

W O R S H I P I N T H E N E W T E S T A M E N T C H U R C H

Summary

The thesis examines individually the various elements which comprised the worship of the Christian church in the New Testament period, and the evidence relating to them, in an effort to trace exactly how much we can know about the practices for worship in the early church. The day of worship was changed from the Jewish Sabbath to the first day of the week at an early date, although use of the synagogue services as opportunities for missionary work kept some people in touch with the Sabbath. But the day for Christian worship was Sunday, which became known as 'the Lord's Day'. That Sunday was the day of the Resurrection of Christ was the determinative influence on the change-over, and explains the title 'the Lord's Day'. On the service as a whole, the only evidence is 1 Cor.14. There the various elements are described, and the aim of the service is laid down as to 'build up' the community and to speak a word of challenge to any visitor.

Preaching: the Christian message is proclaimed in the service; the basic points of Christian belief were treated and elaborated at greater length than in the missionary preaching, and the ethical implications of the new life were expounded also: both aspects of preaching had a part in the congregation's worship.

The Scriptures: the early church took over the Jewish Scriptures and found that their true meaning lay in their pointing to Christ, his life and work, and the era of the church. It is probable that the significance of these Scriptures for the Christians was treated in worship. Alongside this, the habit of reading, probably in the service, letters written to a congregation by an Apostle encouraged the retention and re-use of these letters and the gradual acceptance of them as authoritative led to the subsequent 'canonisation' of them as part of Christian Scripture. At the same time, interest in the words and ministry of Jesus led to the formation of the pericopae out of which the Gospels were subsequently to be composed. There are traces of some collection of Apostolic letters by AD 95, but the first explicit mention of the reading of a Gospel in worship is not until AD 150.

Prayers: despite sparse evidence on prayers as part of the service of congregational worship, it is evident that prayers did form part of the worship also.

Prayers of thanksgiving, intercession or petition, and confession may be traced, and /

:icit reference to them, but rather indirectly to expound their true meaning,
and to defend that against superstition.

W O R S H I P I N T H E N E W T E S T A M E N T C H U R C H

- ITS THEMES AND MOTIFS.

An exegetical examination of the New Testament evidence for the
practices of the early church in worship.

by

Norman M. Pritchard

A thesis submitted to the University of Glasgow for the degree of Master
of Theology, April, 1974.

C O N T E N T S

Abbreviations

I	Introduction	1
II	The Day, the Time, the Place	3
III	The Service	19
IV	Preaching	30
	Appendix: The Creed	46
V	The Scriptures	49
	Appendix: Testimonia	61
VI	Prayers	62
VII	Hymns	75
VIII	The Lord's Supper	82
IX	Baptism	110
	Appendices: The Words βαπτίζειν, βαπτισμα, βαπτισμος	168
	'In the Name of'	169
	The Laying on of hands	170
	σφραγίς σφραγίζομαι	171
	Cullmann's thesis concerning κολοειν	172
	Infant Baptism	174
X	Themes and Motifs of the New Testament Worship	178
	Appendix: The Sacraments in John	181
	<u>Bibliography</u>	186

A WORD OF THANKS

... to Professor William Barclay for his help and guidance, and for all the care he has taken with my work. In addition to his helpful comments as the work progressed, he has taken the trouble to read through the typescript and weed out a great many errors.

... and to my wife and family for their patience and understanding with the inroads which part-time study have made upon my time. Without their help and support, I very much doubt if the work could have been completed.

N.M.P.

Abbreviations

BAG	Bauer - Arndt - Gingrich, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</u> , ET, Cambridge, 1957.
B.G.U.	<u>Berliner griechische Urkunden</u> (Agyptische Urkunden aus den Koniglichen Museen zu Berlin), Berlin, 1895-.
BM	G.R. Beasley-Murray, <u>Baptism in the New Testament</u> , 1963.
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries, London.
<u>C.H.B.</u>	<u>The Cambridge History of the Bible</u> , vol.I, 1970.
ed.	editor.
ET	English Translation.
EW	J. Jeremias, <u>The Eucharistic Words of Jesus</u> , ET, London, 1966.
ICC	The International Critical Commentary.
JB	The Jerusalem Bible, London, 1966.
<u>J.B.L.</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u> , Philadelphia.
<u>J.T.S.</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u> , Oxford.
LSJ	Liddell - Scott - Jones, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u> , Oxford, 1940.
LXX	The Septuagint.
MNTC	The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London.
NCB	The New Clarendon Bible, Oxford.
NEB	The New English Bible, Oxford, Cambridge, 1970.
NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament, Grand Rapids (U.S.A. edition of the following).
NLCNT	New London Commentary on the New Testament, London.
<u>Nov.Test.</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u> , Leiden.
NT	New Testament.
<u>N.T.S.</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u> , Cambridge.
O.G.I.S.	<u>Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</u> , ed. W. Dittenberger, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1903-5.
OT	Old Testament.
RSV	The Revised Standard Version, New York, London, 1952.
P. Hamb.	P.M. Meyer, <u>Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Stadtbibliothek</u> , Leipzig, 1911-24.
PNTC	The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (The Pelican Gospel Commentaries), London.
P. Oxy.	<u>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</u> , edd. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, London, 1898-.

TDNT	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u> , (ET of TWNT), translated and edited by G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids and London, 1964-.
TEV	<u>Good News for Modern Man; The New Testament, Today's English Version</u> , New York, 1966.
TWNT	<u>Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u> , ed. G. Kittel, later G. Friedrich, Stuttgart, 1933-.
UBS	<u>The Greek New Testament</u> , edd. K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger and A. Wikgren, The United Bible Societies, New York and London, 1966.
<u>Z.N.W.</u>	<u>Zeitschrift fur die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u> , Giessen, Berlin.

Biblical quotations are taken from the New English Bible, unless otherwise stated.

Cross references within the thesis are made in the case of a reference within the same chapter, by page number prefaced by the abbreviation 'p.' or 'pp.'. In the case of a reference to a different chapter, the chapter title is given in inverted commas and followed by the page number again prefaced by 'p.' or 'pp.'. In references to books, page numbers are given without the use of 'p.' or 'pp.'.

Blank
In
Original

Introduction.

The object of this work is to trace, as far as is possible, the patterns which the early Christian church evolved for its worship: it seeks to recover from an examination of the NT texts exactly what were the practices by which the early community expressed its faith in worship; and as such, the main thrust of the work is exegetical. And so I have excluded from consideration studies of liturgical theology which rely on information pertaining to a later period. The NT, of course, is not a liturgical handbook: what (few) references there are to the worship of the church usually occur in passing remarks or as background detail. Both author and readers knew what was being referred to and so detailed elaboration was unnecessary, - as in the case of the day for worship. The only exception to this is where the observance of a feature of worship was being given different interpretations by different people, as in the case of the Lord's Supper at Corinth, and in this case more detail is given about what ought to be normal procedure. However the Lord's Supper is the only element of worship for which we are in such a favourable position. Thus, while there are more references to baptism in the NT, all of them occur as incidental details, usually in another connection (thus, for example, baptism is not the main theme of the discussion even in Ro.6!), and so we are forced to rely on conjecture here to fill out our understanding of how the rite was carried out.

Working on worship one is able to profit from the work of many scholars: the subject is far from new. And so, on positions for which I find myself in agreement with others, I have not hesitated to quote from authors who have been able to express better than I could what is the likely extent of our knowledge. But even where agreement exists with the position of a previous author, this has not been reached until I had examined all the relevant evidence for myself. Frequently I have been able to follow authors to a large extent in their treatment of a topic, only to disagree with them on points of detail; so that in some of the comments I would appear to be sniping at, rather than pitching a battle at, the positions of the experts in this field. The aim has always been to define what I consider, after examination of the NT texts, to be the extent of our knowledge of any given feature of early church worship.

The /

The scope of the enquiry has been restricted to the NT period except for two cases. When it was necessary to fill out sparse knowledge with a reference to the Apostolic Fathers, this has been done, usually to substantiate a hypothesis worked out from hints within the NT, in the absence of definite evidence. Also the background to a practice has been touched upon only in the case of baptism, because there it is possible that the antecedents have had some influence, even if only indirectly, on the rite of the Christian church. (This is not the case for the Lord's Supper, where the Passover background was very early to lose its influence, so far as we can tell; and so scant attention is paid to that aspect of the subject.)

The NT is not a liturgical handbook; nevertheless it is the product of a worshipping community, and it is possible by examination of what details are given, to uncover a fair amount of information on the way the early church conducted its worship.

There are surprisingly few references to the day of worship for Christians in the NT. The surprise is occasioned by the fact that while the Christians soon turned their back on the Sabbath, and opted instead for the first day of the week, the Lord's Day (Rev.1:10), later 'Sunday', the change-over did not, so far as we can now observe, provoke much controversy. This is doubtless due to the fact that the controversy over the law centred round the fundamental issue of circumcision, with the result that the issue of which day was observed as the day of worship was relegated to the periphery. In all the Pauline letters, for instance, abounding as they do in references to the Law and its validity for Christians, there are only two references to the question of the day of worship, - Gal.4:10 and Col.2:16, and we shall return to these passages later.

In the present state of our knowledge, we are not in a position to decide how or when the decision to observe the first day of the week in preference to the Sabbath came to be made. That the change-over took place within the period covered by the NT - for the expression 'the Lord's Day' occurs in Rev.1:10 - is the only conclusion we can draw with any strong degree of probability, and we shall see below that even on this point we are relying on inference, and the support of evidence from the Apostolic Fathers. Indeed we have no way of knowing for sure that the change-over was not immediate. There is certainly no evidence to the contrary, and the only references to the practice of the earliest community (Ac.2:46; 5:42) state that the church was in the habit of meeting daily:

'And day by day attending the Temple together and breaking bread in their homes they partook of food with glad and generous hearts.' (Ac.2:46, RSV).

Now in his book 'Sunday', Willy Rordorf has committed himself to the view that the 'Lord's Day' was so called because it was the day on which the 'Lord's Supper' was held¹, and so a verse such as this one, showing a daily meal obviously will /

1. Willy Rordorf, Sunday, ET, London, 1968, 221. Cf. below

will not accord with his thesis². However Rordorf's attempted solution is scarcely satisfactory. He takes refuge in a variant reading preserved in the Western text, in which the expression 'daily' (καθ' ἡμερῶν) is transposed to v.45, and Rordorf maintains

'On the basis of this text we are hardly justified in maintaining that the breaking of bread took place daily in the early community.' (Sunday, 226).

We can scarcely be justified in a recourse to the reading of the Western text in a place where there is otherwise no textual variant in the manuscript tradition³. Rordorf does admit⁴, however, that the τε ... τε construction, (καθ' ἡμερῶν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ... κλῶντες τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον), 'seems to admit the daily breaking of bread.'⁵ But he says caution is necessary because 'the author loves to idealise the circumstances of the primitive community (particularly in his generalising summaries).' (Sunday, 226, n.1). This footnote does seem inconsistent with Rordorf's recourse to the Western text, but he is on firmer ground with his reference to the 'generalising summaries': it is on this point only that the reference to the daily meetings may be questioned⁶. There is general agreement today with Haenchen's remark, - 'To /

2. Leaving aside for the moment the question of the relation between the 'agape' and the 'eucharist' meetings, which is dealt with in the chapter on the 'Lord's Supper'.

3. Bruce Metzger, The Text of the NT, Oxford, 1964, 213, says of the Western text: 'most scholars do not find this text homogeneous enough to be called a textual recension: it is usually considered to be the result of an undisciplined and 'wild' growth of manuscript tradition and translational activity.' So too E.Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, ET, Oxford, 1971, 56.

4. Sunday, 226, n.1.

5. Cf. Haenchen, 192: 'καθ' ἡμερῶν applies to κλῶντες.'

6. For the summaries, cf. Haenchen, 190ff. and the literature cited there.

'To us the summaries appear to flow entirely from the pen of Luke' (195), but when he goes on to agree with Cadbury and Jeremias that 'Luke possessed no special material for the passage under discussion' (195) we may well wonder if this is fully justified. We may not be able to trace the source or sources behind the summary but are we justified in assuming that Luke did not at least work up traditions about the early days which surely existed? That the καὶ ἡμερῶν is taken up again in 5:42 by πᾶσαν ἡμέραν and again in 6:1 by συνεκείνη καὶ ἡμερῶν, may indeed be due to some interdependence of the summary passages 2:42-7 and 5:42, but it may equally well reflect a strong tradition that the earliest community did in fact meet daily. Daily attendance at the Temple formed part of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem (Lk.22:53), and I do not find it incredible that his earliest followers should have followed his example, and if they met daily at the Temple, daily meetings together privately are not impossible either⁷. We have taken pains not to discount these early references in Acts, because it seems that undue scepticism about their contents is unjustified. When one examines them, to be sure, their content is meagre in terms of the information they provide about the early community, and may we not interpret that as a sign that some authentic tradition is here preserved? However that may be, the sources give us no detail of what these daily meetings comprised, in terms of worship, and we have no further mention of daily meetings in the early community. The only other references to a possible day on which worship took place refer to 'the first day of the week' (Ac.20:7, cf. 1 Cor.16:2) and 'the Lord's Day' (Rev.1:10). These of course refer to places other than Jerusalem (Troas, Corinth and Patmos respectively), where, without the daily worship of the Temple, the possibility of daily meetings for worship is not strong. Perhaps we are correct in regarding the daily worship of Ac.2 as influenced by the daily worship of the Temple. Beyond the sphere of the Temple's influence, there would be little to encourage daily worship.

In 1 Cor.16:2 there is the first occurrence of the phrase 'the first day of the week' in the NT, and from our point of view it is the least conclusive.

'On /

7. On καὶ ἡμερῶν ... κλῶντες (v.46), Haenchen rightly notes (192): 'The implication here ... is that the Christian meals took place at home.'

'On the first day of every week each of you is to put something aside and store it up as he may prosper.' (RSV).

Thus Paul is asking the Corinthian Church to save regularly for the needy Christians of Jerusalem and the saving should be done on this particular day of the week - as he had already directed the Church in Galatia (v1). It would seem from this, therefore, that this day had some significance for the Gentile Churches at Galatia and Corinth, but exactly what this significance was, we do not know. A. Deissmann⁸ conjectured that the first day of the week was 'pay day' in the ancient world, but as he himself admits, there is no evidence to substantiate this. It is just possible that (in view of the later evidence that the first day of the week was the day of worship) Paul mentions this particular day because it had significance for Christians, but if we are to rely solely on 1 Cor. 16:2 we could not be certain: by itself the verse is totally inconclusive. It should be mentioned that the expression in v2, *παρ' ἑαυτοῖς* means 'aside at home' (Rordorf 194), and BAG⁹ translates *ἕκαστος ὑμῶν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς* as 'each one (of you) at home'. Thus we do not have here an example of the later practice, attested by Justin¹⁰ of an offering made by those who could afford to, for poor relief - the offering made after the Eucharist. The Corinthian Christians saved their money at home on the first day of the week. More than that we cannot, with any certainty, assert.

The second passage to come under discussion is the Troas incident of Ac.20:7-12. It occurs in one of the so-called '"we" sections' of the book. These sections - characterised by their use of the first person plural in the narrative - were once regarded as incorporating the eye-witness account of one of Paul's companions. Many scholars today, however, are more sceptical of their historical value, and Haenchen¹¹ for example, follows Dibelius¹² in distinguishing between an itinerary (which comprised a bare mention of places visited) and the 'we' material, which 'was perhaps first inserted during the re-editing by Luke in order to make known his own part in Paul's journey'.¹³

Haenchen /

8. A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, ET London 1927, 104ff.

9. s.v. *παρὰ* II 1 b .

10. Apology I.67.7 .

11. Haenchen, 490.

12. In, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ET London 1956, 104f.

13. Dibelius, loc. cit.

Haenchen however would assert less for the 'we' material, evaluating each occurrence independently. Thus in dealing with Ac.20 Haenchen notes that 'we' occurs in vv.7,8 and13, and concludes that 'the story of Eutychus is inserted into the "we" account here'(584), noting later (586) on v.12, '"they" (not "we") were comforted', and concluding that 'Luke has not quite succeeded in linking the Miracle story with the departure scene'(586). Whether the passage describes any factual happening is not dealt with, and the only conclusion Haenchen can come to is that the story

'does not testify with certainty to a Christian celebration of Sunday by Paul, but in the first instance to that usual in the time of Luke. This seems (v.11) to have been only a Eucharist without the proper character of a meal (the congregation certainly did not wait until after midnight for their supper!) preceded by a Sermon.'(586).

I am not sure that I want to follow Haenchen in all the details of his treatment. His detachment of the Eutychus narrative, for instance, from the framework of the 'we' verses (vv.7,8,13) seems arbitrary: one can hardly conceive how the author could have introduced a 'we' into the terse narrative (vv.8-12) without unnecessarily expanding the story with incidental detail.¹⁴ And further, to read any significance into the third person plurals of v.13, ἡγάγον παρεκλήθησαν, as Haenchen does, ('"they"not "we" were comforted') seems artificially subtle: the person of the verb παρεκλήθησαν is obviously influenced by that of ἡγάγον, 'they led the lad home', which is equivalent to no more than 'the lad was taken home'. Indeed there are within the passage several marks of an eye-witness account: not merely the mention of dates, times and places (20:1ff., especially vv.6,7,13- certainly from an itinerary, of whatever type); the mention of lights (v.8, on which Haenchen quotes Knopf's remark, 'good recollection of the eye-witness', but without any comment!); and the fact that the meeting was held on the third storey (τρίστοχος, v.9). To be sure, it is not too fanciful to suggest that v.9 still bears the marks of the eye-witness' having watched Eutychus fall deeper and deeper into sleep. And so it would seem/

14. For example, it is obvious, despite the singular καταβας Παυλος (v.10) that more people than Paul went down to the ground floor, but the author writes καταβας ... Παυλος because he only mentions the essential details.

seems to me that the story retains more items of historical worth than Haenchen would allow.

We must, however, ask how far this verse (v.7) will take us in regard to the question of the first day of the week. In the light of the large number of travel references in Ac.20 it is not impossible that there is no significance at all in v.7; that it is just one more in a long line of dates, and there was no special reason why that meeting was held on the first day of the week, - it could just as easily have been any other. Indeed the only reason the meeting is recorded is because of the Eutychus incident - in contrast to the uneventful departures from Ephesus (v.1), Greece (v.3) and Philippi (v.6). Or the meeting could have been the regular weekly meeting of the Christian community at Troas. The latter possibility is the line NEB opts for: 'On the Saturday night in our assembly for the breaking of bread ...', but I very much doubt if the verse is sufficiently unambiguous to justify this interpretation. Further, to render ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων by 'Saturday night' without noting the equally possible translation 'Sunday night' is also to treat supposition as fact - for we do not in fact know what Luke intended by ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων. If he was using the Jewish method of dating¹⁵, then NEB would be correct - he would have intended 'Saturday evening', as we understand it, for the first day of the Jewish week began at 6 p.m. on Saturday. If, however, Luke was using the Roman method of dating¹⁶, under which the first day of the week begins after midnight on Saturday (as in our present system) then 'Sunday evening' would be required. Haenchen accepts this latter interpretation without any discussion, and comments that the phrase 'ranks beside 1 Cor.16:2 (and Rev.1:10?) as the first mention of the celebration of Sunday.' (584). Rordorf (201,n.4) says that 'the majority of exegetes is in favour of the Sunday evening', but this is no more than a counting of /

15. Cf. the reference to the Passover in Ac.20:6, cf. Lk.23:54.

16. He uses the Roman method, for example, in Ac.4:3 - 'They arrested them and put them in custody till the morrow for it was already evening.' (RSV). (NEB translates ἐς τὴν ὥραν by 'for the night').

heads, we have no way of deciding for sure ¹⁷. It may perhaps be held against the 'Saturday' interpretation that if the meetings were held on Saturday evenings, as a regular practice, we would then have to explain why the change-over came to be made to Sunday, which we know did happen. In short the passage, taken by itself, is of little value. The only possible way of advance is by conjecture. Taking 1 Cor. 16:2 and Ac.20:7 together, it seems too much of a coincidence (especially in view of later observance of Sunday) that the only references in NT to specific days of the week should both be to the first day of the week. Either passage on its own could arguably be an incidental reference to the particular day in question, which just happened to be the first day of the week; but taken together they may be held to be pointers to the later Sunday observance of the Church. Thus they may be signs of Sunday observance before the name 'Sunday' gained currency in Christian circles, - and before the other name for that day came into use - the Lord's Day.

The first recorded use of the expression ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα occurs in Rev. 1:10 at the point where John begins his vision. The phrase is, of course, open to various interpretations - for instance Rordorf (207) discounts an "Adventist interpretation" he has discovered from the 19th century¹⁸ whereby the reference is to the Sabbath - this is "of no basis whatsoever" (207) And as there is no evidence for the use of the phrase in Christian circles as equivalent to the eschatological 'day of the Lord' from Judaism, into which John's vision has transported him by a kind of prolepsis, this too is rejected by Rordorf¹⁹. Indeed W. Stott²⁰ sums up all the possible interpretations, and concludes /

17. F.F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Gk. Text and Commentary), London 1952, 372, holds that the combination of ἐρασπιον (v. 7) and αὐγῇ (v. 11) favours the Roman method, but even under the Jewish method each 'day' had a dawn the difference being that under the Jewish reckoning the dawn occurred a few hours later in the 'day' than under the Roman method.

18. J.N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath and First day of the Week, 1876, 187ff.

19. Rordorf 208 and n.3.

20. In N.T.S. 12, (1965-6) 70-75.

concludes that this is a use of the Lord's Day as the day of Christian worship. For Cullmann this is significant - it means that the vision was granted at a time when the Christian community was gathered together -

'Thus he (the seer) sees the whole drama of the last days in the context of the early Christian service of worship which, so to speak, has its counterpart, and at the same time its fulfilment in the coming aeon, so that all that takes place in the early Christian community, seen from this side, appears as an anticipation of that which in the last days takes place from God's side. Hence the whole book of Revelation is full of allusions to the liturgical uses of the early community.'²¹

This however is surely to go beyond the facts:

- (a) it assumes that John is at worship when he receives his vision - scarcely possible for a man suffering the penalty of relegatio in insulam²² for his faith.
- (b) it ignores John's statements that he is allowed to participate in heavenly worship²³.
- (c) further, Gerhard Delling²⁴ has shown that the pictures are drawn almost totally from the OT, and as they are used to explain what John sees, are probably mainly his own composition.

Thus we may discount Cullmann's suggestion and assume that the purpose of the phrase ἡ Κυριακή ἡμερα is merely to date the vision. What is significant for the purposes of this paper is that he uses this particular phrase, and expects his readers to understand which day he meant. The phrase is shown to refer to the day of Christian worship, by its recurrence in two more or less parallel phrases from the Apostolic Fathers.

Firstly /

21. Early Christian Worship, ET, London, 1953, 7, cf. 37.

22. Cf. G.B. Caird The Revelation of St. John the Divine, London (BNTC) 1966, 22.

23. So, e.g. E. Stauffer, NT Theology, ET, London 1956, 202.

24. In Nov. Test. 3, (1959) 107 ff.

Firstly, in Didache 14:1 we read *Κατὰ Κυριακὴν τοῦ κυρίου συνελθόντες
κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ τωραπτήματα ὑμῶν... κτλ*

(Come together on the Lord's Day (or Lord's own day²⁵) break bread and give thanks, having first confessed your sins) - a clear reference to the Lord's day as the day of worship.- Later usage amply attests that *ἡμέραν* is to be understood with *Κυριακὴν*. Rordorf is correct (209-10) in saying:

'The context points unambiguously to the weekly act of worship

on Sunday, for which the Christians assemble to break bread.'

And secondly, Ignatius, Magn. 9:1 - *μηκετι σαββατιζόντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ Κυριακὴν
ἔσονται κτλ* (No longer observing the Sabbath but living by the Lord's Day). Here there is definite antithesis between Sabbath and Lord's Day. But when is the 'Lord's Day'? We have implied that it is the first day of the week, but how do we know this equation is correct? There are two pieces of evidence for this, firstly in Justin Apology (I, 67.7): he mentions that Christian worship was held *τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ* - an obvious reference to the planetary seven day week which we know was in use at that time²⁶. Justin's reasons as to why that day was used are that it was the day of Creation and the day of our Lord's Resurrection. Thus the day of worship (which we know from the Apostolic Fathers was 'the Lord's Day'), is Sunday. Further Barnabas 15:9 refers to a curious expression, "the eighth day". He says *δοῦ καὶ ἑορτάζομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδοὴν εἰς ἑξοσυσμένην*. 'Accordingly we joyfully celebrate the eighth day.' This has been explained by J.A. Jungmann²⁷ as evidence that the writer did not want the week to end (and therefore climax) on the Sabbath, and so the Sunday was counted as the 8th day of the week (and, simultaneously, of course, the first day of the new week!)

The /

25. On the curious pleonasm cf. Rordorf 210 for discussion.

26. Cf. Rordorf 24 ff.

27. The Early Liturgy, 22.

The second reason for equating Lord's Day and the first day of the week is to be found in the repeated testimony of the early Fathers, that the Lord's Day was observed to commemorate the Resurrection of Jesus. On this point I feel I must disagree with Rordorf: he says (220)

'It must be a cause of some surprise that the memory of the resurrection did not occupy a more prominent place in the Christian Sunday worship Moreover H. Reisfeld²⁸ has rightly noticed that in the earliest texts which bear on the Christian Sunday there is absolutely no mention of the resurrection, and when the resurrection does appear

one has the notion that this motivation is a secondary one.'

Now of course we do not find the reason for Sunday as the day of worship in the earliest texts! The earliest texts mention the day only incidentally, in accordance with the usage pointed out by Rordorf²⁹ regarding liturgical practice:

'If they (liturgical usages) are mentioned somewhere it is rather more as a matter of chance, and they are dealt with more briefly and incompletely, as if they were traditional and self-explanatory

It is only to be expected that it is not until later, with the Fathers, that we get any explanation. The point that the resurrection appears as a secondary motive, however, requires some examination in detail. Rordorf accepts Riesefeld's point that in the Fathers the resurrection is only a secondary motive, where it is mentioned at all. When one examines the relevant passages, one finds that this is just not so.

The first passage to note is Ignatius Magn. 9:1, which reads *μὴ κετι σαββατιζοντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ὡντες ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτελεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.... κτλ.*

In the phrase *ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν* the *καὶ* is taken as showing that the reason given is secondary. Of course it is! The reason given in this relative clause is that our life also (*ζωὴ ἡμῶν*) arose again, and this /

28. In Studies in honour of T.W. Manson, 1958, 212.

29. Rordorf 177.

this of course is secondary to Christ's resurrection: it was ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ that we received life. Thus the significance of Sunday for Ignatius is two-fold: it was the day Christ rose from the dead; and secondly through Him and His death we also have life. Thus the Resurrection is the primary reason.

The second passage bearing on this question is Barn. 15:9-- δὲ καὶ ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδοὴν εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἐν ἣ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς.

(Therefore we joyfully celebrate the eighth day, in which (a) Jesus rose from the dead; and (b) having appeared to His disciples He ascended into heaven).

Riesenfeld (and, presumably, Rordorf, if he is following him) seems to have been so taken with the verbal parallel of the ἐν ἣ καὶ in this passage as in the Ignatius one, that he presumed the meaning was the same. This, however, is not so: here the construction is a double καὶ, the equivalent of τε ... καὶ, 'both ... and,' allowing the translation given above '(a) (b) .' Thus the resurrection of Jesus is given as the first reason in Barnabas also. From these two passages it can clearly be seen, against Riesenfeld and Rordorf, that the reason Sunday came into prominence was that it was the day of Christ's resurrection. Later, to be sure, this reason is given a secondary place - Justin Apology (I.67.7)³⁰ gives as the first reason the fact that Sunday was the first day of creation, as well as the day of Christ's resurrection. We need scarcely doubt that this is merely an extension of the reasoning to make Sunday fit into the universal Scheme of God's action, and not intended to play down the importance of the resurrection.

Rordorf goes on to posit that the connection between Sunday and the Easter event is to be found in connection with the only other occurrence of the word Κυριακός in the NT.

'The /

30. The relevant passage reads - τῇ δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ τὴν συνέλυσιν ποιοῦμεθα ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶ ἡμέρα ἐν ἣ ὁ θεὸς τὸ σκοτὸς καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρεφὼς κόσμον ἐποίησε καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ὑμετέρος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη κτλ.

'The only occasion on which κυριακος occurs in the NT (apart from Rev. 1:10) is in 1 Cor. 11:20, and there it is associated with δεπνον in the sense of the 'Lord's Supper'. We have, therefore, every reason for assuming that there existed an inner connection between κυριακη ἡμερα and κυριακον δεπνον. Since the expression κυριακον δεπνον seems to have been used earlier than the corresponding expression κυριακη ἡμερα it is probable that the title κυριακη ἡμερα is derived from the designation κυριακον δεπνον: in other words, it seems probable that the whole day on which this "Lord's Supper" took place received the title the "Lord's Day"³¹.

Surely this is a gross non sequitur! The only 'inner connection' between κυριακη ἡμερα and κυριακον δεπνον is that they both have to do with the same κυριος. Rordorf is guilty of playing verbal games here without sufficient evidence. It is, arguably, only by the vagaries of manuscript survival that there are the only 2 examples of the use of κυριακος from the NT period. We are not in a position to infer the extent of the word's usage in other written sources, far less its oral usage from only 2 extant examples. The argumentum e silentio is never a strong one. Indeed the examples we are able to adduce from the contemporary records and writings which have survived, ought to induce caution. As well as the Christian usage κυριος had a strong secular usage, meaning 'lord', 'master', and was used e.g. of the Emperor³². The adjective κυριακος has turned up twice on an Egyptian inscription of the first century AD³³. For Christians the step would therefore be easy from κυριος of their Lord (post Easter usage) to the adjective κυριακος, and there are many later examples of a wide use of κυριακος in the /

31. Rordorf, 221.

32. In inscriptions; e.g. B.G.U. 1200, 11, κυριος is Augustus. Cf. LSJ s.v. κυριος B3.

33. O.G.I.S. 669.

the early Fathers³⁴. The likelihood here is that the oral linguistic usage may well have been wider than the surviving written examples of usage may suggest, and we are scarcely justified in following Rordorf's shaky hypothesis.

Rordorf supports his argument by maintaining a weekly, evening eucharist, on the evidence of Ac. 20:7 and Epp. X.96. (where it is explicitly said that the Christians came together ad capiendum cibum), and by discounting the Ac.2:46 picture of daily meetings with food.³⁵ Rordorf may be correct in stating that the early practise, after the initial daily meetings, was for weekly Eucharists held in the evening. But we cannot be certain. Ac.20:7 may, or may not, be evidence for this, as we have seen. 1 Cor.11 gives us no clue as to the time of meeting. Indeed just how precarious is our knowledge of the period may be seen from the fact that when Pliny (X 96) tells Trajan that the Christians were in the habit of worshipping before dawn³⁶, this is our first evidence for any such practice: whether it was merely local, or whether it was general practice we just cannot say³⁷.

In mentioning Pliny we have now used all the available evidence for the early period. Actually Pliny's letter, valuable and fascinating as it is, especially as the first pagan account of Christian practice, casts little light on the question of the day of worship: his stato die is correctly taken to mean Sunday. He mentions 2 meetings - one before dawn, involved worship, and commitment /

34. For example κυριακή κεφαλή (Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5:6), κυριακή ἡμέρα (Clement, Paed. 2:2), and Eusebius (H.E. 4.23:12) quotes a second century writer Dionysius as referring to κυριακῶν γραφῶν - writings about Christ. Further examples in Lampe, A Patristic Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford (1969)s.v. κυριακή.

35. For this passage, cf. pp3f.

36. He writes:- essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquid obstringere Quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum.... etc.

37. We shall return to this passage again, in the chapter on the Lord's Supper.

commitment to Christian living; the other, evening meeting, was for the sharing of food, which had been discontinued in obedience to the edict Pliny had issued prohibiting meetings.³⁸ As it is difficult to imagine the Christians abandoning the Eucharist we may presume that they held it at the morning meeting - the earliest evidence for this, however, is not until Justin (Apology I.67.7)³⁹. What would be of interest would be to know if the edict Pliny mentions had parallels throughout the Empire, or if it was only Christians in Bithynia and Pontus who were forced to renounce their evening meetings. On this, however, we have no evidence.

Thus we have completed a survey of those passages which supply evidence on the subject of the day of Christian worship - fragmentary and incomplete as the evidence is proved to be. Perhaps just a word or two is in order here, although properly it could be the subject of a complete investigation, on the opposite question: the signs within the NT of adherence to the Sabbath in spite of the undoubted move away from it. We know of the influence which the controversy with Judaism had on the formulation of many of the Gospel pericopae⁴⁰, and we can see a similar theme behind the treatment of 'The Jews' in the Fourth Gospel.⁴¹ But there are other passages. We mentioned on page 3 certain passages in the Pauline letters which bear on this subject. In Gal.4:10 we read 'You keep special days and months and seasons and years. You make me feel that all the pains I spent on you may prove to be labour lost.' This passage was written in the heat of the controversy, and can best be interpreted as an exclamation of disappointment that the Galatians were wavering over the (retrograde) step of following the Jewish calendrical observances,⁴² although the alternative (suggested by the UBS text footnote) of an exasperated question /

38. Pliny had been instructed to ban associations and clubs of all sorts as these had been the source of political trouble in Bithynia-Pontus prior to his arrival. Cf. Epp.X.33,34 - Nicomedia was not allowed a fire brigade for this reason!

39. So too, Rordorf, 252.

40. Cf., e.g., F.C.Grant, The Gospels, their origin and growth, 1959, 81ff.

41. Cf. C.K.Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, 1955, 143.

42. From Gal.4:9; 6:13,16, it seems they had not yet succumbed to the propaganda of the intruders.

question ('You're not going to keep special days ... ? ' etc.) has much to commend it. The other passage, Col. 2:16, is addressed to a different situation. The Church there was being infiltrated by false teachers advocating a brand of Jewish Gnosticism, to which however the Christians had not succumbed, judging from Paul's tone of thanksgiving which pervades the letter. He writes in 2:16 "Allow no one to take you to task about what you eat or drink, or over the observance of festival, new moon or Sabbath. These are no more than a shadow of what was to come: the solid reality is Christ's". Paul is somewhat more open in Ro. 14:5, where he allows each individual the right to decide upon what he observes and what he does not; but the situation there was less controversial.

Thus we can see some evidence for a retaining of the old ways, but we have no way of knowing how widespread or deep-rooted it was.

The Time.

We have in fact dealt with all the evidence on the time of meeting already (pp.6ff.), Ac.20:7 has an evening meeting, and Pliny's letter (X.96) tells of a morning meeting (before dawn) for worship and a (discontinued) evening meeting. How typical these were of all Christian gatherings, of course, we just do not know⁴³.

The Place.

We are given two indications of the places the early Christians met: the Jerusalem temple, and private houses. We read of the attendance at the Temple in Ac. 2:46 and in 5:12 Solomon's Portico is explicitly mentioned. That the early community should thus continue the practice of Jesus (Jn. 10:23)⁴⁴ is readily intelligible, and Haenchen is correct (192, n.7) to maintain that they were doing more than merely using the Temple for missionary work. Early references (e.g. 2:1 3:1 etc.) show that the disciples still retained some allegiance to Judaism - however merely 'outward' this is construed to have been.

However /

43. Ac.28:24 cannot be regarded as typical.

44. Solomon's Portico is the only part of the Temple that Jesus is recorded as having used.

However there appears, again from the very outset and alongside of this usage, the practice of meeting in houses (1:13; 2:46; 5:42, etc.). That there were more than communal meal meetings is borne out firstly by Ac.12:12 where the house of Mary⁴⁵ is used for a prayer-meeting. With the growth of hostilities between Judaism and Christianity, especially in the Pauline mission field (cf. Acts)⁴⁶ the development of these houses into places of worship, 'house-churches', was a logical development. They are certainly well attested in the Pauline corpus⁴⁷. There is one reference (Ac. 19:9) to the use of a lecture-hall in Ephesus, forced upon Paul by the hostility of the Jews, but I doubt if this became the centre for Christian worship - cf. Haenchen's remark; 'The Christians would not have held the Lord's Supper in the day-time in the hall of Tyrannus but in the evening in house congregations' (560).

Thus the picture of the external details of the early Church's worship is far from complete: there is much we would like to know, but cannot. The change-over from Sabbath to Lord's Day was not immediate - and even Paul used the Synagogue on the Sabbath for missionary work - but when it became established it seems that the motivating factor was the influence of the Easter event, making the first day of the week in a special sense, 'the Lord's Day'. The change of place - to include houses - was a logical and, later, necessary development.

45. cf. Haenchen (384, n.12) on the possible identification of this house with that used at the Last Supper.

46. We are not dependent only upon Acts for this: cf. Mt.10:17 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν and Jn. 16:2 ἀποσυναγωγὸς ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς cf. Jn.9:22; 12:42.

Further, Paul's reference, 2 Cor. 11:24, that he suffered the Synagogue's punishment of scourging, supports at least in principle, the Acts account.

47. 1 Cor. 16:19; Ro. 16:5; Philem. 2; Col. 4:15. cf. F.V. Filson, J.B.L. LVIII, 1939, 105 ff., 'The Significance of the Early House Churches'.

The Service.

Because of the special nature of the NT writings we know not to expect to be able to find any systematic treatment of the forms of worship which the early church developed. Such details as are given always occur incidentally, in the passing, either as the background description of another event (in Acts), or because one particular aspect of the worship was requiring attention (as, e.g., in Paul). It is only from these incidental references that we are able to learn anything at all, - small wonder, therefore, that what we do in fact learn so often turns out to be enigmatic or fragmentary. Further, the fact that our earliest NT writings date from the fifties of the first century, means that we have no contemporary sources to describe the earliest worship.

The Acts of the Apostles, however, does touch on the earliest days of the community, and Jeremias has made an interesting suggestion about the relation of the first summary passage to worship. He holds the view that in Ac.2:42 the 'four phrases used here, in pairs and dependent on προσκαρτεροῦντες (devoting themselves) describe the sequence of an early church service.'¹ Thus he holds that the early service comprised teaching, (table) fellowship, the breaking of bread and prayers. This is an interesting, and if correct, important observation for our understanding of early Christian worship, but before we accept it we must first examine Jeremias' arguments. He bases his interpretation of Ac.2:42 primarily on the word προσκαρτεροῦντες which he says means 'to attend worship regularly', as in 1:14; 2:46 and 6:4. Thus the four dependent words or phrases can be seen as part of this worship. It is doubtful, however, whether προσκαρτεροῦντες, used absolutely, can have this special meaning which Jeremias attributes to it. The word means basically to adhere to, to persist in (so BAG) even to persist obstinately in (so LSJ), and the object adhered to or persisted in is usually supplied, as in 2:46 προσκαρτεροῦντες ... ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ or in 6:4 τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ ... προσκαρτεροῦμεν. It can be used of a person, (e.g. Ac.8:13; 10:7)² and in the papyri we have examples of the word used of the attendance at the law /

1. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, ET², London, 1966, 119.

2. These are not however 'the only exceptions' (Jeremias, 119 n.1) to the usage 'attend worship regularly' - cf. Mk.3:9, Ro.13:6.

law courts.³ Thus we may not automatically assume a context of worship for this verb. In Ac.2:46 it obviously does not describe one service of worship, since reference is made to both Temple and house meetings!

We turn now to the four items mentioned in v.42, to examine the possibility that they were the ingredients of the service:-

i) διδασκαλία. That teaching could, and did, take place in the worship service is highly probable (against Haenchen)⁴, but I doubt if we could say for sure from this verse that it was restricted to worship meetings.

ii) κοινωνία. Jeremias wants us to understand by this term '(table) fellowship'⁵ and, hence, that the word is used of the Christian communal meal. But I very much doubt that. In the examples Jeremias quotes (120, n.2) to support his case, (Ecclus.6:10; Tob.2:2 and 1 Cor.10:18,20), all have some reference to the context of a meal or eating explicitly made. Here again, (as we found with προσκαρτερεῖν above) Jeremias wants to take the meaning which a word acquires in a given context, and apply it to the word used absolutely, without sufficient justification. It would be better to translate κοινωνία here as 'fellowship' simpliciter, (so BAG), which is by far the most common meaning of the word in our literature. Indeed, neither BAG nor LSJ even list table fellowship as a possible meaning of the word.

iii) κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου. Exactly what Luke intended by this phrase is debatable. It could be a reference to the Eucharist (so described from the opening action of the rite) or it could be a reference to a full meal,⁶ which in Christian circles was later to acquire the name Agape; and there is really little to choose between these two interpretations, on the face of it. Jeremias has rid us of the misconception /

3. προσκαρτερεῖν τῷ βήματι (P.Hamb.4.7) - first century A.D.; προσκαρτερεῖν τῷ κριματηρίῳ, (P.Oxy.261.12).

4. Acts, 191. Cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 119 n.3. That teaching took place in the Temple (Ac.4:18; 5:21,25,42) does not preclude the possibility that teaching also took place within the congregation. Paul mentions it as an element in worship in 1 Cor.14:26. Cf. the chapter on 'Preaching', pp.30ff.

5. In the second English edition of The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, (ET 1966), 120 Jeremias retracts his earlier opinion, given in the first English edition (ET 1955), 87, n.3, that it meant 'contribution' or 'distribution of gifts' along the lines of Ac.6:1ff.

6. So Haenchen, Acts, 191, n.2.

misconception that the phrase is a Jewish expression meaning 'to have a meal' (120 n.1), but the phrase seems to be a purely biblical one.⁷ It could quite readily be supposed to have a liturgical reference in such passages as Ac.20:7 and 11, and therefore, by implication, Ac.2:42 and 46, but for the appearance of the phrase in a patently non-liturgical context in Ac.27:35 Wainwright's thesis that in Ac.27:35 also the word has a liturgical meaning, and that, in fact, Paul did celebrate the eucharist with the (pagan) sailors is scarcely convincing.⁸ Thus Haenchen (191 n.2) thinks 'in itself the phrase simply means a meal', and Bultmann⁹, thinks it is 'very doubtful' that this phrase

κλασις /

7. cf. BAG s.v. κλαω : 'In our literature only of the breaking of bread ... by which the father of the household gave the signal to begin the meal. This was the custom of Jesus.'

8. G.Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, London, 1971, 131. His reasoning is : 'Those on board a ship running on the rocks (Ac.27:29) were confronted by "the last things" : it was a matter of life or death, both physically and, for the heathen, spiritually. Must we exclude the possibility that when Paul proposed to them all that they should take food, telling them that this was for their salvation (τούτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπαρξαι, v.34; ὁ σωθῆναι at v.31.) ... he then celebrated the very meal which is life to all who will choose life?' This fails for four reasons:

- i) God had already promised that no life would be lost (vv.22,24)
- ii) σωζεν and σωτηρια, even in biblical contexts, can still retain their primary, secular meaning of 'save,' 'preserve from danger' - cf. e.g. Ac.7:25 (σωτηρια) Heb.11:7 etc.
- iii) 1 Cor.10:1 - 13 show us that Paul allowed of no interpretation of the eucharist as a φαρμακὸν ἀθανάσιας.
- iv) Regarding the Tertullian reference (205 n.431), - can we be sure, in a definite context of prayer, that Tertullian did not mean 'thanksgiving' by eucharistia, when he alluded to this passage?

9. Theology of the NT, I, 144.

κλῆσις τοῦ ἁγίου, 'was ever a technical designation for the Lord's Supper'. These, of course are statements of opinion, not fact.

(iv) προσευχῇ, prayers. That these occurred in the context of worship we need not doubt, and that they would include specifically Christian prayers (cf. e.g., the prayers Paul mentions in his letters) would, I think, be obvious enough. Haenchen's assertion, accordingly, 'The prayers are above all those offered together with the Jewish congregation' (191) seems an arbitrary and unnecessary limitation. That Christians shared in the Jewish prayers, Acts readily records (Ac. 3:1) but it also notes specifically Christian prayers within the congregation (cf. e.g. Ac. 4:24ff). Jeremias attempts to find further support for his last section of the service, the prayers, by saying, (E.W. 119) 'That, furthermore, the celebration ended with psalms and prayers is to be concluded from Acts 2:46f.' However one may well doubt whether αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεόν, to which he presumably refers, should be given so restricted an interpretation as 'psalms' in this summary verse¹⁰. The phrase certainly does not have that narrow meaning when it appears again in 3:8f. It is rather 'associated with the experience of God's helpful loving-kindness and saving grace' (Haenchen, 193), and while that does not exclude psalms, neither is the meaning exhausted by that translation. Further, the fact that the amplification of 'prayers' in 2:42 into 'psalms and prayers' (dubiously based on 2:47) was judged necessary, is surely an indication of the inadequacy of Jeremias' argument that in 2:42 we have a description of the early form of service.

Thus I hold that Jeremias' conjecture is invalid, and would prefer to follow Haenchen's assessment of the summaries -

'The summaries of Acts attempt to depict the whole of the Christians' way of life, hence the activities paired by καὶ probably represent detached and self-contained units.' (Acts, 191).

This seems to me to be a preferable way of treating the passage here. Ac. 2:42ff. does contain elements of the early Christian worship, but we may not assume that the whole of the service is there depicted.

We have already examined another passage which may be held to describe the early /

10. The phrase αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεόν is a favourite in Luke; cf. Lk. 2:13, 20; 19:37; 24:53D and Ac. 3:8f.

early church worship, Ac.20:7ff, the Troas incident.¹¹ We have seen that much of the interpretation of these verses must remain doubtful, in particular the question of whether the meeting described there was a typical weekly meeting on 'the first day of the week', or a special gathering to bid Paul farewell. The language certainly suggests an informal gathering (διαλεγτο, 'he conversed'¹²; ὁμιλησας 'having spoken' or 'conversed'), and the length of the proceedings was probably not normal - although this does not preclude the possibility that it was a regular meeting prolonged because of the special occasion. Nor is it clear how we are to understand κλιν ἄρτον (v.7) - full meal or eucharist only.¹³ In fact the passage proves to be inconclusive, so far as providing any information on the pattern of worship is concerned.

On another passage, Delling surely throws caution to the wind when he includes this statement among the 'cautious inferences' we can make about worship: 'On the basis of Ac.20:36 we may presume perhaps that the Pauline circle of churches was accustomed to the sequence:address, prayer.'¹⁴ It is scarcely possible to use this verse, so obviously describing a special situation, in an argument of this sort without doing violence to the context: we do not even know if it was a worship meeting!

By far the most important passage for information on the content of early Christian worship is 1 Cor.14. This chapter is called forth to deal with the over-emphasis of some Corinthian Christians on the gifts of the Spirit, especially glossolalia, which while it may be good for the speaker involved (v.4), does not build up the congregation. It is in his attempt to rectify this situation, and put the emphasis where he feels it belongs, that Paul gives us an insight into the content of the worship service, and also into his own understanding of the object of worship /

11. Cf. the chapter on 'The Day, the Place, the Time', pp.6ff.

12. The meaning however could equally be 'preached'; cf. BAG, s.v., 1 and 2.

13. Cf. above, p.20ff for this phrase, and the chapter on the Lord's Supper, pp.93f.

14. G.Delling, Worship in the NT, ET, London, 1962, 42. So too, Haenchen, Acts, 595.

worship. Indeed, the lengths to which Paul goes to stress the edification of the whole congregation as a criterion for expressions of worship is to be seen as an indication of how largely the question of charismata loomed at Corinth. Paul did not despise such charismata: he himself possessed glossolalia (v.18), but he evaluated all such gifts of the Spirit in terms of their usefulness in building up the congregation. His argument is simple: to be effective glossolalia needs to be interpreted (vv. 13, 27, 28); prophecy¹⁵ on the other hand is readily intelligible. His advice to the Corinthians is 'aspire above all to excel in those gifts which build up the church' (v.12, cf. v.39). There is no point in saying something which does not contain some of these elements (v.6): revelation from God (ἀποκάλυψις), enlightenment (γνώσις), a word of prophecy (προφητεία), or an element of teaching (διδασκαλία)¹⁶. Paul sums up his argument (vv.26ff.), and in the passing adds details of the various elements which could be contributed, we should note, by any member of the congregation ('each of you', v.26). (There does not seem to have been any recognised leadership or ministry at Corinth). Thus we discover the elements of the Christian service of worship included hymns (ψαλμοί), teaching (διδασκαλία), revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), ecstatic speech (γλῶσσαι) accompanied by the interpretation of them (ἐρμηνεία) and prophecy (προφητεία). Also included were prayers of thanksgiving and blessing (εὐχαριστία and εὐλογία), to which the congregation responded with Amen (v.16)¹⁷. We may note in the passing the extent of what we would call 'congregational participation' must have been considerable¹⁸, - Paul (vv.27, 29) restricts glossolalia and prophecy to a maximum of three items per service. Barrett is certainly correct when he remarks (1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 25) -

'Paul's instructions suggest that the meetings were sometimes tumultuous, even chaotic; they were certainly not dull.'

At this point it is necessary to note several limitations to the picture Paul gives us. (i). We must first and foremost remember the exceptional character of the church at Corinth, - tempestuous, factious, encompassing the spiritually enthusiastic /

15. I.e., 'preaching' in our terminology.

16. For these terms, cf. the chapter on 'Preaching'.

17. For these, cf. the appropriate chapter.

18. Women clearly participated, but we cannot say to what extent they did, in view of the contradiction between 1 Cor.9:5 and 14:34.

enthusiastic and the morally weak, at times in open revolt from Paul, - and we must not automatically assume that a matter from the Corinthian correspondence necessarily reflects conditions obtaining in other churches (cf. 1 Cor. 11:16). This may, for example, be said regarding the level of pneumatic expression in a service.

(ii). 1 Corinthians was written early (AD55). Although reference is made to 'the word of the cross' (1 Cor.1:18) and to the teaching of Jesus (7:10), and although the OT is quoted, there is no explicit reference to the reading of Scripture. Obviously the early date precludes the possibility of NT Scripture, but the fact that Paul quotes the OT to Gentiles, many of whom had pagan backgrounds, is perhaps a sign that the OT was used at Corinth. In any case, we need not expect to find every ingredient of later worship mentioned in 1 Corinthians.

(iii). Then there is the vexed question of whether 1 Corinthians attests a practice in the early church of separating 'word' and 'sacrament', to use later terminology. 1 Cor.11:17-34 deals with the Lord's Supper, and any reference in that passage to preaching may only be inferred from καταγγελλετε (v.26)¹⁹, while on the other hand, 1 Cor.14 fails to mention the Lord's Supper. Barrett²⁰, following Bornkamm²¹, argues from the use of the same verb, συνελθεσθαι, (of the congregation 'gathering' for worship) in both places, that 'there is no reason why 11:17-34 and 14:1-40 should not refer to the same gathering.' This, the only reason for the identification, seems tenuous, and the connection of the two passages is by no means inescapable. Nor am I convinced by Bornkamm's assertion²² that συνελθεσθαι is a terminus technicus: it has a far wider range of meaning, even within the NT, than a reference to a meeting for worship (cf. BAG, s.v.). The fact is that the evidence here will not allow us to come to a concrete decision. That it was the case later /

19. For this passage, and the relation between 11:17-34 and 14:1-40, cf. the chapter on 'The Lord's Supper', pp.101f.

20. 1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 324-5.

21. G.Bornkamm, 'Edification of the Congregation as the Body of Christ', in Early Christian Experience, ET, London, 1969, 172, n.2.

22. Experience, 172, n.2.

later (AD150) for 'word' and 'sacrament' to be together we shall see when we refer to Justin's evidence, but by that time the eucharist had ceased to be a meal (as it still was in 1 Cor.11), and was instead the rite of sharing bread and wine . Cullmann²³ wants to see a uniform rite from the beginning: this is impossible to prove, but not, I think, impossible to disprove, - as we shall see by reference to Pliny's letter (Epp.X.96) on the question of the Christians, in which we shall find more of value than Cullmann did²⁴. Thus an inconclusive answer here to the question of whether 1 Cor.11 and 1 Cor.14 refer to the same service in which word and sacrament were combined, does not mean that we have confused an otherwise uncomplicated picture. The early church's practice does not appear to have been uniform²⁵. (iv). However, before we move on to Pliny's letter, there is one other issue to be raised as a result of 1 Cor.14:21-25. Paul evidently supposed that it was reasonably possible that unbelievers (ἰδιώται ἢ ἀπίστοι, v.23) should be present at the worship of the congregation - or rather, should enter it (εἰσελθῶσι)²⁶.

Barrett comments:

'It is important to note that such persons could find their way into the Christian assembly at Corinth. Paul does not say that this always happened, but evidently he has no difficulty in conceiving it' (BNTC, 325).

He is not posing a hypothetical question, - this can be inferred from the grammar /

23. Early Christian Worship, 30.

24. Worship, 28.

25. Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the NT, I, 145: 'Probably varying customs were in practice in different places and times; and there is as little foundation for saying that worship by the word and the celebration of the Supper always and everywhere took place separately as for saying that the celebration of the Supper was always and everywhere "the cause and purpose of all congregating" (Cullmann)'.

26. If we press this word in exegesis, we would arrive at the understanding that unbelievers entered, or 'strayed into' (Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, 206 n.440) the worship, rather than being present from the beginning, by invitation. But we are in no position to come to such a conclusion.

grammar²⁷, and from the fact that he can say that glossolalia is a sign for un-
 :believers (v.22). The implications of this for the question of whether anyone
 denied admission to the Lord's Supper belong to that chapter, and are dealt with
 there (cf. pp.104 f.). The fact for us to note at this stage is the possibility
 that unbelievers could find their way into the worship service (as opposed to a
 missionary preaching situation), and that Paul expected the worship to address
 and challenge them (v.25). The extent to which these unbelievers might be present
 in the worship is, of course, impossible to ascertain.

That is the extent of the NT evidence. But we have already noted two pieces
 of information from Pliny and Justin, which document the later practice of the
 church in post-NT times. Pliny's letter (Epp.X.96) provides information about
 the practices of Christians in Bithynia-Pontus c AD112. Not all details are
 clear²⁸, but we do gain some interesting information about the practices of the
 Christians in this province of the Empire at this time. In particular, it is
 clear that it had previously been the practice to meet twice, presumably on Sun-
 day (that is the most likely meaning of the phrase stato die), the first meeting
 being for a worship service which included a hymn and an exhortation (this being
 the /

27. v.23 ἐὰν οὖν συνελθῇ ἡ ἐκκλησία ... εἰσελθῶσι δ' ἰδῶται ἢ ἀπιστοί;
 ἐὰν with the aorist subjunctive denotes 'what is expected to occur under certain
 circumstances from a given standpoint in the present, either general or specific'
 - Blass - Debrunner, A Grammar of NT Greek, 371.4 - cited BAG, s.v. ἐὰν, 1.

28. I feel that Pliny's treatment by Cullmann exhibits an inconsistency on Cull-
 :mann's part. Although he talks about 'the very vague description in Pliny's
 letter', yet he finds it sufficiently specific for him to be able (conveniently)
 to affirm that the two services Pliny mentions are quite evidently 'two parts of
 one unified act'. This is to support the thesis (in my view insupportable) that
 there was only one uniform service of word and sacrament from the very begining.
 Of course the services were complementary; but they were also distinct from each
 other, as Pliny clearly shows.

the equivalent perhaps of $\delta\delta\alpha\lambda\eta$ and $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\mu\theta\iota\alpha$, 1 Cor.14:3?²⁹), and the second meeting being for the sharing of food. Following Pliny's edict which banned all meetings of clubs etc., ($\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rho\iota\alpha$) the latter practice had ceased³⁰. That the early morning meeting for worship had not ceased may have been the reason why the Christians were brought before Pliny in the first place³¹. This much is clear, however: there were two meetings in Bithynia-Pontus prior to Pliny's arrival³². Cullmann's attempt to discredit the evidence on which Pliny's detail rests (cf. Worship, 28, n.3) is not valid. He says 'Above all it should be remembered that his sources are the reports of lapsed Christians and tortured deaconesses.' On the contrary, because the deaconesses, who were slaves, could well have been on trial for their lives, and because they knew they were innocent of any crime, we may surmise that their evidence may be true. And as for the lapsed Christians, what motive could they have had for concealing the truth?³³

Finally /

29. I realise this may be too much. The text speaks of seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere ... etc., and goes on to quote a paraenesis similar to I Pet.4:14-6 (a letter sent to that province). If we are to see this as a reference to some kind of teaching, does sacramento point to the Amen? This is far from certain, but does not affect the main argument in any way.

30. The province had been beset by unrest stemming from organised clubs (collegia, $\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rho\iota\alpha$) to the extent that Trajan refused Nicomedia a fire-brigade in case of trouble from that group (Epp. X.33,34).

31. It is a matter of debate whether collegia religionis causa ~~were~~ included in the ban. Cf. A.N.Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny, Oxford, 1966, ad. loc.

32. Bultmann's remark, 'the morning celebrations ... are probably not services of the word but baptisms' (Theology, I,145,n.) is surely incorrect, though ingenious. Cf. G.R.Beasley Murray, Baptism in the NT, London, 1962, 261,n.5.

33. Even so, we should never have known about an early meeting in the morning but for Pliny's mention of it. As to how long it had been in existence, and whether the edict was ever relaxed to allow reversion to the earlier practice of two meetings, we do not know. It is interesting to note, moreover the willingness of the church to adapt to circumstances brought about by external pressures.

Finally, in Justin Martyr's Apology (I.67) the Sunday service of AD150 is described. It contains these items:- the memoirs (sic) of the Apostles are read, or the writings of the prophets; the president speaks; prayers are said, standing; the Eucharist is celebrated, preceded by prayers of thanksgiving, and the congregational response, Amen; the deacons take the elements to members unable to be present, and an offering is given, by those who can afford it, for those in need. By this time, of course, we are well on the way to later practice, and the Eucharist, for example, had ceased to be a full meal, and was only the rite of the bread and the wine.

If there is one point we may gather from these descriptions, of varying value, it is surely the reminder that we may not presuppose any regular pattern of worship. Further, we may not even assume that what has been preserved was necessarily normative in the early church. But we have at least been able to isolate the individual acts which comprised the service, and we can now turn to examine them in greater detail.

Preaching.

The scope of this paper is to examine the place of what we call preaching in the worship of the early church, and as far as possible, indicate the broad outline of its content. We must, however, first be certain that this is a legitimate line of enquiry : are we justified in using the term 'preaching' at all in the context of the early Christian service of worship? This question is forced upon us by one of the basic premises of C.H. Dodd in his 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments'¹ which has become a standard point for discussion of this subject. Right at the start of this work Dodd writes:

'The NT writers draw a clear distinction between preaching and teaching' (7), - the former involving the proclamation of the Christian message, the kerygma, in a missionary situation, while the latter follows on from the kerygma, indeed presupposes it, and outlines the ethical (and to some extent the doctrinal) implications which the decision of faith evoked by the kerygma, lays upon the convert. Put bluntly, this premise says that the early church knew of 'preaching' to the unconverted, and 'teaching' to the converted. Certainly, evidence can be found to support this schema: e.g. 1Cor.15:2-3 and Gal.1:23 obviously refer to preaching (κηρυγμα) in a missionary situation, while, e.g. Gal6:6, 2 Thess.2:15, and Col.2:7 are examples of 'teaching' to the congregation.

Working from the speeches in Acts and some 'kerygmatic fragments' in the Pauline corpus, Dodd has offered the following outline of the kerygma:

'The prophecies are fulfilled, and the new Age is inaugurated by the coming of Christ.

He was born of the seed of David.

He died according to the Scriptures, to deliver us out of the present evil age.

He was buried.

He rose on the third day according to the Scriptures.

He is exalted at the right hand of God, as Son of God and

Lord of quick and dead.

He will come again as Judge and Saviour of men.'

(Dodd, Preaching, 17).

Reaction /

1. New edition, London, 1944. Hereafter cited as 'Dodd, Preaching'.

Reaction to this has ranged from agreement, with or without modification of various individual items of the kerygma, to an outright rejection of the idea that the kerygma was ever a static list of facts.² The debate on Dodd's thesis in fact falls outwith our present concern, since what missionary preaching as was carried out in a worship context was carried out in the synagogue; and so we can no more than touch upon it. In this connection, we may also remove from our consideration such passages as Ac.2 and Ac.17 (the Athens speech) since these speeches did not occur in a worship context. For the purposes of this paper, suffice it to say that I accept Dodd's outline as suggesting the basic structure of the early missionary preaching, but think that we should allow for a greater flexibility and a wider content, to do justice to two facts which bear upon the subject: (a) we possess nothing more than the barest outline of a missionary sermon, - the longest of the speeches in Acts³ could be delivered in three minutes⁴, while the data from Paul is fragmentary; and (b), the early preaching was not always (or, - not always allowed to be) a monologue:

'The characteristic word of Paul's missionary preaching in the synagogue is argued. In Damascus, in Thessalonica, in Athens, in Corinth, in Ephesus

Paul argued in the synagogue (Ac.9:22; 17:2,17; 18:4; 19:8).⁵ If we give these points due emphasis it will become obvious that we are in no position to define the extent of the kerygma, or to restrict the kerygma to any compositely constructed framework⁶.

Dodd might similarly be charged with a lack of flexibility as regards his rigid distinction between preaching and teaching. Even from the point of view of vocabulary /

2. For a good discussion of the reaction, cf. William Baird, 'What is the kerygma, a study of 1 Cor.15:3-8 and Gal.1:11-7', in J.B.L., 76, 1957, 181ff., and the literature there cited. Cf. C.F.Evans, 'The Kerygma', in J.T.S., n.s., 7, 1956, 25ff.

3. Basic to Dodd's thesis is the acceptance of the historicity of the speeches in Acts. We cannot treat this here, and in any case, the only speech recorded in a worship context (Ac.20:17ff.) does not have any detail for our examination.

4. So, W.Barclay, in Apostolic History and the Gospel (in honour of F.F.Bruce), edd.W.Ward Gasque and R.P.Martin, Exeter, 1970, 165.

5. W.Barclay, op. cit., 166.

6. In fact there is no one passage which exhibits all the kerygma as Dodd defines it; cf. R.C.Worley, Preaching and teaching in the Early Church, Philadelphia, 1967, 42: 'The outline is Dodd's, not that of the early church.'

vocabulary, we must not assume that the NT only knew κηρυγμα and διδασκω.⁷ It is also clear from an examination of the NT usage of these terms that Dodd's thesis does not meet the flexibility of usage which is apparent. For example, the early chapters of Acts, on the historicity of which Dodd depends to a considerable degree, show this flexibility. Thus the 'kerygmatic' section 3:13-26 is followed by the remark that 'the chief priests came upon them together with the controller of the Temple and the Sadducees, exasperated at their teaching (το διδασκουν) the people and proclaiming (το καταγγελλω) the resurrection from the dead ...' (4:1-2). Thus what Dodd argues is a case of το κηρυσσεν is in fact described as το διδασκουν and το καταγγελλεν. Similarly, the 'kerygmatic fragment' Ac.5:30-2 is brought forth as a response to a charge that 'you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching.' (της διδασκας υμων) and the summary 5:42 equates διδασκουν and ευαγγελιζεσθαι, and the very least these passages show is that Luke was unaware of any distinction between these terms (cf. Ac.15:35; 20:20; 28:30-1)⁸.

On the other hand we may well ask if the NT restricts 'preaching' only to the missionary /

7. Thus while κηρυσσεν occurs in the NT more than fifty times, the noun κηρυγμα used in the sense Dodd requires is much less frequent - 1 Cor.1:21; 2:4; 5:14; Ro.16:25 2 Tim4:17; Tit.1:3 - and the meaning in some of these is even disputed. There are also other words used to describe the same activity, in particular ευαγγελιζεσθαι and the noun ευαγγελιον, the latter appearing around seventy times in the NT (W. Baird in J.B.L., 76, 1957, 181ff.), and μαρτυρεν, μαρτυρια for which E.G.Selwyn has contended, (in Background of the NT and its eschatology, edd. D.Daube and W.D. Davies, Cambridge, 1956, 395). Other terms also appear, - αναγγελλεν (Ac.20:20) διαπαγγελλεν (Ac.26:20), καταγγελλεν (Ac.13:15, etc. 1 Cor.2:1) and λαλειν (Ac.4:31, e.g.) So it is clear that the linguistic usage for 'preaching' is wider than Dodd would suggest. This is also true for 'teaching', - as well as διδασκουν, we also find παρακαλειν, παρκαλυθην and κατηχηεν.

8. Worley gives more references in Preaching and Teaching in the Earliest Church 30ff., although I doubt if the passages he cites (33) as examples that Paul's missionary preaching is described as διδασκουν (Ac.11:26; 18:11,25; 20:20) are unambiguous: they could all arguably refer to teaching in the context of a congregation.

missionary situation, and again it would seem that Dodd has been too rigid in his differentiation. Thus for example, Paul writes to the Roman Christians (Ro.1:15) of his 'eagerness to declare the gospel (εὐαγγελισασθαι) to you in Rome ...'. Paul also uses the expression μεταδιδόναι το εὐαγγέλιον in 1 Thess.2:8 to describe the work of initial missionary preaching and the subsequent building upon this foundation, which could have been rendered, in Dodd's thesis, by διδασκαλῶν. Since this work continued over a fairly lengthy period of time⁹, it may be presumed to have included work among the new Christians helping to deepen their grasp of the faith (cf. 2:10-12; 4:1ff.). Another pointer to the fact that 'preaching' was used to describe the work within the congregation are the various references to false teachers, in which such work is described as 'proclaiming another Jesus' (ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσων, 2 Cor.11:4), 'distorting the gospel of Christ' (μεταστρεφει το εὐαγγέλιον του Χριστου, Gal.1:7), and 'preaching a gospel at variance with' Paul's (εὐαγγελισαμεθα παρ' ὃ εὐαγγελισαμεθα, Gal.1:8). There are various other references to this activity in 1 Tim.1:3; 6:3, and the people involved are described in the NT as ψευδο-διδασκαλῶν (2 Pet.2:1), ψευδοπροφηταί (2 Pet.2:1; 1 Jn.4:1; cf. Ac.13:6), even ψευδο-αποστολῶν (2 Cor.11:13). Now it is an obvious inference that this 'false-preaching' or 'false-teaching' was carried out within the Christian congregation; and this is an indication that preaching and teaching were carried out as a part of the life of a congregation, without much difference in meaning. Further, it is clear that both of these activities (if we can separate them in any meaningful way) had a place in the worship of the congregation. This can be seen from 1 Cor.14:23,26 where the context is obviously that of a congregation gathered for worship, and from 1 Cor.4:17 where Paul says that his teaching on the Christian way of life, ('the way of Christ which I follow'), is taught everywhere ἐν παντὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Exhortation and teaching (παρηκλήσεις, διδασκαλία) figure in the context of worship at 1 Tim.4:13. These passages are clear indication that Dodd's distinction is an artificial one; the NT usage was much wider and more flexible. That it was always /

9. Certainly longer than the three to four weeks suggested by Ac.17:2. Paul was in Thessalonica long enough for the Philippians more than once (i.e., 'frequently', Haenchen, Acts, 511) to have sent financial help. Haenchen (loc. cit.) suggests a stay of several months.

always so from the beginning, is a not unreasonable conjecture which is at any rate not contradicted by the available evidence from Acts (cf. Ac.2:42; 5:42; 20:7ff., even though these are not unambiguous). Indeed in the light of what we know about the earliest activities of the missionary church, could it have been otherwise?

It goes without saying that we are sadly ill-informed about the early Christian missionary enterprises, and that there is much we do not know: one thinks of the Hellenists, the founders of the church at Rome and the activities of those Apostles who disappear without trace from the NT records, to name only the obvious blanks in our knowledge. Yet even from the inadequate information we do possess, we can discern signs of the way preaching and teaching were carried out. We have already seen that Paul's stay in Thessalonica was long enough for a period of follow-up work to have taken place over and above the initial preaching of the Gospel in a missionary situation. Indeed he explicitly refers to such teaching in 1Thess.2:10-13, and 4:1-2, the latter passage introducing a paraenetical section (2:2-12) on ⁴ 'doing the will of God'. When he was forced by persecution (2:14ff) to leave, Paul entrusted the new congregation to, we presume, local leaders (cf 1Thess.5:12ff), while he himself kept in touch by letter, and by sending Timothy (3:1,6). 1Thess. is important in the present context because it stands in time closer to the foundation of the church there, than probably any other NT letter (so Bornkamm¹⁰), and in this letter we see both the missionary preaching (1:6ff) and the work with the congregation side by side, and both activities being carried on by Paul.

On the mission in Corinth, the Acts account is supported in essentials by what we can gather from the 'Corinthian correspondence'. At first Paul was forced to earn his own living and did so by working in the workshop of Aquila and Priscilla, confining his preaching to the synagogue on the Sabbath (Ac.18:3-4). Later, probably on receipt of a gift from Macedonia (so Haenchen,(539), reads into verse 5a, - cf.2Cor:11:8), Paul was able to devote his time to full-time preaching. His total stay in Corinth was a year and a half, and from the fact that 1 Cor. refers only to missionary preaching (e.g. 1:17ff, 22; 2:1; 15:1ff) it would be reasonable to suppose that all of this time was devoted to missionary work. This would be supported by 1 Cor.3:6 where Paul says that he planted the seed and Apollos watered ~~it~~.

10. G. Bornkamm, Paul, ET, London 1971, 63.

11. So Barrett, 1Corinthians, BNTC, 4.

watered it, (hence Apollos did the follow-up work), and by 1 Cor.4:15 where he claims for himself the status of father in Christ to the congregation, while all the others are no more than tutors; (cf. 1 Cor.3:10 for a similar claim with a different metaphor: Paul laid the foundation, others built the superstructure). This could be construed to mean that Paul engaged in missionary preaching while the others 'built up' the newly founded community; - Paul 'preached', they 'taught', in Dodd's terminology.

However, the most we can say is that this picture is true in essentials, but is not the full picture. For, from the statement in 1 Cor.3:5 that Paul and Apollos are both διακονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, one can infer that Apollos also had a share in the evangelising work¹². On the other hand, the past tense ἡδυνήθη (1 Cor.3:1) shows that even when he was at Corinth, Paul had expected some advancement from the elementary stage - indeed he expected to impart the 'solid food' himself: οὐκ ἡδυνήθη λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν, 3:1. That is, Paul had had some share in the work of 'building up' himself, - only unsuccessfully. We are partly able to infer what this 'building up' comprised. Arguing from 1 Cor.1:17f. and 2:1f., Barrett defines this 'solid food' which Paul had hoped to impart as follows:

'It rests on the word of the cross, but is a development of this, of such a kind that in it the essential preaching of the cross might be missed, or perverted by the unexperienced. Essentially it differs in form rather than in content, as meat and milk are both food, though essentially different.'¹³

Thus this passage hints at the fact that Paul had hoped to develop his 'word of the cross' - i.e. his missionary preaching, - and amplify it; i.e., what Dodd calls 'kerygma' was to be filled out by 'didache', and by Paul the missionary preacher. In 1 Cor.15 we can see the way in which an element of kerygma may very well have been amplified in this context, from the way Paul develops the implications of the doctrine of the Resurrection in debate with an opposing viewpoint. As further proof that Paul could be involved in questions that were not immediately related to the missionary preaching, we note that part of 1 Cor. /

12. Acts knows of missionary work by Apollos, - cf. Ac.18:24ff.

13. 1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 81.

1 Cor. is involved with answering specific questions pertaining to Christian witness in a pagan society, - most obviously at 7:1ff. However that could be argued to be later than the missionary situation, and therefore not strictly relevant. But it is clear from 1 Cor.11:2, and the mention of 'the tradition I handed on to you', which in fact deals with the question of the covering of the head at worship (11:2 - 15), that Paul was engaged in much more than missionary preaching at Corinth. Nor was this merely a local question in Corinth; 11:6 makes it clear that Paul's view obtained in other churches also.

Thus also from 1 Cor. we can see that Dodd's dichotomy between preaching and teaching does not hold good: Paul, for all his emphasis on his role as a missionary preacher (1 Cor.1:17; 9:16; cf. 2 Cor.10:15; Ro. 15:20) was also involved in what Dodd would have called 'teaching' although his descriptions of his work only talk about 'preaching', (cf. 1 Cor.1:17; 22; 2:1ff.). Paul therefore may be held to have engaged in both of these aspects of the ministry of the word, missionary-preaching and congregational-preaching (which is better terminology than Dodd's),- and so were the other Christians such as Apollos and, probably¹⁴ Cephas, when they arrived at Corinth. We cannot say for sure whether the congregation was dependent on such itinerant Christian leaders for their development,- one would like to hope not! Indeed one can scarcely imagine how Paul could have tolerated such a state of affairs. Yet there is little evidence that there was a leader in the congregation who would be responsible for the continuance of the ministry of the word. Paul certainly has no one to appeal to for help in controlling the factions, unless 1Cor.16:15 points to Stephanas and his family¹⁵, who because of their association with Paul (1 Cor.1:16) may not have /

14. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, 3 regards it as 'probable, but not quite certain' that Peter worked in Corinth; cf. 44.

15. Barrett thinks that, while not appointed by Paul, or the church, Stephanas and family may have seen the need to minister to the saints and 'in a spirit not of self-assertion but of service and humility, they appointed themselves'. Paul asks that such 'natural leaders' be recognised. (BNTC,394).

have carried weight with the various factions.

Local leadership, however, is attested in the NT, e.g. at Philippi (Phil.1:1), - although we cannot be sure how early in the missionary situation such 'appointments' would have been made, or what scope, or function these leaders had. It is probable that the reference to Archippus in Col.4:17 refers to his position of leadership. Also the fact that Philippi was able to provide a fellow-worker for Paul (Epaphroditus, Phil.2:25) points to the possibility of recent converts becoming engaged in missionary work, as is also attested by the founding of the church at Colossae (cf. Col.1:7; 4:12) by Epaphras, whom Paul describes as συνδουλός ἡμῶν (1:7). Further the lists of names of the Christians who send greetings with Paul's letters (cf. end of Romans, Ephesians, Colossians) and in the case of Philippians the unnamed ones, provides a further pointer to the fact that there was much unrecorded Christian activity accompanying and complementing the missionary work of Paul. In this the initial work of mission was consolidated and amplified, and helps us to accept the hypothesis that the follow up work was carried out in the local congregation, as inherently probable. It is to the people involved in this work that the ministry of the word was entrusted. It is surely not an unreasonable assumption that this was also the pattern in those places in Acts for which Luke gives little information beyond the fact that the Gospel was preached there.

In addition to the work of the local leaders of the congregations, we may note the existence of a group of people called 'teachers' and 'prophets' in the early church. There were teachers, for example, in the local congregation at Antioch (Ac.13:1) and we find references to teachers in Ro.12:6f.; 1 Cor.12:8f.; Eph.4:11; Jas.3:1, and, presumably also at 1 Thess.5:12 (τοὺς νοουθετοῦντας ἡμᾶς). We have no information as to who comprised these groups, or the extent of this prevalence - thus we do not know whether there was a teacher in every congregation, or whether they were itinerant. It is perhaps natural, in view of the early missionary situation as outlined above, to expect these teachers to be itinerant, sharing in the work of evangelism (and Paul's references to his fellow-workers (e.g. Col.4:7ff; Phil.4:21 /

Phil.4:21; cf. Eph.6:21) may refer to men whose function included teaching, even if they are not explicitly called $\delta\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$.) In which case their function would be to supplement and amplify the missionary preaching.¹⁶

Yet we must beware of assuming without adequate foundation that an 'office' of teaching existed in the early church. $\delta\delta\epsilon\chi\eta$ was one of the elements which an individual might contribute to the worship at Corinth (1 Cor.14:26), and although this is the only place in the NT where such a reference exists, it is not an unreasonable conjecture that this situation obtained elsewhere also: 'teaching' was a part of worship, even if there were more restricted types of teaching, such as catechetical instruction which would seem to be attested in Heb.6:1, (cf. Gal.6:6 where a form of payment was involved). The vexed question of whether catechetical instruction took place before or after baptism, admits of no solution from the NT evidence. The fact that $\beta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\iota$ (plural) forms the content of the elementary instruction might tend to suggest that before baptism the significance of Christian baptism over against other baptismal rites, was made clear. However, the Acts narrative at several places allows no time for instruction prior to baptism (cf. e.g., Ac.2:38,41; 8:36f.; 16:33f.). According to Heb.5:12 all Christians ought to be teachers, and this would best accord with the picture in 1 Cor.14:26 of any individual offering $\delta\delta\epsilon\chi\eta$ during worship. However there is much that is not clear: for instance, is there any significance behind Paul's distinction in Ro.12:8 between teaching and exhortation ($\delta\delta\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ and $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon$)?¹⁷

Or is /

16. Cf. W.Barclay, art. cit., 169 for a discussion of the conjecture of F.H.Chase that John Mark's function as $\delta\pi\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Ac.13:5) was the equivalent of the synagogue's hazzan; i.e., he was a teacher. On this question generally, cf. most recently, E. Earle Ellis, 'Paul and his co-workers' in N.T.S. 17, (1970-1), 437ff.

17. Cf. Barrett, BNTC, 238: 'Each means a communication, effected in different ways, of the truth of the Gospel to the hearer; in the one it is explained, in the other applied. Yet it could never be explained without application, or applied without explanation.'

Or is the distinction in Eph.4:11 between evangelists on the one hand, and pastors and teachers on the other, due merely to the later circumstances lying behind that letter, (even if Pauline, Ephesians does not reflect an early missionary situation), or was this distinction present from the beginning?¹⁸ We simply cannot say.

Similarly with prophets, - they are mentioned at 1 Cor.12:8, Eph.2:20; 3:5; 4:1; Rev.18:20; Ac.11:27; 21:9. From the references given here we can gather that the prophets engaged in ecstatic speech, but, and this is in contrast to glossolalia, it was not unintelligible speech. At times the prophet foretold the future (Ac.11:27; 21:11ff.; - cf. Paul's journey to Jerusalem in obedience to a prophecy, Gal.2:2), while at other times it took the form of impassioned preaching - cf. 1 Cor.14:24-5, aimed at 'building up the church' (1 Cor.14:27). The picture is further confused by the fact that according to Did. 11:10-11 the prophets taught! It is not possible to resolve the confusing evidence on this question.

Thus far we have attempted to elicit from the fragmentary evidence of the NT, the place of preaching in the early church, and despite the confusion it has become clear that Dodd's dichotomy between preaching and teaching does not hold good. That there was a kerygma in the missionary situation, as Dodd would have us see, is probably correct, only it was probably wider in content and more flexible than Dodd would allow, and it is very easily merged into what Dodd called 'teaching', (only I would prefer to call it a form of preaching also), which filled out the kerygmatic preaching, within a worship context. We now turn to examine its content.

Almost from the very beginning, we may say, Dodd's outline of the kerygma would be inadequate. Preaching in Jerusalem, the earliest missionaries could perhaps presuppose a certain amount of knowledge about who Jesus was, what he did, etc., but in view of the number of Jewish pilgrims in the city at the time of Pentecost, many from far afield, (Ac.2:9f.) one assumes they did not take too much for granted. Thus, from very early in the mission, and, certainly, increasingly as the mission moved outwards from Jerusalem, the early missionary preaching must have contained more allusions to the life and ministry of Jesus. Michael Green /

18. Both Philip (Ac.21:8) and Timothy (2 Tim.4:5) are described as *εὐαγγελιστῆς*. Yet neither in Ro.12:6f. nor in 1 Cor.12:8f. does Paul refer to that term.

Green has expressed it thus:

'As soon as the disciples passed beyond the areas of Galilee and Jerusalem where Jesus was well known, they must inevitably have had to answer the question "Who is your Jesus? What was he like? What has he done?" It would have been absolutely impossible to preach the Gospel effectively without including an answer to these very legitimate questions. The answer must surely have included material remarkably similar to the pericopae of the Gospels.'¹⁹

The remark about the pericopae of the Gospels springs from one of the assured results of form-criticism of the Gospels, namely that the individual pericopae of the Gospel tradition were preserved in the form in which we now have them because they were used in the preaching of the early church.²⁰ We can also see traces of this in the NT letters. Most obvious are those instances where Paul quotes from the teaching of Jesus, - 1Cor.7:10; (cf.7:12) (on divorce) 9:14 (on payment of preachers) and 11:23 (on the Lord's Supper); cf. 1 Thess.4:15; Ac.20:35 (the latter reference being to a saying of Jesus otherwise unknown). These are the most obvious of the references to the teaching of Jesus, but various scholars have attempted to trace, behind other NT references, echoes or reminiscences of the teaching of Jesus. Thus, for example W.D.Davies gives a list of passages which support his contention that 'Paul interweaves words of Jesus almost "unconsciously", as it were, into his exhortations, which suggests that these words were bone of his bone.'²¹ C.F.D.Moule has suggested other examples, where allusions /

19. Michael Green, Evangelism in the Early Church, London 1971, 293,n.128. He cites a forthcoming book, The Primitive Preaching and Jesus of Nazareth, by Graham Stanton.

20. The classic texts of the form-critical method are:M.Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, ET, London, 1934; R.Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, ET, Oxford, 1963.

21. W.D.Davies, 'The Moral Teaching of the Early Church', in The Use of the OT in the NT etc., ed. J.M.Efird, Durham,N.C.,1972, 310ff. He cites these passages: Ro.12:14 (cf. Mt.5:34), Ro.12:17 (Mt.5:39ff.), Ro.13:7 (Mt.22:15-22), Ro.14:13 (Mt.18:7), Ro. 14:14 (Mt.15:11), 1 Thess.5:2 (Mt.24:43-4), 1Thess.5:13 (Mk.9:50) 1 Thess.5:15 (Mt.5:39-47).

allusions to parables may be detected.²² We may also mention those references which in a less direct way presuppose a knowledge of the character of Jesus - e.g. 2 Cor.8:8-9; 10:1; Phil.2:5-11. All these factors point to a wider knowledge of the facts of Jesus life and ministry than the bare kerygmatic outline would suggest. A similar conclusion follows from the (admittedly later) references to Pontius Pilate (Ac.3:13; 13:28; 1 Tim.6:13) and John the Baptist (Ac.10:37; 13:23-5). Further, Paul's bald statement (1 Cor.11:23) about 'the night of the arrest', according to Bultmann,²³ 'permits us to recognise that the telling of the passion story was clothed with some details, for does that expression not imply that the reader was orientated about the events of that night?' Indeed, it is surely obvious that the Gentile mission could not have succeeded without the inclusion of concrete details of the life and ministry of Jesus alongside the skeletal outline of the kerygma. This point is supported by Bultmann, who remarks²⁴

'It is self-evident that the preaching which proclaimed the Risen Lord,

had also to speak in some way of the earthly Jesus and his death'.

That, however is not all, for as long as the missionary work was confined to Judaism, the preacher's task was mainly concerned with the Messiahship of Jesus as the fulfilment of God's promises in the OT. But once the mission moved out into Gentile territory, the background to the Christian preaching, and especially the doctrine of the one God, could no longer be presupposed. Granted, the way was at times prepared for them by the proselytising mission of the Hellenistic synagogue, with the resulting groups of 'God-fearers', but the expulsion of the Christian missionaries from the synagogues brought them into contact with a Gentile world for which the existence of only one God was not necessarily an accepted fact. This can be seen from the references to paganism in such passages as: 1 Thess.1:9; 1 Cor.12:2; Gal.4:8; Heb.6:1; cf. 1 Pet.1:21. In 1 Thess.4:5, and Eph.4:18 the ethical implications of this belief in one God are touched upon.

Mention of ethics brings us to the subject of the end result of the preaching and the expression of faith which it brought about, - namely the summons to repent; and traces of what the repentance involved are to be found in the NT. One must /

22. In Birth of the New Testament, London, 1962, 144ff. Thus, 1 Cor.7:35 has echoes of Lk.10:39f.; 2 Cor.9:10 & Col.1:6,10 has echoes of the Parable of the Sower. In 1 Thess.5:21 Moule detects a reference to a parable only preserved in Clement of Alexandria (strom. 1.28.177) and Basil (Hom. 12.6).

23. Theology of the NT, I, 83.

24. Theology, I, 82.

must avoid the danger of assuming that the ethical implications were secondary to the content of preaching; - in fact the opposite is true. In the Pauline corpus there is a very close connection between kerygmatic statement (or doctrinal statement) and ethics. This has been brought out most conveniently by D.E.H. Whiteley in his Theology of St. Paul²⁵, when he notes that every element in the kerygma, as defined by C.H.Dodd, issues in an ethical appeal. Thus, paraphrasing Whiteley's points, -

i) the fulfilment of Scripture (1 Cor.10:11) is used to show that the Corinthians are those upon whom 'the fulfilment of the ages has come', and this leads into an appeal to consider each other's interests in the matter of food offered in sacrifice.

ii) the coming of the Messiah is cited in Phil.2:5-11 in order to encourage a Christ-like humility in dealings with one another.

iii) the Crucifixion is alluded to in Ro.14:15: 'Do not by your eating bring disaster upon a man for whom Christ died.'

iv) the burial of Jesus is referred to in Ro.6:4 in the context of the discussion on baptism, with the appeal to 'walk in newness of life'.

v) the Resurrection and the Heavenly Session - in Col.3:1-2 - leads to an appeal to 'aspire to the realm above', and the ethical exhortations of Col.3:5ff.

vi)²⁶ the Exaltation: Phil.2:5-11 includes a reference to the Exaltation of Jesus, (v.9), and it is from this that the appeal to 'work out your own salvation' (v.12) and the subsequent ethical admonition is deduced.

vii) the Judgement: in 2 Cor.5:10 the appeal is based on the fact that at the Judgement, 'Each of us must receive what is due to him for his conduct in the body, good or bad'.

Indeed, as Whiteley has rightly maintained, 'Many of Paul's fundamental utterances, essential /

25. Oxford, 1970, 205ff.

26. At this point Whiteley includes the Sending of the Spirit, - for which cf. Gal.5:25, 'if the Spirit is the source of our life, let the Spirit also direct our course' - but, in fact, this does not figure in Dodd's basic outline (Preaching, 17).

essential pillars of Christian theology, are occasioned by the need to drive home some ethical point.' (204) Thus the close interconnection between theology and ethics, or proclamation and ethics, may be seen. It is because of what God has done in Christ that the new way of life is possible, and this new life is held out as the logical inference of the proclamation of the gospel, as both gracious possibility and demand. Indeed Conzelmann²⁷ has pointed out that in Romans, Galatians, Colossians and Ephesians, the dogmatic section (the promise of salvation) is followed by the paraenesis, the ethical appeal. Thus, for instance, the doctrinal section of Romans (Ro.1-11) passes over the paraenesis with 12:1 παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί : the indicative of the Gospel precedes the imperative of ethical demand, but the two are inter-related. This fact may also be observed from the way in which teaching from contemporary ethical instruction was pressed into Christian service: for example there are frequent parallels to the catalogues of virtues and vices (exemplified in NT by Gal.5:19ff.) and to the 'haustafeln' (tables of household ethics) (cf. Eph.5:22-6:9) in both Greek²⁸ and Hebrew²⁹ ethical teaching. On these, Conzelmann comments (Outline, 92) -

'The catalogues are not an expression of the personal views of individual writers, either. Of course, they correspond to the moral views of these writers, but they are not constructed by them, but simply taken over. There is a certain stereotyped basic material. There is no particular 'Christian' significance in the individual concepts. No new morality is developed here.....'

Now while this is true, one may well complain that it does not go far enough. What is significant in these codes borrowed from other sources is the new dimension brought to these codes by the fact of Christ, and his work: they assume new proportions by being included with the Christ-event. Thus the catalogue of vices at Gal.5:19ff. culminates in the warning that 'those who behave in such a way will never inherit the Kingdom of God'(v.21) while the catalogue of virtues/

27. Conzelmann, Outline, 88-9.

28. For the Hellenistic background, cf. Conzelmann, Outline, 91,n.2 and literature there cited.

29. cf. W.D.Davies, 'Moral teaching in the early Church' 310ff., and literature.

viftues (vv.22ff.) is described as 'The harvest of the Spirit', found only in such as 'belong to Jesus Christ'. (v.24). Similarly with the haustafeln, if we take Eph.5:22ff. as an example, we notice the prefatory remark 'be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ' (v.21). Christ's attitude to the Church is the pattern for the reciprocal - ethic which is to direct the husband-wife relationship (5:25-9) and a verse from the OT lends extra force to the appeal. Scripture again supports the injunction that children obey their parents (6:1,2) while parents are reminded of their Christian obligation to their children (6:4). The pattern of their service to Christ is to colour slaves' attitudes to their masters (6:5ff.) while masters are reminded of their master (6:9). These two examples, Gal.5, and Eph.5-6 are here cited by way of example, and what we have found here applies to other examples of this genre. Even when they borrowed from contemporary ethical codes, the early Christians re-cast these codes in a Christian mould, and the indicative of the Gospel was made the ground of the imperative. Thus again we may see the close inter-connection of Gospel and ethic. It was surely material such as that which Paul would have included in his preaching to the Christian congregations at Corinth (1Cor.4:17), Galatia (Gal. 5:21) and Thessalonica (1Thess.2:12), - indeed 1Thess.4:1-2, which leads into 4:3ff., the ethical realisation of the will of God, shows that this is the case.

One further point, and this is on the question of catechetical instruction which we have already mentioned. We have seen that it is not possible to decide whether a new convert underwent this instruction prior to baptism. The question of the content of this 'teaching' which probably was not part of the worship of the congregation, now arises. Obviously the details of the life and ministry of Jesus and the ethics of the Christian congregation would be included, although they also formed part of the worship. Heb.6:1ff. shows that some elementary doctrinal instruction would be involved. From the work of J.Jeremias,³⁰ it may be reasonably concluded that prayer was also a subject for this instruction. Thus, after comparing the context of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke, Jeremias comments -

'The Matthaean /

30. J.Jeremias 'The Lord's Prayer in the light of recent research,' in The Prayers of Jesus, ET London, 1967, pp82ff.

'The Matthaean catechism on prayer is addressed to people who have learned to pray in childhood, but whose prayer stands in danger of becoming a routine. The Lucan catechism on prayer, on the other hand is addressed to people who must for the first time learn to pray and whose courage to pray must be roused. It is clear that Matthew is transmitting to us instruction on prayer directed at Jewish-Christians, Luke at Gentile-Christians. About AD75 therefore, the Lord's Prayer was a fixed element in instructions on prayer in all Christendom, in the Jewish-Christian as well as the Gentile-Christian church.'

Thus prayer was a subject treated in catechetical instruction, although we cannot say when this was first introduced. It prompts the question, Is Paul's reference in 1Cor.11:23 to 'the tradition which I handed on to you' (about the Lord's Supper) an indication that it also had a place in catechetical instruction? - Heb.6 certainly shows that baptism figured in the context, and the conjecture is not impossible. However we can only briefly touch on this subject which is only indirectly concerned with the worship of the congregation. It is also possible that catechetical instruction was carried on outwith a worship context altogether, - just as the synagogue could be used during the week for instruction, - for which cf. Ac.17:11.

Thus an examination of the place of preaching and teaching within the worship of the early church points to a situation which was more flexible than Dodd's rigid differentiation would allow. There was kerygma, - although the early church might not recognise the terminology of present day theology - and while Dodd's outline is valuable, it is only a barest outline, and need not be regarded as normative for all preaching. Surely we are justified in holding that there was a greater flexibility, and a greater inter-play between what Dodd called 'preaching' and 'teaching', both within the missionary context (where the kerygma would have been meaningless without amplification) and within the context of congregational worship (where kerygma was related to ethical paraemesis, as well as being subject to amplification in its own right).

The Creed.

One of the distinctive features of early Christianity was, obviously enough, its belief that God had been acting in an unique way in Jesus of Nazareth, in his life, ministry, his death and resurrection. These beliefs gave the Christian community its distinctiveness, and to a large extent determined its life: they underlay the preaching of the church and provided the impulse for the missionary work. Thus while there may well have been a wider variety in the content of the preaching than we can now recover, it is obvious that there were some items of belief which were generally accepted as basically essential. Thus in Galatians Paul can remind his readers of the gospel which he preached to them, and to which there were no alternatives (Gal.1:6-12). In 1 Cor.15:3 he reminds the Corinthians of 'the gospel that I preached to you', and lists certain points of the story of Jesus, while in Romans he begins by defining the gospel which he has been called to serve (Ro.1:1ff.). These are some of the pointers to the fact that the life and preaching of the early church was based upon certain items of belief.¹

It is highly likely that these beliefs would come into prominence at certain moments in the church's life, especially when a man had responded to the preaching and wished to enter the community. Thus the most obvious occasion for the statement of belief would be baptism (cf. Ac.16:31, e.g.) when the new convert could declare his new found faith. The Western text at Ac.8:37 shows a later example of this type of declaration of belief.² The evidence of the NT Letters suggests that the earliest Christian confession was 'Jesus is Lord' (1 Cor.12:3; Ro.10:9), and while there is no pointer to the context in which this might have been affirmed in 1 Cor.12 /

1. There are other, similar blocks of traditional belief in the NT: cf. e.g., Ro.8:34; 2Tim.2:8; 1 Pet.3:18ff. Cf. J.N.D.Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, (3rd. edn.) London, 1972, 16ff.

2. 'Jesus is the Son of God' is 'confessed' (ὁμολογεῖν) at 1 Jn.4:15.

1 Cor.12³, the assumption is probable that the Ro.10:9 passage points to a baptismal confession⁴, for that is the most obvious context for the combination of belief in Jesus and the assurance of being saved. However, our total lack of knowledge as to the way baptism was administered in the early church - even its relation to the regular service of worship is obscure - prevents our drawing any conclusions from this conjecture which would inform us as to the possible use of credal statements in the worship service.⁵

This lack of precision is apparent in other aspects of the problem of credal statements in the NT. Thus attention has frequently been drawn to the formula-like statements which occur in the NT letters, such as 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Ro.15:6; 2 Cor.1:3; 11:13; Eph.1:3; 1 Pet.1:3) by which the belief in God which the church shared with Judaism is brought within a Christian framework. Similarly, the item of faith that God raised Jesus from the dead became a stereotyped expression (cf. Ro.4:24; 8:11; 2 Cor.4:14; Gal.1:1, etc.). In various other places phrases which have some appearance of being a formula, - or are on the way to becoming such - may be noted, with varying degrees of certainty⁶, but /

3. Cullmann thinks (Early Christian Confessions, ET, London, 1949, 27ff.) that ἀναθεμα Ἰησοῦς (and hence, per contra, κύριος Ἰησοῦς) arose in a context of persecution, on the analogy of Pliny's maledicere Christum (Epp.X.96). This fails because it reads later conditions into NT times without any justification - cf. C.K.Barrett, 1 Corinthians, 279, for discussion. His statement best mirrors the state of our knowledge: 'It is not easy to conceive the circumstances in which one might cry out, Jesus is anathema, and be in danger of supposing that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit.'

4. So C.K.Barrett, Romans, 200, and many others. Cf. the chapter on 'Baptism', p.143 and n.110.

5. Cf. the chapter on 'Baptism', pp.143f.

6. Words such as πιστῶς (cf. 1 Jn.5:5) and ὁμολογεῖν (1 Jn.4:15; cf. Ro.10:9) are taken as clues to confessional material. The noun ὁμολογία is frequent in Hebrews (3:1; 4:14; 10:23, cf. 1 Tim.6:2) in the meaning 'body of belief'.

but again, we are in no position to trace any indication of their setting in the early worship. The most that may be said - or rather presumed - is that they show us the way in which points of faith could become stereotyped at a reasonably early date, and so provide the basis out of which 'creeds' as we know them were subsequently to develop. But that is a process of growth which was not completed until very much later in the history of the church.

On the question of creeds in the worship of the early church we can do no more than quote with approval the words of J.N.D.Kelly -

'It cannot be too often repeated that, in the proper sense of the terms, no creed, confession or formula of faith can be discovered in the NT, with the possible exception of such curt slogans as Kurios Iesous.'⁷

7. J.N.D.Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, 23.

The Scriptures.

The place of the Scriptures, - i.e. the OT¹ primarily -, in the early church and the purposes for which they were used has been the subject of much interest and study² and the investigation is an on-going one³. Most of the debate, however, centres on matters which are outwith the scope of this work, and we shall restrict our investigation to an examination of the place of the reading of Scripture within the worship service of the early church. It is a subject for which the evidence is scant.

That the OT was read in the worship of the synagogue in Jesus' day the NT readily attests, - cf. Lk.4:16, cf. for later Ac.13:14ff.; 15:21, etc., 2 Cor.3:14. This practice was well known to the early Christians, not only because many of them had been Jews prior to their conversion, but also because even in the field of the Gentile mission the initial approach was regularly made through the synagogue (e.g., in Ac.13:14 and 17:2f., the picture is given of Paul preaching in the synagogue after the reading of the Law and the Prophets). Thus even Gentile converts would be acquainted with the reading of Scripture from their association with the synagogue as *σεβόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Further, it is obvious that from an early date the OT was used as 'the substructure of NT theology' (Dodd)⁴, not merely for the purpose of /

1. The term 'the OT', as far as the first century situation goes, is an anachronism, and is used here merely for convenience. It is clear that the limits of the OT canon had not yet been finally determined: there was an established body of writing, 'the Law' (our Pentateuch) and 'the Prophets' were probably well defined also, but while certain of 'the Writings' were accepted, e.g., the Psalms, the final selection and authorisation had still to be made. Thus in the NT Paul quotes, e.g., from the Apocalypse of Elijah (according to Origen) as if it were Scripture in 1 Cor.2:9.

2. C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, 1952; Barnabas Lindars, NT Apologetic, London, 1961, - both standard works on this subject.

3. Most recently, C.K.Barrett, 'The Interpretation of the OT in the New', in The Cambridge History of the Bible, I, Cambridge, 1970, 377ff.; D.Moody Smith, Jr., 'The Use of the OT in the New', in The Use of the OT in the New and other Essays, (in honour of W.F.Stinespring), Durham, N.C., 1972, 3ff, and the literature cited there. Also Hugh Anderson, 'The OT in Mark's Gospel', in the same volume, 280ff.

4. The quotation forms the subtitle of According to the Scriptures.

of missionary apologetic (so Lindars), although that was an important stimulus to OT research, but also as a means of clarifying the church's understanding of her Lord and of herself. The very fact of belief in Jesus, the Crucified and Risen Lord, as Messiah presupposed a judgement on Jewish Messianic expectancy, a judgement which required to be worked out scripturally in the believers' understanding before any missionary preaching could be undertaken. This is precisely what Luke depicts as the post-Easter experience of the disciples: the Scriptures were 'opened' (ἀνοίγειν, Lk.24:32). Thus what Dodd posits as happening as a result of the kerygma may in fact be allowed also for the prior stage, the post-Easter faith:

'The church was committed by the very terms of its kerygma to a formidable task of biblical research, primarily for the purpose of clarifying its own understanding of the momentous events out of which it had emerged, and also for the purpose of making its Gospel intelligible to the outside public.'⁵

The earliest evidence for the existence of such research occurs where Paul refers to its findings. Paul's testimony (1 Cor.15:1ff.) that the gospel he preached in Corinth (c. AD 50) contained the statement that Christ died κατὰ τὰς γράφας, according to the Scriptures, points to an early research activity which had already produced such 'standard' findings; and while 1 Cor.15 is the earliest reference to this activity now extant, the conjecture that the early community had engaged in this research from the first has much to commend it, - and indeed is supported by the pictures in Acts⁶ (cf. Ac.2:16, - even earlier, 1:16!). We have, however, no indication of how this research was conducted, or by whom. Macdonald⁷, arguing from the scarcity of books⁸ except among the rich, suggested that we should therefore assume /

5. Dodd, Scriptures, 14.

6. Presumably the scriptural interpretation of Pentecost in terms of Joel 2:28ff. came not during Peter's speech, but later! Nevertheless, both Ac.2:16 and 1:16 provide examples of the use of the OT to clarify understanding of experiences in the life of the church, for the purposes of self-understanding.

7. Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, 81f.

8. Cf. C.H.Roberts, 'Books in the Graeco-Roman world and in the NT', in C.H.B., I, 67ff. Roberts allows for a greater currency of books than Macdonald, and 2 Tim.3:15 suggests some private instruction in the Scriptures, probably at home, for which some book would be necessary, presumably.

assume that the acquaintance with the OT in its relation to Christianity must have been derived from worship. This is a conjecture which is impossible to evaluate except to say that it may be true up to a point: we also know that the synagogue was used during the week as a school in which instruction in the Torah was given⁹ and at Ac.17:11 we see how Paul could use this daily instruction for Christian missionary purposes, using, presumably, the synagogue copies of the OT. It is not impossible that a similar system obtained in places among the early community (cf. the 'daily' of Ac.2:46). Be that as it may, one obvious way of disseminating a Christian understanding of the OT would be through the meetings for worship, and we do know that the OT was read at worship (1 Tim.4:13, cf. below for this text). On the question of books, 2 Tim.4:13 refers to Paul's¹⁰ books and parchments which he had left behind at Troas. We do not know enough about the background to be able to infer much about this verse, - e.g., whether the books (did they include Scripture?) were deliberately left at Troas (for copying?)¹¹. We would have expected Paul, as a former Pharisee, to have possessed some copy of at least part of the OT, but the extent to which the early Christians in general did so is not determinable, - and this hinders our investigation of whether the OT research was carried out in the church's worship or not. All we can say is that the early church had access to the OT by some means or other, perhaps including orally¹², that they used the OT in their theology, and that the conjecture that some, at least, of this exploration of the OT was carried out in the worship meetings, is as /

9. Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, 81-2: 'these holy places are called synagogues and there the young sit and are instructed in age groups by their elders, attending with sensible decorum. One takes the books and reads them aloud, another, more learned comes forward and instructs them in what they do not know.' Cf. Leon Morris, The NT and the Jewish Lectionaries, London, 1964, 36,n.1.

10. Even those who deny Pauline authorship of the Pastorals admit the likelihood that this verse is a genuine Pauline fragment, whatever the reason for its present context! Cf. Kummel, Introduction, 271.

11. $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omega$ may, but need not necessarily, point to a definite purpose in leaving the books: 'with Carpus', 'at Carpus' house'.

12. As a Pharisee Paul would have learned much of the OT - and the scribal Halakah - by heart. If so, and if $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\alpha$ in 2 Tim.4:13 has no reference to the OT, then it is arguable that the place of the OT in worship could have been minimal, - being introduced /

as good as any.

There is in fact only one indication in the NT that the OT was read in worship in the church: 1 Tim.4:13. There is general agreement that the reference of $\tau\eta$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$ in this verse is to the reading of Scripture in worship, and that the OT is meant. The unresolved problem of the date of the Pastorals renders any attempt to make deductions from this verse impossible: even if it is Pauline, the most that may be said is that it points to the practice of reading Scripture in the worship at Ephesus c. AD 64, although the reference may be to a date much later than that if Pauline authorship is denied. Nor can we infer how long established the custom was from the bald reference in this verse. However it may well be judged preferable to assume that the practice was in operation in the early church from the very beginning, perhaps influenced by the synagogue, and that pure chance has determined that this verse in 1 Timothy is the earliest evidence of the practice, than to assume that it was not customary practice from the first, and was then subsequently introduced. In either case we are required to argue e silentio, but the fact that the missionary activities frequently began in the synagogue may favour the former alternative.

One may not, however, assume that the early church took over the OT without reservation. The church knew that Jesus had subjected the OT to his own searching criticism¹³. This is to be seen in the way he attacked the scribal 'traditions', i.e., the oral Halakah by which the precepts of the Torah were defined and spelled out, and which were regarded by many as being of equal validity with the Torah itself (cf. Mk.7:9,13). This is especially seen in the conflict over the Sabbath, the attitude to which Jesus challenged and disregarded both in action (Mk.3:1ff.) and in word (Mk.2:27). But he justified his position from Scripture (Mk.2:25, the actions of David, cf. Mt.12:5-12). His attitude to the Torah is clear from those places /

12 (cntd.) :duced either in support of a point in a sermon, rather like the way it is adduced in the letters, or to supply the 'text' for a sermon. This, however, is less likely.

13. For Jesus' attitude, cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, I, 205ff., 251ff.; H. von Camp-
:enhausen, The Formation of the Christian Bible, ET, London, 1972, 1-20.

places where he criticises it, and particularly the 'Antitheses' of the Sermon on the Mount. In two instances he goes beyond the Torah, - the rule on killing (Mt.5:21) and the one on divorce (Mt.5:27), but in both cases he does so only to heighten and increase the Law's demand, and in the latter case he again argues from Scripture (cf. Mt.10:2-12) in the way Paul was later to do (cf. Gal.3:15ff.). Thus the church learned from Jesus' criticism of the Law, and his subjection of it to his own personal authority. To quote von Campenhausen,

'We could say that under the guidance of Jesus his church had rejected all Pharisaic scrupulosity and all holy-seeming but purely external behaviour, and had found the way to true freedom. She was now in a position to grasp directly the primal will of God for man and to fulfil it without restriction. And she knows that the meaning and real intention of the ancient biblical revelation, so far from being overthrown by this, in fact corresponds to it.'¹⁴

We may detect this attitude to the OT in the early church most clearly in Paul: in 2 Cor.3:12ff. (and especially v.15) he lays down his attitude to the OT. He writes 'But to this very day, every time the Law of Moses is read, a veil lies over the mind of the hearers', - and this veil can only be removed by Christ, 'the Lord who is Spirit' (v.18). Thus, irrespective of how frequently the OT was read in worship, and how regularly it was read to authenticate the church's experience of herself and her Lord, it was never in itself the final authority: that honour belonged to Christ as Lord of the community. This attitude may also be traced outside the NT. Thus for example, Ignatius deals with the question of 'authorities' (ἀρχαί) in argument against those who will not believe a point in the gospel without OT backing (Ignatius, Philad.8:2). Ignatius argues: 'For me Jesus Christ is the authority (ἀρχὴ ἐστίν); his cross, his death, his resurrection and faith through him are inviolable authorities (ἀθικτὰ ἀρχαί).

Thus far our attention has been focused on the OT, but it was not very long before the early community began to produce writings of its own, and although these were subsequently to be collected into what was later¹⁵ called the New Testament, there /

14. von Campenhausen, The Formation of the Christian Bible, 10.

15. The earliest extant use of the term is in AD 192, in an anti-Montanus work (cf. Eusebius, E.H., V.16.3), ὁ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κινήσεως διαθήκης λόγος, but even so, there was at this time no agreement on the contents of this NT.

there is never any question of the writings being produced with the intention of forming a second section of the canon. C. F. Evans¹⁶ quotes A. Deissmann on this -

'Paul had better work to do than the writing of books, nor did he flatter himself that he could write Scripture; he wrote letters, real letters, as did Aristotle and Cicero, as did the men and women of the Fayyûm.'

The question does arise, however, of the place of these works within the life of the early church, and in particular of their relation to worship. Turning to the earliest NT writings, the Letters of Paul, we find indications that they may have been read in worship, although not, so far as we can gather, as in any sense a complement to the OT; rather, if anything, as a replacement of the sermon. This is the deduction of many scholars¹⁷ from the seemingly liturgical endings of some of the letters, e.g., 2 Cor.13:12; 1 Thess.5:24ff.; Eph.6:23f. (Leitzmann adds Ro. 16:16) and especially 1 Cor.16:20-4. The argument is that since the language of 1 Cor.16:22 contains words which Paul does not use elsewhere (φίλει, for which Paul prefers ἀγαπᾷ, cf. Eph.6:24; ἵτω, for which Paul prefers ἔστω, cf. Gal.1:8-9; ἀναθήματα ἔστω, cf. 2 Cor.12:16 and μαρναναθα, a NT hapax legomenon, cf. Did.10:6 and Rev.22:20) Paul is presumably quoting something of which he was not the author, - the conjecture being that it was a liturgical formula. The conjecture is supported by the fact that the four elements mentioned in this verse, the kiss, the Anathema, the Maranatha and the grace, are later¹⁸ attested to have preceded the Lord's /

16. C.H.B.I, 237, citing A.Deissmann, Bible Studies, Edinburgh, 1901, 44.

17. Leitzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, ET, Leiden, 1953ff., 186, assumes the point without argument. Cf. J.A.T.Robinson, 'Traces of a liturgical sequence in 1 Cor. 16:20-4', in J.T.S., n.s. IV, 1953, 38ff.; G.Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, 169.

C.F.D.Moule puts forward reservations on the point about Maranatha in 'A Reconsideration of the Content of the Maranatha.', in N. T. S., vi, (1959-60).

18. Did.10:6 (following Dibelius' conjecture, cf. 'The Lord's Supper', p.102 and n.73), Justin, Apol. I.65-7; from 65 we learn that the kiss preceded the Lord's Supper, and from 67 we learn that the Lord's Supper followed the reading of the Gospel.

Lord's Supper, although this support falls short of conclusive proof¹⁹. However, even if this conjecture is accepted - and I am inclined to do so -, we must note the extent to which it is helpful in the context of our present line of enquiry. We are not able to deduce from 1 Cor.16 that the reading of letters formed a regular part of worship. That the letter was read to the congregation upon receipt at the worship service, tells us nothing about whether, and if so how often, the letter was re-read at subsequent meetings of the congregation²⁰.

A further pointer to the congregational reading of the NT letters is provided by three NT passages: 1 Thess.5:27; Col.4:16 and Rev.1:3. In 1 Thess.5:27 Paul asks that his letter be read to the whole congregation, and in Col.4:16 he asks the churches at Colossae and Laodicea to exchange letters. Neither verse explicitly mentions reading at worship, but the conjecture is a fair one. If 1 Thessalonians is indeed the earliest NT letter, as many think²¹, then we should notice that from the very beginning (at least as far as the recorded NT letters go) the practice was that they were read to the congregation. We cannot be certain that the letters were copied and then exchanged, but this again is a fair conjecture²². Although there is no mention that the letters should be preserved for future reading, nevertheless this is in fact what happened, they were preserved and re-read, as Clement's reference (Ep. I.47.1) to 1 Corinthians attests. Col.4:16 with its reference /

19. C.F.Evans, C.H.B., I, 241 thinks that the liturgical formulae do not necessarily presuppose a eucharistic context.

20. E.Best, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, (BNTC), London, 1973, 247 thinks that the variant reading which includes 'Amen' at 1 Thess.5:28 may be due to the later liturgical reading of the letter, but that this did not belong to the original letter. Even so, we know nothing about the frequency with which the letters were re-read.

21. So Kummel, Introduction, 181ff.; Best, (BNTC) 11.

22. C.H.Roberts accepts it without argument (C.H.B., I, 63), and compares later, Polycarp, Phil.3:1; Ignatius, Smyrn.11:3; Philad.10:1 and Mart. Polyc. 27:2

reference to a letter to the Laodiceans no longer extant²³, and the reference in 1 Cor.5:9 to a previous letter to the Corinthians²⁴ provide evidence that Paul wrote more than has been preserved for us in the NT, and highlights the significant fact that the letters were in fact retained and preserved. Even the NT contains evidence for this, in 2 Pet.3:15f. an appeal is made to a collection of the letters of Paul (ἐν πασαις ταις ἐπιστολαις). Exactly what this collection comprised, of course, when it was made and how widespread was its currency²⁵, are questions we are no longer able to answer. A similar reference in Ignatius to all the letters of Paul (ἐν παση ἐπιστολῃ, Eph.12:2) points to some process of collection begun before AD 95²⁶. The third NT passage with a bearing on the question of reading the NT letters is Rev.1:3: 'Happy is the man who reads, and happy those who listen to the words of this prophecy ...'. Thus by AD 95 the practice of reading letters in worship was so well established that John could take it for granted that his work (which he has couched in the form of a letter) would be read to the congregation's worship.

The retention and preservation of the letters need not occasion any surprise in view of the role they played in the early missionary situation. A letter such as 1 Thessalonians, sent to a recently-formed congregation under strong pressure was some compensation for the absence of the Apostle and helped to strengthen and confirm the congregation on matters which were in doubt (cf. e.g., 1 Thess.5:13ff.). Indeed, in 1 Cor.5:3f the letter, by assuring the congregation of Paul's presence 'in the Spirit' lends the Apostle's authority to the proceedings. And in the absence /

23. All attempts to identify this letter with one extant under a different name (e.g., Philemon, Ephesians) have been deemed to have failed.

24. Some think that this letter may be preserved in fragmentary form at 2 Cor.6:14ff. Cf. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, (BNTC) 12-7; 2 Corinthians (BNTC) 14, 21-5, 192ff.

25. The fact that Clement (I.47.1) writes τὴν ἐπιστολὴν (singular) τῷ ... Πάλλῳ (i.e., 1 Corinthians) suggests to some that he did not know 2 Corinthians: cf. 2 Corinthians, (BNTC), 22f. In general terms it is inadvisable to conclude that a letter was not known merely because it was not cited. The Funk-Bilmeyer index locorum (Die Apostolischen Vater, Tubigen, 1956) lists several possible allusions to 2 Corinthians in I Clement: Clem. I.36.2 (cf.2Cor.3:18); I.2.7; 33.1; 34.4 (cf.2Cor.8:9) and I.13.1 (cf.2 Cor.10:17).

26. For quotations from the NT in the Apostolic Fathers, cf. C.H.B., I 289ff.

absence of any Christian source of reference for points under dispute, the NT letters containing either a word of the Lord (1 Thess.4:15, 1 Cor.9:14), or in the absence of any such word, the opinion of an Apostle 'as one who, by God's mercy, is fit to be trusted' supplied the need (1 Cor.7:25,40; cf.14:37). The inference from 2 Pet.3:2 is that the references to the Apostles did not necessarily replace the use of the OT. Nevertheless, this looking to an Apostle for guidance would encourage the retention and re-reading of the letters; and again we repeat that the assumption is that this reading was carried out in worship, although we cannot be certain that this was exclusively so.

The reference to 'a word from the Lord' as guidance points to the other main section of the NT canon (to speak anachronistically), - namely the Gospels. As we saw in the chapter on 'Preaching' (cf pp39ff) sayings of Jesus and narratives concerning his ministry circulated from an early date and underwent a period of oral transmission before being reduced to writing. Thus sayings of Jesus from the oral tradition were at times quoted in the letters, including sayings no longer preserved in the canonical gospels. Indeed, the fact that this oral tradition underlay the synoptic gospels renders virtually impossible any attempt to trace a quotation to a written gospel, rather than an oral source. Thus the quotations in Paul may be assigned to the oral tradition, and the same is probably true of quotations in the Apostolic Fathers in the main. But there is no agreement among scholars on whether 1 Clement and Ignatius, both of whom quote sayings of Jesus, knew a written gospel, or were quoting from the oral tradition as they knew it. Most would say that they did, but there are still those who would dissent²⁷. However, the probability is that Ignatius knew Matthew and possibly John²⁸, but he certainly does not reflect a situation in which there was a general acceptance of the written gospel, as Philad.8 (quoted above, p.53) shows: in place of the ἀρχαί of the OT, Ignatius does not substitute a written gospel as the Christian ἀρχαί, but rather the facts of the ministry of Jesus: this suggests oral tradition. On the other hand, Barnabas 4:14 introduces the logion 'many are called but few are chosen' by the expression ὡς γέγραπται; and 2 Clem.2:4 introduces by ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λεγεί the saying preserved in Mt.9:13. Some scholars regard these as being of later /

27. For this point, cf. Kummel, Introduction, 337.

28. Thus, e.g., Kummel, Introduction, 339.

later date, and thus they reflect a more developed stage of the growth towards the Canon²⁹. The position is complicated by the fact that, if the Apostolic Fathers quoted from memory as the NT authors appear to have done in some of their citations from the OT, then we are less able to decide whether they knew, or had access to, a written gospel; and we are therefore less able to decide about the possibility of reading from the gospels in worship. This state of flux is described by von Campenhausen thus (Formation of the Christian Bible, 121) -

'In the first one and a half centuries of the church's history there is no single gospel writing which is directly made known, named or in any way given prominence by quotation. Written and oral traditions run side by side or cross, enrich or distort one another, without distinction or even the possibility of distinction between them.'

Perhaps slightly to redress the balance, one should say that we are forced to deduce the use of the gospels from citations of them in the Apostolic Fathers, and thus our knowledge may be limited by the vagaries of manuscript survival. And, in any case, citation of a book tells us nothing about the use of a gospel in the community out of which it originally emerged (a point to which we shall presently return).

Thus in view of the uncertainty of this area of our knowledge it would be unwise to make any deductions as to the use of the gospels in the worship of the church at that period. It is not until AD 150 that the Apology of Justin (I.67.3) tells us that as part of the Sunday service in his church τα ἀπομνημονεύματα³⁰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινωσκεται, and this is our first explicit testimony to the reading, not only of NT Scripture (cf. n.30 below), but also of OT Scripture³¹; (even in 1 Tim.4:13 we could only assume that τῇ ἀναγνώσει was a reference to the reading of (OT) Scripture in worship). Justin describes the /

29. Cf. von Campenhausen, Formation, 120,n.63 for discussion.

30. He has already defined these for us (Apol. I.66.3): οἱ γὰρ ἀποστολοὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἀκαλεῖται εὐαγγέλια... κτλ.

31. That is what I take συγγράματα τῶν προφητῶν to imply. We have no indication that the early Christian προφητεία was anything other than a verbal, non-literary activity. So too, J.A.Lamb, 'The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy', in C.H.B., I, 570; von Campenhausen, 168,n.95. But does ἢ really have its normal disjunctive force in τα ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράματα τῶν προφητῶν? Did the church of Justin's day read either the gospel or the OT? Surely not.

the Sunday service at Rome, AD 150: we have no way of knowing how long the practice had gone on prior to his writing, or indeed, how widely the practice was shared by other congregations.

Notwithstanding the uncertain nature of so much of the evidence, there is a body of opinion which asserts that the reading of the gospels was carried on in worship from the time that they were published; that, indeed, the reason for their publication was that they should be used in the congregational worship³². The theory that a lectionary consideration underlies the gospel writings has especially been developed by P. Carrington with reference to Mark's gospel³³. Others have advanced similar theories for Matthew and John³⁴. Each author has developed his own hypothesis in his own way, and no one appears to provide corroboration for any of the other hypotheses. In addition their arguments are detailed and complex, so that it is not possible to offer here any detailed criticism; and in any case there has been some critical response to several of these theories³⁵. For our present purposes, the following points may suffice. First of all, we have already noted³⁶ the remarkable freedom which characterised the worship at Corinth at least, in the NT era, and it is difficult to see how a fixed lectionary would accord with this³⁷. Further, we have already noted in this chapter the scarcity of evidence as regards /

32. So, e.g., von Campenhausen, (123): 'We can only conjecture that from the first the gospels were intended for reading aloud in the congregation' (following Michel).

33. P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar, a study in the making of the Markan Gospel, Cambridge, 1952; also his According to Mark, Cambridge, 1960.

34. G.D.Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Oxford, 1946 and A.Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, Oxford, 1960.

35. W.D.Davies, 'Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's "The Primitive Christian Calendar"', in The Background to the NT and its Eschatology, edd. Davies and Daube, Cambridge, 1956, 124ff. C.F.D.Moule, 'The Intention of the Evangelists', in NT Studies, ed. A.J.B.Higgins, Manchester, 1959; Leon Morris, The NT and the Jewish Lectionaries, London 1964.

36. Cf. the chapter on 'Preaching', p.24.

37. The fact that Paul's letters antedate the first gospel in no way affects this; it is assumed that before the appearance of the gospels, a lectionary of OT readings was in use; cf. Morris, (cited in n.35, above), 24f.

regards the reading of Scripture in the worship services, and it is certainly extremely difficult, if not downright impossible, to reconcile this (almost total) silence with the supposed currency of a lectionary. The practice of quoting the sayings of Jesus from the oral tradition in the Apostolic Fathers is likewise inexplicable (cf. above, p.58). But above all, and in my view decisive against Carrington's theory in particular, is the fact that Justin Martyr knows nothing of a fixed lectionary. His description of the Sunday service says that reading from the gospels went on as long as time permitted, (μεχρις εἴχοντα, Apol. I.67.3), and this obviously precludes the possibility that a lectionary was in use. Moreover, Justin describes the Sunday service at Rome, and it is precisely at Rome that Mark's gospel was originally published, as Carrington accepts!³⁸ Thus there was no lectionary in the community out of which Mark's gospel emerged. These points arise out of the argument we have already developed, and they seem to tell against a lectionary hypothesis, at a general level.

This only serves to bear out what we have noticed all along, that the question of the place of the Scriptures in worship is one on which scant evidence forces us more and more to fill out our understanding by conjecture. Nevertheless, a certain basic movement may be detected: from the use of the OT, and the reading of letters in congregational meetings there gradually emerged a body of Christian literature which was, in time, to occupy a more important place than the OT in the Christian church, and especially in her worship. This process, of course, did not finish until long after the Apostolic era.

38. According to Mark, 15, 47, 49, etc.

Testimonia

The question of the testimonia, i.e., OT proof-texts, has not been treated in the main body of the chapter because it did not impinge directly upon worship; nevertheless a word may be added here to indicate that although no consensus has been reached, scholarship is moving away from C. H. Dodd's rejection¹ of the hypothesis put forward by Rendel Harris², that the early church compiled a book of proof-texts which was used by the NT writers, and may have been among the first literary products of the early church. The shift in opinion has mainly been caused by the discovery of just such a book (mutatis mutandis) at cave IV at Qumran, the so-called '4Q Testimonia'. Thus the possibility of there being such a book in the earliest community is, by analogy, strengthened. The idea of a testimonia book is still, however, 'no more than a conjecture, but it is a reasonable one', according to C. K. Barrett³. C.H. Roberts⁴ offers a modification of the theory: the testimonia may not have been in the form of a book so much as in the form of a codex, or a notebook (ὑπομνήματα)⁵. If this were the case, then Dodd's difficulty that the testimonia book might have been expected to have found its way into the NT would probably be removed⁶. But in any case, whether we accept the testimonia hypothesis or not, we have no way of knowing if it figured in early Christian worship.

1. C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 23ff.

2. Rendel Harris, Testimonies, I, II, Cambridge, 1916, 1920.

3. Cf. especially, J.A.Fitzmeyer, '4Q Testimonia and the NT', in Theological Studies, 18, 1957, 513-37.

4. C.H.B., I, 405.

5. C.H.B., I, 53f.

6. According to the Scriptures, 26.

Prayer

A study of the place of prayer within the worship of the early Christian church is bedevilled by an acute lack of information. There are many references to prayer in the NT, but few which bear directly on the question of prayer as an element in the worship of the congregation, and that is the aspect of prayer to which we shall restrict our enquiry.

Jesus left his disciples with a two-fold attitude to the Jewish practices of prayer¹: on the one hand he seems to have lived the life of a pious Jew in that he observed the Tephilla, the routine of prayer at morning, noon and evening; and on the other hand he appears to have gone beyond this set routine, - thus for example, the morning prayer could begin for Jesus $\pi\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\nu\nu\chi\alpha\ \lambda\iota\alpha\nu$ (Mk.1:35), 'in the early morning when it was still dark', and the evening prayer could be prolonged well into the night (Mk.6:46,48; cf. Lk.6:12). In addition, there was the Lord's Prayer, that distinctive mark of the disciples of Jesus², which was probably couched in the vernacular language, Aramaic, - as, it would seem, were all the prayers of Jesus (so Jeremias, Prayers, 77f.). As to the attitude of Jesus to the prayers of the synagogue worship, we have no evidence from the Gospels.

We see this two-fold attitude reflected in the practice of the early church. From the beginning, the early community is depicted as having its own distinctive life of prayer (cf. e.g., Ac.1:14,24; 2:42; 4:24, etc.), while there are also traces that the observance of the Jewish hours of prayer were continued (Ac.3:1). It is the former of these aspects that occupies our attention. We have already seen³ that Ac.2:42, which includes a reference to prayers, does not describe the content of the early worship service, but rather indicates various aspects of the life of the community. One need hardly doubt that included in 'the prayers' were those prayers which were said in a worship service, although this need not be held to have exhausted the meaning of the phrase. However this assumption is surprisingly difficult to prove from the book of Acts: there are no unequivocal references to prayer within the context of worship, and the closest we may approach to certainty is /

1. Cf. J. Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus, ET, London, 1967, 66ff.

2. So Jeremias, Prayers, 77, following Rengstorff.

3. Cf. the chapter on 'The Service', pp.19ff.

ty is by reasonable conjecture. There are five passages which might help and we shall examine each of them.

i) Ac.4:23. Peter and John, after their release, return to their friends and they unite in prayer. The most obvious way to take this passage is to assume that they returned to their friends⁴ and that a prayer was offered spontaneously in the light of their experience⁵. By writing ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦσαν φωνήν (singular), Luke merely wished to underline the unanimity of the group, rather than describe a union prayer⁶. If this understanding of the passage is correct, then it shows that the early Christians were ready to pray together as and when the occasion demanded it, but it says nothing about the worship service. Alternatively, if τοὺς ἰδίους refers to members of the congregation gathered together, (so Haenchen), the reference may be to an agape meeting, although it is not so described, from which Luke relates only the prayer as it was relevant in the context of the outbreak of persecution. This latter view, however, seems the less likely.

ii) Ac.6:4. The 'appointment' of the Seven is felt necessary so that the Apostles need not be distracted from their proper function which is described as τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διδασκίᾳ τοῦ λόγου προσκατεργάζεσθαι. By τῇ προσευχῇ Bruce⁷ thinks 'the regular worship of the church is what is meant', but this admits of no sure proof. Haenchen, on the other hand, thinks that the purpose of τῇ προσευχῇ is no /

4. This removes the difficulty felt by Haenchen (226) on τοὺς ἰδίους: 'the members of the congregation imagined as gathered together'. τοὺς ἰδίους need not refer to the whole congregation, but merely to the friends of Peter and John, - i.e., a small group within the congregation. ἰδίους, to be sure, could refer to their families (both Peter and John had brothers, and Peter at least was married, 1 Cor. 9:5), but this is less likely.

5. This need not contradict Haenchen's point (228) that: 'with the Isaiah(ch. 37) prayer as model Luke has cunningly recast in prayer form an early Christian exegesis of Psalm 2', only the prayer Luke here records would then not be the one used on the actual occasion.

6. If Haenchen has any basis for his remark (226): 'The forms of worship of Luke's own day must have acquainted him with prayers spoken aloud by the whole congregation', it is nevertheless beside the point.

7. F.F.Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, (Greek Text), London, 1951, 152.

no more than to depict the Apostles as great men of prayer (263)! As it stands, therefore, this passage is of little help.

iii) Ac.12:5. After his release from prison, Peter goes to the house of the mother of John Mark where a company are at prayer. That this was a special meeting of (at least part of) the congregation seems possible from the mention of the meeting place, - assuming that this house was a regular meeting place for the congregation⁸. In this case we would then have either a regular meeting (and that would be the obvious inference from 12:12 συνήθροισμὲν καὶ προσευχόμενοι) or at least a regular (agape?) meeting at which prayer for Peter was on this occasion a prominent feature. If the former alternative be preferred, we again have evidence for special prayer meetings but no word about prayer within the context of a full worship service.

iv) Ac.13:2,3. Here the divine commission to Saul and Barnabas is received after a period of worshipping and fasting by the prophets and teachers named in v.1⁹. Then, in a later scene, again after fasting and prayer, Saul and Barnabas are blessed for their work and they depart. Although this scene obviously relates a commission for missionary work, it is, especially in v.2, an indication that prayer was a part of worship.

v) Ac.20:36. Despite Haenchen and Delling¹⁰, both of whom assume that we may deduce a pattern of prayers after the sermon for early Christian worship from this passage, I am quite sure that the very ad hoc nature of the meeting as Luke describes it precludes any such inference: there is not even any indication that Luke is here depicting an act of worship, or that Paul's farewell speech may legitimately be described as a 'sermon'. I very much doubt if the passage is of any value in the context of the present discussion.

Thus a survey of the relevant passages in Acts shows that while the assumption which we today take for granted, that prayer has always been a part of Christian worship is a valid one, nevertheless it is nowhere stated that this was so: Ac.13:2,3 /

8. So Bruce, Acts, 246; but cf. Haenchen, 384, n.11.

9. This is the force of λειτουργούντων δ' αὐτῶν, but Haenchen is correct to say that 'the presence of the congregation is not mentioned but probably presupposed'. (Acts, 395).

10. Cf. 'The Service', p.23, n.14.

2,3 is as near as we can come. The reason for this is not far to seek. Luke, like us, took it for granted that prayer was an essential part of Christian worship and as he was not writing a treatise on worship the omission of concrete evidence on this point is fortuitous.

Turning to the Letters of the NT, abounding as they do in prayers and references to prayer, we find the same situation: actual evidence that prayer was a part of the worship of the congregation is scant. There are nevertheless, two passages which do supply the need.

i) 1 Cor.14. In this chapter which concentrates on glossolalia, with particular reference to its value in the congregation's worship, there are references to the fact that prayers in a strange tongue are of little value to the congregation at large (1 Cor.14:13-9). While Paul does not discount the value of glossolalia prayer for the individual, in private, he is at pains to stress the needs of the plain man (ὁ ἀνεπιληψίων τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδίου) to feel involved in the service (esp. v.16) and to respond ('Amen', v.16)¹¹ to the prayer. Prayer also has the function of upbuilding (οἰκοδομεῖν, v.17) and instructing (καταγγέλλειν, v.19) the congregation. Thus this passage provides the clearest evidence in the NT for prayer in the context of worship, and it would seem that, in Corinth at least, the individual member could and did, lead the congregation in prayer. (In 1 Cor.11:24, in the reference to Jesus' actions and words at the Last Supper, there is the mention of his blessing the bread, from which was to grow the Eucharistic Prayer of the later liturgies. The first recorded examples of this are not found until beyond the NT era¹². Thus while /

11. 1 Cor.14:16 provides evidence for the continuation by the church of the Jewish practice of responding to a prayer with the word Amen, 'so be it'. Cf. Dt.27:14-26; Ps.105:48; 2 Esd.15:13; 18:6. In Rev.1:7 Ἀμήν is translated by ναι 'yes', or 'so be it'. So too, Justin, Apol.I.65.4.

12. The frequently repeated assertion that the Didache contains the first recorded Eucharistic Prayer (cf. W.Barclay, The Lord's Supper, London, 1967, 107-8) is incorrect. M.Dibelius (cf. 'The Lord's Supper', p.102, n.73) has shown that the passage Did.9:1-10:5 preserves the prayers at the agape. The Eucharistic Prayer was at that time still 'free' - τοῖς δὲ προφῆταις ἐπιτρεπεται εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν. Only the introductory liturgy to the Eucharist is preserved by Did.10:6-7.

while the NT contains no reference to a Eucharistic Prayer, nevertheless it points the way to future developments in the tradition about Jesus' words and actions).

ii) 1 Tim. 2:1f. Leaving aside the question of the authorship of the Pastorals¹³, this passage does provide us with an insight into the types of prayer which were said at a worship service. That the reference here is to a worship service seems to me the likeliest interpretation of the verses. The chapter opens in a general vein and it is not until v.8 that we are able to decide that the matter under discussion is in fact corporate prayer and not private prayer. V.8 refers to the author's desire that prayer be said by the men-folk, and v.9 appears to change the subject and to turn to the matter of female dress, with no reference to worship at all. However this is not so: there is a close connection between v.8 and v.9 and this is made clear grammatically by ὡς καὶ τῶς, -therefore v.9 has to do with prayer also, - and again by v.11 with its reference to the need for women to keep silent, the author obviously being faced with problems similar to those in Corinth, cf. 1 Cor. 9:5ff; 14:33. Thus we may take it that 1 Tim. 2 deals with prayer in the context of worship; and even if it is not to be dated until after the death of Paul, 1 Tim. 2 still provides evidence for the practice of first century Christianity.

There are other passages in the NT relating to prayer, and we shall turn to them presently, but in my view we have examined all the NT evidence relating to the question of prayer within a worship context. Later evidence (e.g., Justin, Apol. I.67) provides more explicit evidence of the occurrence of prayer within worship, but the explicit nature of that evidence is explained by the context of that work (an apology, explaining Christianity to pagan readers), in the same way as the absence of such explicit statements is explained by the particular genre of the NT Letters.

Not everyone, however, would agree that that we have examined all the NT evidence relating to prayer. For example, the question (already alluded to in the possibility that Ac. 4:23 and 12:5 referred to prayer meetings) of whether there is evidence of meetings solely for prayer is answered positively by G. Delling and J. Jeremias¹⁴. Thus, for example, Jeremias has written -

'Vigils /

13. J.N.D. Kelly, (BNTC), opts for Pauline authorship, and dates the letters to before AD 66; while C.K. Barrett (NCB) denies that they are Pauline.

14. Delling, Worship in the NT, 110f.; Jeremias, Prayers, 79.

'Vigils, i.e., the extension of the evening prayer far into the night, even right through the night, are often held, as is shown by the passages in which Paul talks of his *ὑπνιά*, his vigils (2 Cor.6:5; 11:27).'¹⁵

This seems to me most unlikely, as the context of both passages makes it clear that Paul is talking about the hazards of his missionary work, not his spiritual exercises. This is the view of C. K. Barrett on both 2 Cor.6:5¹⁶ and 11:27¹⁷.

Delling for his part cites Col.4:2 (*ὑπνιάουσιν ἐν προσέυχῃ*) and Eph.6:18 (*ὑπνιάουσιν ἐν πνεύματι προσκαυχόμενοι καὶ δεόμενοι*) as proof of prayer-vigils at night.

However, in view of the frequency with which these words are used in a metaphorical sense¹⁸, one may well doubt Delling's unsupported assertion that Paul 'obviously does not mean that figuratively but in such a concrete direction for prayer-literally (sic!) : continue steadfastly in the exercise of prayer through the night.'

(Delling, loc. cit.). Similarly the expression 'night and day' which is used in exhortations to prayer (e.g., 1 Thess.3:10; 1 Tim.5:5; 2 Tim.1:3) is not to be understood literally: 'night and day is a cliché regularly associated with prayer ... it was conventional to speak of uninterrupted prayer.'¹⁹ This, it seems to me, also holds good for those occasions when Paul says he prayed 'continually', 'without ceasing' and 'always'; these are not, despite Jeremias, references to the regular hours of prayer as observed in Judaism. It is true that Did.8:3 does attest the repetition of the Lord's Prayer three times a day, in place of the Jewish hours of prayer, but we cannot say, without some proof, that this held good for areas other than the circles of Jewish Christianity out of which the Didache arose; and we have certainly no evidence that Paul or any of his churches were in the /

15. Jeremias, Prayers, 79.

16. 2 Corinthians, (BNTC), 186: 'the lack of sleep and food was due apparently to physical necessity, not to voluntarily undertaken spiritual discipline.'

17. 2 Corinthians, 300: the wakefulness in 11:27 was 'because sleep was impossible, not because it was deliberately shunned.'

18. Cf. BAG, s.vv., for examples. In neither case does BAG suggest the words be taken literally, 'keep awake'; rather the meaning is 'be alert'. For *ὑπνιάουσιν* cf. 1 Cor.16:13; and for *ὑπνιάων* cf. Heb.13:17 (where NEB has 'tireless in their concern' and thus preserves the metaphor exactly.)

19. So J.N.D.Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, (BNTC), 156.

the habit of observing Jewish prayer times (cf. Gal.4:10!).

As to types of prayer used in worship, there is little direct evidence. In Phil.4:6 προσευχή (prayer) and δέυσις (supplication, entreaty) are both qualified by μετὰ ἑὐχαριστίας (with thanksgiving) and the distinction between προσευχή and δέυσις seems small. Similarly in 1 Tim.2:1 four types of prayer are listed: δέυσις, προσευχή, ἐντεύξις (petition), and ἑὐχαριστία, and again it is not easy to differentiate between these terms²⁰. However it is at least clear that the prayers of the church included petition (intercession) and thanksgiving, and this is especially supported by an examination of the prayers which have been preserved in the NT Letters, which, even if they were originally private prayers, may nevertheless be presumed to have had their counterparts in the prayers used in worship. Thus thanksgiving, perhaps the dominant note of all NT prayer, while well attested in the prayers of Paul and especially his prayers for the churches²¹, is also mentioned as a part of the worship of the church, e.g., at 2 Cor.9:12. From the phrase μετὰ ἑὐχαριστίας of Phil.4:6 we see that thanksgiving was to be a prominent note in all prayer: it is based on and springs from, the realisation of what God has done in Christ (cf. Ro.5:11; Col.2:7 after 2:6; 2 Cor.4:15). In several places the form of the thanksgiving is shaped by the Jewish benediction-type prayer, 'Blessed be ...'. This usage (in LXX εὐλογεῖς translates the Hebrew baruk) with εὐλογητός in the NT is thoroughly Jewish and was a frequent item of Jewish prayers and can easily be seen in the Shemoneh 'Esreh, the Eighteen Benedictions. Of examples in the NT, 2 Cor.1:3ff; Eph.1:3ff.; 1 Pet.1:3ff. are typical, - the blessing has been reworked thoroughly with Christian concepts even though an occasional Jewish theme may be retained (cf. 2 Cor.1:3, the all-merciful Father).

Intercession or petition is also well attested and while in the majority of cases Paul is asking for prayer on behalf of his work (e.g., 1 Thess.5:25; 2 Thess.3:1; Col.4:3, cf. Heb.13:18 for a non-Pauline example), nevertheless it was wider than that: in 2 Cor.1:11 Paul knows that many people are praying for his deliverance /

20. Kelly, BNTC, 60: 'his object is to insist on the centrality of prayer, rather than to provide a systematic analysis of its types'. But I doubt if Kelly is correct to find a reference to the Lord's Supper in ἑὐχαριστία here.

21. 1 Cor.1:4-5; 2 Cor.1:3-4; Eph.1:3, etc. Thanksgiving was not confined, however, to Paul's churches, thus Ro.1:8-9; Col.1:3-4; and it could also be made for individuals, as at Philem.4-6.

ance (cf. Phil.1:19; Ro.15:31), and in 1 Tim.2:1f. the objects of prayer are as wide as possible: ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων... κτλ. Now while these passages could refer to private intercession, yet the fact that they are included in letters to churches, letters which, as we have seen²² may well have been read at the congregation's worship, points to a close connection with the public prayers of the church at worship. Obviously Paul's petition for healing (2 Cor.12:8) belongs to private prayer, but Jas.5:13-8 shows us public intercession, although here we cannot be sure if the context was one of worship.

The question of confession of sin in prayer is scarcely treated in the NT. Now this silence could merely be a reflection of the general paucity of references to prayer in the NT, - it need not necessarily imply that confession had no place in the worship. This seems to be the view of Cullmann, for example, for he deduces from the confession of sin in Did.14:1 that 'there was also a confession of sin, even in early times'²³ in the worship. Delling, however, rejects this: 'the NT shows no traces of a special confession of sin by the congregation'²⁴, and he explains this by reference to the nature of the early church's existence, - 'it has not yet settled down in the world and still lives quite strongly by the power of the once-for-all act of forgiveness which each member experienced in the one conversion.' (Worship, 125). By an appeal to Phil.3:20; Ro.5:10; Eph.2:16; Heb.2:17, etc. Delling is able to characterise the church thus: 'It is, of course, not a congregation of the perfect, but it is a company of the reconciled.' We can gain a clear picture of Paul's view of the awareness of sin in the church of his day by recourse to his classic treatment of the subject in Ro.6, a passage which we shall have to examine again in relation to baptism²⁵. In this passage Paul argues that in baptism we died and were buried with Christ, so that as he died to sin, so too Christians ought to regard themselves as dead to sin: 'In the same way you must regard yourselves as dead to sin and alive to God in union with Jesus Christ' (v.11). But lest this be construed to mean that Christians were ex opere operato sinless, Paul /

22. Cf. the chapter 'The Scriptures' p.54 and also 'The Lord's Supper', p.101, n.71.

23. O.Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, 23.

24. G.Delling, Worship in the NT, 125.

25. Cf. the Chapter on 'Baptism', pp.152ff.

Paul continues (vv.12-4): 'So sin must no longer reign (μη... βασιλευτω, imperative) in your mortal body, exacting obedience to the body's desires ... for sin shall no longer be your master (οὐ κατισωται, future tense).' Thus the life of a Christian is that of a man who has died to sin and who is ever striving to make this effective in his experience; and it is this which Paul emphasises. Notwithstanding, Paul knew that sin could, and on occasion did, invade the church. This may most clearly be seen for our purposes from 1 Cor.5 where a Christian who had fallen into sin (and who was persisting in that state, cf. ἐξου, v.1 - present tense), is to be excluded from the community. The man's continuing in sin is probably the reason why exclusion from the congregation is necessary, and why no question of confession of sin arises. There is, however, much in this passage which we cannot understand today, and we would not be wise to use it as an argument in our present enquiry.

The question still remains therefore, Does the NT contain no reference to the forgiveness of sins within a worship context? 1 John does deal with the question of forgiveness for Christians who sin (2:1-2) within the author's debate with the heretics who claim to be above sin²⁶. There is nothing, though, to connect this passage with worship, so even though 1 Jn.2:1-2 does provide a principle which holds good for all prayer, public or private, it nevertheless falls short of proof that confession of sin had a place in worship. There is also a reference to the confession of sin to one another in Jas.5:16, and in a context of prayer (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν). If the possibility is denied that this confession took place within the worship service²⁷, then the very least that can be said is that the confession here takes place in a corporate setting, perhaps even a meeting at which the elders of the congregation were present (cf. v.15). This passage may well be a pointer to the development which brought prayers of confession within the worship service.

There is, however, one prayer in the NT in which confession of sin is implicit: the Lord's Prayer (Mt.6:12, cf. Lk.11:4). This is, I think, the one indisputable piece of evidence that the church did pray for forgiveness in worship. It is true that nowhere in the NT do we find it stated that the Lord's Prayer was used in worship /

26. Cf. Neil Alexander, The Epistles of John, London, 1962, 48-55.

27. So, e.g., Delling, Worship, 125,n.2: 'There is clearly no question of an act of worship'.

worship, but Jeremias' work on the Lord's Prayer²⁸ helps us to infer that this was so. Jeremias has established from the pericopae that surround the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke that both evangelists are transmitting the catechetical instruction on prayer as used in their local churches; Matthew's was directed to Jewish Christians, and Luke's to Gentile Christians²⁹, - and both of these communities used the Lord's Prayer in instruction. Further, the problem of the differing forms of the Prayer³⁰, and the differing lengths of the versions, can be attributed not to caprice on the part of the evangelists, but rather to the communities whose version is being preserved in each case: thus, to take the most obvious example, in place of the simple (and probably original) 'Father' in Luke, Matthew has preserved the form coloured by Jewish Christian piety 'Our Father in Heaven'. Jeremias sums up thus:

'we have before us the wording from the prayer from two churches, that is, the different liturgical wordings of the Lord's Prayer. Each of the evangelists transmits to us the wording of the Lord's Prayer as it was prayed in his church at that time.'³¹

This can clearly be seen in the doxology which is appended to the prayer in some MSS of Matthew, and although the earliest date for the doxology in the gospel is not until the fifth century, the appearance of the same doxology in the Didache (also from a Jewish Christian provenance) attests the early use of the doxology (dating even into the first century, probably). This fact, so clearly worked out by Jeremias seems to me to offer clear proof that the Lord's Prayer was used in worship, in some communities at least, even though there is no direct statement to this effect /

28. 'The Lord's Prayer in the light of Recent Research', in The Prayers of Jesus, . 82ff.

29. Jeremias, Prayers, 88-9; cf. the quotation cited in the chapter on 'Preaching', p.45.

30. Cf. Jeremias, Prayers, 89-93.

31. Jeremias, Prayers, 89.

effect in the NT³². Thus one of the elements of Christian prayer in worship, even in early times was the confession of sin and the petition for forgiveness. Beyond the NT, in conditions more conducive to the production of references to liturgical material, namely manuals of church life, we find definite references to confession of sin in worship (cf. Did.14:1; 1 Clement.60:1ff.).

The Christian character of the prayers of the community, and this holds good whether they are corporate or private prayers, is underlined by the fact that the prayers are made through Jesus Christ: Ro.1:8; 7:25; Col.3:17. This is explained by the statement of 2 Cor.1:20 - 'He is the Yes pronounced on God's promises, every one of them. That is why when we give glory to God it is through Jesus Christ that we say "Amen".' Thus the work of Christ is the presupposition, not to say the precondition, of the approach to God (cf. 1 Cor.1:4ff.). That is why God is referred to as 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (2 Cor.1:3, etc.). Prayers were also offered 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ' (Eph.5:20, cf. Jn.14:13,4, etc.).

The question now arises, Did the early church ever pray to Jesus? According to 2 Cor.12:8 Paul did, - τρις τον κυριον παρεκαλεσα (να δ'προσθη απ' εμου (σκολος)). In this passage κυριος is universally understood as a reference to Christ. Similarly in 1 Thess.3:12 the context (explicit reference to Jesus in vv.11, 13) makes it clear that κυριος is Jesus, cf. 2 Thess.3:5,16. The prayers in the Thessalonian letters /

32. Cullmann, Worship, 13, thinks that 'the fact that in Gal.4:6 and Ro.8:15 all prayers are designated as "saying Abba" seems to connect with the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer,' This may be so, but two facts tell against it: (i). The context of Gal.4:6 is less that of prayer than of the assurance brought by God's Spirit in the heart (cf. BAG, s.v. κραλω, 2b). (ii). This view would require the repetition of the Prayer in Aramaic, even in Hellenistic Christianity, which we know was not the case; cf. Jeremias, Prayers, 93: 'Comparison of the wording of the two forms of the Lord's Prayer therefore shows that, over against Matthew, the Lucan form has been assimilated at several points to Greek linguistic usage.' Jesus called God 'Abba' in all prayers except Mk.15:34, not just the Lord's Prayer, and the references in Galatians and Romans are therefore to the wider idea of Jesus' view of the Father-(abba) - hood of God, which it becomes the Christians' privilege to share.

letters were for the welfare of that church. A prayer to Jesus is also recorded at Ac.7:59f., at the death of Stephen - 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit'³³. These passages have led some commentators to the view that only private prayers were offered to Jesus in the NT period. However, the Maranatha of 1 Cor.16:22, which, as we shall see³⁴, is to be understood as a prayer 'Come Lord Jesus' spoken immediately before the Eucharist, shows that prayer to Jesus did occur in worship. This is a case where the scarcity of evidence for a practice of prayer in the NT should not be taken necessarily to mean the absence of the practice itself.

It is in connection with prayer to Jesus that the phrase 'to call upon the name of the Lord' falls to be considered. Despite Delling³⁵, I am sure that the phrase does point to some form of prayer to Jesus. Certainly Ac.22:16 might refer only to the naming of the name of Jesus at baptism, as Delling maintains, but the phrase also occurs at Ac.2:21, citing Joel 2:32 (LXX 3:5), without any baptismal context, and again at Ro.10:13. It would seem that Joel 2:32 ought to determine the meaning of the phrase, at least in these cases. Thus the basic meaning would be the idea of invoking aid, and hence prayer. Barrett³⁶ is of the opinion that 'To call upon the name of the Lord is to put one's trust in him and to address him in prayer and worship', and he cites Manson's suggestion that ἐν παντι τοπω (1 Cor.1:2) contains an allusion to places of worship, thus giving ἐπικαλεσθαι το ὄνομα κυρίου a context of worship. The liturgical context was certainly present at times, - cf. 1 Clem.64 where the phrase is expanded (an example of liturgical heightening?) to become ἐπικαλεσθαι το μεγαλοπρεπες και ἄγιον ὄνομα αὐτου .³⁷ Nevertheless, 'those who invoke the name of the Lord' seems to have a formula-like ring about it in Ac.9:14,21; 22:16; 2 Tim.2:22, - the meaning in those cases being little removed from the later 'Christian'. It is difficult to come to a hard and fast /

33. Haenchen (296) finds in this prayer 'a specifically Christian devotion which is already so centred on Jesus that it is his name that is invoked in the hour of death.'

34. Cf. the chapter on 'The Lord's Supper', pp.105f.

35. Worship in the NT, 118.

36. 1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 33.

37. In 1 Clem.64 however, the αὐτου refers to God, the subject of the sentence, even though Χριστου stands closer to αὐτου in the sentence. το ὄνομα κυριου, which Joel used of God, became used of Christ (the church's κυριος), as frequently happened in OT citations.

fast ruling on the phrase, in fact: we can as little say that it never refers to prayer as we can say that it refers only to prayer.

We know from the scarcity of the evidence not to expect any systematic treatment of the topic of prayer in the NT: thus in the matter of attitudes for praying we find references to standing to pray with hands outstretched (1 Tim.2:8, and later Justin, Apol.I.67.1), - a very common attitude for prayer in the ancient world in pagan, Jewish and Christian circles. The position of kneeling is also attested (Ac.7:60?; cf.9:40; 20:36; 21:5). While Jesus and his disciples did not fast, (Mt.9:14; Mk.2:18; Lk.5:33) - although this was a mark of piety in Judaism - the practice seems to have carried over into Christianity in areas with a strong Jewish influence. Thus we find references to fasting in the Didache, (e.g., before baptism 7:4), while the voluntary Jewish fasts on a Monday and Thursday were changed for Christians to Tuesday and Friday (8:1), in supposed obedience to Jesus' command not to fast like the hypocrites! (cf. Mt.6:16). To what extent the practice was regular alongside Christian worship we cannot tell; it is attested only at Ac.13:2; 14:23, and the inferior reading at 1 Cor.7:5. The Shepherd of Hermas devotes a great deal of attention to fasting.

In conclusion, one would only wish to repeat the point that it is the ad hoc nature of the NT letters which has produced the fragmentary and sparse evidence on corporate prayer in the NT. The letters attest frequent and earnest exhortations to continue in prayer, and even if these references are to private prayer, we need scarcely doubt that so high an evaluation of prayer would also be reflected in the worship of the congregation. The silence of the NT on many points in this connection is not decisive.

The rendering of praise to God by hymns and psalms had long been a feature of the worship of Judaism, both in the Jerusalem Temple and in the synagogue¹, and also in the family circle at the celebration of festivals. Thus Jesus and his disciples sang the Hallel (Ps.114-8) at their Passover celebration prior to Jesus' death² (cf. Mt.26:30, par.). The early church also engaged in praise privately (Ac.16:25³ and Jas.5:13), as well as corporately.

We can infer very little about the hymnic practices of the early church, however. We have already discounted Jeremias' suggestion⁴ that Ac.2:46-7 contains a description of the sequence of early Christian worship, ending with psalms and prayers, but there are other references to praise in the service of worship in the NT. Thus Paul exhorts the use of 'psalms, hymns and spiritual songs' in worship⁵ in two passages (Eph.5:19; Col.3:16), adding that these result from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (Eph.5:18). But this bald statement does not take us very far. We can gain more information from the reference to hymns in 1 Cor.14. From that passage it is clear that hymns could be part of the glossolalia in the worship, but not /

-
1. W.O.E.Oesterley, The Psalms in Jewish Worship, Oxford, 1910, 129ff., also his The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford, 1925, 73: 'The liturgical use of the Psalms in the Jewish church in pre-Christian times is too well known to need many words.' Also, S.Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I,II, ET, London, 1962; J.A.Lamb, The Psalms in Christian Worship, London, 1962, esp. ch.1.
 2. Cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 255ff: the Hallel was sung antiphonally.
 3. We cannot discover the content of these praises: they could have been OT Psalms, Christian hymns, or both.
 4. Cf. chapter on 'The Service', pp.19ff., and notes there.
 5. That corporate worship and not private devotion is here intended is to be inferred from λαλουντες εαυτους, Eph.5:19 (antiphonal singing?) and διδασκαυτες και ψαλμωδουντες εαυτους, (Col.3:16). As to terminology it is impossible to find any differentiation between ὕμνος, ψαλμὸν and ᾠδή; so Macdonald, Worship, 121, Delling, Worship, 86, J.T.Sanders, The NT Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1964, 4 and C.F.D.Moule, Birth of the NT, 26.

not necessarily so: they could be the product of a man's mind (v.15b $\psi\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \psi\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \nu\omega\iota$). It is also evident that, at least in Corinth, the singing of a hymn was a contribution which an individual member of the congregation could offer (v.26 $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \psi\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$). Thus it would appear that an individual could introduce a hymn of his own into the service⁶; this is the earliest reference to a specifically Christian hymn.

In these three passages we have the sum of all the NT evidence on hymns, - apart from actual fragments of hymns (to which we shall return shortly) - and the use of hymns in the early worship. It is true that Revelation contains more references to hymns being sung than anywhere in the NT, but as we have already noted⁷ that book may be excluded from our investigation of NT worship, since the worship it describes is the seer's vision of heavenly worship: it therefore furnishes us with no details of early Christian worship⁸.

When we go beyond the limits of the NT, we again find very little evidence, beyond the bare indications that hymns were sung in worship. Ignatius appeals for unity and harmony between people and bishop: they are to be in the same harmony ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\rho\mu\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$) with the bishop $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \chi\omicron\rho\delta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\iota\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$, the reason being $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\alpha\iota\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\mu\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omega\nu\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \Upsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ (Eph.4:2), and while this is obviously a metaphorical usage, the choice of metaphor suggests that the church was familiar with hymns, and hymns to Christ at that. However Eph.4:2 and Ro.2:2 mention the Christians $\chi\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\eta\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\ \Upsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$, so Ignatius also knew of hymns to God. In pagan literature there is the reference in Pliny's letter to Trajan that at the early Sunday morning service the Christians sang to Christ: carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem (Pliny, Epp.X.96.7), and despite the various attempts to the contrary⁹, I can see no other possible meaning than that /

6. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 327, remarks on $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\nu$: 'a fresh, perhaps spontaneous composition, not an OT psalm, is intended.'

7. Cf. chapter on 'The Day, etc.' p9f., and nn.20ff.

8. So E.Stauffer, NT Theology, ET, London, 1956, 202.

9. For discussion, cf. R.P.Martin, Carmen Christi, Phil.2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation, Cambridge, 1967, 3ff.

that Pliny understood the Christians to say that they sang a hymn to Christ¹⁰.

Thus the available evidence shows that the practice of hymn singing was carried on in the church from very early times. 1 Cor.14 is our earliest evidence, but it is unnecessary to suppose other than that the hymns were in use from earliest times: the close connection with the worship of the synagogue both in the primitive community itself and in the subsequent Gentile mission of the church makes this inference a safe one. As to how the hymns were rendered in the service, we cannot be sure beyond what 1 Cor.14 says. A hymn was an individual's contribution, and while some think that this may mean no more than that a member learned a psalm, or a Christian hymn, and came to the worship ready to contribute it¹¹, it would seem less tortuous, in view of the strong charismatic influence at Corinth, to view the hymn as a Spirit-inspired utterance which was recited as the Spirit moved an individual. But this does not tell us whether the hymn was a solo item rendered by the individual in question, or whether the congregation was able to join in the singing, - which, of course, would be impossible if the hymns were inspired on the spot. Nor, as we have said before, are conditions at Corinth necessarily to be taken as normative for other congregations. But it is certainly clear that by the turn of the century (Ignatius, Pliny), the congregation did join in and sing. This suggests some non-spontaneous singing, and points to the existence of some hymns which were generally known by the members of the congregation.

The word 'singing', however, may not be accurate. Our knowledge of musical practice in the ancient world is far from precise, and there is much we do not know¹². In general terms we may note, especially in the NT, a certain lack of precision in the use of musical terms, as we have already seen in the use of ὕμνος ψαλμός and ᾠδή. Similarly, in Eph.5:19, λαλέω¹³ is used with ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις κατὰ and in Col.3:16 ᾄδεν is qualified by διδάσκον and νοθεύειν. From the OT musical practices /

10. So too, Martin, Carmen Christi, 8f.

11. Cf. Lamb, The Psalms in Christian Worship, 18.

12. Cf. W.S.Smith, Musical Aspects of the NT, Leiden, 1962, 8ff., 42ff.

13. According to BAG (s.v. λαλέω) the basic meaning is 'give forth sounds', 'utter', from which 'speak' is a derivative meaning.

practices, we know that the music used for singing the Psalms was not of a very high order. Lamb¹⁴ points out that rhythm was the predominant aspect, and that what melody there was would be contained within a short compass. While the liturgy of the Temple encouraged the use of a choir in worship¹⁵, and the synagogue probably had its own cantor or precentor¹⁶, there is no indication of any counterpart in Christian worship until beyond the NT era. In Ignatius there are two references to the congregation acting as a choir (Ign. Eph.4:2; Ro.2:2), but this is in no sense equivalent to the choirs which attended the pagan cultic festivals.

As to musical instruments, again there is nothing in the NT which would enable us with precision to point to the use of instruments in accompaniment, unlike the OT¹⁷. Of the references to music in the NT, such as they are, the reference is either to secular music¹⁸ (cf. e.g., Lk.15:25), or music is used as the tertium comparationis, either by Jesus (Mt.11:16-7) or by Paul (1 Cor.14:7-8) and these references have no more significance than any other metaphor in the NT, such as Paul's reference to athletics, say, in Phil.3:14. Not even words like ψάλλειν can offer any help: it originally meant 'pull', 'pluck' (so LSJ), and it then developed the meaning 'sing (to the accompaniment of a harp)' (so BAG), and while the use of the harp may be in the background at Ro.15:9 (citing Ps.18:49) there is no indication of a harp at either 1 Cor.14:15 or Eph.5:19 (in the latter case, indeed, it is used in apposition to λυλουντες and ψαλουντες). Thus while Moule's conjecture may not be impossible, - 'one never knows whether a harpist or a zither-player (κιθαριστης) might not smuggle his instrument into the secret place of assembly'¹⁹, - it is less than likely, and certainly has no evidence to support it. The question therefore of the use of musical instruments in NT worship cannot be decided; it is not until the middle of the second century that references to musical accompaniment²⁰ begin /

14. Lamb, The Psalms in Christian Worship, 7.

15. Smith, Musical Aspects of the NT, 15ff.

16. Cf. Oesterley, Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, 75.

17. Cf. Lamb, The Psalms, 7 for a list of instruments mentioned in the Psalms; (e.g. Ps.150:3-5 lists trumpet, psaltery, harp, timbrel, stringed instruments. Dancing was also possible, cf. Ps.149:3,;150:4.

18. For full discussion, cf. Smith, Musical Aspects, 95ff.

19. Birth of the NT, 27.

20. So Smith, Musical Aspects, 53.

begin to appear.

The question of the hymnic material which was sung next falls to be considered. In view of the use of the Psalter in Temple and synagogue, it would seem reasonable to look for the use of the OT Psalms in Christian worship. Direct evidence on this point, however, is lacking. At the most, one may say that the frequency of allusion to the Psalms by NT authors may be a pointer in this direction²¹. Lamb²² thinks that 'it would be most surprising if the Christians for a time rejected the Psalter from worship.' But, even granting the use of the Psalms, there is evidence that this was not sufficient, and that the Christian community, even in early times, produced its own hymns for use at worship. Some were undoubtedly of the spontaneous nature which 1 Cor.14:26 attests, and were presumably short lived. However, there are traces that even within the NT itself some hymns had gained sufficiently wide currency to be quoted in the NT letters. The criteria for identifying these hymns are somewhat haphazard, and various passages are categorised as hymns for differing reasons, but among the general marks of identification we may mention the following. Sometimes there is an introductory formula, as at Eph.5:14 (ὁ δὲ λέγει which never introduces a Scriptural quotation), or at 1 Tim.3:16 (καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τοῦ τοῦ ὁσέβειας μυστηρίου)²³. Often there is a distinct rhythm to the passage, with marked parallelisms (cf. 1 Tim.3:16, where there is strong chiasmus), or differences in language from the author's normal usage (this has been stressed in particular for Phil.2:5-11), and these factors are held to point to the presence of a hymn. Often the clue is to be found in the exalted tone of a passage (e.g., Heb.1:1-3; Jn.1:1-18), or the fact that the verses in question are not strictly relevant to their context (thus, e.g., Phil.2:5-11 only partly coincides with the appeal to humility of 2:1-4)²⁴. Now in some cases the arguments for categorisation of /

21. Smith, Aspects, 66: the Psalms, interpreted Christologically, are alluded to by NT writers more frequently than any other part of the OT.

22. Lamb, The Psalms, 21.

23. Kelly, (BNTC), 89, thinks this may be modelled upon the 'regular cult acclamation at Ephesus in the first century' as used in the Diana cult, and attested in inscriptions. Cf. Ac.19:28,34.

24. Cf. Martin, Carmen Christi, 287.

of a passage as a hymn have been thought tenuous, and there are not lacking scholars who will deny that some passages are hymns at all. Thus while R. P. Martin describes Phil.2:5-11 as 'perhaps the most illustrious example of the NT Christological hymns'²⁵, C. F. D. Moule doubts if it is to be regarded as a hymn at all!²⁶ Even among scholars who agree on understanding a passage as a hymn, differences remain, for example, on the question of structure. Thus on Phil.2:5-11 the pioneering work of Lohmeyer²⁷ divided the hymn into six stanzas each of three lines, but this has been challenged by Jeremias and Dibelius²⁸, and no solution has emerged.

Of the commonly accepted hymns in the NT, we may note that they may be classified, broadly into types or 'families'²⁹. The most numerous group may be defined as the Christological hymns, and they have received some attention³⁰. Into this classification Sanders places Phil.2:5-11; Col.1:15-20; Eph.2:14-6; 1 Tim.3:16; 1 Pet. 3:18-22; Heb.1:3, and the Prologue to John. An examination of them reveals wide contemporary influence on the thought forms and the expression of the ideas, and it is clear that in these hymns the Christian message is being adapted to a Hellenistic background. The investigation of this area, - a huge task- is beyond the scope of this work, and perhaps a quotation from Martin, though pertaining to Phil.2 in the first instance, will illustrate the complexity of the problem as a whole.

'It /

25. Martin, Carmen Christi, 294f.

26. Birth of the NT, 25f.; Worship in the NT, 69,n.4 and references there. Moule also doubts Col.1:15-20 (cf. his Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, Cambridge, 1957, 60-3), and 1 Pet.1:3ff.

27. E.Lohmeyer, Kurios Jesus, Eine Untersuchung zu Phil.2:5-11, (1961).

28. J.Jeremias in Studia Paulina, (in honorem J. de Zwann), 1953, 146ff.; M.Dibelius An der Thessalonicher I,II, An die Philipper, (Handbuch zum NT), Tubigen, 1937, ad. loc.

29. Cf. Martin, Carmen Christi, 19, for classification.

30. Most recently, J.N.Sanders, The NT Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1971; cf. R.H.Fuller, Christology of the NT, Fontana Edn., 1969, 204ff. On Phil.2:5-11, R.P.Martin, Carmen Christi, listed above.

'It is not surprising that scholars have been able to detect a bewildering array of categories, so that the verses of this short tribute appear like a Christological miscellany with many contributions: a Son of Man dogmatic; oriental or Greek mythology (Lucifer? the Titans? Herakles?); the first-second Adan speculation of Jewish thought; Hellenistic-Jewish concepts of Wisdom; the Servant of Yahweh concept; a 'Paidology'; an Emperor motif; a divine hero, *Θεός ὢν*, Christology; an enthronement ritual of an oriental monarch; an Iranian or Gnostic redemption myth; all these categories have been suggested with varying degrees of plausibility ... and it is possible that many factors have influenced the poet's thinking.' (Carmen Christi, 297). Further classifications of the hymns have been suggested, as well as the Christological one: e.g., a sacramental context has been posited for Eph.5:14; Tit.3:4-7, et al. Martin assigns to 'meditative' hymns (but were they sung in worship?) the following: Eph.1:3-14; Ro.8:31-9; 1 Cor.13, and to confessional hymns these: 1 Tim. 6:11-6; 2 Tim.2:11-3. No doubt various other groups are possible, and Martin himself accepts that hymns may shade into more than one category. However for our present purpose the point is made that the early church soon developed its own hymns, in their own concepts, for use in the congregation's worship.

The question of authorship in every case is unresolved. In the majority of cases it is assumed that the author of the letter cites a hymn of which he was not himself the author³¹. More than that, however, is speculation, and while attempts are made, - e.g., Stephen is 'a candidate for the authorship' of Phil.2:5-11, according to Martin³² - but on questions such as this, there is no possibility of proof. We know the early Christian church was a richer and more varied phenomenon than even the variety evinced by the NT reveals, and in this area there are few guidelines.

Returning to the role of these hymns in worship, we repeat that while we know nothing about musical performance, the NT hymns do point to a specifically Christian aspect of praise in the church, and presumably these hymns soon gained a wider currency by virtue of their inclusion in the NT letters. On questions of method and frequency of performance, we are as much in the dark, as over the question of authorship.

31. Perhaps 1 Cor.13 is an exception, cf. BNTC, 298ff.

32. Martin, Carmen Christi, 304, cf. 315ff.

The Lord's Supper.

The problems related to this subject are many and vast, and the associated literature still increases. To attempt to treat the subject within an exercise such as this one, is inevitably to risk over-simplification and, in a sense, distortion, while one may seem to take decisions in an arbitrary fashion. There is, however, no other way. In particular, one must stand, gratefully, under the shadow of Joachim Jeremias' monumental work, "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus"¹, a book which has become a sine qua non for discussion of the subject.

A. Jesus.

The earliest reference to the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor.11, points backwards: 'The Lord Jesus, on the night of his arrest ...'. Thus we are taken for our understanding of the rite in the Early Church, back to Jesus and his last meal with his disciples. We are faced with the question of whether we are able to gather from the evidence any insight into Jesus' thinking: what did he intend for his disciples from the meal? Did he intend the events of that meal to be repeated, and if so, why? These are the questions, I think which are basic to our understanding of the place of the Lord's Supper within the Early Church.

So we begin with Jesus. The balance of probability is that the last meal was a Passover meal². It stood at the end of a long series of meals shared between Jesus and his disciples in which Jesus had offered table fellowship to a wide variety of people in a significant way.

'For the oriental every table fellowship is a guarantee of peace, of trust, of brotherhood. Table fellowship is a fellowship of life. Table fellowship with Jesus is more. This becomes especially evident in that table fellowship which Jesus celebrated with sinners and outcasts. The oriental ... would immediately understand the acceptance of outcasts into table fellowship with Jesus as an offer of salvation to guilty sinners and as the assurance of forgiveness /

1. Quoted from ET (second edition), London, 1966. Hereafter cited as 'EW'.

2. It is impossible to argue the case here; cf. EW 15-88 for full discussion.

forgiveness (Lk.15:2 ; Mk.2:15-17 ; cf. Mt.11:19).³

After the Caesarea Philippi confession of Jesus as the Messiah, a new dimension was opened up:

'After Peter's confession every act of eating and drinking with the master is table fellowship of the redeemed community with the redeemer, a wedding feast, a pledge of a share in the meal of the consummation.'⁴

Thus the Last Supper saw 'the Messiah serving at the Messiah's meal' (EW 205).

This emphasis is important as a contribution towards our understanding of the early practice of the Lord's Supper, in that it fills in part of the background to the meal, and means that we must include this element of table fellowship along with the Passover context, as background against which the meal must be viewed.

Jeremias' statement (EW 137) that 'the eucharistic words of Jesus are available to us exclusively in the form of liturgical texts', is not to be taken as an admission that what happened on that night is inaccessible to us. Indeed, one of the benefits derived from Jeremias' work, is that we are able to strip off the accretions of liturgical usages and so recover a common core of basic material which provides in essentials a reliable report of what took place at that meal.⁵

Our earliest text from the literary standpoint is 1 Cor.11, which we may date to the spring of AD 54 (or 55), but which, on Paul's own admission (1 Cor.11:23) is earlier than that date.⁶ And while Jeremias is correct to see in the numerous Semitisms /

3. EW 204.

4. EW 205.

5. Cf. EW 203; 'We have every reason to conclude that the common core of the tradition of the account of the Lord's Supper - what Jesus said at the Last Supper - is preserved to us in an essentially reliable form.'

6. On 1 Cor.11:23, Jeremias (EW 101) thinks that it 'says nothing other than that the chain of tradition goes back unbroken to Jesus himself.' But Bornkamm would go further: 'The tradition not only passes on the Lord's word from the past - naturally it does that; but as this tradition it is his word. He himself meets us in this word and only this gives to the tradition its quality of revelation'. In Early Christian Experience, ET London, 1969, 131. Hereafter cited 'Experience'.

Semitisms in Mark as proof of an early translation from Hebrew or Aramaic, Bornkamm⁷ is right to stress that there are early elements in Paul's account also, - especially the phrase 'after supper' (1 Cor.11:25). Thus we may not simply assume that Paul's version is a liturgically reworked form of the Markan account. On examination, we find close parallels between Luke's account and Paul's, and also between Mark's and Matthew's, so that basically we have two broad traditions of what Jesus said and did on that occasion. These two traditions, when compared, are found to exhibit some differences in detail, but yet to reflect a basic underlying unity⁸. Thus summarising Jeremias (EW 108ff.), we may insert into the actions which Jesus, as host at the Passover meal, would have performed, distinctive words at the rite surrounding the grace at table before the meal, and the thanksgiving after the meal. These words represent, for us, 'the oldest form of the tradition of the words of interpretation attainable by a comparison of the texts.' (EW 173). These words are: (1). (Take) this is my body. (2). This is my blood of the covenant, or the covenant in my blood. (3). Which ... for many. (Jeremias, EW 173). Into this basic structure the various texts have woven various additions in the light of liturgical practice. Thus we are brought back as closely as is now possible to the actual words used in the Last Supper. This is of great value in enabling us to see what Jesus intended in the Lord's Supper. We may conveniently divide consideration of this topic into two sections: (i) what did Jesus intend to convey by his words and actions at table? and (ii) what did Jesus intend for the future? (i.e., the command to repeat).

(i) The meaning of the Last Supper as interpreted by Jesus.

It is, of course, true that Jesus said much more at table than has been preserved for us⁹. For example, his Passover meditation, which may be presumed to have had significance for his understanding of the meaning of the meal, was not preserved. Jeremias conjectures that in view of the theme of sacrifice implied by the bread and wine /

7. Bornkamm, Experience, 134ff. Cf. C.K.Barrett, 1 Corinthians, (BNTC) 268.

8. Cf. Experience, 135: 'The agreement of the two texts is extensive. Their very early date is undoubted, and probably their home is in the Palestinian - Syrian area of the church.' Cf. EW 186-7, esp. 187 n.1.

9. So EW 224.

wine sayings, he may well have used the Passover lamb as an illustration of the sacrifice he was about to make¹⁰. Bornkamm¹¹, however, examined the significance of the Passover motif in the traditions, and concluded that all that we are entitled to infer from them is 'the fact, challenged by no one, that the synoptic writers have placed the Last Supper within the framework of a Passover meal.' He notes that Paul knew the tradition which described Jesus as a Passover lamb (1 Cor.5:7), yet does not refer the Last Supper in that context. He concludes that -

'The result is therefore clear. Wherever the Passover lamb is referred to, nowhere is the Lord's Supper referred to and vice versa ... The result of this consideration is that the accounts of the institution do not receive their meaning from the Passover at all, nor are they to be interpreted in the light of the Passover.'¹²

Paul in fact does refer to the Passover, though indirectly, in 1 Cor.10:16,17; 'the cup which we bless ... the bread which we break' - this is known to us as a formula from the Passover kiddush¹³, but that is not the same as equating Jesus with the Passover lamb. Indeed, if Jeremias' conjecture were correct, we would surely have expected a far greater emphasis on the theme, than the few references in the NT which do preserve the idea of Jesus as the Passover lamb.¹⁴ Further, in view of the fact that the early church's celebrations of the Lord's Supper so quickly came to be independent of the Passover context as virtually to erase all traces of it in the early church - and some scholars still use this point to argue in favour of John's dating of the Last Supper! - we can have no other conclusion than that the Passover context was incidental to the understanding of Jesus' intentions. It was the words and actions over bread and cup which became the focal point in the Christian celebration. Subsequent attention centred upon the bread and wine, not the Passover, so that although we ought not to dismiss the Passover totally from our minds, yet it is clear that it was not the predominating influence.

Jesus' understanding of his death, (and therefore of the significance of his actions /

10. EW 224.

11. Experience, 132.

12. Experience, 133.

13. So Experience, 143.

14. 1 Cor.5:7, cf. 1 Pet.1:18; Jn.1:29; Jn.19:14.

actions at table) centre on the sayings "this is my body" and "this is my blood", added, "contrary to all custom"¹⁵ to the distribution of bread and wine, and on the epexegetic ὑπὲρ πολλῶν | ὑμῶν which attended probably only the bread saying. Thus the sayings are to be seen as a reference to a sacrificial understanding of his death,¹⁶ which makes atonement on our behalf and in our place¹⁷. That ὑπὲρ πολλῶν is probably earlier¹⁸, and is to be understood inclusively in the sense of 'the many', 'the all', as is seen, e.g., in Is.53 (so Jeremias)¹⁹, is to be seen from Jn.6:51, where the phrase is interpreted by ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ἡγῆς. It is by this death that the (new) covenant is established. The covenant reference is either, with Paul, to the new covenant with God (cf. Jer.31), or to the Sinai covenant (cf. Ex.24), with Mark. Jeremias puts it well -

"This is therefore what Jesus said at the Last Supper about the meaning of his death: his death is the vicarious death of the suffering servant which atones for the sin of the 'many', the peoples of the world, which ushers in the beginning of the final salvation, and which effects the new covenant with God."²⁰

By giving his disciples the bread and the wine²¹ he thus gives them a share in the atoning power of his death. The eschatological significance of this meal for Jesus is seen in his "avowal of abstinence" :

"The glory of God has drawn very near. The Passion of Jesus will be the beginning of the last great hour of temptation for the whole earth (Mk.14:38), which will usher in the dawn of the day of salvation (14:58) ... The next meal of Jesus with his disciples will be the Messianic meal on a transformed earth /

15. EW 219.

16. EW 222.

17. Cf. Experience, 143-4.

18 ὑμῶν is seen as an attempt to avoid the ambiguities of πολλῶν ('many' - inclusive or exclusive?).

19. "Without Isa.53 the eucharistic words remain incomprehensible" - Jeremias, NT Theology, I 291.

20. EW 231.

21. Cf. Experience, 139 : "the words of the Lord are clearly not attached to the bread-breaking and wine-pouring, but to the gift itself."

earth.²²

(This of course raises the very complex question of Jesus' eschatological understanding and expectation, into which it is impossible to delve in this paper. We shall confine our investigation into the way in which the Early Church took up the eschatological note in their celebration of the Lord's Supper. Whatever objections scholars make to Cullmann's thesis that this eschatological aspect was realised in the Easter meals of Jesus with the disciples, so that "the first eucharistic feasts of the community look back to the Easter meals", - at least it is to Cullmann's credit that he has grappled with the problem.)²³

(ii) What did Jesus intend for the future?

The question must now be asked, Did Jesus expect the disciples to repeat the rite, and if so, why? The question must be put in this form initially, because although the words "do this in remembrance of me" are preserved in Paul, (1 Cor.11: 24 & 25; Luke has them at the bread-saying only, cf. Lk.22:19), they are nevertheless absent from the Mark-Matthew tradition. This omission, however, has not been regarded as decisive,²⁴ even if it has never satisfactorily been explained.²⁵ Certainly the practice of the Early Church, from the very beginning, of continuing this rite can best be explained in terms of their obedience to this command. To be sure, the conjecture of Cabrol and Leitzmann,²⁶ that the Lord's Supper practice was influenced by the pagan practice of holding 'meals of remembrance' in honour of the dead, has never been substantiated. Above all, the fact that these meals were held annually, on the birthday of the dead man, tells against /

22. EW 217

23. Cf. his Early Christian Worship, 15, and the reference there to his article in Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses 1936, which I have not been able to consult. Cf. Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, 37ff.

24. Cf. Experience, 158 n.38.

25. For a list of suggested explanations, cf. W.Barclay, The Lord's Supper, London, 1967, 52.

26. Full references in EW 238 nn.6 & 8, 239 nn.1 & 3.

against any such connection.²⁷ So we may take it that the tradition that Jesus instructed the disciples to continue the rite (do this ...! Paul, Luke) is well founded.

A second question now arises: what was the purpose behind this command to continue the rite? What do the words "do this as a memorial of me" mean? (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἱμῶν ἀναμνησκέν). The words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε appear at both the bread-saying and the wine-saying in Paul, but only at the bread saying in Luke, and this latter case is probably the original form, since it is easier to conceive the words being added to the cup saying to create parallel sayings at both bread and cup, than that they should have dropped out from the cup saying. It is clear that τοῦτο refers to the rite of breaking the bread, i.e., the rite of grace at table", i.e., "the special grace by means of which the table fellowship of the Messianic community was established, which extolled the salvation activity of God and prayed for the consummation, a prayer which Jesus himself may have used during his lifetime."²⁸ By adding a similar saying to the cup-action, i.e., to the rite of blessing the cup, Paul has given significance to the thanksgiving at the end of the meal. Actually Paul defines what he understands by the phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖτε ,when he goes on (1 Cor.11:26) "For every time you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes." So it is the action, the rite, of breaking the bread and of sharing the cup which the disciples are understood to have been told to repeat εἰς τὴν ἱμῶν ἀναμνησκέν .

This phrase, εἰς τὴν ἱμῶν ἀναμνησκέν , has generally been taken to mean that the rite was to remind the disciples of their Lord and of his death. Some have even seen in the emphatic position of ἱμῶν an implied contrast; whereas the Passover meal was a remembering of what God had done at the Exodus, the emphasis was now shifted on to the new focal point, the saving death of Jesus. Jeremias²⁹, however, doubts /

27. Cf. EW 238-43 for a full discussion.

28. EW 250.

29. EW 251 n.2, and references there.

doubts whether the pronoun could bear any such emphasis in Aramaic. Much more interesting, and controversial, is Jeremias' thesis that the phrase is to be understood as meaning 'that God may remember me'. Jeremias has worked out an elaborate argument for this³⁰, arguing from Palestinian memorial formulae (in cultic usage, in ritual language and in tomb inscriptions), and from Judaism in general that

'by far the most frequent practice of Judaism at the time of Jesus ... is to use *ἐς ἀναμνησιν* and its equivalents of God's remembrance.'³¹
The point of this being, (quoting Michel³²), that 'God's remembrance is always and without exception "an effecting and creating event" ... God's remembrance is always an action in mercy or judgement.'³³

This, Jeremias claims, is related to the Maranatha liturgy of the early church, and the resultant conclusion is that

'As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord's Supper, and the maranatha rises upwards, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation until (the goal is reached that) he comes.'³⁴

(Jeremias' italics).

What are we to say to this? I took up Jeremias' invitation to check whether the Jewish and OT references which he lists have to do with human or divine remembrance, and I did find, as he says (EW 248), that 'for the most part they speak of God's remembrance', but with one important reservation: in most of the passages which Jeremias adduces to support his view the reference to God is made explicit. That God is to do the remembering is at once obvious from the context /

30. EW 237-55.

31. EW 247.

32. TWNT IV, 678.26f.

33. EW 249.

34. EW 253.

context: God is mentioned, or alluded to.³⁵ Thus we may by no means accept Jeremias' point that, on the basis of linguistic evidence, we should presume that Jesus meant "that God may remember me". The statement³⁶ that additions such as Að.10:4 (ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ), Ecclus.50:16 (ἐναντὶ τοῦ ὑψίστου) 1 Enoch 99:3 (ἐνώπιον τοῦ ὑψίστου Θεοῦ) are found only occasionally is to be explained by the fact that the formulae are firmly established³⁷ is in fact not true: these are not the exceptions, these cases are the regular usage, - where God's remembrance is intended, it is usually stated.

In /

35. This holds true for Lev.2:2,9,16; Nu.10:10; Ex.28:12,29 (though not for Ex.39:7) ; Zech.6:14 (cf. RSV for a different interpretation to Jeremias' one). In Ex.12:14 the memorial is for you (not for God), in MT -

וְיָדַעְתֶּם בְּיָמֵי הַמִּצְוֹת אֲשֶׁר יִצְוֶה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

cf. LXX καὶ ἵσταί ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῶν αὕτη μνημοσύνην. So too Ex.13:9 - MT

וְיָדַעְתֶּם בְּיָמֵי הַמִּצְוֹת אֲשֶׁר יִצְוֶה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

LXX - καὶ ἵσταί σοι σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς σοι ... καὶ μνημοσύνην.

- does Jeremias suggest that phylacteries were to aid God's memory?! The tomb inscriptions, I should think, constitute a special class; the remembrance there being of individuals on the last day, which is not quite the meaning wanted in the case of remembrance of the Messiah. In Lev.24:7 God is explicitly mentioned. In Ps.70:1 (LXX 69:1), the subject of ἀναμνησιν is expressed in the epexegetic εἰς τὸ σῶσαι με κύριον. I doubt if Ps.38:1 (LXX 37:1) is relevant here at all. As for the references in Ecclus. 45:9, 11, 16, the translations give a different interpretation to Jeremias: in 45:9 and 11 it is a reminder to the people, in 45:16 a memorial portion, and in Ecclus.50:16, the reference is explicitly defined: μνημοσύνην ἐναντὶ ὑψίστου. Thus an examination of the evidence reveals that Jeremias has not substantiated his theory.

36. EW 248 n.1.

In his examination of Jeremias' argument, Douglas Jones³⁷ limits himself to the occurrences of ἀναμνησις in the LXX (whereas Jeremias had included synonyms such as μνημοσύνη and μνηα), and Jones concludes that 'the use of the word ἀναμνησις in the LXX involves too many ambiguities to provide authority for any particular interpretation of the NT passages.'³⁸ He counters Jeremias' argument 'Was Jesus afraid that his disciples would forget him?'³⁹ with the remark that 'If this is odd, it would be odder still, on Jeremias' view to fear the Father's forgetfulness.'⁴⁰, and he points out that the end result of Jeremias' view 'seems to come near to transforming the community of disciples, and therefore the church into some sort of mediator between God and his Christ, presenting to the divine memory at every eucharist the story of his obedience and sacrifice, that God may remember him, and so effect his vindication on the last day.'⁴¹ This, however, is not quite fair to Jeremias, who obviously uses 'remember' in a specially pregnant way, implying 'usher in the Messianic kingdom', rather than remember, as opposed to 'forget'. (On the other hand, the words with which the last quotation close, 'effect his vindication on the last day', seem to underplay Jeremias' point. Jeremias wants us to suggest that the Lord's Supper is intended as it were to force God's hand almost, and bring about the last day now, to make today the 'last day'!)

Jones is on much firmer ground, however, when he mentions the Passover context⁴² with the predominant aspect of remembrance (cf. Ex.13:8-10) which that rite implied. Jesus is then seen to be telling his disciples to look back upon his death as the salvific event constitutive of the new covenant. We cannot, with any degree of certitude, infer more from the sources. As we shall see, Paul adds his interpretation of the phrase in 1 Cor.11:26, 'For as often as you eat this bread /

37. D.R.Jones, 'ἀναμνησις in the LXX and the interpretation of 1 Cor.11:25', in J.T.S., 6 1955, 183ff.

38. Art. cit. 187.

39. EW 251.

40. Art. cit. 190, n.3.

41. Art. cit. 191.

42. 'The very economy of our Lord's words suggests that he was relying on the associations of that solemn hour to clarify his meaning.' (art. cit., 190).

bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes.' We shall therefore return to this point when we examine Paul's understanding of the Lord's Supper, in the section on the practice of the Early Church, and a final decision will be taken there. In the meantime, our study so far has shown that the Lord's Supper was instituted by Jesus to be and act of remembrance of his death, and a means of sharing in the effects of that death.

B. The Early Church.

In actual fact, there are very few references to the Lord's Supper in the literature of the early community. Within the NT there are possible references in Ac.2:42,46; 20:7-11; two references in Paul, 1 Cor.10:1-13; 11:17-34, and a possible pointer to a liturgical context for the reading of the letter (1 Cor.16:20-24) - all of these we shall examine. Further, we shall look at the bald reference to ἀγῶν in the sense of the communal meal, the so-called 'love-feast' in Jd.12, and possibly again in the variant reading at 2 Pet.2:13. That is the sum total of NT evidence from which we have to learn what we can about the practice and thinking of the earliest community regarding the Lord's Supper.

1. The Acts of the Apostles.

The first passage with a bearing on the subject, Ac.2:42-7, occurs in a summary passage⁴³, and R.H.Fuller has made the following comment on it:

'Although the summary in Ac.2:42-7 is probably the composition of the author, it contains valuable information about the primitive community meal.'⁴⁴

Exactly how much it does contain, we shall presently see. Ac.2:42 reads - "They met constantly to hear the apostles teach, and to share the common life and to break bread and to pray", while the information relevant to our theme from v.46 reads - "With one accord they kept up daily attendance at the Temple, and breaking bread in private houses shared their meals with unaffected joy..."

We /

43. Cf. chapter on 'The Day, etc.' and 'The Service' for further comments on this passage.

44. R.H. Fuller, A Critical introduction to the NT, London, 1966, 128.

We have already⁴⁵ examined v.42 in some detail in connection with Jeremias' conjecture that the verse described the content of the early service of worship. In that connection we saw the ambiguity of the phrase in v.42 'the breaking of bread' $\tau\eta \kappa\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$, and concluded that the phrase is best understood as a reference to the common meal of the early Christians. This is confirmed by v.46 $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\varsigma$, 'they partook of food'. It is a probable conjecture that the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, was included in these meals, and the appearance of the word $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, 'which probably means the mood of eschatological joy'⁴⁶ , points in that direction. An extra piece of information is added in that it is stated that these meals took place daily. This is certainly the force of the $\tau\epsilon \dots \tau\epsilon$ construction, by which both the $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ clause and the $\kappa\lambda\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ clause are linked together to $\kappa\alpha\delta' \acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu$ (against Rordorf⁴⁷). This text is evidence that the table fellowship of the early community was a daily occurrence most likely along the lines of the table fellowship which Jesus and his disciples shared before his death, - although now the rite of the Lord's Supper was added, as stated above. How long this practice continued, we are not able to say; there is no further mention of it in our literature. It is interesting to note in the passing that Luke has preserved this tradition even though (or, precisely because!) it did not accord with the usage in his day. This is, it seems to me, the only valuable information we are able to cull from this passage.

We are again confronted with the difficulty of the phrase $\kappa\lambda\alpha\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in the next passage to be considered, Ac.20:7-11, again one which we have already had occasion to examine⁴⁸. The purpose of the farewell meeting at Troas is given as $\kappa\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (20:7). This could be either Eucharist or Agape, to use the later terminology. Some scholars have found difficulty with the latter explanation, e.g. Haenchen: 'This seems to have been a Eucharist without the proper character of a meal (the congregation certainly did not wait until after midnight for their supper!) preceded by a sermon.'⁴⁹ Yet we may not simply presuppose the demise of the communal meals so soon, without further evidence. There is evidence, as we shall /

45. Cf. 'The Service', pp.19-22.

46. Bultmann, Theology of the NT, I,40.

47. Rordorf, Sunday, 225f. Cf. 'The Day, etc.' p.4.

48. In 'The Day, etc.' pp.6ff. and 'The Service', p23.

49. Haenchen, Acts, 586.

shall see, that the Agape was being observed in Corinth, and at the turn of the century the Didache refers to it also. There is therefore no reason to preclude the possibility that it was current in Troas also, but we must not presuppose a uniformity of practice. On this point, certainty is impossible.⁵⁰

One difficulty is that there is no general linguistic usage: the terms ἀγάπη and εὐχριστικὰ did not become current as technical terms in this connection until later.⁵¹ Paul's κοινικὸν δεῖπνον refers to the whole meal (1 Cor.11:20)⁵² and was later replaced. The use of κλάω ἄρτον, ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου is purely Lucan, and we can gain no insight from his writings as to what was the general meaning. Even the occurrence of the phrase in the gospel (Lk.24:35) is ambiguous, for despite the heavily liturgical language of 24:30, we may not assume for that passage a eucharistic context - as the two disciples on the Emmaus Road were not present at the Last Supper, wherein lay the point of recognition ἐν τῇ κλάσει.⁵³

In short, the evidence from Acts is inconclusive, and may not be reduced to a systematic order. Nevertheless, there are some pieces of information, especially the 'daily' of 2:46, which contribute to our knowledge of the early practice. We are able to infer much more from the Pauline corpus, and 1 Corinthians in particular, about practice in at least one early Gentile congregation.

2. Paul /

50. It is possible that Luke was inconsistent in his usage of κλάω ἄρτον etc., meaning at one time 'eucharist' (Ac.20:7), at another 'agape' (2:46) and 'common meal' (27:35). But in that case, we have no way of determining meaning apart from the context, which is rarely unambiguous!

51. This shows that Luke was not guilty of anachronism. Perhaps his source contained the phrase κλάω ἄρτον and he did not know to which meal it referred?

52. C.K.Barrett, BNTC, 262: "It is clearly implied that the occasion included an ordinary meal as well as symbolic acts and significant words."

53. Against Jeremias, EW 120-1, n.3. It is not an impossible conjecture that they recognised Jesus ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου because they had frequently shared table fellowship with him. But that does not make Lk.24:35 a eucharistic reference. Alternatively, with another of Jeremias' suggestions, "the phrase 'to break bread' has also a wider meaning; it can be used of the whole ritual with which the meal opened: grace, breaking, distribution." (120, n.3). Perhaps Jesus (and his disciples) had a special prayer, or characteristic manner of tearing the bread? We cannot be sure, and Lk.24:35 does not clarify the linguistic usage.

2. Paul.

Paul refers to the eucharist on two definite occasions (1 Cor.10:1-13; 11:17-34) and one possible reference (1 Cor.16:20-24), in all the extant letters. From these three places we are able to gather a fair deal of information about the way the eucharist was observed at Corinth (and, by implication, all the other Pauline churches?) and about his understanding of the rite.

We begin with the details of the practice, such as we are able to ascertain from 1 Cor.11:17-34. This is a passage which has been illuminated for us by G. Bornkamm⁵⁴. He points out that, so far from the Corinthians having a low regard for the sacrament, the very opposite is true: "They have shown themselves to us as robust sacramentalists"⁵⁵. That, indeed is the background to 1 Cor.10:1ff - the Corinthians need to be warned that the sacraments of themselves guarantee nothing. Rather, we see from 11:20ff, especially v.21, that the eucharist was celebrated within the context of a meal, to which each contributed according to his means. The sacrament took place at the end of a meal. Partly through the rich refusing to share their food, (ὅς μὴ κεναί , v.21), partly through excess, (ὅς σε μεθύει , v.21) and partly through a refusal to wait for latecomers, (cf. v.33), the meals served to highlight the disunity of the congregation(v.18).

"We see in Corinth the connection of what is later called the Agape (common meal) with the actual eucharistic action is still taken for granted, even if the increasingly high sacramental evaluation of the Eucharist has led to a devaluation of the Agape and a mockery of the word."⁵⁶

This, then, is the situation which Paul addresses. His intention is not to separate eucharist and agape, but rather to assert what was for him (and, we presume, for the Corinthians also) the true understanding of the meaning of the meal. This leads Paul to remind the Corinthians of the tradition which he passed on to them. We have already utilised Paul's account, in our earlier treatment of the meal, (cf. pp ff) and it is unnecessary to repeat what has been written there. One important point to notice is that Paul alone preserves the words 'after supper' (v.21) /

54. Cf. his 'Lord's Supper and church in Paul' in 'Experience', pp123ff.

55. Experience, 147

56. Experience, 128-129.

(v.21), from which we can see that the original order at the Last Supper was bread - meal - wine; i.e., the 'bread-saying' and the 'wine-saying' were separated by the meal. From this Bornkamm infers the important point that both of these sayings were therefore to stand on their own, independently of one another. But what of these sayings? We ought not to call them 'words of explanation', because in fact they don't explain anything. Thus Bornkamm says,⁵⁷

"The words of the Lord are clearly not attached to the bread-saying and wine-saying, but to the gift itself, and in themselves contain nothing of that explanatory character which goes to make up metaphors and parables."

In fact, to understand how Paul understood these 'words of institution' (as we call them), we must turn to 1 Cor.10:16, a passage which Bornkamm describes as 'the only authentic commentary in the NT itself on the words of the institution.'

Indeed Bornkamm plausibly suggests that this passage also gives the Corinthians' understanding of the words (cf. v.15), and perhaps even the Synoptists' too, - namely that the disciples (and so the congregation, in later celebrations) were offered a participation in the death of Christ, and its saving effects. He says -

"Those celebrating the Lord's Supper receive a share in the shed blood of Christ as they drink the cup. But that means that they share his death ... And they receive a share in the body of Christ given in death as they eat of the bread."⁵⁸

Paul confirms that we were correct not to accept Jeremias' argument that ἵνα ἡμῶν ἐμνησθῇ meant 'that God may remember me' (cf. supra) when he defines how this verse is to be understood (v.26) - "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes." In other words the act of remembering Jesus and the act of proclaiming his death stand in the closest possible relationship. But what is this relationship? Some have understood v.26 to say that the actual bread and the wine are the proclamation, while others have held that the element of proclamation is to be found in the preaching which accompanied the sacrament, - although in fact, we do not have any evidence from /

57. Experience, 139.

58. Experience, 139.

from NT times that this in fact happened⁵⁹. The key word is καταγγελετε. Schniewind⁶⁰ has emphasised that the basic flavour of the word is verbal⁶¹, and following on from that Bornkamm declares -

'Only because the word that rings out in the celebration of the meal is so decisive can it be said of the celebration as a whole "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes", This sentence shows that the "remembrance" of the Lord also happens in word.' (op.cit.141.)

However fine-sounding that quotation may be, it is still a conjecture (albeit a reasonable one) and it seems to owe as much to a German 'theology of the Word' as to solidly-based exegesis.⁶² Perhaps Barrett is nearest the state of our understanding when he declares -

'When Christians held a common meal they recalled aloud the event on which their existence was based. This recalling ... must have had some narrative content.'⁶³

Beyond that assertion, we cannot with any precision, move.

Then there is the phrase 'until he comes', which is a pointer to the fact that, whatever modern theology may make of the fact, the NT writers did voice their expectation that Jesus was going to 'return'. Thus the eucharist had a provisional nature about it. Thus while the church looks back on the death of Jesus in the eucharist, it also looks forward to the consummation. Thus the meals were forward-looking; they were anticipations, or, as Jeremias would have us say, 'antedonations', of the final Messianic banquet of the end-time. We have /

59. The earliest mention of preaching at the sacrament is Justin, Apol. I.67.

60. TWNT I. s.v. ἀγγελλαν.

61. This is the case in the other instances of the word in the NT: 1 Cor9:14 (of the gospel); Ro.1:8; 1 Cor.2:1; Phil.1:17; Col.1:28.

62. So too is Jeremias' conjecture that Jn.6:51c,53-8 is an example of one such word of proclamation. Cf. EW 107, and references there.

63. 1 Corinthians, BNTC, 270.

have already discounted the conjecture that by εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναμνησιν Jesus meant 'that God may remember me', and it is now necessary to examine one of the consequences of that view, namely that the eschatological element in the eucharist is, in fact, an appeal to God to bring in the parousia. Jeremias puts it thus -

"This do that God may remember me": God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia.⁶⁴

Jeremias argues that Paul's phrase, ἄχρι οὗ ἐλθῇ, has, by virtue of its omission of the particle ἄν, 'a certain affinity with the final clause'⁶⁵, so that the meaning is '"until (matters have developed to the point at which) he comes", "until (the goal is reached that) he comes".' (EW, 253). Therefore the proclamation of the death of the Lord ἄχρι οὗ ἐλθῇ in fact does more than recall a past event: it prays for the consummation -

'God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation "until (the goal is reached that) he comes".' (EW, 253, Jeremias' italics.)

It seems to me, however, that Jeremias is trying to force too much out of a grammatical nicety. His statement that 'in the NT ἄχρι οὗ with the aorist subjunctive without ἄν regularly introduces a reference to reaching the eschatological goal', may be true for the cases he quotes. But a similar construction in Gal. 3:19 τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη ἄχρις οὗ ἐλθῇ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπηγγέλεται is not strictly eschatological in that sense which Jeremias requires; and in Rev. 2:25 ὁ ἔχετε κρατῆσατε ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἴξω has ἄν with the subjunctive in a purely eschatological context. Surely the fact is that the reference in the ἄχρι clause is simply temporal - the reference is first and foremost to future time. I should think, in any case, that the wider usages and looser constructions of Hellenistic Greek (as compared with their more exact Classical counterparts) would have rendered an argument based on the omission of ἄν in this case, extremely unlikely. The eschatological reference in the cases quoted surely comes from the fact that it is from the future that the eschaton is awaited. So

I /

64. EW, 252.

65. EW, 253.

I would hold that the $\alpha\chi\rho$ clause in 1 Cor.11:26 is temporal rather than telic. Further, we may attack Jeremias' point from another angle, unconsciously adumbrated by Wainwright, in his support of Jeremias.⁶⁶ He writes -

'At every eucharist the church is in fact praying that the parousia may take place at that very moment, and if the Father "merely" sends his Son in the sacramental mode, we have at least a taste of that future which God reserves for himself to give one day.'

The words 'merely' and 'at least' point to it: if Jeremias (and Wainwright) is correct, then the eucharist becomes the sacrament of great anti-climax, of disappointment, of unfulfilled expectation. The parousia has not come, as a consolation, we may say, the church observes ('celebrates' is hardly appropriate!) the eucharist in disappointment. This is hardly the picture we obtain from the evidence such as we have it. If there were any traces of this view in the early church, and I certainly can't think of any, then surely the basis for this view would have been the Jewish hope that the Messiah would come at Passover, rather than from the teaching of Jesus or Paul. It is certainly difficult to imagine the Jesus of Mk.13:32 viewing the eucharist in terms of Jeremias' thesis. Rather, we should understand the eschatological perspective of the $\alpha\chi\rho$ $\circ\varsigma$ $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ clause more as a simple temporal statement. The church awaits the parousia from the future in God's good time, but it also looks back on the events of Calvary and Easter as God's decisive victory which still waits for final fulfillment. In this interim period, the Lord's Supper is the church's celebration 'between the times', and it gives expression to this interim character of the salvation which the church enjoys. Bornkamm sums up the correct understanding of $\alpha\chi\rho$ $\circ\varsigma$ $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ when he says, (Experience, 152) -

"The Lord's Supper thus receives a very definite terminus ad quem; and by the anticipation of the glory of the new age it becomes a celebration between death and parousia, not beyond time and history, but here on the plain of historical life together."

We shall have to touch upon the topic of the eschatological perspective again, briefly, in the section on the Maranatha, below.

However, we must first mention in passing the section 11:27-32 in which Paul draws /

draws the conclusions which he thinks follow from the Lord's Supper tradition. As may be seen from 1 Cor.10, Paul saw that there was "a particular and penetrating relation" (Bornkamm) between the Lord's Supper and the church, one which he especially worked out in terms of participation :

'When we bless the "cup of blessing" is it not a means of sharing in the blood of Christ? When we break the bread is it not a means of sharing in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, many as we are, are one body; for it is one loaf of which we all partake." (1 Cor.10:16-7.)

Bornkamm comments as follows -

'the body of Christ which we receive in the bread implies for Paul directly the "body of Christ" in which we are all bound together in the sacrament. In it we receive the body of Christ, and, by receiving it, are and show ourselves to be, the body of Christ."⁶⁷

It is this close connection between the sacrament and the church which lies behind 1 Cor.11:27-34. In particular it guides us in our understanding of the phrase $\mu\eta$ διακρίνωμεν το σωμα (v.29). Exegetes have long argued over the interpretation of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$. Does it refer to the sacramental bread or to the church? To phrase the question in this way, however, is to misunderstand the close relation between sacrament and church in Paul's thought, as outlined above. Further we must remember that the context out of which 1 Cor.11 arose was the abuses in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, resulting (1 Cor.11:20) in the disunity of the congregation. This is the situation which is in Paul's mind as he writes and, indeed, he closes on that note (vv.33-4). Against this background $\mu\eta$ διακρίνωμεν το σωμα must be interpreted as having a dual reference: $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is not therefore either the sacramental body or the church, - rather here we have a 'both/and'.

'To discern the body, to esteem Christ's body in its particularity means to understand that the body of Christ given for us and received in the sacrament unites the recipients in the 'body' of the congregation and makes them responsible for each other in love."⁶⁸

Thus we see that vv.33-4 are in fact in context, and are indeed the logical climax of /

67. Experience, 144.

68. Experience, 149.

of the whole chapter, whereas on any other view the verses seem an anticlimax, and out of place.

Turning now to 1 Cor.16:20-4, we see that Paul, at the very end of the letter mentions four things which, partly on the basis of a statement of Justin⁶⁹ and partly on other evidence⁷⁰, have been taken as indicating a liturgical context, - namely that after the letter had been readout to the congregation (assembled for worship), the eucharist was celebrated⁷¹. Let it be said that in accepting the probability of this conjecture we find a piece of evidence to confirm the fact, which we did not find sufficiently substantiated by the evidence from 1 Cor.11 and 1 Cor.14 that the service of 'the word' and the Lord's Supper were held at one and the same time⁷². The liturgical context of these verses would seem to suggest that the one worship service included both items. But in view of the uncertainty of the evidence (based as it is only on two conjectures) I would prefer to suspend judgement and say that we cannot decide with any certainty. After all, the length of such a service of word and sacrament might even tend to suggest that the Ac.20 meeting - prolonged until after midnight - was normal! Bultmann's caution is a salutary reminder of the precarious state of our knowledge :

"Probably varying customs were in practice in different places and times; and there is as little foundation for saying that worship by the word and the celebration of the supper always and everywhere took place separately, as for saying that the celebration of the supper was always and everywhere

"the cause and purpose of all congregating" (Cullmann)". (Theology of NT, I.145)

1 Cor.16:20-4 mentions these four elements : (i) a kiss; (ii) the Anathema; (iii) the Maranatha; and (iv) a prayer for grace. We shall examine each of these in turn.

(i) A kiss (φιλήματα ἀγίων) (v.20). We know that a kiss was exchanged by members of the congregation from Justin (Apol. I.65), and it appears again in NT, significantly /

69. Justin, Apol. I.67.7. Memoirs or writings of the Apostles were read before the congregation moved on to celebrate the Lord's Supper.

70. Especially Did. 10.6. (Dibelius).

71. Bornkamm, Experience, 169, (following Leitzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, 186), so also J.A.T.Robinson, in J.T.S., 4,(1953), 38ff. For a different view, cf. C.F.D.Moule, in N.T.S., VI, (1959-60), 307-10.

72. Cf. 'The Service' p25 for discussion.

significantly only at the end of letters - Ro.16:16; 2 Cor.13:12; 1 Thess.5:16 and 1 Pet.5:14. Of the origins of this practice we know nothing, - it certainly was not borrowed from the synagogue. The kiss seems to have become established very early as a part of worship in the congregation, but we have no way of knowing how widespread it was, beyond the fact that even in the NT period, it was not restricted to the Pauline churches (1 Peter). By the middle of the second century it seems to have been regular liturgical practice, and henceforth held an established place in the liturgy.

(ii) Anathema and (iii) Maramatha. It will be convenient to look at these two elements together, since in the only two early references to them they appear together (1Cor.16:22 and Did. 10:6)

This section of the Didache in question has been clarified by the suggestion of Dibelius⁷³ that Did.9:1 - 10:5 represent the prayers at the Agape⁷⁴ and that the eucharist proper begins at 10:6. The actual details of the eucharist are not described at 10:6, although those for the Agape were: the reason for this is usually assumed to be either the disciplina arcani or the fact that the eucharist was so well known. This latter point seems less probable to me - as the Agape details must have been equally well known, yet they are given. As the eucharist begins, the liturgy takes the form of a dialogue between the leader and the people:

Leader : Let grace come and this world pass.

People : Hosanna to the Son of David.

Leader : If anyone is holy let him come, if he is not holy let him repent.

Our Lord, come.

People : Amen. ⁷⁵

In Paul the language is slightly different. There is no 'positive' side, to correspond to 'if anyone is holy..', and the suggestion is that Paul perhaps abbreviated the liturgical formula at this point (cf. his other letters, esp. Ro., 2 Cor., 1 Thess.). Paul, however, goes on; "If anyone has no love for the Lord /

73. Die Mahlgebete der Didache, in Z.N.W., 37, (1938) 32-41. Cf. EW, 118 n.3 for further literature.

74. As we would call it. The Didache in fact calls it ἐσχαριστία !

75. Following Leitzmann.

Lord, let him be accursed (ἀναθεμα). Before we look at who is referred to by 'if anyone has no love for the Lord', we had better look at ἀναθεμα. On the face of it, this seems more severe than the Didache's expression μετανοεῖτο, 'let him repent'. Bornkamm describes the ἀναθεμα thus:

'The Anathema has the purpose of excluding the unworthy at the beginning of the celebration of the meal from sharing the sacrament.' (Experience, 170). But the question remains, In what sense are they excluded? What does ἀναθεμα mean? The basic meaning is 'devoted to a god', hence either consecrated or, more usually, accursed. Paul uses ἀναθεμα elsewhere; in Gal. 1:8 the purveyor of a false gospel, even if he is an angel, is to be ἀναθεμα. In Ro. 9:3 Paul himself would be ἀναθεμα for the sake of the Jewish people. In these instances, we may say, with Behm, that -

'The controlling thought here is that of the delivering up to the judicial wrath of God of someone who ought to be ἀναθεμα (cursed) because of his sins.'⁷⁷

So the point of the Anathema would appear to be a prayer for the exclusion of an offending person from the community. It was not however an expulsion carried out by the church, as would appear to have been the case in 1 Cor. 5:5 (cf. 5:3).

Bornkamm puts it this way -

'It expresses the decision as coming from God for the given situation and leaves the transgressor to the judging punishment of God. In this the responsibility falls entirely on the one addressed and the Anathema represents the summons to self-examination.' (Experience, 171.)

We have thus no reason to assume that any persons were removed from, or asked to leave, the assembled congregation. In other words, it would appear that Paul's ἀναθεμα is not unlike his statement in 11:28 that a man must test himself before he partakes of the Lord's Supper. Thus the Anathema statement is not far removed from the μετανοεῖτο of the Didache, - and the end result was the same, that before the Eucharist a man was reminded of his duty to examine himself.⁷⁸

This /

76. In T.W.N.T., I, 354-5.

77. On the other occurrence of the word in the NT, 1 Cor. 12:3, ἀναθεμα ἡ σοφία Barrett's discussion is valuable. He says, 'It is not easy to conceive the circumstances in which one might cry out "Jesus is anathema" and be in danger of supposing that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit.' (BNTC, 279).

78. Cf. Did. 14, - a confession of sin preceded the sacrament.

This, then poses the question of who is referred to in Paul's phrase 'anyone who does not love the Lord', and the equivalent in the Didache 'anyone who is not holy'. Discussion of this point centres around the question of whether or not the eucharist was reserved for baptised Christians only. Bornkamm is correct to say that the texts do not draw the line between the baptised and the unbaptised. However, Did.9:5 does explicitly say "Let none of you eat or drink your eucharist except those who have been baptised in the Lord's name." Bornkamm's argument against this phrase, that 'the directions expressed clearly presuppose that this regulation was not self-evident' (Experience, 171) seems, without further evidence, unduly arbitrary: are we to suppose that only those regulations which were not being observed gain a mention in the Didache? On this reasoning, Did.10:7 "Allow the prophets to give thanks as much as they will" is evidence that there had been complaints about the length of their prayers! Further, Bornkamm's argument (171) that "Did.10:6 presupposes earlier conditions than the criteria for admission of Did.9:5" assumes a redactional complexity for which we have no evidence or explanation. Similarly, while it is correct to say (171) that, "The Pauline letters in no way give reason to see baptism from the first as a conditio sine qua non for participation in the Lord's Supper", I feel that this is due to the fact that Paul did not pose the question in this way. We must beware of forgetting the ad hoc nature of the Pauline corpus - each letter was called out to meet a particular situation in an individual congregation. We do have evidence that Paul presupposed that every Christian was baptised (cf. Ro.6:3 and 1 Cor.12:13), so that for our present enquiry the question becomes, Was it possible that unbelievers were present at the service? Reference must now be made to the passage we have already examined⁷⁹, 1 Cor.14:23-5, in which Paul shows that he was aware of the possibility that unbelievers might be present at a worship service - or rather, might enter (εἰσελθῶν) during the worship. If this reference in 1 Cor.14 is to an act of worship which included the eucharist, - and we have seen that this is a possible conjecture - then the question is solved: the anathema is directed towards outsiders /

79. Cf. the paper on 'The Service', pp.26f.

outsiders - those unbaptised persons who have come into the service, and remained to worship⁸⁰. Therefore, on this understanding of the evidence from 1 Corinthians, we must assume a change in the situation between the writing of 1 Corinthians and the Didache: in Paul's day the unbaptised who were interested in the faith were allowed to stay (and were warned by the anathema of the seriousness of sharing in the Lord's Supper), whereas later there do not appear to have been unbaptised present. This makes best sense of the change in language from Paul's 'If anyone does not love the Lord' (i.e. unbelievers) to the Didache's 'If anyone is not holy' (i.e. sinning Christian?). However, we must bear in mind the sporadic nature of the evidence, and we are certainly not justified in assuming a universal custom from either of the passages under discussion. In conclusion, though, it appears that the Didache passage may point the way to later practice: the ruling that only the baptised were allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper is confirmed by Justin (Apol. I.66.1, 'none is allowed to partake except he who believes our teaching is true'). One may conjecture that this hardening of attitudes may have arisen in periods of persecution which later befell the church. In less dark days (1 Cor.) the church was much more open and restricted the Lord's Supper only by asking that those who partook could claim to 'love the Lord'. This would seem the ideal practice.

Turning to the Maranatha, (1 Cor.16:22; Did.10:6), the first point to notice is the fact that even in a letter addressed to a predominantly Gentile (cf. 1 Cor.12:8) congregation, Paul can use an Aramaic word and expect to be understood (he doesn't translate). The point is made by Kuhn⁸¹ -

"The untranslated Aramaic term is meaningful only if it is a fixed formula well-known to the church."

We /

80. That not all did remain is to be inferred from v.23 - 'you are mad'. Despite Barrett, (BNTC, 326), this phrase does mean 'you are suffering from a mental disease'. His ingenious suggestion, 'you are possessed' fails for two reasons: i) The word is not found with this meaning elsewhere in the NT, while the sense 'out of your mind' occurs at Ac.24:24f; 12:15. ii) The translation 'you are possessed' would involve an element of recognition of the validity of their religious experience in the glossolalia. Paul's point is that they are unimpressed, and therefore leave.

81. K.G. Kuhn, in T.W.N.T. IV, 470.

We are certainly correct in supposing that the origin of this term is to be sought in the primitive Palestinian community. This surely implies that any understanding of the sacrament which is based upon the presupposition of an origin within the Hellenistic community is doomed to failure: this phrase is evidence of Palestinian origins, and very early origins at that. The problem of the meaning of the phrase is a difficult one, and there are three main possibilities: i) taking it as a prayer, the meaning would be 'Lord, come' as a petition for the parousia; ii) as a confession of faith, 'Our Lord has come' (into the world at the Incarnation); or iii) as a statement, 'Our Lord is present' (in the worship, especially in the sacrament), (following Kuhn). In 1 Corinthians, the word occurs without any contextual clue as to its possible meaning. However, in the Didache, there is just such a clue. We read 'Let grace come and this world pass away... Maranatha.' Here it is quite obviously a prayer for the parousia, and that is how maranatha is to be understood, in the sense of i) above. This is supported by the accepted recognition that the maranatha probably lies behind Rev.22:20, where Jesus' statement 'I am coming soon' is taken up by the response 'Amen, come Lord Jesus.' This 'prayer for the parousia' interpretation is not to be rejected because it places the church in the position described by Jones⁸² as 'some sort of mediator between God and his Christ'. The prayer 'maranatha' is little different from the petition in the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy Kingdom come'.

iv) Grace. In view of the very frequent use of this term both at the beginning and end of Christian letters from Paul onwards, it would be difficult to decide whether the reference in 1 Cor.16:23 could definitely be said to be of liturgical flavour, as opposed to the normal epistolary ending. Perhaps the latter, combined with the practice of reading letters prior to the celebration influenced the adoption of the grace into the eucharistic liturgy?

Having thus surveyed the evidence from the NT, we now move, much more briefly into some of the literature of the post-Apostolic age to enable us to see the way the trends were moving.

3. Evidence /

82. Art. cit. (see note 37 above), 191.

3. Evidence from Beyond the NT.

We have seen that the original tradition which Paul preserved, placed the eucharistic actions within the context of a meal, as at the Last Supper. We have, curiously enough, no evidence that this original order, 'bread - meal - cup' was ever practised in the church of the first century. The situation at Corinth, which Paul was not attempting to alter, was for the meal to be followed by the bread and wine rite, the whole thing, meal and eucharist, being given the name of 'The Lord's Supper'. This is the situation which appears in the Didache, following Dibelius' conjecture, as we have seen. The letters of Ignatius show that he knows both eucharist and agape⁸³, but he describes neither, and it is not possible to discover what practice he was familiar with, from his letters. By the time of Justin, (AD150), we can see that some changes have taken place, in some places at least: at the Sunday meeting the eucharist is no longer celebrated in the context of a meal, but has become the rite of the bread and the wine, at the end of the worship service. We cannot really say why this change-over should have taken place.

We turn now to consider one fascinating piece of evidence from the Roman province of Bithynia-Pontus, in Asia Minor, dated c.112 A.D. - Pliny's letter to Trajan (Epp. X.96-7). Of particular interest is the section (par.7-8) which gives information on the practice of Christians at worship in that area. The original practice was to assemble on a fixed day before dawn for worship, and for commitment to Christian standards of living (is this a reference to teaching? - if so, it is very abstruse.)⁸⁴ They re-assembled at night for a simple meal, which, to judge from the language Pliny uses - ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium - was a full meal. We assume that this refers to the eucharist, and that it was celebrated as part of a meal, although the evidence does not go far enough on this. This, however, was not current practice, because the Christians had obeyed the edict which /

83. In Philad.4, εὐχαριστικα comprises σαρξ καὶ αἶμα. In Smyrn.8, he lays down that the presence of a bishop is necessary for the valid celebration of either eucharist or agape.

84. Cf. 'The Service' p27f. and n.30.

which Pliny had published forbidding gatherings of any kind of society - *ἐταπρία* - because these societies had been the source of political trouble in the province prior to Pliny's arrival⁸⁵, and so the Christians had discontinued the evening meeting. We presume that the worship meeting was still continued (the text does not say otherwise - perhaps this was the cause of the Christians' being brought to trial in the first place?) and on the grounds that they believe it impossible that the Christians should have given up the eucharist, scholars have conjectured that it was held at the morning service as the rite of bread and wine, outwith the context of a meal. If this was so, then it could be seen as a precursor for the later practice of the church. Assessment of the evidence, however, is not easy; - for instance, we do not know how widespread the practice was of holding a service in the early morning (Pliny's letter being our first evidence for this); we do not know whether the edict was repeated in other parts of the Empire, - it would seem unnecessary in view of the generally peaceful atmosphere of Trajan's reign to which Bithynia-Pontus was an exception; nor can we tell if the situation such as Pliny described it (early morning only for worship) continued indefinitely, or if the edict was later revoked, allowing the church to revert to the earlier practice. The most we can say about Pliny's evidence is that it shows us the prevailing practice at a given time in a given situation, and the situation was probably responsible for the separation of eucharist and agape. This was, as we have seen, the situation in Justin's time: the eucharist was the rite at the end of the morning worship (Justin does not mention the Agape).

Although the texts suggest that the agape was in decline, it was by no means finished; - it is attested in later writers such as Tertullian (c.A.D.200) (Apol. 39:16-9), Minucius Felix (Octavius, 31.5), Origen (Contra Celsum 1.1) and the 'Treatise on the Apostolic Succession' of Hippolytus. In many of these the agape is being defended from attack, but as can be seen from the NT itself (Jude 12: "These men are a blot on your love-feasts" cf. 2 Pet. 2:13, v.l., "revelling in their love-feasts") and later evidence (e.g. Clement of Alexandria, Paedagogus, 2)⁸⁶ the agape was /

85. Cf. Pliny Epp. X.32, 92-3 and esp. 93 fin.: Trajan is willing to concede a benefit society for the citizens of Amisi (who by federal rights have a certain amount of self-government) si tali collatione non ad turbas et ad illicitos coetus sed ad sustinendam tenuiorum inopiam utuntur.

86. These examples cited from W. Barclay, The Lord's Supper, 58-60.

was particularly liable to the abuses which appeared as early as 1 Cor.11:17-22. It was later discontinued. At a much earlier date, of course, the eucharist had come into its own as the Christian celebration of the death of the Lord, and soon became established outside the original context of the meal.

Thus we have surveyed the NT evidence, and some from a later date, on the practice of the early church. Starting from Jesus and his last meal with his disciples the church obeyed his command to break bread and share wine in remembrance of, and in participation in, his death and its saving power as the opening of the new covenant with God; and in anticipation of the final consummation which the church awaited from God. Although originally part of a meal, the eucharist soon came to be regarded as a rite in itself, either celebrated at the end of a meal or outwith the context of a meal altogether, although the process by which the change came about is no longer accessible to our investigation.

Baptism.

A. Introduction: The Antecedents to Christian Baptism.

The history of the ministry of Jesus begins in a sense with baptism: Mk.1:1-4, 'Here begins the Gospel of Jesus Christ ... John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness proclaiming a baptism in token of repentance, for the forgiveness of sins.' Jesus was himself baptized by John (Mk.1:9-11), and may have included among his disciples several of John the Baptist's disciples (Jn.1:35ff.). In one sense that supplies a context against which to study Christian baptism, but in another it merely pushes the question of origins one stage further back, and the question of John's baptism then has to be examined. On this topic there is much discussion, made necessary by the uncertain state of much of the evidence, and here we can only indicate the outlines of the debate in the passing.

1. Old Testament Lustrations.

There is a wide measure of agreement that, while the use of water for lustrations as laid down in the OT may have provided an ultimate starting point out of which various baptisms more or less directly developed, nevertheless these lustrations were not a direct influence in themselves. Their main thrust was in terms of ritual and ceremonial purity. In Lev.15 there is a list of instructions on how to cleanse the body and clothes from the uncleanness caused by bodily emissions; in Lev.16 the ritual for the day of Atonement laid down that the priest had to cleanse himself before putting on the ceremonial clothes. Uncleanness due to death and contact with the dead is dealt with in Nu.19. There is nothing in this connection which could be argued to have had a direct influence on Christian baptism, but the importance of the lustrations lies in the fact that they provide the general background against which later developments took place.

2. Jewish Proselyte Baptism.

This is an area of great difficulty, as the evidence is of uncertain interpretation. The main point at issue is the date at which proselyte baptism became current /

current in Judaism. The earliest evidence for the practice is given in the Mishna and concerns the dispute between the disciples of Shammai and Hillel over the relative merits of baptism and circumcision, dated about AD 90¹, and it may even be earlier. The dispute, according to Jeremias 'presupposes proselyte baptism as a rite no longer in dispute'², and according to Billerbeck³, the beginnings of the rite are to be dated 'with certainty to pre-Christian times'.

Another passage in the Mishna⁴ refers to the different views on the right of the newly circumcised to celebrate the Passover: 'The school of Shammai maintains, If a man becomes a proselyte the day before the Passover he may immerse himself and consume his Passover in the evening. And the school of Hillel say, He that separated himself from his uncircumcision is as one that separates himself from the grave.' (i.e., he is unclean for 7 days, cf. Nu.19:11). Jeremias dates this to before AD 30⁵. As a pointer to the complexity of the debate, Scobie⁶ has questioned whether this reference here, and the next one (below) are to baptism, or merely to ceremonial Passover lustration.

The third passage, (Pes.8.8) cites Rabbi Eleazar ben Jacob, 'Soldiers were guards of the gates of Jerusalem: they were baptized and ate their Pascal lambs in the /

1. So G.R.Beasley Murray, Baptism in the NT, London, 1962, 24; - hereafter cited by the abbreviation 'BM'. Jeremias prefers an earlier date for the controversy, to before the destruction of Jerusalem, AD 70 (Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, ET, London, 1960, 24); hereafter cited as 'Infant'.

2. Infant, 28.

3. Kommentar zum NT am Talmud und Midrash, by H.L.Strack and P.Billerbeck (1922-61) I, 103.

4. Pes. 91b - 2, cited from Danby's translation.

5. Infant, 28.

6. C.H.H.Scobie, John the Baptist, London, 1964, 98.

the evening.'⁷ Various other pieces of evidence are adduced with varying degrees of certainty, - e.g., the passage in the fourth Sibylline Oracle, dated AD 80, - 'Wash your whole body in perennial streams, and lifting up your hands to heaven, seek pardon' , and Epictetus, Discourses II.9.⁸

In general terms, two points frequently made are worth repeating. The first is the complete failure of any first century writer to mention Jewish proselyte baptism; - this is remarkable, if baptism were current practice. It is absent from the works of Josephus, Philo and the NT despite the controversy in the NT over circumcision as it affected Gentile Christians, and despite the references to the proselytizing activities of the Jews (Mt.23:15; cf. Ac.2:10; 6:5; 13:43). This silence, of course, may be quite fortuitous, but it is certainly remarkable. The second point is one stressed by Jeremias,⁹

'it may be reckoned impossible that the rite (proselyte baptism) did not originate until a time in which Christian baptism was already practised' because,

'an influence of the Christian rite on the Jewish one must be excluded as impossible.'

We are not able, however, to state with any accuracy when proselyte baptism came into general practice. Many scholars incline towards the view that the rite was in use in the first century AD, and while Jeremias can produce an impressively long list of those who support the pre-Christian origin of the rite¹⁰, yet the view is not unanimously accepted¹¹. Such imprecise dating of the rite renders any attempt to assess the influence of the rite over the Christian one an impossible task.

3. Qumran./

7. Cf. Jeremias, Infant, 28,n.1.

8. On this passage Scobie, John the Baptist, 99,n.2, cites P.E.Matheson as saying 'It is not certain whether ... Epictetus is thinking of Jews or of Christians who at that time were often confused with them.'

9. Infant, 28, 24, respectively for the quotations.

10. Infant, 29,n.1; cf. BM 18,n.2

11. BM 19,n.1 cites Brandt and Thomas as important dissenters from the majority viewpoint.

3. Qumran.

That the Qumran community practised lustrations is in no doubt - it is amply attested in their literature¹². It is also probable that new members of the group had to undergo a baptism of initiation. In a passage in the Community Rule¹³, there is a description of the man who refuses to join the community: '... he shall not be reckoned among the perfect: he shall neither be purified by atonement, nor cleansed by purifying waters, nor sanctified by seas and rivers, nor washed clean by any ablution. Unclean, unclean shall he be. For as long as he despises the precepts of God he shall receive no instruction in the Community of His Counsel' (Vermes' translation). The document goes on to describe the man who enters the sect: 'He shall be cleansed from all his sins by the spirit of holiness uniting him to His (God's) truth, and his iniquity shall be expiated by the spirit of uprightness and humility. And when his flesh is sprinkled with purifying water and sanctified by cleansing water, it shall be made clean by the humble submission of his soul to all the precepts of God ...'. This last sentence points to the fact that the Qumran sect held no magical view of their lustrations: forgiveness was not mediated ex opere operato; - as is attested by a reference in 1 QS.5.14: 'they shall not be cleansed unless they turn from their wickedness: for all who transgress His word are unclean.'

The sect in all probability conducted their lustrations in seas and rivers, rather than in the complex system of tanks and cisterns which have been excavated at the monastery, as some had supposed¹⁴. John Allegro has stated that 'the sectarians would have preferred the running waters of the Jordan with its ancient associations, or even 'Ain Feshkha to the south to the static tanks of the settlement.'¹⁵

The influence of the sect is difficult to gauge now, but it seems probable that we may expect to find some connection between them and John the Baptist. Particularly striking is the common use of the same OT prophecy, Is.40:3, to express their understanding of their roles as eschatological forerunners preparing for the day /

12. Cf. e.g., 1 QS.3.4.9; 4.21 refer to 'the waters for impurity' and C.D. 10.12.13 gives regulations about bathing.

13. 1 QS, 2.25 - 3.12.

14. E.g., W.H.Brownlee, in The Scrolls and the NT, ed. K.Stendahl, London, 1958, 39.

15. John Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, London, 1956, 90.

day of the Lord¹⁶, although they chose different methods to live out Is.40:3, the Qumran sect withdrawing from Israel to the desert, while John ministered to Israel from the desert. Their message had elements in common, especially their stress on the need for repentance before the imminent eschaton, although the sect did not preach this to Israel, as John did. The common use of water, however, may be more apparent than real: the Qumran 'baptism' introduced a novice to the community, but lustrations were also part of the daily life of the community¹⁷, whereas we have no indication that John's baptism was other than a once-for-all rite. Nevertheless, the fact that John's ministry was conducted in the wilderness of Judaea, in all probability close to the fords of Jordan just south of Jericho, no more than ten miles from Qumran, makes the conclusion inescapable that John knew of them¹⁸. How far he was influenced by them, however, is much more difficult to assess.

4. John the Baptist.

In dealing with the place of John the Baptist and his importance for Christian baptism, it will be convenient to divide the treatment into two sections, as befits him who marks the transition from the old dispensation from the new. In this section therefore, we will look at the significance of his work and ministry in general terms, before we examine his position vis-à-vis Jesus, and subsequently, the early church.

John the Baptist's work and Ministry.

We have evidence on John the Baptist from all four Gospels, the Acts, and a passage in the Antiquities of Josephus (18.117), although the Josephus reference is inadequate in some respects. For our purposes, it will be convenient to deal with his work under two headings.

(a). Baptism. That the most distinctive element in John's ministry was his baptism of the people is confirmed by the the fact that he was described as ὁ βαπτιστής, the /

16. Cf. 1 QS.8.12-6; 9.19f., for Qumran; Mk.1:3par. for John.

17. Josephus mentions three lustrations daily, Bell. Jud., II,8.5.9.

18. Cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, I, 43.

the Baptizer, even in Josephus. This baptism was described as βαπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Mk.1:4) - a baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins. Although the exact interpretation of this verse has been variously debated, it seems to me to be indicated by the order of words in the phrase, in which εἰς ἄφεσιν is dependent upon μετανοίας, - thus the sense is a baptism of repentance bringing or resulting in forgiveness of sins. Thus Dunn interprets it: 'John's baptism is the expression of the repentance which results in the forgiveness of sins.'¹⁹ We also may set beside this the statement of Josephus (Antiq.18.5.2) that 'the baptism was not to be employed as a means of seeking pardon for particular sins, but as a means of purifying the body, provided that the soul has been thoroughly cleansed beforehand by righteousness.'²⁰ Further, we have seen that the Qumran community never saw their lustrations as having the power to cleanse from sin (e.g., 1 QS.3.3-4). Thus John stood close to the Qumran community in excluding any idea that forgiveness could be obtained by the performance of a ritual act (and this is in line with those elements of his preaching which Luke has preserved for us), and in this respect both John and Qumran stood in the OT prophetic tradition²¹. What was important about John's rite was that the Jewish people were being told of their need for repentance, and for the first time outside sectarian Judaism, Jews were accepting their need of baptism, in the face of the coming eschatological crisis which John preached. Thus John's baptism was essentially preparatory: it pointed beyond itself to the Coming One.

(b). John's Preaching. There was a strong note of eschatological urgency about John's preaching. This is especially to be seen in his use of Mal.3:1 (the messenger to prepare God's way) and Is.40:3 (the voice crying in the wilderness)²².

The fact that both John and the Qumran sect used this latter testimonium to justify their roles, is a sign of the strong eschatological mood then current, at least in some circles, and an indication that if Qumran did not influence John in his use of this text, then they both may be presumed to have drawn the point from a common source /

19. James D.G.Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, London, 1970, 15.

20. Jeremias, NT Theology, I, 44: 'perhaps this note should not be put on one side as lightly as usually happens'.

21. cf. e.g., Ps.40:6; 51:16-7; Hos.6:6, etc.

22. Cf. C.H.Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1963, 252-3, cf. 289.

source. Nor need we wonder at the absence of any eschatological reference in Josephus' account of John's ministry: Josephus was anxious to portray the Jews in as good a light as possible, and any mention of an eschatological dimension - which would have been interpreted as having political overtones - did not accord with his apologetic purposes, and we are not justified, therefore, in discounting this element of the gospel account merely because of Josephus' silence.) Now whether John made his eschatological proclamation in quite the distinctively 'Christian' language of Mt.3:2 (cf. Mt.4:15, where the same message is ascribed to Jesus!) or not, we may be sure that the note of eschatological urgency was a distinct feature of John's message. His role was, as he himself said²³, to prepare the way for the Coming One, to urge upon the people the need to repent in view of the crisis soon to break in upon them. In this respect he disclaims all Messianic status, perhaps also disclaiming the status of Elijah²⁴, and points to the Coming One (Mk.1:7f.par., Jn. 1:26f, 30f, cf.15) and to his gift of the Holy Spirit (Mk.1:8 par., Jn.1:26-7, 33b, cf. Ac.1:5; 13:25). In the fourth gospel the contrasting baptisms (ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι ... αὐτός ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) have been separated to underline the meaning with the story of the descent of the Holy Spirit on Jesus. The exact meaning of the saying of John the Baptist which has a bearing on the question of baptism, is under debate, and here we have space only to note 'the complicated phenomena of agreement and disagreement among no fewer than five versions of the Baptist's prediction'.²⁵ It is generally assumed that Matthew and Luke have preserved the more ancient form of the tradition by which the coming baptism was to be 'by the Holy Spirit and by fire'. How is this to be interpreted? Some hold that John the Baptist could not have spoken of the Holy Spirit, and that ἁγίῳ is a Christian interpretation²⁶, while others think that by πνεύματι John was referring to wind²⁷. My own view is with those /

23. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 252-3: 'In view of the passage from the Manual of Discipline in the "Dead Sea Scrolls", it is by no means unlikely that the Baptist should have set himself the role of the voice.'

24. Jn.1:21; cf. Historical Tradition, 265-6.

25. Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 256 for discussion and details.

26. So, e.g., W.F.Flemington, The NT Doctrine of Baptism, London, 1958, 19. For full discussion, cf. BM 35ff.; and Dunn, 9f. for possible Qumran influence here.

27. So, e.g., F.W.Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus, Oxford, 1964, 39f.

E.Schweizer, The Good News According to Mark, ET, London, 1971, 34, suggests this but opts for another line.

those who say that John did speak of a baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire, which is to be understood as a reference to the two-fold task of the Messiah as judge, - cleansing with the Spirit and judging with fire²⁸.

Thus far it has been possible to treat John the Baptist from within the framework of antecedents to Christian baptism, but now we must cross over to the period of the ministry of Jesus and continue the study of John the Baptist within that context.

B. The Ministry of Jesus.

1. John the Baptist and Jesus.

The synoptic gospels are unanimous that Jesus underwent a baptism experience in connection with the Baptist's ministry²⁹, - and as Jeremias has said³⁰,

'Such a scandalising piece of information cannot have been invented.'
- as we can see from Matthew's embarrassment (3:14-6), and similarly from the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews³¹. We must therefore accept the historicity of the event /

28. This is in fact the view Schweizer opts for finally; so too BM 37, Dunn, 11-4.

29. Only Mk.1:9 and Mt.3:13 make it explicit that Jesus was baptized by John. Mt. 3:16 makes this fact an incidental detail by changing Mark's indicative βαπτισθῆναι into a participle, βαπτίζοντος, while Lk.3:22 relegates it even further in importance by the use of the genitive absolute construction. On this Schweizer (Mark, 37) comments, 'No unbiased person reading Lk.3:21f. after Lk.3:20 would guess that it was John who baptized Jesus.' This is probably due to the fact that Luke incorporated information on John the Baptist from his special source (3:10-4, e.g.) and rounded off his treatment of John the Baptist anachronistically (3:19-20) before resuming the synoptic material (3:21). The fourth gospel does not make any mention of the fact that Jesus was baptized.

30. Jeremias, NT Theology, I,45.

31. Quoted Jerome, Dialogue against Pelagius, 3.2. Jesus says to his family, 'wherein have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless this very thing that I have said is a sin of ignorance.'

event and see what significance it had, if any, for the later practice of the church.

For some scholars, the baptism of Jesus is the first anticipatory stage of the work of redemption: Jesus was taking the first step in bearing the sin of the world. This is the view, for example of Oscar Cullmann³², -

'The baptism of Jesus points forward to the end to the climax of his life, to the cross, in which alone all baptism will find fulfilment.'

Unfortunately Cullmann's work has about it a telegraphic brevity, at times bordering on the dogmatic, which does not include detailed argument of his case.

Nevertheless, the point is important for our understanding of what baptism is, and how it should be resolved in our understanding. The points Cullmann marshalls in support of his case may be summarised as follows:

- (i). The voice at Jesus' baptism referred only to Is.42:1, the Servant of Yahweh passage. Any reference to Ps.2:7 which may be present (Cullmann is not specific on whether he wants the Ps.2:7 reference excised) does not affect the interpretation.
- (ii). Mt.3:15 'to fulfil all righteousness' is to be given a 'concrete meaning', namely, 'Jesus will effect a general righteousness' (18).
- (iii). For Jesus, as Mk.10:38, Lk.12:50 show, to 'be baptised' from now on means 'to suffer', 'to die for the people' (19).
- (iv). Jn.1:29-34, which Cullmann describes as 'the first commentary on the synoptic account' provides confirmation of his thesis, from such elements as 'Lamb of God' (v.29), 'sin of the world' (v.29), 'elect of God' (v.34) -accepting the poorly attested variant reading in favour of the better text³⁴ - we may see that John 'rightly understood the call as a demand upon Jesus to fulfil the Ebed-Yahweh mission' (21).

I am not convinced by this thesis, even though the ease with which it can be made to link up with the Pauline doctrine of baptism as dying and rising with Christ (Ro.6) /

32. O.Cullmann, Baptism in the NT, ET, London, 1950, 13-22. Quotation from page 19.

33. Cf. Cullmann, Baptism, 16-7. Jeremias also (NT Theology, I, 54-5) discounts any thought of a reference to sonship from Ps.2:7 in his interpretation.

34. Reading ἐκλεκτός, with p⁵ vid χ* it, syr and Amrbose (so UBS textual apparatus) instead of υἱός, - a doubtful expedient, influenced more by a desire to harmonise Jn.1:34 with the Servant Song, than any scientific textual criticism.

(Ro.6) obviously makes it attractive. However we shall see that the connection is by no means as simple as Cullmann would make out. I would want to make the following points against Cullmann.

Against (i), we are by no means justified in discounting the reference to Ps.2:7 from Mk.1:11 par.. (a). It is distinctly possible that in Luke the reference to Ps.2:7 was the only one: some MSS and the majority of the Fathers read 'You are my Son, today I have begotten you' - exactly Ps.2:7! Certainly this reading is the less well attested in terms of MSS authority, yet it is not impossible that it was original. We can as easily imagine that 'today I have begotten you' was altered in the copying to correspond to the parallel 'with you I am well pleased' in Mark and Matthew, as that the reverse should have occurred in the face of the synoptic parallels. And if the original had read 'with you I am well pleased' it is certainly not obvious why the change to the reading of Ps.2:7 should have been made only in Luke³⁵. Be that as it may, however, the variant reading in Luke attests an early interpretation of the logion which included a reference to Ps.2:7, and suggests that Cullmann is wrong to exclude it from his interpretation.

(b). Cullmann confuses the reference to the Royal Psalm (Ps.2) with the idea that Jesus is being hailed as a king. This is totally out of place: the reference is to Jesus' being hailed as son³⁶. That this is the case is to be seen from the Temptation narrative that follows immediately after the baptism, where his status as son, and in particular how Jesus will interpret the implications of that status are tested (Mt.4:1-11, esp. vv.3,6).

(c). In actual fact it is the reference to Is.42:1 which requires the defence, - for the language in Mk.1:11 is by no means parallel to the LXX of that passage. Indeed, Miss Hooker³⁷ would have us remove any thought of a reference to Is.42 from consideration here, but this is probably not justified, in view of the similarly loose /

35. Further arguments on this point in A.R.C. Leaney, The Gospel According to St. Luke, (BNTC), London, 1958, 110-1.

36. So, e.g., Schweizer, Mark, 40.

37. Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, London, 1959, 68, 73.

loose reference to Is.42 in Mt.12:18. Also one could arguably claim to be able to find in Mk.1:11b reminiscences of Gen.22:2; Is.44:2; 62:4 - passages with no reference to the Servant³⁸.

These points show, I think, that we are not justified in over-emphasising Is.42:1, although that does not mean that it was not an influence. We must therefore see in Mk.1:11 references to both Ps.2:7 and Is.42:1, to sonship and to servanthood³⁹, and accordingly, Cullmann's interpretation in terms of the latter concept only is defective.

Against Cullmann's point(ii), we may say that the argument is strained:

πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην means no more than 'fulfil all righteousness', i.e., 'fulfil all the righteous acts God requires'⁴⁰. Jesus' action in submitting to baptism is thus a righteous act in the sight of God: it does not effect a general righteousness. Further, to argue that Lk.3:21-2 (ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τοὺς λαοὺς) supports this view, is surely wrong (against Cullmann, 18). For Luke this is no more than a descriptive phrase, intended to set the scene; and anyway, if Cullmann's thesis were correct, Jesus' baptism would have rendered unnecessary, even irrelevant, the baptism of all the people - and this makes nonsense of the passage!

Against (iii), one does not doubt that in Mk.10:38 and Lk.12:50 the word βαπτίζεν is used in the context of Jesus' death, but what one must reject is the conjecture that, therefore, Jesus was referring back to his baptism in the Jordan, and that, for Jesus, baptism always and only has this significance. In Mark, there is also reference to drinking a cup as a metaphor of his death, and this is a metaphor found in the OT⁴¹. We have no reason to doubt that βαπτίζεν was not also being used as a metaphor here⁴².

Against (iv), the attempt to relate John the Baptist's testimony to Jesus to the Suffering Servant on the basis of the variant reading ἐλεεκτός will scarcely do /

38. So, D.E.Nineham, St. Mark, (PNTC), London, 1963, 62.

39. So, e.g., V.Taylor, St. Mark, London, 1962, ad. loc.; so also, S.E.Johnston, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (BNTC), London, 1960, 39.

40. Cf. BAG, s.v. δικαιοσύνη, 2a.

41. Cf. e.g., Ps.75:8; Is.51:17,22ff.; Jer.49:12f.; Lam.4:21.

42. This usage is found in the LXX, cf. Is.21:4. BM comments, (76): 'the subject of our Lord's words is his death and not his baptism, and .. it is his death which is likened to a baptism, and not his baptism which is likened to a death.'

do: $\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is the better attested reading⁴³. It is also obvious that the 'Lamb of God' concept was seen Messianically (Jn.1:41ff.). Further if John related the concept of Ebed Yahweh to the baptism of Jesus, is it not inexplicable that he omitted all reference to Jesus' baptism? No, our understanding of Jn.1 must proceed along lines other than Cullmann's.

Thus I would hold that Cullmann's thesis does not hold good at its starting point, the baptism of Jesus, and that we must base our understanding of that event elsewhere.

I think that a point of fundamental importance to be noted is that Jesus' baptism was within the framework of John the Baptist's ministry: that is how the synoptic gospels describe it, especially Luke (3:21), and the possibility then arises that this experience of Jesus is to be seen within the framework of anticipation, of the 'not yet', and no other⁴⁴. Thus Jesus is seen to have been associating himself with the movement around John the Baptist; he is attaching himself to the people of the end-time whom John is summoning, and it is in terms of his solidarity with the people that the christological problem posed by Jesus' baptism is to be resolved.

The relation between Jesus' baptism and his reception of the Holy Spirit has proved needlessly troublesome in the past. The synoptic accounts are unanimous and explicit about one fact: it was after Jesus had been baptized that the Spirit was given. Thus the verb βαπτίζω- used in the indicative in Mark and the participle in Matthew and Luke - is in the aorist tense, signifying that the action of the verb is over and done with. In both Mt.3:16 and Mk.1:10 Jesus has left the water, while in Lk.3:21 he is praying, when the Holy Spirit is given. In the Fourth Gospel John the Baptist testifies to the descent of the Spirit, and no mention of the baptism has in fact been made! I quote Dunn's words with approval:

'It must be stated emphatically that the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit are two distinct events, related but distinct.'⁴⁵

Thus it is the openness of Jesus to the Father's will, expressed in his solidarity with the people at his baptism, which makes him available for the gift of the Spirit from /

43. Against NEB. Cf. UBS apparatus which makes $\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ a 'B' standard of reading.

44. So, Dunn, 36, n.43, cf.99 n.18.

45. Dunn, 35.

from God. The place occupied by the baptism of Jesus, immediately followed as it was by the Temptation, right at the start of Jesus' ministry, surely points to the fact that however many superficial parallels may exist between Jesus' baptism and the later Christian baptism of the church, it is nevertheless wrong to assume a one-to-one correspondence. The significance of Jesus' baptismal experience is tied up for him in his unique relation to the Father, and his unique possession of the Spirit. His experience must be seen as possessing a totally different character from any other experience at baptism. Beasley Murray expresses the point well:

'Jesus was acknowledged Son of God at baptism (Mk.1:11) and in him we become sons of God in baptism by faith (Gal.3:26f.). The former citation is a proclamation of the messianic office of Jesus, the latter indicates the creation of a filial relationship to God. There is therefore a vast difference between the two experiences, yet there is also a connection between them.'⁴⁶

Thus we are not justified in equating the baptismal experience of the Christian with that of Jesus. Jesus' baptism belongs to the time of anticipation, the Christian's to the time of salvation. There are two further strands of material from the gospels related to the question of baptism, to which we now turn.

2. Jesus the Baptist?

The question of the relation between Jesus, baptism and the baptist movements is complicated by the statement in John, repeated no fewer than three times (Jn.3:22, 26,; 4:1) that Jesus himself practised baptism, (ἐβαπτίζεν, 3:22) - the verb being in the imperfect tense, implying an activity extending over a period of time. According to C. H. Dodd, 'This is a statement for which nothing else in the NT prepares us.'⁴⁷ In view of the success of John the Baptist (Mk.1:5) the statement that Jesus was more successful than John the Baptist (Jn.4:1) makes the silence of the synoptic gospels all the more puzzling. The problem is in a sense complicated by the note in Jn.4:2 - 'although in fact it was only the disciples who were baptizing, and not Jesus himself' - a statement which is usually regarded as either a correction /

46. BM, 65

47. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 285.

a correction⁴⁸, or a gloss⁴⁹. Neither of these solutions, however, seems satisfactory. Against the idea that it is a correction from the author, Dodd rightly remarks (Historical Tradition, 285) -

'it is difficult to believe that any writer would have made a statement and contradicted it in the same breath, to the hopeless ruin of his sentence.'

We must surely agree that the author of the Fourth Gospel was above such an ineptitude as this proposal would entail. However, against the view that it was a gloss, we may make two points: i). the total lack of any MSS evidence for its omission from the text (so Barrett, John, 192) - although the editorial Jn.21:24 may show the possibility of a 'pre-publication' gloss, as it were, and Jn.4:2 may originate from the same hand as Jn.21⁵⁰. And ii). a more serious objection is Bultmann's - 'Admittedly one would rather have expected an editor who wanted to make a correction to have done so at 3:22.'⁵¹ Perhaps the least unsatisfactory solution is to say that here John is preserving two independent but conflicting traditions, and we should note that 4:2, even if a 'correction' nevertheless goes beyond the synoptic tradition in telling us that Jesus' disciples engaged in a baptist ministry, prior to Jesus' own ministry in Galilee.

Let us assume for the moment that John had in his hands an ancient tradition that Jesus baptized. Dodd, in his examination of this hypothesis, finds arguments which prove that here, at Jn.4:2, we have 'an undigested scrap of genuine information'. The question to be faced is, can this be held to accord with the synoptic account? In fact the answer is positive: Jn.3:24 is not to be viewed as a correction to Mk.1:14, where Jesus enters Galilee after the arrest of John the Baptist. Rather, with Barrett (John, 184) it is in fact the case that John places the events of chapters /

48. So Flemington, 30,n.43; BM 68, quoting (n.4) Bultmann's silent concurrence with this view.

49. So Dodd, Historical Tradition, 285; Jeremias, NT Theology, I 45, esp. nn.3-5.

50. So Dodd, Historical Tradition, 311,n.3.

51. R.Bultmann, The Gospel of John, 168,n.1.

of chapters 1-4:4 before the Baptist's imprisonment, i.e., before the Galilean ministry of Jesus. Further, Dodd argues that the synoptics 'imply something of the kind'⁵³ by the parable of the children in the market place (Mt.11:16-9, Lk.7:31-5) in which the conduct of the Baptist and of Jesus are portrayed as strictly parallel, as 'two persons engaged in comparable activities' simultaneously⁵⁴. Thus the suggested chronology would be: Jesus' baptism and temptation are followed by a period of baptist activity, parallel to John's, which meets with great success. John is put in prison, Jesus senses danger (Jn.4:1) and moves into Galilee where the ministry as described by the synoptics (beginning Mk.1:14) commenced. Thus it would seem that John's picture of a baptismal activity is not ruled out on chronological grounds. The following arguments may also be held to support this view, though they are more indirect.

i). 'It is easier to understand the quite remarkable fact that the primitive community began to baptize after Easter, if Jesus himself had already been active in administering baptism.'⁵⁵

This remark of Jeremias is true so far as it goes: it helps to explain the outward similarity of the two rites, and relates them both, in their own way, to Jesus.

Barrett's caveat, however, (John, 192), is also necessary -

'baptism practised during the ministry (even if historical) cannot be regarded as a sufficient explanation of the later rite.'

ii). The conjectured tension between the disciples of John the Baptist (cf. Ac.18:25; 19:3) and Christians⁵⁶ which some scholars think is partly reflected in the Fourth Gospel (cf. the stress on John's avowed inferiority to Jesus, Jn.1:19-28), would be easier to explain if Jesus had also engaged in a baptist ministry similar to John's (and was therefore, in the eyes of the Baptist's followers, merely John's equal)⁵⁷.

However /

53. Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 291.

54. That the context of the parable tells against this interpretation, is, according to Dodd, no argument, for the parables occur in a discourse editorially constructed from several pericopae whose original context we cannot ascertain.

55. Jeremias, NT Theology, I, 46. So too, Flemington, 31.

56. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 300; cf. Barrett, John, 142.

57. Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 272, for discussion of the suggestion that Jesus began as a disciple of John the Baptist.

However the evidence we have on the Baptist sect outside the NT⁵⁸, is not sufficient for us to be able to confirm this conjecture.

It must be remembered, moreover, that both of these points above are indirect, and far from conclusive. A further difficulty lies in the question, Granting for the moment that Jesus did baptize, what was the nature of this baptism? That it was not 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' which John the Baptist had predicted from the Messiah, is at once obvious from Jn.7:39 - 'the Spirit had not yet been given' (against Dodd)⁵⁹. Beasley Murray, who accepts as 'probable' the view that Jesus baptized,⁶⁰ adapts a suggestion of Hoskyns that 'any baptism authorised by Jesus the Messiah is differentiated by its relation to him', and therefore, -

'the baptism of the ministry therefore was neither Jewish, nor Johannine, nor Christian: it was baptism in obedience to the Messianic proclamation under the sign of the Messianic action and in anticipation of the Messianic deliverance; more than that we cannot say.'

This is, to my mind, unsatisfactory speculation which does not explain the difference between the 'ministry baptism' and the later Christian rite.

Such an answer as we are able to infer on the question of the nature of this 'ministry baptism' may be hinted at in the texts. It may be that the 'entirely detached statement' of Jn.3:25 ἐγένετο ὑποψία περὶ καθάρισμα, which has puzzled commentators⁶¹ could provide a clue. As Dodd says, 'the curious thing is that it leads /

58. Justin, Trypho, 80; Clement, Recogn. 1.54.60

59. C.H.Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953, 310.

So too, Cullmann, Baptism, 79f; cf. Dunn, Baptism, 20

60. Curiously he argues (69) from the similarity of Jesus' demand for repentance (Mt.4:17) to John's (3:2) that though Jesus had a greater note of urgency 'through his consciousness of being the agent of divine sovereignty', their message was the same. 'The people, then must repent. John demanded its expression in baptism. Did Jesus decline to ask for baptism?' Beasley Murray goes on to quote Marsh with approval, 'He (Jesus) ought not to be accused of prohibiting an experience which in his own case had brought a divine revelation.' A case of fanciful eisegesis!

61. Bultmann, John, 168: 'Not only is it entirely superfluous, but the whole story would be made more coherent by its omission.'

leads to nothing' (Historical Tradition, 285), - and so either it is out of place (for which we have no evidence) or it has a bearing on the context, namely the baptist ministry of Jesus:

'In this context this can only refer to baptism, which would mean that it was a discussion about the relation of Jesus' to John's baptism.'

(Bultmann, John, 168). The puzzle of why καθαρismus and not βαπτισμῆς is used is resolved if we accept the possibility that the baptism of Jesus was no more than a καθαρismus, i.e., a preparatory baptism similar to John's, rather than, with Barrett(John, 182) something 'within the Jewish system of purifications'. John thus plays down in his gospel, not only the role of John the Baptist, but also the baptismal activity of Jesus, - as it belonged to the preparation and no more.

All the preceeding argument has been based upon the hypothesis that Jesus did conduct a baptismal ministry prior to his Galilean one (Mk.1:14ff.). However, there is one basic objection to this hypothesis: if Jesus' experience in the Jordan was as important and definitive as the synoptic gospels suggest, why was it that he felt the need to delay and spend time in a preparatory ministry? Does the baptist ministry hypothesis not involve a curious anti-climax of delay after the heights of the 'sonship' experience subsequent to his own baptism by John? For if the tradition of a baptist ministry as in Jn.3-4 is historical, we can be in no doubt that it took place after Jesus' own baptism, - as is implied in the allusion to the synoptic account in Jn.1:32ff. Unless we can explain a reason for the delay (and I cannot) we are at impasse: the evidence is conflicting and confusing. If Jesus did exercise a baptist ministry, it is difficult to explain why or to relate it to his later ministry. In which case the tradition preserved in the early chapters of John prove to be of little help in our enquiry into baptism.

3. The Command to Baptize.

Mt.28:19-20 is the only⁶² passage in the NT which relates a specific command of Jesus to baptize. Beasley-Murray⁶³ has gone over all the main arguments which have /

62. Mk.16:16 is secondary, but see the discussion below.

63. BM, 77-92.

have surrounded the saying in an attempt to evaluate it positively, and in what follows I am indebted to him for the structure of the argument, and for some of the points. Objection has been made to Mt.28:19-20 along various lines.

i) Only Matthew records these words of the Risen Lord.

ii) There is evidence that early citations of these verses, especially by Eusebius, do not presuppose the form in which we have them⁶⁴.

iii) The appearance of the trinitarian formula on the lips of the Risen Christ is suspect: it is certainly not found in other early literature⁶⁵.

iv) The problems attendant upon the Gentile mission are inexplicable if the command $\mu\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \epsilon\theta\eta$ formed part of the church's commission⁶⁶.

It is possible, however, to counter these objections.

Against (i), it is true that Matthew alone preserves these words, but that is not as decisive as it might at first sight appear. We no longer possess the ending of Mark's gospel (so most commentators), - the ending we do have, Mk.16:9-20, is best seen as 'the first attempt to supply a conclusion' (E. Schweizer). Now these verses also contain a command to baptize (v.16, -'Those who believe the good news and receive baptism will find salvation'), and it is significant that with regard to these verses, E. Schweizer from his position of radical redaction-criticism should hold the opinion that 'the statement is related to Mt.28:19-20 but is not a copy of it'⁶⁷. Thus the Markan ending is not dependent upon Matthew in this respect at least. As the reference to baptism is couched in a quite different way to Mt.28:19-20, the conclusion is not impossible that we have here an independent variation of the baptismal commission found in Matthew. Nor is the absence of this commission /

64. This is the argument of F.C.Conybeare, 'The Eusebian form of the text of Mt.28:19-20' in Z.N.W., 1901.

65. F.V.Filson, The Gospel of St. Matthew, London, (BNTC), 1960, states that the absence of the trinitarian formula elsewhere in the NT 'raises a serious question whether Jesus explicitly commanded its regular use.' (305).

66. So, H.Klostermann, St. Matthew, (Handbuch zum NT), 2nd. edition, Tubingen, 1927, 233. McNeile, St. Matthew, London (1915-52), 435; D.Hill, Matthew, London (NCB) 1972, 326.

67. Schweizer, Mark, 376; so too, BM 80.

commission in Luke decisive (Lk.24:44-9): the language of v.47 is closely parallel to Lk.3:2 and Ac.2:38 - both references to baptism - and baptism may be at the back of Luke's mind here. Further, Luke reproduces another version of the commission in Ac.1:4-8, which has elements parallel to Mt.28:19-20, including a reference to baptism (Ac.1:5), although the form of this statement goes back to John the Baptist (Mt.3:11, Lk.3:16). Did Luke choose to introduce the saying here, not merely as a forward reference to Pentecost (which is significantly never referred to as a 'baptism') but because of the tradition of a commission to the disciples which included baptism?

Similarly John knows of a commission which includes a reference to forgiveness of sins (Jn.20:23), and which has prompted some commentators to trace at least a hint of a reference to baptism. Thus, e.g., Barrett, (John, 475):

'There is probably a reference to baptism in the Johannine charge also ...

But it is hardly necessary to restrict the meaning of the saying to baptism.'

These references in the other gospels and in Acts suggest that the authors knew of a tradition which linked the disciples' commission with a reference to baptism. It is highly unlikely that they were all dependent upon Matthew.

Against (ii), we must emphasise that recourse to the Eusebian text does not question the command to baptize, but only the occurrence of the trinitarian formula. However, even Conybeare's arguments on the Eusebian text have not found ready acceptance, and E. Riegenbush⁶⁸ has shown that Eusebius was not exact in his quotations. A further point against Conybeare is the absence of any MSS evidence of a variant reading at Mt.28:19-20.

Against (iii), we must recognise that the lack of any other occurrence of the trinitarian formula in the NT is a serious objection to Mt.28:19-20. Indeed the evidence of Paul and the Acts is that the early church baptized 'in the name of Jesus' (cf. e.g., Gal.3:27; Ro.6:3a; Ac.2:38, etc.), and this is inexplicable if Jesus had explicitly commanded baptism 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'. Now it is true that there are passages in the NT in which the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are grouped together, (cf. 1 Cor.12:4; 2 Cor.13:14; Gal.4:6, cf. 1 Pet.1:2; - so McNeile, St. Matthew, 436), but these are best viewed /

68. Cf. BM 81 for this reference.

viewed as the first stages of a theological development which was later to grow into the doctrine of the Trinity. The only other evidence for baptism with a trinitarian formula is Did.7:1. Thus the likelihood is great that Mt.28:19-20 does not preserve an authentic word of Jesus in its present form. Hill is probably correct when he states -

'The Sitz im Leben of the verse probably lies in the life and work of the church about 50 years after the death of Jesus.'⁶⁹

We are certainly not justified in trying to rescue the trinitarian formula by a compromise, with Bruce⁷⁰, who says that 'baptism in the name of Jesus was reserved for Jews and Samaritans only, who, since they 'already acknowledged the one true God were required only to confess Jesus as Lord and Messiah', while Gentiles, 'turn-
:ing from paganism to the Living God' required the full trinitarian formula! This, quite simply does not accord with the facts: we can see that Gentiles were baptized 'in the name of Jesus' from Gal.3:27, and by implication from 1 Cor.1:13,15; and perhaps also, Ac.19:5. Just how insecure such arguments are is shown by the fact that G. Delling⁷¹ can entertain the opposite possibility, namely that baptism 'in the name of Jesus' was confined to the Greek-speaking world! I feel we are safer to assume that the trinitarian formula is an anachronism, read back into the Resurr-
:ection narrative. Beasley-Murray (83) suggests that the strong Christological context of vv. 16-20 may point to an original Christological baptism command, i.e., an equivalent to baptism 'in the name of Jesus'. It is again important to note the extent of this point of criticism: all that is suspect is the trinitarian form-
:ula, not the command to baptize⁷².

Against (iv) /

69. Matthew, (NCB) 326.

70. F.F.Bruce, The Book of the Acts, (NICNT), London, 1968, 181,n.32.

71. G.Delling, Worship in the NT, 130.

72. So T.H.Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, (MNTC), London, 1928, 237: it is 'very possible that the trinitarian formula is a reflection back into the narrative of the practice of the early church, but there is no need to doubt the essence of the command.'

Against (iv), - the problem of this verse as it relates to the Gentile mission, has been well put by Jackson and Lake⁷³ : 'to accept Mt.28:19 is to discredit the obedience of the Twelve beyond reasonable limits'. This is the view of many commentators since. Hill, the most recent English commentator on Matthew finds the Apostles' attitude to the Gentiles 'inexplicable' (326) if this is a genuine saying of Jesus. He goes on,

'It must be presumed that the Church, having learned and experienced the universality of the Christian message assigned that knowledge to a direct command of the Living Lord.' (326).

However this is by no means so. In the first place we should note that the existence of a word from Jesus on the question of 'clean' and 'unclean' foods (cf. Mk. 7:14ff.) did not prevent the controversy within the church on this very question, as Gal.2:11f.; Col.2:21 and Ac.15:20 show. And secondly, turning to the Gentile mission, it is clear that the narrative of the early chapters of Acts does not in any sense give us a clear picture of the early community, and it certainly does not trace the activities of the Twelve⁷⁴. Further, the pains to which Luke goes (Ac.10-11) to show how God willed and brought about the Gentile mission⁷⁵ do not necessarily disprove the authenticity of Mt.28:19-20, because Luke himself has recorded just such a command himself (Ac.1:8). Also the assumption is frequently repeated that Paul was fighting for the Gentile mission against the opposition of the /

73. The Beginings of Christianity, London, I, (1920), 328,n.2.

74. Thus, e.g., 1 Peter knows of some contact between Peter and Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1:1). Even if 1 Peter is pseudonymous this point still stands, as the author would hardly have pressed fictitious material into service in an attempt to lend credibility to his letter. Other early literature gives evidence of wide-ranging missionary work, which we cannot test: cf. 1 Clem.42.3f.; Justin, Apol.I.39.3; Hermas, Sim.9.25.2. Within the NT itself, we know nothing of the founding of congregations at Damascus, Ephesus, Antioch and Rome.

75. Cf. Haenchen, 362: 'As Luke presents them, these divine incursions (Peter's vision, etc.) have such compelling force that all doubt in the face of them must be silenced. They compellingly prove that God, not man, is at work.'

the Jerusalem Apostles is just not true, and is contradicted by Paul himself (Gal. 2:6-10). The crux of the controversy was not the validity of the Gentile mission, -that was accepted - but rather the terms on which Gentile converts might be admitted to the church. The Gentile freedom from the Law (Paul's solution) had a corollary that Jewish Christians also shared this freedom, and this was the basis of the dispute which led to the so-called 'unfortunate incident at Antioch' (Gal. 2:11-14). This was the point at issue, not the question of whether there should be a mission to the Gentiles; and thus the argument against Mt.28:19-20 on this point is invalid. As mentioned above, Luke has a parallel of sorts to Mt.28:19-20 in Ac.1:5, which, however much it owes its form to Luke's use of it as his 'contents page' (Haenchen), nevertheless does attest a similar injunction to a universal mission. If, however, one did wish to question the universal nature of the original command, one could easily postulate an original such as $\mu\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ ($\lambda\upsilon\theta\omega\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$), which became more specific in the light of subsequent experience. Even so, this is not a direct attack on the validity of the command to baptize as such.

One further argument may be adduced in support of there having been an original command to baptize in Jesus' commission to his disciples is the fact, agreed on by all, that from the very earliest days of the church's mission, baptism was practised as the initiatory rite: we cannot now point to a time when baptism was not practised after Pentecost. Bultmann says of baptism

'It can be regarded as certain that from the very beginning it was practised as the rite of initiation.' (Theology of the NT, I,39.)

There can be no other explanation than that the church was following a known command of Jesus⁷⁶, and we know of no other occasion when Jesus may have given this command. McNeile's hypothesis (437), that the command was given before Jesus' death is totally without foundation; and, indeed, he himself has no evidence to offer for it!

The following statement by Oepke⁷⁷, provides a fair conclusion:

'The community must have been aware that in baptizing it was fulfilling the intention of the Lord. Quite irrespective of the ceaseless critical objections to Mt.28:18-20 and Mk.16:16, we may conclude from the very existence and significance /

76. Against McNeile, 435. He says 'It is impossible to maintain that everything which goes to constitute even the essence of Christianity must necessarily be traceable to explicit words of Jesus.'

77. T.W.N.T. I, 539.

'significance of the apostolate ... that there was knowledge of a missionary command, or many such commands, of the Risen Lord, and that in accordance with the new situation this command was understood as a command to baptize.' We now turn to the way in which the early community carried out this command, first in Acts and then in the Pauline letters, for references to the way in which baptism was understood.

C. The Early Church.

1. The Acts of the Apostles.

We cannot now point to a time when baptism was not practised in the early church. The earliest literature, the letters of Paul, presuppose the practice of the rite, and indeed assume that every Christian had been baptized (Ro.6:3; 1 Cor. 12:13). This is also the picture Acts gives us of the earliest community, immediately after Pentecost. Thus there is no need to doubt that Luke is guilty of an anachronism in depicting baptism as normal practice from the first⁷⁸. Of course, the 120 disciples who shared the experience of Pentecost were not baptized, but this fact is of no significance for later practice⁷⁹. Rather the Pentecost experience is to be seen as the unique once-for-all act of God which initiates the era of the Spirit, the age of the church⁸⁰.

The /

78. So BM 93ff. against Weiss, A History of Primitive Christianity, ET, London, 1937, 50f.; Jackson and Lake, Beginings, I, 338.

79. The Cornelius incident (Ac.10-11) is not a parallel (against Beginings, I, 338f). There are some elements of parallelism (cf. 10:47; 11:15,17; 15:8, - so Dunn, 51-2), but for Cornelius, unlike the others, baptism followed (10:47). Despite Jackson and Lake (loc. cit.) there are insufficient grounds for excising this verse.

80. BM 95; cf. Flemington, 42. He suggests that 'most, if not all, of the original Apostles had probably been disciples of John the Baptist. Thus it was likely that they had already received John's baptism in the River Jordan.' Just how true this is, we have no way of knowing; nor do we know how many of the 120 were eligible to fill the twelfth place, (and therefore, by implication, had received John's baptism at the beginning of Jesus' ministry). Cf. Dunn, 44ff. for Pentecost discussion.

The preaching which followed the Pentecost experience ended with a call for repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus the Messiah, for forgiveness of sins, and the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit (Ac.2:38). Standing as it does at the end of the first Christian missionary sermon, we may well see it as a significant verse. According to Dunn, (90),

'Luke probably intends Ac.2:38 to establish the pattern and norm for Christian conversion-initiation in his presentation of Christianity's beginnings.'

This, I think, is indeed the case; especially when it is noted that in this verse three important elements which are involved in the conversion-initiation process are all present while in later baptismal contexts not all of them are necessarily mentioned explicitly. We will examine these in turn, filling out our understanding of them from other places in Acts. These three elements are repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus, and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The first of these elements is repentance, man's response to the preaching of the word, and even in those cases where it does not explicitly occur, it is usually to be inferred from the context⁸¹. The form which this response may take can be variously expressed: μετανοεῖν, turning away from sin (Ac.2:38), ἐπιστρέφειν, turning to God (9:35), or πιστεῖν, commitment to, or trust in, God (16:31)⁸², and there is usually some such term to express the response which man must make to the word. By the act of submitting to baptism the candidate gives public expression to his response. Thus baptism is not an act which brings a man to faith any more than it can be said to 'confer' (Conzelmann, Outline, 48) forgiveness of sin. Rather, with Dunn, (Baptism, 97),-

'it may symbolise cleansing, but it is the faith and repentance which receive the forgiveness, and the Holy Spirit who conveys, confers and effects it.'

This is underlined by the fact that Luke nowhere mentions baptism alone as the condition for forgiveness, - on the contrary, repentance or faith are frequently mentioned as the sole prerequisite⁸³ for receiving forgiveness.

In /

81. Cf. Ac.10:43; cleansing at 22:16; response to the word at 8:12; 9:18; 16:14; 16:32; 18:8 and 19:3.

82. For the usage of these terms, cf. Dunn, 91.

83. Cf. Lk.5:20; 24:47; Ac.3:19; 5:13, etc., so Dunn, 97.

In the second element, baptism in the name of Jesus, the church plays its part. We are unfortunately in no position to be able to learn much about the procedure of the act of baptism, since only in Ac.8:36 (the story of the Ethiopian Eunuch) is any descriptive detail given, and in this case the situation is so exceptional (so far as the procedures are concerned) that we can infer nothing from it about regular church practice. Thus we may not deduce that the regular practice was for immersion⁸⁴, or for sprinkling⁸⁵. It was much later laid down (Did.7:1-3) that running water (hence immersion?) was the ideal, and that pouring water over the head of the candidate was a last resort all else failing, but we cannot say how early this practice obtained, or how widespread it was. If, as would seem likely, the early church followed the practice of John the Baptist⁸⁶ then immersion would have been normal practice, but we do not know if this was, or even could be, carried out in Jerusalem.

There is general agreement that the earliest practice (it is also attested in Paul)⁸⁷ was for the candidate to be baptized 'in the name of Jesus'. There are two related aspects of this, the phrase used was either ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ac.2:38) or ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι...καὶ (10:48) or εἰς τὸ ὄνομα...καὶ (8:16). It is probable that here two actions are referred to: (i) the candidate invoked the Lord by name⁸⁸ i.e., prayed to him - (cf. Ac.2:21; 22:16, cf.4:12); and (ii) the name of the Lord was pronounced over the candidate, which is probably referred to in Jas.2:7, 'the name which is spoken over you'.⁸⁹ Thus, to quote Dunn, (Baptism, 97) -

'Water baptism is to be regarded as the occasion on which the initiate called upon the Lord for mercy and the means by which he committed himself to the one whose name was named over him. Properly administered, water-baptism /

84. Cf. Barn.11:11, so Bultmann, Theology of the NT, I, 138.

85. Cf. Heb.10:22

86. Dunn (99,n.18) quotes Buchsel: 'Had John not baptized there would probably be no Christian baptism'.

87. 1 Cor.1:13 implies as much.

88. This may be related to the confession of Christ at baptism, to be inferred from Ro.10:9; Eph.5:26; 1 Pet.3:16 and perhaps 1 Tim,6:12. Cf. BM, 100f.

89. I can find no justification for Bultmann's remark (Theology of NT, I, 137) that 'the naming of the name is an independent sacrament competing with the bath of baptism' and which was allegedly joined to baptism at a later date.

'baptism must have been the climax and act of faith, the expression of repentance and the vehicle of commitment.'

The sequel to baptism, - God's response, as it were, - is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Here it is important to note one major point. Despite the mass of scholars who declare otherwise⁹⁰, there is no passage in Acts where it is stated that baptism confers the Holy Spirit. As with Jesus, for whom the reception of the Spirit was an experience subsequent to baptism, so too with the church: the Spirit comes after baptism, not during it. Thus in a sense Christian baptism is similar to John the Baptist's rite, - an act of commitment and preparation, in the face of which God gives the Holy Spirit. That the Spirit is not tied to baptism is obvious from the narratives of Cornelius (Ac.10-11) and Apollos (Ac.18:24ff.), both of which we shall presently examine. One further element which is indicated by the language of Ac.2, is that of leaving one community, or group of people (2:40-1: 'this crooked age'), and entering another, the congregation, the group of disciples.

We have therefore seen that the basic pattern of the conversion-initiation process involved the three elements, response, baptism and the gift of the Spirit, and that it was a reasonable assumption that this was the normative pattern of events⁹¹. But was it always so? The question is prompted by those several 'problem passages' in which Luke narrates a divergence from this pattern, viz., the account of Philip's mission in Samaria (Ac.8), the Cornelius incident (Ac.10-11), the Apollos case (Ac.18:24ff.) and the case of the disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus (Ac.19:1ff.). I have developed the basic treatment of baptism in Acts mainly from Ac.2 with some cross-references to amplify the details, but without any mention of these four passages, because it is my view that in these passages Luke was describing exceptional, unusual cases, which were not allowed to remain exceptional, but were brought into line with the normal pattern of events in the conversion-initiation process, as it was experienced, and as outlined above. This view can be illustrated by an examination of the narratives in question.

(i). Philip's mission in Samaria.

In this narrative, the people are explicitly said to have believed; they were baptized /

90. Cf: Dunn, Baptism, 98,n.17 for a list.

91. I do not think there is any significance in the fact that in certain summarised accounts there is no mention of the Holy Spirit's coming after baptism, as at Ac.16:14,33; 18:8, e.g.

baptized, but did not receive the Spirit until some time later, and then only as the result of subsequent action which included 'the laying on of hands'. 'The problem is', according to Dunn (55), 'that in the context of the rest of the NT these facts appear to be mutually exclusive and wholly irreconcilable.' Various solutions to the problem have been suggested, but none has really proved satisfactory.⁹² Thus, for example, I agree with Dunn (56) that Beasley-Murray's proposed solution (BM, 119), - that the Spirit was present, but that it was the charismata that were absent - is insupportable from the evidence of the text. Haenchen's solution is to reject the authenticity of the narrative as it stands and to suggest that Luke has combined two originally independent stories: Philip's mission to Samaria, and the Simon narrative. But the reason for this, - particularly since, as Haenchen admits (308), the resulting narrative is far from problem-free, - is hard to envisage. Dunn's answer is that the faith of the Samaritans was defective, that therefore they were not fully Christian and for that reason the Spirit was withheld (Baptism, 63f.) -but this view also has objections, which I shall treat as we go through the passage. In advance, however, I think we do well to keep in mind one fact: Luke does not give us a reason why the Spirit was withheld. Turning to the passage, the following points may be made.

(a) To assert that Philip's preaching was misunderstood in terms of Samaritan theology (so, Dunn, 63-4)⁹³, and that therefore the Samaritans' belief was defective, seems unjustified, especially in view of the fact that Luke nowhere states that the Samaritans had to undergo further instruction in the Christian message before the Holy Spirit was given. How then, can Dunn claim (63) that 'Luke intended his readers to know' that their faith was defective?

(b) To attribute the Samaritans with imperfect faith because of imperfect understanding of the preaching of Philip, on the basis of the fact that their response to Philip (προσέχον δ' οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπο τοῦ φιλιππου v.6) is described in language similar to their response to Simon (v.10, ὃ προσέχον πέντες), is no solution; it fails because of the statement that the Apostles hear ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σιμωνία τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, v.14, which as 11:1; 17:11 show, means 'had become Christian' (against Dunn, 67, n.48).

(c) There/

92. For discussion, cf. Dunn, Baptism, 55ff.; BM 104ff.

93. Dunn does admit (63, n.36) that this argument is based on later Samaritan texts.

(c) There is indeed something curious about the use of πιστεύειν in this passage, especially as it is applied to Simon (v.13), whose later conduct is incompatible with true belief. On Dunn's argument (65,c,d,) we should probably want to translate the verb here 'go through the motions, make an outward pretence of belief', and while that may appear to be the sense required, it is certainly not justified linguistically⁹⁴.

(d) The mystery deepens when we consider the question of whether the Apostles laid hands upon Simon. Dunn regards this as 'improbable' (67,n.44), but Haenchen's remark seems more justified: 'There is no indication that he was excluded from the laying on of hands, and there was presumably no reason to exclude him.' (304).

(e) Dunn holds that in the passage 'Luke's aim is to highlight the difference between true and false Christianity, and he does so by devoting most attention to Simon ... in order to draw out the ultimate contrast between him and the Samaritans.'

(66). This may be true for the latter part of the narrative, but it does not explain why neither Simon nor the Samaritans received the Spirit initially.

(f) And Dunn's appeal to the racial animosity (67f.), while attested elsewhere in the NT as a real issue between Jews and Samaritans, fails here because Luke nowhere alludes to it; as far as Luke was concerned, it was not a real issue which played any part in events.

In short, the difficulties are insoluble. If Luke knew why the Spirit was not given to the Samaritans, - and it is by no means impossible that by the time the tradition reached Luke the original circumstances were long since obscured - then he has not communicated them to his readers. What is important is not the reason for the unusual occurrence, but the fact that the early church took what steps it could (prayer, the laying on of hands in blessing) to rectify the anomaly. The narrative, incidentally, shows that the Spirit is not the automatic sequel to baptism; the gift of the Spirit is in no way mediated ex opere operato. Nor is the Spirit the possession of the church; all that the church can do is pray for the sending of the Spirit, and when that happens it is always the gracious gift of God, who knows the hearts of men and is free to grant or withhold (Simon) the Spirit's coming.

(ii). /

94. This use of πιστεύειν which Dunn describes as 'unique in Acts' (65) may in fact have a parallel in a roughly similar passage - Ac.19:2, for which, cf. below. However there is no other example in the NT of πιστεύειν used absolutely of non-Christian 'believing'.

(ii). The Conversion of Cornelius. We may deal more briefly with the problems relating to this incident, since the majority of these do not bear on the question of baptism⁹⁵. Our present interest in the passage focuses on one point: Cornelius and the company receive the Holy Spirit independently of, and prior to, the act of baptism, although Peter quickly makes good the omission of baptism. We need not doubt that once again we have an exceptional case. The devout God-fearer summons Peter to his house in obedience to a vision, and while the latter is speaking, and, perhaps significantly, while he is speaking about forgiveness of sins (Dunn, 80), the Holy Spirit comes upon the company. Thus Peter and the company knew that God had accepted these Gentiles and given them a share in the experience of the Spirit. As Dunn says (80), 'The Spirit was not something additional to God's acceptance and forgiveness, but constituted that acceptance and forgiveness.' - in view of which Peter did not feel justified in withholding baptism.

Two points are worthy of mention in this connection:

- (i) The Spirit may be gifted independently of baptism. Those who misleadingly speak of baptism conferring, effecting, or the like, the gift of the Spirit, do not take this passage sufficiently into account: the Spirit is God's gift which he may bestow as he pleases.
- (ii) It is also noteworthy that even after the gift of the Spirit Peter still felt it necessary to administer baptism, which, as the ensuing narrative makes clear, thus involves joining with and acceptance by the community of believers (Ac.11:1-18). Thus, as we noted above from Ac.2:40-1, the element of entering the community of the church was present from the earliest days.

In these two cases so far reviewed, from the early stage of the church's mission, Luke has related two incidents of departures from the normal baptismal practice. Later, (chs.18-19), he relates two more: sequels, this time, to the ministry of John the Baptist, and both with a bearing on early Christianity. Apollos and the dozen or so 'disciples' of John the Baptist had been baptized by John, but whereas Apollos had gone on to a commitment to Christianity and then exercised /

95. Cf. Haenchen, Acts, 355-63 for full discussion.

exercised a Spirit-filled ministry⁹⁶, the others had remained untouched by the Spirit. This again is the decisive point at issue: the presence or absence of the Holy Spirit. That Luke so understands these narratives, is at once clear from the fact that he links these two incidents together, although they were quite unrelated chronologically (by Ac.19:1 Apollos had left Ephesus and was in Corinth, and Paul had returned to Ephesus)⁹⁷. To these incidents we now turn.

(iii) Apollos. In actual fact the Apollos narrative is of little importance for our enquiry. 'He taught accurately the facts about Jesus' (v.25), although he had not received Christian baptism⁹⁸. He had, however, received the Holy Spirit⁹⁹, and he preached the Christian message in the synagogue in Ephesus. We do not know how serious was the lack of knowledge which Priscilla and Aquila set right, but in view of the ἀκριβῶς (v.25) it need not have been much. All that Acts says is that his accurate knowledge was deepened (ἀκριβέστερον, v.26). Nor did this deepening of his knowledge in any way alter his status: there is no suggestion that baptism (i.e. Christian baptism) was thought necessary, or that his hold on Christianity was in any way defective. We are therefore to presume that John's baptism was supplemented by a subsequent gift of the Holy Spirit (under what circumstances, we cannot now say)¹⁰⁰, and that no other rite was thought necessary. The significance of what /

96. So Dunn (82) interprets ἡτὼς τῷ πνεύματι. Haenchen (550,n.7) points out that while it is true that the use of πνεῦμα of human spirit, giving the meaning 'fiery temperament' is 'certainly very unusual', yet the opposite view is not without its difficulty: 'the possession of the Spirit by an evidently still imperfect Christian does not really seem conceivable'. But this misses the point: it is precisely because it is unusual that the situation has to be rectified. Cf. below.

97. The narratives may already have been linked in some tradition of the congregation at Ephesus, however. This tradition continues until Ac.19:40.

98. This is probably the meaning of ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου.

99. Cf. note 96 above.

100. G.W.H.Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, London, 1951, 66 suggests: 'Possibly a direct commission from the Lord was deemed to have conferred upon him the Spirit, for he ranked high among the Apostles, being regarded by the Corinthians as standing approximately upon the same level as St. Paul.'

of what Luke is saying in this narrative becomes clear from his juxtaposition of it with the story of the Ephesian μαθηται, to which we now turn.

(iv) The Disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus. There is no small debate over the standing of this dozen: Luke describes them as *τινες μαθηται* (Ac.19:1), and ascribes to them an act which includes *πιστεωσαν* (19:2), - or rather Paul does. Linguistically, *μαθητης* used absolutely would imply that they were Christians, - as far as NT usage goes¹⁰¹, and although elsewhere Luke can specify other groups of disciples by explicit reference to their master (cf. e.g., Lk.5:35; 7:18; 11:1), the reference to John the Baptist does not occur until v.3b, and so it is not likely that *μαθηται* here means 'disciples of John the Baptist', from the linguistic point of view. Dunn (84) makes much of the absence of the article *τινες μαθηται*, instead, presumably, of *τινες των μαθητων*, in which he sees a hint from Luke that the persons referred to were not members of the local congregation at Ephesus, since in Acts *οι μαθηται* only refers to 'the whole Christian community of the area referred to'. We may well doubt, however, if Luke's usage was quite so exact, especially in the light of Lk.6:17 where *οχλος πολλος μαθητων αυτου* refers to Christian disciples, although the presence of the genitive *αυτου* may come to Dunn's aid by filling the same function as the article would have done here¹⁰². In fact, of course, the subsequent narrative shows that their Christianity was regarded as defective: they had not received the Holy Spirit¹⁰³, and Paul's question likewise suggests that he was not speaking to members of the Christian congregation¹⁰⁴. Thus Dunn's point adds nothing to our understanding! Rather the clue to the understanding of *μαθηται* lies in the *τινες*. Here the usage of *τις* is similar to the usage with proper names, as laid down by LSJ: 'with proper names *τις* commonly signifies one named /

101. '*μαθητης* for Luke always signifies Christian', Haenchen, 553.

102. It is, I think, because of Lk.6:17 that Dunn can only refer to the usage in Acts. But are we to posit so minute a stylistic change between the gospel and the Acts? I would doubt it: Dunn's point has not defined the usage of *μαθητης*.

103. We must reject any tortuous exegesis which renders v.2b as 'Whether there is a Holy Spirit on earth for men' (Wendt, cited by Haenchen, 553,n.3), or 'Whether the coming Holy Spirit as promised by John was now an accepted fact' - cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 385-6.

104. Against Bruce, *Acts*, 385, who says 'Paul's question ... suggests strongly that he regarded them as believers in Christ.' and BM, 111-2.

named so-and-so' (LSJ, s.v. τις A.6). Here μαθηται is not strictly a proper name, rather it is a title, in all probability self-imposed, and the meaning is 'Paul came to Ephesus and found certain so-called "Disciples" or, 'certain people calling themselves "Disciples"'. This naturally lead to the question on the nature of their discipleship (v.2a), and so on. This usage with τις is not unknown in the NT, cf. Ac.10:5 μεταπεμφαι Σιμωνε πνευ δς ... κτλ ; cf.21:16;22:12.

On the use of πιστευεν absolutely in a context which probably indicates less than a full Christian belief, this passage may be a parallel of sorts with Ac.8 (cf. n.94, above), but here again the context is not specific as to exactly what kind of belief is involved. It may well be, however, that a conjecture from Dunn may help us at this point, especially if taken along with the conjecture on τις above. Dunn writes (84) -

'Nor need the πιστευοντες mean any more than a mistaken (or charitable) presumption on Paul's part - a mistake which Paul discovered and rectified by putting them through the complete initiation procedures as with all new converts.'

Thus the sequence of events is that Paul discovers a group separate from the Christian community, but calling itself μαθηται. He asks if they are Christian μαθηται (not a ridiculous question in view of their separation from the other Christians) - 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?' Their answer reveals an inadequate belief which Paul immediately rectifies. Thus we need not speculate about the extent of their connection with John the Baptist¹⁰⁵, nor about what their 'belief' comprised; we may proceed directly to the point which Luke wishes to make: the absence of the Holy Spirit was the decisive factor which Paul rectified by teaching about Jesus, and by baptism with the laying on of hands. That baptism was deemed necessary in their case, despite their having received John's baptism¹⁰⁶ is a pointer to the fact that they stood at a considerable distance from Christianity. However, leaving conjecture aside, it is to be noted that the decisive /

105. Cf. Dunn, 84-5, BM109. Bruce, Acts, 386,n.12 says: 'these Ephesians probably received John's baptism after the death and exaltation of Jesus ...' We may well wonder how Bruce arrived at this piece of information!

106. It is difficult to see where Dunn bases his remark (89) that 'all other such disciples of John and the earthly Jesus who had heard and experienced nothing of Pentecost' were similarly rebaptized, - notwithstanding the considerable support he can command (n.14).

decisive point, indeed the climax of the incident, lies in their reception of the Holy Spirit. And this is the common link between the narratives Luke has here juxtaposed: 'in the beginning the Spirit was the decisive factor in early Christianity.' (Priesker, cited by Dunn, 89). The Spirit could be given subsequent to the Baptist's rite (a commitment to Jesus, of course, being presupposed), - as in the case of Apollos, or the Baptist's rite could be ineffectual in terms of the Spirit, in which case those so involved would require to undergo the full initiation process. Above all, these narratives show that the presence or absence of the Spirit was the decisive criterion of a Christian¹⁰⁷.

Thus in these four narratives, Luke has shown us various exceptional cases to the normal conversion-initiation pattern, but he is at pains to stress that always the church strove to bring the exceptions into that pattern of experience which was regarded as normative, - viz. repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus, and the gift of the Spirit. That God was free to act in a new way in certain circumstances is attested by the Pentecost experience, the conversion of Cornelius and perhaps also by the Apollos incident, but the church did not regard this as in any sense acting in opposition to their practice, it was rather seen as the complement of the community's rite.

2. Paul.

We have already had occasion in this study to note the dangers of drawing systematic conclusions from the individual references to a practice or a subject in any given NT author. This caution, necessary in all areas of Pauline theology, is especially necessary in dealing with the complicated theology of baptism, and here we can only venture a summary of the main themes of Paul's thought. We shall pursue our enquiry along two lines: the extent to which the practice attested by Paul coincides with the picture we have derived from a study of Acts for baptism in the earliest community, and secondly, the pointers which Paul provides for his theological understanding of baptism.

Turning /

107. This suggests some knowledge of Jesus on the part of this twelve, which the language of v.4 may suggest is erroneous. In which case, it is a matter simply of the conversion and initiation of non-Christians.

Turning first to the baptismal practice evidenced by Paul's letters, we saw in Acts that the first essential element in the conversion-initiation process was repentance, or some similar concept which expressed the response to the preached word. In Paul there are few references which can be taken as parallel to this element, but one important one is Gal.3:26-7, in which a reference to baptism is prefaced by a reference to becoming sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ¹⁰⁸. Thus Paul here points to the fact that baptism is dependent on faith, - the faith which he has said in Ro.10:17 is awakened by the preaching of the gospel. Indeed, the Ro.10 reference occurs in a passage in which the relation between faith and baptism is also brought out¹⁰⁹, - as is to be inferred from the almost universally-accepted¹¹⁰ conjecture that 'Jesus is Lord' was in fact the confession of faith made at baptism by the candidate. Although the practice is nowhere explicitly mentioned in Acts - the closest approach to it being the 'calling on the name of the Lord' (Ac.2:21; 22:16, cf.4:12) - yet the recurrence of the theme in 1 Tim.6:12 suggests that the baptismal confession was widespread in early days. This, of course, assumes that 1 Tim.6:12 refers to the baptismal confession ('You confessed your faith nobly before many witnesses'), which seems to me a more satisfactory conjecture than many /

108. Against BM 150, who separates $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\ \iota\eta\varsigma\omicron\upsilon$, to give 'You are all sons of God in Christ Jesus through faith', - so RSV, NEB. It is difficult to see why this should be preferable to 'You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.' There is little, if any, difference between $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ (here, cf. Gal.1:4, Eph.1:15, 1 Tim.3:13 etc.) and $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ (Col.2:5, Ac.20:21 etc.)

109. 'Baptism is properly to be regarded as the expression of response to the gospel and the vehicle of commitment to the Lord.' (Dunn, Baptism, 151).

110. So, e.g., Barrett, Romans, (BNTC) 220; Dodd, Romans, (MNTC) 166; Flemington, 65,n.2; BM 66,87, 101 etc.; even Dunn accepts the reference to baptism here! (150, n.30). The 'almost liturgical style' of the passage, and the confessional terminology ('believe', 'confess', 'be saved') point in this direction; cf. R.Schnackenburg, Baptism in the thought of St. Paul, ET, Oxford, 1964, 82.

many of the alternative proposals¹¹¹, and is accepted by the majority of commentators¹¹². Thus both of these references point to the existence in NT times (at least as early as AD55 or 56) of the baptismal confession. The Romans passage in particular makes clear the very close connection that was assumed between baptism and faith. This is to be maintained, even in places where faith may not be explicitly mentioned.

The element of forgiveness is present, most clearly at Col.2:13 in an explicit baptismal context (v.12): 'in baptism you were also raised to life with him (Christ) ... And although you were dead because of your sins ... he has made you alive with Christ. For he has forgiven us all our sins; he has cancelled the bond which pledged us to the decrees of the Law.' Similarly in 1 Cor.6:11, a reference to washing, sanctification and justification occurs in a context which, while mainly directed to the Corinthians' conversion experience, surely has baptism in the immediate background of Paul's thought¹¹³. Paul is in fact describing in an unsystematic way the effects of their conversion experience which had turned them from the various sins listed in vv.9b-10. Thus while it may not be everywhere to the fore, the view that baptism involved a response to the preaching of the gospel and the gift of forgiveness is attested in Paul, as we saw it was in Acts.

That Paul also knows the practice of 'baptism in the name of Jesus' is to be inferred from 1 Cor.1:13, where, to counter the divisiveness of the Corinthian church Paul ironically asks, 'Was it Paul who was crucified for you? Was it in the name of Paul that you were baptized?' Thus Paul supports Luke's picture in this respect also. A problem surrounds the formula βαπτίζεν εἰς Χριστόν (Gal.3:27, Ro. 6:3a), and has most recently been raised by Dunn in his study of 'Baptism in the Holy /

111. E.g., a reference to the ordination vow, (Jeremias, E.K.Simpson) or trial before a court (Cullmann). Cf. BM 205, nn.1,2 for references, and the appendix to this chapter, 'The Creed', pp46f., and notes.

112. So, Lock, ICC, (1924); 71; Scott, MNTC, (1936), 77; Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, (1948), 166; Kelly, BNTC, (1963) 142; Michel (art. δοξολογία) TWNT V, 211; BM 204-6; Dunn, 169.

113. So Barrett, BNTC 142-3, against Dunn, 120.

'Holy Spirit', but now the problem has lost the earlier complications of 'mystical incorporation'¹¹⁴. Dunn's approach is coloured by his debate with Pentecostalist and sacramentalist in their insistence that baptism be completed, either by 'baptism in the Holy Spirit', or by ecclesiastical confirmation, and while his general approach seems to me to be well grounded, nevertheless at times he presses more into his service than the evidence will allow. Thus, for Dunn, while βαπτισεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ refers to the rite of water-baptism, the phrase βαπτισεν εἰς Χριστόν is simply a metaphor, drawn certainly from the water rite, but used to describe 'the entry of the believer into Christian experience, or more precisely the entry of the believer into the spiritual relationship of the Christian with Christ, which takes place in conversion-initiation.' (109)¹¹⁵ In fact, for Dunn, βαπτισεν εἰς Χριστόν is equivalent to baptism in the Spirit¹¹⁶. He argues this from an examination of Gal.3:26-7: because Χριστόν ἐνεσυσκαθε is a metaphor, so also is εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτισθητε. But this need not be so: the two phrases are not so much 'alternative and interchangeable expressions for the same reality' (Dunn) as they are descriptions of two stages in the conversion-initiation process: (i) baptism, (ii) the ethical consequences of baptism, namely 'putting on Christ'. The Χριστόν ἐνεσυσκαθε phrase in fact refers to the logical sequel to the εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτισθητε. To argue that 'Quite possibly the metaphor was suggested by the baptizand's action of unclothing before and reclothing after baptism', and yet insist in the immediately following sentence 'But it no more refers to water baptism as such than it does in Romans, Colossians and Ephesians' (so Dunn, 110), and that in a context in which βαπτισεν occurs is surely an inconsistency born of special pleading! Similarly, in 1 Cor.10:2 /

114. Cf. Schnackenburg, 22-3 for discussion; he rejects the notion of a mystical incorporation of the phrase by appealing to 1 Cor.10:2, where a mystical interpretation would be impossible, and Ac.19:3-5 where εἰς simply expresses a relation.

115. Cf. again Dunn, 130, 171.

116. However Paul uses this term only at 1 Cor.12:13. It also occurs at Mt.3:11, Mk.1:8, Lk.3:16, Jn.1:33, Ac.1:5; 11:16. That Pentecost saw the fulfilment of this Johannine prophecy, and that Christian baptism was the equivalent after Pentecost is to be inferred from Ac.11:16 (cf. 10:47; 11:15,17; 15:8, in all of which Cornelius' experience is compared with the Pentecost experience of the disciples), - but it is nowhere expressly stated, and Paul certainly does not use this terminology.

in 1 Cor.10:2 the unparalleled expression εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐβαπτίσαντο, a phrase obviously coined by Paul ad hoc on the analogy of εἰς Χριστόν, is used in a context in which the point of the typological parallel is the rite of water-baptism¹¹⁷. Hence we are justified in inferring, against Dunn (125f.), that this passage also points to the fact that εἰς Χριστόν βαπτισθεῖν was used to describe the water rite and was equivalent to εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ β.¹¹⁸ This is also the case with Ro.6. I find it scarcely conceivable that Ro.6:3 ὅσοι ἐβαπτισθῆμεν εἰς τὸν Χριστόν ἡγοῦνται εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτισθῆμεν is to be taken as a metaphor of 'the spiritual, mystical reality of union with Christ effected by God' (Dunn, 141), while the strikingly similar expression διὰ τοῦ βαπτισματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον 'marks an extension of Paul's thought to embrace the water rite' (Dunn, 140). Rather διὰ τοῦ βαπτισματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον (v.4) is a parallel to the phrase εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτισθῆμεν (v.3b) - especially as the οὖν in v.4 shows that Paul is inferring in that verse the consequences of the βαπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον which itself takes up the preceding βαπτισθεῖν phrases of v.3. Therefore all these phrases are of identical import: they all refer to the water rite while v.3b is an amplification describing the meaning of the shorter phrase in v.3a. Thus I feel that we are justified in equating βαπτισθεῖν | βαπτισθεῖν εἰς Χριστόν with the fuller phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ, and that we have further evidence here that the early church did baptize 'in the name of Jesus'.

There is no evidence in Acts to suggest how the rite was performed (except, perhaps, for Ac.8:36?), but from the points Paul makes in Ro.6 and Col.2:11-3, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the practice which obtained in the churches he knew was immersion. We cannot, however, say if this was general practice, particularly in view of a verse in Hebrews which, as we shall see, mentions sprinkling.

The evidence of Acts showed that baptism was normally followed by the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is attested in Paul in the closely related passages in 2 Cor.1:21-2 and Eph. 1:13 (and there is also a passing allusion in Eph.4:30)¹¹⁹.

Dunn /

117. That the point is made in a midrash allegory (Dunn, 112) does not tell against its use as a parallel.

118. So Barrett, Romans, (BNTC), 112. BM 147, cf. Dunn, 140, n.2.

119. Cf. BM 173f. for discussion. Also Flemington 66, n.2.; Bultmann, Theology of the NT, I 138, and Conzelmann, Outline, 270 accept the baptismal reference here.

Dunn¹²⁰ is surely wrong to refuse a reference to baptism here. That the primary reference in 2 Cor.1:21-2 is to 'the actuality and fulness of the Spirit of God'¹²¹ is undoubtedly correct - it derives, after all, from the context of the letter. But to deny any reference to baptism, even in the background of Paul's thought here, despite Dunn's own admission, 'That the Spirit usually came at baptism is probable' (133) seems to me illogical. Paul assumes, surely that the Spirit was given at baptism, and he argues from that for the assurance which Christians may derive from their reception of the Spirit. We may also see a connection between baptism and the Spirit in Galatians, where the baptismal passage 3:26-7 leads on to 4:6 and a reference to 'the Spirit of his Son'. Similarly the ethical exhortations which occur in the baptismal contexts of Ro.6 and Col.2:11-3, point to the connection between baptism and the Spirit, in view of the fact that the 'life of the Spirit' is the assumed consequence of the gift of the Spirit (cf. e.g., Gal.5:25).

Thus we may see that the elements which comprised baptismal practice in the earliest community, as Luke had described it, also appear in the letters of Paul. We now turn to the second line of our enquiry, - those strands of evidence for the theological understanding which we find in Paul.

To start at the most obvious level, the use of water in the baptismal rite, together with the influence of OT lustrations in the background, made the idea of baptism as a cleansing a natural one. This view of baptism as cleansing finds expression in Paul: 1 Cor.6:11; Eph.5:26, and if Pauline,¹²² Tit.3:5. The last passage develops the thought a little along the lines of regeneration.

In 1 Cor.6 Paul criticises the appeal, by a Christian to a pagan court for judgement /

120. Cf. Dunn, 132-3. I agree with Dunn's concern to safeguard baptism from being misunderstood as a magical act which 'confers' the Holy Spirit. But it seems to me that he goes too far in always driving a wedge between the act of baptism and the coming of God's Spirit as a gift subsequent to the conversion-initiation process.

121. Dunn, 133 cites Schnackenburg, 91 with approval.

122. To deny the Pastorals to Paul does not preclude the presence of Pauline features; even if we are only to regard them as 'a somewhat *affined* Paulinism' (Bultmann, cited in Kummel, Introduction to the NT, 270).

judgement in a case concerning a fellow-Christian. He contrasts Christians and non-Christians: there will be no place in the Kingdom for fornicators, idolaters, ... thieves drunkards etc. 'And such were some of you. But you have been through the purifying waters: you have been dedicated to God and justified through the name of the Lord Jesus and the Spirit of our God' (v.11). This verse contains an undoubted reference to baptism (against Dunn)¹²³, although as Barrett points out, the fact that ἀπελούσασθε is written, and not ἐβαπτισθητε 'shows that it is the inward meaning rather than the outward circumstances that is important for Paul' (1 Corinthians, (BNTC), 141). The voice of ἀπελούσασθε is probably best taken as middle to mean 'you had yourselves washed' (so Schnackenburg, 3, Dunn, 123), or as middle used as passive¹²⁴ 'you were washed'. The importance of this verse lies in the relation between baptism as cleansing and the central Pauline ideas of sanctification (ἡγιασθητε) and justification (ἐδικαιωθητε)¹²⁵. Thus this verse shows the primary role of baptism in the overall process of conversion-initiation which effectively deals with the old sin-ridden (vv.9-11a!) life.

The Ephesians reference is found as an incidental remark in a very definite context - the paraenetic section dealing with the relations between wives and husbands (eph.5:22ff.). The experience of the church in salvation - i.e. the experience of being loved by Christ the κεφαλή της ἐκκλησίας - is used as an illustration to prove that a husband as κεφαλή της γυναίκας ought also to love his wife. It is important /

123. Dunn, 120ff. His arguments against a reference to baptism do not hold:

(i) ἀπελούσασθε can hardly have a spiritual reference only, on the ground that it is the preceding list of vices that had been washed away, for, in fact, Paul uses the second person plural of the verb, so the thought in his mind is of the people's being cleansed. (ii) ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, while it may have occurred in e.g., exorcism (Dunn, 121), nevertheless was used in baptismal contexts also, and this is preferable here, in view of ἀπελούσασθε, (so BNTC 141). The baptismal reference is allowed by Flemington, 55f., BM 162f., and Schnackenburg, 3f. Cf. Ac.22:16 for baptism as cleansing.

124. So Oepke, TWNT, VI, 306, BNTC, 141.

125. Barrett rightly understands ἐδικαιωθητε in the sense of 'acquittal at God's court', rather than, with Bultmann, (Theology I, 136) 'made morally righteous'.

important to notice that vv.25b-7 (καθως και ... ἄγια και ἄμωμος) refer only to the church's experience of salvation and are introduced as such: there is nothing whatever in these verses (which may even be a kerygmatic fragment) on the subject of husbands and wives. The original thought, the husband-wife relationship, is not resumed until v.28 (where οὕτως picks up the καθως of 25b) and the implications of the illustration of Christ's love are worked out. There is thus nothing in vv. 25b-7 to point to a 'bridal analogy',¹²⁶ and the attempt to see in καθαρῶς τὸ λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος a reference to a pre-nuptial bridal bath is totally unnecessary¹²⁷, - there never was a bridal bath effective against a σπιλος or a ῥυτίς (v.27)! Hence the primary reference here is not to physical cleansing. It does not follow, however, that Paul was only referring to spiritual realities: the reference to λουτρῶ τοῦ ὕδατος makes that obvious! Thus we are justified in seeing here a reference to the literal bath of baptism (λουτρῶ τοῦ ὕδατος) which accompanied the spiritual bath of cleansing for the Christian. The phrase ἐν ῥήματι has proved a problem for interpretation: some think there is a reference to the word preached in the proclamation of the church¹²⁸, others to the word spoken over the candidate for baptism, i.e., the name of the Lord Jesus, or - less likely at such an early date - the name of 'the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit',¹²⁹ while others prefer /

126. Against Dunn, 162ff. Cf. Schnackenburg, 5,n.10 for references.

127. BM, 201, thinks that if there is an allusion to the bridal bath, 'there can be little doubt that the readers are expected to recognise its counterpart for the Bride of Christ in Baptism.' But such desperate expedients are unnecessary.

128. Thus Dunn, 164. He calls Ro.10:8,17 'determinative Pauline passages' for the meaning of ῥήμα . In fact the word only occurs in Ro.10:8 in quotation of Dt.30:14 and in the explanation of that quotation, while the use of it in v.17 is probably under the influence of the context (v.8, cf. 18, ῥήμα again quoted from LXX passages). In Eph.6:17 the Sword of the Spirit is said to be the ῥήμα τοῦ θεοῦ . Otherwise the word does not recur in Paul (in 2 Cor.13:1, ῥήμα means 'thing', and is the equivalent of the Hebrew dabar, - so BAG). Normally when Paul refers to the gospel message he uses ὁ λόγος (τοῦ θεοῦ).

129. Abbott, ICC, 169. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians, 205f., cf. 125.

prefer a reference to the candidate's confession of faith at baptism¹³⁰ (cf. Ro.10:9). In fact we have little to help us decide between these suggestions¹³¹, except to note that whether ἐν ῥήματι is to be taken with ἄγιστον (less likely because of the positioning) or with καθάριας ... ὕδατος, the subject of the action to which the ῥήμα refers is Christ. This would perhaps exclude a reference to a baptismal confession or the naming of Christ's name at baptism, and so we may well prefer to opt for a reference to the message of the gospel (with Dunn), but this is far from conclusive. Despite uncertainty on this point, the Eph.5 passage does give us an insight into Paul's theology of baptism. From v.25 we learn that baptism is preceded by God's grace as revealed in the love of Christ (ἡγάπησεν) and his sacrificial death (ἐαυτὸν παρέδωκεν), the end result of which was to be a pure, sin-free church (v.27).

The passage in Tit.3:4-7 introduces a development of thought in terms of rebirth (παλιγγενεσία), as well as several themes from elsewhere (δικαιωθεὶς ... ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου, v.7). The main point at issue here is how we are to understand the phrase δια λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου (v.5). Is ἀνακαινώσεως genitive after δια (and is thus a second, independent element in the process), or is it to be taken with παλιγγενεσίας and so is dependent upon λουτροῦ? The former option is accepted by NEB. However, as we might more properly expect δια to be repeated before ἀνακαινώσεως on this interpretation, and more importantly, as we would then be faced with a situation unparalleled in the NT - namely the existence of two separate actions in the salvation process, baptism effecting rebirth and also renewal by the Spirit - we would be wiser to follow the majority of commentators¹³², and adopt the latter interpretation where παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως ... ἁγίου both alike depend on λουτροῦ. In other words the bath is described as 'the water of rebirth and of renewal by the Holy Spirit' (NEB, mg.). Thus interpreted, the verse is in line with the rest of the NT teaching that the gift of the Holy Spirit was normally closely connected with baptism. The term παλιγγενεσίας in particular has caused problems because of its frequent use in the¹³³ mystery /

130. E.F.Scott, (MNTC), 239, Flemington, 65.

131. Cf. BM, 204 for an attempt to hold all the possibilities together.

132. So, Locke, (ICC), 154f.; Scott. (MNTC) 175; Kelly, (BNTC), 252; Flemington, 101, n.5; BM 210; Schnackenburg 10f.; Dunn, 166; C.K.Batrett, (NCB), 142.

133. BAG, s.v. παλιγγενεσία, 611, for references.

mystery religions, and some scholars try to make much of this¹³⁴. However, we may well doubt whether it is necessary to have recourse to this field: *παλιγγενεσία* recurs in the NT, in Mt.19:28, of the new birth of the whole creation in the Messianic age, while God's act of salvation is described by the cognate verb *ἠναγεννεν* (1 Pet.1:3, cf. 1:23) and Jn.3:5 has *γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος* (a close parallel to this passage, in thought) as a necessary prerequisite for entry into the Kingdom of God¹³⁵. Further parallels to the concept of rebirth have been cited from Judaism¹³⁶ as well as the mystery cults. The extent to which the mystery cults influenced the writer here, if at all, is impossible to assess: he may well have been drawing on a common tradition, in which several strands of influence were operative, but even if that is true, we can see that he uses the terms in a distinctly Christian context (as 'justification', 'grace' etc. in Eph.3:5 clearly demonstrate).

Thus the passages so far discussed show the association of baptism with cleansing utilised in early Christian paraenesis.

A second line of enquiry is opened up by the recollection that baptism in Acts was the method by which a convert entered the Christian community: 'Baptism to Christ is baptism to the church; it cannot be otherwise for the church is the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*.' (BM 279). This element is present in Paul's theology; - he found cause to stress the consequences of this in certain contexts. Thus for the Galatians, troubled by the relation of Gentile Christians to their Jewish counterparts, (Gal.2:11-4), and to Judaism (Gal.2:1-10), Paul sums up the consequences of baptism thus: 'Baptized into union with him, you have all put on Christ as a garment. There is no such thing as Jew or Greek, slave or freeman, male or female, for you are all one person in Christ Jesus,' (Gal.3:27f.). Similarly, at Corinth the experience of baptism in the name of Christ is used to argue against the sectarian rivalries which /

134. E.g., M.Dibelius, The Pastoral Epistles, (ET of Handbuch z. NT), London, 1973, ad. loc.; cf. Flemington, 104f.; Schnackenburg, 11ff. gives assessment.

135. In Barn.6:11-4; 16:8 regeneration occurs in a context of the forgiveness of sins, though baptism is not mentioned.

136. Cf. Schnackenburg, 15f., for discussion; also Flemington, 104-5.

which had gripped the church in that city. 'Was it Paul who was crucified for you?', he asks. 'Was it in the name of Paul that you were baptized?' (1 Cor.1:12f.) A similar line of argument is pursued in 1 Cor.12:13 where the danger of charismatic individualism is countered by an appeal to the shared common ground, baptism, in which they had received the gift of the Spirit¹³⁷. The relation between baptism and church is touched upon by the reference here to the concept of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ to which Paul alludes in a reference to both sacraments (1 Cor.12:13, baptism; 10:17, Lord's Supper, cf. 1 Cor.11:29).

Most of the references to baptism in the Pauline corpus are of the nature of incidental remarks, and this is true of the important passage in Ro.6, which Schnackenburg calls the 'locus classicus' of Paul's baptismal theology. In actual fact, baptism is not the main theme of the section here¹³⁸. Rather, Paul counters the antinomian reductio ad absurdum of Ro.6:1 with an argument which uses the common understanding of baptism as a starting point. Paul argues that, as baptized Christians, we have died to sin, and we now live for God, - a point which he illustrates by reference to the baptismal experience (vv.2-4). He obviously presupposes the connection between baptism and the death of Christ ($\eta \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\tau\lambda$, v.3)¹³⁹. The basic point of the illustration is that, in baptism, the Christian is baptized /

137. The reference in 1 Cor.12:13 is to baptism, against Dunn, 129f. He argues: 'It is their experience of the one Spirit (not water-baptism) which is the basis of their unity' (130), and so misses the point. Paul was trying to make the Corinthians see the fact that all ($\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) did share the one Spirit, despite the diversity of charismatic manifestation, and so he appeals to the one obvious shared ground, baptism. Cf. Dunn, 129,n.42 for those who accept the baptismal reference.

138. So Dunn, 139. Cf. Kummel, Introduction, 217: 'Against the charge that the proclamation of justification by grace alone creates indifference to sin, Paul retorts: on the basis of baptism the new life is in principle free from sin (6:1-14)!.'

139. Paul would not have supported his point with a fact which was unknown, and thus not accepted by the Corinthians. That Paul is here appealing to common knowledge is accepted by Dodd, (MNTC), 87; Barrett(BNTC), 121; Bornkamm, Experience, 74 and 85,n.5. It may be, with Schnackenburg 33f., that Paul develops a known belief further than had previously been done. Dunn, 144 and n.17 disagrees, but he fails to distinguish between $\circ\upsilon \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega \acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ (Ro.1:17 etc.) which is a polite way of passing on new information, and $\eta \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ (Ro.7:1) and $\eta \circ\lambda\kappa\epsilon \circ\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ (Ro.11:2 etc.) which /

is baptized into Christ's death (v.3). This is emphasised in v.4a, - baptism represents a being buried with Christ¹⁴⁰ (συνταφύμεν οὖν αὐτῷ) and thus the finality of the εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ is brought out¹⁴¹. Then in v.4b the thought is developed by the ἵνα clause which 'introduces the divine condition and demand under which we stand'¹⁴², i.e., the demand to 'walk in newness of life'. Thus there is a connection between baptism and the death of Christ from which ethical consequences flow, just as Christ's resurrection followed his death. Verse 5 follows on from this (γὰρ adding the explanation)¹⁴³ and develops the thought of sharing in the death of Christ as a prerequisite of sharing in the resurrection.

The interpretation of v.5, however, is under dispute. We may follow Grundmann¹⁴⁴ in deriving συμψυτοι from συμψύω, to grow together (used, e.g., of the grafting of plants), and hence the meaning would be 'united with', even 'fused' (Moule), while from Ro.1:23; 5:14; 8:3 and Phil.2:7, Dunn concludes (142) that ὁμοιωμα denotes 'a very close likeness ("that which is precisely like")'. Thus the meaning/

(139) which are questions of mild surprise, pointing out what they do (or at least, should) know. (partly against BM 126, n.2).

140. Taking εἰς τὸν θάνατον closely with διὰ τὸν θάνατον (so, Bornkamm, Experience, 85, n.6).

141. "'The event of dying, of departure from the world was first really concluded by burial": in the thought of the ancients, a dead man went fully into the realm of the dead at this point.' Schnackenburg (34), citing E.Strommel.

142. Bornkamm, Experience, 74, citing (n.8) Stauffer, TWNT, III, 323ff.

143. Despite Dunn, (140): 'The γὰρ of v.5 picks up the theme of death with Christ and death to sin, not of baptism, and vv.5 and 6 are further illustrations and expositions of the theme of v.2, not of baptism.' But Dunn anticipated Paul's argument: the theme of the passage is death to sin, but Paul has not yet developed that aspect. So far it has only been mentioned, and then death with Christ in baptism was introduced as the basis of dying to sin, which is not fully developed until vv.7ff.

144. TWNT VIII, 786; cited by Dunn, 141.

meaning of the phrase in v.5 $\epsilon\gamma\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omega\ \delta\mu\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, would be 'For if we have become united with a death to sin precisely like Christ's ...' (cf. Dunn, 143). But even if the reference in v.5 were not to baptism (as Dunn holds) one is at a loss to understand this rendering. How does one become 'united with a death precisely like Christ's', or 'united with the likeness of his death'? What does this mean? And why did Paul choose to express himself so obliquely?

And so, I find myself drawn more and more to the earlier solution that we must supply $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ (i.q., $\chi\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon$) after $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$, despite the formidable opposition¹⁴⁵. This is, after all, an approach supported by many of the translations, NEB, RSV, JB, TEV,; and the meaning then becomes: 'If we have been united with him in a death like his then we shall also share in a resurrection like his', which at least gives tolerable sense. Thus we become united with Christ in baptism in a death and resurrection precisely like his¹⁴⁶. In favour of the insertion of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ here to aid our understanding (I am not suggesting that it should be added to the text), we may note the number of times it does occur, or is implied in the text of the passage: $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ (v.4), $\delta\alpha\pi\epsilon\delta\alpha\upsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ (v.8), $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\sigma\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ (v.8). Of particular importance is v.6 $\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ with no object expressed, which can be held to refer to no one but Christ, - thus providing a close parallel for understanding $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ with $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ in v.5. This still preserves a balance in the argument, - between union with Christ in his death, and union with him in his resurrection, - and this thought is developed more fully in vv.10f. The value of inserting $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ is that it means that the important element in baptism is not the baptism as such, but the solidarity with Christ to which baptism gives expression. To omit the inference of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ would give us some such translation as Schnackenburg's (36)- 'For if we have become men united with the form of his death, so shall we also be with (that of) the resurrection.' $\Theta\mu\omega\mu\epsilon$ then must be seen to refer to baptism, and it is baptism which becomes the focal point, not Christ; baptism becomes the goal /

145. Dunn, 142, n.7 gives a list.

146. But the resurrection is still awaited from the future (cf. v.8 $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \delta\tau\iota$); it is an object of faith. And 'the future resurrection is already to become apparent in the conduct of the one freed from sin.' (Bornkamm, Experience, 74.).

goal with which we aim to be united. Thus I find myself drawn to a rendering of Ro.6:5 such as NEB gives: 'For if we have become incorporate with him in a death like his, we shall also be one with him in a resurrection like his.' This, despite NEB's placing a new paragraph at the begining of v.5, is closely linked with v.4, - as the shows (v.5), and is a comment on what Paul had already said about baptism.

What aspects of Paul's understanding of baptism emerge from this passage? Paul presupposes the understanding of baptism as a union with Christ in his death and resurrection. This was expressed in terms of a real union. The 'grave' in which the believer is laid at baptism is not his own, but Christ's. Thus Bornkamm:

'The death which the baptized and Christ die is only one death, i.e., the death of Christ himself, and through baptism this death becomes the death of the believer.' (Experience, 76).

As to how and when this connection between baptism and the death and resurrection of Christ first arose, we cannot say with any certainty. In view of the connection between the sequence of thought here - 'died ... buried ... raised' and in the kerygmatic fragment in 1 Cor.15, the conjecture that the connection was first made in pre-baptismal instruction is, in the absence of any other pointers, a reasonable one¹⁴⁷, and is certainly preferable to Beasley-Murray's fanciful idea that this element in Paul's thought is to be derived from the saying of Jesus in Mk.8:34f which connected discipleship with the cross, and the losing of one's life for Christ's sake. Any appeal to the mystery religions¹⁴⁸ would seem to be ruled out by the strong ethical consequences which Paul insists are the logical sequel to baptism. Bornkamm sums up the import of this passage thus:

'As a sacramental presentation of the Christ-event, baptism establishes the basis of Christian existence: in it the condition to which we are called is revealed and the certainty on which we await eternity is based.' (Experience, 76f.). A very similar view of baptism is expounded in Col.2:11-3, in which baptism is again viewed as dying and rising with Christ. Here again Paul's approach is coloured by the context out of which his treatment arises. In Colossians Paul seeks /

147. Cf. BM 127-8.

148. Barrett, (BNTC), 122, doubts if they played any real part in Paul's thought here, and on this basis I have excluded all reference to them, as to have included treatment would have greatly amplified an already long paper. The most recent treatment of them is in G.Wagner, Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries, ET, London, 1967.

seeks to counter the Jewish-Gnostic colouring of Christianity which was causing trouble at Colossae, and which sought to introduce into the faith such elements as asceticism, ritualistic worship of the elemental spirits, Jewish ritualism and angelology. In the section beginning at 2:9 Paul deals with the fullness of Christ and stresses that it is in union with him that the Christian will find fulfilment, rather than as a result of any 'hollow and delusive speculations' (v.10). The union with Christ is expressed in two ways, negatively by a death (vv.11-12a) and positively by a rising to new life (v.12b), the contrast being amplified in v.13. The thought is paralleled by the language, - the two clauses are both introduced by ἐν ᾧ καὶ and in both cases the ᾧ refers back to Χριστῷ (v.8), or αὐτῷ (v.9) as the antecedent¹⁴⁹. In vv.11-12a the act of being buried with Christ in baptism is depicted in terms of contrast to circumcision - probably for ad hoc apologetic purposes¹⁵⁰. Baptism, or more precisely, the being buried with Christ which it expresses is equated with a περιτομή ἡ Χριστοποιήτος, in which everything sinful (σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς) is stripped off. Thus baptism can be called the περιτομή Χριστοῦ ('Christ's way of circumcision', NEB), in which Χριστοῦ is a genitive of quality and περιτομή is a metaphor. The sequel to the baptismal burial is rising to new life in Christ, one aspect of which includes freedom from sin (vv.13ff.). The thought here is emphasised again in 3:1, εἰ οὖν συνήχησθε, τὰ ἄνω ἡγύεστε, to which this passage leads. Thus while the resurrection is more explicit in Col.2 than it was in Ro.6, the ethical dimension, the resurrection life here and now, as it were, is not lost sight of either. In this passage the concept of faith /

149. So the majority, - cf. Dunn, 154,n.7 for references. Against BM, 153f., Flemington 62, Oepke TWNT I, 543. Thus we can see a clear structure: v.8 ... Χριστῷ v.9 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ... v.10 καὶ ἔστε ἐν αὐτῷ ... v.11 ἐν ᾧ καὶ v.12b ἐν ᾧ καὶ .

150. Thus Paul is not simply contrasting baptism and circumcision, far less is he replacing circumcision with baptism (against Jeremias, Infant Baptism, 39-40). Rather, he uses circumcision as an illustration (most likely because of the context of the debate with Judaistic tendencies) of what takes place at baptism: the stripping off of the old body of sin.

faith explicitly occurs, - faith in the power of God who raised Jesus from the dead (cf. Ro.10:9) is basic to our rising again with Christ. Here again the pattern of the kerygma on which faith is based (buried ... raised) occurs. It is probable that the similar passage in Eph.2:4-6 is only a verbal parallel to this passage, but there are those who prefer to see a baptismal reference there also¹⁵¹.

Thus in a rapid survey of the main Pauline baptismal passages we have found some agreement with the picture of Acts, and , especially in terms of baptismal theology, some new points which Acts does not reflect. Before leaving Paul, there are two passages which have given rise to controversy, to which we must devote some attention before moving on : 1 Cor.10:1-4 and 1 Cor.15:29.

It is very important that the 1 Cor.10 passage be viewed in context, or misunderstanding will arise: Paul is not giving instruction on the nature of the sacraments¹⁵², rather he points to the OT experiences of God's grace, and to the fact that, even after these experiences the Israelites sinned and were rejected. These were examples (τοῦτοι, v.6) of what holds good for the Christian also: even with experiences of grace he too may be rejected. Thus 10:1-4 is connected (γὰρ v.1) to Paul's fear (9:27) that he himself may be ἀδύναμος. This is Paul's own interpretation of the passage (cf. vv.11-2): 'All these things that happened to them were symbolic (τοῦτοις συμβεβηκεν ἑκείνοις) ... as a warning ... If you feel sure that you are standing firm, beware!' Thus Paul uses the OT story of the Israelites in the desert to warn the Corinthians against idolatry and the attendant danger of being rejected by God. Thus all attempts to elicit a theology of baptism from these verses miss the point: Paul's aim is to underline the need for Christians to live consistently with their baptismal experience of grace. From this it will be seen that it is not necessary to enquire too closely into problems of interpretation, for instance the unparalleled phrase εἰς τὸν ἕως ἡμεῶν ἐβαπτίσθητο (v.2) was obviously coined ad hoc¹⁵³. The point of the passage is that Paul does not view baptism as a guarantee of salvation.

Next /

152. So Barrett, BNTC, 221-3, but cf. Dunn, 124,n.25: 'The great majority of commentators refer 10:1-5 directly to the Christian sacraments.'

153. So Schnackenburg, 93; - the phrase does not occur in Judaism, and 'manifestly it is in imitation of εἰς Χριστόν (Gal.3:27, Ro.6:3).'

Next we examine that most curious passage, 1 Cor.15:29, which occurs in the midst of Paul's attack on those in Corinth who said that there was no resurrection from the dead (15:1ff.). It is not possible to examine all the points that have been made in connection with this verse¹⁵⁴, rather we confine our enquiry to two main questions: (i) what exactly was involved in being baptized ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν and (ii) did Paul approve of it?

On the first point all that Paul writes is ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, i.e., 'on behalf of the dead', simpliciter. He does not say whether they were believers who had failed to complete their catechumenate¹⁵⁵, or total outsiders (e.g. relatives of believers), who had died unbaptized. On this point certainty is impossible, but the attempt to solve the problem by giving ὑπὲρ an unusual meaning (e.g., 'for the sake of' the dead) and conjecture from this that unbelievers were baptized with the purpose of being united at the Resurrection with believing relatives who had died, is highly improbable¹⁵⁶. Thus Oepke seems to me to be correct in affirming that 'All interpretations that try to eliminate the vicarious baptism for the dead, lead astray.' (TWNT, I, 540). But we cannot say what was involved in this vicarious baptism, except to note that from v.29b εἰ ὅλως ..κτλ it is obvious that the baptism for the dead was intended in some way to influence the condition, even status, of the νεκροὶ at the Resurrection, - presumably to have them numbered among the Christian saved. The inference therefore is that the practice was carried out on behalf of unbaptized people, and more than that we cannot say. As to who was actually doing the baptizing, the plural expression οἱ βαπτίζοντες in the present participle points to a definite group of people who were still engaged in the activity at the time of writing (perhaps one of the factions /

154. Cf. M.Rissi, Die Taufe für die Toten, 1962; B.M.Foschini, 'Those who are baptized on behalf of the dead, 1 Cor.15:29', Worcester, Mass., 1951. Foschini has counted over 60 interpretations of this verse!

155. Thus Barrett's remark, 'They were Christians though unbaptized' (BNTC, 364) is totally unfounded. It is difficult to see how circumstances would have arisen in which a number of catechumens all died prior to baptism: 1 Cor.11:30 sheds no light on the problem either.

156. So Maria Raeder in Z.N.W., 1955 259ff., approved by J.Jeremias in 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God', in N.T.S., 1956, 155-6. The usage of ὑπὲρ needed for this view is rare, and one cannot see why Paul would express himself so. So too BNTC, 364.

factions which were so much part of the church scene at Corinth. We should, however note, in the passing, that there is nothing in the text of v.29 which demands that οἱ βαπτίζοντες were Christians, - and it is just possible that Paul is using the activity of an outside group as an argument against the view of the Resurrection held by some of the Corinthians. If this were so it would answer our second question on Paul's approval of the practice of baptism for the dead with a negative, and help to explain why Paul, if he disapproved, did not add at least a word of criticism against the practice: since they were outsiders, Paul did not feel justified in criticising (cf. 1 Cor.5:12). However, this is less than likely. More probable is the conjecture that the βαπτίζοντες were members of the same faction whose views sparked off the whole discussion in ch.15, and they were members (cf. ἐν ᾧ τινες, v.12) of the Corinthian congregation.

The second question, Did Paul approve of the practice? , cannot be finally answered from the text of 1 Cor.15:29 itself. Paul only cites the practice in order to demonstrate how inconsistent with it was a denial of the Resurrection, and it was to try to rebut this denial that Paul mentioned the practice in the first place. In view of the seriousness of this argument, Paul need not be expected to deal with this matter in 1 Cor.15, according to some¹⁵⁷, - perhaps it was to be dealt with when he arrived at Corinth (cf.1 Cor.11:34). Or perhaps the practice was confined to a section of the church at Corinth in which Paul had no standing, - but that would surely not have deterred Paul from interposing his own point of view. It is a sign of our bewilderment that we are reduced to such hypotheses, - we simply cannot say, as far as the evidence of 1 Cor.15 goes. However, in view of the seriousness with which Paul viewed baptism, and in view of the importance he attached to justification by faith alone, I feel drawn to the view that Paul did not approve¹⁵⁸, although this is by no means the majority view.¹⁵⁹ Nevertheless, it must be said that if Paul did disapprove of the practice, his silence is certainly remarkable.

The only other line open to us is to say that, for Paul, baptism was not a matter of any importance, as Barrett does (BNTC, 364, cf.48), citing 1 Cor.1:14ff. in support /

157. BM, 191 cites von Dubschutz: 'Paul smites the Corinthian deniers of the resurrection with their own weapons, without stopping first to estimate their value.'

158. So, e.g., Dunn, 104,n.1, BM 190.

159. Barrett, BNTC, 364: 'Paul need not have actively disapproved.'

in support. This view is, I feel, erroneous, because insufficient stress has been placed upon the context of the 1 Cor.1:14 saying. That verse arose out of a context of the trouble being caused by the existence of several factions in the church, ranged behind the figure of the person who baptized them, or to whom they felt allegiance. Paul, who did not himself escape being associated with this strife, expresses his thankfulness that he did not often administer baptism, and so give more weight to the divisiveness. That Paul, as a missionary, should place more emphasis on preaching than on baptism (1 Cor.1:17) is, in the nature of the first century missionary situation, not to be wondered at. He did baptize on occasion, as he himself attests (1 Cor.1:14ff.), therefore he did not regard baptism as unimportant; but he normally left this to others, perhaps to the people he left in charge of congregations (cf. Ac.14:23)¹⁶⁰. This may be the inference to be drawn from the fact that Paul baptized Stephanas (1 Cor.1:16) and his household, and they were later described as the first family in Achaia to be converted (1 Cor.16:15), and who perhaps assumed a leading role in the congregation, - they may even have baptized others themselves.

Thus we have covered the main passages in Paul which refer to baptism. His understanding of baptism centred on the association of it (probably pre-Pauline) with the death and resurrection of Christ. Paul laid great stress on the ethical consequences which he expected to flow from the commitment expressed in baptism. We also find a broad measure of agreement between Paul and Luke on the significance of the rite, in terms of cleansing, incorporation into the church as the body of Christ, and in the gift of the Holy Spirit subsequent to baptism.

3. Other NT references to Baptism.

1. Hebrews.

There are two definite references to baptism in Hebrews - Heb.6:1-6 and Heb.10:19-22. These /

160. if the detail is historical, cf. Schweizer, CONT, 5i and n 271.

These refer to the subject of baptism in definite contexts and always within the framework of thought in which the author was working. Thus in chapter 6 the author appeals that the Christians should not remain stationary at an elementary stage in the Christian life, but rather should press on towards maturity. The elementary stage (Θυμειλιον), which comprises a negative side, μετανοιας ἀπο νεκρων ἔργων, and a positive one, πιστῶς ἐπὶ Θεόν, is described as including four elements βαπτισμῶν διδασκῶν¹⁶¹, ἐπιθεσῶς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστασεως τε νεκρων και κρημενος ἀλυσίου. (v.2). Thus the passage mentions the elements which comprised the early catechetical instruction in one congregation at least, and among the objects of instruction were matters relating to βαπτισμοί¹⁶². It seems to me correct to infer that this διδασκῶν could take the form of differentiating between Christian baptism and other water-rites such as John the Baptist's (cf. Heb.10:9), and perhaps also, although we cannot be sure about this, those of the Qumran sect and Judaism¹⁶³. The close association of ἐπιθεσῶς τε χειρῶν with βαπτισμῶν is an important piece of information, since this could point to their being part of a single ceremony, as the τε suggests¹⁶⁴, and apart from Acts, this is the only explicit reference to the combination of baptism and the laying on of hands in the NT. We cannot say whether it was always and /

161. Reading διδασκῶν, with p⁴⁶, B, it^{d(e)} syr; (so too Dunn, 207, F.F.Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews, London, 1965, 112, J.Moffatt, Hebrews, ICC, Edinburgh, 1924, 74, NEB). The construction therefore is that διδασκῶν is in apposition to Θυμειλιον. διδασκῶς is read by A,C,D,etc., and is the reading of UBS and NEB mg., but it is easier to see why an original διδασκῶν should have become διδασκῶς under the influence of all the surrounding genitives, than vice versa.

162. In view of the other uses of βαπτισμῶς in the NT (washing of dishes, Mk.7:4,8; John's baptism, Heb.10:9) it may be better to translate here 'washings' or 'lustrations', ('cleansing rites', NEB). The word also occurs at a well attested variant in Col.2:12, where it would mean 'baptism'. Dunn, 207, points out that in this passage some reference to Christian baptism should be included.

163. So Flemington, 97, BM 243, Dunn, 207. One is at a loss to know the basis for Moffatt's remark 'at baptism, for example, the catechumen would be specifically instructed about the difference between the Christian rite ... and the ablutions which were required from Christians in subsequent worship.' (ICC,75).

164. So Dunn, 207, citing Spicq; cf.BAG, s.v.τε1. In the next phrase ἀναστασεως τε νεκρων, that τε looks forward to the ensuing και to form a pair also.

and everywhere the practice, or indeed, when the laying on of hands was introduced¹⁶⁵. It is worth noting in the passing the occurrence of this practice, which was well known in Judaism, in a letter so obviously steeped in Jewish thought-forms and ideas. The inference of 6:1-2 is that one of the elements of catechetical instruction was in fact teaching on the significance of baptism.

The exhortation to advance to maturity (v.1) is picked up and explained (γάρ, v.4), where the effects of the foundation are described: Christians are described as those who have tasted the heavenly gift and shared the Holy Spirit (the same idea expressed in different ways), while experiencing the goodness of God's word and the powers of the age to come. The ἡμεῖς φωτισθέντες phrase is best taken to refer to 'the saving illumination brought about by the Spirit through the Gospel' (Dunn, 210), rather than as a synonym for βαπτισθέντες¹⁶⁶. It was only later that the verb φωτίσκειν was used to refer to baptism, and probably under the influence of this passage¹⁶⁷. We may also note several themes already familiar from other baptismal contexts, - repentance and faith, and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The statement in v.4ff. has been the subject of much debate and controversy since Hermas (Shepherd2.2.1ff.) interpreted it to mean that the author discounted the possibility of repentance for post-baptismal sin, although Hermas relaxed this to concede one opportunity (but only one) for repentance for post-baptismal sin. This was rejected by Tertullian who unequivocally supported auctor (whom he thought was Barnabas) in making the repentance impossible. Some have accepted that this was indeed what the author of Hebrews meant: thus, F. C. Burkitt¹⁶⁸ wrote that 'The author of Hebrews will allow no forgiveness for Christian sinners', while others have tried to tone down the ἀδύνατον in terms of Mk.10:27. Thus E. C. Wickham¹⁶⁹: '"Impossible!" It is a final word. But the impossibility spoken of is an impossibility /

165. Cf. Appendix 3 - 'The laying on of Hands'.

166. Cf. BM 245, who compares 2 Tim.1:10; 2 Cor.4:4-6; Eph.1:18 and Jn.1.

167. Cf. Justin Apology I.61.12f., 65.1 where φωτισμός and φωτίσκειν refer to baptism.

168. Cited A.Nairne, The Epistle of Priesthood, Edinburgh, 1913, 130.

169. The Epistle to the Hebrews, 2nd. edn., London, 1922, 43.

impossibility to man, not to God.' However, it is likelier that the correct interpretation is to focus on *παράπτεσθαι*, and to find in its meaning the clue to the saying as a whole. Now while the cognate noun *παράπτωμα* is frequently found in the NT with the meaning of 'a sin', the actual verb *παράπτειν* occurs only here. The most likely meaning of the verb here, - already prepared for in the LXX, cf. Sir.6:9; 12:2 - is to commit apostasy, and this fits in well with the context of the Letter to the Hebrews as a whole. Thus *παράπτεσθαι* here is the equivalent of *ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠγωνίζεσθαι* (3:12), and *ἐκούσιως ἁμαρτάνειν* (10:26) in import, and 12:17 provides a parallel to the sense of this passage.¹⁷⁰ Heb.6:1-4 therefore shows that for the unknown author baptism was of great importance: it was listed among the fundamentals, and viewed as the entry into a way of life from which there was no turning back.

There is another reference to baptism in Heb.10:19-22, - an appeal for a confident approach to God in full assurance of faith, *ῥευντισμένοι τῆς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ*. The latter phrase, *καὶ λελουσμένοι...κτλ.* is an undoubted reference to baptism¹⁷¹, but a problem is posed by the question of the relation of the preceding clause *ῥευντισμένοι... πονηρᾶς* to the *λελουσμένοι* clause. Some¹⁷² regard the clauses as set in apposition, so that they both describe the same event by a sort of rhetorical parallelism, while others take them independently of each other, and view them as descriptions of two related aspects of the conversion process¹⁷³, in which the *ῥευντισμένοι* clause describes the inward, spiritual process, while the *λελουσμένοι* clause describes the outward act of baptism which gives expression to the inner experience. There is really little to choose between these two options, and the sense is little affected either way. Thus if we take them in apposition, the inner cleansing of the heart is accompanied by the outward act and baptism is viewed as a cleansing; if the clauses stand independently of one another, then baptism is the act which gives expression to a previous inner experience, and both of these are possible interpretations. In this passage also (cf. vv.19ff.) there is a connection between baptism and the death of Christ, only for this author the significance is brought out /

170. So Moffatt, 79; Bruce, 123; W.H.Montefiore, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 109.

171. G.H.Lang denies the baptismal reference: The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1951, 167.

172. So Moffatt, 68; BM 249; Bultmann, Theology, I, 137.

173. Bruce, 250; Flemington, 98; Dunn, 212.

out in cultic, sacrificial terms. The eschatological reference (v.25) is not connected directly with baptism.

It is instructive that in both passages examined above, reference is made to the possibility of the baptized Christian falling away (cf.6:6; 10:26ff.), - thus the author did not view baptism as effective for all time, unless it were accompanied by a continuing commitment to Christian living, which, as we saw, Paul also stressed in his paraenesis.

2. 1 Peter.¹⁷⁴

According to Dunn (215), 'the one indisputable reference to baptism in 1 Peter' occurs at 3:19-21, in a passage which is markedly confessional, and which 'may even be a fragment of a hymn' (so BM 258,n.1). The baptismal reference is argued from a typological use of the story of Noah who, with his family, was brought safely through the water¹⁷⁵ of the Flood. The exact grammatical structure of v.21a is in doubt. Short of emending the text¹⁷⁶, the best way to understand the verse is to view ὁ ὕδατος as the antecedent which the relative ὅ picks up, and to translate: '... water which now saves you as antitype, namely baptism.' Though the in /

174. It is impossible to develop here the question of whether 1 Peter was originally a baptismal homily. The various hypotheses put forward (cf. J.N.D.Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, BNTC, London, 1969, 15ff.; Kummel, Introduction, 294ff.; BM 251ff. for treatment and discussion), all founder on Moule's objection that it is impossible to imagine how 'a liturgy-homily, shorn of its "rubrics" ... but with its changing tenses and broken sequences all retained, could have been hastily dressed up as a letter and sent off (without a word of explanation) to Christians who had not witnessed its original setting.' Cf. C.F.D.Moule, 'The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter', in N.T.S., 3, 1956-7, 4.

175. So BM, 259, resolves the difficulty of ὁ ὕδατος. Dunn is probably correct to observe that the expression is deliberately ambiguous to enable the typological argument on baptism to be drawn from the Noah story.

176. ὁ altered to ὧ, which, however has very poor MSS support, is probably an early attempt out of the difficulty of grammar. Nevertheless, BM follows Hort and Beare 'reluctantly' (260) and emends.

in apposition is awkward, the sense is clear enough: baptism is the antitype¹⁷⁷ (i.e., the thing foreshadowed by the type) of the Flood water and it is this which saves you also. To Beasley Murray's objection that this interpretation involves regarding baptism as effecting salvation (BM 259), Dunn has rightly countered (217): 'It is simply because ὁ βαπτισμὸς is the antecedent of ὅ that Peter feels it necessary to add the qualifying and corrective clause' (namely, οὐ σαρκὸς ... κτλ). The point of the typology is the water, only in the Christian understanding it is not the action of the water (οὐ σαρκὸς ὑποβολὴς ἵππου)¹⁷⁸ which is effective; rather the efficacy is described in the ἀλλὰ clause - ἀλλὰ συναδυσσας ἀγαθῆς ἐπερωτήματι εἰς θεόν. However, this phrase is open to two interpretations, depending on the translation of ἐπερωτήματι.

(i). Deriving the noun from ἐπερωτᾶν¹⁷⁹, to ask, entreat, one might translate 'through an appeal to God for a clear conscience' (so RSV, taking συναδυσσας ἀγαθῆς as objective genitive), or 'through an appeal made to God by a good conscience' (so NEB, taking συναδυσσας ἀγαθῆς as subjective genitive), and thus baptism is seen as involving a prayer.

(ii). B. Reike¹⁸⁰ has argued that ἐπερωτήματι was the technical term for making a contract (Latin stipulatio), and could in particular denote the undertaking given by one of the parties to an agreement in answer to the formal question addressed to him. In this case we should translate 'the pledge to God of a good conscience' (so JB, TEV), - i.e., baptism is viewed as an act of commitment to God on man's part.

We have no way of knowing which of these alternatives is preferable, although it seems to me that the emphasis which the early church placed on faith and repentance as /

177. This is preferable to Selwyn's interpretation of ἀντιτύπον in apposition to ὕμῳ, - i.e., he suggests the typology is Noah / you: E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1955 (2nd. edn.), ad. loc. Cf. Dunn 216 for alternative suggestions, also BM 259 and n.5.

178. Kelly's view (BNTC, 161) that circumcision is intended by the οὐ σαρκὸς ὑποβολὴς ἵππου, is unlikely: such a reference in this context would be out of place.

179. So Moffatt, The General Epistles, (MNTC), London, 1928, 143; Flemington, 99; H. Greeven TWNT, II 686,; Bultmann, Theology, I, 136.

180. B. Reike, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, Copenhagen, 1946, 182-5.

as essential pre-requisites for baptism, would point to the latter. Baptism then expresses the act of commitment on man's part to the grace of God. Dunn is certainly correct to point out (218) that what this verse implies is that the action in baptism is man's action (and this holds good whether ἐπερωτημα is taken as a prayer or as a pledge). Thus he says 'Baptism is the means by which men come to God rather than that by which God comes to man.' (219). But we must also note that the efficacy of baptism is grounded in God's action in raising Christ (vv.21-2, δι' ἡμετέρας ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...).

Thus we have seen that the NT does not give us one coherent view of baptism at once, - we are rather obliged to piece together the various elements which were in play and form them into some systematized thought. Even if the resultant picture is not clear at all points we do get a reasonably broad outline. Thus baptism was seen as the expression of man's response to what God had done in Jesus and in the preaching of the word. In repentance and faith a man turned to God and was baptized, and he received the gift of the Holy Spirit. The baptism was viewed theologically in various ways - cleansing, union with Christ in his death and resurrection, etc., and a new way of life was to follow in which sin was no longer present. It is a conjecture which is not unreasonable that the normal baptismal practice was by immersion, probably carried out by the leader of the local congregation. In this, the early church knew that it was carrying out the will of Jesus.

4. The Apostolic Fathers.

There is little in the early Fathers to add to our understanding of baptism. The list of instructions in Did.7:1-4 inform us that at that time baptism was preceded by instruction and by fasting (this latter point being new information), - fasting by the congregation, if possible, and certainly by the candidate, and for one or two days. The baptism was to be administered in running water (ἐν ῥέματι ὕδατος), failing which, if possible cold water; but if this was not available, then warm water was allowed. Failing sufficient water for immersion, the baptism could be performed by affusion, and the Didache also parallels the Trinitarian formula of Mt.28:19-20. Thus we have details on how baptism was administered around the turn of the century, but how ancient or widespread the practices attested by the Didache were, we cannot say.

Ignatius /

Ignatius tells us that a bishop's presence was necessary (Smyrn.8:2) - a step towards 'ecclesiastical control'. And from Barnabas, (11:1) and the reference to το βαπτισμα το φερον εφεσιν εμαρτιων , we see the danger of a development into a later magical view of baptism.

Beyond the Apostolic Fathers we enter a period of more evidence and more development in baptismal theology and practice, but that is outwith the bounds of our present study.

Baptism.

Appendices.

1. The words βαπτίζην, βάπτισμα, βάπτισμος

The verb βαπτίζην is the intensive form of βάπτειν, to dip, and βαπτίζην can also mean to dip, or plunge. The intensive form has a wider range of metaphorical meanings than the simple verb βάπτειν, and while the latter occurs in the NT with the simple meaning to dip, (e.g. Lk.16:24 βάπτειν ἄκρον δακτύλος ἐς αἶμα), βαπτίζην only occurs in the NT in a ritual sense (so BAG), to dip, immerse, or, in the middle voice, to immerse oneself or wash.

βαπτίζην, however, had a long secular history, mainly metaphorically used, from the fifth century B.C. onwards. Thus in Plato, Symposium, 176b βεβαπτισμένοι means 'soaked in wine', i.e., drunk; and exactly parallel to our 'get into deep water' we have Euthydemus, 277d γνούς βαπτιζόμενον το μελακίον. Josephus used the word of refugees flooding Jerusalem (ἐβαπτισαν τὴν πόλιν, Bell. Jud.4:33), and of falling unconscious: βαπτιζεσθαι εἰς ἀναισθησίαν καὶ ὕπνον. In LXX 4 Ki.5:14 καὶ κατεβη Ναιμν καὶ ἐβαπτισατο ἐν τῇ Ἰορδάνῃ ἑπτάκι (cf. Judith 12:7; Is.21:4 LXX; and in Sir.34:25 it is used of the cleansing of defilement caused by touching a corpse - βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀπτομένος τι ὥφελισεν ἐν τῇ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ; - a good example of ritual lustration).

The use of βαπτίζην in the NT is closely related to the original meaning, dip, even when used metaphorically. Thus when Dunn says (129, cf. 171) that, 'βαπτίζην in itself does not specify water-baptism' he is, strictly speaking, correct, and we must determine from the context whether or not the reference is to baptism. Thus Mk.10:38, Lk.12:50 are metaphorical usages unrelated to the Christian rite of baptism, but 1 Cor.10:2 does refer to water baptism, and the tautology alleged by Dunn in Ac.1:5 and Jn.1:26,31 is in fact necessary because one rite is being contrasted with another. βαπτίζην alone obviously specifies water baptism at 1 Cor.1:13, and Dunn's argument is seen to fail.

Of the nouns derived from βαπτίζην, both seem to be derived from the cultic sense of the word. Thus βάπτισμα is only found used of John's rite or the Christian one. (LSJ and BAG give no examples outwith early Christian literature).

βάπτισμος seems to be the wider term denoting any religious washing, - thus Josephus uses it of John the Baptist's rite (Antiq.18.5.2), while in the NT there are the examples, Mk.7:4 washing of implements and pots, Heb.9:10 different washings, and Heb.6:2 διδάχην βάπτισμων, which we saw involved teaching on the difference between Christian baptism and other water rites.

2. 'in the name of'.

We have seen that baptism was administered 'in the name of Jesus', or, 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit'; what do the phrases mean? The expression is known from Greek and Hebrew sources, as a standard formula in both languages, and scholars have offered varying interpretations, according to which language they think determined the NT usage.

Thus, if it is pure Greek, it is a banking metaphor, used of the transfer of something to another's account. Thus baptism εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ, signified that the person changed owners, as it were, and became Jesus' property.¹ And so Dunn, apropos of 1 Cor.1:10-17 regards the banking background of the phrase as decisive, since Corinth was an important commercial city. Now, while this is true, this fact need not determine the flavour of the phrase, for what is important is not the Corinthians' understanding of it, but Paul's understanding of the expression; and from his use of the OT (even to Gentile Christians), as well as his use of Aramaic words in his letters, the other view, namely that the predominant flavour of the word is Aramaic, or Hebrew, is by no means excluded. In which case, the phrase would mean 'with respect to' (בְּיֶחֱוָה), which Beasley-Murray interprets thus -

'On this analogy baptism in the name of the Father, etc. sets the baptized on a definite relation to God; the Father, Son and Holy Spirit become to the baptized what their name signifies.'

However, as Beasley-Murray indicates, the end result of deriving the phrase from a Hebrew or Aramaic starting point is little different from a Greek derivation - either way a relationship is entered into. Thus Dunn, -

'baptism in the name of Christ is the formal act wherein and whereby the baptizand gives himself to Christ.' (Baptism, 117).

James 2:7, - 'the name spoken over you' may be an allusion to this.²

1. Cf. Dunn, Baptism, 117, n.5 for a list of references.

2. So Bultmann, Theology, I, 134.

3. The Laying on of hands.

There is no doubt that, for our purposes, the origin of the laying of hands upon a person is to be found within Judaism. In the OT¹ we find that the rite is used for: i) the offering of a sacrifice (Lev.1:3); ii) the consecration of Levites in the Temple (Nu.8:10),; iii) the transference of authority (e.g., from Moses to Joshua (Nu.27:18,23); and iv) the imparting of a blessing (Gen.48:14-18).

Linguistically, the OT differentiated between these; thus for sacrifice or consecration נָחַם , to lean, was used - expressing the idea of transference of personality -, while for the giving of a blessing the verb used is נָתַן , to place, - the idea being conveying some beneficial value. This was also the case for acts of healing.

In the NT hands were laid upon a person in connection with healing (e.g. Mk.5:23), commissioning (Ac.6:6; 1 Tim.4:14), as well as in certain references to baptism, e.g. Ac.8:17, Heb.6:4. These are the only references in a baptismal context, and they are far from clear. We have already seen that the two Acts references are best viewed as exceptional cases, and the Hebrews reference, by its construction (κα) suggests that baptism and the laying on of hands were closely associated. If so, then this is the first explicit reference to this practice, and it is not at all obvious in the Acts examples. Further, Paul nowhere mentions the action in a baptismal context³. Thus we have two options: either (a) the laying on of hands accompanied baptism from the beginning (so Bultmann, Theology, I, 134); or (b) it could possibly have been a later introduction, but owing to the uncertain date of Hebrews we cannot say when it was introduced (and can we assume that the situation depicted in Hebrews held good everywhere?). Certainly, if it was in existence from the beginning it is curious that Luke is not more explicit. On the latter hypothesis, we are at a loss to suggest why it should have been felt necessary to introduce the rite.

1. Cf. D.Daube, The NT and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956, 224ff. A.Richardson, Introduction to the Theology of the NT, 329ff., 355ff.

2. The Ac.9:12 reference is best viewed as an act of healing.

3. If we accept the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, this is true; - 1 Tim.4:14 and 2 Tim.1:6 are best seen as references to ordination (for which, cf. E. Schweizer, Church Order in the NT, 6g,k, 25c,e).

4. σφραγίς. σφραγισμοί

The point frequently made that the NT refers to baptism as a 'seal'¹, is based mainly upon 2 Cor.1:22; Eph.1:13; 4:30. These passages state that God has anointed us (all Christians)² and sealed us, and given us in our hearts the Spirit as ἀρραβών (2 Cor.1:22), and that sealing with the Holy Spirit is the ἀρραβών of our future inheritance (Eph.1:13); while in Eph.4:30 it is stated that Christians are sealed in the Holy Spirit 'for the day of our final liberation.' From these passages the deduction is made that 'the idea of baptism as the seal of the Spirit'³ is contained in these passages. However that is not the case: the text does not allude to baptism at all. Rather, as Dunn (133, 160) and Beasley-Murray point out (BM 174), the seal referred to in these passages is the Holy Spirit. It is by the Holy Spirit that Christians are sealed against the day of redemption (Eph.4:30). That the idea of the imparting of the Spirit was in the background of Paul's thought here is to be inferred (with Beasley-Murray⁴ and against Dunn⁵). It was not, however, until the second century that the σφραγίς words were directly applied to baptism, Hermas being our first extant witness to this⁶. Indeed, in view of the diffuse, non-baptismal use of σφραγίς in the NT, - cf. especially 1 Cor.9:2; 2 Tim.2:19 and Ro.4:11 (where it is used of circumcision) - the possibility that σφραγίς words were technical terms for baptism is excluded. We must not read the NT with hindsight from second century literature!

1. Cf. Flemington, 66, and references in n.4; Richardson, Theology, 350ff.

2. So, e.g., Dunn, 133, n.54.

3. Richardson, Theology, 351.

4. BM 174: 'Thus the "seal of the Spirit" is neither baptism in water, nor a baptism of the Spirit divorced from the rite of baptism: it is the "baptism of the Spirit" in association with the laying (sic) of the Name of Jesus on a believer in the rite of baptism.' (BM's italics).

5. Thus when Dunn (133) states that water baptism does not occur in 2 Cor.1:22, while he concedes 'That the Spirit usually came at the event of water baptism is probable', we have another case of Dunn's tendency to excise every possible reference to water baptism in favour of baptism in the Holy Spirit.

6. Similitudes, 9.16.3 (cited BM 172): 'Before a man has borne the name of the (Son of) God, he is dead; but when he receives the seal he layeth aside his deadness and resumeth life. The seal then is the water, so they go down into the water dead, and they come up alive.'

5. Cullmann's thesis concerning κωλυσεν.

In an appendix to his book, 'Baptism in the NT' O. Cullmann has argued from the striking repetition of the verb κωλυσεν in several baptismal contexts (Ac.8:36; 10:47 11:17; cf. Mt.3:13ff., Gospel of Ebionites (cited Epiphan. 30:13) and also Mk. 10:13-16) that it is possible to detect an early liturgical formula used in baptism, in which it was asked if there was any impediment to a candidate's being given baptism (Ac.8:36, τι κωλυσει) to which the reply was given εἵλεται (Ac.8:37, Cullmann). Thus Cullmann feels that he is able to assert that 'when former heathen or Jews came over to Christianity this was one of the essential and universal conditions demanded.' (Cullmann, Baptism, 75).

We may immediately exclude Mt.3:13f. from our reckoning for these reasons:

- i). The situation in Mt.3:13 is the opposite of what Cullmann ought to wish to find. There John the Baptist tries to prevent Jesus from being baptized because he himself, John the Baptist, is unworthy!
- ii). The verse bears strongly the marks of a later redactional hand, and is the first of several later attempts to remove the offence to the church caused by the involvement of the sinless Jesus with a baptism 'for the remission of sins'.
- iii). If κωλυσει were liturgical formula in the early church, introduced from the sitz im leben into the baptismal narrative at Mt.3, we should expect to read ἐκωλυσεν not διεκωλυσεν: the appearance here of a compound verb (with no apparent difference in meaning from the simple verb) tells strongly against Cullmann's idea of a formula which we should expect to find in a fixed form. Also the imperfect tense is awkward for Cullmann, suggesting as it does a meaning such as 'began to protest'. The NEB rendering is good, 'tried to dissuade him', - and tells against Cullmann.

On Ac.8:36f., the fact that v.37 is not part of the original text removes εἵλεται as the proposed reply, and while this weakens Cullmann's argument, it does not invalidate the possibility that τι κωλυσει¹ was a formula². However, the frequency with /

1. That εἵλεται was not part of a liturgical formula is at once evident from the number of variants which do not include εἵλεται in the verse 37 which they print.
2. τι κωλυσει - the candidate asks if there is any impediment. The problem of how the Ethiopian can be expected to broach this topic de novo may be resolved either by assuming that Philip brought up the subject of baptism (this is not explicit but the narrative is abbreviated) or by assuming that Luke reflected the sitz im leben of the church with no thought for the authenticity of the narrative. Neither is satisfactory.

with which the phrase occurs in secular literature (cf. LSJ, s.v. κωλύειν, 6, Delling, Worship, 134) may be felt to weaken the point. In Ac.10:47 the picture seems to be of a bystander (τις) being asked if he has any objection³. In Ac.11:17, while the context is baptismal, the import of the verb κωλύει is not as in the cases above: here the object is expressed, τοῦ θεοῦ, - i.e., the meaning is 'Who am I that I could withstand God?' The language is outwardly similar, but the meaning is certainly not (against Haenchen, 355).

A basic objection which tells against there being a formula behind all of these passages is that there is no uniformity of practice in the use of the 'formula'. Thus in Ac.8:36 the candidate puts the question, in Mt.3:14 the baptizer, and in Ac.10:47 and 11:17 it is a third party who Cullmann declares 'had the function of a kind of God-parent (in the second passage (i.e., Ac.10:47) the water, in the third (Ac.11:17) God himself)'. (76). I don't know which is more absurd, the notion of the water as God-parent, or the notion of God as God-parent! There is a similar lack of uniformity as to who should answer the question, - as Cullmann has noted, (76), and this also tells against the idea of a 'formula'.

When he goes on to include for our examination Mk.10:13-6 which even he admits is not a baptismal passage (77), and which, as the parallel in Mt.19:14 shows was not regarded as containing a stereotyped formula⁴, we may conclude that the thesis has proved untenable.

3. Cullmann's idea that the water is personified is absurd! (74 and n.1). Haenchen (354 and n.1) regards the genitive of articular infinitive as having a consecutive significance, and translates 'Can anyone deny these water and make them go without baptism?' That makes much more sense.

4. So Delling, Worship, 134. That Matthew alone of the synoptists preserves, according to Cullmann, the formula at Mt.3:14, and yet alters Mark's formulaic word order ἀφετε τα παιδια ἐρχεσθαι προς με και μη κωλυετε αὐτα, to read ἀφετε τα παιδια και μη κωλυετε αὐτα ἐλθεν προς με, shows that Matthew was not aware of any formulaic influence, either here or at 3:14. Further, if a baptismal formula were being preserved here at 19:14, then we would have yet another variation in practice, - this time the church (the disciples) raise the objections!

6. Infant Baptism.

The controversial topic of infant baptism may rightly be left to an appendix because it is nowhere attested in the NT itself. Even exponents of the view that infant baptism was practiced in the NT period concede this point; thus Jeremias¹ writes 'For the first century we have no special evidence for the baptism of Christian children.' The attempts made to get round this fact, are in my view unsuccessful. Thus, I feel that Cullmann obscures the issue by asserting that 'there are in the NT decidedly fewer traces, indeed none at all, of the baptism of adults born of parents already Christian and brought up by them.'² That is statistically imprecise: the score is in fact no references to infant baptism and none to Cullmann's class, - thus 'fewer traces' is inaccurate! And in any case the greater part of the NT literature does not reflect the conditions of the church as it settled down to live in the world. Since it is mainly a missionary situation that is reflected in the NT, the absence of any references to the class Cullmann mentions need cause little surprise.

At best the view that infant baptism was practised in the NT church rests on argumenta e silentio. Much is made of the so-called 'οἶκος-formula'³, those passages where salvation comes, or baptism is given to a person 'and all his household' - as at 1 Cor.1:16, Ac.16:15,33; 18:8, cf.11:4. Now in not one of these cases are children expressly mentioned, although their existence is confidently presupposed by many. Jeremias has provided an example of over-confident conjecture in this respect:-

'The addition of ὅλος , πᾶς , ἑπᾶντες (the whole, all) makes it quite clear that no single member of the household was excluded from baptism; and in view of the general sociological picture we have of the oldest communities of the missionary church, it is extremely unlikely that the households of Cornelius, of the keeper of the prison in Philippi, of Lydia, of Crispus the leader of the synagogue and of Stephanas ever included a considerable group of slaves to whom /

1. Infant Baptism, 55.

2. Baptism in the NT, 26, cf. 70. (Cullmann's italics in the quotation).

3. Aland rightly protests against elevating the οἶκος references into a formula at all; cf. Did the Early Church Baptize Infants?, ET, London, 1963, 87ff.

'whom the words ὅλος, πᾶς, ἅπαντες could refer. Accordingly the natural conclusion is that we should take these additional terms to refer to all the children of the house.' (Infant, 20).

In my view this is presupposition, not fact, born of the special pleading which is necessary in order to find infant baptism in the NT. If we give the texts their proper weight they no more prove that the several οἶκοι included children but no slaves than that they included slaves but no children. In fact we cannot say whether the οἶκοι included slaves or children or both or neither⁴ from the term οἶκος alone. There are, however, several pointers which tell against an inference in favour of infant baptism. Paul says that the οἶκος⁵ of Stephanas 'laid themselves out to serve God's people' (1 Cor.16:15), suggesting, but by no means proving, a mainly adult composition. Paul also says that he baptized Crispus (1 Cor.1:14; and in view of 1 Cor.1:16 (household of Stephanas) Paul seems to be quoting accurately) - not the household of Crispus as Ac.18:8 has it. On the Cornelius household we may note, first of all, the existence of slaves⁶ (they are explicitly mentioned in Ac.10:7); and secondly, that here alone of all the NT οἶκος references is the membership of the οἶκος defined: Ac.10:24 τοὺς συγγενεὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαιούς φίλους. There is a marked absence of allusions to children! This fact seems curiously neglected by pro-infant baptism expositions, and the Ac.10:7 reference flatly contradicts the lengthy quotation from Jeremias, given above. Of the brief reference to Lydia and her household (Ac.16:15) we may make nothing, and in Ac.16:25 the conversion of the jailer at Philippi, while again we have no details of who made up the οἶκος, we should note that the word was preached to 'everyone in the house' (v.32 πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ)⁷. Thus it is a reasonable conclusion that the οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες who were baptized were the ones who had heard the word /

4. Aland's point (90), however, against Jeremias, that it is 'virtually certain' that Lydia, Cornelius, Crispus and the Philippian jailer had some servants seems not unreasonable. Cornelius certainly had at least two οἰκεῖται (Ac.10:7). Cf. below.

5. There is no distinction between οἶκος and οἶκος. In Jn.4:53 οἶκος is used in way similar to the so-called 'οἶκος-formula'.

6. οἰκετής originally meant 'house servant', and then 'slave' generally.

7. For οἶκος, cf. n.5 above.

word and there is no suggestion that others who had not heard the word (e.g. children) were brought in for baptism⁸. Thus I would hold that it is impossible to adduce the οἰκος references in support, even indirectly, of the existence of infant baptism in the early church. If anything the reverse, - that it did not exist - may be indicated at those places where the composition of the οἰκος is referred to.

A passage often referred to in this connection is 1 Cor.7:14, where Paul urges partners in mixed marriages not to seek divorce because through them their pagan partner belongs to God (ἡγιασται). The point is supported by analogy with the case of children: 'You must not seek divorce, 'Otherwise your children would not belong to God, whereas in fact they do (ἡγιασται)'. It is now clearly recognised, however, that this verse has nothing to do with infant baptism⁹, indeed it may even infer that these children belong to God independently of baptism¹⁰.

The passage in Ac.21:21 that Paul taught the Jews of the diaspora not to circumcise male children is adduced by Jeremias as evidence that Paul replaced circumcision by baptism (on the strength of Col.2:11). Even if the Col.2 verse were to be taken thus, and we have already seen that this is not justified, we should note that Ac.21:21 says nothing about baptism. The conclusion must be made that Jeremias has again read more into the passage than is legitimate.

The only further passage to consider is Mk.10:13-6 parr., - the passage where Jesus blesses the children. Jeremias finds himself arguing at a tangent on this verse, because, as he himself admits, 'the narrative itself, we must emphasise, has nothing /

8. The point often made that the faith of the husband determines the religion of the household seems to founder, at least partly, on 1 Cor.7:14b, where the possibility is expressed that there will be marriages with heathen husband and Christian wife, and even Christian husband and heathen wife. Thus there were cases known to Paul where the faith of the husband (whether Christian or pagan) was not determinative.

9. So Jeremias, Infant, 48. Aland, 80, cites Leitzmann-Kummel, I,II Corinthians, (Handbuch zum NT), 4th edn., 1948, 177.

10. Aland, 81.

'nothing to do with baptism, but is "pre-sacramental"'.¹¹ However by a series of four doubtful and inconsistent arguments Jeremias attempts to show that the sitz im leben of the passage was the early church practice of infant baptism.

i). By comparing the three synoptic parallels with Jn.3:5 and Justin, Apology I.61.4 and Apostolic Constitutions 6.15.5, Jeremias attempts to show that the pericope was held to have a baptismal context in the early church. There is no room to develop the points here, cf. Aland 95ff. for critical discussion.

ii). The appearance of the verb $\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$ leads Jeremias to call in Cullmann's thesis (cf. Appendix 5, above) which he gives a wider basis (after E. Molland) with two later references neither of which is in an infant or child baptism context. We have already found Cullmann's thesis inadequate.

iii). Reference is made to the laying on of hands (Mk.10:16, Mt.19:15, it is absent from Luke), - an act which 'belongs to the ritual of baptism' and which therefore 'must have been a further reminder of baptism to those who read the story' (54). This is stated despite the fact that the laying on of hands had a wider usage in non-baptismal contexts, Christian and Jewish, (blessing, healing, etc.).

iv). Luke has $\tau\epsilon\ \beta\acute{\rho}\epsilon\phi\eta$ rather than $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon$, - a change which Jeremias adduces as proof: 'The early church already practised child-baptism as infant-baptism, and with this in mind Luke will have inserted the expression $\tau\epsilon\ \beta\acute{\rho}\epsilon\phi\eta$.' (54). Now the evidence adduced in support of this astounding claim (56), does not refer to the NT period at all! In a footnote (54,n.5) Jeremias thinks he has spotted evidence of liturgical shaping of the evidence by Luke, yet with reference to iii) above, we saw that Luke alone omits the alleged liturgical action of laying on of hands! Jeremias can't have it both ways! Thus we may reasonably claim that Jeremias' case does not stand with regard to Mk.10:13ff. parr.; the passage can in no way be made to refer to infant baptism, or to reflect infant baptism in the church of the NT period. The question of when infant baptism was introduced, falls outside the scope of this, already long, paper: cf. Aland. 100ff.

11. Jeremias, Infant, 49.

12. Aland, 95f., cf. 95-9 for full discussion. Also E. Schweizer, Mark, 205ff.

We have examined the various elements which comprised the service of worship in the early church, although it is not possible to assume that conditions were sufficiently settled for there to have been a fixed pattern of worship in every place. What now remains is to indicate the general themes of the worship.

From the beginning, whenever the Christian community met together as a congregation, -i.e., excluding Christian participation in the worship of the synagogue,- their meetings were based upon their experience of what God had done for them in Christ: it was distinctly Christian worship. This fact obviously underlay the change in the day of meeting, even allowing for the fact that pressure from the Jews in driving out the Christians from the synagogues may have been at least as much to the fore as any consciousness of a marked separation between the Christians and Judaism. That the choice of day fell on the first day of the week may be a pointer to the influence of Christ's resurrection, even if that reason is not attested until the end of the first century. The terminology used supports this:

ἡ κυριακή ἡμέρα points to the κύριος as the influencing factor.

The experience of what God has done in Christ was recalled in the preaching of the Christian message. This included some detail of the life, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus, as well as the theological interpretation of these events - the 'for us' of 1Cor.15:3. Also included were the ethical implications for the believer of the new life in Christ. The preaching was supported, and indeed, based upon the reading of the Scriptures, and especially those sections of the OT which were understood to have been fulfilled by Christ in his ministry. Gradually, and we might also say in regard to the Epistles unconsciously, the community produced its own literary forms which were subsequently to acquire a standing alongside the OT scriptures, and above them as the 'New Testament'. The joy and gratitude of the community in the face of what God had done finds expression in acts of praise, the singing of psalms and hymns (the latter with a deep Christological flavour) and prayer where the new access to God available in Christ is opened up. Prayers are made to 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ', and are offered 'through Jesus Christ' and 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ'. Prayers were also said to Christ, although less frequently at this early stage.

The /

The distinctively Christian consciousness of the community is highlighted especially by the two liturgical acts by which the community life is established and enriched. By baptism in the name of Jesus the convert is brought within the community of salvation, and through the Lord's Supper ever recalls and lives from the central event upon which his faith is based. Thus, throughout, the worship of the community is distinctively Christian, even Christocentric.

Underlying all the various elements within the service is the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This is to be seen especially in 1 Corinthians; and while Corinth was exceptional in the high value it accorded the manifestations of the Spirit, there seems little reason to doubt that the influence of the Spirit was present at other worship assemblies¹ - Luke certainly knew about glossolalia, (Ac.2; 19:1), and so did Paul (1 Cor.14:18). It is scarcely possible that the influence of the Spirit was not felt in the worship of other communities than Corinth. In this connection we may therefore take it that, while the points Paul makes in 1 Cor. 14 were brought about by the need to counter the excessive importance placed upon charismata at Corinth, nevertheless these points were such as would find agreement in any congregation. Thus we may note the general principle that the influence of the Spirit did not preclude, or at least should not have precluded, a seemly and orderly service - πάντα δε εὐσημῶς καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω (1 Cor.14:40). Not only that, but Paul shows that the Spirit was, as it were, under the control of the individual: glossolalia was not to take place unless it were known that there was a person present who had the gift of interpretation, and only one speaker was to embark on glossolalia at the one time (1 Cor.14:27f.). However, the freedom of the Spirit to interrupt a prophecy was recognised (v.30). This was supported by the point that God was a God of peace, and not disorder.

Two other points which Paul makes may be noted. The aim of the service is to upbuild, οἰκοδομεῖν², the community: πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω (v.26b).

'We have to make it quite clear: Paul never speaks of edifying oneself; he always means: edifying the congregation. The goal of the service is by no means the comfort, the happiness, or even the salvation of the individual /

1. Against Macdonald, Worship in the Primitive Church, 43.

2. Cf. Bornkamm, Experience, 163f., for discussion of this word.

'individual taking part in it. It is always the upbuilding of the church.'³ Thus Paul rejects anything that is individual or esoteric (e.g., glossolalia without interpretation (v.16), which is thus meaningless to the congregation at large), in favour of all that operates for the upbuilding of the community.

The second point is that not only is the community to be built up, but the outsider⁴ (ἰδιώτης ἡ ἀπώστος, v.23) is to be challenged. This is what Bornkamm has called 'the missionary function of the word, even in the case of the word in worship'⁵. Thus the service of worship is seen to have a two-fold effect: on the members, for edification, and on the visitor, for challenge. Indeed it is the visitor who matters most for Paul, according to Schweizer⁶ -

'For always the outsider, the idiotes is the most important person in the whole assembly (14:16,23f.). If he cannot understand what is said it is not God's Spirit who speaks but a bumptious religious boaster.'

Thus when the early church met for worship it met to celebrate what God had done for them in Christ. The various forms by which this was expressed were carried on under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with a two-fold aim: to build up the community in the faith, and to speak a word of challenge to any unbeliever who was present.

3. E.Schweizer, Neotestamentica, Zurich, 1963, 337-8.

4. This denotes one person, and not two different types of person such as a catechumen and an outsider. So C.K.Barrett, 1 Corinthians, (BNTC) 324; against BAG s.v. ἰδιώτης, 2.

5. Bornkamm, Experience, 163.

6. Neotestamentica, 339.

The Sacraments in the Fourth Gospel.

The question of the treatment of baptism and the Lord's Supper in John's Gospel is complex, and has produced no agreed conclusion. Thus one distinguished commentator on John can say that, 'it is true that there is more sacramental teaching in John than in the other Gospels'¹, even if John does not record explicit commands of Jesus on the subject; while another can write, 'while the evangelist came to terms with ecclesiastical practice in regard to baptism and the Lord's Supper, it remained suspect to him, because of its misuse, and that is why he makes no mention of it.'² The problem has produced much literature, so that we can only touch on the subject here³.

On the Lord's Supper, Bultmann's argument⁴ that Jn.6:51b-8 is the work of an 'ecclesiastical editor' has met with little acceptance⁵; rather the verses are to be attributed to the evangelist, who is therefore responsible for the eucharistic teaching /

-
1. C.K.Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, London, 1955, 69.
 2. R.Bultmann, The Gospel of John, ET, Oxford, 1971, 472; cf. Theology of the NT, II, 58f.
 3. Cf. R.E.Brown, New Testament Essays, London and Dublin, 1965, 52-6 for a survey of opinions. Also G.H.C.Macgregor, 'The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel', in N.T.S., 9, 1962-3, 111ff.; C.T.Craig, 'Sacramental interest in the Fourth Gospel', in J.B.L., 58, 1939, 31ff.; O.S.Brooks, 'The Johannine Eucharist', in J.B.L., 82, 1963, 297ff.; O.Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, 37ff. Most recently, J.D.G.Dunn, 'John vi - a Eucharistic Discourse?', in N.T.S., 17, 1970-1, 328ff.; cf. his Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 183ff.
 4. The Gospel of John, 218f., 234.
 5. Cf. Dunn, N.T.S., 17, 329, and references there.

teaching of the verses⁶. In these verses the importance of the sacrament is underlined, and indeed heightened vis-à-vis the synoptic accounts: (vv.55f. σαρξ for σωμα⁷, τρωγεν for φαγεν), and in a way that emphasises the physical reality of the elements (v.55). Yet it would seem that this is negated in subsequent verses (vv.60ff. and especially v.63, in which the flesh is explicitly said to be of no avail, οὐκ ὠφελεν οὐδεν). How is this seeming tension to be resolved? Dunn is correct to point to the importance in John's thought of the λόγος becoming σαρξ at the Incarnation (Jn.1:14), but that it is not in the Incarnate One as such that salvation is to be found, but in the Crucified and Exalted One (as v.62 underlines). He writes

'he (John) takes great care to emphasise that it is the Incarnate Jesus only as given up to death who is the bread of life. However essential was the incarnation to the work of redemption, for John it is not merely Jesus descended who gives life, merely as σαρξ , but rather as also ascended, when he gives himself in and through the Spirit.'⁸

Whether Dunn is justified in his assertion that John 'uses eucharistic terminology with a metaphorical sense'⁹, I would very much doubt. John holds on to the reality of the sacraments, and indeed their necessity, (v.53), but asserts that by themselves they are not efficacious, as is shown by the sequel to this discourse (vv.66, 70f.)¹⁰.

On Baptism, Bultmann¹¹ would again excise any sacramental reference, - especially in this case the ὁδωτος και of Jn.3:5 as 'an insertion of the ecclesiastical redaction', although he does admit that this is not without difficulties. It is a suggestion /

6. Bultmann does not deny that the verses point to the eucharist; only that John wrote them in his original gospel.

7. σαρξ is used of the eucharist in Ignatius (Phil.4:1; Smyrn.7:1). This may be an Ephesian tradition of the Lord's Supper, either altered from, or independent of the Markan one (σωμα). Cf. Dunn, N.T.S., 17, 334.

8. Dunn, art. cit. 337-8.

9. Dunn, art. cit. 334, cf.335: 'John uses eucharistic language for its metaphorical value.'

10. Dunn, (art. cit.337) notes that John only mentions Judas as receiving the bread at the Last Supper, and that for him it brought the entry of Satan; but he omits to mention the reference to Judas here in ch.6 also.

11. The Gospel of John, 138 n.3.

suggestion which has not commanded support. Most commentators¹² agree that the most obvious meaning of ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος in 3:5 is as a reference to the Christian sacrament of baptism. Of those who reject this interpretation, Dunn is the most recent. He writes as follows:

'What is the initial point of reference of the water in 3:5? The most likely answer is that the author intended his readers to understand the water initially in terms of John's baptism, since in the other relevant passages of the first three chapters the water spoke directly of the old dispensation's rites of purification, particularly John's baptism ἐν ὕδατι.'

The result of this is that

'the reader would then understand 3:5 to mean that Christian conversion-initiation is more than Johannine baptism ἐν ὕδατι: it consists either of (Christian)baptism in water and the gift of the Spirit in close connection, or of a cleansing by the Spirit, a cleansing symbolized by John's baptism ἐν ὕδατι.'¹³

This, however is surely not the case. Any reference to John's baptism here would be totally out of place, illogical even. It is also difficult to justify grammatically, as Dunn has in fact seen: 'in 3:5 water is co-ordinate, not contrasted, with the Spirit' (Baptism, 189), and again, 'The phrase is a hendiadys, and the single preposition governing both words indicates that ὕδωρ καὶ πνεῦμα forms a single concept - water-and-Spirit' (192). Thus, to drive a wedge between water and the Spirit by referring them to different baptismal rites, is wrong. Here again, I think the reference is to the Christian sacrament, and as at ch.6, the point of the reference is to the true understanding of the sacrament. Christian baptism is ineffectual if it is merely a birth ἐξ ὕδατος: there is, John is saying, no ex opere operato effectiveness of the sacrament. What is necessary for birth ἀνωθεν is birth which is both ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος: the Holy Spirit is a sine qua non for the experience of new life in Christ (cf. vv.6ff. where the necessity of the Spirit is underlined). Here also John is emphasising the necessity of the sacrament, as he did for the Lord's Supper (ἐάν μὴ γενηθῇ ... οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ).

Various /

12. References in Dunn, Baptism, 183, nn.2,3.

13. Dunn, Baptism, 190 for both quotations.

Various attempts have been made to see sacramental references in other places in John¹⁴, two of which we may mention briefly. The footwashing narrative in ch.13, occupying as it does the place which the synoptists give over to the institution of the Lord's Supper, has been seen as a reference either to baptism¹⁵, or to the Lord's Supper¹⁶, or to both¹⁷. Bultmann sees John 13 rather as Jesus' service for his own (John, 473 and n.1), and prefers to find a reference to the Lord's Supper in ch.17 (485ff.). Again we note in this passage, (ch.13), John's protest against mechanical sacramentalism: Judas receives Christ's service, and then leaves to betray him (13:21ff.).

The second passage, Jn.19:34, the flow of blood and water from the side of Jesus, is probably best seen as rooting both sacraments in the death of Jesus. This is the 'definite meaning' of the verse, according to Bultmann(678):

'It can scarcely be other than that in the death of Jesus on the cross, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper have their foundation.'

(Only, Bultmann rejects the authenticity of these verses, preferring to see them as a 'secondary addition' (677 n.6).)

If these sacramental references are correct, the question then becomes one of why John should have treated the sacraments in this fashion. We may reject Bultmann's view that the sacraments were 'superfluous for him' - the care with which they are worked into the Gospel tells against that.¹⁸ Rather John's treatment is explained by the situation out of which his Gospel arose. There was no need to recount the institution of the sacraments by Jesus, - they were known and accepted as dominical by the church. There is much to be said for Barrett's point that John did not indicate a specific moment of institution because he wanted to anchor them, not to one particular date in the ministry, but to the whole Christ event - his /

14. Cf. Culmann, Worship, 37ff.; a list of possibilities in Brown, Essays, 75f.

15. So Craig, J.B.L., 58, 36-7; Barrett, John, 70, with reservation.

16. Cf. Culmann, Worship, 105ff.; Brown, Essays, 62f. for other references.

17. Macgregor, N.T.S., 9, 113; cf. Craig, J.B.L., 58, 36 n.22 for list.

18. Bultmann, John, 472; cf. Theology of the NT, II, 59.

his life, death and exaltation(Barrett, John, 71). The sacraments were an established feature of church life when John wrote, but there was a danger that they were being over-valued in a mechanical way, and regarded almost as a guarantee of salvation. Thus Ignatius, a near contemporary of John, writing to the Ephesians, could refer to the Lord's Supper as a $\phi\alpha\rho\mu\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu \alpha\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma, \acute{\iota}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\eta \acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$. (Ignatius, Eph.20:2). As Dunn puts it,

'John is concerned lest too much attention be given to the ritual act and lest eternal life be thought of as somehow dependent on or given through the physical elements.'¹⁹

Thus John is seen to take the sacraments with the utmost seriousness, and at the same time indirectly to indicate the way in which they were open to misunderstanding in the church of his day.

19. Dunn, art. cit.,337.

Bibliography

(Books referred to more than once in any chapter may be abbreviated in the notes, either to the author's surname, or, if more than one of that author's books are under consideration, the abbreviation will include some distinguishing word from the title of the book in question. Any special abbreviations are added here in brackets after the title of the book.)

Reference Works.

- Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature, ET by W.F.Arndt and F.W.Gingrich, 1957. (Abbreviation: BAG).
- Kittel, G., ed. Theologisches Worterbuch zum NT, later volumes edited by G.Friedrich, 1933ff. (Abbreviation TWNT).
ET by G.W.Bromily, Theological Dictionary of the NT, 1964ff. (Abbreviation; TDNT).
- Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R. A Greek-English Lexicon, a new edition, revised ... by H.S.Jones, 1940. (Abbreviation: LSJ).

Books, Articles, etc.

- Ackroyd, P.R. and Evans, C.F. The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. I, Cambridge, 1970.
- Aland, K. Did the Early Church Baptize Infants?, ET, London, 1963.
- Alexander, Neil The Epistles of John, London, 1962.
- Allegro, John The Dead Sea Scrolls, London, 1956.
- Baird, William 'What is the Kerygma, a study of 1 Cor.15:3-8 and Gal.1:11-7', in J.B.L.;76, 1957.
- Barrett, C.K. The Gospel According to John, London, 1955.
The Epistle to the Romans, (BNTC), London, 1957.
The First Epistle to the Corinthians, (BNTC), 2nd. edition, London, 1971.
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (BNTC), London, 1973.

- Barrett, C.K. 'The Interpretation of the OT in the New', in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol.I, 1970.
- Barclay, William The Lord's Supper, London, 1967.
'A comparison of Paul's Missionary Preaching and Preaching to the Church', in Apostolic History and the Gospel, edd. W.Ward Gasque and R.P.Martin, Exeter, 1970.
- Beasley-Murray, R.G. Baptism in the NT, London, 1962. (Abbreviation: BM).
- Best, Ernest The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, (BNTC), London, 1973.
- Bornkamm, Gunther Early Christian Experience, ET, London, 1969.
Paul, ET, London, 1971.
- Brooks, O.S. 'The Johannine Eucharist', in J.B.L., 82, 1963.
- Brown, R.E. New Testament Essays, London and Dublin, 1965.
- Bruce, F.F. The Acts of the Apostles, (Greek text and Commentary), London, 1952
The Epistle to the Hebrews, (NLCNT), 1965, London.
The Book of the Acts, (NLCNT), 1968, London.
- Bultmann, Rudolph The Theology of the NT, 2 vols., ET, London, 1952, 1955.
History of the Synoptic Tradition, ET, Oxford, 1963.
The Gospel of John, ET, Oxford, 1971.
- Caird, G.B. The Revelation of St. John the Divine, (BNTC), London, 1966.
- Campanhausen, H., von The Formation of the Christian Bible, ET, London, 1972.
- Carrington, P. The Primitive Christian Calendar, Cambridge, 1952.
According to Mark, Cambridge, 1960.
- Conzelmann, H. An Outline of the Theology of the NT, ET, London, 1969.
- Craig, C.T. 'Sacramental Interest in the Fourth Gospel', in J.B.L., 58, 1939,
- Cullmann, O. Early Christian Confessions, ET, London, 1949.
Baptism in the NT, ET, London, 1950.
Early Christian Worship, ET, London, 1953.
- Davies, W.D. 'Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's "The Primitive Christian Calendar" ', in Background to the NT and its Eschatology, edd. W.D.Davies and D.Daube, Cambridge, 1956.

- Davies, W.D. 'The Moral Teaching of the Early Church', in The Use of the OT in the New and other essays, 1972.
- Delling, G. Worship in the NT, ET, London, 1962.
- Dibelius, Martin From Tradition to Gospel, ET, London, 1934.
- Dodd, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its developments, new edition, London, 1944
- According to the Scriptures, London, 1952.
- The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953.
- Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1963.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit, London, 1970.
- 'John vi - a Eucharistic Discourse?', in N.T.S., 17, 1970-1.
- Efird, J.M., ed. The Use of the OT in the New, and Other Essays, Durham, N.C., 1972.
- Ellis, E.Earle, Paul's use of the OT, Edinburgh, 1957.
- 'Paul and his Co-workers', in N.T.S., 17, 1970-1.
- Evans, C.F. 'The Kerygma!', in J.T.S., 7, 1956.
- Filson, F.V. 'The significance of the Early House Churches', in J.B.L., 58, 1939,.
- The Gospel of St. Matthew, (BNTC), London, 1960.
- Fitzmeyer, J.A. '4 Q Testimonia and the NT', in Theological Studies, 18, 1957.
- Flemington, W.F. The NT Doctrine of Baptism, London, 1958.
- Fuller, R.H. A Critical Introduction to the NT, London, 1966.
- Green, Michael Evangelism in the Early Church, London, 1971.
- Guilding, A. The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, Oxford, 1960.
- Haenchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles, ET, Oxford, 1971.
- Hill, D. The Gospel of Matthew, (NCB), London, 1972.
- Jeremias, Joachim Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, ET, London, 1960.
- The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, ET, 2nd edition, London, 1966.
- The Prayers of Jesus, ET, London, 1967.
- NT Theology, vol.I, ET, London, 1971.
- Johnson, S.E. The Gospel According to Mark, (BNTC), London, 1960.

- Jones, D.R. 'ἀναμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. 11:25', in J.T.S., 6, 1955.
- Kelly, J.N.D. The Pastoral Epistles, (BNTC), 1963, London.
The Epistles of Peter and Jude, (BNTC), London, 1969.
Early Christian Creeds, 3rd. edition, London, 1972.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Oxford, 1946.
- Kummel, W.G. An Introduction to the NT, ET, London, 1966.
- Lamb, J.A. The Psalms in Christian Worship, London, 1962.
'The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy', in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol.I, 1970.
- Lang, G.H. The Epistle to the Hebrews, London, 1951.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Gospel According to St. Luke, (BNTC), London, 1958.
- Leitzmann, H. Mass and Lord's Supper, ET, Leiden, 1953ff.
- Lindars, Barnabas NT Apologetic, London, 1961.
- Macdonald, A.B. Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1934.
- Macgregor, G.H.C. 'The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel', in N.T.S., 9, 1962-3.
- McNeile, A.H. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, London, 1915.
- Martin, R.P. Carmen Christi, Phil.2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation, Cambridge, 1967.
- Metzger, Bruce The Text of the NT, Oxford, 1964.
- Moffatt, J. The Epistle to the Hebrews, (ICC), Edinburgh, 1924.
The General Epistles, (MNTC), London, 1928.
- Montefiore, W.H. The Epistle to the Hebrews, (BNTC), London, 1964.
- Morris, Leon The NT and the Jewish Lectionaries, London, 1964.
- Moule, C.F.D. 'The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter', in N.T.S., 3, 1956-7.
The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, Cambridge, 1957.
'The Intention of the Evangelists', in NT Studies, ed. A.J.B.Higgins, Manchester, 1959.
'A reconsideration of the content of Maranatha', in N.T.S., vi, 1959-60.

- Moule, C.F.D. The Birth of the NT, London, 1962.
- Mowinckel, S. The Psalms in Israel's Worship, 2 vols., ET, London, 1962.
- Nairne, A. The Epistle of Priesthood, Edinburgh, 1913,
- Nineham, D.E. St. Mark, (PNTC), London, 1963.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. The Psalms in Jewish Worship, Oxford, 1910.
- The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford, 1925.
- Reike, Bo The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, Copenhagen, 1946.
- Richardson, Alan An Introduction to the Theology of the NT, London, 1958.
- Roberts, C.H. 'Books in the Graeco-Roman World', in the Cambridge History of the Bible, vol.I, 1970.
- Robinson, J.Armitage St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1903.
- Robinson, J.A.T. 'Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in 1 Cor.16:20-4', in J.T.S., n.s.,4, 1953.
- Robinson, T.H. The Gospel of St. Matthew, (MNTC), London, 1928.
- Rordorf, Willy, Sunday, ET, London, 1968.
- Sanders, J.T. The NT Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1964.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, ET, Oxford, 1964.
- Schweizer, E. Neotestamentica, Zurich, 1963.
- The Good News According to Mark, ET, London, 1971.
- Scobie, C.H.H. John the Baptist, London, 1964.
- Selwyn, E.G. The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd. edition, London, 1955.
- Smith, D.Moody Jr. 'The Use of the OT in the New', in The Use of the OT in the New and Other Essays, 1972.
- Smith, W.S. Musical Aspects of the NT, Leiden, 1962.
- Stauffer, E. NT Theology, ET, London, 1955.
- Taylor, V. The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, 1962.
- Wagner, G. Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries, ET, London, 1967.
- Wainwright, G. Eucharist and Eschatology, London, 1971.
- Whiteley, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford, 1970.

Wickham, E.C.

Worley, R.C.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, 2nd. edition, London, 1922.

Preaching and Teaching in the Earliest Church,

Philadelphia, 1967.