theocracy. But far wider differences were implied in their religious experience. The fact that they were impelled to summon their fellow-Jews to repentance, in view of the apostasy in rejecting Jesus the Messiah is significant of a vivid consciousness that they had something vital in religious reality that the Jews had not. They knew how Jesus had freely criticised his people for their failure to live up to the best their religion offered. Their intercourse with him had made them less legally minded. There was thus an implied criticism of Judaism which in the

course of time was destined to result in the break with Judaism. The primitive church was hesitant enough in following the spiritual logic of their religious experience, but the logic was there.

(5) In view of the modern tendency to lay more stress on the Greek elements in the development of Christianity, a tendency which sometimes finds bizarre expression in views which look on historical Christianity as almost entirely due to Gentile influences at work on a bare minimum supplied by Jesus, we have to bear in mind the fact that the cardinal elements of Christian experience were either already to the forefront or at least were implied in the experienced gospel of the primitive church which based its affirmations on the impact of the personality of Jesus upon the first believers. It may be readily admitted, and almost regarded as axiomatic, that the Christian experience was profoundly modified as Gentile thought made its contact with it in the course of its expansion in the world. Greek speculation succeeded apocalyptic interpretation and produced considerable modification of the original substance of the new faith. But this wider influence lay rather in the realms of interpretation and elucidation of empirical data already given in the primitive church experience. Further, it was not as in the case of Philo,^{a question} of Jewish Christians being influenced by Greek thought entirely, but ~~it was a case~~ of Greeks, or Greek-thinking Gentiles, finding new life in what was coming to them from a church taking its start in a Judaistic background, and thus far as Christianity spread into the world, it was Palestine that was doing the influencing rather than the Greek

elements.

(6) If the problem of the New Testament be 'How did the Jesus of history come to be the Christ of experience, with his position as the second person in the Trinity,' the study of the primitive church may be regarded as making some contribution towards its solution. We cannot speak of a primitive church theology, for not sufficient time had elapsed for reflection to discover what was implied in their relationship to Jesus the Christ. But the identification of Jesus with the exalted heavenly Messiah of Jewish apocalyptic speculation involved at the outset a remarkable recasting of Jewish thought, since the very exaltation was regarded as having come through the suffering and death of Jesus the Messiah.

(7) Finally, the so-called gap between Jesus and Paul is seen to have less point and relevance when the primitive church discoveries and affirmations are thoroughly understood and given their true value. While much has yet to be done before Paul's contribution to Christianity can be accurately estimated, for which purpose we need data of his relation to Rabbinical thought and practice, to Graeco-Oriental speculation and religious outlook-data which have yet to be forthcoming from erudite research in these respective fields-at the same time there is sufficient ^{common} ~~common~~ ground to ~~both~~ the primitive church and to Paul to warrant the conclusion that the apostle was less of an innovator than is generally supposed. Still less can we regard him as the creator of the church itself. Apart from what we are able to deduce as to

the debt Paul owes to the church before him, we have his own claims to have received the fundamentals of his experience from the primitive church tradition, and we know that he was in close touch with the church at Jerusalem. Paul himself was never aware that he was introducing 'another gospel;' he was a convert to the primitive church which was thus introduced to a thinker and interpreter of the Christian experience devout and original in his outlook. There was bound to be enrichment of the tradition when Paul brought his distinctive genius to bear upon the new faith in the light of his own experiential discoveries. But he was convinced himself that he rested on what had gone before him, and there is every reason for concluding that the apostle to the Gentiles was right in this matter.

The religious experience of the primitive church is rooted and grounded in Jesus the Christ. Spiritual reality of the highest order was for the first time placed within the reach of men, who as they received their impressions and experiences of his life-producing personality and influence, established the church on the basis of what they had experienced and were still experiencing in him. Though not realized as yet, the discoveries were being made which were ultimately to result in the awareness of the Divine Sonship of Jesus, and it was only a matter of time before the spiritual logic of Christ worked out in the devotion of men ^{of whom it could be said that they} ~~who~~ [^] had experienced Christianity as a Divine history of their inner being; believing in Christ, they had obtained access to God; in

the Son they had found the Father. In this innermost, most certain fact of their consciousness, there lay for them the impulse and the necessity to place the person of Christ, the founder of this their new life, in the closest, most vital relation to the Father."*

*Dorner, "The Person of Christ," Eng.Tr.Div.I.Vol.I.p.47.

APPENDIX I

THE RESURRECTION APPEARANCES—JERUSALEM OR GALILEE?

The Gospels present two contrasted traditions ^{with} ~~with~~ regard to the scene of the appearances of Jesus risen from the dead, ~~and~~ which seem to be mutually exclusive. These are the 'Marcan-Matthaeian and the Lukan-Johannine, the former being supported by the Johannine Appendix (Jn.xxi.) and the apocryphal Gospel of Peter.

The Marcan-Matthaeian tradition assigns the appearances to Galilee whither the disciples proceeded by instruction of women disciples, and there they were to behold the risen Jesus (Mk.xvi. 7, Mt.xxviii.10). Mark's narrative breaks off at the point where the women receive the command to instruct the disciples to go to Galilee, but Matthew reports that the eleven disciples went to Galilee and received a resurrection appearance where Jesus gave them the command to make disciples of all the Gentiles (Mt.xxviii. 16-20). The resurrection scene in which Simon Peter figures so prominently by the Lake of Galilee is recorded by the Johannine Appendix, which thus witnesses to the Galilean tradition (xxi.).

On the other hand, the Lukan-Johannine series reveals the disciples and adherents remaining in Jerusalem in response to a command of Jesus (Lk.xxiv.49, Acts i.4,14), there to await the promised gift of the Spirit (Acts i.8). The appearances here are all in Jerusalem or the vicinity. Matthew of course records the appearance of the risen Jesus to the women returning from the tomb, but this instruction is absent from the Lukan-Johannine tradition which sets forth the disciples themselves examining the empty tomb (Mt.xxviii.9f., Lk. xxiv.12, Jn.xx.4ff.). The women are reminded by the angel that Jesus had told his disciples when in Galilee that he would rise again (xxiv.6f. (Lk)).

These divergent traditions seem irreconcilable, and the acceptance of the one logically implies the rejection of the other. The difficulty is not overcome by the suggestion that given a resurrected Jesus, there would be no geographical limits to his reappearances. But there are geographical limits imposed on the disciples, who are still bound to earth as human beings. The real point is, that as the gospel narratives stand, we have two sets of conflicting commands and experiences, and the narratives give no clue to their solution. If our discussion on the experience of the disciples during the period from the Cross to the Resurrection has validity, we have here the factor of religious experience as a point in favour of the Jerusalem tradition.

This is not to admit that Jesus never spoke of his intention to go to Galilee after rising from the dead (Mk.xiv.28). The truth

of such an intention receives from the unfulfilment of the prophecy an unintentional support, i.e. when the force of the words 'I will go before you' is seen in the light of the expectation of the divine kingdom. Weiss takes this phrase to signify "ich setze mich an eure spitze und führe euch nach Galiläa," which when taken with "there shall ye see me" means in a Messianic sense, "nachdem ich mich hier in Jerusalem nach meiner Auferstehung mit euch vereinigt habe, führe ich euch in die Heimat; dort wird dann das kommen, worauf wir warten-das Reich Gottes" (op.cit. p.12). There was no fulfilment in Galilee of the advent of the Kingdom. Indeed, a new Messianic community rose in Jerusalem probably because the solution of the experiential conflict of the silent period between the Cross and the Resurrection occurred in the locality where the conflict had been intensified to its climax in the Cross, viz. Jerusalem; the Resurrection experience coincided with the solution of the experiential conflict at Jerusalem (cf. pp. 189-194).

How then, did the Galilean tradition arise? The words about the scattering of the sheep and the flight of the disciples (Mk. xiv. 27f.) were followed by an intimation that after Jesus was risen from the dead he would go forward to Galilee, and there the disciples would see him. But the Galilee expectation was not fulfilled. There is no evidence that the disciples fled away from Jerusalem in the momentary panic of Jesus' arrest (cf. pp. 184f.). They were more likely to hover near the scene in view of the strange hold Jesus still had upon them (cf. pp. 189ff.). The disciples were neither in a fit^{state} of mind to remember intimations of Jesus and thus there would be no impulsive influence to make them go to Galilee. But if Jesus did make any such intimation of going forward to Galilee, it probably had reference to what he would do in the Kingdom when he inaugurated it.

At all events Mark has accepted the fact that such an intimation was given and is content to note that the disciples may or even ought to have gone to Galilee, causing the angel at the tomb^e to command the women to tell the disciples to go there. Matthew has this tradition in a more developed form, since the command now comes through the risen Jesus himself to the women, bidding the disciples go to Galilee, where they should see him; in obedience to his instructions they assemble in Galilee and receive his farewell instructions. The Johannine Appendix has developed the tradition a little more, by following up with the story of an appearance while the disciples were back at their old trade of fishing.

The Galilean appearances seem therefore to be due to the product of later reflection working on certain remembered intimations of Jesus of something he had said about going to Galilee and bringing in the Kingdom.

APPENDIX II

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

The only direct references are

(1) Mk.xii.36 (cf.Mt.xxii.43). This is no more than an expression of the familiar idea that scripture was written under the inspiration of the Spirit (cf.pp.114,263).

(2) Mk.xiii.11. Jesus promises his disciples that the Spirit would speak in them when they were handed over to trial. This promise should not be dismissed along with Mark xiii as the intrusion of apocalyptic into the authentic gospel tradition, and therefore only to be regarded with reserve. Nor is the reference necessarily due to the reflection of later experience (E.F.Scott, "The Spirit in the New Testament," 1923, p.73). While it is true that the saying "undoubtedly agrees with the experience of Christian confessors and martyrs" (H.Wheeler Robinson, "The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit," p.130), the extraordinary crisis at hand which Jesus had in mind demanded extraordinary qualities, and the Spirit would be instinctively thought of as the source of the inspiration at the abnormal moment. It would not be merely a voice in the disciples witnessing to them what they should say; it would be the Spirit actually speaking, using their vocal organs, so that the words they actually uttered in the hour of crisis would denote that it was not they, but the Spirit that was speaking in them (cf.pp.113f. cf.pp.113f.263,271f.). It is possible that Jesus is here drawing on his own experience, and we have seen reason for ascribing all that Jesus said and did to the energy of the Spirit in him (cf.pp.237-239). The sudden mobilizing of personality in reply at a critical moment seems naturally accounted for by the Spirit's presence; a precogitated reply in defence might savour of self-regard, but the abnormal conditions would demand purely 'God-regard' in the simplicity of the Spirit's control. When face to face with enemies in the name of Christ there is possible a marked accession of the Spirit, thus affording another instance of the experience summed up in the words "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst" (Mt.xviii.20).

^{is}
~~are~~ (3) Mt.x.20, cf.Lk.xii.12. The same series of empirical ideas are discerned in the promise of Jesus that the Spirit would speak in the disciples as they went out on their preaching tour, but this may be an echo of Mk.xiii.11 discussed above, which in the growth of the gospel tradition has found its way into this incident.

(4) Lk.xi.13. Jesus states that the Heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that asked him; the parallel saying in Mt.vii.11 has 'good gifts' for 'Holy Spirit,' and since Jesus has already spoken of the custom of fathers to give good gifts, rather than evil, to their children, it would seem as if the Matthaean form of the saying is the authentic one. The Western Text (D Lat/vt. Orig. Amb.) has 'good gift' in Lk.xi. but this may be no more than a scribal harmonization in view of Mt.vii, since the reference to the 'Holy Spirit' would not likely be understood. But the Lukan 'Holy Spirit' may be in contrast to 'evil things' which ordinary fathers avoided giving to their children: "if ye then, being evil, give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit..." i.e. instead of the corresponding thing in evil, an evil spirit. There was much similarity between the two forms of spirit-experience (cf. pp. 281-287). In this case the Holy Spirit is the gift of God to His children (cf. A.T. Cadoux, "The Parables of Jesus," pp. 76f.).

(5) Mt.xii.28. Jesus declares that the power in him which enables him to cast out the demons is the Spirit of God, but the Lukan parallel replaces 'Spirit' by 'the finger of God' (xi. 20). Luke's version is probably the right one, inasmuch that if 'Spirit' had stood in 'Q' he could hardly have avoided using it, in view of his frequent use of the word, while in Matthew the word 'Spirit' may have entered to prepare the way for the teaching about forgiveness and the Spirit in Mt.xii.31f. (cf. McNeile, op.cit. ad loc. and E.F. Scott, op.cit. p. 74). And yet something may be said in favour of 'Spirit' as being the original rendering, for the question was as to what sort of Spirit it was by which Jesus cast out demons (cf. pp. 134f.). The idea of the Spirit of God was undoubtedly there, and from the standpoint of the eyewitnesses there would be no question as to the underlying activity in casting out demons, and that was the presence of the Spirit. There is therefore an intimate connection between the Spirit of God and the activity of Jesus. This empirical truth is further reinforced by

(6) Mk.iii.28-30, a statement of Jesus that there is no forgiveness for the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is contrasted with Jesus himself. Whatever be the precise theological meaning of the words, the point for us is that the eyewitnesses have laid hold of the vital fact that "the power behind his (sc. Jesus) miracles is that of the Spirit" (E.F. Scott, op.cit. p. 76). For the casting out of demons heralded the Kingdom, and the Spirit was the power behind this as in all the activity of Jesus (cf. pp. 110f. 127, 148, 172, 237-239).

(7) In addition to the statements of Jesus we have the story of the descent of the Spirit at his baptism (Mk.i.10), and the Spirit as the unseen energy which drives him into the wilderness (ver. 12). The knowledge of both these experiences of Jesus which the disciples had must in the first place have come

from Jesus(cf.pp.126,183), and they would view such experiences, as indeed Jesus did, as resulting from the activity of the Spirit of God.

(8) Among the fragments which we have of the Gospel to the Hebrews there are two agrapha which purport to be sayings of Jesus; "and if any accept the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself saith, 'Even now did my mother the Holy Spirit take me by one of mine hairs, and carried me away unto the great mountain Thabor'" (quoted in Orig. on John ii.12); "if anyone receive that saying, 'Even now my mother the Holy Spirit took me and carried me up unto the great mountain Thabor'" (ibid.'On Jeremiah,'homily xv.4). The real interest of these two passages is the reference to the Spirit as 'mother', but this is due simply to the fact that the Hebrew for 'spirit' (רוח) is feminine. The reference is presumably to the Temptation of Jesus (Mt.iv.1ff.Lk.iv.1ff.), and embodies a quasi-physical operation to the Spirit. There is no ground, however, for supposing that the words go back to Jesus.

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

APPENDIX III

FURTHER EXAMPLES OF THE INTEGRATION CAUSED BY EXPERIENCE OF VISION WITH RELIGIOUS REFERENCE

The writer of this thesis, in the course of his career as a minister of the Christian Church, has had occasion at least **twice** to observe the integrating power of religious vision in the personality of the experient concerned.

First, when minister of Wood Green Congregational Church, London, he was stopped at the close of an evening service by a well-dressed woman, bearing every sign of being happy and comfortable as far as material circumstances were concerned. She was an entire stranger, and had entered the church somewhat late, during the reading of the second lesson. Outwardly reserved and calm, the moment she was in the vestry with the minister, she burst forth into a paroxysm of weeping, which continued for quite half-an-hour, interspersed with ejaculatory cries, "I've done wrong," "God will never forgive me." By small degrees, the writer was able at last to get her story, which was that of her unfaithfulness to her husband and children, since she had been guilty of

adultery with a man of whom she had allowed herself to become enamoured, and the wrong had been going on for some weeks. Some neighbours who knew what was going on, were threatening to report the matter to her husband, and this unpleasant possibility was no doubt the immediate stimulus to her repentance. At the same time there was no doubt in her mind that she had put herself beyond the pale of the Divine mercy, and there was much spiritual distress. Along with her cry, "I daren't face my husband knowing it", went the repeated wail, "God will never forgive me." For many years she had attended church regularly as a member, the church being in the South of London somewhere. Things had come to a crisis with her that Sunday afternoon. After tea, she had gone out, hardly knowing whither she was going, took a tram which brought her on the long, winding journey from South to North London, and a sudden impulse made her get off at the end of the road where the writer's church was. She did not know the church was there, but began to walk down the road. Within a minute or two she came across the church, and obeying a sudden impulse in her distracted condition, entered. Something touched her and she decided to speak to the minister and tell him all her trouble. Such was the story of her distraction, and of the way she came to the church.

There was no denying the crisis in the woman's personality. The factors involved were (1) fear of being exposed, and (2) a dread that she had forfeited the divine goodwill; as she said, she had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. At times she became like one possessed as she raved about the enormity of what she had been doing. When calm began to supervene under the suggestion that the divine mercy was potent enough even for such as she, the writer read the account of the woman taken in adultery (Jn.viii.lff.), and he repeated once again the words, "Go thy way; sin no more"(ver.11). "What shall I do about my husband?" she asked. The reply was, "Go in the forgiveness of God and tell him all about it, and God will open the channels of forgiveness for him. You will then not only forestall your neighbours, but you will win him by your own open spirit in confessing your wrong." There was prayer in the vestry; she prayed too, "O God, I will go my way and sin no more; help me to make it good by giving me courage to tell my husband..." She broke off at that point and the minister continued the prayer for her.

But the reason why she broke off at the point she did was because at that moment, she had lifted up her eyes and was staring at a corner in the ceiling. When the minister finished his prayer, he saw her gazing as if transfixed. For several minutes she remained like this, lost to the vestry, to the minister, lost to everything but what she was seeing near the ceiling. Her face had undergone a change; the writer just waited and watched; the hysteria and the tension had died out, the look of grief and pain were not there. It was as if something had removed all these features as if stripping off a mask. In their place an

expression of profound peace and quiet calm had come. It was clear that she was receiving something which the writer could not see, but ^{she} could at least discern its effects on her.

Within a few minutes she rose to her feet, and stated very simply, "I have just seen God up there. He looked so kind and pitying. He put his hand of light out and said, "Go thy way, sin no more. Go and tell your husband and it will be alright; you shall start a new life together. Only trust." Though she had risen from the vision, the writer carefully observed the look of ineffable peace remained.

What seems to have happened is that the story of the woman taken in adultery brought her struggles up to the climax where in ensuing prayer her personality achieved integration through religious inspiration, and that the integration and sense of peace it produced inspired her to take the open course in the conviction that in so doing she was making atonement not only to her husband but to God. A few days later she returned to say that she had taken the course suggested, and that all was well. The same radiant peace was still there. Someone had found permanent integration of what had promised to develop into a situation threatening mental disorder as well as spiritual hopelessness.

The second case came under the writer's notice while a minister in Glasgow. A woman in her early thirties was dangerously ill. Operation had succeeded operation, and all concerned were very dubious about her. For a space of nearly eighteen months she hovered between life and death. As she herself tells the story, one day she saw a very bright light come to the bedside, and Jesus Christ stood from it, and with his face bathed with compassion, put his hand on her head and she heard him say, 'be thou healed.' She is very emphatic about what she saw and heard, especially as consciously she was not thinking about getting better nor about religion at the moment. But the significant thing is that she took ~~her~~ turn for the better that day, and what had dragged on for so many months, was only a matter of a few weeks before a full and complete recovery was hers. Her own conviction is that Christ came to her and healed her.

Here is an instance where vision is probably explained by a conflict of the conscious and subconscious in personality. Consciously she had often wondered whether she would be well again, she had observed the dubious looks of those around her, she herself was consciously aware of the seriousness of her case. But, as a devout, pious woman, she also had at the back of her mind the thought of Jesus the healer, though consciously inhibited by reason of the usual attitude that Jesus did not heal today as he did when he was on earth. But in the subconscious the conviction grew and grew, and achieved its victory in an integration which produced healing.

APPENDIX IV

A FURTHER EXAMPLE OF ABNORMAL ACCOMPANIMENTS
OF RELIGIOUS REVIVAL MOTIVED BY THE SPIRIT

The Rev. T. Rook, M.A. of Buxton, in a personal note, describes an experience he had, and which is given in his own words. "The experience..occurred at Tarbet, Harris, on Sunday, Aug. 30, 1914. I took a seat at the back of the Presbyterian Church there at 12 o'clock...though I knew the service was to be a Gaelic one. The church was pretty well filled downstairs with men wearing blue serge, and women with dark skirts and light blouses. Before the service commenced I was disturbed by hearing from one or two parts of the Church a sound exactly like the barking of a collie dog. As the service proceeded the barking increased, and it became evident it was not that of dogs, as I had supposed. From upstairs, too, came other cries of distress in the voices of women not unlike the screeches of gulls. The minister conducting the service had a tender pleading sympathetic voice and once I noticed him look down to a particular pew where two young women were almost hysterical, and speak as though he were trying his best to give them relief. I could not understand the Gaelic, but that was evidently what he was doing. Towards the close of the service a woman with streaming hair was led down the open staircase from the gallery and taken out, and a young woman in the pew in front of me, I noticed, began to heave violently and quickly with her breast, as though she were on the verge of hysteria too. I had a sense of the Presence in spite of the fact that I could not understand what was being said and sung..."

After service I strolled down to the ship 'Dunara Castle', on which I had come, and standing there on deck I watched the worshippers scramble into their fishing-boats..and make their way home to the islands. Amongst the folk were some with dishevelled hair and wet eyes and troubled faces.

After they had gone I found a man standing beside me who had been speaking a good deal to them as they embarked. I tried to find out from him the explanation of the strange experience in church. I thought it was probably due to some bad news from the Front (since the Great War was in being), but after a time he very reluctantly told me that they were connected with a religious revival that had been going on for about twelve months. These people who barked and screeched were under conviction of sin, and they continued to manifest their condition, until light broke and release came. Then the symptoms went and never returned. He told

me he had never known such things to happen before and that the minister had tried his best to discourage them, but they appeared in spite of all he could do.

I gathered he was an Elder or Superintendent. I pointed out to him that the sounds were not due to excitement created in and by the service, since I noted them before even the service began. He answered that these people came 'in the Spirit.' Pointing to the eight or ten fishing boats now well on their way home, he said, 'You know, every one of those has an Elder in it, and all those folk before they set out to come here, gathered in their homes or barns for prayers.'

I wrote afterwards to the minister of the church asking him to tell me the history of the Revival and of these manifestations, telling him I was a minister too...but I got no reply."

Here we are amidst the atmosphere of the primitive church with its physical marvels. The example is cited because of its modern occurrence.

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

APPENDIX V

"THE TWELVE" AND THE APOSTLES

"The Twelve" (οἱ δώδεκα) is the designation given to a body of personal disciples of Jesus, Mark and Luke expressly stating that they were appointed to such a position, and Matthew implying the same fact (Mk.iii.16,Lk.vi.6-13,Mt.x.1). In the Synoptics the Twelve are rarely referred to as 'apostles'; Mark twice mentions them as ἀπόστολοι (iii.14,vi.30), but in the former instance the phrase οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ἠνθμασεν is a later addition to the text, being absent from the Old-lat and Old-syr, but present in Aleph B C* 13 etc. Syr-hl.mg. The authority for the reading makes Swete accept its authenticity, although he is not quite sure since he says "the name was not perhaps given at the time" ("The Gospel of St.Mark," ad loc iii.14). More likely we have here a Western non-interpolation from Luke (cf."The Beginnings of Christianity" ed.Foakes Jackson and Lake, Vol.V.p.37). Luke uses more frequently ἀπόστολοι, both in gospel and Acts. On the other hand, Mark refers many times to οἱ δώδεκα without using ἀπόστολοι of them (iv.10,vi.7,ix.35,x.32,xi.11,xiv.10,17,20,43) while Matthew,

the more natural *μαθηταί*.

"The Twelve" seem to be special attendants and messengers of Jesus (cf. pp. 166, 170, 172), the mission on which they are sent out being to preach the kingdom and cast out demons (Mk. iii. 14f). Nowhere in Mark are the Twelve looked on as the basis of a new organization. Their function as 'messengers' is even seen in Luke with his more formal 'apostles' (xi. 49), while Matthew follows the Marcan impression here (x. 7).

The announcement of the messengers was eschatological in character on the whole; even where Jesus was not thinking in apocalyptic, they would view it from such a standpoint (cf. pp. 179ff.), while they are to be the assessors at the divine judgment in the Kingdom (Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30, cf. pp. 296, 461f.).

But the eschatological hope did not mature: the primitive Messianic community emerged into the church with the experience of the Kingdom actually present in the world, and as the society of that kingdom with the eschatological hope transmuted into eternal life in the Kingdom not of this world (cf. chs. VII-VIII, pp. 355-380). Organization thus received a powerful stimulus, and the "Twelve" come to be viewed as a sort of apostolic collegium, a close corporation, viewed not eschatologically, but officially, in view of the organized church which had come into being. Luke reveals this later approach, and especially so in the Acts. The concluding charge of Jesus is to the Eleven Apostles (Acts i. 2, 13), while Luke builds up the qualifications of the authenticity of his chronicle by submitting that his record is based on the duly authoritative witness of the Apostles (Acts i. 2f.). They had personal experience of Jesus' resurrection, of what Jesus said and did in life, but these qualifications were held by many more than the Eleven (cf. pp. 121-130, 136-142, 205, 210), while women could become apostles on this basis (Lk. viii. 1ff. cf. pp. 167, 210). The election of Matthias seems designed to fill up the vacancy in the collegium, whereas no more was empirically implied than to complete the number 'twelve' in view of the imminent Kingdom (Acts i. 15ff. cf. pp. 296f.). The 'collegium' appears in 'the teaching of the Apostles' (ii. 42), the subsequent words 'and the fellowship' leading some commentators to explain the 'fellowship' as 'the fellowship of the Apostles' (cf. p. 324). The Eleven Apostles and Peter are the interpreters of the Pentecost phenomena (Acts ii. 14ff.), while to them the quickened hearers apply as to what they ought to do to be saved (Acts ii. 37).

But Luke betrays that there are other apostles, besides the Twelve, e.g. Barnabas (v. 36), while Paul has no doubt that he is as much an apostle as any among the twelve (Rom. i. 5, xi. 13. I Cor. iv. 9, ix. 1f. xv. 9f. II Cor. xii. 12, Gal. i. 17, etc.). He evidently attached great importance to his commission, which is indeed authorized of God (Gal. i. 1f. Rom. i. 5). He never seems to have heard of the "Twelve," as understood in any official sense of a collegium; at least he only quotes the phrase once (I Cor. xv. 5), where he is

quoting primitive church tradition.

As against the 'collegium' idea of the Twelve, there is further the discrepancy in the names which appear in the several lists (Mk.iii.16-19, Mt.x.2-4, Lk.vi.14-16). Had the Twelve been so important a body in the primitive church, the names would have been better preserved, and would be further free from so large a number of "names and nothing more". Further, the position of James the Lord's brother to which he afterwards attained as president of the Jerusalem community suggests that he, although not an apostle in the official sense, or belonging to the Twelve, took precedence of every one, apostle or non-apostle, collegium or otherwise (Acts xv.). Paul's lists of resurrection appearances (I Cor.xv.3ff.) gives an appearance to The Twelve, and afterwards, to all the Apostles, suggesting that the Twelve still retained their status of personal attendants of Jesus, while the apostles were a more general class.

Despite the conflicting presentations of "The Twelve" and the Apostles, there is no need to conclude with J.Weiss ("Urchristentum" op.cit.p.34) that there is no historic evidence for the appointment of the Twelve. The facts seem to be that Jesus originally selected a few disciples as his personal attendants and messengers, and made the specific number up to twelve in view of his message of the Kingdom, which they were sent out to announce. There may well have been other disciples similarly engaged; indeed, we hear of one who specially shared the mind of Jesus, viz.the Beloved Disciple(cf.pp.62-64). But why was the appointment of the Twelve connected with the mission of heralding the Kingdom? The answer lies in the eschatological character of their function and number. The number was more important than the office

On the other hand, Luke, reflecting later church consolidation and theory, has set forth the Twelve as an official collegium and the word ἀποστολοι has been almost narrowed down to be synonymous with the Twelve, the governors and administrators of the church. In view of this later theory why was the story of the appointment of the Twelve by Jesus, and with such differing functions from those in Acts, invented? Their inconsistency with the later standpoint suggests at least that if invented, the story would have been related with an eye to the later theory. But on the contrary the story of the appointment of the Twelve stands out in its simple naivete, as is illustrated by the efforts to bring it more into line with the later idea (Mk.iii.14)

The facts also suggest that the Twelve were not a closed corporation governing the church as the early chapters in Acts seem to hint. Such governing body as there is consisted of a wider group with James as the head, and he was not of the Twelve, nor is there any hint that he was ever included with the Twelve. Cf.Acts xv.13 and 'elders'(πρεσβυτεροι) xv.6. How is it that the original leadership of Peter on whom was conferred the 'keys of the kingdom of heaven'(Mt.xvi.19) passed over to a man who

not of the 'collegium'? The question is insoluble, because Acts tells us nothing about it, but it points to the fluidity of the apostles' authority rather than to the existence of any Apostolic College. Even the believers appoint the Seven (vi. 2ff.), and here again textual variants (B reads 'let us choose' i.e. the apostles are the appointing body) reveal the later idea influencing the earlier facts. But J.H. Ropes indicates serious doubts about the Western Text at this point ("The Beginnings of Christianity," ed. Foakes Jackson and Lake, Vol. III. 1926 p. 59), and the ordinary text reveals a less ordered and consistent state of things in the primitive church than the harder conception of an apostolic collegium in existence would allow.

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

APPENDIX VI

WHO WERE THE HELLENISTS?

In Acts vi. 1 the Hellenistic section of the primitive church obtrudes itself for the first time, and somewhat unexpectedly. Who were the Ἑλληνισταί? A.C. McGiffert regards them as "Hellenistic Jews who were largely represented in Jerusalem at this time, and even proselytes, who were also numerous in the city" (op. cit. p. 76), and this general conclusion is supported by J.V. Bartlett ("Apostolic Age" p. 28), J. Weiss (op. cit. p. 119 "griechisch redenden Juden"), H.J. Holtzmann ("Apostelgeschichte" on vi. 1, "die Juden mit griechische Volksthümlichkeit und Sprache, während die Hebräer.. palästinische Juden sind"), F.J.A. Hort ("The Christian Ecclesia," pp. 50, 206).

On the other hand the view that these Hellenists are Gentiles has found recent expression by H.J. Cadbury, who inclines to this solution ("The Beginnings of Christianity" ed. Foakes Jackson and Lake, Vol. V. pp. 68ff.), but there is nothing in his analysis of the etymology of the word and its appearance in post-Nicene writers which really precludes the view that Ἑλληνιστής may well be a Greek-speaking Jew, the word reasonably denoting "Anyone who practises Greek ways—whether a Greek himself or a foreigner (ibid. p. 60).

There are three instances of the word in the Acts. In vi. 1 the almost certain reference is to Hellenistic Jews, including

Gentile proselytes to Judaism and God-fearers who would not take the final step of circumcision, i.e. the reference is to the Jews from the wider world, whether sons of Abraham by race, by proselytizing, or by interest in the Jewish religion, on the fringe of Judaism. The writer of Acts is careful throughout his work in matters involving language: he is careful to tell us that the men of every nation under heaven who were astonished at the Pentecost phenomena were Ἰουδαῖοι (ii.5); he is careful to tell his readers that Paul did not understand the vernacular of Lycaonia (xiv.11); we are reminded that Paul was not to be confused with an Egyptian unable to speak Greek (xxi.37, cf. the word Ἑλληνιστῶν here); that Paul addressed the crowd before the castle of Antonia in Aramaic (τῆν Ἑβραϊκὴν διαλέκτῳ xxi.2). Further, it seems hardly historical to assume the presence of specific Gentiles so numerous, to cause a dissension in the church; Gentiles there were, but well within Judaistic influence; even the publicans and sinners were all on the Jewish fringe, and these elements would be present. The Seven were probably Hellenistic Jews, one being a proselyte (Nicolaus, vi.5), but the presence among them of a God-fearer is not precluded. The Greek names of the Seven cause no difficulty, since Jews under Greek influence, still more proselytes and God-fearers had such names.

In Acts ix.29 the converted Paul disputes with Hellenists in Jerusalem, and the subject of disputation, Jesus the Christ, points to the Greek-speaking Jews or proselytes as being indicated here, since as yet Jesus meant nothing to the purely Gentile world. Mr. Cadbury seems to be misled too readily by his desire to read the Lukan theory of the church into the references when he says that "there is no reason why the author may not be supposed to have introduced here a prompt fulfilment of the prediction made at Paul's conversion that he would be a missionary to the Gentiles" (op.cit.p.70). Why then did not Luke show this desire as he narrates Paul's missionary journeys where the apostle to the Gentiles is set forth as beginning with the Jews of the Diaspora, and finding these obdurate, turns to the Gentiles (Acts xiii.5,14,xiv.1,cf.xiii.44-46)?

In Acts xi.19f. we get the first preaching to the Gentiles by converts from Cyprus and Cyrene, the Ἑλληνιστῶν being the object of their message, in contrast with those who were limiting their preaching to Jews only. Here the connotation of the term is Gentiles. In fact a variant reading Ἑλληνας (A D Aleph (c)) points to what was probably the original reading, i.e. 'Greeks' (cf. F.H.A.Scrivener, "A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," 4th.Edn.1894, Vol.II.pp.370f. but cf. the discussion on the text here by J.H.Ropes ("The Beginnings of Christianity" ed Foakes Jackson and Lake, Vol.III.ad loc.)).

INDEX I REFERENCES TO CANONICAL, NON-CANONICAL, AND
OTHER ANCIENT WRITINGS

(i) The Old Testament

Genesis		Leviticus		Deut.(ctd)	
i. 6	113	iv.13	333	xxiii.2-4	331
iv.26	419	15	333		340
vi. 2	269f.	viii. 4	333	9	331
4	290	xi.44	322		340
xii. 8	420	xiv.2-32	146	xxvi.17f.	118
xiii. 4	420	xvi.	456	xxviii.10	420
xix.	107	5	333	xxxii.17	290
xxi.33	420	xix. 2	333	xxxiv. 9	115
xxxii. 1	107	18	162		
xli.38	113	xxiv.11	420	Joshua	
	264			vii.24	118
xlix. 6	331	Numbers		ix.15	333
Exodus		i. 2	333	18	333
iii.14f.	420	53	333	xi. 5	333
v.23	420	v.14	287	xxii.16f.	333
xii. 2	431	30	287	18	333
3	332f.	xiv. 5	333	20	333
6	331	xvi. 2	332f.		
	333	3	331	Judges	
xiii.11-13	435	5f.	333	iii.10	113
xvi. 1f.	333	9	333	ix.23	287
9f.	333	11	333	xii.14	281
22	333	16	333	xiii.25	113
xix. 5f.	118	xx. 4	331	xiv. 6	112f.
6	322	xxii. 4	113	8	333
xx.24	420		331	xv.14	113
xxi. 3f.	113	6	113	xx. 2	331
xxii.29f.	435	xxvi. 9	333	xxi. 5	331
xxiii.19	435	xxvii. 3	333	8	331
xxiv. 8	436	17	333		
xxv.22	333	xxxii.16	333	I Samuel	
xxviii. 3	288	xxxiii. 4	333	x. 1	101
xxix. 7	101	iv.34	333	6	113
42f.	333	x. 3	333	10-12	113
xxx. 6	333	4	333	xvi.13	101
10	456	2-6	334	13f.	113
30	101	Deuteronomy		15	112
36	333	v.19	331	xvii. 4	419
xxxii. 3f 13, 264		vi.16	470	45	420
13	431	ix.10	331	47	331
17	431	xii. 5	420	xviii.10	287
xxxiii.20	456	15	112	xix 9	287
xxxiv.14	420	xiii.1-3	291	20-24	113
19f.	435	xviii.16	331	xxv. 5	419
				8	418
				25	418

Isaiah (ctd.)		Ezekiel		Hosea	
lxi. 1	114	i-ii.	211	i. 1	211
lff.	115	ii. 2	113	ii.10ff.	337
lxiii.19	420	3ff.	113	iv.12	287
lxv-lxvi.	100	iii.12	113	v. 4	287
lxv.13	432	12-14	258	vi. lff.	337
17f.	95	14	113	vii.12	333
Jeremiah		viii. 3	113	viii.13	378
i. 4-10	211		258	Joel	
6	212	xi. 1	113	i. 7	154
15	90	5	113	ii.16	331
iii.17	95	19	288	28f.	114,240,248
iv. 1f.	95	24	114	Amos	
v.15	90		258	i. 1	211
vi.18	333	xvi.40	331	iii. 3	333
20	378	xvii.22-24	153	iv. 4ff.	337
22	90	xx. 5	431	v. lff.	337
vii.10	420	xxi.25f.	95	21-23	378
10f.	420	xxv.	95	ix.12	420
14	420	xxx. 6	153	13f.	95
30	420	12	153	Micah	
x.10	95	xxxiii.30	310	ii. 5	331
22	90	xxxiv.14	95	iv. 1f.	95
xii.16	95	16	95	7	95
xiv. 9	420	27	95	vi. 6f.	378
14	291	xxxv.	95	vii. 2	310
14f.	257	xxxvi.18	95	Habakkuk	
xv.16	420	26	95	i.1.13	
xvi.19	95	27	115	Zephaniah	
xxiii. 5f.	90	30	95	i.10ff.	90
16	291	35	95	iii. 9	419
xxiv. 5f.	90	xxxviii. 4	331	13	95
xxv. 9	90	8	90	17f.	95
11	90	16	90	Haggai	
11f.	91	17	90	i. 2	95
12	99	xl-xlviii.	90	8	90
29	420	Daniel		ii. 6-9	90
xxvi.17	331	ii.47	471	20-23	90
xxix.10	90	iv. 8f.	113	Zechariah	
12	91	12-14	153	i.18	95
xxx.20	333	13	108	ii.11	95
xxxi. 8	330f.	17	108	iii. 7-10	90
31f.	95	21f.	153	iv. 9	129
118		v.12	288	vi.12f.	90
31ff.	437	vii.18	322	vii. 9	310
xxxiv.14	291	22	322	ix. 9	129
xliv. 1f.	337	ix. 2	91	Lamentations	
l. 9	331	18	420	i.10	331
Lamentations		19	420		
i.10	331	x.13	108		
		20f.	108		
		xii. 2	105,465		

Zechariah (ctd)	
xii.10	288
xiii. 9	420

Malachi	
ii.10	310
iii. 1	219,423f.
2f.	221
23	104

(ii) The Apocrypha

Tobit		Wisdom of Solomon		Sirach	
iii. 8	111	i. 7	113	1.25f.	303
viii.15	322	ii. 4	111	I Maccabees	
xii.12	108	v. 4	216	ii.44	137
15	108	vii.27	318	48	137
		ix.17	115	II Maccabees	
		xix.13	216	vii. 9	465
				11	106
				xiv.46	106

(iii) The Pseudepigrapha

Jubilees		Jubilees (ctd.)		Enoch (ctd.)	
i.11	290	xxiii.29	111	xvi. 1	289
21	112	30	98	xix. 1	110
23	112	xxx. 7-17	97	1f.	290
	290	xxxv.17	109	xx.	108
26	98			3	108
27	108	Martyrdom of Isaiah		5	108
29	98	(Mar.Is.)		6	289
ii. 2	108	ii. 4	111	7	108
	258	v.14	250	xxi. 1f.	96
19	431	Ascension of Isaiah		xxii.	106
31	431	(Asc.Is.)		xxiv. 4	432
32	431	x.29	111	xxv. 4f.	432
iv.15	110	Enoch		xxvii. 2	96
22	110	i.96	96	2f.	462
26	98	xxxvii-lxxi		xxix. 5	111
v. 1-9	110	i-xxxvi.	465	xxxviii. 2	65,96,100,
7	110	x. 6	96		463,101
9	110	x.17-xi. 2	96	4	322
x. 2	110	x.21	96	xxxix. 6	461
3	110	xii. 4	108	xxxix. 7	465
8	110	xiii.9	96	xl. 5	101
8f.	110	xv. 8	290	7	111
12	111	8f.	289	9	108
xv.31	97	11f.	289	xlv. 3f.	101
xvi. 1	111			4f.	96

Enoch (ctd.)		Enoch (ctd.)		Levi (ctd.)	
xlvi. 2	101	lxxiii-xc.	91,99,100	viii.14	97,102
2f.	101	lxxv. 5	113	xiv. 4	97
3	464	xc.20	96	xviii. 7	287
xlviii. 2	101		26	11	432
3	466		26f. 462	12	102,287
4	465		29		
6	466		30-34		
7	465		33ff. 96	Judah (T.Jud.)	
10	100	xcv-civ.	97	xiii. 3	287
xliv. 1	461		106	xvi. 1	287
2	101	xcv.10	97	xx. 1	288
	464		12	5	288
3	114f.		12-17	xxiii. 1	290
	288		13		
	461		15-17	Zebulun (T.Z.)	
4	101	xcii. 3	97	vii.12	112
	464	xciii.	97	viii.20	112
l. 2	96	xcviii. 3	97		
li. 1	106		462	Dan (T.D.)	
	465	xcix. 7	290	i. 6	287
3	101	ciii. 4	97	v. 6	287
	461		7f. 97	10	102
5	101		8	vi. 2	108
	465			7	97
lii. 4	101	Testaments XII Patr.		Naphtali (T.N.)	
liiii. 3	111	Reuben (T.R.)		ii. 2	287
6	101	iii. 1	287	5	97
	461		3	iii. 3	290
	465		4	iv. 5	102
liv. 6	111		5	viii. 3	97
lx.14f.	113		6	Gad (T.G.)	
16-21	113		7-12	i. 9	
lxi. 5	465	vi. 7-12	102		
17	288		12	Asher (T.Ash.)	
11	188	xviii.12	102	vii. 3	97
lxii.	466	Simeon (T.S.)			
2	114f.	iii. 1	287	Joseph (T.J.)	
6	461	iv. 7	287	xx. 2	115
7	101	v. 1	287	xxiv. 1	102
7f.	465	vi. 1	287	1ff.102	
9	101		5	5f. 102	
14	101		6	xxv. 2	108
14f.	465			5	97
15f.	106	Levi (T.L.)			
lxix. 4	111	ii. 3	115	Benjamin (T.B.)	
6	111		287	ix. 2	97
11	111		97	x. 5	97
lxx. 2	114	11	97		
lxxi.11	288	iii. 2f.	96	Tests XII. Appendix I	
		iv. 4	97	x. 9	112

Sibylline Oracles (Sib.Or.)	Apocalypse of Baruch	Psalms of Solomon
i. 5,5 114	xx. 2 98	ii.38f. 137
iii.49 102	364	iii.11 137
356-560 96	xxiii. 7 98	13 137
723 289	364	iv. 9 137
	xxv. 98	27 137
Assumption of Moses (Ass.Mos.)	364	xii. 8 137
x.10 462	xxix. 4f. 98	xv. 9-14 137
	xxx. 1 98	xviif. 102
Secrets of Enoch	3 98	6 137
.xviii. 1 108	xxxii. 6 98	23ff. 47
xx. 1 108	xl. 3 98	27 102
xxv-xxxii. 99	xlvi.50 98f.	31f. 102
xxxiii. 1 99	xlix.2-li. 200	33 102
	202	34 102
Fragments of a Zadokite Work	li. 3 99	35 102
i. 7 102	liv.15 98	36 102
ii.10. 103	21 98	38 102
viii. 2 103	lix. 8 98	41 102
ix.10 103	lxxiii. 1 98	xviii. 6 102
29 103	IV Ezra	8 102
xv. 4 103	xiv. 22 114	288
xviii. 8 103	263	III Maccabees
		iii.24 216

(iv) The New Testament

Matthew	Matthew (ctd.)	Matthew (ctd.)
i. 1 129	iv. 1ff. 516	v.11f. 349
1-17 12	1-11 132	18-13 16
18 113	5-7 219	12 269
18-20 238	7 470	13 151
19 84	8-10 126	14 151
20 108	10 470	15 350
22-25 12	24 147	18 352
ii.13 108	24f. 123	19 16
19 108	v. 82	21-48 171
iii. 2 414	v-vii 60,171	22-24 310
7 414	352	25f. 16
7-10 462	1-4 349	27-31 16
9 69,414	1-12 346	44 268
10-12 414	2-4 16	44-48 349
11 221	5 16	44ff. 16
12 463	6 349	47 310
16-19 522	7f. 16	vi. 5f. 268

Matthew (ctd.)

vi. 9-13	16,268
	346,350
19-21	351
19-23	16
22f.	350
25-33	351
46	471
vii. 1-5	16,349
3	159
3-5	310
7-11	350
7-14	16
11	515
12	349
15	291
16	292
16-18	16,349
16-20	159
21	178,349
	470,471
24	291
24-27	159,349
24-28	16
28	350
viii. 2-4	145
5f.	143
5-10	16,350
6	470
8	470
11f.	16,352
	463
13	350
15	145
17	123
19-22	16
29	283
ix. 8	290
16f.	155
34	280
37f.	350
38	470
x. 1	520
2-4	166
4	169
5	303,338
7	521
20	514
23	338
24f.	16,400
	470
26	464
26f.	350

Matthew (ctd.)

x.28-31	350
32	350
34-36	351
37	351
38	351
39	351
xi. 3	359
11	414
16-19	151f.
18	280
19	138
21-23	463
24	291
25	470
xii. 7	339
23	129
24-30	464f.
25-28	155
28	515
29	155
33	349
38f.	463
39-42	132
41f.	463
xiii.16f.	351
24-30	178
31f.	152
31-33	350
32	153
33	152,359
36	171
37-43	348
39	109
41	109
47-50	178
49	109
52-58	122
xiv.23	268
xv.14	155
22	129,289
24	338
31	139
xvi. 1-4	132
16	172,340
16-19	12
18f.	205
19	522
xvii.15	289
xviii.10	109
12f.	351
17	340

Matthew (ctd.)

xviii.17f.	12
20	514
xix.28	296,433,
	461,521
xx.30f.	129
xxi. 5	129
9	129
10f.	133
15	129
15f.	133
26	152
41	157
43	158
xxii.1-10	152
1-14	433
43	514
xxiii.37-39	178,463
xxiv. 39	471
xxiv. 11	281
14	339
24	281
26-28	350
31	109
37-41	350
43	357
43-51	350,463
.45-50	470
xxv. 1ff.	433
xxvi.17	429
26-29	346
26-30	427
27f.	427
29	427,432
31	184
37	62
53	109
xxvii. 3-5	190
40	130
xxviii. 1	167
2	196
2f.	199
6	196
9	167,196
9f.	512
10	512
11-15	196
17f.	196
16-20	196,512
19	12,213
	339,413
20	368,458

Mark

i. 2	104
4	414
7f.	414
8	412
10	273,515
11	168
12	415
13	108
15	127,337
17	168
18-20	316
20	168
21	171
22	122
23	285
23-26	147
24	128,147
	283,285
25	128,147
26	122,147
27	122,146f.
29	170
29ff.	143
31	145,170
32	147
34	128,283
35f.	268
36ff.	171
37	123
38	165
38f.	337
40-44	145
43f.	128
44	146
45	128
ii. 7	131
14	169,316
15	171
16	131
20	375
21f.	155
23	171
23-28	171
24	131
25-27	60
iii. 1	131
1-6	164
2	131
2ff.	124
5	144
6	131,341
7	171

Mark (ctd.)

iii. 8	123
11	128
11f.	283
12	128
14	520
14f.	296,521
16	520
16-19	166,521
17	63
18	169
18f.	186
21f.	283
22	131,152
	280
23-27	146,291
23-29	60
24-26	155,289
27	155
28-30	515
30	280
31	283
35	169,311
iv. 1ff.	163
8-10	183,126
9	150
10	171,520
10f.	150
11	149
12	12,128
	149,155
	348
14	122
15	122
21	151
22	464
26-29	359,400
28	127
30-32	152,359
34	171
39	182
41	123
v. 1ff.	171
2ff.	289
3-5	283,284
4	283
5	146
7	128,283
9	146,289
13	146,281
15	283
31	171
37	166

Mark (ctd.)

vi. 1	171
1-6	122,337
4	281
7	520
14f.	127
30	520
30f.	171
31	171
32-42	23
45-51	171
46	268
48	283
vii. 1	131
1-5	171
5	132
14f.	161
17	171
24	132
31	132
viii. 1-10	23
8	126
9-13	176
10f.	126
11	130
14	170
14-21	165
28	104
29	172
30	168
31	175,182
	185,375
32	183
32f.	75
35-37	375
ix. 2	62,166
9-13	165
10	184
17	284
18	146,283
20	283
25	284
26	146
28	242
30-32	183
31	185
32	165,169,184
33f.	184
33-37	187
34	184
35	520
38-40	187

Mark (ctd.)

ix.43	462
45	462
47	462
50	151
x.21	316
28	316
29f.	160
32	183,184
	185,520
35	63
35-45	187,375
37	182
38-41	375
41	63
45	375
47f.	129
xi.10	129
11	520
30	414
xii.10	158
10f.	156
13-17	140
14-17	130
25	109
36	514
40	462
xiii.	178,462
3	166
11	263,514
22	291
27	109,462
33	268
36	357
xiv. 1	429
2	430
10	520
10f.	186
12	429
17	520
18f.	186
20	520
22-24	40
22-25	184
22-26	426
24	436
24f.	438
25	431
26	430
27	184
27f.	513
28	185,512

Mark (ctd.)

xiv.28	186
32-39	268
33	62
37f.	186
43	186,520
47	430
50	187,188
66-72	187
xv. 2	129
12	129
12-15	130
21	430
22	146
26	129
46	430
56	430
xvi. 1	430
4-6	196
5f.	199
7	185
12	196
Luke	
i. 1	10
1f.	9
$\frac{1-4}{6}$	$\frac{8,20}{84}$
15	280
26	259
28	84
32	196
34	84
34f.	113
35	238,259
36f.	84
68	84
69	196
ii. 9	108
10	13
38	84
47	127
iii. 6	13
12f.	139
7-9	462
16	221
17	463
iv. 13-39	114 ¹³
1	114
1-12	132
1ff.	516
5-8	126,183
8	126,470

Luke (ctd.)

iv.12	470,471
14	238
16-30	122
22	124,127
23	222
28f.	389
37	122
39	145
v. 1-11	167
8	168
12-14	146
16	268
17	131
33-35	131
36	156
36-38	155
vi. 4	138
6-13	520
11	131
12	268
14-16	166,522
17	123,349
20-23	349
26	291
27f.	349
28	268
29-33	346
31	349
38	155
37f.	349
40	16,470
41f.	159,349
43f.	159,349
46	470
46-49	349
47-49	159
vii. 1-10	350
6	470
16	290
19	128
29	139
29f.	152
31-35	350f.
33	280
34	138
37	138
37f.	167
47-50	167
viii. 2	146,167,
	289

Luke (ctd.)

viii. 3	170
17	464
25b	123
27	284
28f.	174
29	283,284
ix.18	268
20	172
28f.	268
31	175
35	101
	461
39	283
42	146,283
45	12,183
49	63
51	132
52	109
53	301
54	63
54f.	187
x. 1ff.	166,316
2	350,470
13-15	463
17	172
20	172
21	470
23f.	351
25-37	311
30-37	161
38ff.	167
xi. 1	268
2-4	268,346
	350
5-8	268
9-13	350
13	515
14	146
16	463
17-20	155
17-23	146
21	155
24	146
26	146
29-32	463
33	350
34f.	350
46	94
49	521
xii. 2	464
- 2f.	350
4	318

Luke (ctd.)

xii. 4-7	350
8	350
12	514
22-31	351
33	316
33f.	351
35-38	155
39f.	350,463
42-46	155,350
	463
49-53	375
51	351
53	351
xiii. 1	85
6-9	152
7	154
16	283
18f.	152
18-21	350
20f.	152
23	320
28f.	352,463
34f.	463
35	471
xiv.15	453
16-24	152
24	154
26	160,351
27	351
28-30	159
31f.	159
xv. 1	140
3-7	161
7	161
4-7	351
8-10	161
10	161
11-32	161
xvi.13	351,471
17	352
xvii.23f.	350
24	357
26f.	350
33	351
34f.	350
xviii. 1	268
2-8	268
9-14	161,268
34	12,183
xix. 8	140
38	129
39	133

Luke (ctd.)

xxi.20	178
34	357
36	268
xxii. 7	429
14-20	346
15	429
15-20	427
16	427
17	427
17f.	376,432
17-19	40
18	427,432
19a	427,428
19b	427,428
	442
19	376,427
19b20	427,428
19f.	428
20	427
21	427
29f.	433
30	109,296
	461,521
35	101
37	377
39	185
45	185
xxiii.35	461
46	212,364
xxiv. 4	199
10	167
15	197
17	197
13ff.	197
19-21	355
21	84
22f.	210
23	108,199
25-27	197
26	301
27	301
29f.	197
30f.	170
31	197
32	165
36	226
36ff.	197
36-43	203
39f.	197
41f.	199
42f.	197
47	213

Luke (ctd.)		John (ctd.)		John (ctd.)	
xxiv.48	214	viii. 1f.	138	xx.15f.	197
52	165	1-11	140	-19f.	197
John		1ff.	517	26-29	197
i.35-42	167	11	517	xxi.	512
37-42	168	31ff.	60	5	203
37	168	44	61	12f.	203
40	169	48	281,303	Acts	
41	167	ix. 16	137	i. 1	20
43	168	24f.	137	2	521
ii. 1-10	144	31	137	2f.	521
iii. 2	242	33	289	4	512
3	56	x. 20	281	4f.	484
5	413	21	289	5	412
3ff.	59	xi. 1ff.	144	6	84,18,370
5-14	56	55	215	7	357
15f.	360	xii. 12f.	215	8	214,235
22	414	19	133		484
36	360	32-34	130	9	453
iv. 1	414	xiii-xvii	56	11	28,216,323
2	414	1f.	171,184		453
9	303		429	13	521
9-12	219	18	61	13f.	294
31	170	23	62	14	167,226,235
v.24	360	29	429		265,326,512
vi. 3	126	xiv,xvii	61	15ff.	263,521
14	127	16f.	239	16	263
15	125	17	288	21-26	295
19	283	26	239	ii. 1	297,326
25f.	126	xv. 1ff.	61	1ff.	167
26ff.	60	11	61	1-4	28,221,240
30	126	14f.	318		265,297
32ff.	126	16	61	1-13	23
40	360	19	61	2f.	222
41ff.	60	26	239,288	3f.	297
47	360	xvi.13	288	4	227,273
53-56	41	13f.	239	5	524
54	360	22	61	5-11	23
63	41	xvii. 4f.	61	5-12	3
66	126	13	61	6	222
68f.	170	xviii.28	429	7	323
vii.11	126	xix.14	429	13	23,223
12	127	26	62	14	271,297
15	127	31	429	14ff.	223,521
15ff.	60	42	429	14-36	23
20	281	xx. 1-10	196	15	223,484,23
28ff.	60	2	62,210	17	370
40f.	127	4ff.	512	17f.	248
41ff.	127	12	108	17ff.	240,356
52	94	12f.	199,210	17-21	297
vii.53-viii.11	140	13	210	22	241f.460
		15	210		

Acts (ctd.)		Acts (ctd.)		Acts (ctd.)	
ii&22-24	37,271,297	iii.26	74,271	v.36	521
22-28	271	iv. 1-3	265	37	85
23	28,194,299	3	302	40-42	391
	301,355,453	4	23,306,371	41	269
25	65	5ff.	302	41ff.	302
25-28	453	8	263,273	vi/viii.	4,22
29	310	8-12	271	vi. 1	302,306
30	196	10	453		315,385
31-33	297	10f.	355		386,523
33	240,273,279	10-12	158,356	2	306,385
	355,356,455	12	371,466	2ff.	523
34f.	462	13	272	2-6	385
36	37,271,297	18-21	391	3	264
	299,371,453	23	240,265	4	266
	460,467	23-31	302	5	21,272
37	373,521	24	326		273,302
37-40	298	24-29	266		524
37-41	23	25	263	6	266
38	266,373,416	27	378,460	7	320
38-40	462	27f.	377	8	241,250
39	356	27-29	240	8f.	386
40	321,370	29	271	8-10	302
41	300,371	30	240,378	10	264
42	265,300,324	31	23,28,223,240	11	388
	346,423,449		266,272,273	11f.	302
	521	32	263,300,313	13	388
42f.	17		315,326	15	387
42-47	23	32f.	17	vii. 1	387
44	319	33	467	2	310
44f.	313	34	300	7	389
44-47	300	34-36	313	16-18	389
46	265,269,319	34-37	23	17	389
	326,423	35	315	24-29	389
47	269,306,320	36f.	315	35f.	389
iii. 1	265	v. 2-4	315	38f.	390
1-7	241	3-5	260	39-41	389
iii.1-v.16	22	4	314	42	111
6	242,243,265	8f.	315	42f.	388,390
12ff.	241	9	260	49	388
12-26	23,265	11	329	51f.	388
13	74,378,453	12	240,326	51ff.	373
13ff.	271	14	306	52	28,101,299
13-15	299	15	241	54	387
13-16	301,377	19	109,258,260	55	250,453
14	101,461	20	371	55f.	269
15	371	27-40	302	56	461
17	310	28-32	391	57-59	387
18	194,301	30-32	356	58	26,303
20	272,460	31	371	59	267,364
20f.	371,453	32	242		467
22	310	34-39	356		

Acts (ctd.)

viii. 1 26,329
 3 26,303,329
 4-8 303,411
 5-13 21
 5-40 22
 6-8 241
 7 285
 8 270
 12 319
 14f. 266
 14-17 303,345
 16 416
 16f. 411
 18f. 241
 25 303
 26 258
 29 273
 29ff. 258
 32f. 378
 32-35 74
 34f. 378
 35 301,377
 37 319
 39 258,260,
 270,273
 ix. 1f. 306
 1-19 44
 1-30 22,26
 2 303,345
 3 275
 3ff. 206,275
 3-6 36
 7 206
 8f. 251
 10 307
 10ff. 251
 13 322
 17 310
 19 303,307
 27 275
 29 524
 31 272,329
 31-xi.18 22
 32 322
 34 242,243
 36 307
 38 307
 40 242,267
 41 322
 43 250

Acts (ctd.)

x/xi.18 17
 x. 1 394
 3 108
 3f. 258
 5 250
 9 250,267
 9ff. 248
 10 249
 11 249
 12f. 249
 13 249
 15 249
 19 250,273
 19f. 263
 20 258,319
 30 108
 38 242,460
 42 371,461
 43 319
 44 273,395
 44ff. 384,394
 44-48 266
 45-47 263
 46 224,395
 48 405
 xi. 1-3 391
 2f. 394
 3 405
 11f. 263
 12 273
 15 224,263,273
 15-17 266,412
 17 263
 18 270,395
 19 303,393
 19f. 524
 19ff. 17,21
 20 393,397
 21 319,393
 22-24 345
 23 270
 24 264,272
 26 307,308,323
 27 21
 28 263
 29f. 345
 30 403
 xii. 1-3 261
 1-23 22
 2f. 267
 5 267

Acts (ctd.)

xii. 7 258,260
 7f. 109
 12 267
 15 109
 23 261
 25-xv.35 22
 xiii/xiv. 401
 xiiiiff. 26
 1-3 21,345
 399
 2 402
 2f. 265
 5 524
 6 291
 8 320
 14 524
 26 310
 39ff. 319
 44-46 524
 46 270,275
 48 270,319
 52, 270,307
 xiv. 1 524
 3 240,275
 8ff.223
 9 242
 11 524
 20 307
 22 307,320
 26-xv.2 21
 28 307
 xv. 1 310,402
 1ff. 17
 1f. 345
 2 402
 4 404
 5 319
 6 404,522
 7 319
 8 263
 9 263,320
 10 307
 11 319,457
 12 263
 13 522
 22f. 21
 22-26 404
 23 310
 23-29 407
 25 326
 28 265,407

Acts (ctd.)

xv.29	404,407
30-40	21
32f.	310
xv. 403,404,408,522	
xvi. 5	320
6	273
9	275
11-18	20
15	318
16f.	283
18	242
34	320
xvii. 1-10	27
2b	27
3	27,317
xviii. 9	275
23	307
25	345
26	345
27	307
xix. 1	307
1-7	411
2	307
7	307
11	240
6	224
9	345
11f.	275
12	241
15	283
16	283
21	263
23	345
30	308
xx. 1	308
5-15	20
7	308,449
7-12	449
9-11	449
22	263,283
xxi. 1-18	20
23	307
25	345
26	345
27	307
xxii. 2	224
3	31
3-21	44
4	345
6ff.	206
14	461

Acts (ctd.)

xxiii. 8f.	109
xxiv. 5	323
6f.	512
14	345
17	403
22	345
xxvi. 2-20	44
5	46,83
10	322
12ff.	206
24	283
28	323
xxvii.1-xxviii.16, 20	
xxviii.25	263

Romans

i. 3	196
4	37
5	521
9	32
13	310
14	311
15	32,34
15f.	33
ii.16	32
iii.24	42
25	43
iv. 1f.	389
3	38
10	38
11	38
16-18	205
v. 3	269
5	291
vi. 3	40
4	40
6	42
17	42
19f.	42
vii. 1	310
7-25	45,274
viii. 3f.	37
7	43
9	277
17	43
20	42
23	275
26	226
26f.	275

Romans

ix-xi.	36,46
1	277
3	291
x. 9	33
16	33
xi.13	521
xii. 5	277
10	312
15	48
xiv.17	275,277
xv.16	32,33,277
19	33
xvi. 1	311
15	311

I Corinthians

i. 2	277,328
9	277,327
10f.	310
11 . 18	320
ii. 4	275
6f.	275
10	275
14	30,252
iii. 16	273,277
iv. 9	521
v. 7	42
vi.11	45,277
	413
vii.15	311
21f.	311
23	42
viii. 5	469
ix. 1	206
1f.	521
5	311
13	32
x.16	38,40,
	327,427
	428,432,439
20f.	290
21	40,427
	428,432-
	439
32	329
xi. 2	30,31,32
3-16	30
23	31,428
	442
23ff.	428

I Corinthians

xi.23-25	30,40
23-26	342,427
24	439
24f.	427
24b	427
25	427,439
26	428
xii. 1-3	291
3	277
9	241,277
10	252,280
13	277,311,413
26	48
28	241,329
28ff.	38
xiii.12	43
xiv. 2	224
2ff.	224
3f.	224
15	224
18	275
19	224,328
23	283,328
27	224
34f.	38
xiv. 38,229,280	
xv. 1	30,33
3	30,75,32,205,377
3ff.	522
3-7	30,31
5	295,521
5-8	205
6	215,295
8	36,206
9	329
9f.	521
23ff.	465
35ff.	43,207,364
36-38	207
43-48	208
xvi. 1-5	403
19	328
22	467

II Corinthians

i. 2-4	275
3	275
ii.12	521
15	320
17	277

II Corinthians

iii.17	278
iv. 3	32
6	206
16-18	364
v. 1-8	364
14	37
18-20	43
21	37,43,277
vi.10	48
viii. 1	328
1-4	403
9	37
17	30
ix. 1	403
2	403
8	48
11	48
12	403
xi.13	291
14f.	291
xii. 1	206
2ff.	31
11	225
xiii.13	277,326
xv. 1	115

Galatians

i. 9	30
1f.	521
6f.	33
9	30
11	310
12	30,275
13	329
13f.	45
16	45
17	521
ii. 403	
1-10	403,408
2	31,33,275
402	
6-9	404
9	53,404
10	403
11f.	405
11ff.	449
11-13	405
12f.	405
13f.	405
14	33
15	137

Galatians

ii.17	277
21	407
iii. 1ff.	38
13	75
25	43
26	277
27	40
28	48,311
iv. 1-7	42
4	37
6	291
8f.	42
14	30

Ephesians

i. 7	42
13f.	34
14	42
22	38,329
ii.13	33
16	48
18ff.	275
19	48
21f.	273,277
22	37
iii. 3	275
5	275
8	33
10	329
12	275
15	420
16	276
17	277
21	329
iv. 3	275
17	277
v. 2	42
26	33
vi. 8	311
10	275
18	275
19f.	275
23	310

Philippians

i.12	310
ii. 1	277,326
5-11	37
6	36
6-8	37
9f.	169

Philippians		II Thessalonians		I Peter	
iii. 1	277	ii. 1-10	357	i. 3f.	357
5-6	45	1	465	3-5	354
20	48	2	357	4	357
iv. 7	277	10	30	6	320
9	30	15	26	7	357
11	48	iii. 6	29,30	8	320
13	48	10-12	357	10f.	357
				11	263
Colossians		I Timothy		12	52
i. 2	310	i.10	51	14-16	354
13-19	169	iv. 1	51	15	322
14	42	12	51	19	74
15f.	37	v. 2	311	22	312
18	38	8	51	22f.	354
24	38	vi. 3	51	ii. 9	52,354
ii. 6	30	10	51	10	52
9-15	37			14	52
iii.11	311	II Timothy		17	325
		i.13	51	22f.	74
I Thessalonians		14	277	iii.18	74
i. 5	27	16-18	52	iv. 5	461
6	28,30,275	ii.10f.	52	7	351
10	28,356	iv. 1f.	52	12-16	52
ii. 1	310	3	51	13f.	269
12	356	5-22	52	16	269,323
13	30	Titus		v.12	52
15	28	i. 9	51		
iv. 1	30	13	51	II Peter	
9	312	ii. 1	51	i. 1	52
15f.	357	iii.12-15	52	14ff.	52
16	465				
v. 1-3	29	Hebrews		Jude	
1-8	357	i. 1	54	12	449
		7	11		
James		14	258	Apocalypse	
i. 1	53	ii. 8-10	54	ii.20	407
ii. 23	318	iv. 1	54	24	407
iii. 15	283	9-11	54	ix.20	290
		v. 1-6	389		
I John		vi.18-20	54		
iv. 2f.	291	vii. 1-9	389		
v. 8	413	viii. 5f.	54		
12f.	360	ix. 7	456		
19	111	23-28	54		
		26	54		
		xi. 8-19	389		
		10	54		
		xii.26-28	54		
		xiii. 1	312		
		14	54		

(v) The New Testament Apocrypha

The Gospel according to the Hebrews	Gospel of Peter	The Book of John the Evangelist
65,66,204 215,516	xiii.55-57 196	52

The Agrapha
66,67,138

(vi) Ancient Christian Writings

The Didache	Papias	Ignatius
1. 349,408	(quoted in Eus. H.E.iii.39)	ad Rom. vii.3 41
i-vi 347		Eph. xx. 41
ix. 432,438	13,63,223	Philad. iv. 41
ixf. 447		
x. 6 467	Justin Martyr	Origen
xi. 8 292	Apol.lxvi. 41	Comm.John ad loc
	Dial.Trypho 68f.75	ii.12 512
		On Jeremiah, homily xv. 516
Tertullian	Irenaeus	Chrysostom
'De Idol'	H.E.Eus.iii.23 63	In 'Matthew' xxxi.
iv. 290	v. 8 63	137
	20 63	
Eusebius	Adv Haer.iii.1,1 223	Augustine
HE.iii.4 21	10,6 223	Confessions vi.23
23 63		252
39 13,63,	Jerome	
223	'De Illustr. 2	
v. 8 63	166,204,215	
16 231		
20 63		
vi. 5 251		

(vii) Ancient Jewish Writings

Josephus	Josephus	Philo
Antiquities	(Wars of the Jews)	'De Decal.'9,11. 222
(Ant.)	(B.J.)	
vi.8,2 292	II.viii.1 169	Pirke Abot
xiii.5,9 47	14 47,200	iii.15 94
xviii.1,1 169	III. i.2 85	ii. 6 94
1,3 47	VII vi.3 290	
1,6 169		Jerus.Sabbath
8,3 47		15d 94
xix.8,2 261		Pesachim vi. 11f. 430

(viii) Other Writings

Thucydides I.22 56.	Lucius Menipp.11 137
Plutarch 'De Curiosit.'7 137	Iamblicus in Suidas 137

INDEX II BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. and P.OT = The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,
in Two Volumes, ed.R.H.Charles, 1913
- art = Article
- Aufl. = Auflage
- BC/FJ and L = The Beginnings of Christianity, ed.F.J.Foakes Jackson
and Kirsopp Lake, in Five Volumes, 1920-33.
- Cam.B. = Cambridge Bible
- CB = Century Bible
- CQR = Church Quarterly Review
- ed. = edited
- Edn. = Edition
- EL = Everyman Library
- Enc.Bi = Encyclopaedia Biblica, in Four Volumes, 1899-1903,ed.
T.K.Cheyne and J.Sutherland Black
- Eng.Tr. = English Translation
- ERE = Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, in Twelve
Volumes, 1908-1921, ed.J.Hastings
- Expos. = Expositor
- ET = Expository Times
- H-CZNT = Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament
- HDB = Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, in Five Volumes,
including Extra Vol. 1898-1909
- HL = Hibbert Lectures
- HTR = Harvard Theological Review
- HZNT = Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
- ICC = International Critical Commentary
- JR = Journal of Religion
- JTS = Journal of Theological Studies
- TS und K = Theologische Studien und Kritiken
- WC = Westminster Commentaries
- WNT = Westminster New Testament
- Z fur K = Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte

The numbers, apart from dates, indicate the page of thesis where the book is referred to. Where no number appears it indicates that the book has been studied, but without actual reference being made.

- Abbott-Smith, G. Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, 1921. 40
- Abrahams, Israel art."Sabbath"(Jewish) ERE Vol X. 425,434
- Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels,
Series I. 1917 140
- Series II. 1924 72

- Ali, Muhammad Translation of the Holy Quran, 1928. 259
- Allen, W.C. St. Matthew, ICC. 3rd. Edn. 413
- Andrews, H.T. The Acts of the Apostles, WNT, 1908 222
- The Apocryphal Books, 1908 65
- The Christ of Apostolic Faith 174
- ← The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul, Expos. 41
- Angus, S. The Environment of Early Christianity, 1914
- The Mystery Religions and Christianity, 1925, 50.
- Arnold, W.R. The Relation of Primitive Christianity to Jewish Thought and Teaching, HTR. 83, 135
- Bacon, B.W. Beginnings of Gospel Story, 1909 8, 14
- The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, 1910
- Bartlett, J.V. Acts, CB (?1910) 221, 250, 295
- The Apostolic Age 1911 224, 225, 261, 298, 326, 346, 347, 402, 445, 403, 523
- art. "Didache" HDB, Extra Vol. 67
- Bartlett, J.V. and Carlyle, A.J. "Christianity in History" 1917 136, 373, 473
- Bede Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation, EL. 243
- Bernard, E.R. art. "Resurrection", HDB, Vol. IV. 105
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. The Faith of the Apostles' Creed, 1918 216
- Bevan, Edwyn Hellenism and Christianity, 1921 90, 479
- Sibyls and Seers, 1928. 2
- Beyschlag, W. New Testament Theology, Eng. Tr. 2nd. Edn. 1896, Vol. I. 53, 378
- Blass, F. Acta Apostolorum sive Lucas ad Theophilum liber alter 1895 22
- Philology of the Gospels, 1898, Eng. Tr. 22
- Bourne, F.W. The King's Son (Life of Billy Bray) 1891. 271
- Bousset, W. Kurios Christos, 1913 50, 469
- Brainerd, David Diary and Journal, edn. 1902, Vol. I. 230, 231
- Branscomb, B.H. Jesus and the Law of Moses, 81
- Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1907 322
- Bruce, A.B. The Training of the Twelve, 1871 188
- Büchler, Der galiläische Am-ha Ares, 1906 171
- Bultmann, R. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 1921. 11
- Burkitt, F.C. Christian Beginnings, 1924 8, 173, 294, 403
- Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, 1922
- Gospel History and its Transmission, 1907. 9, 341
- JTS. Apr. 1907 15
- Cadbury, H.J. The Hellenists, in BC/FJ and L. Vol. V. 523, 524
- The Making of Luke-Acts, 1927, 9, 11, 13, 19, 313
- The Names of Christians in Acts, BC/FJ and L. Vol. V. 324, 334
- A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship, HTR. 140

This article reproduced in P.T. 2964TH, "The Church and the Sacraments" 1927, pp. 143-159.

Cadbury, H.J.	The Speeches of Acts, BC/FJ and L.Vol.V.	298
Cadoux, A.T.	A New Orthodoxy of Jesus and Personality, 1934	375,461
	The Parables of Jesus, 1931	133,149,152,154,515
Cairns, D.S.	The Faith That Rebels, 5th.Edn.1933	238
Carpenter, J.	Estlin, in Preface to W.Wrede's 'Paul' (v.s.)	39
Charles, R.H.	The Apocalypse of Baruch in A.and P.OT, Vol.II.	98
	Between the Old and New Testaments, 1914	96
	The Book of Enoch in A.and P.OT.Vol.II.	97,101,106
	Eschatology, 1899.	85,90,96,119,207
	Fragments of a Zadokite Work in A.and P.OT.II.	102
	The Book of Jubilees, in A.and P.OT.II.	97
	Revelation, ICC.Vol.I. 1920	55
	The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in A.and P.OT. II.	
Cheyne, T.K.	Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, 1895	105
	art. "Judas Iscariot," in Enc.Bi.Vol.II.	186
Clemen, C.	Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources, Eng.Tr. 1912	47,78
Collinge, W.	The Little Flowers of St.Francis, (Trans.)	244
Coe, Prof.	The Spiritual Life, 1900.	235
Dakin, A.	Psychology of the Gospels, ET.Oct.1931	17
Dale, R.W.	The Atonement, 5th.Edn.1876	376
Dalman, G.	The Words of Jesus, Eng.Tr.1909	102,169,433,471
Davenport,	Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals, 1906.	262
Davidson, A.B.	art. "Angel" HDB. Vol.I.	107
Davies, T.Llynfi	Was Jesus Compelled by the Crowd to enter Jerusalem? ET. Aug.1931	129
Deissmann, A.	Bible Studies, 2nd.Edn. Eng.Tr. 1909.	49,417
	Light from the Ancient East, Eng.Tr.4th.Edn.	469
	The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, Eng. Tr. 1923.	276,504,
	St.Paul, Eng.Tr.1912.	26,50,276
Denney, J.	The Death of Christ, Revised Edn.1911.	51
	Jesus and the Gospel, 1908	
Dobschütz, E.	The Eschatology of the Gospels, 1905	178
	Das Judentum der Zeit Jesu in neuer Beleuchtung, in TS und K. 1929, I.	84f.
	Probleme des Apostolischen Zeitalters, 1904.	
Dodd, C.H.	The Epistle to the Romans, 1932.	
	The Meaning of Paul for Today, 1920.	45
Donner, J.A.	The Person of Christ, Eng.Tr.	511
Easton, B.S.	The Gospel before the Gospels, 1928	10
Edersheim, A.	Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 7th.Edn.1892.	
	Vol. I. 137,153. Vol.II. 154.	
Emmet, C.W.	The Case for the Tradition in BC/FJ and L. Vol. II 1922, 19.	
	The Eschatological Question in the Gospels, 1911	178
	Is the Teaching of Jesus an Interimsethik? Expos. Vol.VIII.4.	178

- Fairweather, W. Background of the Gospels, 3rd. Edn. 1920
85, 89, 90, 119
art. "Development of Doctrine in the Apocryphal
Period," HDB. Extra Vol. 107
Jesus and the Greeks, 1924 49, 83
Findlay, J.A. Jesus as They Saw Him, 1920 125
Flower, C.J. Psychology of Religion, 1927. 263
Fox, George Journal (Tercentenary Text, ed. N. Penny)
EL 229, 230, 245, 246, 253
Freud, S. Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis,
Eng. Tr. 1922 87
Fuchs, E. Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi und der Anfang
der Kirche, Z. für K. 1932. 205, 220, 295
Gardner-Smith, P. The Narratives of the Resurrection, 1926.
66, 216, 220
Garvie, A.E. The Beloved Disciple, 1922 59, 133
Glover, T.R. Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman
Empire, 8th. Edn. 1919
Progress in Religion, 1922
Goguel, M. Jesus of Nazareth, Eng. Tr. 1926 500
The Life of Jesus, Eng. Tr. 1933 414, 429, 431, 500
Gore, C. The Holy Spirit and the Church, 1924 239, 434, 443
Gray, G. Buchanan The Psalms of Solomon in A. and P. OT II. 47, 137
Isaiah, Vol. I. ICC. 1912 74
Gressmann, H. Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen
Eschatologie, 1905 78
Gunkel, H. Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des
Neuen Testaments, 1903 78
Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes,
3 Aufl. 1909 113, 115, 116, 260, 264, 294
Gwatkin, H.M. Early Church History, 2nd. Edn. 1912, Vol. II. 232
Hadfield, J.H. Psychology and Morals, 1923 87, 143
Haldane, J.S. The Sciences and Philosophy, 1928 68
Hall, G. Stanley Jesus, the Christ, in the Light of Psychology,
1921, Vol. II. 143, 144, 145, 147
Hamilton, H.F. The People of God, 1912. Vol. I. 119
Vol. II. 36, 336
Harnack, A. The Acts of the Apostles, Eng. Tr. 1909 22
Mission and Expansion of Christianity, Eng. Tr.
2nd. Edn. 1908, Vol. I. 248, 284, 317, 320, 323,
324, 328, 336, 390, 397, 407, 410.
The Sayings of Jesus, Eng. Tr. 1908. 15, 349
Harris, Rendel The Newly-Recovered Gospel of Peter, 1893. 66
Harrison, P.N. The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, 1921. 51, 52
Hatch, W.H.P. The Pauline Idea of Faith, in Harvard
Theological Studies, II. 278
Headlam, A.C. The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ,
1923 82, 95, 341
Heiler, F. Das Gebet, 5 Aufl. 1923 267

- Lake, Kirsopp and Cadbury, H.J. Commentary on Acts in
BC/FJ and L. Vol.IV. 1933 304,424
- Lake, Kirsopp The Communism of Acts in BC/FJ and L. Vol.V.
1933 314
The Earlier Epistles of St.Paul, 1911 41,403
The Narratives of the Resurrection, 1912
- Lietzmann, H. Apostelgeschichte in H-CZNT 424
Bemerkungen zum Prozess Jesu, ZNW Vol.XXXI. 133
I and II Korinther, HZNT 1907 327
- Leuba, Prof. A Psychological Study of Religion, 1912 475
God or Man, 1934 475
- Lightfoot, J.B. The Epistle to the Galatians, 7th.Edn.1881. 403
St.Paul and Seneca, in The Epistle to the
Philippians, 6th.Edn.1890 48
- Lindsay, T.M. The History of the Reformation, 2nd.Edn.
1908, Vol.I. 245
- Lock, W. The Pastoral Epistles, ICC 1924 51
- Macgregor, W.H.C. Eucharistic Origins, 1928. 423,427,431,448,449
The Gospel of John, 1928 56,63,126,133
- Mackenzie, W.D. art."Jesus Christ", ERE, Vol.VII. 75
- Mackinnon, J. The Gospel in the Early Church, 1933.
299,390,504,505
The Historic Jesus, 1931. 13,52,66,213
- Mackintosh, H.R. The Person of Jesus Christ, 3rd.Edn.1920. 42,47
The Christian Experience of Forgiveness, 1927.
- Manson, T.W. The Teaching of Jesus, 1931. 146,149,178
- Marett, R.R. The Threshold of Religion, 1909 498
- Margoliouth, D.S. Mohammedanism, New Edn. 259
- Mason, A.J. The Early History of the Church and the
Ministry, ed.by- 1918 332
- Mayor, J.B. The Epistle of St.James; 3rd.Edn.1913 29,53
The Epistle of St.Jude and the Second Epistle
of St.Peter, 1907 29
- McDougall, W. An Outline of Abnormal Psychology, 1926.
143,255,257
The Group Mind, 2nd.Edn.1927. 498
- McGiffert, A.C. History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 1897
298,391f.394,402,407,523
- McNeile, A.H. The Gospel According to St.Matthew, 1915.
,130,137,153,169,340f.429,433,515
- Menzies, A. art."The Gospel According to the Hebrews," HDB.
Extra Vol. 66
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 1912.
37,66,327.
- Middleton, W.C. The Denunciations of George Fox Viewed
Psychologically, JR.XI.Oct.1931. 230
- Milligan, G. St.Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, 1908
27,29,30
- Morison, J.Cotter Life and Times of St.Bernard, 1868. 243f.

- Moffatt, J. The Approach to the New Testament, HL.1921.
Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 3rd.Edn.1918. 23,51,339
Love in the New Testament, 1929. 318
II Maccabees in A.and P.OT. Vol.I. 106
Theology of the Gospels, 1919
- Montefiore, C.G. Contemporary Jewish Religion, in Peake's
Commentary, 1920. 91
Judaism and St. Paul, 1914 80
Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by
the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews,HL.1892.
72,91,171
Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings,1930.81
The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. I. 1910. 171
- Moore, G.F. Judaism, 1927. 81 Vol. I. 64,71,135,384
Vol.II. 82,98,104
- Moulton, J.H. Prolegomena to the Grammar of the Greek New
Testament, 3rd.Edn.1908. 49,149,282,416
- Moulton,J.H. and Milligan,G. Vocabulary of the Greek Testament,
49,216,468
- Mozley, J.K. The Doctrine of the Atonement, 1915. 378,379
- Mundle, W. Das Apostelbild der Apostelgeschichte,
ZNW Vol. XXVII. 24
- Micklem, E.R. The New Psychology and the Healing Miracles of
the New Testament, 143
- Nestle, E. Textual Criticism of the Greek Testament,
Eng.Tr. 1901. 427
Greek New Testament (Text prepared for the
British and Foreign Bible Society by Nestle)
10th.Edn. from which the Greek Text quotations
in thesis are taken.
- New, Silva art.The Name, Baptism, etc. in BC/FJ and L. Vol.V
414,417
- Nolloth, C.F. The Rise of the Christian Religion, 1917. 23,324
- Oesterley,W.O.E. Hebrew Religion, 1930. 73
The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy,
1925. 61,325,335,423,425,430,
431,432
I Maccabees, in A.and P.OT Vol.I. 137
- Oesterley,W.O.E. and Box, G.H. The Religion and Worship of the
Synagogue, 2nd.Edn.1911. 93,425,427
- Otto, R. The Idea of the Holy, Eng.Tr.1923. 263
- Parry, St.John St.James, 1903. 53
- Peake, A.S. Critical Introduction to the New Testament,
1909. 53
The People and the Book, 1925 73
- Peterson, E. Die Kirche, 1929. 220
- Plummer, A. art."Judas Iscariot", HDB.Vol.II. 186
- Pratt, J.B. The Religious Consciousness, 1923. 233,234,256

- Pfleiderer, O. Early Christian Conception of Christ, 1905. 47
 Paulinismus, 1873 116
 Primitive Christianity, Eng.Tr.1906, Vol.I. 47
- Prince, J.D. art. "Scribes and Pharisees", Enc.Bi.IV. 47
- Rackham, R.B. The Acts of the Apostles, WC 2nd.Edn.1904. 222
- Rainy, R. The Ancient Catholic Church, 1902. 67
- Ramsay, W.M. Historical Commentary on the Galatians, 1899.
 The Church in the Roman Empire, 8th.Edn. 1904.
- Ratisbonne, M. Histoire de S. Bernard, 1843, Vol.II. 244
- Raven C.E. Jesus and the Gospel of Love, 1931 81
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, 1926. 489
 in "Foundations" ed.B.H.Streeter, 1913. 470
- Redpath, H.A. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, WC 1907. 153
- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen,
 2.Aufl.1920 49
- Rendall, G.H. The Epistle of St.James and Judaic Christianity,
 1927 53, 347
- Réville, Jean Les Origines de l'eucharistie, 1908. 436, 440
- Reuss, E. History of Christian Theology in the
 Apostolic Age, Eng.Tr.1872.Vol.I. 84
- Richmond, W. The Gospel of Reminiscence, CQR Jan.1933. 64
- Riddle, D.W. Approach to the New Testament from the Study of
 Religious Experience, JR Vol.XI.Oct.1931. 7
 The Occasion of Luke-Acts, JR.XI.Oct.1931. 24
- Robertson, A. Regnum Dei, New Edn.1908 (Bampton Lectures) 74
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. I Corinthians, ICC 2nd.Edn.1914.
 31, 252, 291
- Robinson, J.A. St.Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, 2nd.Edn.1922.
- Robinson, T.H. Prophecy and the Prophets, 1923.
- Robinson, H.W. Christian Doctrine of Man, 2nd.Edn.1913. 117, 118
 Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, 1928
 236, 237, 514
 Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, 1913.
 72, 74, 90
- Rodwell, J.M. Translation of the Koran, EL. 1909 259
- Ropes, J.H. The Text of Acts, BC/FJ and L. Vol.III.1926.
 59, 60
- Sabatier, A. Life of St. Francis of Assissi, Eng.Tr.1894. 245
 The Religions of Authority and the Religion
 of the Spirit, Eng.Tr.1910. 474
- Salvatorelli, L. From Locke to Reitzenstein, HTR.Vol.XXII. 1
- Sanday, W. The Oracles of God, 1891 71
 Life of Christ in Recent Research, 1907.
 ed.by Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, 1911.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A.C. Romans, ICC. 5th.Edn. 1902.
- Schmidt, K.L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919 10
 Die Kirche des Urchristentums, in Festgabe für
 A.Deissmann z.60.Geburtstag, 1927. 220
- Schultz, H. Old Testament Theology, Eng.Tr.1898, Vol.I. 75f.

- Schmiedel, P.W. art."Acts of the Apostles" Enc.Bi.I. 22
 art."Gospels" Enc.Bi. II. 339
 Thessalonians, H-C.
- Schurer, The Jewish People in the Time of Christ
 I. 137,169. II. 169
- Schweitzer, A. Mysticism of Paul the Apostle,1931. 39,41
 Quest of the Historical Jesus,1910 177
- Scott,C.Anderson art.'Camisards', ERE. III. 232
 Christianity According to St.Paul,1927. 325
 What Happened at Pentecost, in 'The Spirit,'
 ed.B.H.Streeter,1919 233,294,324
 The Fellowship of the Spirit,1921.
 39,226,269,324,327,467,473
- Scott, Ernest F. Beginnings of the Church, 1914
 8,24,36,39,222,225,293,414,423,427,443,505
 Epistle to the Hebrews, 1922. 54
 The Fourth Gospel,2nd.Edn.1920. 56,59,133,144
 The Gospel and its Tributaries,1928, 68
 The Spirit in the New Testament,1923. 514,515
- Scott,W.Melville The Christian Covenant, 1912. 118
- Seckendoff, Ausführliche Historie des Luthertums,1714.III.
 245
- Simpson, J.G. Irving and the Catholic Apostolic Church,ERE
 Vol.VII. 232
- Skinner, J. Isaiah, Cam.B. I. 75. II. 78.
 Prophecy and Religion, 1922.
- Smith, W.Robertson The Religion of the Semites,New Edn.1923. 118
- Smith,W.Robertson and Kautsch,E. art."Messiah", Enc.Bi.III. 47
- Smith, G.Adam The Book of Isaiah (no date) II. 71
- Souter, A. Novum Testamentum Graece, 1910. 140
- Spitta, Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren
 Geschichtlicher Wert, 1891. 22
- Srawley, J.H. art. "Eucharist"(to end of Middle Ages)
 ERE V. 441
- Stevenson, W.B. Grammar of Palæstinian Jewish Aramaic,1924. 150
- Strack,H.L. and Billerbeck,P. Das Evangelium nach Matthæus
 erläutert aus Talmud,u.s.w. 1922. 81
 Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas,
 und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte
 erläutert aus Talmud,U.S.W. 1924. 81,322,345.
- Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels, 1924. 10,13,15,16,249
 The Primitive Church, 1929. 5,38
 Reality, 1927. 250,252
- Streeter,B.H. and Appasamy, A.J. The Sadhu,1923. 254,255
- Streatfeild, F. Preparing the Way, 1918.
- Stevens, G.B. The Christian Doctrine of Salvation,1909.
 Theology of the New Testament,2nd.Edn.1911.
- Swete, H.B. Gospel According to St.Mark,3rd.Edn.1920.
 123,137,161,169
 The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church,1912.

Storr, V.F.	Christianity and Immortality, 1918.	
Scrivener, F.H.A.	A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th. Edn. 1894, II.	524
Talbot, N.	The Mind of the Disciples, 1914.	191
Tansley, A.G.	The New Psychology, 1920.	499
Taylor, C.	The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 1886.	67
Torrey, C.H.	The Composition and Date of Acts, 1916.	21
Troeltsch, E.	The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Eng. Tr. 1931. I.	160, 311, 315
Tyrrell, G.	Christianity at the Cross-Roads, 1909.	88, 89
Underhill, Evelyn	Life of the Spirit and the Life of Today, 1922.	255
	The Mystic Way, 1913.	
Underwood, A.C.	Conversion; Christian and Non-Christian, 1925.	234, 271
Verity, G.B.	Gospel According to St. Paul, CQR. CVII. 1928.	44
Walker, T.	The Teaching of Jesus and the Teaching of His Age, 1923.	93, 98, 107, 119
Waterhouse, E.S.	The Philosophy of Religious Experience, 1923.	2
Watson, J.B.	Behaviour, 1914.	475
	Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviourist 1919.	475
Weinel, H.	Paulus, 2. Aufl. 1915.	41
	St. Paul, Eng. Tr. 1906.	45
Weiss, Bernhard	Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Eng. Tr. 1882, I.	281
Weiss, Johannes	Korinther I & II, in Kommentar, ed. Meyer.	321.
	Das älteste Evangelium, 1903.	10
	Das Urchristentum, 1917.	7, 13, 22, 24, 41, 194 206, 215, 270, 298, 314, 513, 522, 523
Weizsäcker, C.	The Apostolic Age, Eng. Tr. 1894, I.	194, 401, 407
Wellhausen, J.	Das Evangelium Marci, 1909.	122, 134, 156, 175
Werner, M.	Der Einfluss paulinische Theologie im Markusevangelium	15
Wesley, John.	Journal	246f. 261, 262, 269
Westcott, B.F. and Hort, F.J.A.	The New Testament in the Original Greek, 1895.	427
	Introduction to the New Testament in Greek, 3rd. Edn. 1896, II.	427
Wood, H.G.	The Parting of the Roads, 1912.	463
Woolman, John	Journal	233
Wrede, W.	Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, 1901.	375
	Paul, Eng. Tr. 1907	4
Zahn, Th.	Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1897. II.	427
Zimmern,	Keilinschriften und Bibel nach ihren religionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhang, 1903.	78
Zwaan, J. de	Was the Book of Acts a Posthumous Edition? HTR, XVII.	19

ADDENDUM.

KÖHLER, K.

The Origins of Synagogue and Church,
83, 131, 132, 134, 136.

WINDISCH, H.

The Case against the Tradition, in BC/FJ and L. II

19