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This thesis is intended as a study of some aspects of the process by which the Christian faith found articulation in the early Church and was communicated to others. The problems inherent in the use of kerygma, or of kerygma and didache in combination, to designate the Christian message in operation provide the starting-point of our discussion. The ambivalence of these terms suggests that early Christian discourse requires analysis in more precise, descriptive categories: hence our hypothesis that appropriate categories may be found in (i) propheteia; (ii) paraaclesis and homily; (iii) paraenesis and catechesis; and (iv) paradosis: categories corresponding respectively to the inspirational and charismatic, to exhortation and exposition in a scripture using community which was also messianic, to instruction and guidance in matters of belief and action, and to the transmission of tradition for the purposes of edification. The hypothesis is then tested by an exploration of each category in relation to a possible hinterland in the Graeco-Roman and Jewish world and then in terms of spontaneous development at the hands of Jesus and the early Christian Church. The extent to which each category may be said to operate kerygmatically and didactically is noted, as is also the extent to which the categories are inter-dependent. Such forms of articulation presuppose certain conditions: initial dependence upon existing Jewish religious traditions (e.g., religious concepts; practices such as midrash); the memory of one dynamic religious figure, Jesus of Nazareth, together with recollection of certain specific experiences related to the Risen Lord and continuing fellowship with him in cultic practices; the koinonia of the messianic community, with its manifold activities - worship, sacraments, spiritual life; its constant exploration, under the guidance of the Spirit, of the meaning of the great events of which it knew itself to be part, and the necessity to communicate its message to those within and outwith its fellowship, for apologetic, nurtural or
evangelistic purposes. The results of our investigations are brought together in
the Conclusion, which therefore presents a sketch of the total process of the
articulation of the earliest Christian message together with a very brief
consideration of the importance of our findings for Christian communication today.
SUMMARY OF THESIS.
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spiritual life; its constant exploration, under the guidance of the Spirit, of the meaning of the great events of which it knew itself to be part, and the necessity to communicate its message to those within and outwith its fellowship, for apologetic, nurtural or evangelistic purposes. The results of our investigations are brought together in the Conclusion, which therefore presents a sketch of the total process of the articulation of the earliest Christian message together with a very brief consideration of the importance of our findings for Christian communication today.
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION.

1. The Problem of "kerygma" and "didache".

The dawn of modern, kerygmatic theology broke upon the slumbering world in 1892 with the publication of a work by Martin Kähler(1) which decisively challenged the historical relativism of the nineteenth century "lives of Jesus"(2) and redirected attention to the Christ of the apostolic preaching. "The real Christ is the preached Christ, and the preached Christ is the Christ of faith."(3) The high noon of the movement was marked by the ascendancy of Barth and Bultmann, blood brothers of the Formgeschichtliche Schule but diverging sharply, as brothers sometimes do, in the very manner in which they developed their inheritance. The post-Bultmannians still walk in the afternoon sunlight of kerygmatic theology, even if the lengthening shadows suggest that the darkness of the night will not be postponed indefinitely. The twentieth century day, thus illumined by the sunlight of the kerygma, has had its own share of diurnal difficulties, many of them

(1) Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus, 1892.
(2) There were, of course, other reasons for the abandonment of the "old quest". In particular, W. Wrede's emphasis on the "Messianic secret" in Mark pointed to the writer's theological and dogmatic concerns and, in this anticipation of Redaktionsgeschichte, undermined widely held assumptions about the overriding historical concern of Mark's outline: Das Messiasgeheimnis der Evangelien, 1901. Also A. Schweitzer's critical appraisal of the liberal enterprise in Von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906 (Eng. tr., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1922), clearly demonstrated the degree of subjectivity involved in it and drew attention to the importance of the eschatological element, a point also insisted upon by J. Weiss, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes, 2ed., 1900. A classic comment on liberal subjectivity is that of G. Tyrrell: "The Christ that Harnack sees, looking back through nineteen centuries of Catholic darkness, is only the reflection of a Liberal Protestant face, seen at the bottom of a deep well": Christianity at the Crossroads, 1909, p.44; cf. D.M. Baillie, God Was In Christ, 1946, p.40.
still unresolved as the working day draws towards its close, but it has always claimed the advantage of locating clearly the genuine source of light and power: the kerygma, the preaching which has characterised and enshrined the Christian faith from the beginning. Yet this basic nuclear concept presents a concatenation of problems, a further examination of which is essential to any appreciation in depth of the nature of Christian utterance.

(i) the meaning of kerygma in the New Testament.

The term kerygma, like the English word "preaching", possesses inherent ambivalence. It may refer to preaching as an activity or as the content of proclamation, and sometimes it is not easy to decide which meaning predominates. When Paul comments that "it pleased God through the foolishness of the kerygma to save those who believe" (1 Cor.1:21), is he referring to the folly of the activity of preaching or the folly of the message itself? With G. Friedrich, one may note Paul's desire to underline the content of preaching (1:23, "we preach Christ crucified", and perhaps also 1:18, "the word of the cross"): the kerygma in 1:21 is then the content of the message, which is mere foolishness to the sophisticated Greek. But in 1 Cor.2:4 where Paul again dissociates his logos (speech) and kerygma (preaching) from the plausibility of worldly wisdom, he is clearly referring to the act of preaching which has an eschatological dynamic, so that the faith of those who responded to his preaching was born not of human wisdom but of the power of God. This nuance can hardly be absent in 1:21.

C.F. Evans strikes a delicate balance in his interpretation:

(1) T.D.N.T., III, 716, n.2.
(3) ἐν ἀποδείξει Πνεύματος καὶ Δύναμεως.
"The content of the activity corresponds with the activity itself, 'Christ crucified' being the apparently foolish content of the foolish activity of preaching".  

If one were to assess where the weight of meaning falls generally, one would conclude that kerygma almost invariably contains the primary notion of the dynamic activity of preaching, but no context excludes the idea of content, (2) which must therefore be included within the general connotation of the term.

A further ambivalence is illustrated by the difficulty of interpreting a phrase such as "the kerygma of Jesus Christ" (Rom.16:25).

If the construction is taken to be an objective genitive, the meaning is "the preaching about Jesus Christ", the whole phrase being a summary, perhaps, of Rom.10:8-12. (3) If the phrase is modelled on the corresponding expression "according to my gospel", the meaning is "the message which Jesus Christ proclaimed". (4) This allows a direct parallelism between the kerygma of Jesus and the kerygma of the early church, but New Testament usage is frequently more sophisticated and ambivalent. Thus "Christ" is often the content of the kerygma: "we preach Christ crucified" (Rom.1:23); but additionally and at the same time Christ is the agent in and behind the activity of preaching, as is clearly shown in Paul's understanding of his commission (Gal.1:16). (5) This eschatological dimension has been rightly stressed by R. Bultmann.

In the Pastorals, kerygma can also denote the office of preaching with which the apostle is entrusted and which is the means of manifesting

---


(2) The notion of content predominates in the shorter ending of Mark and the difficult, and secondary, Rom.16:25.

(3) Cf. Sanday and Headlam, Commentary on Romans (I.C.C.), 1895, ad loc.


eschatological truth (Titus 1:2f.; cf. 2 Tim.4:17). But as will be subsequently illustrated, when the content of kerygma is essayed in a more detailed way, no agreement exists as to its precise constituents.

(ii) some modern uses of kerygma.

That kerygmatic theology in general has attempted to remain faithful to this complexity of central concern may readily be admitted. Bultmann treats the kerygma as "eschatological event"; his hermeneutic is directed to the problem of the meaningfulness of the kerygma to "modern man"; and if he plays down the delineation of its content in terms of explicit formulae, he emphasises that it always has to do with God's action in Christ. (1) But the brand of kerygmatic theology which exercised considerable influence in Britain and beyond in the mid-twentieth century can hardly be credited with maintaining a similar equilibrium. The publication of C.H. Dodd's attractive and influential book, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, had the unfortunate effect of encouraging an inflexible understanding of the kerygma in terms of supposedly primitive and relatively stereotyped confessional formulae. It became a commonplace in English theological circles to assume the existence of "a common pattern of kerygma in early speeches in Acts, in several passages of St. Paul, and in Mark's summary of Jesus' preaching in Galilee". (2) Such widespread

(1) It is true that Bultmann stresses kerygma as "address" and resists objectification of it in terms of a merely historical recital: cf. Theology of the New Testament I, Eng. tr., 1952, p.307. But he also says that the kerygma is "the word of Christ whose contents may also be formulated in a series of abstract propositions": Kerygma and Myth I, p.209, and that it "necessarily assumes the form of tradition": ibid., p.115.

acceptance of a hypothesis that was by no means exhaustively argued suggests that it spoke to some psychological need on the part of the English-speaking theological public. A century or so of critical scholarship that had left the old dogmatic orthodoxy threadbare and discredited had also presented the New Testament as a conglomerate of oddments dazzling in their variety and fascinating in their peculiarity but reflecting many different historical and doctrinal milieux. The rediscovery of the primitive, kerygmatic pattern suggested that the vital clue to the unity of the New Testament and the location of its true focus had been uncovered. (1) The consequence of the inherent rigidity of this position was that the dynamic and fluid activity of preaching was caught and stopped as by a still camera. The electric shock of the eschatological "now", the moment in a man's experience in which the living word of preaching strikes home more sharply than a two-edged sword, was neutralised by the intrusion of the concept of a timeless and eternal Kingdom, a Platonic form (2) to be detected in the


the process of realisation, if not wholly realised, amid the temporal and ephemeral.

Fortunately, the element of aberration in this understanding of the *kerygma* has become much clearer in more recent discussion. If the film is temporarily stopped to allow analysis of the sermons of Peter and Paul in Acts, it must be recognised that such sermons, even if they do represent an authentic summary of what Peter and Paul actually said on the occasions in question, are the products of a fluid process of development in thinking and interpretation within the Christian community from its earliest stages onwards.\(^1\) Besides, the credal formulae abstracted from the film clip are themselves wholly time-conditioned, and in consequence have their limitations as vehicles for the wealth of insight, experience and faith which they strive to bear. Such desiccated formulae have little point of contact with Paul's preaching "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power". In more flamboyant vein, T.G.A. Baker invites the modern reader to study again the kerygmatic formulae abstracted as described and to ask whether, on their own, they "would ever convert a fly - even a first-century Palestinian fly - let alone one of the twentieth-century European variety".\(^2\) In other words, such formulae are no longer kerygmatic in operation.

(iii) how biblical is modern usage?

The use of the Greek word *kerygma* as a technical term in modern theology carries an implicit claim that biblical usage is thus

---

\(^1\) Cf. Appendix "A".

\(^2\) *What is the New Testament?*, 1969, p.20. For a survey of the use of *kerygma* in critical scholarship, from J.S. Semler in 1777 (where *content* predominates, though not in unchanging formulae) and J.G. Herder (d.1807: in his usage of it, the oral nature of the gospel as *announcement* is stressed) to R. Bultmann (in whose work it acquires central hermeneutical significance), cf. G. Ebeling, *Theology and Proclamation*, Eng. tr., 1966, pp.113-118.
perpetuated. Yet κήρυγμα itself is not particularly prominent in the New Testament, and the term εὐαγγέλιον, occurring nearly ten times as often, would appear to be more representative of biblical practice. (1) Not only does εὐαγγέλιον express the note of joyful-ness, but it is also more satisfactory as a holistic term for the Christian message. (2) The limitations of the term kerygma have led to several disquieting terminological developments in modern biblical theology. Even in the heyday of the "objectifying" view of the kerygma so strongly advocated by C.H. Dodd, its monolithic structure was rendered questionable by the failure of its advocates to agree upon the precise composition of the ancient message. (3) Its holistic inadequacy has led to the use of didache as a supplement to kerygma; and while this may appear to echo biblical usage - "preaching and teaching" is a recognised biblical formula - it is not clear in practice that modern usage follows or preserves the biblical meaning. (4) A more recent development has been to use the plural term kerygmata to express the variety of ways in which the central message is communicated: "... it would be better to speak of 'kerygmata' than, too confidently, of 'the kerygma'". (5) However valid this insight may be and however preferable to the uniform, monolithic structure indicated

---

(1) Like κήρυγμα, εὐαγγέλιον reflects the activity of a herald but stresses the "good tidings" that are proclaimed. It has a worthy O.T. pedigree (cf. Is.40:1-11; 52:7f.), reflected in N.T. usage (cf. Mk.1:3; Rom.10:15).

(2) The preference for kerygma in modern theology may be explained partly by the fact that "gospel" acquired other connotations in the post-apostolic age: e.g., as a literary term.

(3) Thus W. Baird wrote: "Hunter and Craig posit a three-point kerygma, but their three-points are not identical. Filson lists five facts or doctrines, while Glasson ardently contends for five slightly different elements. The Swedish scholar Gartner suggests a kerygma of seven essential points": What is the Kerygma? A Study of 1 Cor.15:3-8 and Gal.1:11-17. J.B.L. 76, 1957, p.182.

(4) The problem is discussed below.

(5) C.F. Evans, op. cit., p.41.
above, in relation to terminological concerns misgivings abound. To use the plural form is to depart even further from New Testament usage. And the original object of kerygma terminology was to express the unity of the Christian proclamation, which is now apparently dissipated in a plurality of forms. Two conclusions are indicated: first, "the term kerygma is more a technical term of modern biblical theology than of the Bible itself"; and in the second place, in studies of Christian origins relating to the emergence and early articulation of the Christian message, the term kerygma can be used only with the greatest caution, and if it can be replaced by a terminology more representative of New Testament usage and practice, this alternative terminology should be adopted.

(iv) the relationship between kerygma and didache.

If kerygma was the solar centre in the universe of kerygmatic theology, didache was sometimes represented as a lesser satellite whose function was entirely governed by the greater planet and whose light was no more than a lunar reflection. C.H. Dodd writes: "It was by kerygma, says Paul, not by didache, that it pleased God to save men", although a glance at 1 Cor.1:21 indicates that Paul said nothing of the kind. Elsewhere, Dodd writes:

"It is evident from the whole New Testament that the message of the church was conceived as having two main aspects: the Gospel of Christ, the theme of preaching (kerygma), and the Law or Commandment of Christ, the theme of teaching (didache) ... The two are intimately united, though distinguishable".

This inner dualism is worked out at several levels: for example, between the proclamation of salvation in Christ and the teaching of

---

(1) The plural is used not infrequently in Philo as in classical Greek, but not in a theological sense: cf. Agric. 117; Leg. Gaj. 46.
(2) W. Baird, op. cit., p.184.
Christian moral practice; and between the proclamation to the non-Christian world and the instruction of those within the community. G. Wingren commented:

"It is surprising that Dodd, who in the whole New Testament sees the manifestation of one and the same oft-repeated kerygma, can be tempted by such a distinction. The Epistles that preach the kerygma most clearly, for example, 1 Peter and others like it, were sent to Christian congregations in trouble ... It is false intellectualism to separate those who belong to the church from the missionary kerygma". (1)

In somewhat similar terms, C.F.D. Moule writes:

"...if we maintain the familiar distinction between kerygma and didache too rigidly, we shall not do justice to the real nature of all Christian edification, which builds, sometimes more, sometimes less, but always at least some of the foundation material into the walls and floors". (2)

That there is a broad distinction between preaching and teaching, (3)

---

(3) Didache in the N.T. usually indicates the totality of teaching, whether of Jesus (Matt.7:26; 22:35; Mk.1:22 etc.; Jn.7:16f.; 18:19; cf. 2 Jn.9f.), of the Pharisees (Matt.16:12), of the apostles (Acts 2:42; 5:28; 17:19), or, for that matter, of "Balaam" (Rev.2:14), of the "Nicolaitans" (2:15), or of "Jezebel" (2:20, 24). Paul adopts this holistic usage in Rom.6:17 (the "standard of teaching") and 16:17, but implies a particular expression of Christian didache in 1 Cor.14:6 and 26. Nevertheless, only in Heb.6:2, where didache refers to doctrinal formulae relating to cleansing rites, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, and in 13:9 ("diverse and strange teachings") is didache completely particularised, as it came to be in the apostolic Fathers (Did.2:1; 6:1; 11:2; Barn. 9:9). Cf. Rengstorf, T.D.N.T. II, p.163f. It is therefore undesirable to use didache of a particular form of Christian communication or even a group of forms.

Didaskalia, frequently used in close association with δίδασκαλός and διδάσκαλος denotes in particular the activity of teaching (Rom.12: 7; cf. Eph.4:14) and the teaching that comes through scripture (Rom.15:4). In the Pastorals it occurs in this sense (1 Tim.4:13, 16; 5:17; 2 Tim.3:10; Tit.2:7), but it also suggests Christian teaching in its totality, especially over against other teachings which have no authority and are harmful (1 Tim.4:6; 6:1; in plural - 4:1; Col.2:22; cf. Matt.15:9; Mk.7:7). The teachers have now come into their own as the transmitters and guardians of the apostolic tradition. Rengstorf, op. cit., quotes Clement of Alexandria: μεθ ἐμοῦ γέγονε τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐπίτροπος διδάσκαλος οὗτος ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπὶ περισσότερος (Strom.VII, 17, 108). But despite the shift of emphasis, it is still recognised that the total Christian message is communicated by preaching and teaching in combination: 1 Tim.5:17; cf. 2 Tim.4:17.
in the ancient and the modern world, must be allowed. W.D. Davies is justified in underlining Matthew's didactic vocabulary in his introduction to the Sermon (5:1), but one notes that the distinction lies in the informality of the situation and the posture of the teacher rather than the substance of the message: indeed, Luke and presumably Q tend towards a sermonic rather than a didactic presentation of essentially the same material (cf. Luke 6:17-20). Further, preaching and teaching are properly regarded as being broadly complementary and as denoting the whole process of communicating the appropriate message. This operates equally for the ministry of Jesus (cf. Matt.4:23; 9:35; 11:1) and the apostolic mission (Acts 28:31). The extent to which the terms overlap and integrate makes it difficult to separate them except in general terms. Thus, Friedrich's contention that those who heard Jesus' preaching are different from those who heard his teaching would be difficult to maintain in any rigid sense; and he goes on to show that Jesus, exercising his distinctive ἀγορά (Mt.7:29), preached in the synagogue (the normal place for "teaching") as he proclaimed the advent of the kingdom (cf. Luke 4:21). In fact, the terms are so interrelated that they can be used virtually as synonyms: the disciples, sent out in Mk.3:14f. to "preach (κηρύσσειν) and ... cast out devils", return in Mk.6:30 to "report to him all that they had done and all that they had taught (ἐστίασαν)". Equally, the attempt to distinguish between them in terms of content - the usual assumption being that didache represents ethical teaching - is shattered by Rom.2:21, where as J.J. Vincent has put it "the 'content' of the preacher's

(1) The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, 1964, p.7f. For the Jewish practice of teaching in a seated position, cf. Aboth 1:4, 3:2,6
(2) T.D.N.T. III, p.713, the point being that διδασκαλία has to do with exposition of scripture to the pious in the synagogue, κηρύγμα is the herald's cry to the outsiders.
preaching (κήρυγμα) is good, solid ethical διαχ'!

such distinction as exists between them must be sought in less tangible features.

An important contribution to this debate was made by K. Stendahl. He distinguished between kerygma as a formal, functional activity (Formalbegriff) - roughly what Bultmann means by "address" - and kerygma as content (Inhaltsbegriff), usually related to "the things concerning Jesus" and taken by Dodd as Heilsgeschichte. He argued that preaching in the first sense may be "kerygmatic" without however presenting kerygma in the second sense. Conversely, if kerygma in the latter sense is presented as no more than a recital of events or a string of propositions, it is not in fact kerygmatic: it is unkerygmatisches Kerygma. And what is in effect didache operating in a particular situation may be profoundly kerygmatic: this is, in Stendahl's terminology, kerygmatliches Nicht-Kerygma. Bearing this insight in mind, J.J. Vincent examined the synoptic gospels in order to identify their kerygmatic elements and emerged with the conclusion that the key to the intrinsic synoptic kerygma lay precisely in its didache, which relates to the whole story of Jesus: "... the only Kerygma of which we are entitled to speak on the basis of the Synoptics is 'a didactic kerygma'".

---

(3) He found that the content of Kerygma in the gospels "(1) is not generally the kind of summary of Heilsgeschichte that we might have expected, (2) refers almost as often to repentance and forgiveness, not always in the context of a 'therefore' after a heilsgeschichtliche statement, (3) can also be a testimony to a miracle": op. cit., p.269.
the way of the Cross, for example, "the radical διάστημα is the κηρύγμα of God". (1)

What are we to conclude from such evidence? Kerygma and didache can still be used as complementary terms to denote the central complex of Christian utterance but because of their peculiar interrelatedness they cannot provide a basis for a proper operational analysis of Christian communication. It is not enough to attempt to identify given material formally as kerygma or didache, for it might have both kerygmatic or didactic characteristics to a greater or lesser degree and at the same time possess other features which signify its nature and intention in a more useful way. This is, in effect, to insist upon the elucidation of the broad hinterland of Christian communication of which the form critics were well aware but which in practice was subordinated in their work to the analysis of particular forms of the gospel tradition. Hence we propose to lay more, not less, stress upon the Sitz im Leben of early Christian utterance, for it was within the koinonia of the early communities that Christian meaning and insight found articulation and took on appropriate formal structures (cf. Acts 2:42), although their utterances may themselves point back to some prior origin or continuing tradition.

An introduction to such a project is readily provided by a number of scholars who have attempted to move in this direction. A survey is therefore made of representative work from two different camps - Roman Catholic and Scandinavian - before we attempt to formulate our own hypothesis.

2. Towards an Analysis of Early Christian Preaching and Teaching.

(i) Formal Analysis in Roman Catholic Debate.

Roman Catholic discussion, recognising a "crisis of preaching" in the modern situation, has moved the subject into a position of central concern. In part a response to the problems inherent in the secularization and dechristianization of society, the debate has drawn upon the resources of modern biblical, patristic and liturgical studies, ecumenical concern and philosophies of communication, and has been influenced strongly by the modern Verkündigungstheologie, or kerygmatic theology, associated in Roman Catholic catechetical circles with J.A. Jungmann in particular. Protesting against the notion of preaching as the mere vulgarization of theology, Jungmann points to the biblical model of the proclamation of the gospel as the key to dynamic preaching with strong pastoral and kerygmatic concern. For him, kerygma is the christocentric message that comprises the essential content of Christian teaching and is designed for proclamation. He sees a correlation between the original kerygma in its first century setting and the proclamation of salvation today in a dechristianized world. It is to be distinguished from catechesis, which consists of practical religious training, teaching the history of redemption as in the scriptures, and systematic instruction in doctrine.

A. Réti, in his more detailed historical research on the subject, emerged with a three-fold distinction: kerygma, the proclamation of the kingdom of God in Christ for evangelistic purposes; catechesis (or didache), the teaching that introduced converts to Christian doctrine and moral practice; and didaskalia, the more advanced instruction in

---

the faith. Retif, however, admitted the fluidity of New Testament usage. (1)

D. Grasso, in search of criteria for distinguishing forms of preaching, finds an empirical indicator in those to whom the message is directed: pagans, catechumens, and those already Christian; and an intrinsic criterion in the goal of the preaching: missionary preaching aiming at encouraging people to accept the faith, initiatory preaching giving knowledge of the faith in doctrinal and moral terms, and liturgical preaching enlivening a faith already accepted and understood. Grasso therefore emerges with a triple structure: evangelization, catechesis, and homily, all of which have their focus in the person of Christ the Saviour. (2) Evangelization, which is supremely kerygmatic, includes the proclamation of salvation history, centred on the cross and resurrection, and calls for decision. Catechesis follows evangelization and is instructional, presenting the message of salvation with a view to initiating the convert into the Christian life and the mystery of Christ, either before or after baptism. Homily takes place in a liturgical context, within the family of the faithful, as "a means whereby the liturgy realizes its proper goal, the union of the faithful with Christ", and is aimed at the will. (3) There is, however, an overriding unity in preaching, no one form being totally independent of the others.

The debate has brought about a partial clarification of some of the terminological difficulties inherent in formal analysis, though

(1) Qu'est-ce que le kerygma?, N.R.T. 71, 1949, pp.910-922.
(3) Op. cit., p.230ff. Grasso is at pains to stress the difference between catechesis and homily. The former aims at the intellect, is systematic, didactic and rational, calm and static. The latter aims at the will and feelings, "tends to see the affective element, more the heart than the mind of God", is lyrical and vivacious, dynamic and disturbing.
much confusion remains.\(^{(1)}\) To those accustomed to the complexities of the hermeneutical debate in Reformed circles, the approach of Grasso and others may appear simplistic in places,\(^{(2)}\) although it has the merit of direct concern with the practice of preaching and teaching. Jungmann's general division of Christian communication into the kerygmatic and the catechetical (or didactic) is appropriate enough as far as it goes, and so also is Retif's desire to subdivide the latter category, although it must be questioned whether didaskalia is the best form to employ for this purpose. Grasso's three-fold analysis is also useful, its main limitation being that his formal analysis is insufficiently related to the study of New Testament forms and is much influenced by the "reading back" of church practice into the apostolic period.\(^{(3)}\) The inter-dependence of the different forms though recognised,\(^{(4)}\) is not fully developed, and the more instructional forms lack the dynamic they appear to possess in the New Testament.

(ii) Scandinavian approaches to formal analysis.

The synopsis of early Christian preaching given by B. Reicke\(^{(5)}\) is something of a seminal work in this field. Reicke finds his starting point in form criticism and comparative folklore disciplines which indicate that early Christian preaching, like other types of cultural development, cannot have been without set forms at any stage; and this finding corresponds with such evidence as the New

---

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. *op. cit.*, p.240.
\(^{(2)}\) For example, the practical relevance of the rediscovery of kerygmatic preaching to a dechristianized society is insisted upon in spite of recognition of the fact that verbal communication is devalued in the modern world (cf. Grasso, *op. cit.*, p.xiv) and the unease felt about its contemporary effectiveness in Reformed circles traditionally thirled to "the word".
Testament itself provides. While the apostolic message was admittedly new and *sui generis*, historical research yields no support for the hypothesis of *creatio ex nihilo* as far as external forms are concerned. Since the apostles were the representatives of the Lord, "an extension and multiplication of His person", the comparison of their preaching with the models offered by the teaching of Jesus is particularly illuminating, but further prototypes may be sought in Old Testament prophecy and the messianic proclamations of the intertestamental period.

Reicke then turns to a consideration of the main aspects of the divine messenger's activity, which he identifies as (i) conversion, including admonition and invitation, (ii) instruction and edification, (iii) testament, and (iv) revelation: a classification which might apply to "the patriarchs and the prophets, or Jesus and the apostles, or their successors". His main interest, however, lies in the relationship between the preaching of Jesus, the divine messenger *par excellence*, and that of the apostles, his immediate followers. Their successors in turn, "the ordinary ministers and laymen in the local congregations", carried on the work of Christian preaching and teaching under the personal and literary oversight of the apostles, who thus maintained the congruity between congregational preaching and teaching.

(1) E.g., the sermons of Acts and the *kerygma* as reflected in Paul's epistles. Reicke appeals to the "primitive Christology" of the sermons in Acts (e.g., Jesus as *τάφας*) as evidence that they conform to a "real tradition". This argument has perhaps less force than was once supposed: cf. C.F. Evans, *op. cit.*, p.40f.; and *vid.* Appendix "A".
(3) The Book of Enoch and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are cited in particular. Influences from outside the Jewish tradition are also admitted but regarded as weak at this early stage.
the mind of Jesus.\(^1\)

Reicke has done much to open up the subject and provide a springboard for further research. The limitations of his work are related to its largely theoretical basis, partial exemplification, and the degree to which his various categories either overlap or are unequally yoked. The theoretical nature of his categories encounters unexpected difficulties where the general classification is challenged by the particular example. In vacuo, it may appear innocuous enough to remark that "'conversion' may be considered a primary purpose of the messenger's activity".\(^2\) But some of the greater prophets were markedly unsuccessful in converting the people and even conceived their ministry to be characterised from the outset by this failure.\(^3\) Conversion may indeed result from the prophet's activity, as Jonah recognised to his displeasure, but his orders were simply to deliver a message of admonition to the city of Nineveh (1:2ff.; cf. Jer.1:7ff.).

The prophets

"were messengers sent with a message from the Invisible One Enthroned. They were sent to speak for the Speaking One, whose Word would accomplish its purpose". \(^4\)

Their word might admonish, proclaim, exhort or console; but "conversion" is not in itself a function of the divine messenger. To claim that it is so would be theologically unsound and linguistically inaccurate. Nor can "conversion" describe a category of preaching. Reicke is, of course, thinking primarily of early Christian missionary preaching, but here again the prophetic motif operates. The missionary proclaims the good news and calls for decision (cf. Acts 2:38ff.).

Evangelist and teacher act as husbandmen; it is God who gives the growth (1 Cor.3:6).

By "instruction" and "edification", Reicke refers primarily to exhortation and advice to people already within the Christian community, just as Jesus appears to have imparted private instructions to his disciples. Yet it is difficult to insist upon anything approaching such a sharp distinction in Christian circles between preaching directed to outsiders and teaching reserved exclusively for believers. Believers have constantly to be reminded of fundamentals. What edifies a believer may also bring an unbeliever to decision (cf. 1 Cor.14:24f.). And the exhortatory type of address was in fact to develop into the popular sermon or homily, which all were invited to hear. However, apart from the difficulty of demarcation, Reicke's category is much too general to be of practical use. Much of Jesus' teaching in Matt.5-7, for example, is different in form from a diatribe of Paul, despite the fact that these chapters contain homiletic material and that Paul sometimes quotes a "word of the Lord".

This comprehensive category requires to be broken down, as far as possible, into its constituent elements, i.e., into the identifiable forms of communication which it embraces.

After the too general category of "instruction", Reicke proceeds to a very specific third category, which he calls "testament". Paul's speech to the elders at Ephesus is not merely an exhortatory address with apologetic overtones, but a particular type of

(1) Cf. the Qur'an: "... thine it is only to deliver the Message, and God sees his servants"; Sura III 19.
(3) Cf. 1 Cor.15:1-11; Rom.1, 2, 6; etc. Cf. also the function of Jewish symbols such as mezuzah, phylacteries and fringes.
(4) This issue will be discussed more fully in Chapters Two, Three and Four, infra.
rhetorical discourse, the "farewell discourse",\(^{(1)}\) apparent also in certain speeches of Jesus and in some Old Testament traditions.\(^{(2)}\) A.N. Wilder has commented that this terminology, though suggestive, is a misleading modernisation.\(^{(3)}\) In any case, the category is probably too specific for Reicke's purpose. It would appear to indicate not a general form but merely a distinctive expression - often literary - of a broader sermonic or homiletic form.

Reicke's fourth category, "revelation", is at first sight the most puzzling of all. He proposes to include within it sayings referring to the messenger's experiences of the other world.\(^{(4)}\) While "revelation is necessarily a feature of all the other forms, because of their eschatological bearing",\(^{(5)}\) the existence of special traditions in Judaism as well as in the early Christian church demands the recognition of a separate category. In the early church, ecstatic "revelations" were not uncommon, and Paul uses the term to denote the inspired insights given to a man by the Spirit in the course of worship (1 Cor.14:26). To this tradition belongs the whole range of apocalyptic teaching, including the preaching to the spirits in prison (1 Peter 3:19). What is open to question is the use of the term "revelation" to denote a form of preaching. On the one hand, it is essentially a theological term, denoting the unveiling of the mystery of God in human history and therefore the concern, to a greater or lesser extent, of all Christian communication. On the other hand, "revelational" utterances in the New Testament are

\(^{(2)}\) John 13:17; Deuteronomy passim.
regularly attributed to "prophets", (1) and the question must be raised whether that kind of communication should not be classified with the prophetic preaching as a whole. (2) Other forms of apocalyptic would seem to belong within some kind of teaching category, even if they form a singular strand of it.

Thus Reicke's grouping of the principal forms and elements of early Christian preaching is open to serious question. In denying that the classification is to be made on purely formal grounds, (3) he leaves himself open to the charge that he has produced a quasi-formal analysis; and it is no defence to claim that this peculiar type of classification, unlike a formal analysis, illustrates the unity of the whole corpus of tradition. Part of the confusion may be traced to his somewhat rigid notion of "apostolic succession" in both the transmission and the forms of the message. Freed from this straitjacket, a thorough-going structural analysis based on careful study of the New Testament evidence and related to parallel forms elsewhere should serve to clarify the inter-relationships within the total corpus of Christian communication.

Among other valuable Scandinavian contributions, a special place must be given to the work of H. Riesenfeld. (4) Concerned with the pre-history and origins of the gospel traditions, with the Sitz im Leben of the tradition of the words and deeds of Jesus, Riesenfeld is critical of at least latter-day form-criticism:

"Though at the time it opened up new and fruitful paths of study, and in many respects was of abiding importance, yet in its

(2) Note that the Pentecost story with its ecstatic elements concludes with a call to repentance and the "conversion" and baptism of a large number of people.
one-sidedness it became one of those scientific dogmas or myths which have their day and then must gradually be set aside if they are not to impede the further development of investigation". (1)

In particular, Riesenfeld attacks the ascription of the gospel tradition to an origin in early church "preaching", "catechetical instruction" or "controversy", and the assumption of "an extraordinary creative capacity in the first Christian generations", (2) which he describes as "a truly miraculous and incredible factor in the history of the Gospel tradition". (3) A comparison of various examples of preaching in Acts with the gospel material indicates that "mission preaching was not the Sitz im Leben of the Gospel tradition". (4) Besides mission preaching, Riesenfeld considers that the proclamation of the gospel within the Christian communities possessed a strong instructional and moral emphasis - the latter in the form of paraenesis. In this community preaching reference was undoubtedly made to the gospel tradition (e.g., 1 Cor.7:10f.; James passim). Yet, since such preaching did not so much transmit the gospel tradition as assume a knowledge of it on the part of the hearers, the Sitz im Leben of this tradition is not to be found in this communal instruction either. Such negative findings clear the way for Riesenfeld's main thesis, subsequently corroborated in large measure by B. Gerhardsson's study in depth of the transmission of tradition in the Jewish world in particular, (5) that the gospel tradition belongs to a category that is sui generis and is to be designated as paradosis. In the transmission of this material, the apostles had a particularly important role: they were the

---

(1) The Gospels Reconsidered, p.133.
(2) Ibid., p.134.
(3) Ibid., p.135.
(4) Ibid., p.138.
(5) Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, 1961 (denoted henceforth in this work by "M.M.").
witnesses to and guardians of the holy tradition of the words and deeds, the life and work, of Jesus, which form "a holy Word, comparable with that of the Old Testament": \(^1\) "the New Torah", "the Word of God of the new, eschatological covenant", \(^2\) recited in Christian public worship and communicated to a wider circle by a growing Christian ministry. Its special character is explained by the fact that

"this tradition, qua tradition, was derived from none other than Jesus. Hence our thesis is that the beginning of the Gospel tradition lies with Jesus himself". \(^3\)

This thesis is supported by a consideration of the rabbinic methods of instruction which Jesus, as a teacher, used within the circle of his disciples and which can still be traced in such stylistic features as poetic constructions, in Aramaic echoes and in parabolic forms. Even parts of the Passion narrative are referred back to Jesus' own interpretation of the events that were about to happen, as are the essential constituents of Christology and ethics. Equally, the Johanneine tradition is referred independently to the discourses and meditations of Jesus in the circle of his disciples. \(^4\)

The picture is completed by the assumption of messianic consciousness on the part of Jesus:

"Jesus is not only the object of a later faith, which on its side gave rise to the growth of oral and also written tradition, but, as Messiah and teacher, Jesus is the object and subject of a tradition of authoritative and holy words which he himself created and entrusted to his disciples for its later transmission in the epoch between his death and the parousia". \(^5\)

Riesenfeld's preoccupation with the gospel tradition distinguishes his approach from that of our thesis, which is concerned with

\(^2\) Ibid., p.146.
\(^3\) Ibid., p.147.
\(^4\) Ibid., p.151.
\(^5\) Ibid., p.153.
the structure of early Christian communication as a whole, but in the background a structural analysis is discernible in his work in terms of mission preaching, community preaching (with strong instructional and paraenetic overtones), and the transmission of tradition or paradosis. His great achievement was to secure the place of the last mentioned in its own right within the complex of early Christian communication. His other categories are less satisfactory. Community preaching appears an amalgam of several elements: preaching in the homiletic sense, catechesis, more advanced doctrinal and theological instruction, and ethical paraenesis. His understanding of mission preaching utilises the notion of a "compressed summary of the saving work of Christ" and he sharply distinguishes such kerygmatic preaching to an outside audience from proclamation within the community. Both of these points we have already found less than satisfactory. Even more serious is his flight from genuinely creative elements in the early church, such as propheteia inspired by the Spirit. Even if he is justified in pillorying the excesses of the form critics in this respect, he is in imminent danger of ending up with an one-sided view as that of his opponents. (1)

3. An operational model for early Christian preaching and teaching.

The above brief survey of selected contributions to the debate has prepared the way for the articulation of our own thesis. To begin with Riesenfeld's startling omission: prophets and prophetic occupy a position of considerable prominence in the New Testament. (2) Prophets


appear closely associated with apostles in the foundation of the church as well as in its ministry. Propheteia has to do with the reception and articulation of revelation, and while it is frequently associated with the pneumatic spontaneity of ecstatic utterance, it is regarded by Paul primarily as enunciating an intelligible message (1 Cor.14:3ff.). It is therefore bound up with a number of important aspects of church life. In dealing with the deepest mysteries of the faith, it represents a genuinely creative force in the church, stimulated and directed by the Spirit. On the inspirational side, it finds expression not only in prophetic oracles and ecstatic utterance but in praise and hymnody, the "spiritual songs" of Colossians 3:16 (cf. Eph.5:19) - again a creative activity issuing in elevated utterance. The prophet, however, is closely linked also with the teacher and the evangelist. As in Old Testament prophecy, there is a formal teaching aspect to propheteia, whether through oracle or admonition or ethical teaching or apocalyptic message which may draw upon the "visions and revelations" (2 Cor.12:1-4, 7) of elevated perception. In relation to evangelism, we note not only the empirical fact that some evangelists were also closely associated with prophecy - like Philip's household at Caesarea (Acts 21:9) - but that prophecy and evangelism combine in their concern for the proclamation of the divine message. Behind Christian propheteia there stands the whole prophetic tradition of Israel:

"'Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved'.
But how are men to call upon him in whom they have not believed?
And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard?
And how are they to hear without a preacher?
And how can men preach unless they are sent?
As it is written, 'How beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news'". (Rom.10:13ff.).

The apostolic and prophetic compulsion and commission arise from the

(1) Cf. 1 Cor.13:2; Eph.3:5.
awareness of the eschatological significance of the Christ event and are themselves eschatological phenomena: "Now is the day of salvation" Thus, propheteia represents a main strand of early Christian discourse, the structure of which should become plain on closer examination.

A second important category is set firmly within the worshipping community. Its immediate background is synagogue worship, and in this setting we find Paul operating in Antioch of Pisidia:

"On the sabbath day they went into the synagogue and sat down. After the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent to them, saying, 'Brethren, if you have any word of exhortation for the people, say it.' So Paul stood up ..." (Acts 13:14ff.).

Exhortatory preaching, paraclesis, is at home in liturgical or community circles and is dependent upon midrashic tradition, for the scriptures are the starting-point and the basis on which the Christian arguments are built. Such paraclesis based on Christian midrash was an important and creative contribution to the articulation of the Christian message over against Jewish scepticism in particular: Paul "powerfully confuted the Jews in public, showing by the scriptures that the Christ was Jesus" (18:28). In Romans, Paul mentions paraclesis as a distinctive function within the community, and elsewhere in the New Testament its prominence is clearly indicated.

---

(1) Cf. Acts 17:2f., where Paul "explains and proves" the messiahship of the crucified Jesus. For the place of the edifying discourse in the synagogue service, cf. E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Eng. tr., 1885, II ii, p.76. It is particularly emphasised by Philo. In course of time, Paul had to move out of the synagogue (cf. Acts 19:8f.) but there is no indication that the form of his utterances was significantly altered by that fact.


(3) E.g., 1 Tim.4:13; Heb.13:22; 1 Peter 5:12; Jude 3. Within the community itself there is a responsibility for mutual exhortation: "a charisma of pastoral exhortation": O. Schmitz, T.D.N.T., V, p.796.
Paraclesis is the foundation of the church's homiletic tradition. "Homily" itself is a later term, but it may be held to be represented seminally in New Testament paraclesis. Thus at Troas (cf. Acts 20:7) the table talk at the meal or "love feast" (cf. 1 Cor.11:20ff.) is described by the verb ὑμν.λ.ω, which "here obviously means not a set address but familiar interchange of thought." Yet what would this "interchange of thought" be concerned with if not the meaning of the sacrament or further Christian exposition of the faith, since Paul was so outspokenly opposed to regarding the meal as no more than a social occasion (cf. 1 Cor.11:22)? Baptisms and festivals also provided homiletic occasions. Thus Peter "testified in many other words and exhorted (παρεκλησιν;) them" before baptism (Acts 2:40), and afterwards those who had been baptised "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship" (2:42). Melito of Sardis preached a homily at the Passover season.

To indicate this important general area of Christian discourse we shall link the earlier and the later terms: "paraclesis and homilia".

---

(1) On παρεκλησις and παρακλήσιν, cf. O. Schmitz, op. cit., pp.794ff. As used here, paraclesis is the address or discourse, frequently exegetical, that has its locus as a rule in the worshipping community and contributes to its edification and encouragement (paraclesis in the wider sense). The aim of this kind of discourse thus partly overlaps that of intelligible propheteia (cf. 1 Cor.14:3) and that of didache (which appears to denote a "lesson" or scriptural exegesis in 14:26). It is thus obvious that paraclesis has both a kerygmatic and a didactic function.

(2) ὑμν.λ.α in classical usage has a social connotation ("company", "intercourse": cf. 1 Cor.15:33), in hellenistic Greek it frequently means "speech" and in Justin it occurs as "sermon": Dial.26:85.


(4) It is conceivable that departures also provided homiletic opportunities: cf. Paul's departure from Miletus (20:18-35): cf. B. Reicke, op. cit., pp.153ff. Even if this argument were granted, the so-called "testament" remains only a special variety of homily or paraclesis.

(5) This subject will be discussed more fully later.
Of the typically didactic structures within early Christian discourse, (1) two terms in particular command our attention: paraenesis and catechesis. Paraenesis comes from the root "recommend", "advise", and is typically associated with ethical counsel and moral education, with a suggestion of intimacy and practicality. Widely used in the ancient world, it tended to produce distinctive forms which can be traced in Christian utterance also, and paraenetic topics became a marked feature of Christian teaching. (2) Catechesis, derived from καθηχέω meaning "to tell about something" or, as in Paul, "to give instruction concerning the content of faith", (3) comes to denote Christian instruction, especially in the basics of the faith, and in due course provided the church with the vocabulary of catechist, catechumen and catechism. (4) Even in Acts 16:25, where Apollos is said to be "instructed in the way of the Lord", there is an indication of the word's scope. A natural place for it is as instruction prior to baptism. P. Carrington and E.G. Selwyn have argued for the existence of a "Christian Holiness Code", associated with baptism and apparent in Thessalonians, 1 Peter and elsewhere. (5) It involved abstinence from lust and avarice, and focused upon the principle of "love". Selwyn identified a second form of baptismal catechism, "conceived on more positive and imaginative lines" (6) which stressed the renunciation of κακία and revolved around the ethical triad of

(1) This is not to deny that a kerygmatic element may also be present in them: the didactic predominates.
(2) Vid. infra, Chapter Three
(4) 2 Clement 17:1 provides evidence for the use of catechumen of one preparing for the sacrament.
truthfulness, humility and love. It also contained a social code for civic duty and domestic life. Such contentions deserve further consideration. Paraenesis and catechesis are closely associated with each other and are therefore used jointly in this thesis to denote a major area of didactic concern.

The importance of paradosis has already emerged in our review of Riesenfeld's work. As O. Cullmann observed, "Jesus and the early church lived in an atmosphere entirely permeated with the concept of tradition". (1) True Christian paradosis is instruction (didache) which must be held fast at all costs. (2) Paradosis is always "unto edification" and may supply the central point of reference in a paraenetetic topic. It is also closely associated with kerygma and may act as the basis of the church's proclamation (cf. 1 Cor.15:1ff.). Inherent in the use of paradosis are assumptions about its authority and source. The Formgeschichtliche Schule has done much to illuminate gospel tradition, by the methods of analysis and subsequent synthesis. (3)

(1) The Early Church, Eng. tr., 1956, p.63. In the gospels, paradosis is used of the "traditions of the elders", which Jesus dismissed as "the traditions of men": Matt.15:2f., 6; Mark 7:3, 5, cf., 13: cf. Gal.1:14; and similarly false teaching in the church is called "human tradition" (Col.2:8).
(2) 2 Thess.2:15; 3:6; 1 Cor.11:2.
(3) Their first two groupings are fairly straightforward: (i) Paradigmen (Dibelius), Apophthegmata (Bultmann) or Pronouncement stories (Taylor); and (ii) Novellen (Dibelius) or Miracle stories (Bultmann, Taylor): (K.L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919, M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 1919, R. Bultmann, Der Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 1921; V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, 1933; R.H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, 1935: the formgeschichtliche hypotheses are essential to the work of the entire post- Bultmannian school). Other stories about Jesus cause the form critics much more trouble because, as Taylor observes, they have no definite structural form, and refuge is taken in "elastic" terms such as "Myth" or "Legend" (op. cit., pp.31ff.). The continuous narrative of the Passion story is admitted as an early tradition by the majority of form critics, although they are not unanimous as to its contents (cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp.57ff.).
The overriding purpose of the early Christian teachers in evolving, receiving and using units of tradition is not dissimilar to that of the gospel writers at a later stage, viz., to transmit the tradition of "witness" to Jesus in such a way that, in Johannine terms, their hearers might accept him as the Christ, the Son of God, and thus find "life" (Jn.20:31). Luke's prologue, which appears to represent a deliberate historicizing tendency, is still angled towards knowledge of the "truth" (1:4), a far broader category than a merely historical understanding. (1) But, as we have seen, a strong challenge to the formgeschichtliche assumptions — and one of very great consequence for the study of paradosis — was issued by H. Riesenfeld and B. Gerhardsson. In slightly different ways, they contrived to place maximum significance upon the exactitude with which paradosis was handled in Jewish circles and therefore in the early church. Both scholars, however, while supplying valuable correctives to some of the basic assumptions of the form critics, probably overstate their case:

"Gerhardsson, like Riesenfeld, underestimates (as the form critics tend to overestimate) the interpretative activity of the early church, which was calculated (to quote Davies) 'to lend fluidity rather than fixity to the material transmitted, a fluidity in which event and meaning, ipsissima verba and their interpretation, would tend to merge'. (2)

The question of paradosis is therefore prominent in current debate. Our contribution will be to discuss further its operation as a mode of Christian communication and to draw attention in particular to its function within the total context of early Christian discourse.

In following up this four-fold hypothesis, three perspectives must be kept before us. One is the Sitz im Leben provided by the early

---

(1) This illustrates the kerygmatic nature of paradosis and how close it is to paraenesis and "evangelism". The paradosis is not preserved for its own sake but as an instrument of edification or even proclamation.

church with its many-sided koinonia and leiturgia. The second is the hinterland of early church communication in its various forms: a hinterland which may throw light on certain factors influencing or even determining the form of the early Christian utterance. It may come into operation in terms of, for example, the mission of Jesus, to which the apostles stood in intimate relation; (1) or a cultural ethos embracing the entire Jewish, Graeco-Roman and Persian worlds. Within this perspective lies the particular problem of Christian origins, the birth of the early Christian message itself. The third perspective embraces hermeneutical issues. To study early Christian kerygma and didache is to be aware that they enshrine and seek to express meaning and truth which have been open to interpretation down the ages and have proved of crucial significance to Christian civilisation. (2) In the late twentieth century questions of relevance, meaningfulness and truth underline the cruciality of the problems of interpretation and communication. (3) While such issues must remain in the background in the main sections of our thesis, something will be said about them towards the end, in the light of the research as a whole. Here it may be observed

(1) Bultmann differentiates between Jesus' preaching and that of the early church by terming the former Verkündigung and the latter kerygma. Nevertheless, he admits several important points of contact, esp. the eschatological: cf. Theology of the New Testament I, Eng. tr., 1952, pp.3-32; and he does on occasion call Jesus' proclamation kerygma: cf. G. Ebeling, op. cit., pp.40 and 155, n.20. The problem is to see where they converge without losing sight of the difference between the two: ibid., pp.69ff. On the whole subject, cf. ibid., pp.32-81.

(2) The New Testament situation, viewed formally, was of course modified by the emergence of apostolic and other authoritative writings, their use in the churches, the fixing of the canon, and the development of church tradition.

(3) Thus R. Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology, 1960, p.45, where he describes demythologizing as "a hermeneutic method of interpretation and exegesis". Cf. also G. Ebeling, Word and Faith, 1963, p.11: "The hermeneutic task consists for theology in nothing else but in understanding the Gospel as addressed to contemporary man".
that the science of "hermeneutics" is in imminent danger of being divorced from the practice of Christian communication and of becoming merely an exercise in philosophical theorising. (1) In the early church, hermeneia had an immediate aim in view: the discovery of meaning, the edification of the community, the proclamation of God's mighty acts in terms intelligible to man, and the instruction of converts. A corresponding emphasis today would be to insist that hermeneutical principles are defective unless they guide not merely the scholar but the preacher and are relevant also to the teacher of adults or youth. (2)

(1) This may be described as an occupational hazard inherent in a hermeneutical procedure which allots a focal place to philosophy. That of K. Heidegger is basic to Bultmann and the "new hermeneutics": cf. Bultmann, The Problem of Hermeneutics in Essays Philosophical and Theological, Eng. tr., 1955, pp.234ff. Those who follow him are convinced that such procedures pay dividends in the end. Thus E. Dinkler holds that Heidegger's analysis of human existence "offers structures and defines terms fit for theologically clear speaking": Martin Heidegger in Christianity and the Existentialists, ed. C. Michelson, 1956, p.120. J. Macquarrie states that such philosophical analysis "is indispensable to theological transparency": The Scope of Demythologizing, 1960, p.56. On the other hand, A.N. Wilder pleads that the new approach should "avoid being chargeable with its own form of unexamined dogma" by enlarging its view of man, its understanding of history and its treatment of the rhetoric of early Christianity: New Testament Hermeneutics Today, in Current Issues of N.T. Interpretation, 1962, pp.45-52. An alternative approach is that of linguistic analysis as set forth by Ian T. Ramsey, Religious Language, 1957.

(2) This is simply to insist upon the totality of the hermeneutical process, as articulated in the threefold schema of Reformed exegesis: explicatio, meditatio, applicatio. Theologians, as Macquarrie admits (op. cit., p.36), tend to be engrossed with the middle factor. E. Fuchs appears to work with a fourfold scheme: (i) a serious study of the text, combining objectivity with sympathetic engagement; (ii) a more thorough-going recognition of the life-situation that impinges on the text; (iii) existentiell identification with the ancient writer and the event he describes; (iv) existentialist interpretation of that identification, employing a specific phenomenology of man: cf. Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie, Gesammelte Aufsätze I, 1959, p.85f. That his general approach can admit of practical application is illustrated by the excellent work of one of his pupils: cf. E. Linnemann, The Parables of Jesus, Eng. tr., 1966.
KERYGMA AND DIDACHE

CHAPTER ONE:

PROPHETEIA
CHAPTER ONE: PROPHETRIA

The prophetic tradition in Old and New Testaments.

"The Lord God does nothing without giving to his servants the prophets knowledge of his plans. The lion has roared; who is not terrified? The Lord God has spoken; who will not prophesy?" (Amos 3:7f.).

"When you read this you can perceive my insight into the mystery of Christ, which was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph.3:4f.).

Several reasons may be advanced to account for the popular view that prophecy belongs to the Old Testament rather than the New. The New Testament concentrates upon the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Christian prophets do not at first sight appear particularly prominent, and in the subsequent history of the church little is heard of them. False prophets and heretical movements of an inspirational type tended to discredit prophecy in the eyes of the institutional church.(1) The rabbis, in particular, cultivated the idea that, with the closing of the canon of the prophetic books,(2) authentic prophecy was restricted to an idealised prophetic era in Israel's history. "When Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the latter prophets, were dead, the Holy Spirit departed from Israel, but the heavenly will was made known by the Bath Qol."(3) At the same time, the rabbis deliberately subordinated the prophets to the Torah: the latter expounded it without making significant additions to it. In this way, the wise men or scribes were seen as their legitimate successors.(4) "Up to now the prophets prophesied in the Holy Spirit

(1) E.g., Montanism, Gnosticism.
(4) The wise men, the bearers of the oral law, also received their inspiration from Sinai, acc. to R. Jishaq (c.300A.D.). The Bath Qol effectively continued the role of the Spirit in prophecy and inspired the decisions at Jannia (c.95A.D.). Nevertheless, a certain tension between the role of the prophet and that of the wise man persisted in Judaism: T.D.N.T. VI, 818f.
From now onwards incline your ear and hear the words of the wise. (1)

The one-sidedness of the picture can be demonstrated without difficulty. The case for regarding the church as the fulfilment of prophecy rests partially on the fact that its members prophesy (Acts 2: 17f.). Though infrequently mentioned, prophets enjoy a very high status in the early church: they are associated with the apostles more closely than any other group, (2) and with the apostles form the foundation on which the church is built (Eph. 2: 20). Prophecy is a prominent feature in the life of at least some churches (1 Cor. 14) and prophets are honoured highly in the Didache (13: 1-7). John the Baptist is regarded as a prophet (Luke 7: 26; 1: 76), and even Jesus was understood in this way (Matt. 21: 11). Moreover, the rabbinic interpretation of the prophetic tradition does not represent the unanimous verdict of Israel and indeed was subject to exception even in rabbinic circles. Apart from Josephus' evidence of a group of Pharisaic prophets at Herod's court, (3) R. Akiba emerged as a typical ecstatic prophet at the time of the Bar Kochba revolt. (4) Prophecy occurs frequently in the context of political turbulence. In the setting of Maccabean times, Daniel is a prophet in the tradition of Zechariah (9: 1-3; 20-27). John Hyrcanus I had charismatic gifts which led to his recognition as prophet, priest and king. (5) Josephus describes Jesus ben Ananias and his prophecy of doom in the years preceding the first century siege of Jerusalem:

"A voice from sunrise,
A voice from sunset,
A voice from the four winds:

(1) Seder Olam rabba 30.
(2) 1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 3: 5; 4: 11; cf. Rev. 18: 20.
(3) Jos. Ant. 17: 43ff.
(4) The name occurs in the D.S.S. as "Ben Koseba".
Woe to Jerusalem and the temple.
Woe to the bridegroom and the bride.
Woe to the whole people." (1)

Zealot prophets were prominent amid political disaster. (2) The Essenes, on the evidence both of Josephus and Qumran, engaged in prophecy and various types of pneumatic experiences. (3) Philo, for whom prophecy was the highest stage of righteousness, regarded ecstasy as its hallmark. (4) Until the destruction of Jerusalem in 132 A.D. and its fateful consequences for the Jews, pneumatic prophecy must be accepted as a feature of Judaism; after that time, such pneumatic movements could have had dangerous political repercussions and, with the gradual strengthening of synagogal religion, they were virtually eliminated by the nomistic rationalism of Pharisaic rabbinism. (5)

Thus there appears to be a prophetic tradition of pneumatic inspiration connecting the later canonical prophets, such as Haggai and Zechariah, with the New Testament, Daniel being an important link in the chain. Tensions within the prophetic movement have been characteristic of it, so it is not destructive of our thesis to find in Zechariah (13:2-6) a devastating criticism of certain contemporary ecstatic prophets who probably represent a continuation of the primitive Israelite prophecy of Saul's day and in turn are the prototypes of Jesus ben Ananias; nor to find periods in Judaistic times

(1) Jos. Bell. 6:300 ff.; tr. R. Meyer.
(2) Jos. Bell. 6:283 ff., 299. There were also Messianic prophets, e.g., Theudas: Jos. Ant. 20:97 f.
(5) There were isolated occurrences of pneumatic prophecy at a later date, such as the Messianic prophet of Crete described by the historian Socrates: cf. R. Meyer, T.D.N.T. VI, 827.
when no prophet spoke, (1) for prophecy is dependent on the moving of the Spirit. Is New Testament prophecy then viewed justifiably as a continuation of what may be termed classical prophecy (2) rather than a movement whose affinities lie with the prophetic underground?

Among the motifs running through prophecy in Israel and in the early Christian church, the following may be instanced as particularly significant.

(1) Prophets are par excellence proclaimers of the word of God. "... The true prophets are conscious of being mouthpieces of Yahweh and nothing else. They are nothing but channels for the stream of revelation. What they have to bring forth is not their own words (they would be worthless) but only the precious divine word which has been put in their mouth." (3)

Thus Jeremiah, attempting to evade the prophetic call on the grounds of his youthful inability, is told:

"You shall go to whatever people I send you and say whatever I tell you to say" (Jer. 1:7).

God is always "the Lord your God who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery" (cf. Ex. 20:2; Amos 3:1), and the prophets as his spokesmen admitted to his counsel witness to his mighty deeds and bring a particular message at a particular time from the God of the covenant. (4) The archetypal prophet is, of course, Moses "whom the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. 34:10) and whose mission was intimately bound up with those mighty acts of God which were determinative of the history and religion of Israel (34:11f.). The prophets remind Israel

---

(1) In times of total desolation the prophetic voice may be silent. Thus, Ps. 74:9 ("there is no longer any prophet") is best taken to refer to the destruction of the Temple by Babylon (T.D.N.T. VI, 814); and 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; and 14:41 refer to the silence of prophecy during the Maccabean struggle, a silence finally broken by the appearance of John Hyrcanus (16:11-22), who bears the triple title: prophet, priest and king. Cf. T.D.N.T. VI, 815f.

(2) "Classical" prophecy refers to the utterances of the literary prophets whose work is included in the canon, together with those prophets who can be associated with them, e.g., Nathan.


of God's sovereignty over past, present and future. They summon her to decision as they remind her of her destiny and call her to live in obedience to Yahweh's will and in expectation of the fulfilment of his purposes. Their utterances are effective and creative, not merely descriptive. They are characterised by admonition, warning and stern demand, although when need arises they can bring comfort and encouragement.

"Therefore have I lashed you through the prophets and torn you to shreds with my words: loyalty is my desire, not sacrifice, not whole-offerings but the knowledge of God" (Hos. 6:5f.). (1)

The prophets' message is intelligible, though sometimes puzzling. Lindblom regards them primarily as preachers of repentance and heralds of doom or bliss. (2)

In the New Testament, revelation comes from God through Jesus Christ, who reveals to his servants what must shortly happen (Rev. 1:1) - a concept strikingly similar to that of Amos 3:7. (3) The Christian prophet bears witness to "the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ" (1:2). If, as Charles suggests, the testimony is given by Christ, (4) then Christ himself bears witness to or attests the revelation of God and the prophet duly testifies to Christ's testimony. (5) Hence the magnalia to which the Christian prophet always looks and by which his prophecy is determined are "the things concerning Jesus". The "mystery of Christ" is now revealed to the apostles and prophets as never before. The prophet's utterances possess all the authority of divine revelation, bringing bliss to those who heed them

(1) For a famous example of an oracle of comfort, cf. Is. 40:1f.
(4) Cf. 22:6. On the other hand, in 1:9 it is objective.
(5) ἔμμορφησάτο... τῷ μαρτυρῆν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. The martyr stands in close relation to the prophet in this respect: 6:9; 19:9.
(Rev.1:3; 22:7) and judgment upon any who add to them or subtract from them (22:18). The writings of John of Patmos are evidently intended to be read aloud at services, and therefore to be on a level with the prophetic books of the Old Testament. In general, John claims an authority comparable to the apostles alone in the Christian church.

Elsewhere in the New Testament, as has been noted, prophets appear to rank second only to apostles and, with the apostles, they form the foundation on which the church is built (Eph.2:20). The gift of prophecy is prized very highly (1 Cor.14:1, 39). Paul equates it with intelligible utterances which contribute to the strengthening of the faithful (14:3ff., 12, 31). It conveys revelation (14:30). It can search a man's conscience, convict him of his sins and bring him to God (14:24f.). It is a sign that "God is certainly among you" (14:25). Luke finds the prophetic motif running through the entire life of the early church. Beginning with the prophesying at Pentecost (cf. Acts 2:17), he describes the primary function of "the Twelve" as proclaiming the word of God (6:2), which they do as they witness to Christ and his resurrection (Acts 1:21f.). The physical extension of the church stands in direct relation to the progress of the prophetic word.

(ii) Prophecy evinces striking inspirational characteristics. Inspiration denotes a mental excitement or exaltation which can strengthen and pass into ecstasy, a state in which the prophet is no

---

(3) 1 Cor.12:26; Eph.3:5; cf. Rev.18:20.
(4) Cf. 4:31; 12:24; 19:20. It is not suggested that Revelation, Paul and Acts present an identical understanding of prophecy, which is a complex phenomenon. Vid. infra.
longer consciously in control of all his faculties. (1) Lindblom describes it in this way.

"The normal current of mental life is interrupted. The ordinary mental faculties, and sometimes the physical powers, are put out of function. Ecstasy is a psycho-physical detachment, arising from a one-sided concentration on a dominant fact. Ecstasy is a sort of psychic paralysis except for the one point at which a dominating idea or complex of ideas, or an intense feeling, powerfully captivates the attention. To be inspired is to be filled with and seized by a new and surprising mental content. Ecstasy is a similar state of mind intensified to such an extent that the normal psychic, or even physical, powers are thrown out of gear." (2)

Inspirational or ecstatic experiences are common both to the early or "primitive" prophets in Israel and to the classical prophets. They include "revelations" received in visions or auditions of an ecstatic nature (the initial call of the prophet was often among these), and "symbolic" perceptions. Associated with this state are predictions, songs or laments, stammerings or incoherent sounds, and "symbolic" actions. (3) Ecstasy could also be induced by music. (4)

In the New Testament "revelations" are given to prophets in worship (1 Cor. 14:6, 26ff.); they direct the apostle (Gal. 1:12; 2:2; cf. Eph. 3:3) and come to the seer in ecstasy (Rev. 1:1, 10). Visions and auditions are not exceptional, (5) and Paul's experience on the Damascus road bears a strong resemblance to the call of a prophet.

Prophets foretell coming events (Acts 11:28) and perform "symbolic"

---

(1) In fact, they are under the command of another mightier power, i.e., God. From this factor springs the element of fear often experienced: cf. Is. 21:3f. Cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, its Life and Culture, 1926, I-II, p.161.
(4) Cf. 1 Sam. 10:5; 2 Kings 3:15. Canaanite prophets also performed ritual dances and inflicted wounds upon themselves (1 Kings 18:26-29), and this tradition was present in the Israelite cultic prophets (Zech.13:6).
(5) 2 Cor. 12:1ff.; Acts and Revelation passim.
acts. (1) Glossolalia is the most prominent New Testament form of ecstatic behaviour, corresponding to the stammerings and incoherent sounds of the prophets. (2) Inspirational singing is part of worship (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16).

At the same time, however, ecstatic behaviour in the Christian church, though common especially in the earliest period, is much more controlled than its Old Testament counterpart. Ecstasy must be subordinated to the edification of the community (1 Cor. 14:26) and to good order (14:40). "It is for the prophets to control prophetic inspiration, for the God who inspires them is not a God of disorder but of peace" (14:32f.). Yet it must be noted that it was necessary for Paul to issue this injunction; and, on the other hand, that the Old Testament prophets themselves disowned the later dervish type ecstasies who claimed descent from Saul and Elijah (Zech. 13:2-6).

(2) Acts 2:4, 11 (for a discussion of Pentecost, vid. infra); 1 Cor. 12:10, 28, 30; 13:1, 8; 14 passim. Cf. Is. 26:10 — saw lasaw saw lasaw gaw lasaw gaw lasag. Lods interprets this as glossolalia: op. cit., p. 105 and n. 1; but he does not discuss the question fully. Isaiah's enemies compared his message to "baby talk" (cf. 28:9), i.e., sheer nonsense: cf. Lindblom, op. cit., p. 201. Some take it as the babbling of a drunkard (cf. 28:7f.), but many scholars find the key in the teaching of a school master to young children: v. 10 might then refer to children learning the alphabet, in which פ follows י. Alternatively, the prophet may be spelling out צי "distress". Cf. R.B.Y. Scott, The Book of Isaiah, Int. Bib. V, p. 316. J.R. Driver, Semitic Writing, 1948. The final phrases, usually translated "here a little, there a little" may have been intended to suggest the words of the teacher calling "a little one here, a little one there" to recite the lesson: O. Procksch, Jesaia I, 1930, ad loc. Whatever the precise reference, Isaiah skilfully turns the taunts into a telling oracle of doom: "Truly I tell you, by men of strange lips and an alien tongue will Yahweh speak to his people"; i.e., when the Assyrian armies with their barbaric language descend upon Israel (28:11). Thus the context may seem not to favour the idea of glossolalia here, yet the structure of the incident should not be ignored. Three stages are suggested: (i) Isaiah utters unintelligible sounds; (ii) his enemies represent this as baby talk, in some sense or other; (iii) Isaiah interprets the sounds as the foreign voices in Jerusalem by which Yahweh will signify the judgment of Israel. It is therefore impossible to rule out the notion of glossolalia.
(iii) Prophecy is attributed to the power of the Spirit.
Although a legacy from primitive times when it referred to the motive power in orgiastic ecstasies, \(^{(1)}\) ruah (lit. "breath", or "wind") in the Old Testament is never independent of Yahweh and denotes his Spirit which, like his hand, precipitates the revelatory state of mind. Thus, the Spirit is the prophetic energy which inspired Balaam and Saul to prophesy. \(^{(2)}\) The prophet is "the man of Spirit" (Hos.9:7). The Spirit enables Micah to preach his admonitory message to Israel \(^{(3)}\). \(^{(3)}\) The prophetic office is part of the function of the righteous servant for which he is equipped by the Spirit. \(^{(4)}\) In Ezekiel, the Spirit inspires the prophetic visions and ecstasies. The ethical concern of Old Testament prophecy is also inspired by the Spirit. The faithful remnant will be cleansed by the Spirit of judgment and the Spirit of burning (Is.4:4). Hence the eschatological expectation is characterised by the outpouring of the Spirit (cf. Haggai 2:5; Zech.12:10), and in Joel 3:1f. (Heb. text) this will be signalled by the prophesying of the whole community, together with the dreaming of dreams and the seeing of visions.

In the New Testament also, the Spirit prompts the prophet to declare his message. In Luke 4:18, Jesus applies the prophecy of Is. 61:1f. to himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor..." The Spirit is, in

---

\(^{(1)}\) Lindblom, op. cit., p.57.

\(^{(2)}\) Num.24:2; 1 Sam.10:6, 10; 11:6; 19:20, 23. Note that the Spirit can also bear the prophet off to deliver his message: 1 Kings 18:12; 2 Kings 2:16; Ezek.3:12 etc.

\(^{(3)}\) Amos and Jeremiah did not make use of the concept of the Spirit, probably because the theocentricity of their thought rendered it superfluous. Their silence is not to be construed as condemnatory, despite Mowinckel (J.B.L., liii, 1934, pp.199ff.). Any suggestion that ruah might be dismissed as a primitive, even demonic, notion is countered by its lofty ethical connotation, e.g., Is.31:3; Ezek.36:26f. Cf. Lindblom, op. cit., p.178.

\(^{(4)}\) Is.42:1; cf. 48:16; 59:21; 61:1.
fact, cardinal in Luke's interpretation of Jesus. (1) At Pentecost, the expectation of Joel is fulfilled (2:16-21). The new community is filled with the Holy Spirit (2) and speaks the word of God with boldness (Acts 4:31). Stephen speaks by the Spirit (6:10). The Spirit directs missionaries and missionary preaching (8:29, 39; cf. 16:7). The Spirit directs Peter into the Gentile mission (10:19; 11:12), and gives insight to the prophet (11:28; 21:4; Rev. 1:10 etc.). The Spirit gives power to the apostle’s preaching (1 Cor. 2:4). 2 Peter 1:21 states: "No prophecy ever came by the impulse of man, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God".

These examples, culled from a rich store, suggest that the concept of the prophetic Spirit in Old and New Testaments is very close, particularly in Luke's writings and in Revelation. (3) The unique element in the New Testament is that the Messiah, on whom the Spirit rested in accordance with scriptural expectation (4) himself bestowed the Spirit on his followers (Jn. 20:22) or was closely bound up with its bestowal (Luke 24:49). The Spirit of Jesus thus becomes a synonym for the Holy Spirit (Acts 16:7) and the Lord and the Spirit are identified in 2 Cor. 3:17.

(iv) It is always necessary to distinguish between true and false prophecy. In the Old Testament, there is constant tension within the ranks of those who are called nebi ‘im. (5) Jeremiah, for example, who is always called nebi’ in the narrative sections of his

(2) There is, of course, a strong ethical aspect to life in the Holy Spirit; hence the call for repentance: cf. Luke 2:38ff.
(3) Cf. Lampe, op. cit., p. 163.
book, continually attacks the nebi'îm as fraudulent, (1) because they claim to speak the word of Yahweh although he has not commissioned them. Their message has its origin in human opinion and desires, "their own deluding fancies" (14:14). Characteristically, they proclaim shalom where there is no shalom, winning approbation through a happy message of victory in war or a speedy termination of exile. But the final test of their prophecy is the historical outcome: "when his words come true, it will be known that the Lord has sent him" (28:9). The falsity of a prophet often shows up in his life (23:14; 29:23). Impressive signs or portents cannot justify a prophet who leads people after other gods and away from the God who brought Israel out of Egypt (Deut.13:1-5). Other charges made against them are that they make predictions for money (Micah 3:5), and that they are stupified with wine (Is.28:7-13). The latter allegation may well relate to ecstatic behaviour induced in this way. A total repudiation of such prophecy occurs in Zechariah 13:2-6. A sensitive prophet like Jeremiah is intensely aware of this prophetic conflict, which can reach critical proportions in his own experience when the word he receives runs counter not only to other prophets but also to the apparent tradition of Israel (Jer.14:13; 28). (2) No facile distinction between the canonical prophets and the others will serve - for example, that the latter are establishment or institutional prophets while the former are individualists or spearheads of anti-establishment protest.


(2) His message is the opposite of Isaiah's a century or so before; on the other hand, Jeremiah points to the prophetic tradition which proclaimed disaster and judgment (28:8).
Their distinctiveness lies ultimately in the non-rational sphere of reception of the Word of Yahweh. This brings them into conflict with the popular view and thus establishes their unique position." (1)

In the Christian church, the existence of false prophets in past, present and future is accepted. (2)

"Israel had false prophets as well as true; and you likewise will have false teachers among you" (2 Pet.2:1).

Consequently, one must "test the spirits, to see whether they are from God" (1 Jn.4:1; 1 Thess.5:21). For this, discernment is required (1 Cor.12:10). A necessary ingredient in all true prophecy is the confession of Christ (1 Jn.4:2f.); but this serves only to eliminate those who refuse to make such a confession (cf. 1 Cor.12:3), not those who make it hypocritically (cf. Mt.7:22). Another important criterion is the kind of life the prophet leads and the work he does (Did.11:8; Herm. M. 11:2-17; cf. Matt.7:19). Disqualifications include selfishness, mercenary conduct, arrogance and deceit and unwillingness to share in divine service where he will be shown up by the devotion of the truly religious. Like the false prophets of Israel, he always tells people what they want to hear. Such men belong to the godless world. That is why the world listens to them, but the man who knows God has sufficient insight to recognise true prophecy (1 Jn.4:4ff.). Unserviceable criteria include miracle-working, for false prophets can use miracles as a means of enticement. Ecstasy by itself is not to be trusted; and with the rejection of Montanism the status of ecstatic prophecy was considerably lowered in the church. The "testing of the spirits", however necessary, introduces yet another tension into the prophetic sphere, for it runs

(1) Rendtorff, op. cit., p.807.
(2) In the past, Luke 6:26; 2 Pet.2:1; in the present, Acts 13:10; 1 Jn.4:1-6; cf. 2 Jn.7; 1 Jn.2:18; Rev.2:20; in the future, Matt.24:11; Rev.16:13; 19:30; 20:10 etc.
counter to the intrinsic authority of the prophetic commission. In the last analysis, the Christian community to which the prophet is subject is the arbiter in matters of faith and discernment.

Thus despite differences of situation, function and content, the prophets of Old and New Testaments are linked together as essential strands of a prophetic motif which is common both to Israel and the early Christian church.

The formal structure of Old Testament Prophecy.

It is possible to analyse prophetic discourses at various levels. For example, a purely linguistic analysis can be made: the "prophetic perfect" denotes the fact that the action has already been completed in the purposes of God.\(^{(1)}\) The analysis can be directed to the rhetorical elements: satire, scorn, irony; and the various types of imagery, such as simile or metaphor. The literary units of prophetic discourse are sometimes extensions of these figures: parables, allegories. In addition, however, there are hymns, prayers, and poems of many kinds; there are monologues, dialogues, judicial debating, descriptions of visions or auditions, "wisdom" teaching and discussions of religious or moral problems. The letter is sometimes used, and also biographical and autobiographical memoirs. But the basic prophetic unit is yet to be mentioned: the oracle, of which the public speech or sermon is frequently an extension or application,\(^{(2)}\) including various rhetorical figures indicated above.

The prophetic discourse communicates the will and ways of Yahweh to his people; and since Yahweh works through historical events the prophet's message characteristically transcends the barrier of present

---

\(^{(1)}\) Pedersen, \textit{op. cit.}, p.45.
\(^{(2)}\) Lindblom, \textit{op. cit.}, p.155; Eissfeldt, pp.76-81.
and future time and so has a predictive element associated with
warning or promise according to the circumstances; but, even as the
prophet speaks of the future, he conveys God's demand upon his hearers
in the present.

"The predictive saying - including threats and promises - and the
warning saying - appearing as diatribe (Is.1:2-3; 3:12-15) and as
exhortation (Amos 5:4-5a; Zeph.2:3), are the basic prophetic types to
which may be traced back the very manifold variations which they have
undergone." (1)

Such sayings originate in very concise forms or oracles, which may be
defined as brief, rhythmic utterances characterised by mystery,
ambiguity and an allusiveness born of prophetic symbolism and metaphor
(cf. Is.21:11f.), although on occasion their meaning could be stated in
a direct and uncompromising fashion (cf. Is.22:17f.). The oracle of
reproach or invective begins typically with the phrase "Woe unto ..."
(cf. Is.5:8, 11, 18, 20ff.) or "Shame on ..." (cf. Is.1:4); or with
a call for witnesses to hear the accusation (Is.1:2f.), or with ironic,
mocking imperatives (Is.29:9). Frequently, the reproach is closely
followed by a threat, introduced by "therefore". (2) Thus, after a
series of "woes" in Is.5:8-23, the oracular poem continues:

"Therefore, as the tongue of fire devours the stubble,
and as dry grass sinks down in the flame,
so their root will be as rottenness,
and their blossom be blown away like dust" (24a).

Admonitory preaching arises naturally out of Israel's covenant with
Yahweh. Because Israel is the chosen of Yahweh, more is required of
her (cf. Amos 3:2). The aim of admonitory prophecy is primarily to
call for a change of heart in Israel. Thus, Ezekiel is told:

"Son of man, I have made you a watchman for the house of Israel;
whenever you hear a word from my mouth, you shall give them warning
from me" (3:17).

(1) O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p.79.
(2) The threat can also take the form of a solemn oath: 1 Sam.14:44:
"Yea ..." It may terminate in an emphatic pronouncement (e.g.,
Is.8:15). On this whole subject, vid. R.B.Y. Scott, op. cit.,
p.154.
There is a conditional element in Yahweh's judgment - operating so forcefully, indeed, that an oracle originally given may have to be replaced by another. When this happens, repentance is always seen to be a key factor.\(^1\) The man who, when warned, refrains from sin shall surely live (Ez.3:2). Hence the prophet calls for obedience to the covenant, warns of the perils of disobedience and holds out hope of God's blessing when his demands are answered by the people.

"Seek good, and not evil,
that you may live;
and so the Lord, the God of hosts will be with you,
as you have said.
Hate evil, and love good,
and establish justice in the gate;
it may be that the Lord, the God of hosts,
will be gracious to the remnant of Joseph" (Amos 5:14f.).

The oracle of promise thus springs from the nature of covenantal thinking equally with the oracle of warning or threat.\(^2\) Thus, the statement of the covenant in Exodus 19:5 testifies to the elements of condition and of promise:

"If only you will now listen to me and keep my covenant, then out of all peoples you shall become my special possession".

In the prophetic books, a succession of short oracles frequently forms a longer oracular poem which is so integral in construction as to suggest that the longer composition reflects the utterance of the prophet himself rather than later editorial construction. Its constituent oracles are seen to be inter-dependent and to lack meaning in isolation.\(^3\)

Such oracular poems, together with short oracles of an

\(^{1}\) Cf. Jer.8:7f.; and the two oracles addressed to Hezekiah: 2 Kings 20:1-7; Is.38:1-6.

\(^{2}\) An oracle of promise may begin: "It shall come to pass on that day ...", and end on an emphatic note (cf. Is.31:4-9). In Deutero-Isaiah the predominant motifs are promise, assurance and exhortation. Hymns of praise abound in this context: 40:12-26; 27-31; 44:23; 48:20f.; 49:13.

independent nature, represent the characteristic method of communication, particularly in the older classical prophets: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah. In Jeremiah and Ezekiel the sermon emerges as an equally important vehicle, and this phenomenon is observed also in the Deuteronomic writings, in which priestly or Levitical influence may also be at work. Thus Eissfeldt concludes that

"from about the beginning of the seventh century prophets and priests began to use, in addition to the saying forms, their normal charismatic and ecstatic forms of expression, the more rational medium of the sermon, or, if it should prove that they used such a medium at an earlier period, it was at any rate at this period that they began to use it to a much greater degree". (2)

A typical example is found in Jeremiah's Temple sermon, which is a three-pronged diatribe: (i) against the prevailing Temple superstition, with a threat of the destruction of the Temple itself (7:1-15); (ii) against the cult of the queen of heaven, with a threat against Jerusalem (7:16-20); (iii) against sacrifices and "Topheth", with a further threat of disaster for Jerusalem (7:21-8:3). Another example is provided by Ezekiel 20, in which the prophet is concerned to reject a temple or cultic centre proposed by the exiles. (3) His method is to discourse upon the apostasies of the people of Israel throughout their history, precipitating the present position in which Yahweh can no longer be enquired of (20:1-32). The theme then switches to the restoration of the nation, when in the land of Israel the sacrifices of the people will be acceptable to Yahweh once again

---

(3) The genuineness of this chapter has been contested, e.g., by G. Holscher, Hesekiel. der Dichter und das Buch, 1924, ad loc. Others assign 20:1-32 to the earlier activity of the prophet, 33-44 to the later; but Eissfeldt argues that the essentially negative content of most of this chapter demands a positive counterpart, which is found in vv.40-44 and also in chs.40-48, on which this chapter sheds a new light. "We may thus no more doubt the genuineness of the basic material of 40-48 than that of the core of 20": op. cit., p.376.
Ezekiel's recital of apostasies is formally paralleled by the Deuteronomistic recital of the gracious acts of Yahweh which must evoke the ceaseless gratitude of Israel (e.g., Deut. 8:2-20; 9). In both cases, historical events provide the material in which Yahweh's activity is discerned, and historical retrospect is combined with warning or exhortation relating to the present and future.

The prophetic use of sermons, speeches or longer discourses does not mean that the inspirational drive is no longer operative. Certain formal adaptations did take place. For example, the discourse may begin with a call for attention or invitation to listen which has been borrowed from non-prophetic and even non-religious sources. The cry "Ho everyone, come" is the slogan of oriental street traders. But this formal adaptation does not mean that the link with the inspirational origins of prophecy or even with the prophetic oracle is necessarily broken. In Jeremiah's Temple sermon there is embedded an oracle on the fate of the Temple (Jer. 7:14).

The oracular formulae still occur: "thus says Yahweh" (the royal message), "hear the word of Yahweh" (a more rhetorical form), "thus has Yahweh said to me" (the formula of personal revelation), and the more primitive "whispering of Yahweh". The sermon may well mark the disintegration of the oracle form in the utterances of the prophet concerned, but it performs the function of an oracle as the vehicle of direct revelation. Lindblom suggests several possible ways in which the revelation finds its formal enunciation. The prophet receives revelation through ecstasy or strong inspiration, gives form

(1) Cf. R.B.Y. Scott, V.T. II, 1952, pp.278ff. Scott terms such oracles "embryonic" or "germinal".
(2) Lindblom terms such sermons "pseudo- oracles", op. cit., p.156, without, however, implying any falsity of content.
and shape to it while still in an elevated frame of mind, and then goes out and delivers it to the people. Again, the prophet might be seized by ecstacy in public and utter a well-nigh instantaneous prophecy. On the other hand, the prophet might receive the revelation in the form of a short oracle which becomes the nucleus of a subsequent sermon. (1)

The prophets were teachers as well as preachers. The prophetic word is **torah**. "Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching (torah) among my disciples" (Is.8:16). (2) This didactic function they shared with the priests, who were the primary guardians of torah in Israel.

The word **torah** originally denoted the communication of oral information concerning cultic and ethical matters (cf. Hag.2:12f.); but a certain bifurcation of direction in Israel's teachers sees the priests emphasising cultic issues and their ethical consequences, and the prophets religious and ethical issues. Yet, despite the tensions that existed between these groups, the attachment of prophets to the sanctuaries tended to narrow the gulf between them (cf. Zech.7:1-7; Ez.43:11f.). Thus didache as well as kerygma may be said to be represented in prophetic utterances. Charged as he was with the proclamation and reinforcement of God's Law, the prophet often reflected in his teaching the forms of the legal pronouncement. Thus Ezekiel restates in apodictic form the laws about just trading:

"You shall have just balances, a just ephah, and a just bath" (45:10).

---

(1) The diversity of sermon usage is to be noted. The Deuteronomistic writings suggest the hypothesis that priests and Levites used the sermon for teaching purposes: cf. G.E. Wright, *op. cit.*, pp.325-30. Wisdom sayings also come to be included in sermons, as in the Wisdom of Solomon (1:1-5:23) and later sermons which reflected various traditions as well as contemporary influences such as the hellenistic diatribe: cf. 4 Macc.; Test. of XII Patriarchs: *vid.* Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, p.164. The sermon in itself, of course is far from being an exclusively prophetic form: *vid.* Chap. Two.


In his teaching he repeats the divine conditional:

"If the wicked restores the pledge, gives back what he has taken by robbery and walks in the statutes of life, committing no iniquity, he shall surely live, he shall not die" (33:15).

The curse, which is another form of apodictic law particularly common in Deuteronomy (cf. 27:15-26) where an original association with the amphictyonic centre at Shechem is suggested, (1) is also frequently used in prophetic teaching:

"Cursed be the man who does not heed the words of this covenant ..." (Jer.11:3). (2)

Underpinning the demand of God in prophetic teaching is the notion of God as Judge. In his name sanctions are imposed by the Law, but he is himself the ultimate authority in Israel who gives life to those who seek good and not evil and who passes judgment upon those who resist his will - a judgment that can be worked out within the flux and flow of history or related to the eschatological Day of the Lord. In this kind of teaching, apocalyptic finds a natural place, as in Ezekiel and Daniel above all.

The formal structure of the preaching of John.

"The preaching of John as a whole belongs to the same strain as the preaching of the greatest Old Testament prophets." (4) With remarkable unanimity, the New Testament writers and their sources describe John the Baptist as a prophet, and this fact remains unchallengeable amid all the controversy that has surrounded John. In the ancient world, the sectarian movement that looked to John as leader

---

(3) Cf. the prophetic interpretation of history in Joshua, Judges and the Deuteronomic tradition generally; Ezekiel's interpretation of the fall of Jerusalem; and the prophetic use of human adversaries as instruments of God's judgment (e.g., Amos 3:11). For the Day of the Lord as judgment, cf. Amos 5:18ff.; Is.2:12-17; Zeph.1:14ff.
clearly ranked him even more highly, as Messiah. Early church
tradition presented him as the forerunner of the Messiah, the promised
Elijah (cf. Mal.4:5), and as witness to the Coming One, who was the
ture Messiah. \(^{(2)}\)

Apparently, however, John made no explicit claim
to be Elijah. Accordingly, A. Schweitzer argued that John's message
was concerned with the coming of Elijah, and that it was Jesus who
first identified John with Elijah. \(^{(3)}\) In Johannine tradition, John
explicitly refuses to be identified with Elijah (Jn.1:21), a point
significant enough in itself even if we do not accept G.S. Duncan's
deduction that he may have thought of himself as Elijah's servant
(1 Kings 18:43; 19:3). \(^{(4)}\)

Luke's own view is that John marks the
transition point from the old age to the new (16:16). He is still
effectively a figure of the old age, of the Law and the prophets. To
his preaching of repentance Jesus added the preaching of the kingdom;
to his baptism was added the Spirit when the new age was come.
Accordingly Luke tends to exclude references to John as the Elijah:
rather, John is the last of the prophets. \(^{(5)}\)

Matthew, however,
records several sayings which, despite Bultmann's hesitancy, may have
claims to authenticity on form critical grounds and which suggest that
John marks the shift of the aeons, the ushering in of the time of
fulfilled promise. \(^{(6)}\)

It is for this reason that Jesus appears to

---

\(^{(2)}\) This is the view represented by Mark and Matthew. It is seen
also in Luke's birth narratives: 1:17, 76.
\(^{(3)}\) The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910, pp.371-4.
\(^{(4)}\) Jesus, Son of Man, 1947, p.85.
\(^{(6)}\) Cf. Matt.11:11a, 12ff.; 21:32; also Mk.11:27-30. Cf. N.
Dibelius, Jesus, Eng. tr., 1963, p.56f.; C.H. Kraeling, John the
Baptist, 1951, p.156f. The major form critical grounds for
accepting the authenticity of such traditions is that the Church,
so far from inventing a high estimate of John, tended for apolo-
getic reasons to play down his ministry: cf. J.M. Robinson, A New
Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1959, p.117, n.1. Bultmann's
hesitation may be ascribed to excessive caution or scepticism:
H.S.T., p.164f.
find affinity with him and that the early Christian preaching grants a
place to him. He emerges in his own right as the eschatological
prophet in whose work and message the kingdom of God was brought near
to men. (1) Characteristic features of prophecy recur in his ministry:
"I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness ..." (Jn.1:23). His
call is dated and described in prophetic terms by Luke (3:1f.; cf.
Jer.1:1f.). He prophesies of the Coming One (Mk.1:7f.) and proclaims
imminent judgment (Mk.3:7f.). His baptism is open to interpretation
as a prophetic action. (2)

John's preaching bears all the marks of the admonitory type of
prophetic proclamation. He calls for repentance, baptism being
associated with this demand (Mk.1:4; Matt.3:2; Luke 3:3). Injunctive
and denunciation are part of his message. He compares Pharisees
and Sadducees to a brood of vipers scurrying desperately for safety
before a fast-spreading wilderness fire. He admonishes them against
complacency: to be "children of Abraham" affords no ultimate security,
for that can be achieved only through the kind of living that follows
upon repentance (cf. Matt.3:8). He addresses the strongest possible
rebuke to Herod Antipas (Mk.6:18; Matt.14:4). His message is one of
urgent warning before the impending doom. Laying the axe to the root
of the tree recalls the familiar prophetic symbol of judgment (Is.10:
33f.) but the image possesses an urgent immediacy. The metaphor of
winnowing is of a similar type. Also characteristic of admonitory
preaching is the strong ethical emphasis (as in Amos, for example):
"Bear fruit that befits repentance" (Mt.3:8). Josephus represents
John as commanding the Jews "to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness
towards one another and piety towards God ..." (3) This ethical

(1) For further discussion of this point, vid. Chapter Three infra.
(3) Jos. Ant. 18:5.
concern links naturally with his didache, for like the prophets John's torah was communicated by preaching and teaching (Luke 3:13f.). Basic to it is the concept of imminent judgment, which is the subject of his predictive oracle. His preaching of repentance differs from that of the rabbis in that while for the latter repentance was the condition of the coming of the Messiah and the lack of it was delaying his advent, for John the day of judgment and the arrival of the Coming One make up the one inexorable and imminent event, bringing disaster and destruction to the unrepentant and a place in the kingdom of God to the faithful (cf. Mk.1:15 par). (1) The nucleus of his oracle is found in his prediction of the Coming One:

"I baptise you with water; but he who is mightier than I is coming, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie; he will baptise you with the Holy Spirit (and with fire)." (2)

In some form, this oracle stood in both Mark and Q, and was continued in Q with the saying on "winnowing". If baptism with fire was part of the original oracle, the reference is similar to the use of "fire" that is found elsewhere in John's preaching (i.e., the fire of punishment following upon judgment) and it reflects prophetic and apocalyptic usage. (3) Baptism with the Holy Spirit does appear to have been part of the original oracle and to refer to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the last days, by which the new, restored Israel will be

(1) Cf. Scobie, op. cit., p.83 and his discussion of John as preacher pp.60-89.
(3) Cf. Amos 7:4; Ez.38:2; Mal.4:1; Enoch 90:24-27; Ps. Sol.15:6; 1Q5 2:8 etc. Cf. also the "river of fire" in Dan.7:9f.; 2 Esd. 13:10; 1QH 3:27-32. In John's preaching the notion of punishment dominates rather than that of refining (Mal.3:2; 1 Cor. 3:13ff.).
The formal structure of the preaching of Jesus.

Jesus was not infrequently called a prophet by "the people" or "the crowds", and by certain individuals, including the disciples. This description did not arise because of any explicit prophetic claims Jesus made; he does little more than identify himself with certain proverbial prophetic motifs (Mk.6:4 par.; Lk.13:33). Nevertheless there was apparent a certain broad similarity to the Old Testament prophets and to the holy "men of spirit", evidenced in prophetic insight into men's thoughts or future events, or in his manner of teaching or his prophetic actions. According to Matthew, Jesus points to such activities in answer to John's question: "Are you he who is to come, or are we to look for another?" (11:3ff.; cf. Luke 4:18ff.). Explicit claims that Jesus was a prophet and more than a prophet - the second Moses, for example - are advanced by the evangelists rather than by Jesus; yet, as Friedrich suggests, Jesus may have spoken more often and more explicitly of his prophetic role than the evangelists have recorded. In some early Christian circles the term may have been avoided as doing less than justice to the uniqueness of Jesus. At all events, it is freely admitted that Jesus spoke and acted in the prophetic manner.

Among scholars who have examined this question, R. Otto

(1) Cf. Ezek.36:25ff.; Is.44:3; Joel 3:1f.; 1QS 4:20f.; Test. Levi 18. There is always the suspicion that it comes from the early church and the theology of the Spirit reflected in Luke. Cf. R. Bultmann, H.S.T., pp.245ff. The matter must be decided on phenomenological grounds: is this type of oracle and concept congruous with the ministry of John? Could he have transmitted it to his hearers through whom it percolated to the church so that it could be subsequently used by its theologians? To this, a positive answer may be given.
(2) Cf. Mk.6:15 par.; 6:28 par.; Mt.21:11, 46; Lk.7:16; Jn.6:14; 7:40; also Jn.4:19; 9:17; Lk.24:19.
(4) The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, 1938, pp.333-81.
concluded that the original tradition represented Jesus as a charismatic for three main reasons: (i) only in this way can the emergence of a Spirit-led, enthusiastic church be explained; (ii) the individual traits discernible in the portrait of Jesus which we have in the gospels harmonize into a unity of the charismatic type; (iii) the whole charismatic type harmonizes with and has the same meaning as the message of the kingdom of God which is already breaking in and has been experienced as dynamic. (1) According to Otto, Jesus equated the secret power of the divine kingdom with the Pneuma (Lk.4:16), and Otto draws attention to the "typical little catalogue of charismatic gifts" which Jesus quotes from Isaiah 61:1f. and which he claims to realise in his own person (4:21). These gifts included healing and exorcism; charismatic preaching - it was "with power" (Mk.1:27), and was recognised as such by his hearers (Lk.4:22); (2) διακρίσις, the gift of discernment; (3) and charismatic metonymy, evidenced by the renaming of the disciples. Not least important was the gift of prophecy itself: he speaks prophetically of Jerusalem, the fate of the sons of Zebedee, Judas, and his own death. Some of the more elaborate prophecies in the gospels may have had originally the character of simple divination. (4) Other charismatic elements were his claim to forgive sins and his promise to his followers that they would be charmed against injuries (Lk.10:19; cf. Mk.16:17).

C.H. Dodd, in an important study, (5) examines "the external or

(2) Χαρίσσει means Χαρίσση in Lk.4:22; Acts 6:8.
(3) He "knew what was in men", "perceived their thoughts"; cf. Nathaniel (Jn.1:47); the water-carrier (Mk.14:3ff.); etc.
(4) Lk.12:50; cf. Mk.11:12ff.; 9:31 etc. Perhaps the Petrine tradition rested on an oracle such as: "You, Cephas, shall not see death".
(5) Jesus as Teacher and Prophet, in Mysterium Christi, ed. G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann, 1930, pp.53-66.
more obvious aspects of the ministry of Jesus" to find what caused men to rank him with the prophets. He points to the sovereign authority\(^1\) with which he spoke: the immediacy of authority in his "but I say to you ..." is as total as the prophets' "thus says the Lord". He points to the poetical form of his sayings, so similar to prophetic oracles; to his visions and auditions, predictions and symbolic actions. Dodd then looks for resemblances to the prophets at a deeper level. Jesus appeals to the teaching of the prophets for support in his attack on the formalism of contemporary Judaism.\(^2\)
The tendency of his eschatology was in harmony with that of the prophets, both in its radically ethical nature and in its dissociation from the popular hope. Prophet like, he announced the reign of God in face of the power of evil in the world. He was a preacher of repentance:

"His ἑρταφώσετε is an echo of the prophetic ἐξελήφθη. His aim is to set before men the momentous issue between good and evil, and to bring them to a decision. This more than anything else is the differentia of the prophet as a religious phenomenon". \(^3\)

Finally, Dodd believes he can identify certain personal traits in Jesus which suggest an affinity with the prophets. He received his call in a pneumatic experience, and his sayings testify to an understanding of his vocation in the manner of Jeremiah (cf. Jer.1:5).

This prophetic vocation presupposes a divine revelation received in intimate communion with God: he "knows" God and "is known" by Him. He is God's representative, like the prophets. To accept or reject him is to accept or reject God. His mission, like that of the prophets, is directed primarily to Israel: hence his choice of twelve

---

\(^1\) There is no implication here that Judaism was necessarily petrified or ossified in Jesus' day: the intention is simply to indicate the prophetic authority in Jesus' utterances.

\(^2\) In the light of the Qumran discoveries, we would now add the legalistic perfectionism of that community to the Pharisaic legalism so prominent in the gospels.

disciples, and his parable of the vineyard. He did not merely declare the word of God but like the prophets played his part in its fulfilment through his life, ministry and death. This being so, Dodd concludes that "in his personal religion (so far as this is accessible to us in the records) Jesus stands in the succession of the prophets, while he goes beyond them". (1)

There can be little doubt that in general terms the case presented by Otto and Dodd stands. Particular elements of it, however, are open to question. Neither scholar pays sufficient attention to the critical problems raised by gospel material. Dodd qualifies his references to Jesus' personal religion with the parenthetical comment: "so far as this is accessible to us in the records"; yet nowhere in his article does he elucidate this reservation or attempt to show to what extent it modifies his claim. How confident can we be that the material under examination provides data that enable us to probe Jesus' prophetic consciousness, and how far do these data merely reflect early church interpretation of Jesus? One notices, for example, the frequency with which both Otto and Dodd illustrate important points from the writings of Luke, the most "Spirit conscious" of the gospel writers. (2) Again, both scholars tend to confuse the self-consciousness of Jesus and his self-understanding. Baptism and temptation are put in the category of visions and auditions experienced by Jesus in the prophetic tradition; that is, they are open to psychological investigation as possible keys


to the self-consciousness of Jesus. But does the material lend itself to this treatment? Are such narratives not "epiphanies"? If so, they hold the key to the church's interpretation of Jesus rather than to Jesus' inner personal experience. Even Dodd's confident appeal to the sovereign authority detectable in Jesus' utterances is open to challenge. Bultmann holds the "I-sayings" to be mainly the work of the hellenistic churches, with an initial contribution from the Palestinian milieu, for in these communities "Christian prophets filled by the Spirit spoke in the name of the ascended Lord sayings like Rev.16:15". Finally, Otto and Dodd may be open to the charge of reading their own interpretation of the kingdom of God and eschatology into the prophetic consciousness of Jesus.

In making this kind of assessment, two perspectives must be kept in mind. First, there is the early church's understanding of Jesus as a prophet. In fact, the New Testament writers tend to be less than enthusiastic about such a description of Jesus and may have eliminated from the tradition sayings which appeared to make such an identification. Christologically, he is "more than a prophet";

(1) R. Bultmann, H.S.T., pp.247-253 identifies the baptism narrative as a "faith legend". He writes: "Admittedly it would not do to psychologize and talk of a "call" story and reckon its contents as a calling vision. It is characteristically different from calling stories like Is.6:1-13; Jer.1:5-19; Ez.1 and 2; Acts 9:1-9; Lk.5:1-11; Rev.1:9-20; Jn.21:15-17: not only is there not so much as a word about the inner experience of Jesus, but there is also no word of commission to the person called, and no answer from him, things which we normally find in proper accounts of a call. Nor is the passage concerned with Jesus' special calling to preach repentance and salvation, but the real subject is his being the messiah, or the Son of God, and that cannot be described as a "call"... The legend tells of Jesus' consecration as messiah, and so is basically not a biographical, but a faith legend" (p.247f.). For his discussion of the temptation narrative, ibid., pp.253-57.

transcends the status of prophet. (1) The picture of Jesus presented by the evangelists, and Luke in particular, is of a pneumatikos, who lives and moves in the Spirit. This concept is wholly compatible with the church's understanding of Jesus as Messiah (cf. Is.11:2ff.); and also, as Otto has argued convincingly, it supplies the necessary correspondence between the pneumatic Christian community and its head. This raises the second perspective: that of Jesus himself in relation to prophecy. To attempt to ascribe all pneumatic elements in the gospel story to the interpretative and inventive powers of the early church would be wholly subjective and excessively sceptical. The picture is much too consistent, not only in Luke who consciously underlines these elements, (2) but in the other gospels also. Moreover, there are further significant pointers. Jesus is described as taking up his ministry where John left off and therefore as standing within the tradition that John represented, which as we have seen was the prophetic tradition. (3) The early church could have had no motive for inventing this; rather the reverse. Many elements identified by Dodd remain important, despite the criticisms advanced above. The crowds undoubtedly detected the authority and immediacy of his preaching and teaching, whether we possess his verba ipsissima or not.

The visionary element is most cogently represented by Lk.10:18—"I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven". Certain symbolic actions

(2) Thus Jesus "rejoiced in the Holy Spirit" (Lk.10:21); i.e., "he was seized by the Spirit and spoke by inspiration": Friedrich, ibid.
(3) But Jesus developed his prophetic ministry on different lines from John: healing, exorcising, avoiding asceticism. Cf. E. Käsemann, Primitive Christian Apocalyptic in New Testament Questions of Today, Eng. tr., 1969, p.112. G. Vermes, in an important study, Jesus the Jew, 1973, which came to hand only as this thesis was nearing completion, concludes: "the person of Jesus is to be seen as part of first century charismatic Judaism and as the paramount example of the early Hasidim or Devout": op. cit., p.79. Vermes stresses the importance of Galilee as the milieu of Jesus and his disciples.
appear beyond question, and some predictive elements are essential to Jesus' self-understanding and cannot therefore be written off as mere vaticinia ex eventu. Jesus' clash with the rabbis, with whom he appears to have had much in common, is also bound up with this question. Windisch comments neatly: "The Pneuma turns the student of Torah and teacher of Wisdom into a prophet". It is precisely at this point that Jesus is rejected by synagogal Judaism. Similarly, his challenge to the Temple has a prophetic motivation and, indeed, expression. His deeds and his fate are part of his total significance.

C.K. Barrett has devoted attention to the important question of Jesus' apparent avoidance of prophetic claims. He accepts as part explanation the Christological interest of the church, which perhaps minimised such claims as might have been made. But this, he suggests, is not a sufficient answer to the problem; the evangelists left many traces of the popular viewpoint. Barrett takes up Otto's suggestion that Jesus was dissatisfied with the term as applied to himself, just as he was dissatisfied with its application to John the Baptist. The danger here is that of straying into the quicksands of "messianic consciousness", even if appeal is made to a Q saying (Mt.11:9; Lk.7:26). Q affords no guarantee of penetration beyond church interpretation or tradition to the workings of Jesus' mind. More cogent, perhaps, is the point Barrett takes from Dodd, that Jesus followed the practice of some prophets (e.g., Amos and Jeremiah) who did not speak of themselves as prophets or as "men of Spirit". Barrett's own

---

solution seems to me to involve, at least to some extent, reading back Christian theological interpretation into the life of Jesus. (1) Perhaps one might suggest that Jesus appears as a general rule to have avoided making verbal claims to traditional, religious titles. Jesus did not claim to be a prophet; he acted as a prophet when occasion demanded. He did not claim to be Spirit inspired; he acted in the power of the Spirit when it was appropriate and necessary to do so. Thus the totality of his words and actions, his appearing and his dying, is the vehicle of his message and mission. In this sense he was truly prophetic. (2)

It remains only to outline the prophetic forms employed by Jesus. His initial preaching clearly follows upon the ministry of John the Baptist (Mk. 1:14f.) and like his predecessor's stresses the eschatological urgency for men to repent (Matt. 4:17; cf. 3:2). Mark's account of this initial preaching is coloured by the terminology of early Christian preaching, but even without Matthew's more precise account one would have concluded that Jesus' proclamation and invitation followed the prophetic motif of John's preaching with "repentance" as its focus. From the absence of admonitory preaching at this point, some commentators have concluded that Jesus largely omitted this prophetic form. Thus Bo Reicke writes: "It must be noticed that Jesus did not, like the prophets, rebuke contemporary

(2) We suggest that Jesus exercised similar restraint in his use of "Son of Man". If he used it apocalyptically, the early church may then have applied it retrospectively to him; cf. H.E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, Eng. tr., 1965, p.295. Most recently, G. Vermes has argued that Jesus used it simply as a neutral speech form. "There is no evidence whatever, either inside or outside the Gospels, to imply, let alone demonstrate, that 'the son of man' was used as a title" (sc. by Jesus), although the Galilean disciples "eschatologized" his usage subsequently: op. cit., p.186. Important but unproven solutions were put forward by T.W. Hanson, The Teaching of Jesus, 1955, p.227f. and E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, 1951, p.6; and by many others.
life indiscriminately". (1) Apart from the unbalanced concept of Old Testament prophecy involved in this statement, (2) its general tenor is misleading. Jesus probably used the admonitory form rather more often than Deutero-Isaiah, for instance. A strongly admonitory note is sounded in his criticism of the scribes (Mk.12:38ff.) and in the oracle of seven woes in Q, which Matthew and Luke expanded in different ways. (3) Two points require to be made. (i) The "woes" were clearly used for apologetic and polemical purposes in the early church and consequently tended to attract more material into their format; (4) (ii) This does not preclude the possibility that they reflect admonitory preaching of Jesus in the setting of his own polemics with the Pharisees. Bultmann admits that the "woes of the rich" (Luke 6: 24ff.) which Luke has in formal antithesis to the beatitudes, may well represent ancient tradition. (5) The lament over Jerusalem (Matt.23: 37ff.; Lk.13:34ff.) which could have originated in Jesus' prophetic preaching, also includes the use of Jewish prophecy and is minatory in tone. (6) Other sayings, equally characteristic of prophetic admonition, may well have been uttered by Jesus but even if they were not they testify to the fact that the early church thought them appropriate to his preaching. These include sayings against "this generation" (Lk.11:29-32; Mt.16:4, 12:41ff.); about failure to interpret the signs of the times (Lk.12:54ff.); about the rejection of the Jews from the kingdom of God and the inclusion of Gentiles (Lk.13:28ff.). Some sayings which had Christological nuances when

(2) The prophets' admonitions were characteristically balanced with appeals for repentance and the note of hope: e.g., Amos 5:14f.
(3) Matt.23:4-29; Lk.11:39-52.
(6) Bultmann, op. cit., p.114.
used in the early church may have had a prophetic connotation on Jesus' lips: "whoever is ashamed of me and of my words ..." (Mk.8:38; Lk.12:8); "daughters of Jerusalem ..." (Lk.23:28-31); "why do you call me 'Lord', 'Lord' ...?" (Lk.6:46; cf. Mt.7:21); and certain eschatological sayings (Matt.24:37ff.; Lk.17:26-30). Some parables grow out of this admonitory concern. One can see the process at work in Matt.24:40f. A good illustration is provided by the wheat and the tares (Matt.13:24-30; interpreted vv.36-43) which Bultmann describes as a "pure parable". (1) There can therefore be little doubt that admonition was well represented in the discourses of Jesus, and in this he was typically prophetic. The application and adaptation of this material in the early church assured that the admonitory emphasis was not lost in Christian preaching.

Equally prominent in Jesus' utterances, if not more so, are the oracles of salvation, of which the beatitudes may be taken as a leading expression (Matt.5:3-10; cf. Luke 6:20f.). Luke probably reflects that the original teaching more closely, although Bultmann suggests that the evangelist himself has changed the third person to the second. (2) A further beatitude occurs in Luke 10:23f. (Matt.13:16f.): the blessedness of those who experience the reality that confronts them now. (3) This reality is described in pneumatic terms, modelled on Isaiah, (4) in Jesus' reply to John the Baptist's question

---

(2) Op. cit., p.109f. Luke 6:22, like Matt.5:11f., appears to reflect later tradition. I cannot follow Bultmann in rejecting Matt.5:10 from the earliest tradition. The fact that Luke does not have it is not necessarily significant; and Jesus is as likely as Matthew to have shaped the beatitudes in a group of seven. Does it represent the utterance of Jesus which gave rise to the ecclesiastical midrash in the following verses?
(3) Luke 14:15 contains a further beatitude based on the messianic banquet but not in fact attributed to Jesus. Bultmann (ibid.) regards this as accidental.
(4) Is.55:5f.; cf. 61:1; 29:16f. Jesus' oracle, however, is more than a compilation of scriptural references: there is no reference there to lepers. Cf. Lk.4:21.
(Lk.7:22ff.; Mt.11:5ff.), and the oracle concludes with a beatitude. The oracles of salvation put beyond reasonable doubt the contention that Jesus understood his own work as eschatologically decisive. (1)

This raises the fascinating question of the explicit *autokerygma* of Lk.10:21ff. (Mt.11:25ff.), normally attributed to Q. Bultmann, with Dibelius and Bousset, characterises v.27 as a hellenistic revelation saying, originally handed down, perhaps, as a saying of the risen Lord (cf. Matt.28:18). (2) Yet Bultmann ignores Luke's introduction to this *logion*: "he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit", a clear reference to prophetic or pneumatic speech, normally issuing from ecstasy. (3) Is this to be dismissed as no more than a peculiarly Lukan interpretation, imposing his own frame of reference upon a later Christian formulation composed probably under Christian prophetic influence and read back into the life of Jesus? Or does it supply a vital clue to the nature of his *autokerygma*? While this question cannot be wholly resolved on the available evidence, the second alternative deserves much more serious consideration than it frequently receives. Otto's plea that one may presume some reciprocity between the pneumatology of the early church and the practice of Jesus (4) remains an important point. The consistency and pervasiveness of the prophetic strain in Jesus' words and actions provide a context in which this *logion* is wholly admissible. (5) If this is so, then the

---

(1) Cf. his statements in relation to exorcism: Lk.11:20. Also Lk.11:21ff.; Matt.12:29, Mk.3:27, where a parabolic element appears.
(3) Str. - B.II, 127ff.; Barrett, op. cit., pp.95, 101f.
(4) And, we may add, between the "I am" sayings in John and the utterances of Jesus.
(5) It might be argued, against Bultmann, that the use of hellenistic or other alien imagery by a Jewish pneumatic of first century Palestine - or Galilee - is perfectly conceivable in view of the much greater degree of cultural cross-fertilization which we now know to have existed in Judaistic circles of that period.
germ of Christology is to be found not merely in the church's interpretation of Jesus' fate but also in his explicit utterances. Formally, the autokerygmata corresponds to the "secret" oracle of the prophets, and as the prophet confided his secrets to his disciples so the locus of Jesus' autokerygmata may be his discourses within the community of disciples. (1)

Luke 10:18 is frequently taken as a crux interpretationis in relation to Jesus' eschatological orientation. It may also indicate the ecstatic element in Jesus' experience. Even Bultmann admits that this saying could be classed as a vision and suggests that "the tradition" might have suppressed other passages which described visions or auditions. (2) Lk.10:18 may have belonged to a lengthier narrative which has been almost totally reduced. Windisch comments that Jesus' apocalyptic pronouncements may spring from the context of ecstatic experiences to a much greater degree than appears in the written tradition. (3) Otherwise, the apparently ecstatic phenomena in the baptism, temptation and transfiguration narratives can only with extreme difficulty be regarded as affording direct evidence of Jesus' psychic experience. They are in the form of epiphanies and are most easily understood as community interpretation. Yet the point might be made, with some caution, that these narratives suggest that psychic or ecstatic elements were properly attributable to Jesus. In similar fashion, Jesus' predictive oracles (4) may be taken as evidence of his pneumatic leanings, and some at least seem demanded as part of his self-understanding in relation to the events in which he

(1) E. Küsemann, in a remarkable passage, speaks of "a unique secret in Jesus" and comments further that "Liberalism, too, saw a point of cardinal importance when it emphasized the immediacy of the relation of Jesus to God as Father": op. cit., p.112f.
(4) Vid. supra.
was involved (Lk.13:33). Not all of them have the appearance of vaticinia ex eventu. As is the case with prophetic oracles generally, there are elements of unfulfilled prophecy: Matt.10:23, Mk.9:1, or Mk.10:39. On the other hand, the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple in Mark's little apocalypse (13:2) "is certainly older than the event". (1) The impression persists that predictive oracles, which bear some similarity to oracles of promise or warning, fulfilled an essential role in Jesus' ministry, involving the understanding of the present not only in terms of itself or of the past but also in relation to the future. (2)

The prophetic role includes a teaching function. Jesus' prophetic torah appears to have utilised his predictive oracles as the focal point of its apocalyptic teaching, such as that reflected in Mark 13 where the paraenetic emphasis is strong. (3) Prophetic teaching is also concerned to relate the theme of judgment to the audience, and in this context Jesus' prophetic understanding of eschatology, with its dialectic of present and future, may have led him to a concept of judgment, immanent in history, in which a principle of reciprocity operates:

"Whoever is ashamed of me and of my words ... of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed" (Mk.8:38).

"So every one who acknowledges me before men, I will also acknowledge before my Father ..." (Mk.10:32f.).

(1) Friedrich, T.D.N.T., VI, p.845.
(2) Structurally, it is necessary to admit a future dimension in Jesus' self-understanding. This does not plunge us into the irrational apocalypticism of A. Schweitzer, nor does it prevent us from recognizing that Jesus related the Kingdom of God to the present. But the structure of prophecy requires the note of judgment, and in this the concept of Son of Man may have played a part. Cf. Todt, op. cit., pp.52-112; Bultmann, Theology I, p.30.
(3) Cf. Chapter Three, where paraenesis is discussed.
"If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father also will forgive you ..." (Matt.6:14). (1)

Moreover, even if the antitheses of Mt.5 in their present form are a secondary development, they testify cumulatively and consistently to the authority of the original teacher whose radicalizing of the demand of God sprang from a new and penetrating insight into God's will. (2)

"Not any imminent end of the universe, not any principle of creation, not any casuistry, led Jesus to his understanding of God's will. He passed beyond all principles he had inherited, beyond the light of Law and Prophet, to what we can only call an intuitive awareness of the will of God in its nakedness." (3)

This intuitive awareness, supplying the key to his eschatological and ethical teaching, is the very essence of prophetic experience; but prophetic insight which transcended Law and Prophets is something unique in Israel and raises the question of the nature of the prophet who has now emerged in all his radical many-sidedness. It is understandable that Matthew has virtually prefaced his gospel with the new law, transcending and fulfilling but not abolishing the old (Mt.5:17f.); and that the disciples, like the early Christian community in its turn, dared to believe that a prophet greater than Moses had at last arisen in Israel (cf. Deut.34:10).

(1) E. Käsemann, in his essay Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament, op. cit., pp.66-81, has argued that a number of such sentences have an immediate origin in early Christian prophecy and a hinterland consisting of O.T. casuistic law and the jus talionis. There are weaknesses in his thesis. He is unable to illustrate it convincingly from the O.T. (the LXX form of Ex.21:12 is accidental): cf. J.M. Robinson, in Current Issues in N.T. Interpretation, ed. Klassen and Snyder, p.277. Also, his examples in the gospels are taken from too narrow a range. Admittedly, some of them (like Mk.10:32f.) look as if they might have been influenced in their final form by Christian prophetism, but, equally, the reciprocity principle is reflected in the Lord's Prayer itself and in commentary upon it and is thus both integral to Jesus' own procedures and congruous with his own prophetic emphasis.


(3) Ibid., p.432.
Prophecy and the origins of the early Christian preaching and teaching.

In describing the rise of the early Christian church, Luke devotes considerable attention to the earliest preaching and the circumstances which gave rise to it. Although he is writing at a later date, his understanding of the earliest preaching is important as an assessment acceptable within the church in the generations that succeeded the apostles. In Acts 4, which according to Harnack's source theory is earlier than the Pentecost narrative, Peter is said to be filled with the Holy Spirit as he addresses the rulers and elders of Israel (v.8). After the release of Peter and John, there is an outburst of praise from the whole community (4:24-30), at which amid earthquake-like phenomena the Holy Spirit comes upon all, giving them the power to speak the word of God fearlessly (4:31f.) and uniting them in a truly inter-dependent community (4:32-37). Here inspiration supplies the motive force for the preaching. The narrative of the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost begins with a striking description and interpretation of apparently ecstatic phenomena. Associated with the festival of Pentecost which had come to commemorate the giving of the Law, the epiphenomena of the ecstasy suggest a possible parallel with the events of Sinai (2:3). In this case, however, the new people of God is coming into being. Prima facie, the same phenomena also suggest the overcoming of the language barrier as a symbol of the inherent universality of the gospel (2:4, 6-11). Such an understanding appears to diverge sharply from Paul's view of glossolalia (cf. 1 Cor.14).

(3) For "tongues of fire" used to denote divine action, cf. Enoch 14: 8-15; 71:5.
(4) Vid. infra.
There has been a certain inevitability about the course of the scholarly discussion of this problem. Rationalization has failed. Lake attempted a reconciliation of the divergent views of Luke and Paul by interfering with the text of the Acts narrative, but for this there is no justification. An attempt by J.G. Davies to prove that Paul's view in fact corresponds with Luke's must be judged tendentious. More significantly, Dibelius tended to scepticism about penetrating beyond the layers of interpretation in the Pentecost narrative. With E. Haenchen, source criticism is virtually abandoned; Redaktionsgeschichte is the rule, and attention is focussed on the particular, theological interest evident in the composition of Luke's work.

(1) Beginnings, V, 1933, pp.111-21.
(2) Davies argued that the verb ἐγγραφέω and its cognates in the LXX and N.T. (apart from 1 Cor.12 and 14) refer to the translation of a foreign language, as shown by the linguistic background of Is.28:14, (loosely cited by Paul in 14:21). "Against such a background it is reasonable to assume that St. Paul understood glossolalia to be talking in foreign languages ..." Pentecost and Glossolalia, J.T.S., III NS, 1952, pp.228-31. But ἐγγραφέω is the natural word to use for translating from one medium of expression to another, whether it is a question of foreign languages or of translating incoherent or unknown sounds into intelligible language (cf. 2 Mac.1:30) or of interpreting figurative or mysterious utterances. The rabbinic argumentation of 1 Cor.14:21 can hardly be taken as evidence of Paul's concept of "tongues", even if the original reference of the prophet is identified with confidence. Paul uses the analogy of foreign languages in 14:10f.: cf. the manner in which he returns to the concrete situation: "so with yourselves ..." His real point is about intelligibility (14:9), not about foreign languages. Further, to speak in a tongue is to speak "without the mind" (14:19; cf. 14:14): to utter sounds without conscious thought and in the ecstasy of the moment. They can be interpreted, in Paul's view, not by calling in someone who has knowledge of the foreign language allegedly in question but only by one who possesses the spiritual gift of interpretation. There is no question of an outsider happening to recognise the language (14:23).
material was ready to hand. (1) Since the mission to the Jews precedes that to the Gentiles, the universality of the gospel is not yet stressed. (2) The reality, source and power of the Spirit are emphasised, and with a neat double entendre the "tongues of fire" indicative of divine action are distributed among the apostles and bestow a "tongue" upon each. (3) With a quick change of step, Luke switches to the notion of ecstatic and incomprehensible speech (2:12), preparatory to Peter's sermon, given to "the others" (v.13). His application of the verb ἀναφέρεσθαι to this speech suggests inspired but intelligible utterance, suited to prophetic hermeneia, the clarification of the mighty acts of God. (4) A similar design may be found in the Cornelius episode in which the phenomena of ecstasy are freely used to mark a significant advance in church life and are duly

---

(1) Cf. Tanhuma 26c: "Although the ten commandments were promulgated with a single sound, it says, 'All people heard the voices': it follows then that when the voice went forth it was divided into seven voices and then went into seventy tongues, and every people received the law in their own language." There were supposed to be seventy languages in the world (cf. Gen.10). Also relevant are the following passages from Philo: De Confus. Ling. 3:405; De Decr. 9, 11; cf. Jos. Ant. I, 1, 4. Jewish eschatology included the expectation that in the last days the elect of God will have one tongue: cf. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jud.25:3.

(2) οὐκ μὴ ὑπάρχῃ οὐδὲ ἀποκλήσεως is omitted by א, and its position is changed in C. It may have been originally a gloss on ἀναφέρεσθαι. Cf. Lake, op. cit., p.113f. The meaning is then that from the beginning the gospel is for all men, and while the Gentiles listened the Jews did not. But a new problem is created: why represent the Cornelius story as a breakthrough if the principle of universality has been established from the beginning? It is better to retain οὐκ μὴ ὑπάρχῃ with B. "Both Jews and proselytes" (2:10) may indicate not so much "one of the component parts of the crowd" (Lake) but its general composition. The speech is specifically addressed to a Jewish audience. Cf. E. Trocmé, Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire, 1957, pp.202-6.


(4) ἀναφέρεσθαι means "speak out", "declare", "utter", including the utterings of "the oracle-giver, diviner, prophet, exorcist, and other 'inspired' persons": A. & G., ad loc. In the LXX it is used in Ez.13:9, 19 and Zech.10:2.
interpreted as revelatory in the accompanying speech of Peter.(1) The total design is integrally related to the structure of the "forty days", of which Pentecost and its aftermath are essentially the continuation.

From the literary construction of Luke we turn to the situational teaching of Paul in 1 Cor.14. The crucial question would appear to be whether the prominence of the pneumatic element at Corinth was a relatively recent phenomenon, a foreign intrusion which Paul had to strive to check and control, or whether it was wholly indigenous to the Christian church and simply required channelling in the most profitable direction. Paul addresses himself to the problem in a manner which leaves little room for doubt. Prophecy is the most important charisma (14:1) and the status accorded to the prophets is unassailable.(2) Equally clearly, Paul does not handle the disorders at Corinth as if they represented recent intrusions in church life. His approach to innovations in the doctrine of the resurrection is markedly different.(3) In chapter 14 he is making careful modifications to the existing course, without rocking the boat.

"Now I want you all to speak in tongues ..." (14:4).
"I thank God I speak in tongues more than you all ..." (14:18).

His course correction is his insistence that prophecy be regarded as intelligible utterance, as distinct from the incoherence of tongues. It must involve the mind as well as the spirit (14:13ff.). Having established that criterion, he can insist upon intelligible and well ordered worship (14:20-32). Finally the mailed fist appears:

(2) Rom.12:6ff.; 1 Cor.12:28f.; Eph.2:20; 3:5; 4:11; Rev.18:20; also Acts 15:11. Paul makes no attempt to eliminate glossolalia or other pneumatic elements at Corinth.
(3) Cf. 1 Cor.15:12-57.
"If anyone thinks he is a prophet or a pneumatic, let him acknowledge that what I am writing to you is the Lord's command. If anyone does not recognise this, he is not recognised. So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking with tongues; but let everything be done in a dignified and orderly way" (14:37-40).

Paul's distinction between "prophet" and "pneumatic" here possibly reflects the emergence of a highly esteemed "Spirit-endowed" group who are held to possess much higher pneumatic gifts than what Paul calls prophetic utterances: in this case, glossolalia. Such a procedure would be in accord with the rise of Gnostic thinking within church circles. (1) While Paul is prepared to recognise a variety of spiritual gifts, to contrast "spiritual" and "unspiritual" in the church (1 Cor.2:13-3:3; cf. Gal.6:1) and to accept that some are "mature" and others not (Phil.3:15), the basis of his view is that the Spirit is given to the church as a whole and that the individual must strive to realise the potentialities that are thus presented to him. When, however, this striving becomes boastful or is not made to operate for the edification of the community, it is inadmissable. Paul evidently sharply reverses the popular evaluation when he puts intelligible preaching before tongues, but he does so with an openness which testifies to the delicate nature of the issue. All this suggests that he is dealing with a phenomenon which, despite its more recent extravagances, has long been established in the church. His aim is the correction of more recent aberrations and the refining of its essential constituents: expressions of pneumatic inspiration, interpretation and intelligible proclamation. That this is a typically Pauline procedure is seen from the similar refinement he effects

(2) Cf. 1 Cor.12:31; 14:1; 12:39; also Bultmann, op. cit., pp.139ff., 158ff.
in the concept of the Spirit. His deliberate playing down of ecstatic elements is further illustrated by the apologetic manner in which he refers to his own visions and revelations.

The reality of the Spirit and the various expressions of it in the church from its earliest phase are therefore presupposed by Luke and Paul. All the gospels add their testimony to this fact. Luke avails himself of the magnificent paeons of praise in his first two chapters and so draws attention to the tradition of Christian psalmody associated with prophetic inspiration and spontaneity (cf. Acts 16:25). Examples of such hymns, possibly associated on occasion with baptism, occur in Eph.5:14 and 1 Tim.3:16 and in various passages of Revelation. Prayers are also offered "in the Holy Spirit", whether addressed to Jesus or more usually through Jesus, and the persistence of such words as Abba, Amen, Maranatha and Hallelujah testifies to a lively congregational participation. The form in which Matthew in particular and Luke present the logion concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit strongly suggests the existence of the Spirit-filled community. If Luke's enthusiasm for the Spirit has

(1) Thus for Paul "'to be in the Spirit' no more denotes the state of ecstasy than 'to be in Christ' is a formula of mysticism": Bultmann, op. cit., p.335; cf. pp.330-40. His refinement of the concept includes the development of its eschatological significance; cf. (2 Cor.1:22; 5:5) and (Rom.8:23); of its christological associations (cf. 2 Cor.3:17); of its ethical consequences (cf. Gal.5:22), of its personal intimacy (cf. Rom.8:14; Gal.5:18). Cf. A.M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, 1954, pp.40, 107ff.

(2) Cf. 2 Cor.12:1-4. His emphasis on "fourteen years ago" seems to suggest the irregularity and perhaps non-continuation of such experiences (v.2). Nevertheless, one cannot be sure that the reference is to his call on the Damascus road.


(4) Similar claims have been made for Col.1:15-20; Phil.2: 2 Tim.2: 11ff.; 1 Pet.3:16-22: bibliography in Moule, op. cit., p.69, n.4.


led him to insert the term at certain points in the tradition, the
same may be said of Matthew and Mark. (1) All three therefore pre-
suppose a Spirit-based community. All three interpret Jesus'
Messiahship in terms of the descent of the Spirit upon him at baptism,
and all three, together with the fourth gospel, presuppose that the
Spirit which empowered Jesus as Messiah was imparted to his church
after his death. For John and perhaps Matthew the bestowal of the
Spirit is the work of the Risen Christ (Jn.20:22; Matt.28:16-20).

Luke's theological framework is more elaborate: resurrection, the
"forty days", Pentecost; and this schema is clearly and carefully
spelled out (Lk.29:49; Acts 1:4, 8).

One of the points at which the Lukan evidence in Acts breaks down
historically is in its suggestion of the earliest Christians preaching
to vast crowds and converting them by the thousand. (2) As Haenchen
observes:

"It is likely, however, that in reality the Christians sought
adherents for their Lord, in the earliest days, without attracting
much attention: 1 Corinthians is there to tell us that the ecstatic
experience of the Spirit, to which modern presentations give so great
a role in psychological reconstructions of Pentecost, does not impel
people to preach in the streets but rather makes them cling together
in a narrow circle; it was the 'Hellenists' ... who first broke out
from this reserve of the Jewish sect that believed in Jesus". (3)

Such ecstatic groups were as typical of the hasidic side of Judaism as
those in Corinth might have been of hellenistic enthusiasm; and
Judaism has a persistent tradition of this type. A.C. Bouquet tells
of a visit to such a group in the mid-twentieth century:

"The shouting of the responses was deafening, and the rocking of
the body intense and exaggerated, so that some bent almost double.
Here and there a man clenched his fist and struck the board in front
of him, and in other cases smote his head or his breast or lifted his

---

21:14f.
(2) Love of numbers is not peculiar to ancient historians. A modern,
sophisticated version of Luke's procedures is not hard to find in
the work of K.S. Latourette: e.g., A History of the Expansion of
Christianity.
hand in the air, while his face was convulsed as he almost shrieked out his responses. Although the whole service was controlled by the use of a set form of words, the recitation of these words was filled with such intensity and accompanied by such movements of the body that the whole scene became one of frenzied ecstasy ... I could well picture this Chasidic congregation interrupting St. Paul with angry contradictions ... It was also easy to understand how the Apostles, might have been mistaken by unsympathetic bystanders for people under the influence of strong drink".  (1)

In these early hasidic groups, there is something of a crisis of articulation, yet amid the intensity of their devotion inherent meaning gradually found expression. Particular elements in their devotion (apart from those derived directly from their Judaistic background) included their recollection of Jesus, their memory of his teaching and death, their experience of his resurrection, itself difficult to articulate, and their present awareness of the Spirit. It was precisely in such groups that there emerges the earliest Christian interpretation - hermeneia, midrash - of the Cross as in some sense "for us"; of the resurrection itself; of judgment and the coming of the Lord (cf. James 5:9); of the Torah sharpened by the work of the messiah; and of the Spirit leading them in the way of truth and understanding. (2) Hence it is necessary to presuppose a prophetic base for the articulation of the focal points of the faith. Usually such a deposit was jealously guarded within the groups, yet there was an infectiousness about their devotion which led to the establishment of groups throughout Judaea (cf. Gal. 1:22) and doubtless in Galilee their home country, if not beyond. (3) Of this stage, one might say that the kerygmatic nucleus of the faith is conceived within the hasidic or prophetic movement which combined the Jesus tradition with its subsequent elevated experiences. Gradually this hub of

faith found expression in various forms as kerygma and didache. The launching of an aggressively evangelistic policy was probably the achievement of the hellenist group, who inaugurated a preaching mission within the hellenist synagogues and communities and exhibited a freedom towards the Law and christological developments which the more orthodox Jews counted religiously unacceptable (cf. Acts 6:13f.) and politically dangerous. The articulation of the message then relied primarily on the missionary sermon which, prima facie, appears to draw much from the synagogue homily as well as from the new Christian midrash, and to be related to prophecy only in the derivative sense of proclaiming that which was first revealed to prophets.

Yet the specifically prophetic tradition continued and flourished in the hellenistic as well as the Jewish setting. To this the book of Revelation itself bears abundant testimony. The prophet becomes the mouthpiece of God:

"'I am the Alpha and the Omega,' says the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty" (1:8).

The book abounds in didache, apocalyptic in tone and content but closely related to the contemporary situation.

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard behind me a loud voice like a trumpet saying, 'Write what you see in a book and send it to the seven churches ...'" (1:10f.).

And the churches are exhorted to "hear what the Spirit says to the churches". As a literary production, Revelation stands in the apocalyptic tradition of Daniel and Enoch, and characteristically of its kind, spoke a much needed message of hope and inspiration in times of

(1) The Jewish religio-political settlement with Rome and the status of Judaism as a religio licita could be placed in jeopardy: cf. Appendix B.
(2) Cf. Appendix A.
(3) R.H. Charles, Revelation, ICC, 1920, ad loc., questioned the authenticity of this verse but without textual warrant; his argument is to be rejected: cf. N. Turner, Revelation, in Peake, 1046.
stress and persecution. The predictive oracle, while frequently admonitory as in the seven letters, can also bring the word of assurance and release:

"These words are trustworthy and true. And the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets, has sent his angel to show his servants what must soon take place. And behold, I am coming soon" (22:6f.).

The book is an extravaganza of apocalyptic symbolism, largely influenced by Jewish models and abounding in Christian songs, doxologies, thanksgivings, laments, prayers and oracles; and it stands self-consciously within the prophetic tradition, with strong Johannine connections. Many features of the Fourth Gospel itself may be traced to Christian prophecy operating in a liturgical setting.

Thus C.F.D. Moule summarises the thesis of A.C. MacPherson:

"The presumption is that a leading member of the Ephesian Church, possessed of very vivid traditions about the words and deeds of Jesus - if not actually himself an acquaintance of the Lord - might weave into his extempore eucharistic 'propheteia' - his prayer and discourse - an extended meditation on the mission and work of Christ, in a form in which he as it were (though with complete reverence) impersonated Christ. Christ was the unseen Celebrant, and the disciple or elder, uttering the eucharistic prayers and praises and discourse, drew upon the very words which had come down in the living traditions as Christ's own words on the eve of His betrayal. The whole Gospel may have grown up round such worship".

To sum up, the creative contribution of propheteia to the articulation of the Christian faith in the early phases of the church's life appears to be considerable. In the intense devotion of the koinonia, the awareness of the Spirit permeated the recollection of Jesus' words and works to produce a prophetic immediacy of address, a kerygmatic liveliness, which is explicit in John and implicit in the

(1) Cf. 1:3; 19:10; 22:7, 9, 18.
(2) Cf. Charles, op. cit., p.xxii. It is not, of course, suggested here that there is identity of authorship.
Synoptics where the formal contours of the historical and environmental situation tend to retain a certain prominence. Prophecy therefore contributes to the definition of the kerygmatic core of the faith, which provides the central point of reference for Christian discourse and teaching.\(^{(1)}\) Its most distinctive form is the oracle, whether simple-predictive (cf. Acts 11:27f.) or dominical, as frequently in John and Revelation. Derivative from it is prophetic didache, which may use the imagery and mechanisms of apocalyptic to achieve its purposes (such as the elucidation of the concept of mission, or exhortation in face of persecution or the delay of the parousia); and it is always open to it to reinterpret dominical traditions relevant to the problem on hand. Similarly, prophetic didache may be ecclesiastically orientated, giving authoritative guidance to the church;\(^{(2)}\) and Paul on occasion combines the prophetic and apostolic roles for this end (cf. 1 Cor.14:37; Gal.1:9). The creative freedom of prophecy contributes directly to Christian praise and prayer, but this freedom is both fruitfully exploratory and dangerously open to new ideas not necessarily consistent with the kerygmatic centre of the faith. Thus inspired hymnody presents the resurrection of the Christian in a wholly realised fashion (cf. Eph. 2:5; 5:14; Col.2:12f.; cf. also 2 Tim.2:18) and receives correction in John through an underlining of kerygmatic address and in Paul by a re-presentation of apocalyptic teaching (cf. 1 Cor.15).\(^{(3)}\) Thus from the immediate post-Easter situation onwards, prophecy played an important role in the articulation and development of the faith, combining kerygmatic, eschatological and apocalyptic, experiential and

---

\(^{(1)}\) This will be elucidated in the succeeding chapters.


traditional elements in new and exciting, if sometimes dangerous, ways. E. Kasemann has described apocalyptic as the mother of Christian theology. (1) In terms of our analysis, the claim might be predicated of prophecy with a greater degree of justification.

A brief note may be added on the subsequent development of prophethism in the church. Among the Fathers, explicit references to charismata are to be found in Justin, Eusebius, Irenaeus and Origen. (2) The importance of the prophetic message is upheld in the Didache, although the regulations governing the itinerant prophet suggest a certain ambivalence towards the apparently large number of prophets then in prominence. (3) Authority is shared between the official local office-bearers and the charismatic visitors. (4) Clement of Rome seems to have exercised a prophetic type of ministry in which the eschatological element of judgment played a notable part. (5) Ignatius may be seen as a prophet-bishop: "the Spirit," he says, "is not misled ... When I was with you, I cried out, raising my voice—it was God's voice." (6) Prophetic overtones occur in a number of the Odes of Solomon; (7) and prominence is given to visionary experience in the Shepherd of Hermas, (8) who says he is commanded to proclaim his visions. (9) Celsus gives a graphic, if unsympathetic, picture of

(2) Justin, Dial. with Trypho 39:1-13; 82:1; 87-88; Eusebius H.E. 5, 3f.; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 2,49,3; 5,6,1; Origen, Contra Celsum, 1:2, 46; 2:8; 7:8. Cf. also Clement of Alexandria, Excerpta ex Theodote, 24:1.
(3) Cf. Did. 10:7; 11:7f. Doctrinal and moral tests are imposed (11:1f.; 6); and the length of stay is regulated (11:4f.).
(6) Philad. 7:1f., tr. C.C. Richardson. Cf. also Pol. 2:2.
glossolalia and subsequent interpretation, even if he was a witness not to prophecy at its greatest but to the

"small fry on the geographical and spiritual periphery of the church, men who were living on the remains of the prestige of characteristics which were dying out". (1)

Yet prophetism is discernible in Tertullian, Hippolytus and Novatian, and Cyprian had also prophetic leanings. (3) On the basis of sixteen oracles confidently held to be Montanist, (4) Montanist prophecy may be said to have involved a type of ecstasy in which the prophet, sometimes described as being asleep, can be compared to a passive instrument in God's hands.

Opposition to Montanism was perhaps an element in the decline of prophetism in orthodox circles, but other factors were more important. The early prophets had done their work well: definitive revelation was seen to lie in the past, in the apostolic age, as the emergence of the canon abundantly testifies. The ethos of the church was also changing, with the widening of church membership, the elaboration of ecclesiastical structures and the many-sided development of what is known today as institutionalisation. (5) Yet prophetism and pneumatic

phenomena are not unknown in the later history of the church and are attracting renewed attention today.


(2) Cf. L. Newbigin, The Household of God, 1953, pp.87-110; M. Harper, As At the Beginning, 1965; J.L. Sherrill, They Speak with Other Tongues, 1967; C.L. d'Spinay, Haven of the Masses, 1969 (a study of Pentecostalism in Chile); C.G. Strachan, Pentecostal Worship in the Church of Scotland, L.R., Nov. 1972, pp.16-27.
CHAPTER TWO:

PARACLESIS AND HOMILY
"After the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent to them, saying, 'Brethren, if you have any word of exhortation (λόγος παρακλητικός) for the people, say it'." (Acts 13:15).

"Bear with my word of exhortation (λόγον τῆς παρακλητικῆς) (Heb.13:22).

With paraclesis, "exhortation", and homilia, "familiar converse", we enter the world of popular preaching. The hinterland of paraclesis is permeated with religious meaning: "comfort", "consolation", "asking for help"; and as "exhortation" the word can denote both summons to decision and encouragement to persevere. The ethos of homilia, the term later applied to popular preaching, is one of intimacy and familiarity, of friendly converse and persuasive argumentation, with overtones of serious intent and instruction. The world of the first century was as open to moralistic discourse as the modern world is closed to it. The church began in a cultural environment in which preaching was a basic mode of communication.

Behind this cultural phenomenon stood centuries of development and preparation, the roots of which were embedded in the Greek situation bequeathed to posterity by Alexander. The soil was the international culture, based on Hellenism. Yet such hellenistic internationalism contained within itself immense tensions. It had killed the city state and the order of things which it symbolised; yet it was from the age of the city state that it drew its inspiration. Its focus was upon the past; its present was derivative, imitative. Hence the hellenistic age was wracked with problems: problems of identity, amid the depersonalisation of the huge unit; of freedom in a tyrannical state; of values, now that the meaningfulness of the

(2) This is not to ignore the distinctive contribution of the much older Hebrew tradition, which is fully discussed below.
city state democracy was gone; of religion, now that the gods of the
city state were dead; of security in a world shaken to its founda-
tions. Amid such confusion and fearfulness, the man who was listened
to was the one who entered into dialogue with his audience in familiar
terms and retained throughout his discourse a firm pragmatic concern
as he recommended to his hearers a particular life-style as an anti-
dote to the perplexities and confusion of their life situation.
Among the proliferation of philosophical tendencies which addressed
themselves to a greater or lesser extent to this situation were the
Cynics, who evolved the form of discourse known as the diatribe, which
was to be of great consequence for Christian homiletics.

1. Popular Preaching in the Graeco-Roman World.
   (a) The Cynic Diatribe.
   
   By the time of Horace, the diatribe had attained complete
cultural respectability and took its place beside other leading art
forms:

   carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis,
ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro. (1)

   Among the third century philosophical protagonists, Bion of
Borysthenes, (2) whose sermones are cited above as examples of a kind of
satire that was as coarse as it was witty, has particular importance
not simply as an expositor of the ἰωσ (Diogenes Laertius
puts him in the tradition of the Academy, although admitting Cynic
connections) but as the effective originator of the diatribe. Of
Bion's predecessors - however the precise philosophical succession is
interpreted - a brief mention is perhaps all that is required. The

(1) Horace Epp. 2, 59f.
(2) Cf. Diogenes Laertius IV, 46-57.
Cynic life-style generally had three characteristics: it was a mendicant and ascetic life; it evinced a defiant detachment from all forms of convention; and it employed a peculiarly enthusiastic mode of communication, το σκουδαίογέλοιον.

"The true Cynic felt that he had a mission to wander through the world as a 'doctor of souls' or 'inspector sent by the gods', putting false standards out of currency by his ferocious criticism, dispelling men's illusions, and teaching them the way of truth and virtue." (1)

To be sure, no two Cynic philosophers combined these elements in precisely the same way. There was the cheerful and attractive Crates (fl. 326 B.C.), one of the teachers of Zeno, the founder of Stoicism. Crates was distinguished for his social concern, going from house to house in Athens, reconciling men to their brothers and advising them in moral and social matters. Not for nothing was he called "Door-opener" (Θυρεστάοικτος ). Before him, Diogenes (404-323 B.C.) embodied the defiant detachment and asceticism of Cynicism to an extraordinary degree, and may well be reckoned the true founder of the movement. (2)

Diogenes Laertius, however, opts for Antisthenes (446-366 B.C.) as its founder: Antisthenes, he says, "learned his hardihood (τo καρτερίκον) from Socrates, and inaugurated the Cynic way of life". (3)

D.R. Dudley casts some doubt on the validity of the Alexandrian view of philosophical succession and is content to regard Antisthenes as the "precursor of Cynicism", leaving the glory of being the founder to Diogenes, (4) (an honour Diogenes would have spurned as "pride"). It must be admitted that in his asceticism, his concern to be free from "corroding" emotions, (5) his detachment from

(3) Diog. Laert. VI, 2.
(5) "As iron is eaten away by rust, so the envious are consumed by their own passion."
conventionality, Antisthenes is very close to the Cynics who came after him. Even more significant, however, is the fact that Socrates was the supreme philosopher who combined in one multi-disciplined system the multifarious aspects of truth, while his disciples, with the exception of Plato, were unable to grasp the whole and pursued fragmented segments of his teaching with unbalanced and blinkered zeal. At any rate, the Cynic characteristics of asceticism, defiant detachment, and concern to communicate truth are represented within the complexities and sophistication of Socrates' position, but he criticised Antisthenes for parodying his teaching, and Plato described Diogenes as "a Socrates gone mad". Xenophon, however, brought out an aspect of Socrates not usually regarded as typical. In the Memorabilia, Socrates illustrates the moral danger of selfish indifference by the apologue of the choice of Hercules, which included reference to the parable of the two paths in Hesiod. Here are several characteristics of the later Cynic diatribe: the moral anecdote, the appeal to the mythical heroes as exemplars, and the quotation of the ancient poets. More typically, Socrates' discourses were dialogues rather than monologues. In the leisureed circles of the aristocracy in which he moved, he did not hesitate to spend time in developing the conversation at leisure, guiding it finally to the discussion of moral issues. His audience must "follow the argument wherever it might lead, not caring how many digressions were made, provided that truth was attained in the end". In the hands of Plato, this produced the literary genre of the Socratic dialogue; other literary forms were the symposium and the epistle. The early Cynics discovered that traditional philosophical methods,

(2) μανόμενοι οὕτος Σωκράτης ἐστίν.
(3) Theoct. 172D.
appropriate in the leisured milieu of Athens, were ineffective with
the type of hellenistic audience with which they were usually con-
fronted. Both Diogenes and Crates attempted traditional methods, but
without success. Diogenes observed that "when he spoke seriously
about weighty subjects, noone stayed to listen, but when he began to
whistle a crowd soon assembled." (1) Here we discern what was to
become one of the most distinctive Cynic characteristics - the art of
communicating at a popular level. (2) In its hinterland, however,
stands the conviction that goes back to Socrates, viz., that virtue is
communicable.

But to return to Bion: (3) his claim to lasting recognition comes
as much from his style of communication as from the content of his
philosophy.

"The most obvious point about Bion's philosophy is that it treats
of ordinary human problems in a common-sense spirit, though for
emphasis employing all the devices of contemporary prose style. It
follows the spirit of the Socrates of Xenophon's Memorabilia, or of
Crates going from house to house to cure the dissensions that arise in
family life. The situations dealt with are those that may confront
any man, from the universalia of old age, poverty, exile, slavery, the
fear of death, down to the more particular case of a nagging wife.
The panacea is still αὐτορρίκεια - αὐτοθεία but with a difference; for
the blending of Hedonist and Cynic doctrines adopted by Bion had
evolved an αὐτορρίκεια quite different from the aggressive asceticism
of Diogenes, one best expressed by the famous simile of the Actor.
The actor's concern is to play adequately the part assigned to him by
the playwright; but while doing that he preserves the integrity of
his own personality." (4)

Diogenes Laertius, no admirer of Bion to whom he applies the term
"scum" ( λυμφός ), gives no record of Bion's lectures or publications.

(1) Diog. Laert. VI. 96.
(2) Cf. P. Wendland, Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur, 1912, p.75.
(3) The son of a fishmonger and a "hetaira", Bion was familiar with
vulgar talk from the beginning, but on being sold into slavery he
joined the household of a rhetorician and finally inherited his
master's property. Realising his assets, he set out for Athens,
went the round of the schools and then embarked on lecture tours
of Greece, including Rhodes and Pella.
(4) D.R. Dudley, op. cit., p.65f.
He mentions many "memoirs" of Bion and "sayings of useful application"; and reference is made by Philodemus to a diatribe on "anger". Yet from this scattered evidence it is possible to form a coherent picture of Bion in action. The diatribe as he developed it drew inspiration from the rhetorical schools of which he had direct experience, from philosophical predecessors such as Diogenes, and from his own experience and personality. The diatribe is "un dialogue monologue", a discourse on a moral subject, given by a preacher before an audience but retaining the mannerisms and devices of animated conversation.

Particularly appropriate rhetorical devices, therefore, include rhetorical questions, frequent interrogative formulae, short and incisive phrases, together with vivid, if commonplace, metaphors from everyday life, quotations, allegorical personification and stock figures.

Here is Bion in full flood:

"Therefore we should not try to alter circumstances but to adapt ourselves to them as they really are, just as sailors do. They don't try to change the winds or the sea but ensure that they are always ready to adapt themselves to conditions. In a flat calm they use the oars; with a following breeze they hoist full sail; in a head wind they shorten sail or heave to. Adapt yourselves to circumstances in the same way. Are you old? Do not long for youth. Again, are you weak? Do not hanker after the prerogatives of the strong ... Are you poor? Do not seek the ways of the wealthy ..."

One of Bion's favourite personifications is Poverty, who can address her reviler with full diatribal aplomb:

"What is your quarrel with me? Have I deprived you of any blessing? - such as prudence, or justice, or courage? Are you short of any of the necessities of life? Well, aren't the roads full of herbs and the springs of water? Do I not offer you a bed wherever there is soil, and bedding wherever there are leaves? Can you not be joyful in my company? Have you never heard an old woman singing to herself as she munches her barley-cake?"

Bion delights in the use of simile, especially from the animal world, and of metaphors, which he sometimes mixes to striking effect. The

(1) R. Leijs, op. cit., p.610.
(2) Cf. Wendland, op. cit., p.77f.
influence of the rhetorical school is clear, not only in the use of character sketches, χρείαι or scenes influenced by mime but also in the careful use of rhythm, the balance of syllables, parataxis, asyndeton and assonance.

One other aspect of Bion is of moment. He was the prototype of the wandering preacher, who was to become so important a few centuries later. He personifies the ideal of the κοσμοπολίτης who practised what he preached by travelling from city to city rather than adopting Athens as his fixed point. His own adaptability is illustrated by the fact that, unusually for an early Cynic, he became a court-philosopher and once more anticipated later developments within the Cynic movement.

Of the other prominent early Cynics, Menippus, Cercidas and Teles, it will be sufficient to comment briefly on the first. In Menippus the spirit of humorous mockery and ridicule prevail. His mordant wit is turned against the illusory grandeur of wealth or power (Philip of Macedon cobbles old shoes in a corner of the Underworld), the pedantry of learning ("Away with scientists, mathematicians and clerks"), the emptiness of beauty (famous beauties are indiscernible in Hades), the folly of the Stoics. For Menippus, the world ends not with an awful conflagration but - with a grin.

The Cynic diatribe was therefore both satirical and amusing, but possessed at the same time a deeper moral earnestness than is sometimes apparent at first glance. Its purpose has been summarised as "to put across ethical teaching in a popular way by sugaring the pill.

(1) Lucian describes him as κοσμοπολίτης και γελοτοποίων. Only a few fragments of his work survive, though according to Diogenes Laertius he wrote thirteen books. The best known was the Journey to the Underworld (Νεκυία).

with a strong element of parody". Its persistence for many centuries and its influence both on Roman literature and Christian preaching testify to its usefulness and effectiveness.

(b) Diatribe and Satire.

Any consideration of satire as a literary form may appear redundant at this point, since our concern is primarily with the spoken word rather than with literature as such. But Roman satire consciously reflects the hellenistic diatribe. Horace, for example, denies that he is a poet. He writes for friends, giving them moral advice as his father had done before him (Sat. I, 4). "His style is 'Sermoni propriorum". His "speaking the truth with a smile" (I, 24) reflects the comic earnestness, Το στόμα του αυτού, of the Cynic diatribe.

When Roman critics claimed the satire as wholly theirs, they had in mind the absence of any model in Athenian Satyric drama. The word satura seems to have meant originally "a dish of many ingredients, such as a hotch-potch or haggis or Irish stew"; hence "medley". Satira, however, is the Etruscan word for "speech"; hence Horace's use of the term "sermo". Originally applied to a primitive Italian dramatic form with no plot but much impromptu dialogue, "satire" was withdrawn from the stage when Livius Andronicus introduced the more sophisticated Greek play c.240B.C. and given a more purely literary expression. Ennius (239-169B.C.) introduced the elements of

(2) Higginbotham, op. cit., p.229.
(3) Quintilian XI, 93: satira quidem tota nostra est; Hor. Satires 1, 10, 66: Graecis intacti carminis. Quintilian's dictum has been much discussed. Certainly it is clear that Aristophanes exerted an influence on Roman satire, and possibly earlier Greek writers too: Higginbotham, op. cit., p.260.
(6) Livy, VII 2, 4-13.
popular philosophising or moralising, including the use of the fable, thus bringing satire close to the popular sermonising of the hellenic world. Lucilius (c.180-103 B.C.) added the element of invective: "Lucilius flayed the town," said Perseus.\(^1\) He used the dactylic hexameter, as Timon the Cynic had before him.\(^2\) With Varro (116-26 B.C.), we have the first fully explicit identification of Roman satire with a Cynic. His books (150 in all), called satirae Menippeae, after Menippus to whom reference has been made above, were satirae of the old kind, in prose and verse, affording graphic pictures of life at Rome, with a social, moral or philosophical slant and characterised by a highly personal note.\(^3\) Horace (65-8 B.C.) took over most of the features but used hexameters only, omitting the prose and the variety of meters used by earlier satirists. For the furious invective of Lucilius he substituted a milder form of ridicule, for reasons of politics and personal predilection.\(^4\) The first three of his satires in Book I follow the style of the diatribe. The first is directed against avarice, the second against lust, the third against uncharitableness. In the third satire, after criticising the singer Tigellius for his contrariness, Horace introduces the imaginary interrupter:

"Now someone may say to me: 'What about yourself? Have you no faults?' Yes, but different ones, and perhaps lesser ones" (3:19f.). Horace goes on to consider this habit of judging others harshly while being indulgent towards oneself:

"When Maenius was girding at the absent Novius, someone says: 'Here you! Do you not know yourself, or do you think you are deceiving us as if we didn't know you?' 'I beg pardon of myself,' Maenius says. This self-love is foolish and imprudent and worth

\(^1\) secuit Lucilius urbem: I. 114. Cf. Hor. Sat. I, 10, 3f.
\(^3\) Quintilian, X 1, 93.
\(^4\) Cf. Sat.I. 10, 14f.: fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res.
taking note of. While you look at your own faults through purblind
eyes, why is it that in the case of your friends' faults you see as
acutely as an eagle or a serpent from Epidaurus? But roles are soon
exchanged: they seek out your faults as you do theirs." (5:21-28).

Horace preaches the necessity to reverse this procedure, touching on
the theme of forgiveness and making some derisory remarks about Stoic
philosophy to boot. Here Horace is at least in part, a literary
version of the popular preacher, both in style and in substance. His
subjects range from moral discourses on discontent and envy (I, 1) to
satirical hints on legacy hunting (II, 5) and humorous skirmishing
with the Stoics (II, 3; II, 7). There is, it is true, a subtle
development in his approach in his second book. It has been
suggested that he follows the Xenophontic Socrates in his first book,
which is more typical of the diatribe, while in the second he is
nearer to the ἐνοψεῖα of the Platonic Socrates, (1) but diatribal
characteristics persist even in the second book.

After Horace, Persius (34-62 A.D.), possessed of a Stoic austerity,
reflected a moral seriousness in his verses and pilloried bombast,
hypocrisy, excess, pride of birth and similar anathemata. The dia¬
tribal personifications, Avarice and Luxury, occur in his fifth satire.
His third satire is a lively sermon, preaching the abiding value of
Stoic detachment. "He is important in the history of Satire in that
he was the first poet to harness the satirical Hexameter to Stoic
preaching." (2) Petronius (d.66 A.D.) concentrated upon a connected,
dramatic narrative, characterised by frequent addresses to the reader or an imaginary companion, frequent dialogue and an absence of plot. (1) Finally Juvenal (c.65-125 A.D.) turned satire in the direction of monologue and the vitriolic denunciation of every form of vice.

"The 'medley' is no longer a medley; for the invective, imparted into it almost accidentally by Lucilius, has overwhelmed the other ingredients and leavened the whole lump." (2)

Yet the saeva indignatio which he felt when he looked at society - difficile est saturam non scribere (Sat. I, 30) - commands attention. At first sight, it indicates the overwhelming compulsion felt by an Amos or a Paul, but closer examination disproves the possibility. Juvenal's targets are already dead; his invective is like that directed against Stalin in the post-Stalin era. The vices he attacks with most abandon are the gross and venial faults; breaches of convention seem to rank higher than crime. His patriotism is of the narrow, suspicious variety. His gifts are literary and rhetorical, not spiritual; the philosophies he detested would have made him a better man. Yet sometimes he can be capable of tender emotion and reflect the best elements of the philosophic diatribe: maxima debetur puero reverentia (xiv, 47). The fourteenth satire is, in fact, totally sermonic, being devoted partly to the consideration of parental example and partly to the denunciation of avarice.

(c) The Stoic-Cynic Diatribe of Imperial Times.

Like the Cynics, the Stoics claimed the life-style of Socrates as their basic model. Zeno (333-261 B.C.), the founder of the movement, was a disciple of Crates for some time, but he was also a pupil of Stilpo the Megaric and Polemo the Academic. Finally he lectured

(1) Cf. the Dinner of Trimalchio.
(2) Duff, op. cit., p.xxxii.
himself in the Stoa of Pisianax. Like the Cynics again, the Stoics inclined towards disengagement and asceticism—moderately in Zeno's case. Zeno gave his philosophy a particular nuance by developing the cosmic speculations of Diogenes into a consistent world view which, when fully elaborated by the contributions of Cleanthes (331-232 B.C.) and Chrysippus (262-206 B.C.), emerged as an elaborate tapestry in which logic, physics (2) and ethical theory were the predominant motifs. Among these, ethical theory occupied the focal position. (3)

The life-style that follows from this basic mythology has as its lynch-pin the conviction that man must conform to the laws of the universe ("nature") and to the rationality that is his own true nature. In a sense, he cannot do anything but assent to the laws of necessity, but he should do so voluntarily and rationally. Virtue is thus life according to reason. The wise man is the good man; the foolish man is evil; there is no intermediate position. With striking inconsistency, the Stoics modified the position they claimed as unalterable.

(1) Zeno was a native of Citium, a Phoenician colony in Crete, and was often called "the Phoenician": Diog. Leerdt. 2:114; 7:3 etc. It is sometimes claimed that his eastern connections encouraged not only his cosmopolitanism but also his intense moral earnestness (cf. J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 1913, p.273) and his popular preaching (cf. W.B. Sedgwick, The Origins of the Sermon, H.J., XLV, 1946, p.158), but this line of argument should not be pressed too far.

(2) I.e., metaphysics.

(3) Cf. Stace, op. cit., p.345. Their logic is the logic of sensationalism: knowledge enters the mind through the senses, real objects producing a particularly strong impression of reality. Their physics stem from the materialism or corporeality of the universe, even "God" and "the soul" being described in these terms. Fire is the basic material (pace Heracleitus), the primal fire pervading the entire world as the soul permeates the body. Since the divine fire is rational, the world is governed by reason and evinces the orderliness of design and the necessity of cause and effect; and the human soul too is rational. The cycle of the world's existence will terminate in a conflagration in which everything returns to the primal fire. Finally, the ethical system which is thus underpinned focuses upon the determinism that governs man and upon man's rationality. The cosmopolitanism which they championed was an important by-product of their view of man and the universe.
They admitted mild and rational emotions. Among the externals which they called "indifferent", some were to be preferred to others; and even the absolute distinction between good and evil was compromised by the admission that they themselves had not attained to the level of Socrates or Diogenes but were simply "proficient". Subsequent developments within Stoicism brought out a milder and more human emphasis, thus preparing the way not only for the eclecticism of a Cicero but also for a certain synthesis of philosophic thought (1) from which only the Epicureans and Sceptics were barred and which gained expression in the Neo-Platonic movement. (2)

The characteristic Stoic emphasis on life-style was well maintained by the four great Stoics of Imperial times: Seneca, Musonius Rufus, Epictetus (c.50-120 A.D.) and Marcus Aurelius (c.121-180 A.D.). Of these, we will select Seneca and Epictetus as examples and examine their work, briefly of necessity, from three angles: (i) style; (ii) themes; and (iii) form.

(1) Thus, the doctrine of the conflagration was dropped by Stoics like Diogenes of Babylon, Boethus of Sidon and Panaetius of Rhodes. The idea of divine providence, however, remained firm. Posidonius of Apamea (130-46 B.C.) did much to produce a Platonized Stoicism, involving the adoption of the tripartite psychology of Plato and a consequent adjustment of the uncompromising Stoic moral stance, whereby he held that emotions and passions should be kept under control, not eradicated. The cosmology of Posidonius saw man's position as intermediate between the higher and lower (divine and animal) worlds. Man's soul, the seat of rationality, is an emanation from the sun, which has passed through various degrees of divinity to the sublunary world in which man is placed and afterwards will ascend again to its own proper place in the aetherial regions. Here Stoicism approaches the Gnosticism which was to characterise man's self-understanding for centuries. A later idea was that of "astral immortality", in which some Pythagorean influence may be detected; and Platonic Ideas came to be identified with the wisdom of the divine fire Logos conceived in terms of Providence. Cf. Armstrong, op. cit., p.144.

(2) As the name suggests, Platonism was dominant in it; Stoicism and Aristotelianism were merely contributors.
(i) Seneca is the great exponent of the pointed style of the silver period of Latin literature -

"a kind of writing which, without sacrificing clearness or conciseness, regularly avoids, in thought or phrase or both, all that is obvious, direct and natural, seeking to be ingenious rather than true, neat rather than beautiful, exercising the wit but not rousing the emotions or appealing to the judgment of the reader". (1)

This terse, epigrammatic style is paralleled in Greek literature by the post-classical writers of the third and second century, B.C. (2) precisely at the time when the Cynic diatribe came into its own. Bion's style was distinctly pointed. He was said by Eratosthenes to have clothed philosophy "in the gay attire of a courtesan", (3) and the fragments of his work abound in epigram, antithesis and paradox. Witty sallies and all kinds of apophthegms were integral to this style, which proved congenial to many Romans. The chain that links Bion and Seneca includes Cato and Cicero, while the rhetorical schools cultivated the pointed style as a means of gaining attention and applause. Seneca, often availing himself of colloquial vocabulary, makes ready use of illustrations from medicine, war, athletics or gladiatorial combat and displays characteristic ingenuity in epigrams and rhetorical tropes and figures. (4)

(ii) The declamationes of the rhetorical schools specialised in the kind of commonplaces - loci philosophumeni - which had characterised the diatribes of the Cynics: the times are evil, poverty is preferable to wealth, peace to war, and so forth. The themes of Seneca's letters to Lucilius are comparable, but are pervaded with the intense moral concern that was typical of the Stoic philosopher:

---

(1) W.C. Summers, Select Letters of Seneca, 1910, p.XV.
(2) Such as Timaeus of Tauromenium.
(3) Strabo 1.2.2.
"Don't make a parade of your philosophy" (v); "The dangers of Evil Company" (vii); "Live as in the Sight of All" (xliii); "How to Treat Slaves" (xlvi); "How to bear the death of a friend" (lxiii); "Lessons from the Wrestling School" (lxxx). The concern of each letter is to explain and commend the life-style of the truly wise man.

(iii) The form of the letters reflects that of the spoken discourse. Thus, to take Ep. XXVIII as an example, the philosopher begins with a declaration of the theme: in this case Lucilius' discovery that travel does not ease his depression. That does not surprise Seneca: animum debes mutare, non caelum. The theme is illustrated by quotations from Vergil and Socrates, as the argument is advanced by a series of rhetorical questions. When one has learned to lay aside one's mental burden, he argues, then one finds any place congenial - within limits, of course (a typical, self-contradictory qualification). Then, characteristically, there follows a text - not always linked as closely with the context as in this letter, but providing a final note to linger in the mind. In this letter, it is supplied by Epicurus: initium est salutis notitia necati. And with some final observations on the necessity for searching self-appraisal, the letter ends. The unity of the discourse is safeguarded, while flexibility is allowed in the development of the argument.

Epictetus of Hierapolis, son of a slave woman and a slave himself for a time, was a pupil of Musonius Rufus before setting up as a teacher in Rome, moving finally to Nicopolis in Epirus when Domitian banished all philosophers from Italy in A.D.89. His discourses are preserved in the form of lecture notes by his pupil Arrian, who denies in his preface any attempt by himself to compose or reconstruct his master's speeches.

"Whatever I heard him say, I used to write down, word for word, as best I could, endeavouring to preserve it as a memorial, for my own
future use, of his way of thinking and the frankness of his speech..." Here then is an opportunity to get as close as one can to a first hand impression of a first century, philosophical preacher at work.

(1) Much attention has been paid by Bultmann to the style of Epictetus. Accordingly, a few brief comments will suffice at this juncture. His style is predominantly colloquial, avoiding the periods of highly stylised prose and using short sentences in the cut and thrust of debate, real or imaginary. This is the λέξις αναμύνη, the "paratactic diction", that characterises the diatribe. In full flow, the rhetorical questions are relentless. A statement of circumstances may be followed by an imperative (3:24, 25); or by a question (2:17, 18); an imperative may be followed by a statement or a question (2:17, 22). Question and answer are frequently used, and conditional clauses are a common device for advancing the argument. Repetition is another characteristic, effected sometimes by the use of οὕτε ... οὕτε:

"In a word, neither death nor exile nor pain nor anything else of such a kind is the cause of our doing something or not doing something, but rather our opinions (ὑπὸ ληφθείσα) and our wills (δυναμείς)" (1:11, 33).

A similar effect is obtained by repeating interrogative formulae, such as τί οὐν ἂν ... (1:18, 22). Rhetorical devices include parallel-ismus membrorum and antithesis. "Show me a man," asks Epictetus,

"who is in ill health and happy, in danger and happy, dying and happy, in exile and happy, in disgrace and happy."

"Show him," he goes on. "I want to see a Stoic." (2:19, 24). The

---

(1) Tr. W.A. Oldfellow, Loeb Classical Library.
(2) Cf. Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe, 1910.
(4) Other rhetorical devices include the use of apostrophe and personification, similes, metaphors and analogies. For a full discussion, cf. Bultmann, op. cit., pp.10-46.
flow of the diatribe is vigorous and arresting. The attention of the listener is not allowed to wander. He cannot easily disengage. The result is a discourse that is relentless but colourful, startling and lively.

(ii) The diatribes of Epictetus usually have an explicit theme, which is frequently philosophical: Providence (1:6; 1:16; 3:17); the nature of the Good (2:8); that Logic is necessary (1:17; 2:25). Sometimes they are concerned to dispute with other philosophical schools: Against the Academics (1:5); Against Epicurus (1:23); Against the Epicureans and Academics (2:20). But their overriding concern is with a life-style based on Stoic cosmological presuppositions. Thus, in 1:3, Epictetus starts with the datum that God is the father of all, and goes on to discuss the consequences of that view in pragmatic terms (cf. 1:9). Most discourses are concerned directly with this latter aspect: how a man can always maintain his proper character (1:2); how we should behave towards tyrants (1:19); how we should struggle with difficulties (1:24; 1:30); how we ought to bear sickness (3:10). Others deal with themes such as contentment (1:12), anger (1:28), courage tempered by caution (2:1), tranquillity of mind (2:2), anxiety (2:13); inconsistency (2:21); friendship (2:22).

(iii) The diatribe is flexible in form, but nevertheless a general pattern is discernible. Take 1:18 as an example - a discourse about not being angry at the errors other people make. Epictetus begins, not unusually, with a quotation from the philosophers, followed by a question to his audience. We may paraphrase thus:

"If what philosophers say is true, viz., that everyone possesses basic convictions on which he acts ..., why do you express anger against so many people when they are doing precisely that?"

This dilemma is expanded diatribally to give a microcosm of the whole
"Because they are thieves and robbers, you may say. What do you mean by thieves and robbers? They hold wrong convictions about good and evil. Why then be angry with them? Shouldn't we rather pity them? Show them their error. You will see them abandon their mistakes. If they don't recognise that they are wrong, then they have failed to improve upon their present standpoint."

Thus, having the right mental attitude is all important. The central part of the diatribe explores various aspects of the theme. First, there is, as so often, a negative argument directed against the proposition that thieves and robbers should incur capital punishment.

What is wrong with them is that their faculty of distinguishing good and evil is impaired - a condition arousing pity rather than hate.

Next, he raises the question why people do in fact show anger or hate towards them. Is it, he asks, because we value so highly the things of which these men rob us? So the philosopher advances the familiar theme of detachment - from clothes, wife, possessions.

"As long as you value these things, be angry with yourself rather than with the thief and the adulterer."

Spelling the matter out in detail, he shows that the thief's convictions are exactly the same as his audience's: the good life consists in possessing things. A personal anecdote adds immediacy and colour. Epictetus had an iron lamp which a thief stole - not surprisingly. A man only loses what he possesses. Finally, the philosopher points out that the one thing that no-one can take away - not even a tyrant - is the will. Self-knowledge is essential, as is discipline. "If you have a headache, don't say, 'Alas! I have a headache.' Don't say 'Alas!'" If you have this attitude to life, you are free, you are invincible. And so to the peroration, strikingly parallel in form to Romans 8:

"Who then is invincible? It is he who is disturbed by no extraneous thing (i.e., nothing independent of the will). Take an athlete. He has won the first contest. What about the second?"
What if there should be a heatwave? What if it should be at Olympia?...

What if you put a young girl in his path — what then? What about the temptations of darkness? What about the effects of fame or abuse? What about praise, or death? In all these things he is victorious..."

Bultmann concludes that the diatribe, generally speaking, has three parts: the positive exposition of the ideal, followed by the negative presentation of it or the chiding of the audience for not living up to it, and finally a concluding statement of the philosopher's meaning. (1) The above example illustrates this general form, within which considerable variation is possible. The concern for formal unity is illustrated by the fact that the opening statement can be reflected in the conclusion. Thus, the opening sentence of 2:1 — "the opinion of the philosophers perhaps seems to some to be a paradox" — is picked up at the end: "So this paradox will no longer appear either impossible or indeed a paradox at all" (2:1, 40). At other times, this device is used to round off a particular section of the discourse. (2) The introduction to the discourse can be effected in various ways. Some concrete circumstances may prompt it. "I am sick here," said one of his pupils, "and I want to return home." (3:5) This is the prelude to a diatribe on having a right attitude of mind, concluding: "If you possessed it, you would be content in sickness, and in hunger, and in death..." A foppish rhetorician comes to see Epictetus (3:1), and earns a diatribe on finery in dress. Normally, the discourse either begins with a philosophical statement or speedily leads up to it, thus setting out the theme of the whole speech. Frequently, as in the example outlined more fully above, the statement is introduced as a condition, followed by a question, addressed to the hearers, which opens up the issue. The central part of the discourse,

(2) As in 2:18, 1 and 2:18, 7. Cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.46f.
picking up the introduction, is capable of flexible development, moving hither and thither around a central point of the Stoic ethic, and employing traditional philosophical terms and stock homiletic metaphors, comparisons and illustrations. The negative arguments and the logomachy present opportunities of attacking attitudes or stand-points of which the philosopher disapproves, and consequently throwing into relief the appropriate point of Stoic ethic. Dialogue, mock dialogue, irony and direct imperatives are frequently employed at this point, but the philosopher can also adopt a warm, fatherly tone of encouragement. The conclusion is often marked by antithesis, or straight advice given by imperatives; at other times, by a witticism or pun, or by blunt home truths.

2. Popular Preaching in the Jewish Tradition.

(a) The rabbinic tradition.

That the church of the earliest times was predominantly Jewish is beyond question. There were, of course, various divisions within the Jewish community, as, for example, between Judaean and Galilean, and Palestinian and Diaspora Jews. Of the Jews who entered the church, those of the Diaspora would naturally have the more direct contact with stoic-cynic homiletics, even if few of them, perhaps, read Horace. Yet the diatribe was "in the air". Even Jerusalem was a largely hellenised city,(1) and the rhetorical and homiletic devices of the Greek preachers were by no means strange to Jewish ears. This was largely because the Jews also had a homiletic tradition which for several centuries had performed its function within Judaism all the more successfully by adapting hellenistic rhetoric to its own purposes.

(1) J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, 1969, p.64.
The centre of the Jewish homiletic tradition was the synagogue. The post-exilic institution of the synagogue brought to the fore the educational motif central in Judaism. In Jewish thinking, the synagogue derived its inspiration from Moses who was concerned that all Jews should, in Josephus' words, "obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge" of the Law.\(^{(1)}\) To achieve this end, the synagogue service included not only the focal reading of the Law and prophets but also a sermon "devoted to instruction as much as to edification".\(^{(2)}\)

Evidence for this view is amply provided by Philo, the earliest authority for the synagogue service:

"Indeed they are forever assembling together and deliberating with each other; the majority preserving silence, except for the custom by which the readers address them. One of the priests, if present, or one of the elders reads the sacred laws to them and explains them one by one until late in the evening."  \(^{(3)}\)

Undoubtedly, Philo gives a highly hellenised view of the synagogues of the Diaspora, yet the basic structure is clear enough. The sermon combined instruction in the knowledge of the Law and rabbinic tradition with moralistic applications and anecdotes. Rabbi Meir, it is said, "devoted one third of his sermon to law, one third to Haggadah, and one third to parables".\(^{(4)}\) Little wonder that Philo remarks on the length of the synagogue service. It is possible, however, that he exaggerates the passivity of the congregation. As the institution developed, popular participation increased. The prayers were recited vocally, not unlike the manner in which children recited their lessons;

\(^{(1)}\) Contra Ap. II, 17, 175. He actually says that Moses introduced weekly readings of the Law; so also Philo, Vita Mos. III, 27.


\(^{(3)}\) Pragm. apud Euseb. Praep. evang. viii 7, 12f.; cf. also De Septemario, 6; Quod omnis probus liber, 12.

\(^{(4)}\) Quoted in Baron, ibid. This might be taken as typical of the Palestinian but not the Babylonian tradition. In Babylon, the Halachah predominated.
and at least to some extent this participation affected the sermon.

Thus Baron writes:

"Even the sermon was not an altogether solo performance by the preacher. It usually started with questions from the public and probably led to extensive discussions thereafter. The unfortunate experience of R. Levi ben Sissai in Simonias may serve as an illustration. Employed in a variety of communal functions, the rabbi was to deliver his first discourse at the synagogue. But he was so overwhelmed by the magnificent pulpit erected for him that he found no words to answer homiletical and two legal questions hurled at him from the audience." (1)

The synagogue sermon, therefore, bears the mark of being the "dialogue monologue", even if it was not always completely "monologue". It differed from the Greek discourse, however, in that it was primarily exegetical, although a great deal of preaching licence was normally used and expected.

It would be rash to assume with Friedländer, that the synagogue was itself the product of hellenistic Judaism; (2) equally rash to accept literally the ascription of it by Philo and Josephus to Moses. There appears to be a reference to it in Ps.74:8, which may come from the sixth century B.C. (3) The Greek term συναγωγή corresponds to the Aramaic kenishta and the Hebrew keneset. C.C. Torrey claimed to have deciphered the words bet kenishe and Yerushalem in a sixth century ostrakon from Elath, suggesting a synagogue in that area at an early period. (4) A pre-exilic precursor of the synagogue may have been the bet 'am, house of the people, in Jer.39:8. At all events it is reasonable to assume that the synagogue as we know it emerged from the informal assemblies of the exile, in which prophetic and priestly influence was strong and an impetus given to renewed study of the Torah. Possibly the institution itself was formalised during the

(1) Baron, op. cit., p.281f.
(2) Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfängen, 1908, pp.53ff.
(3) But both the reference to "synagogues" as such and the date of the psalm are disputed.
(4) A Synagogue at Elath? BASOR 84, p.4f.
Persian period, the natural outcome of the stress laid upon the Law by Ezra and Nehemiah. This is to assume a historical residuum in the tradition of Nehemiah 8, while allowing that it may well have been revised in the light of synagogue practices. The original exposition of the Law in the Jewish tradition comes therefore from the prophetic and priestly traditions. The scribes, however, by an almost inevitable process of evolution, assumed ascendancy over the synagogue tradition at the time when Judaism was entering the period of hellenisation.

In no sphere was hellenistic influence more apparent and more widespread than in education. Hellenistic schools flourished in the Gentile cities in Palestine itself, obviously attracting the children of certain Jewish families since the rabbis hasten to decree that "one is not to hand over to the idolaters a child for the purpose of teaching him letters or a trade". At certain times of tension, the teaching of Greek was totally forbidden. At best, many rabbis considered Greek a useless acquisition, although in government circles more open to foreign influence Greek philosophy was frequently taught, a procedure which did not escape strong criticism: "Cursed be the man who has his son taught Greek philosophy".

(3) By virtue of the fact that the descendants of Aaron must teach the Law (Lev.10:11), and the prophets must declare the word. The more worldly scribal teacher was not originally an expounder of scripture.
(4) Aboda Zara 15b.
(5) Sotah 9:14. Perhaps in this injunction "Quietus" should be read instead of "Titus". In that case, the date would be 117B.C. Cf. Rab. Anth. 681.
(6) Cf. Cohen, Everyone's Talmud, p.188f.
(7) Baba Kamma 82b.
extreme statements, usually directly influenced by the Jewish political situation of the period, must not be taken as the general rule. An official Greek translation of the Scriptures was allowed, although Aramaic and Syriac translations were not permitted in Palestine by R. Judah. \(^{(1)}\) Greek was regarded as an accomplishment for a girl. As the number of Jewish schools increased, their educational organisation corresponded to the Athenian model, although they could never become wholly Greek in nature since they drew from the Hebrew tradition through the synagogue to which they were attached. The content of the instruction was fundamentally Jewish. \(^{(2)}\) Nevertheless, hellenistic influence was strong and insidious, even at the tertiary level of education. Apart from the more obvious linguistic borrowings, the method of disputation developed to such a fine art by the scribes betrays hellenistic influence in a striking way. Thus when we hear of a celebrated rabbi who possessed such skill in arguing both sides of a case that he could prove "the unclean to be clean" or vice versa, \(^{(3)}\) we recognise the authentic accents of the hellenistic rhetorical schools and begin to see that rabbinic disputation with its finely argued casuistry, so different from the methods of the earlier wisdom teachers, drew at least part of its inspiration from the colonnades of Athens. \(^{(4)}\) The synagogue sermon, therefore, may be expected to reflect the dual nature of the synagogue itself from hellenistic times onwards. Its basis is, indeed, truly Jewish - the Law of Moses in

---

\(^{(3)}\) Morris, op. cit., p.74.
\(^{(4)}\) The wisdom tradition in Israel, heavily indebted as it was to Egyptian and Assyrian scribalism, represented an ancient didactic tradition. But post-exilic scribalism differed in several ways from its earlier representatives; first, it was Judaized (illustrated by a comparison of Ben Sirach with the writer of the central section of Proverbs), and second, it was hellenised (hence disputation tends to replace proverb).
its widest sense. Its pedigree reaches back beyond the period of Greek domination. The homiletic method, however, had become strongly influenced by Greek rhetoric, making the sermon at least approximate to Greek discourses, and as Philo shows, even its basic concepts were readily translatable into the familiar virtues of the Greek world. (1)

The proof text for midrashic (2) exposition has traditionally been supplied by the reading and interpreting of the Law by Ezra and his fellow scribes (Neh.8:8). Interpretation had always been an important task in Israel, (3) but after the codification of the Torah the interpretation could no longer be built into a later recension of the written Law. The scribe, the learned doctor of the Law, had the professional duty of ensuring that by interpretation the gap between the past and present, between the Torah that was fundamental to the Jewish way of life and the conditions in which that life had to be led, was firmly bridged.

"Has not after all 'every word of the Scripture seventy aspects'? These aspects were latent; and as generation after generation found expression for some or other of these aspects, they revealed again and anew the Torah which Moses received on Sinai." (4)

These words of Epstein give a fair general picture of the function of the homiletic tradition in Israel, which eventually bifurcated into Halachah and Haggadah. (5) The difficulty is to recover from the collected midrashim evidence of the form of the spoken discourses in which they were originally embedded, and that at a sufficiently early date to be relevant to the study of early Christian preaching and teaching.

(1) Cf. De Septemarie, 6.
(2) From "darash" - to search, probe, enquire.
(5) From "holach" - to walk, and "nagged" - to tell, narrate.
A starting-point may be found in the familiar Passover Haggadah.

L. Finkelstein has argued persuasively that this contains the oldest haggadic midrash available to us, reaching back to the third century B.C. At any rate, it is clearly early and appears to ante-date the Pharisaic position. On close examination, it reveals a framework that is lucid and systematic:

I: Introduction, denouncing Laban the Aramaean for seeking to destroy Jacob.
II: Protest against emigration from Palestine.
III: Exhortation to the Egyptian Jews to retain their ancestral customs.
IV: Reflections on the rapid increase of the Israelites in ancient Egypt.
V: Citations of parallels to Deut.26:6-7, from the relevant verses of the Exodus.
VI: Denunciation of the Egyptian bondage.
VII: Enunciation of four propagandist views, of which two concern theology and two politics.

The framework is dictated by the passages from the Pentateuch which serve as the basic texts. The midrash itself, however, is governed by the contemporary situation. The teacher not only reflects hostility to Syria and possibly a desire to placate Egypt but is also intensely concerned about contemporary Jewish emigration to Egypt and the spiritual welfare of Jewish communities there, as well as theological and political matters. Accordingly, Finkelstein describes it as "essentially a propagandist tract, endeavouring to impress the views of its compiler on the many pilgrims who came to Jerusalem for the Passover".

But in view of the importance of the spoken word in Judaism the "propagandist tract" is more likely to have originated as a sermon delivered by some authoritative representative of the priestly and

(3) As in Finkelstein, op. cit., p.298.
and patrician group at one of the main festivals to which pilgrims
came in large numbers and possibly in the precincts of the temple
itself. At any rate, it gives a fascinating indication of the likely
procedures of an early Judaistic homily. It is built on the skeleton
of cited texts, which are developed with reference to the contemporary
situation and the particular viewpoint which the author wished to
impose.

K. Smith carried out some investigations into the form of rabbi-
nic homilies in the halachic tradition. (1) His difficulty was to
find in the Tannaitic literature sufficiently full examples, for often
the homilies are represented by the merest summaries. He does
produce several examples which may be said to give at least a clue to
their structure. The first passage (Taanit 2:1) is admittedly
extremely brief. Following an introduction to the sermon on the
theme of repentance, the main section, beginning with the address "our
brethren", concentrates on discussing by means of proof texts the
scriptural teaching on repentance. A further example (Taanit T.1:8),
similarly introduced on the theme of repentance, is found to contain
an introduction of its own:

"My sons, let not a man be ashamed of his companion, and let not a
man be ashamed of what he has done." (3)

This introduction is antithetical to the main section, which develops
the thought that to be thus ashamed is better than to suffer a fate
such as famine, a fast that the Lord has not seen. That thought in
turn is developed antithetically - on the acceptable fast. In

(1) Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels, 1951, pp.78-114.
(2) I omit his second example, Sotah 6:1, since it is based directly
on the O.T. and cannot with certainty be taken as typical of a
Tannaitic homily (op. cit., p.102).
addition to the scriptural citations, the device of illustration is used.

Smith's other examples appear to be fragments of larger sermons, but they may be taken to provide a certain corroboration of his general conclusions. In its full form, the rabbinic homily may be assumed to have had an introduction which either contained a statement of fundamental principles or a statement which stood antithetically to the main section. This main section is not so concerned to bring out a new truth as to present a relevant list of points or a telling illustration of the theme. The argument is exegetical in rabbinic fashion and frequently assumes list structure. The conclusion, it is deduced, usually had the purpose of warning, exhorting or recapitulating, sometimes repeating a proof text from the introduction or earlier part of the homily.\(^1\)

A similar kind of pattern can be discerned in haggadic midrashim. The subject of haggadic homilies was derived from the scriptural sections read on the sabbath or at festivals.

"These homilies consist usually of introductions (proems) followed by an exposition of the opening verses and verse-texts of the scriptural lesson, and ending with 'a Messianic or other confronting verse'. They are thus mainly homiletical in character with an admixture of exegesis." \(^2\)

One such homily from the Pesikta on Is.61:10 is cited by F. Delitzsch and by Oesterley and Box as a fair illustration of the first century synagogal homily.\(^3\) The structure of the main section again follows the list principle. The "garments of salvation" in the Isaianic text

\(^3\) Cf. Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p.87. They quote F. Delitzsch, A Day in Capernaum, p.155f.
are interpreted as the "seven garments of the Holy One", and each of the seven garments is identified in turn by means of an interpreted text of scripture. The last one is the Messiah's garment (Is.61:10), the most glorious of all. The homily reaches its climax in the messianic benedictions, the eschatological song of Israel. (1)

The literary products of ancient Judaism also provide evidence of the influence of the synagogue homily. (2) The testamentary speech of Mattathias in 1 Maccabees 2:49-59 makes striking use of the list principle, citing models from Abraham to Daniel. III Maccabees 2:2-20 illustrates homiletic material within a prayer structure that includes a recital of God's works of righteousness and judgment (giants, Sodom, Pharaoh, the establishment of Jerusalem and the temple ...). The prayer of Eleazar (6:215) has a recital that includes Pharaoh, Sennacherib, "the three friends in Babylonia", Daniel and Jonah, and sets them in relation to the present day. IV Maccabees has been described as being "of the nature of a sermon, whether actually delivered in a synagogue or not" and as being "thoroughly homogeneous" as a moral discourse. (3) There is initially a theme statement (1:1-4), on the supremacy of reason. The sermon develops by means of a series of examples, the focus being upon the constancy of the nine martyrs under torture.

H. Thyen finds that such synagogue sermons were closely related

(1) Problems of dating and of finding evidence of homilies in the edited midrashim prevent us from regarding this material as anything more than a general pointer to the type of homiletics customary in orthodox rabbinic circles.


(3) R.B. Townshend, IV Maccabees, in R.H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament II, 1913, p.654. J. Freudental took this book as a specimen of synagogue preaching, and while this remains hypothetical the grounds on which it has been attacked - e.g., the lack of a biblical text - are patently inadequate in view of the state of the evidence about such matters.
stylistically to the cynic-stoic diatribe but may nevertheless be distinguished from the latter in several respects. (1) Their style is heavier, lacking the vivacity of the Greek preachers. Genuine dialogue tends not to occur; and in keeping with the more solemn tone the witticisms and humour of the exponents of the diatribe are also lacking. Yet almost all the devices of the diatribe recur in Jewish preaching, and it must be remembered that the diatribe itself underwent changes not unlike those which are found in the Jewish form.

(b) The Qumran community.

The homiletic tradition of Qumran was closely associated with the midrashic and hermeneutical procedures which characterised the outlook of the sect itself. One particularly prominent feature in commentaries such as those on Habakkuk, Micah and the Psalms, was the explanation of the text in terms of the history of the sect. Thus the text may be related to the appearances and mission of the teacher of righteousness; or it may be applied to a different group in contemporary, national history, such as the wicked priest and his followers, or the Kittim. An interest in eschatology permeates almost all the writings: "the whole past and present experience of the sect is conceived as eschatological". (2) Normally, the commentator proceeds by means of verse by verse exegesis, although other techniques are possible, such as in the Midrash on the Last Days, where various texts are brought together and interpreted to present a coherent message. The homiletic and hermeneutic freedom allowed to

---

(3) O.T. quotations appear to fall into four broad categories in Qumran usage: (i) the literal or historical; (ii) the modernized, with reference to sect history; (iii) the accommodated, or deliberately adapted; and (iv) the eschatological; cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, The Use of Explicit O.T. Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the N.T., N.T.S. 7, 1960-1, pp.305ff.
to the exegetes is well illustrated by the *Words of Moses*, an address in testamentary form in which the speaker departs from the biblical text and presents his message in imaginative but biblical terms. Even greater freedom is in evidence in the paraphrastic *Genesis Apocryphon*, which fills out the biblical narrative while smoothing out difficulties in the text.

Two examples of homilies may be taken to indicate general homiletic procedure. In the so-called *Damascus Rule*, a prominent place is given to an exhortation or sermon in which the preacher, probably "a Guardian of the Community",(1) encourages his flock to remain faithful and develops the theme that faithfulness is rewarded and disobedience punished. It begins:

Now listen, all right-minded men, and take note how God acts: He has a feud with all flesh and exacts satisfaction from all who spurn Him. Whenever Israel broke faith and renounced Him, He hid His face both from it and from His sanctuary and consigned them to the sword. But whenever He called to mind the covenant which He had made with their forebears, He spared them a remnant and did not consign them to utter extinction." (2)

In what is in fact an elaborate, proclamatory introduction, the theme of the discourse is clearly stated, with its inherent antithesis between the stubbornness of the wicked, who incur God's wrath, and the faithfulness of the remnant, whom God spares. The sermon, developing by self-conscious steps,(3) is structured antithetically and makes use of the list principle for biblical illustration. These two motifs are used in conjunction. Thus, the "heavenly watchers" (rebel angels), their sons ("giants"), the generation of the flood, the sons of Noah - all these went astray and incurred God's anger. By contrast, "Abraham did not walk in this way" and was accounted the

---

(1) Verme, *op. cit.*, p.95.
(3) Cf. 1:1; 2:2, 14, with the recurring "Now listen ..."
friend of God, a status also conferred on Isaac and Jacob, partners in God's covenant. By contrast again, the sons of Jacob strayed and were punished ...; and this leads to a recalling of the sins of Israel in Egypt, for which they were inevitably punished. Yet there was always a faithful remnant, with whom God made good His covenant (cf. 3:12ff.). And so the preacher proceeds, with specific reinforcement of the obligations of the covenant in later sections (cf. 6:11ff.). The conclusion of the sermon is strongly eschatological (cf. 7:9ff.) and is built around the familiar antitheses:

"All that reject these things shall be doomed to extinction when God visits the world to requite the wicked ..." (7:9).

"Howbeit, all that hold fast to these enactments, going and coming in accordance with the Law; that hearken to the voice of the Teacher ... all of these shall rejoice and their hearts shall be strong, and they shall prevail over all that dwell in the world. And God will accept their atonement, and because they took refuge in His holy name they shall indeed see salvation at His hand." (1)

The sermon is undergirded throughout by midrashic interpretation, some of it very far fetched to the modern mind, involving alterations and omissions in the text and the application of highly symbolic or allegorical interpretations. (2)

The Community Rule or Manual of Discipline contains a homiletic outline on the theme of the spirits of truth and falsehood in man, and this has been inserted by the compiler as "a model sermon" (Vermes) in a part of the work that seems to have been originally the "prompt book" for a sermon (Gaster). As the theme indicates, the sermon structure is characterised by antithesis, with strong eschatological overtones. Notable use is made of cataloguing as a paraenetic method. Ultimately, an end is ordained for falsehood and truth shall prevail. Renewal and judgment are central to the eschatology.

(1) B. 20:27-34, tr. Gaster.
(2) Cf. Vermes' discussion of the use of Amos 5:26ff.: op. cit., p.96; Gaster, p.110.
(3) Vermes, op. cit., p.71; Gaster, op. cit., p.43.
(c) Philo of Alexandria.

Philo has been called "the founder of the art of preaching as we know it" and "perhaps the greatest philosophic preacher that has ever lived". Both judgments are sweeping. What cannot be doubted is the importance of Philo for the study of the homily in Hellenistic Judaism.

The evident background of Philo's writings is the synagogue homily. Philo himself refers in several places to the sermon or homily given for instructional purposes in the synagogues on the sabbath. Either Philo was himself a prominent synagogue preacher who subsequently gave literary expression to the spoken discourses, or he adopted the model of such homilies for much of his written work. His writings, therefore, echo the diatribal technique and topics while retaining the midrashic character of Jewish exposition. They also strongly reflect the influence of the synagogue lectionary, in which the Torah or Pentateuch was read cyclically. Philo's exegesis is directed to those books only, and they give him the texts - one might cynically say the "pretexts" - for his philosophical ramblings. A characteristic device is to express his philosophic concepts in language and imagery derived from scripture. His philosophy itself is drawn from many schools and, because of his exegetical procedure, it is never developed systematically - which leads H.A. Wolfson to the conclusion that "Philo was a preacher with a flair for philosophy rather than primarily a philosopher".

Careful analysis of Philo's discourses suggests that they fall

(3) Wolfson, op. cit., p.96.
into various categories. We may put aside as not germane to the purpose of our study one group which comprises apologies: the Hypothetica, Adversus Flaccum and Legatio. The others, all bearing the stamp of the homily, can arguably be separated into two groups: one intended for Jewish audiences and one intended for the Gentile proselytes or "God-fearers" who were associated with synagogue communities. (1) The latter type is illustrated by the De Vita Mosis and the Exposition, if the persuasive arguments of E.R. Goodenough are to be accepted. (2) His discourses to the Jews consist of at least two types. The more technical works, such as the Allegory and the Quaestiones, seem designed for the more advanced thinkers in the Jewish communities, while the discourse which has been plausibly identified as De Benedictionibus et De Exsecrationibus (3) represents a much more popular presentation of a "simple Judaism" to a less sophisticated audience. (4)

---

(1) Philo implies no distinction between "proselytes" and "God-fearers", for he does not make an issue of circumcision; cf. Quaestiones in Ex. II, 2.


(3) This alleged discourse is to be found at the end of most editions of De Praemiis et Poenis (XIV, 79). At this point there is a lacuna in the text, and Cohn inserted the title λπίχριαλαγόντως καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῶν ἑαυτῶν, relying on a reference in St. John Damascene who, however, has λπίχριαλαγόντως ... Here there is a change of tone (as Goodenough pointed out), which is maintained in the following part λπίχριαλαγόντως καὶ ἑαυτῶν, XXI, 127). F.H. Colson, however, rejects Goodenough's suggestion that a separate discourse has replaced the original ending of De Praemiis et Poenis, the change of tone being attributable to the parts of the Torah which Philo was expounding (Loeb series on Philo, VIII, 1939, p.xixf.). I find Colson's argument unconvincing, especially in view of the lacuna which indicates manuscript disturbance. He may be right, however, in suggesting that Goodenough overstated the distinction between the Jewish and Gentile audiences. Philo, Colson argues, "writes primarily for Gentiles but also for Jews, and has at one moment the first, at another the second class of readers in view ..." But it seems to me reasonable to conclude that in the discourse that may be called "On Blessings and Curses" Philo had mainly a humble Jewish audience in mind.

(4) Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 1940, p.54f.
This last mentioned homily provides a useful starting-point for an impression of Philo's preaching. It has been described as "a thorough Deuteronomic address" (1), although it draws considerably upon Leviticus 26 also. The theme of the first part is that careful observance of the Law will be rewarded with many blessings. Scriptural quotations abound, introduced in the Greek rhetorical manner. The sermon frequently proceeds as a straight homiletic discourse, but here and there vividness is added by the use of rhetorical questions, hypothetical dialogue and imaginary interruptions. Briefly, the blessings promised are victory over enemies, successes in war, the achievement of peace with all its blessings, the honours that accrue to the successful and, on a slightly lower plane, good bodily health (XX, 118). In the second part, the curses which fall on the unfaithful are vividly portrayed: famine, with all its attendant horrors and miseries; enslavement, total failure in all undertakings, disease, and many kinds of terror. By contrast, the proselyte will be exalted, for he came over to God's side and won the highest of all prizes. But after a time, God will renew the nation:

"For just as when the stalks of plants are cut away, if the roots are left undestroyed new growths shoot up which surpass the old, so too if in the soul a tiny seed be left of the qualities which promote virtue, though other things have been stripped away, still from that little seed spring forth the fairest and most precious things in human life, by which states are constituted manned by good citizens, and nations grow into a great population". (2)

Here we have possibly Philo's nearest approach to a homily for unsophisticated people. The general outline of the talk is simple - almost childishly so. The language is characterised by a vivid realism - the blessings are very solid blessings, the curses very horrifying: a procedure designed for maximum impact on an impressionable audience. Where the linguistic model is complicated (Philo does

(1) Ibid., p.54.
(2) XXIX, 172; Loeb translation.
not use the easiest of Greek) the context usually carries the attention of the hearer to the next part. The rhetorical devices would be familiar: the rabbinic casuistry, the allegorical interpretations, the extended similes; and the sense of urgency is increased both by his zeal in expounding scripture and by his tone of moral earnestness.

A second discourse of Philo which may be considered briefly here is the De Decalogo. It falls naturally into three main sections, of which the first deals with the theophany at Sinai (1–49), the second with the exposition of the ten commandments (51–153), and the third with the particular laws that can be placed under each commandment (154–175). There follows an epilogue, which dismisses the absence in the decalogue of specific punishments for the breaking of the commandments: the punishment of transgressors is left to God's subordinates. Once again, even in a more sophisticated discourse, the general structure is simple.

Philo tended to build up his discourses in carefully conceived sections, frequently rounded off by a summary phrase: "These are the reasons suggested to answer the question under discussion ..." (De Dec. V); "Such was the reason ..." (X, cf. XII); "Enough on this subject" (XXVII). Moreover, he is sensitive to the problems of communication, building into his discourse a considerable degree of repetition and underlining points that he particularly wished his hearers to remember (cf. XXIX, 154–XXXIII, 178). A favourite structural device is the listing of points: four possible reasons for the giving of the Law in the wilderness rather than the city; three reasons for God's giving of the Law to each individually - "you (sing.) shall not ..."; three examples of the gravity of bearing false witness. His graphic attack on city life, which is the outcome of his reflection on the desert setting of Sinai, indicates his
ability to make pungent comment in a homiletic context.

Philo's discourses differ from the diatribe of the Cynics and Stoics in their exegetical emphasis. They are also much more philosophical than the Cynic diatribe, and their fundamental impetus and goal differ from the Stoic. Their correspondence to the diatribe is strongest in the moralistic passages and the homiletic common-places, but a closer examination shows that the similarity is merely external and superficial. (1) For Philo, the ultimate judge of truth and falsehood is God:

"These are the reasons suggested to answer the question under discussion: they are but probable surmises; the true reasons are known to God alone" (De Dec. V).

Elsewhere, Philo echoes the moral philosophy of the Alexandrian teacher Antiochus, but with sufficient detachment to indicate division

(1) Philo followed the accepted cultural pattern of the Graeco-Roman world in associating his rhetoric with his philosophy, the form with the substance (cf. A. Michel, Quelques Aspects de la Rhétorique chez Philon, in Philon D'Alexandrie, 1967, p.89f.). In his De Congressa Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia, (cf. M. Alexandre, La Culture Profane chez Philon, in ibid., pp.105-129) he lists rhetoric with the other "propaedeutic" arts: grammar, dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy - all of them servants of philosophy, the "queen of the sciences". (Cf. Cicero, De Orat. I:9-11; III, 56, 127; De Finibus, I, 26, 72; III, 3-5. Seneca, Ad Lucil. 86.) In the hellenistic world, these seven subjects formed the εγκώλιος παίδεια, the total educational system consisting of the εγκώλια μαθήματα. These formed the trivium and quadrivium of the Middle Ages. A Michel (op. cit., pp.61-101) has shown the remarkable degree of common ground shared by Philo and Cicero. The lively philosophical school at Alexandria embraced both Academics and Peripatetics. (Cf. Cicero, De Orat. III, 106ff.; De Finibus V, 7ff.) In Philo's youth, the Academy was divided by a grave dispute between two leading figures, Philo of Larissa and Antiochus of Ascalon. Philo of Alexandria may well have been taught by a pupil of Antiochus, to whom Cicero was also much indebted. Antiochus rejected the position that the philosopher could have no absolute criterion of truth and falsehood, and in moral philosophy held that the supreme good was a combination of three types of "goods", viz., that of the soul, of the body and of external things (e.g., glory and riches).
of opinion, and like Cicero, he eventually deserted the position of Antiochus for the kind of eclecticism that was to characterise Neo-Platonism. But both of them were conscious of the whole tradition of philosophic rhetoric which stemmed from Gorgias in the fourth century and which taught them how to generalise their thinking and express it in universal conceptual language based on reason. Thus Philo, approaching the exposition of the Law by means of a "cosmological introduction" on the theme of creation, explains that

"the cosmos is in harmony with the Law, and the Law with the cosmos and that the law-abiding man is thus a true citizen of the cosmos, regulating his actions according to the will of nature, which is itself the governing power over the whole cosmos". (3)

Further, Moses is the consummate philosopher, distinguishing the active Cause, the Father and Creator who even transcends virtue, knowledge, goodness and beauty, from the passive object which requires to be set in motion, designed and enlivened by Mind before it can become the perfect product which this cosmos is. Since man is born in the image of God ("image" corresponds to "Mind"), his mind can reach out to the "patterns and originals" behind sensible objects and, as in divine ecstasy, approach the Great King of the cosmos, although the eye of the understanding is always dazzled by the light of the divine radiance. (5) Thus Philo applied his rhetorical training to the exposition of the Law of God in broad philosophical terms, comprehensible throughout the spectrum of hellenistic rationalism, while Cicero applying his, for the most part, to the elucidation of the laws of Rome in particular cases in the Forum, was always similarly informed by his philosophical expertise.

(1) De Abrietate, 200.
(2) E.R. Goodenough, op. cit., p.41.
(3) De Opificio Mundi, 1, 3 (Loeb).
Philo, however, was essentially a synagogue preacher and he aspired to rhetoric only in so far as it assisted him to communicate his religious message. Michel has been criticised for apparently overlooking or subordinating this fundamental ingredient in his work, although he admits that Philo gives the rhetoric of the orators a lesser role than Cicero does. It is suggested that there is even an ideal of non-eloquence in Philo, as in Socrates (Apol. 17) and Moses (Ex. 4:10) — a determined rejection of rhetorical virtuosity, exemplified by the Therapeutae. This corresponds to the rhetoric of the synagogues, in which rabbinic exegesis occupies the centre of the stage and honour is paid to expertise in the exposition of the Law, not to rhetorical brilliance as such.

One last point about Philo's rhetoric concerns his use of allegory. He distinguishes between the literal (τοῦ ἐπιτελοῦς) and the allegorical (τοῦ προς εἰκόνοις, τοῦ συμβαλλόντος), the latter category subdividing into the physical (cosmological or theological), the ethical (or psychological) and the mystical. The allegorical method was well known in the ancient world and provided a means of interpreting Homer and other mythology, although Plato preferred the

---

(1) By M.V. Mikirovetsky, in the Discussion de la Communication de Michel, in Philon d'Alexandrie, 1967, p.102f.
(3) Cf. De Contra Pl., 75.
(4) A distinction must, however, be made between applied rhetoric in which Philo is undoubtedly close to the synagogue tradition, and the philosophy of rhetoric which Philo uses in a way analogous to his character Moses who acquires rhetoric in Egypt to confound the Egyptian politicians and sophists but finds that it is also conducive to true happiness through contemplation: cf. Michel, Op. cit., p.84f.
(5) To Philo's "literal" corresponds the "literal" or "historical" of the Fathers, and the pesat of the rabbis; his "physical" to the "allegorical" (Fathers), remez (rabbis); his "ethical" to the "moral" (Fathers), deras (rabbis); his "mystical" to the "anagogical" (Fathers), sod (rabbis); cf. R. Marcus, Philo, Suppl. I, Questions and Answers on Genesis, Loeb, 1953, p.ixf.
alternative course of eliminating the offending myths altogether. (1) In Jewish circles it was equally well known. The rabbis used it and it is prominent in the Wisdom of Solomon. (2) Philo acknowledges a debt to traditions of allegorical interpretation handed down by his own people (3) but shows a certain indecision in his attitudes to it. It was congenial to him in that it helped him to find Plato in Moses and to remove gross anthropomorphisms from the Old Testament. (4) He refers slightingly to literalists at a number of points; (5) at other times he refers to the literal and the allegorical as possible and acceptable lines of interpretation. (6) He can even castigate the allegorisers for "handling the matter in too easy and off-hand a manner" and "exploring reality in its naked absoluteness":

"It is quite true that the seventh day is meant to teach the power inherent in the Unoriginate and the non-action of created beings. But let us not for this reason abrogate the laws laid down for its observance, and light fires or till the ground or carry loads or institute proceedings in court ... It is true that receiving circumcision does indeed portray the excision of pleasure and all passions, and the putting away of the impious conceit under which the mind supposed that it was capable of begetting by its own power, but let us not on this account repeal the law laid down for circumcision. Why, we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the Temple and a thousand other things if we are going to pay heed to nothing except what is shewn us by the inner meaning of things". (7)

No completely satisfactory hypothesis has been established to explain Philo's preferences, and perhaps he does not achieve complete


(2) Cf. 10:17, where the pillar of cloud and fire is allegorised into Wisdom (cf. Philo, Quid rer. div. haer. 42; Vit. Mosia 1:29); 18 -24 where the long robe of the high priest is the whole cosmos (cf. Philo, Vit. Mosia III, 11-14; De mon. II, 5f.; and Josephus, Ant III, 7). Cf. J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus, I, 1888, pp.18-22.

(3) Cf. Vit. Mosia 11.1; De Circumcisione 2; De Justitia 3.


(5) E.g., Quod Deus Immut. 1, 260; De Sobrietate, 1, 397; De Confus Ling. 36.

(6) E.g., De Spec. Leg. III, 32.

(7) De Myst. Abr. 16.
consistency. If so, his failure is attributable to the fact that his basic procedures are homiletic. Allegorical interpretation can hardly be made into a scientific system; it is an art rather than a science, and it is a tool which preachers of all ages have thankfully accepted. It is, of course, always tempting to write it off as a wholly subjective process, consisting of reading into the text whatever meaning one wants to find there. But this does less than justice to its religious significance and to the contribution it has made to spiritual development. Properly used, it is not capricious or far-fetched.

Since allegorical interpretation is a recurring feature in homiletics, several concluding observations may be offered at this point.

(1) An evolutionary view - that he began with a literalist view and advanced into allegory, or vice versa - cannot be upheld on the evidence of his writings. Again, it has been maintained that different types of interpretation apply to different types of scripture. Thus, R. Eleazar b. Jose of Galilee taught that the mashal (allegoric interpretation) was only to be used in the Prophets and Hagiographa, "but the words of the Torah and commandments you must not interpret as mashal". The creation story is usually treated allegorically, and where it is not (as in Quaestiones in Genesim) the difference may be explained in terms of the audience to which it was addressed. Even less consistency, however, is found in his treatment of the legal ordinances, and further distinctions have been introduced to explain this - for example, that some prescriptions are not really laws and need not be observed literally. A more plausible observation is that, generally speaking, the emphasis in interpretation varies in relation to groups of commentaries. In his Exposition of the Law, with its apologetic aims, he tends towards the literal, the allegorical supplementing the literal without ruling it out. His Allegory, intended for Jewish consumption, is highly symbolic and fundamentally haggadic, directly reflecting the moral homilies of the synagogue. (Cf. J. Daniélou, Philon d'Alexandrie, pp.20ff., 85-95.) Yet even this distinction cannot be fully justified. As J. Pépin points out, (Remarques sur la Théorie de l'Exégèse Allégorique chez Philon, in ibid., p.154f.) the most outspoken appeal for the literal sense occurs in De Migr. Abr. 16, which properly belongs to the second or allegorical cycle. Further, the assumption that Philo would use the literal rather than the allegorical in his approach to the Greek world is surprising. Besides, it is doubtful whether even the hypothesis of two separate cycles of commentaries can be maintained.
The criterion by which acceptable levels of allegory are differentiated from the unacceptable must be established. It may be a grasp of the total meaning of scripture, or a concept of the dominant motif of the faith, in the light of which other passages or themes of scripture may be reinterpreted. A precondition of its use is therefore an enlightened and imaginative exegete or preacher.

Rapport between preacher and congregation is essential. In the absence of it, allegorical interpretation might be offensive and multiply misunderstanding. Given such rapport, it can launch preacher and congregation into new heights of insight and illumination. It can be exploratory, creative and suggestive.

It supplies a useful means of bridging the gap between the "past" of sacred scripture and the "now" of the congregation, and enables the preacher to use the text flexibly: for example, to draw moral teaching from a historical or traditional narrative; or to eliminate what appear naivities or absurdities to the contemporary hearer by directing attention to other aspects suggested by the text to the interpreter. True, there is an element - sometimes a large element - of "reading in"; but this is one aspect of the encounter of a contemporary mind with a document of the past which is rendered contemporary by the very process of interpretation.

The key to its use is flexibility - which may include its non-use (i.e., the insistence upon the literal), or its many-sided use. The sensitive interpreter finds many indications in scripture to serve as points of departure for allegorical interpretation: trees of life; etymologies that invite exploration; that which is absurd or gauche if interpreted literally; contradictions; anthropomorphisms and other points inappropriate to the divine nature. For anyone who

(2) Cf. the use Augustine made of the parable of the Good Samaritan; cf. C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, 1936, pp.11ff. Whatever criticisms one may advance against it, he was successful in interpreting the story for his own times. A byproduct of this cryptogrammic method, however, is that it makes life difficult for later interpreters who no longer possess the key to the code or who are repelled for other reasons.
will not accept allegory at such points he can only feel pity, for the literal is clearly nonsensical.

3. The homily in the preaching and teaching of Jesus.

A dominant motif in the ministry of Jesus is his preaching and teaching in the synagogues of Galilee. (1) As the synagogue service had already been evolving for several centuries, the order followed may be assumed to have been fairly well established by this time and, at least in its basic elements, to correspond to the pattern of synagogue worship of the Mishnaic period. His preaching and teaching in the synagogue would therefore follow the customary form of the homily, and he would be invited to take part as a visiting teacher.

What little may be gleaned about the form of Jesus' synagogue homilies emerges from the study of two passages. One is Luke 4:16-30 in which the synagogue setting is described in some detail (vv.16-20) and the homily heard with rapt attention. Some aspects of the homiletic procedure are clear: the reading of Isaiah 61, which supplies the text for the homily; and the bald statement of homiletic purpose, viz., to show the present as related to the past in terms of fulfillment. Thereafter, the sequence of the narrative is puzzling and most probably reflects editorial manipulation. Luke has rearranged traditional material in order to develop a particular thesis of his own, viz., that consequent upon the programmatic statement of his ministry at Nazareth, Jesus is rejected by his own people and turns to a wider public, as at Capernaum, and finally to the Gentiles. (2) The composite nature of the passage is suggested by the abruptness with

---

which v.23 introduces the Capernaum—Nazareth conflict, by the incorporation at v.24 of a floating lexicon of the proverbial type, (1) and by a further homiletic excerpt (vv.25ff.) which offers commentary on the theme of the acceptance of Gentiles before Jews and includes stories of Elijah and Elisha structured in typically rabbinic list-form. In view of the extent of Luke's editorial work, it would seem that the elements are totally disparate and that vv.25ff. echo a different homily from v.21. Yet caution should be exercised on this point.

Luke's principal feat of manipulation is the advancing of the whole Nazareth episode to a leading position, although his material shows that work at Capernaum preceded it (v.23); his subsidiary manipulation of materials operates through congregational reaction and repartee (22f.). From previous examples of rabbinic preaching, (2) it may just be possible to conceive of a homiletic pattern combining Luke 4:16-21 with 23-27. On the basis of Is.61, the theme of the salvation of Israel is set forth as the thesis, winning a favourable reaction from the congregation (v.22). (3) The antithesis is then advanced, viz., that Gentiles may in fact be preferred before Jews in the sight of God - an argument illustrated by citations from the prophets, Elijah and Elisha. The expected conclusion - linking the antithesis to the theme of Is.61 - is not given, for so great is the offence of the antithesis that Jesus is expelled forthwith. However, whether Luke uses material from one or more homilies, the significant point is that he portrays Jesus' homiletic activity in the synagogue and assumes sufficient situational informality to permit some discussion in the course of the homily.

(2) Vid. supra, pp.
(3) Or at least 22a. 22b is problematic.
The second passage is John 6. Here our starting point is the comment of the evangelist at 6:59 - "This he said in the synagogue, as he taught at Capernaum". Prima facie, the preceding material may be assumed to reflect in some way a synagogue homily - an assumption that should be confirmed or refuted by a more detailed analysis of the passage.

The unity of the discourse has become a crux of Johannine exegesis, hinging to a considerable extent on the interests of the exegete. Thus, the sacramentalists have tended on the whole to detach vv.51c-58 from the context given to it by the evangelist. But on strictly literary criteria the contrast between this passage and its context is very slight; the entire sequence is thoroughly Johannine, and the interpolation theory at best doubtful. The most significant studies for our purpose are those by P. Borgen, in which he suggests that the key to the understanding of the discourse lies in its midrashic character. The "text" is John 6:31- "Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, 'He gave them bread from heaven to eat'". The reference to the eating of the manna recurs in vv.49 and 58, thus indicating that the whole section is midrash. The theme of "bread from heaven" is followed throughout the whole passage and the term "eating", reintroduced at v.49, becomes the centre of the debate thereafter. The text itself is developed

---


according to the familiar midrashic pattern of contrast: "not (Moses) ... but (my Father) ... for ..." (v.32f.). There is initially a positive response from the congregation (v.34), enabling Jesus to expound the theme with specific reference to his own ministry (vv.35-40). Then the first objection, which repeats Jesus' words (v.35), is raised by the congregation (v.41f.) - part of the objection coinciding with the Jews' comments in Luke 5:22b and highlighting the paradox of Jesus' personal position. Jesus' response is to state even more vigorously (vv.43-51) the meaning of his interpretation, citing Is.54:13, repeating the theme (vv.48ff.) and sharpening the paradox. A second objection (v.52), concerning the concept of "eating the flesh", follows a similar pattern, the response once more presenting the concept in uncompromising terms and ending (v.58) with a total recapitulation of the theme.

Several points may be offered here in brief:

(i) The passage as it stands is so thoroughly Johannine that one must allow for the evangelist's reworking of the material in total fashion. Nevertheless, the reworking has retained the form of a synagogue homily, and it is inherently unlikely that John invented such a setting for the discourse. (1) He apparently identifies the setting only as an afterthought (v.59).

(ii) Similarities with Luke 4 are informative. Jesus uses the synagogue homily as a means of disclosing some significant aspects of his mission and ministry, indeed of his self-understanding; and in consequence his preaching precipitates something of a crisis (Luke 4:

(1) I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, First Series, 1917, p.10f., pointed out that this discourse must have been given in the spring (cf. 6:10, "much grass"; 6:9, 13, "barley loaves") and that in the second year of the triennial cycle the lessons for the first weeks in Iyyar (April/May) were taken from Exodus 16, which contains the story of the Manna - an interesting comment in view of the structural factors noted above.
28f.; Jn.6:60, 66). In both cases, the role that he claims for himself in the purpose of God (Lk.4:21; Jn.6:35, 38 etc.) sharpens the contrast between his human and divine origins (Lk.4:22b; Jn.6:42). In John, the midrashic יָדְיוֹ יִדּוֹ (vv.35, 41, 48, 51) identifies Jesus with an Old Testament word or concept - just as John the Baptist is connected with "the voice of one crying in the wilderness" and as the rabbis later connected Trajan with the vulture of Deut.28:49. (1)

(iii) Jesus' personal involvement in God's work of fulfilment and salvation suggests the point at which he broke the constrictions of rabbinic practice and entered the realm of the prophetic or pneumatic. He can do so while still using rabbinic midrashic techniques and the language of exegesis, but his expositions bring his hearers to the point of decision about him. (2) Hence, he speaks with יָדְיוֹ and not as the scribes, according to the Synoptics; and in John his words are "spirit and life" (6:63). Thus Jesus' words and acts, like his origin and destiny, are shot through with divine significance and identified with the eschatological purpose of God. (3)

(iv) The imagery of the whole passage is clearly metaphorical. The literal is the level at which the objectors operate (vv.41, 52), the level of those not taught by God (6:45). Against the literal stands the negative in the statement of theme (v.32): not Moses but... The whole discourse then moves at the deeper, allegorical level, on which "bread", "hunger", "eating", "drinking" are to be understood - whether or not eucharistic language is to be identified here. Even if there are eucharistic overtones, they are secondary and not to be interpreted literally; that is, the sacrament does not guarantee life. It is the Spirit that is life-giving, and man must be drawn by the Father (6:44). Thus, to those to whom it is given, the deeper realities are revealed. Jesus of Nazareth is truly "the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know" (6:42). He who knows that fact alone has no worthwhile knowledge; he sees, yet does not believe (6:36). But he who is led to recognise the άναπαύω of Jesus as the

(2) Cf. vv.29, 35, 36, 40, 47, 49, 64; cf. also 20:31.
(3) Thus, to identify Jesus' procedures as prophetic in no way undermines the Christian estimate of him as more than a prophet: cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.448.
(4) Cf.6:27 - "Do not labour for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life ..."
bread given for the life of the world and to believe in him will abide in him for ever (6:56ff.). Such a \( \text{αὐτὸς} \) becomes possible only because Jesus actually lived in the flesh and died a real death; hence the heavily anti-docetic emphasis of vv.51-58.\(^{(1)}\)

(v) Therefore in the final reworking of the tradition, John has characteristically combined the Palestinian \textit{Sitz im Leben} of Jesus with the post-crucifixion church perspective in which the Son of Man is ascended and the faithful look to him to raise them up on the last day. In John, the union of these perspectives is organic; yet one of the elements is clearly the recollection of a prophet-like figure of flesh and blood, interpreting the scriptures in a synagogue in Capernaum and causing offence and bewilderment to "those who have eyes but will not see".

The study of Luke 4 and John 6 serves only to illustrate the use of the synagogue homily by Jesus. Other passages may be held to presuppose it or to reveal its use. The plucking of the ears of corn (Matt.12:1-8 par.) gains point if Num.28:9f. and 1 Sam.21:1-10 had been read that day. "Have you not read in the law ...?" and "Have you not read what David did ...?" have then an immediate reference. In the Fourth Gospel, the discourse in chapter 7 appears to have as its background the Festival of Tabernacles, during which Zech.14:8, which Jesus seems to have quoted (7:38), was probably read. Moreover, the Tabernacles ceremony of water-drawing was interpreted by the rabbis to mean the draught of the Holy Spirit, and this is also reflected in the Johannine narrative (7:39).\(^{(2)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. Dunn, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.333-8.
\(^{(2)}\) I. Abrahams, \textit{op. cit.}, p.10f.; cf. Genesis Rabba. 70.
4. The homily in the early Christian church.

Several types of homiletic structure emerge from an analysis of early church material. When allowance is made for a degree of overlapping or inter-penetration, three broad categories can be discerned with reasonable distinctiveness: (a) the recital or "list" form of discourse, or one in which recital or listing predominates; (b) the thematic form of homily; and (c) more lyrical forms.

(a) The recital form in homiletics.

It is virtually a commonplace of New Testament criticism that the speech of Stephen in Acts 7:2-53 does not belong to the context of his martyrdom but is essentially a hellenistic synagogue sermon, perhaps recalling the kind of recital given in the synagogue on feast-days, but presenting Christian kerygma. E. Haenchen suggests, on the basis of the "seams" inherent in vv.43f. and 47f., that Luke has taken over this stock homiletic form and adapted it for his purposes (possibly by abbreviation and by adding a conclusion), bringing out clearly the antithesis between faithful Israel and Israel in revolt against God. Our concern, of course, is not with what Stephen might or might not have said but with the form of the discourse. Apart from the anti-Jewish insertions, it consists almost entirely of the recital of God's action in history from Abraham to David (7:2-50). Luke's manipulation of the material, however, is not without its significance, for such a recital in hellenistic Jewish homiletics was normally given particular nuances by the preacher and was related to a particular applicatio such as Luke gives it, in brief but intense fashion, in vv. 51ff. The ancient Jewish recital form, which may be regarded as a

particular manifestation of the Hebrew fondness for listing points in oral discourse, tended to be predominant in its context, which might be provided by various types of literature.\(^{(1)}\) A good example is Sirach 44:1-50:24, where the structure consists of an introduction (44:1-15), the recital (44:16-50:21) and a brief conclusion picking up the invitatatory note of the introduction (50:22ff.).\(^{(2)}\)

A specific instance of a synagogue address attributed to Paul is found in Acts 13. Indeed, the writer of Acts describes Paul as a missionary apostle whose natural \textit{locus operandi}, at least initially, was in the synagogues of the Diaspora.\(^{(3)}\) In the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, Paul and Barnabas, having listened to the reading of the Law and the prophets, are invited to say a "word of exhortation" (\textit{λόγος παρακλήσεως}) to the congregation (13:15).\(^{(4)}\) Paul obliges, and the speech in 13:16-41 is the first full outline of a discourse attributed to Paul in the Book of Acts.

Happily, it is possible for us to side-step much of the scholarly

---

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. the prayer-homily of Neh.9; the credal formula of Deut.26:5-11; and Psalms 78, 105-7, 135-6.

\(^{(2)}\) F.J. Foakes-Jackson, \textit{op. cit.}, p.68 raises the question whether the speech of Stephen might not be "an earlier prophetic diatribe, popular among the earliest Christians ..." This suggestion is attractive in several ways: the speech proclaims the mighty acts of God, in prophetic fashion; and in the intensity of its admonition and denunciation it is equally prophetic. The whole speech, however, is too discursive to be typical of \textit{προφητεία}. But it may well be, that Luke saw the hellenistic sermon as appropriate to a prophetic-ecstatic context: cf. Acts 6:15; 7:55ff.

\(^{(3)}\) E.g., Acts 9:20 (Damascus); 13:5 (Salamis); 13:14ff. (Antioch in Pisidia); 14:1 (Iconium); 17:1 (Thessalonica); 17:10f. (Beroea); 17:17 (Athens); 18:4 (Corinth); 18:19 (Ephesus). Luke's thesis is that Paul went first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles, and there may be some artificiality in his presentation of it; but it corresponds to the picture given in 1 Thess.2:14ff. and in Rom.1:16.

\(^{(4)}\) Paul stands to preach, whereas Jesus sat to teach in Luke 4:20. It has been suggested that Paul's exhortation was not of the same order as Jesus' exposition of the scriptures: I. Abrahams, \textit{op. cit.}, p.8f.
debate - marred as it is by contradictions and hidden assumptions\(^{(1)}\) - that has been directed to this speech. In any case, we discuss elsewhere the problem of the speeches in Acts.\(^{(2)}\) The conclusions of Redaktionsgeschichte are adequate for our purpose: Luke has created this sermon, not *ex nihilo*, but out of the materials of the Christian preaching of his own time.\(^{(3)}\) The recital of sacred history follows a similar model to the example considered above, but, "as far as possible Luke avoids repeating anything already said in Stephen's speech".\(^{(4)}\) After addressing Jew and God-fearer, Paul launches into a recital of God's dealings with Israel, beginning with the law (election, exodus, the land), proceeding to the prophets (judges, Samuel, Saul, David), and finally using the concept of the Davidic covenant to announce the Saviour, Jesus, to whom John the baptizer bore witness. After this recital, a further section takes up the theme of salvation. It deals with the rejection and condemnation of the Saviour by "those who live in Jerusalem and the rulers" (vv.27ff.), who thereby unwittingly fulfilled the scriptures of which they were themselves ignorant. God's action in raising Jesus marks the time of fulfilment (vv.30ff.) - a list of three proof texts clinches the point (vv.33bff.); and the second David is seen to excel even the first (v.36f.). The section then closes with the proclamation of forgiveness through Christ - a forgiveness that reaches further than the law of Moses (v.36f.). Finally, solemn warning is given against

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. B.W. Bacon, who says that this speech "is quite un-Pauline, and contains not one trait of his characteristic gospel", and P. Gardner, who says it is "eminently Pauline; and the manner, apart from the mere choice of words, is also Pauline". Quoted by F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 1954, p.277.

\(^{(2)}\) Vid. Appendix A.


\(^{(4)}\) Ibid., p.415.
taking these tidings lightly, a quotation from the prophet Habakkuk (v.40f.) lending reinforcement.

I. Abrahams recognised that "Paul's exhortation follows Jewish lines in its structure" and that it resembled the exhortations in the Books of the Maccabees. Its genius lies in the fact that it takes the use of the Law seriously before showing the ultimate insufficiency of the Law. Much weight is carried by the kind of recital which had an Old Testament pedigree and an inter-testamental expression, and was now becoming a stock Christian homiletic device. The next section, containing a hint of antithesis or paradox (the Saviour of Israel is rejected by the potentates of Israel), enlarges upon the climactic point of the earlier part and leads up to its own climax at v.38f., employing characteristic midrashic methods as well as stock Christian traditional material.

Hebrews 11 is of similar homiletic type, on the theme of "faith". After a brief statement of the theme (11:1-3), the argument is developed by a catena of examples, in scriptural order: Abel, Enoch, Noah (11:4-7); Abraham (developed at greater length, 11:8-22); Moses (11:23-31); and a generalised summary in conclusion (11:32-40), highlighting the theme expressed throughout, viz., that faith involves the assurance and conviction of things not yet seen or realised in the visible world: the "not yet" of the writer's eschatology.

It may be that Hebrews 11 is part of a larger homiletic structure.

(3) Cf. Acts 7:2-53; also, though in variant form, Heb.11.
(4) E.g., leading statement, followed by "for ..."; concise recital; list of confirmatory citations from scripture.
(5) Concise summary and interpretation of Jesus' death, burial and resurrection, with apostolic witness and scriptural proofs. The structural misunderstandings which result when this material is regarded as the framework of the speech is obvious.
incorporated in the epistle, although it could practically stand on its own. Thus, the end of chapter 10 might be held to introduce a homiletic theme on "faith and endurance" (vv.32, 36, 39). Chapter 11 then represents the first main sub-theme, on "faith"; while chapter 12, taking its cue from the eschatological "not yet", represents the second main sub-theme, on "endurance". Strengthened by the "great cloud of witnesses" (just cited) and by Jesus the "pioneer and perfecter of faith", his hearers are exhorted to run the race ἐκ τοῦ ἀναπτύσσεσθαι (12:1). This theme is developed in terms of πεποίθησις, which is an essential experience of sonship (12:9-11). The conclusion is exhortatory (12:12f.). In the total structure, the leading part is taken by the recital, which in its oral form may have been longer since in the epistle the latter part of it is telescoped by the writer (cf.11:32ff.).

Perhaps the most striking use of the technique of recital and listed examples is to be found in 1 Clement. The letter is fairly lengthy and strongly exhortatory and paraenetic in flavour and structure. In itself it is not a homily but would appear to contain overtones of preaching within the community. A good example is the discourse on "rivalry" (φιλονεικία), adumbrated in ch.2f. and launched with a résumé of the story of Cain and Abel in ch.4. This is followed by a lengthy list of examples of "rivalry", taken first from scripture (from Jacob to David: 4:7-13) and then from "the heroes nearest our own times" (5:1): Peter, Paul and a "great multitude of

(1) Calvin was correct in holding that the theme commences in the last section of chapter 10, not at the beginning of 11; cf. J. Moffatt, Epistle to the Hebrews (ICC), 1924, p.158. For a different analysis based on literary considerations, cf. A. Vanhoye, La Structure Littéraire de L'Épître aux Hébreux, 1963, pp.180ff., although he admits that vv.10:36-39 announce developments to come.
the elect" (5:2-6:3). The hearers are not allowed to stray from the point: "Rivalry and contention have overthrown great cities and uprooted mighty nations" (6:4). At this point (7:1), the homiletic flow is interrupted by epistolary comment which, however, is not foreign to the preacher's aim, for it identifies the writer with the hearers and underlines "the glorious and holy rule of our tradition" (7:2). In a strongly exhortatory passage, the writer links his attack on "rivalry" with an appeal for repentance. Once more he adopts the list principle:

"Let us go through all the generations and observe that from one generation to another the Master 'has afforded an opportunity of repentance' to those who are willing to turn to him". (7:5) (1)

First, he points to the preachers of repentance: Noah, Jonah and "ministers of God's grace" such as Ezekiel and Isaiah who are quoted at some length. Next, the list of exemplars of those who avoided strife and "rivalry" is lengthy: from Enoch (9:3) to Rahab (12:8), with considerable scriptural narrative. Humility is what scripture enjoins (13:1), and Jesus teaches mercy and forgiveness (13:2). Such themes are endorsed by frequent quotations from the Old Testament and biblical exemplars. Indeed, throughout the epistle - and especially in the first part - one hears the echo of the hellenistic preacher, steeped in the scriptures of the Septuagint and familiar with at least some of Paul's letters and the gospel material, as he speaks from the texts of scripture and the teachings of Christian tradition to an urgent contemporary situation: never more at home than when he is reeling off scriptural examples to reinforce his message, or urging the Christian virtues with earnest moralism.

Thus, early Christian paraclesia included a type of homily in

(1) Tr. C.C. Richardson, Early Christian Fathers I, 1953, p.47.
which recital or the listing of examples played an important part. Luke included several speeches of this type in Acts, and even in Peter's early sermons the "things concerning Jesus" are related in a narrative form that is virtually a recital (cf. 2:22ff.; 3:13ff.; 10:34-43). Paul's summary of kerygmatic tradition in 1 Cor.15:3-8 follows recital form and includes the listing of witnesses to the resurrection (vv.5ff.). Thus the Christian magnalia were communicated conveniently by means of these homiletic devices.

One final observation may not be without importance. The recital form is appropriate to the magnalia both of ancient Israel and of the early church because their focus is historical events which must be communicated and interpreted through narrative. But such procedures, involving a high degree of selection and imaginative insight, spring not so much from systematic theology as from homiletic practice. That is as true of the covenantal recitals of the Deuteronomist as it is of early Christian preaching; equally, it is an appropriate medium for the psalmist. In approaching the study of biblical material through such perspectives, allowance must always be made for "the preacher's awful licence". A strong element in Heilageschichte is homiletics! (1)

(b) The thematic form of homily.

Paul's letters provide evidence of the more strictly thematic

type of homily. Though not written as sermons, some of his letters are clearly intended to convey a message which he would have delivered personally in a sermon to the assembled community had opportunity been given him (Rom. 1:10ff.; cf. 15:23, 32). It would therefore be surprising if in composing such a letter he did not, consciously or unconsciously, reflect his homiletic procedures, even if necessarily in condensed form.

Rom. 1:1-15 is epistolary, like 15:14-33 and 16 passim. It is conceivable that a shorter form of Romans, excluding the latter epistolary material, circulated in some areas of the church as a doctrinal tract. (1) Apart from the introductory remarks (1:1-15) which, however, conclude with Paul's assertion that he is "eager to preach the gospel to you also who are in Rome", we discover that the substance of the letter begins with what looks like a statement of homiletic theme in v. 16f., which can be subdivided into four parts:

"I am not ashamed of the gospel. It is the power of God for salvation to everyone who responds in faith (a), to the Jew first and also to the Greek (b). For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith (c); as it stands written: 'He who is righteous through faith shall live'" (d).

But if this is a theme statement, how do we identify the homily which develops it?

Rom. 1:18-32 is antithetical to the theme statement (part 'a') in that it deals with the wrath of God as opposed to the salvation he offers, but as in the theme statement ('a') salvation is available to everyone who has faith so in the subsequent passage the judgment of God falls on "all ungodliness and wickedness of men", who are without excuse because of God's revelation of his nature in the created order.

- without excuse, indeed, whoever they are (2:1; cf. 'b'). Here, the area of discourse is subtly extended to include Jews (the Gentiles having borne the brunt so far) and to open up the possibility of salvation to all: God's forbearance and kindness is not to be presumed upon but is meant to lead men to salvation (2:4). Judgment and salvation therefore concern all, the Jew first and also the Greek, the theme words (1:16c) being repeated at 2:9 and 2:10. At this point, the discourse has established that "God shows no partiality" (2:11) either in judgment or salvation.

This confident and, to some, startling thesis receives necessary expansion in 2:12-29, in which it is demonstrated how the Gentiles can be "doers of the Law" (vv.12-16) and how the Jew, instructed in the Law and circumcised, may be totally disobedient (vv.17-24). Thus, when true circumcision is understood in terms of total obedience to God, Jew and Gentile are once again seen as being in a comparable, if not equal, position in the sight of God (2:25-29).

The obvious objection is anticipated: "Then does the Jew not have any advantage? Has circumcision no value?" (3:1) - to which Paul gives a strong affirmative. The Jews received "the oracles of God" (3:2), and God does not break his pledge (3:3ff.). But the Jew cannot complain of God's unfaithfulness or injustice if God pronounces judgment against his unfaithfulness, nor can he draw any antinomian conclusions from it. Therefore, in relation to the question of obedience, Jews are in fact no better off than Gentiles. All, both Jews and Greeks (3:9 again repeats the theme), are under the power of sin, a point illustrated by a catena of Old Testament quotations (3:10-18). Thus the Law effectively shows the plight of all men, made aware of their sinfulness by the Law and helpless to remedy it (3:20). Parts 'a' and 'b' of the theme statement have thus been fully discussed.
Then comes the positive solution (cf. part 'c'), which is given by the grace of God as a gift (3:24) to all, without distinction (3:22b).\(^1\) The divine grace, manifesting itself on the Cross and capable of reception only by faith (3:25), shows the extent of God’s righteousness and forbearance. In a series of rhetorical questions, human "boasting" is eliminated, not on the principle of works of the Law but on that of faith, by which alone man is accepted by God as just (3:28). And — repeating the 'b' motif once again — this applies to all mankind, Jew and Gentile alike (3:29f.), without abrogating the authority of the Law (3:31).

With E. Käsemann, we hold that chapter 4 is closely related to the foregoing argument, not only because, as he states, "here the scriptural evidence is marshalled for the theme of the righteousness of faith which has been expounded in 3:21-31,"\(^2\) but also because it provides the exposition of the remaining part 'd' of the initial thematic statement, "he who through faith is righteous shall live" (1:17b). Abraham is the prototype of the believer, and is the model for uncircumcised and circumcised alike (4:10ff.). His true descendants are those who share his faith (4:16b). Despite all the odds, he never wavered in the trust he put in God and his promises (4:20f.) — in the God "who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist" (4:17b). Thus, "belief in God’s power of resurrection is identical with belief in justification", \(^3\) the first being

---

\(^1\) Some commentators (e.g., A. E. Hunter, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1955, p.15) take 3:21 as the beginning of an entirely new major section of the letter, so that the divisions become 1:18-3:20; 3:2-8:39. This seems to me a singularly ill-judged analysis. Not only does it ignore a more radical break at 5:1 but it fails to recognise that Paul is developing his argument on the theme of 1:16f. by means of the judgment-salvation antithesis, as is shown particularly by 2:7-10. 3:21-31, with its positive statement of the righteousness of God, is an integral part of this development.


\(^3\) Käsemann, *op. cit.*, p.95.
both the presupposition and the ratification of the latter. The basis of Abraham's faith was the promise. The Christian has before him the reality of the cross and resurrection of Christ (4:23ff.).

It can hardly be disputed that 1:18-4:25 gives a closely reasoned exposition of the theme stated in 1:16f. Structurally, it falls into two main parts: (i) 1:18-3:20, and (ii) 3:21-4:25. The development is by antithesis: (i) stands in antithesis to the theme statement, which is positively developed in (ii). (i) and (ii) are thus antithetical to each other. This love of antithesis in homiletic structure is a rabbinic characteristic. The antithetical sub-themes are skilfully inter-related, however, as in 2:6-10. Another structural unifier is the insistence on the fundamental similarity of Jew and Gentile, in the thematic statement (1:16), the first main section (2:1, 9ff., 26, 28f., 3:9), and the second (3:22, 29f.; 4:9-12, 16f.). This unifier is absent from chs.5-8, thus underlining the structural homogeneity of 1:16-4:25 and differentiating this structure from that of the four subsequent chapters.

Stylistically this homily, even in the presumably telescoped form in which Paul adapted it to his correspondence, abounds with the rhetorical figures which characterise living discourse. Like the Jewish preachers of the Diaspora, Paul had learned to use a style acceptable to hellenized Jews and cultured God-fearers, not to mention magistrates and officials of the Roman Empire; (1) and it appears that rabbinical training included practical rhetoric which of necessity drew upon the resources of popular hellenistic philosophers and textbooks that provided quotable passages from Greek literature to support

the Law of Moses or the monotheistic view of the universe.\(^1\) W.L. Knox detects a certain pomposity in Paul’s opening proclamation of the wrath of God \((1:18)\),\(^2\) and the succeeding arguments Knox describes as “those which the synagogue had learnt from popular Greek philosophy and turned into commonplaces ...”\(^3\) Stylistic procedures derived from the diatribe include the sequence of word-play in \(1:23, 25, 27f.\),\(^4\) the catalogue of vices in \(1:29ff.\),\(^5\) adorned with assonance and incorporating a closing cadence in the best classical style;\(^6\) the addressing of the imaginary opponent \((2:1, 3)\);\(^7\) the repeated use of short rhetorical questions,\(^8\) sometimes combined with a pointed *ad hominem* address:

"You then who teach another, do you not teach yourself?  
You who preach against stealing, do you steal?  
You who say that one should not commit adultery, do you commit adultery?  
You who abhor idols, do you rob temples?  
You who boast in the law, do you dishonour God?"  \(^9\)

But if Paul appropriates the diatribal style for his homily, he does so as a hellenistic Jewish preacher, availing himself at the same time of rabbinic exegesis and argumentation. A scripture quotation \((Is.52:5)\) rounds off the rhetorical argument at \(2:24\). A series of quotations is given in \(3:10-18\), and a double quotation at \(4:7f.\).

Paul’s exegesis of the Abraham passage in chapter 4 is thoroughly rabbinic in its methods, and his use of certain stock proof-texts

---


\(^2\) Cf. W.L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (Schweich Lectures, 1942), 1944, p.31.

\(^3\) *Ibid.*


\(^6\) \(\ldots \quad ^3\) a double cretic with the latter long syllable of the first cretic resolved. Cf. W.L. Knox, *op. cit.*, p.32.

\(^7\) Also 9:20; cf. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p.66.

\(^8\) E.g., 2:3f.; 3:1, 3; 3:27-31, which ends on the characteristically diatribal note: \(\gamma \nu \n
suggests a parallelism with Philo. (1)

That Paul is at least reflecting his homiletic style in the early chapters of Romans has been widely admitted. C.H. Dodd, while not suggesting independent composition, commented that this section "seems to follow the lines of a sermon or sermons which Paul must often have had occasion to deliver, probably when he was debating in the synagogue". (2)

W.L. Knox said of the earlier part:

"the form is a deliberate parody of the portentous grandiloquence with which the synagogue preacher encouraged his Jewish hearers to thank God that they were not as other men are and to encourage the Gentiles among them to become proselytes". (3)

We have argued further that Rom.1:16-4:25 is in fact a coherent unit, a thematic homily antithetical in structure and expounding systematically the initial statement of theme (1:16f.).

Briefly, two further examples may be taken from Paul's correspondence. As in Romans, Paul's opening remarks in 1 Corinthians lead him to emphasise his preaching mission (1 Cor.1:17; cf. Rom.1:15); and he then proceeds to advance a theological proposition which, in conjunction with a scriptural quotation (Is.29:14) and the succeeding discourse, appears to operate as a theme statement (1:18f.): "the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God ..." The first part of the discourse (1:20-2:5) takes up the question of divine and human wisdom in highly rhetorical vein and with much use of antithesis, reaching a climax in the gospel statement at 1:23f., which serves to restate the theme. After further rhetorical development (vv.25-31), Paul rounds off this part with his personal testimony (2:1-5). The second

(1) W.L. Knox, op. cit., pp.35ff.
(2) The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, 1932, p.xxxf.
main part (2:6-3:25), standing in antithesis to the first, focuses upon the "wisdom" Paul does preach (2:6): the hidden wisdom of God, revealed by the Spirit, totally different from "the spirit of the world". Using the images of the gardener and the master-builder, Paul emerges with the notion of the church as the Temple of God (3:16f.) and brings his argument to a triumphant, rhetorical climax in 3:23. There is a final eschatological section (4:1-13), concluding with a series of startling and unforgettable antitheses (9-13). Here the folly of the cross as the power of God for salvation is clearly displayed. Epistolary style is resumed at 4:14. On this analysis, 1 Cor.1:18-4:13 is seen to reflect the structure of a thematic homily, developed systematically and by antithesis on a stated theme (1:18).

The second example is provided by Romans 9-11, a self-contained unit as many commentators have noted. (1) Structurally, 9:1-5 is a statement of theme, although highly personalised: Paul's anguish at the present plight of Israel, with whom he is identified by race, a plight that is all the more deplorable when contrasted with their great religious heritage. That the personal tone is appropriate to the statement of theme is borne out by the repetition of Paul's concern for and sensitivity towards the Jews in the main body of the argument.

The first main section (9:6-29) picks up the natural response to the antithesis between Israel's sacred role and its present position, viz., the suggestion that God has not kept his word (9:6). Paul takes this impossible suggestion and shows, by rabbinic exegesis, the

---

(1) Thus John Knox says that these chapters "constitute a more or less independent element in the epistle and can be considered not only as a unit, but also with less reference to the rest of the letter than can any earlier section": Int. Bib. IX, Romans, p.535.
outworking and implications of God's election (vv.7-13). This evokes two further objections: is God unjust? (vv.14-18); and, how can God find fault with man, if his will is irresistible? (vv.19-29).

Paul's response to both objections relies once more upon rabbinic exegesis of two or more passages, together with the diatribal expostulation, μὴ γένοιτο (v.14), and a series of rhetorical questions which includes the biblical figure of the potter and the clay (vv.19-24).

In the next part of his argument, introduced in typically diatribal style, Paul counters the apparent arbitrariness of election by affirming the principle of faith (9:30-10:21). No sooner has he accounted for the rejection of the Jews on this score than he reintroduces the note of intense personal concern in his prayer for them (10:1). Finally a series of rhetorical questions and scriptural citations establishes that "faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ" (v.17), but Israel remains disobedient.

Another diatribal device marks the transition to the third main section of the thematic development, in which the faithful remnant is identified (11:1-6). The fact that the rest of Israel is disobedient has become the providential occasion for the enrichment of the Gentiles, who may stand in awe before the graciousness of God but who have no grounds for pride, for they too could fall from grace. And the door is not finally closed on the Jews themselves:

"For if you have been cut out of a naturally wild olive tree and

(2) ης οὖν ἐρωκένυ; . . . . . cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.67.
(3) λέγω οὖν . . . . . μὴ γένοιτο (11:1).
grafted unnaturally into a cultivated olive tree, how much more readily will these natural branches be grafted back into their own tree?" (11:24).

And he spells out this μυστήριον: the hardening of Israel until the full number of the Gentiles come in (v.25), and then the salvation of all Israel, as scripture says (v.26). Even when disobedience seems to prevail, the mercy of God is reaching out to men.

With this sublime and comforting thought as the climax of the argumentation, the preacher fittingly closes his homily with an outburst of praise to God (vv.33-36).

The unitary structure of these chapters is as self-evident as the diatribal style and rabbinic characteristics. The theme differs from that of 1:16f. in that it is problematical, and its outworking reflects this in its exceptionally close argumentation and in its anguished intensity. Here above all in the epistles, we hear the authentic voice of Paul the preacher. Dodd, however, mechanises Paul's procedures anachronistically when he imagines him eagerly laying hold of a sermon laid aside for just such an eventuality and incorporating it in this epistle, "to save a busy man's time and trouble in writing on the subject afresh"; only one step away from depicting him telling his secretary Phoebe to locate the sermon in the card index system under the heading: "Jews - rejection of". The recognition of the unitary structure and homiletic nature of these chapters requires neither the hypothesis of an interpolation nor of a previously written document. The theme is by its very nature one upon which Paul must have discoursed frequently, and its inner structures and delicate nuances were imprinted deeply upon his mind.

Thus, when the theme suggested itself as appropriate within the total structure of this letter, Paul introduced his well-used material with only a slight abruptness at 9:1 to betray his mental switch. (1)

Outside the Pauline corpus, we have already identified a recital type homiletic structure in Hebrews. From the point of view of form, this work is a peculiar document, (2) with an epistolary conclusion but no epistolary introduction and a high degree of exhortation throughout.

The following points may be made in brief:

(a) The document as it stands is designed to be sent as a letter (cf. ch.13), but no attempt has been made to impose epistolary form on the main part of the document or its introduction. Within church circles, it would be eminently suitable for reading aloud to the assembled group or congregation. (3) Parallels are not lacking for writings designed for epistolary use but without epistolary introductions. (4) The specific purpose or occasion of the epistle need not be discussed here. (5)

(b) The substance of the document is homiletic. The writer himself speaks of his λόγος παρακλήσεως (13:22), the phrase used to describe a synagogue address in Acts 13:15. The expressly hortatory

(1) There might be a case for arguing that Rom.5:1-8:39 evinces homiletic structure: 5:1-5 might be regarded as the theme statement, adapted to the overall epistolary purpose; and the main sections would be 5:6-21; 6:1-7:25; and 8:1-39, all of which develop the argument systematically and lead up to a glorious, rhetorical conclusion (8:35-39), reminiscent of Epictetus I, 16, 22. These chapters also abound in rhetorical devices: e.g., rhetorical questions (cf. 6:1; 7:7; 8:31), parallelism (cf.5:9f.; 12:19), antitheses (cf. 6:10; 38f.), comparisons or analogies (cf. 6:16ff.; 7:2ff.); repetition (cf. νόμος in 7:7-8:2). Nevertheless, the identification of a self-contained homiletic structure is less convincing here than in 1:16-4:25 and 9:1-11:36. It is probably safer to describe 5:1-8:39 as mainly epistolary in form though employing homiletic and paraenetic elements.

(2) A.C. Purdy describes the question of its literary form as "one of the unsolved problems of New Testament research": Hebrews. Int. Bib. XI, p.591.

(3) Evidently an accepted procedure: cf. 1 Thess.2:2; Col.4:16.

(4) Cf. IV Maccabees, 1 John, II Clement, Barnabas.

(5) Cf. W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1951.
passages\(^1\) are integral to the design of the material, not mere inter-
polations. The writer thinks of himself as a speaker rather than a
writer, and of the recipients as hearers rather than readers.\(^2\)
Hebrews may therefore be fittingly thought of as "an epistolary sermon
which the preacher was prevented from delivering orally"\(^3\) or "a
written sermon with an epistolary ending".\(^4\)

(c) The document, not unlike Romans, evinces a total unitary
structure which nevertheless includes several main constituents. The
total unit has been secured not only by the progressive type of the
argumentation but also by subtle authorship. The author gives
advance notice of some of the theological themes he will subsequently
develop. For example, the theme of Jesus as high priest, developed
in 4:14-5:19 is adumbrated in 2:17 and 3:1; "God's rest" (4:1-13) in
3:11 and 18; and the Melchizedek argument (7:1-8:7) in 5:6, 10; and
6:20. But without denying this essential unity, it is also necessary
to see whether the author has made use of smaller and originally
independent units to construct the total document. Prima facie this
would appear to be the case. A.C. Purdy commented:

"Hebrews as a whole can hardly be called a homily. It is rather a
writing produced by a preacher and teacher who weaves into the whole
materials he has often used". \(^5\)
This judgment can only be tested by a formal analysis.

Hebrews 1:1-4 has the hallmark of the theme statement: the final
and perfect revelation of God in his Son (1:2f.), contrasted with the
earlier revelations (1:1) and lesser divine beings (1:4). The
following theme provides a precise exposition of this theme statement
by elucidating the antitheses implicit in it: the Son is greater than
the angels (1:5-14), therefore attend to him (2:1-18); his Gospel is
greater than the Law of Moses (3:1-6), therefore rejection of Christ
is worse than rejection of Moses (3:7-4:13). Like Israel of old, we

\(^{1}\) Cf. 2:1ff.; 3:7ff.; 5:11-6:20; 11 passim.
\(^{2}\) Cf. "speaking" - 2:5, 6:9, 8:1, 9:5, 11:32; cf. 12:25, 13:6-
hearing" - 5:11.
\(^{3}\) F.F. Bruce, Hebrews, in Peake, p.1019.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p.1008.
can easily fail to enter the "rest" God has provided for his people.

While in Paul the voice of the preacher and teacher is echoed in the abundance of diatribal devices, in Hebrews the homiletic concern expresses itself in strongly exhortatory passages, fully integrated with the main current of the theme and representing the application following upon the exegesis. This is apparent both in 2:1-18 and 3:7-4:13, neither passage being in any sense extraneous or superfluous but integral to the homiletic build-up. The formal structure is that of a thematic homily, developed by means of antithesis and chiasmus. Thus, if we take the theme statement as comprising two positive theses about the Son ('A' - he is the heir of all things (1:2), and 'B' - he reflects the glory of God (1:3)), together with two corresponding antitheses ('a' - the earlier revelations are secondary (1:1), and 'b' - angelic beings are inferior), then the argument proceeds with a scriptural base as follows:

an examination of 'b' points to the truth of 'A', . . . hold to 'A'.
an examination of 'a' points to the truth of 'B', . . . beware of rejecting 'B'.

Although simpler, this structure possesses some similarity to Rom.1:16-4:25. It is also parallel with the Romans passage in that the theme statement of Hebrews (1:1-4), like Romans 1:16f., provides both the theme for the entire epistle and that of the succeeding argument. It seems reasonable to conclude that the writer is here recalling a homily which he has previously used, the structure of which is discernible in 1:1-4:13.

The theme statement (4:14ff.) for the next part of the homiletic development (4:14-10:25) has to be accommodated to the continuing flow of the epistle as a whole. It has to link specifically with what has gone before (cf. 4:14a), and has to maintain the explicit homiletic concern (4:14b, 16). The theme is the great high priest, Jesus the
Son of God (4:14), who endured the temptations of humanity without succumbing to them (4:15) and who thus inspires believers with confidence as they approach the "throne of grace" (4:16).  

The development of the theme is carried out by a series of antitheses, with accompanying exhortations. The first is 5:1-10, where the contrast is between the "high priest chosen from among men", and the high priesthood of the Son. This adumbrates the next antithesis, but the matter is of such intrinsic difficulty (5:11) that the preacher must prepare his hearers by means of extensive exhortation (5:11-6:20), at the close of which he brings them back precisely to the place where he left off (cf. 5:10 and 6:20b). The antithesis now developed is between the priesthood of Melchizedek and that of Aaron (7:1-28), Christ being "a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (6:20). The third and culminating antithesis takes up the point that Christ ministers in the heavenly rather than the earthly sanctuary and consequently the old covenant and the old sanctuary are superceded by the new covenant and the mediatorial work of Christ whose sacrifice is perfect and unrepeatable (8:1-10:18). His argument completed, he concludes the homily once more on the note of exhortation (10:19-31).

This theme clearly approximates to a type of structure which we have already met: the progressive theme, antithetically developed. The coherence of its structure, together with its intense homiletic concern, creates the strong possibility that it was originally an independent homily which the author has incorporated skillfully into

(1) Note the tenses. The life of Jesus is in the past; the inspiration he gives to believers is in the present; exhortation is for the present and future, but its basis is often in the past.
his written document and made the hub of his argument.\(^{(1)}\)

2 Peter and Jude are related to one another closely enough to justify a joint consideration of them. The thought and some of the phraseology of Jude 4-18 are found in a slightly different but easily identifiable form in 2 Peter 2:1-18 and 3:1-3.\(^{(2)}\)

The application of the canons of literary source criticism to this problem has been characterised by extreme subjectivism and has therefore yielded no assured conclusions.\(^{(3)}\) In any case, the kind

---

\(^{(1)}\) Apart from the recital type homily on "faith and endurance" (10: 32-12:13), the remainder of the document is made up of sundry ethical exhortations, properly classed as paraenesis.


\(^{(3)}\) More conservative commentators - e.g., Spitta, Zahn, Bigg - who, unlike Calvin, hold firmly to the theory of the Petrine authorship of 2 Peter have found little difficulty in finding evidence to support the priority of that epistle. The larger number who reject Petrine authorship often do little more than assume the priority of Jude: cf. A.E. Barnett, The Second Epistle of Peter, and The Epistle of Jude, Int. Bib. XII, 1957, who writes on p.317: "Clearly ... Jude was known to the author of II Peter. The latter incorporated it substantially as his ch.2" (cf. ibid., p. 164, where a similar assumption is made). G.H. Boobbyer, II Peter, in Peake, 1962, discussing the authorship and date of 2 Peter, makes the axiomatic statement: "The use of Jude implies a date later than Jude; and would a leading apostle like Peter have borrowed from the epistle of one who was not an apostle?" (p.1031, 901a). Two pages later, he writes, "901a has shown that 2 Peter is almost certainly later than Jude". Circular? Subjective? Even if the subjectivism of the modern critic is overlooked, the machinery of literary criticism appears inadequate to deal with the problem. Thus, it is arguably more probable that a later writer made use of a brief tract like Jude, rather than that the latter should abstract only the middle portion of a letter already in circulation. Per contra, Bo Reicke properly observes: "Jude ... would seem to be mainly of secondary origin since it summarizes in an elegant style points which Second Peter expounds with greater effort and more detail. Such smoothness of style is frequently characteristic of editors who condense and revise what has been laboriously drawn up by others": The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, 1964, p.169ff. Against Reicke might be quoted Moffatt's observation that Jude's forcible and terse style has a fair claim for originality when compared with the "cloudy and rhetorical" language of 2 Peter, especially if the occasional reference in 2 Peter becomes intelligible in the light of the text of Jude: op. cit., p.351; cf. 2 Pet.2:10ff.; Jude 9. A similar argument might apply to the omission of the story from the Assumption of Moses (Jude 8ff.) and the passage from 1 Enoch (Jude 14ff.); cf. Sidebottom, op. cit., p.68.
of parallelism that obtains between the two documents is such as virtually to rule out any literary dependence of the one upon the other. Only one phrase of any length is precisely reproduced in each writing. (1) Otherwise, the impressive list of continuous parallels consistently involves linguistic differences and differences of meaning, as well as constant variation in structure and presentation. Granted that the correspondences "are too close to be a matter of accidental coincidence", (2) the last resort of literary source criticism is to appeal to the unlikely hypothesis of a third document on which both epistles independently drew. (3) Literary source criticism seems therefore to be played out, and an explanation must be sought in terms of non-literary tradition.

"The best assumption is that both epistles derive from a common tradition which may well have been oral rather than written. Very possibly there was a sermon pattern formulated to resist the seducers of the church. This would explain both the similarities and the differences in a satisfactory fashion." (4)

The correctness or otherwise of this conclusion must be put to the test of formal analysis. Taking the shorter first, does the epistle of Jude lend itself to such an analysis? Can the supposed sermon pattern be identified in it, and is it similar to those we have claimed to identify elsewhere?

(1) "the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved": 2 Pet.2:17, Jude 13.
(2) Sidebottom, op. cit., p.67.
(3) In its earlier form, the source document was supposed to explain "the legendary elements" (Moffatt, op. cit., p.350), but these are now adequately covered by the Book of Enoch. In its more modern form - advanced by T.F. Glasson, Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology, p.63 - the resemblance between Jude 6, 2 Pet.2:4 and the story in Hesiod of the punishment of the Titans is held to argue for such a source but can more easily be accounted for in other ways. The hypothesis is unlikely because the parallelism throughout is not nearly so precise as that offered by the teaching of Jesus in Matthew and Luke which gave rise to the "Q" hypothesis, and also because Jude is virtually co-extensive with the hypothetical document and is therefore hard to account for. Cf. Sidebottom, op. cit., p.190.
(4) Reiske, op. cit., p.190
The first two verses of Jude are purely epistolary, while verse 3 links the epistolary introduction to the theme of the document, an appeal to stand fast in the defence of the faith, at present endangered by the enemies of religion who have infiltrated the church and whose doom is certain (3b, 4).

The next verses (5-7) expand the notion of the judgment of God against the disobedient in Israel - the judgment of the same God who saved them from Egypt (v.5). Examples of the disobedient angels (cf. Gen.6:1-4) and Sodom and Gomorrah are listed. This may fairly be called the introduction to the discourse.

The main body is concerned to relate the contemporary enemies of God to the examples of God's judgment. Like those already exemplified, they "defile the flesh" (8a); they also reject authority (8b, 10), unlike the archangel Michael himself (9). They are thus to be identified with Cain, Balaam and Korah (11). By their excesses they mar the agape, the love feast of the community (12a), and are roundly denounced in an attractive series of metaphors (12b, 13), leading once again to the notion of judgment (13b), with scriptural attestation (14f.) from Enoch 1:9.

The concluding part contrasts the behaviour of such men with that required of true believers. They are grumblers, malcontents ... (16); you must recall the apostolic warnings about the emergence of scoffers in the last time (17f.). They cause divisions, are worldly, lack the Spirit (19); you must build yourselves up on the foundation of the holy faith, pray in the Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, wait for the mercy of Christ, convince the doubters, snatch some from the burning ... (20-23).

The ascription of promise is presumably an epistolary addition, although a spoken discourse intended for community use could have
ended in this way.

The form of the discourse enshrined in the letter is therefore as follows:

**Theme statement:** exhortation to true believers, in view of the enemies within, doomed as they are (3b, 4).

**Main body:**

**Introduction:** the gracious God also acts in judgment against his enemies, with examples (5-7).

**First section:** the enemies of God today and the judgment of scripture against them (8-15).

**Second section:** the enemies of God and the true believers whom the preacher addresses and exhorts (16-23).

The discourse is thematic, beginning and ending with an exhortation to true believers but being concerned primarily with the judgment of God against the enemies and disrupters of the faith. It might well have followed readings from Genesis reflected in the introduction to the main body (5-7). The discourse develops systematically, employing the traditional Jewish pattern of listed examples and making use also of strong contrast or antithesis (cf. 8f., 16ff., 19ff.). Its admonitory note is strengthened with one "Woe to them", reflecting prophetic admonition.

The conclusion that we have here a homiletic outline or pattern can hardly be resisted. Epistolary convention affects only verses 1-3a, at which point the writer switches dramatically to the theme of the homily. The more usual type of exhortation must give way to emergency measures in face of heretical trends. He preserves not only the form of the homily but also something of the warm, friendly yet serious manner in which it would usually be delivered. The document, however, is restrained and economical, and reinforced with
the evocative name "Jude" (1) - a useful and effective tract for circulation in areas of the church threatened by incipient gnosticism. The homily so neatly enshrined in it probably represents standard anti-heresy or apologetic preaching. As B. Reicke observes:

"Jude does not appear to express personal feelings and reactions but puts into effective and elegant form an exhortation already traditional". (2)

From the formal point of view, the interest of 2 Peter lies in the use it makes of the apologetic homily so well utilised in Jude and in its adaptation of it to a slightly different purpose. (3) In its form, it is differentiated from Jude in two ways. First, it is more consciously epistolary (1:1f.; 3:1); and in the second place, it is testamentary: it takes the form of a farewell discourse of Peter (1:14f.). (4) In line with these factors, 2 Peter is more contrived stylistically, reflecting the baroque and extravagant Asiatic school increasingly fashionable at this period (early second century) - a style also suited to the writer's emotional intensity and perhaps to his Semitic background. (5) 2 Peter also differs from Jude in its aim and theme. The writer's overriding concern is to urge the recipients of the letter to remain steadfast in the eschatological faith, expressed in terms of the coming of the Lord Jesus at 1:16 but elsewhere as the coming of the Day of the Lord (or of God: cf. 3:12). It is this faith that is under attack from the false prophets and teachers, and in reply the writer stresses the cosmic nature of the

(1) Cf. Sidebottom, op. cit., p.78f. Jude was associated with his brother, James (v.1) and therefore the brother of Jesus. Later evidence suggested that in gnostic circles Jude was regarded as Jesus' twin.
(3) This is not to say that 2 Peter is necessarily later than Jude or that it is dependent on Jude.
(4) Cf. Deut.29ff.; Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs, passim; John 13-17; Acts 20:17-38; cf. 2 Tim.4:6.
eschatological drama and the urgency of godly living in face of the Day of the Lord.

2 Peter is therefore doubly interesting in that it not only presents a kind of epistolary homily on a theme of its own but it shows, in comparison with Jude, how readily homiletic material can be adapted to meet a different situation. This presupposes, of course, a fair degree of common ground, represented in the case of Jude and 2 Peter by their concern with false teachers.

2 Peter 1:1-16 is largely epistolary in structure. The epistolary opening (1:1f.) is followed by informal didache, showing the influence of rhetoric (1:5ff.), with emphasis on recall (1:12) and with testamentary overtones (1:14f.). Then the beginning of a homily is discernible, 1:16-21 representing a slightly extended theme statement:

The Proclamation of the Parousia rests not only on myths but on personal testimony (cf. Transfiguration) and on prophecy inspired by the Holy Spirit.

The first part of the main body of the discourse is largely derived from the apologetic tradition used by Jude. In 2 Peter, it is introduced in antithesis to the last part of the theme statement: there are false prophets who mislead many, as opposed to the true prophets who speak by the Spirit. This part may be divided into three sub-sections:

(i) false prophets, their success and impending condemnation (2:1-3).
(ii) how the judgment of God operates against the unrighteous, especially those who "indulge in the lust of defiling passion and despise authority" (2:4-10).
(iii) denunciation of the unrighteous troubleurs of the church, the "slaves of corruption", whose latter state, having once known Christ, is worse than ever (2:10b-22).

(2) Kasemann says that it "provides support via negationis for the proof which is being built up"; op. cit., p.178.
The second part of the main body, introduced by an epistolary note, returns to the main theme by an appeal to "the predictions of the holy prophets" (as opposed to the false ones), reinforced by the "commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles" (3:2), together with a renewal of the eschatological emphasis (3:3f.). The remainder of the discourse (3:5-10) is devoted to a defence of traditional eschatology, in which the "scoffer" has always figured (3:3f.), and to the ethical consequences of such belief (3:11-18). The urgency of this message removes the need for an independent conclusion.

It would appear that, after allowance has been made for literary and epistolary elements, 2 Peter discloses a classic Jewish homiletic structure, in which the three main parts stand in antithesis to each other in such a way that the third or concluding part resumes and presses home the leading theme of the first part or introduction.

Some of the older commentators, impressed by the inadequacy of the term "epistle" as a classification for "James", have described it as a homily, without however making a precise formal analysis of this document. (1) Moffatt's comments illustrate how unsatisfactory such an approach is. Denying that the "homily" is "a loosely knit series of quasi-proverbial passages" and equally that it is "the logical exposition of a single theme", he observes that the initial leading ideas (of "faith", "wisdom" and "trial") recede into the background after 4:11, and

"even the earlier part of the writing contains groups of aphorisms with as little cohesion as a handful of pearls".

The paragraphs, he maintains, are "semi-detached", and quoting Wordsworth, he suggests that they are orderly and bound to each other "by a

continuous and acknowledged tie, though unapparent".\(^1\) However admirable in poetic feeling, this approach represents the denial or the abandonment of formal criticism. It is all the more surprising to find it recurring without any apparent justification, in a modern commentary.\(^2\)

Most recent commentators accept the extreme looseness of form as a characteristic of the document. Thus Bo Reicke writes:

"It consists of a series of admonitions on different themes which are dealt with one after another without any clearly discernible plan".\(^3\) Accordingly, it may be designated as paraenetic,\(^4\) "a collection of wise instruction from a highly competent Christian teacher".\(^5\) The admitted lack of a general theme,\(^6\) together with the absence of a clearly identifiable structure, exclude it from the category of homily as we have defined it, despite the fact that it contains diatribal characteristics at many points.\(^7\)

1 Peter represents another epistle which some modern commentators have categorised perhaps too precipitately as a sermon - in particular, a baptismal sermon extending to 4:11, where a break is generally recognised.\(^8\) While a baptismal concern is evinced at various points (1:2; 3:21), a homiletic or sermonic structure is difficult to identify. There is no theme statement, nor is there a systematic development of thought. Selwyn's analysis, admittedly "not easy",

---

\(^1\) Cf. L.E. Elliott-Binns, James, in Peake 1962, p.1022.
\(^3\) C.L. Mitton, The Epistle of James, 1966, p.237f.
\(^4\) Cf. Easton, op. cit., p.3.
distinguishes three doctrinal sections separated by three hortatory sections, but this is perhaps no more than a general guide to the reader and does not amount to a proper formal analysis. The epistle does not correspond to a homily either as a total entity or in most of its parts. The final part (4:12-5:11), taken by some to be addressed to the whole congregation, has perhaps the best claim to be of homiletic derivation. Thus, 4:12f. may well be the theme statement: persecution must be expected and accepted in fellowship with Christ and in an eschatological perspective. The first main section (4:14-19) expands upon the Christian attitude to suffering; the second (5:1-10) is a charge to elders and congregation, highly rhetorical in places (5:2), to carry out their duties in the right spirit, "knowing that the same experience of suffering is required of your brotherhood throughout the world" (9b). The last note, which might be a condensed conclusion, is the assurance of God's restorative work after suffering endured (10).

(2) Thus, his first doctrinal section has been described as a prayer-hymn (1:3-12); his first hortatory section as pure didache (1:13-21), together with a baptismal dedication (1:22-25), and the beginnings of a festal song (2:1-10): cf. H. Preisker in H. Windisch, Kommentar z. Kath. Epp. H.N.T., 1951, pp.156ff. Other parts have been identified as a hymn about Christ (2:21-4), a revelation (3:13-4:7a) and an amended prayer (4:7b-11). The document might therefore be a liturgical guide - perhaps even to be ascribed to the baptismal celebration at the Paschal vigil: cf. F.L. Cross, 1 Peter, a Paschal Liturgy, 1954. Such a solution has met with criticism, cf. C.F.D. Moule, The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter, N.T.S. 3, 1956, pp.1ff., but it has at least the merit of indicating the diversity of material contained in this general epistle - which remains, perhaps, the best description of it: cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p.1; A.M. Hunter, 1 Peter in Int. Bib. XII, 1957, p.81. It presents an interesting similarity to Ephesians: cf. C.L. Mitton, The Relationship between 1 Peter and Ephesians, J.T.S., n.s.1, 1950, pp.67ff.
Outside the New Testament, Second Clement is of critical concern for our investigation, since it is widely recognised as a complete homily and probably the earliest unadulterated example we possess. (1) Whatever its precise date or origin, (2) it can be considered sufficiently close to the ethos of the New Testament writers to share their assumptions as to basic homiletical procedures.

The homily has been written out by a presbyter (17:3) for delivery before a congregation (19:1), and its place in the liturgy is after the reading of the scriptures (cf. 2:1; 19:1). It abounds in exhortation to the faithful and in warnings against any form of antinomianism. It contains a high notion of the church and a number of references to baptism (6:9; 8:6; 19:1), and to apostolic writings and apocryphal works as well as the Septuagint, and it has an eschatological orientation.

The structural analysis of the homily has never received justice at the hands of the commentators. R.M. Grant considers that the author lacks the rhetorical and logical skill of the writer to the Hebrews or Melito of Sardis, and that, since he proceeds from one topic to another by mere association of ideas or words, the homily has no clear logical development. (3) Grant's outline of the contents illustrates the looseness of structure he finds in it. (4) K.P. Donfried has suggested that the homily consists of a theological section (chs. 1 and 2), followed (after a transitional chapter) by an ethical section (4:1-14:5) and finally by an eschatological section. (5)

(2) 2nd century, A.D., at Rome, Corinth or even Alexandria.
(4) Ibid., p.111.
This analysis suggests a degree of compartmentalisation not unknown in later theological education but hardly characteristic of early Christian writings. (1)

An examination of the homily designed to elucidate its inherent structure produces the following analysis.

1:1-4:5 Introduction or Theme Statement. The theme is our salvation: what Christ has done for us (1:1ff., 4, 6ff.; 2), and what we can do for him in return (1:3, 5; 3-4). Structurally, it is essential to note that the theme statement is concerned both with the action of God in Christ and with the appropriate response of man to him. It is therefore unsound to separate 1:1-2:7 as a theological section from the chapters which follow it. As 1:3 and 5 make clear, the human response is in view from the outset. The theme is in fact primarily man's response to God's graciousness - a response that must not be verbal only but expressed in action (cf. 4:1).

5:1-15:5 Main Section. 5:1-7:6 I The Christian must make his response in this world while looking to the next (5:1ff., 5ff.; 6:1f.). This world and the world to come being essentially in opposition, the Christian must do the will of Christ here (6:5-9) as a contestant (7:1-6, an analogy from the games), and must "keep the seal" (i.e., of his baptism).

8:1-12:6 II Repentance is the essential basis of the response of man-in-the-world to God (8:1f.). Using the analogy of the potter and his clay, the writer stresses obedience to God now (8:2ff.). Chapter 9 underlines the importance of life "in the flesh" with an appeal to the incarnation, and renew the emphasis on action here in terms of "loving one another", "repentance" and other ethical virtues. The Christian, however, is orientated to the future (10:4), making his way in faith and love towards the ineffable joy of the kingdom (11:7), and ever remaining watchful for the coming of the Lord (12:1).

13:1-15:5 III Repentance and obedience to Christ essential for man-in-the-Church. Repentance goes with taking "sober thought for what is good" (13:1); and not the least important aspect of inconsistency in belief and practice is its alienating effect upon others. Those who truly obey Christ gain admittance to the eternal Church, but those who

(1) Theology is not confined to the first chapters - theological concern probably reaches its peak in ch.14. Similarly, eschatological concern is apparent throughout the homily (e.g., chs.5, 7, 11, 12).
fail him turn the Church into a den of robbers (14:1). At this point the writer reflects theologically (and Platonically) upon the nature of the Church. The eternal Church is the body of Christ, manifested in the flesh of Christ and empowered by his Spirit. Those who are faithful to her share this Spirit; the unfaithful cannot possibly do so. Those who heed this advice share with the preacher in salvation, and both parties must act in faith and love and so find access to God (15:1ff.).

16:1-20:5 Concluding Appeal.
In a series of appeals, the writer urges his congregation to turn in repentance to God (16:1), being mindful of the day of judgment; and to give priority to self-denial and love (his priorities place almsgiving before fasting, and fasting before prayer). He urges them to mutual strengthening (17:1ff.), to regular attendance at Church and consistency of belief and practice, with further reminders of the eschaton. Let them repent and have salvation and life: they will thereby set a goal before the young (19:1). Let them accept admonition (19:2) and do what is right, even if in this life the pious suffer (19:4) and the wicked prosper (20:1). The eschatological reward is not quickly granted, for righteousness would then be brought down to the level of a business deal. It would then become unrighteousness, on which divine judgment falls. The homily concludes with an ascription of glory. This analysis shows that allegations of a lack of logical development are ill-founded, and the appeal to an external and preconceived pattern misleading and unjustified. The writer does not work with the tight rhetorical patterns of Hebrews or Melito, but he possesses considerable rhetorical skill of his own type. His rhetoric is that of the congregational preacher. Its effectiveness is well illustrated by his attack on inconsistency of belief and practice in 13:2ff.

Its intrinsic form is that of the simple, thematic homily, with an introduction containing the theme statement, a main body which is divisible into three parts, and a conclusion which, while reflecting several topics dealt with in the homily, is designed mainly to press home the challenge of the homily with eschatological urgency. Antithesis is not apparent in the formal structure but it is implicit in the theme itself: God's action and man's response, subsequently
reflected in faith and works. Stylistically, the use of the rhetorical question is obvious, especially in the first person plural, and this is coupled with the hortative subjunctive. Analogy (e.g., from the games) is also used, but the most frequent device of all is the citation and discussion of scriptural passages. References to baptism are undoubtedly included, but while the homily may well have been delivered at a baptismal service this cannot be proved, since the references may be intended simply to refer to the baptism which all Christians undergo. It should therefore not be termed a baptismal homily, as this would in any case imply that the homily belonged to a special category. This is not so. We have here from the second century, a prime example of the thematic homiletic form.

Finally, one important consequence of the development of the thematic homily in the early church should be indicated. It provided the framework for a newGattung, the written gospel. Mark, we may assume, had no earlier model on which to fashion his work. He had an abundance of material, provided by church paraeneias and paradosis. His problem was to weld it together in a coherent whole which would adequately present the gospel of Jesus the Messiah, for his concern was kerygmatic and didactic. One hesitates to characterise Mark's work simpliciter, with W. Marxsen, as a Predigt. It is not a sermon or homily as it stands; it is a new literary form, which came to be called a euangelion. But its framework or structure, like its intent, is unmistakably derived from the thematic homily. Consider

(1) Der Evangelist Markus, 1956. The main difference is that it consists throughout of paraenetic and traditional material, by means of which the reader is instructed with the help of editorial comment or addition. It lacks explicit homiletics, but it shares with the homily both kerygmatic and didactic purpose and structural features.
the following possible outline:

theme statement: Mk. 1:1 (the gospel of Jesus the Messiah).
part 1, introduction: Mk. 1:2-13 (incl. the disclosure of the Messiah and his confrontation with evil).
part 1, main body: Mk. 1:14f. (programmatic) - 8:26 (the ministry of the veiled Messiah, actualizing the Kingdom).
part 2, introduction: Mk. 8:27-9:8 (confession of Messiah; Messiah-ship and the Cross).
part 2, main body: Mk. 9:9-15:47 (the way to the Cross, the crucifixion of the King, death, burial).
conclusion & climax: Mk. 16:1-8 (the resurrection).

(c) more lyrical homilies

Many commentators have seen 1 John as not so much a letter, more a tract or homily. "... 1 Jn. is not an ordinary letter; it is a homily or tract, written at a time of schism (2:19), due to heresy."

To seek confirmation of such judgments by means of formal analysis is by no means easy, because the author adopts a peculiar, convoluted style which develops by means of its inherent gyrations and consequently yields only with great difficulty to any superimposed pattern. The varieties of outlines produced by commentators witness eloquently to this fact.

The document begins with a clearly defined prologue or exordium (1:1-4) enshrining the theme, which is no other than the original kerygma of the church; indeed, in the portentous grandiloquence of the opening statement the message is held to be rooted in the beginnings of things (cf. Gen.1:1; Jn.1:2). The theme is enunciated in terms of life, eternal life, revealed in the event of Christ - life that is creative of fellowship, both at the human level and with the

(1) One is concerned here with the overall pattern rather than detailed analysis. Mark skilfully blends the various elements together, so that it is not always easy to be sure where one section ends and another begins (e.g., the introduction of part 2 and the main body). An analysis based solely on groupings of pericopae therefore differs from that given above: cf. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 1952, pp.90-104.


Father and the Son. “What is proclaimed as tangibly experienced is the primal divine reality manifested both as life and truth”. (1)

But while the prologue or theme statement is easily identified, the contours of the rest of the discourse can be discerned only by close analysis. Thus, while it is true that 1:4, 2:17 and 5:12 mark natural pauses in its flow, it would be unwise to attempt to structure the discourse round these points without first ascertaining whether the inner logic and sequence of the discourse corresponds to such a pattern. The subsequent discussion will therefore be a structural exploration.

The first unit to be discussed is the tightly constructed 1:5-10.

God is light; (a)
in him is no darkness at all. (b)

If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, (a)
we lie and do not do the truth. (b)
But if we walk in the light as he is in the light, (a)
we have fellowship with one another (b)
and the blood of Jesus his son cleanses us from all sin. (c)

If we say that we have no sin, (a)
we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us, (b)
If we confess our sins, (a)
he is faithful and just, so that he will forgive our sins (b)
and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. (c)

If we say that we have not sinned, (a)
we make him a liar and his word is not in us. (b)

This appears to be a hymn or poem, (2) showing striking similarity to parts of the love hymn in 1 Cor.13. 1 John 1:5b-10 may well have been composed and in use before the writing of this epistle, (3) but whether it is the work of some one other than the writer of 1 John is

---

(2) I.e., a consciously composed literary or rhetorical unit with characteristic rhythm, parallelism and structural regularity and balance. It was not necessarily sung, probably recited ecphonetically.
(3) Cf. O.A. Piper, I John and the Didache of the Primitive Church, J.B.L. LXVI, 1947, p.449f.
a matter for subsequent discussion.

The "hymn of light" is succeeded by what appears to be a commentary, which is as carefully balanced as the hymn itself. Introduced on an epistolary note (2:1a), the initial commentary (2:1-6) falls into two parts: 2:1-3, and 2:4-6. The first part is a conditional antithesis, recalling the notion of sin and release from it (2:1f.; cf. 1:8f.) and involving didactic material on the atonement (2:1b, 2; cf. 1:7b). This is rounded off by the definitive formula καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν δόξα ..., identifying the knowledge of God with keeping his commandments (2:3) - the correlative of having fellowship with God and walking in the light (1:7). The second part of the commentary offers an antithesis that virtually paraphrases what is already given in the hymn (2:4f.; cf. 1:6f.), before concluding on a definitive note again introduced by ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν δόξα ... (2:5b, cf. 3a). Then, in a kind of parenthesis once more introduced in epistolary fashion, the writer, as if conscious of the apparent novelty of his teaching, juggles with the paradox of the old and new commandment (2:7f.), which enables him to show the eschatological significance of the light now shining (2:8-11). But the latter part of this parenthesis in fact resumes the commentary on the "hymn of light". 2:9ff. reflects the light-dark antithesis of 1:5f., applying it to relationships with one's brother and underlining its eschatological significance. (1)

2:12ff. is something of an epistolary extravaganza, which underlines the fact that the whole section from 2:1 onwards is basically epistolary and which also probably reflects a rhetorical way of

---

addressing the whole congregation. Here, the verbs are indicative, pointing to the eschatological realities of the present situation: forgiveness, knowledge of the eternal God, the overcoming of evil. It is therefore fittingly capped with an imperatival climax (2:15ff.), which consists of an interesting didactic grouping.

2:1-17 has all the marks of being composite. Its unity derives mainly from the intimacy of the epistolary address which the writer adopts, although the individual groupings have their own integrity of structure. It appears that the author's commentary on the "hymn of light" may itself be secondary. R. Bultmann has suggested the possibility of discerning a source which the author has broken up to suit his purpose as commentator. Reconstructed, it reads as follows:

"He who says 'I know him' but disobeys his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him; (2:4) but whoever keeps his word, in him truly love for God is perfected. (2:5a) He who says he is in the light and hates his brother is in the darkness still. (2:9) He who loves his brother abides in the light and in it there is no cause for stumbling. (2:10) But he who hates his brother is in the darkness and walks in the darkness". (2:11a)

These five couplets, introduced with one exception (5a) by ℓ and the present participle, present a remarkable counterpart to the five clauses of the "hymn of light". The latter, however, has two extended clauses (1:7c and 9c) which are integral to the literary poem as it stands but which probably did not belong to the original utterance since the couplet appears to be basic. The purpose of the

(1) Cf. Dodd, op. cit., pp.37ff. There is probably no real significance in the distinction between τακτία (v.12) and παθότα (v.13).
(2) It consists of (i) the negative command; (ii) the exposition of the conclusion to be drawn if this command is not followed; (iii) the reasons for this situation; (iv) the climactic positive statement. This paraenetic form will be discussed in the next chapter.
addition is to introduce the doctrine of the atonement upon which the
author then comments in his first epistolary note (2:1-3).

A similar tendency is seen at 2:5b, 6, which is a definitive statement
interjected into the flow of the couplets. The interruption is
continued in the following epistolary and didactic note (2:7f.). The
source is then resumed, a final comment being added at 2:11b. Bult-
mann's suggestion is therefore convincing. Accordingly, we conclude
that the basis of the first section is the "hymn of light" containing
eleven couplets in all. The source would appear to emanate from a
highly rhetorical and poetic milieu, probably to be associated with
prophecy.

The next section of the epistle is both polemical and eschatologi-
cal (2:18-25). In another series of rhetorical units (2:18f., 22f.),
the writer takes the appearance of antichrists as symptomatic of the
approach of the eschaton, and concludes with a rhetorical exhortation
(24f.) which reiterates in simpler form the essence of the prologue
(1:1-3). It would appear that the writer is making use of familiar
didache, which is already in highly stylised form in this part of the
church. V.23 is the only perfect couplet in the passage, and is
also of crucial importance. V.21 is epistolary, as is also the
following passage, v.26f.

With A.N. Wilder, we detect a transition point at 2:28 rather

---

(1) The addition may have been made prior to the writing of the
epistle. Thus Piper, op. cit., p.449, writes: "1 Jn.1:6-10 has
its perfect stylistic equivalent in the Pauline hymn 1 Cor.13 ..."
We suggest that this form has evolved from an original grouping of
six couplets.


(3) The familiarity of Polycarp (e.g., to Philippians 7), Papias (cf.
Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III, 39, 17), and Irenaeus (adv. Haer. I, 9,
3; III, 17, 5, 6) with the Johannine epistles suggests the
province of Asia as their milieu - a conclusion, Dodd remarks,
which few would question even if they were to assign the Fourth
Gospel to another area: op. cit., p.lxvii.
than 3:1, (1) for 2:18-27 appears to be a unit of the epistle and 2:28ff. is integrally related to 3:1ff. In 2:28-3:24, the recurring theme is the children of God (3:1f., 10), who are "born of God" (2:29; 3:9) and have "confidence" before God (2:28; 3:21; cf. 3:19). An apodeictic formula for discerning the children of God is given at 3:10. Also characteristic is the emphasis on doing what is right (2:29; 3:7, 10, 22) or what is loving (3:10f., 14, 16, 18, 23), and on being pure (3:3), the outward deed being the sign, as it were, of inward grace (3:10). Another definitive formula points to the cross as the key to our knowledge of love and the impulse towards reproducing it (3:16). Love must be expressed not simply in word or speech but in deed and truth (3:18). But even in such a positive exposition the antitheses appear: sinners (3:4ff.), who are of the devil (3:8ff.), like Cain (3:12); the world, that hates or does not recognise the children of God (3:1, 13). At the same time, in the complex interweaving of the author's thought, other motifs from the foregoing discourse are repeated: "abiding" in God, eschatological concern, the Spirit.

E. von Dobschütz anticipated Bultmann's source criticisms in a study of 2:28-3:12, in which he identified as basic, prior material four couplets containing antithetical parallelism, which are surrounded in the text by commentary. (2) They are 2:29b and 3:4; 3:6a and 6b; 3:7b and 8a; 3:9a and 10b. All except 3:7b and 8a begin with ματσα and a participle; 7b and 8a do not have the ματσα.

"Every one who does right is born of him. (2:29)
Every one who commits sin is guilty of lawlessness, (3:4)
No one who abides in him sins;
No one who sins has ever seen him. (3:6)
He who does right is righteous. (3:7b)
He who commits sin is of the devil. (3:8a)

(2) Johanneisiche Studien I, Z.N.W. VIII, 1907, p.4ff.
No one born of God commits sin. (3:9a) No one who does not do right is of God." (3:10b)

As well as the formal unity of each couplet, this grouping can appeal to a common ethical concern presented in a common religious perspective. The total unity, however, is not quite so convincing as that of the "hymn of light". This is probably due to the way the author has split up the couplets, varying their contents slightly in the process. Besides, other material makes a fair approximation to those listed above; for example, 2:23:

"No one who denies the Son has the Father. He who confesses the Son has the Father also."

Sometimes, a line gives the impression of being one limb of such a couplet:

"Everyone who has this hope in him purifies himself" (3:3a).

The conclusion must be that there is evidence here not only of source material (for source material in the form of quotable didache occurs throughout the epistle) but of one particular source, in the form of balanced couplets, probably related to the "hymn of light" source, (1) but worked over much more severely by the author, so that it is reflected here rather than cited.

4:1-6 is another polemical section which recalls the tenor of 2:18-25. The object of attack is the false prophets, whose pneumatic exercises are, however, no guarantee of their validity. Once again, a stern couplet is definitive:

"Every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God."

(1) It is possible, as already hinted, that the "hymn of light" and the couplets cited here originated in the inspired outpourings of Christian prophecy, and that the "hymn of light", or rather 1:6-10, was expanded into the form of an independent hymn or poem.
There is considerable formal pattern to the warnings against false teachers, both in 2:18-25 and 4:1-6, the author once again making use of church didache.

4:7-21 presents a loosely-knit, flowing unit, containing many elements of recapitulation and serving the homiletic purpose of summing up and reinforcing salient points in the writer's message with something approaching climactic force. There is a strong impression that sources of some kind are in use here, but they have been worked over to such an extent as to defy precise reconstruction. A number of couplets is visible. Perhaps, however, there is in the background a "hymn of love", embodying the essence of Johannine teaching and employing the shorter line for maximum effect:

Love is of God.
He who loves is born of God
and knows God,
For God is love. (4:7f.)

No man has ever seen God.
If we love one another,
God abides in us,
and his love is made perfect in us. (4:12)

God is love.
He who abides in love
abides in God,
and God abides in him. (4:16)

This suggestion helps to explain the repetitiveness and circularity of this section - excessive even for this writer. Around the hymn, the writer constructs his commentary, using homiletic exhortations (4:7, 11), definitive statements (4:9f., 13, 17) and didactic material,

(1) A.N. Wilder expresses agreement with the source theory here, on the grounds that "the use of parallelism is so clear": *op. cit.*, p.276. That there is "balance of thought and form" in 4:5f. is readily discernible, although in the existing material all the elements are not present. This points once again to the rather free use of source materials by the writer.

(2) E.g., 7b, 8a (if there is any truth in our suggested "hymn of love", this couplet is secondary and probably originates in catechetical teaching); 4:15; 4:20f. (cf. 2:4).
including material of a confessional nature (4:14ff.; 18-21).

The chapter division at 5:1 is artificial, for there is no essential break in the narrative. Beginning with a couplet followed by a definitive statement (5:1f.), the writer once again links faith and love. A catechetical pattern may be discerned at 5:5. In his final paragraph (5:6-12), he is concerned with testimony - not least with the testimony of the Spirit (5:7f.) - and his climactic point is once again a couplet:

"He who has the Son has life;
he who has not the Son of God has not life" (5:12).

The remainder of the chapter is clearly epistolary (5:13), structured around the theme of knowledge. (1)

To conclude our survey of the document as it stands, the following outline analysis might be offered:

1:1-4 introduction to letter
1:5-2:17 (A) the children of God - the "hymn of light", with appropriate commentary,
2:18-27 (B) the children of God and of antichrist (polemical).
2:28-5:12 (A) the children of God - their way of life.
4:1-6 (B) the children of God and of antichrist (polemical). 
4:7-5:12 (A) the children of God - the "hymn of love" with interspersed commentary, and the divine witnesses.
5:13-20 conclusion of letter.

The document as it stands is in epistolary form though lacking the usual kind of epistolary formulae in the introduction and conclusion. Despite its apparent meanderings, repetitions and recapitulations, its structure follows the lines of simple antithesis, corresponding to the antithetical characteristics of the author's style and material. In what other ways can it be described? Rhetorical? Very much so - in the introduction, the rhetorical elaboration is almost painful.

Homiletic? Yes, indeed, although in its present form it is a letter.

(1) 5:13, 15 (twice), 18, 19, 20. In v.20, διάνοιαν, "understanding", and ἔλεγχος are also used.
- however peculiar.

The evidence as we have analysed it points to a combination of various elements in 1 John: didactic statements and pronouncements, catechetical formulae, couplets - single or in groups - using parallelism and antithesis, poems or hymns. As there is a build up of different elements, so there is an intensification of complexity until 1 John emerges from the crucible in all its problematical glory. The motive for the build up is probably mainly didactic\(^{(1)}\) - to illustrate the Christian way of life and the indissoluble link between confession and practice. Nevertheless, the lyrical quality is never completely lost. At certain points the teacher is elevated in spirit to glimpse the significance of the Christian revelation in its totality, and in this mood of heightened sensitivity is inspired to poetic utterance, using as his raw material utterances already articulated within the Christian community. At least the "hymn of light" and the "hymn of love" should be assigned to Christian prophecy, and the author himself suggests this debt in his reference to the testimony of the Spirit.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. O.A. Piper, \textit{op. cit.}, passim.

\(^{(2)}\) There can be no doubt as to the essentially Christian nature of these utterances. The "hymn of light", even in what we suspect to be its earlier form, contains a clear reference to the forgiveness of Christ (1:9): there appears to be no good reason to doubt its authenticity as O'Neill does (\textit{op. cit.}, p.10). The equally mystical "hymn of love" dwells upon the notion of God as love; the commentary relates it explicitly to the sending of the Son, and his incarnation and atonement (4:9f.). Bultmann's contention that there is a theological discrepancy between the source material and the author of 1 John is therefore weak: cf. Piper, \textit{op. cit.}, p.447: "One might be tempted to enquire whether any differences of christology existed between the 'Vorlage' and the rest of the epistle". Indeed, the whole tenor of the epistle is against such a presumption. A teacher does not highlight inadequate material unless he is going to launch a specific attack on it, which is not the case here; nor does he make inadequate material the basis of a pupil's handbook. But O'Neill's argument that the source derived from a Jewish sect which provided the background of the writer and his followers (now Christian) and also his opponents (who refused to become Christian) is ingenious and attractive, though perhaps not capable of complete proof: cf. \textit{op. cit.}, p.6f., and passim.
The strongly kerygmatic and didactic notes in 1 John indicate that, although our document is in epistolary form, it reflects the kind of discourse the author might give orally. It is therefore indicative of a lyrical type of homily, which might be compared to the "interpretation" that expounds prophetic utterance. 1 John appears to enshrine in its innermost being several elevated poetic passages, not unintelligible in themselves but requiring elucidation and commentary. That the writer handles the original utterances with a certain freedom, interleaving didactic commentary, suggests that they may well be the creations of his own exalted experiences or that they have become wholly integrated with his own thinking.

Outside the New Testament, Melito's Peri Pascha, first made available to a wide public as recently as 1940, is of interest from the point of view of its form. Although C. Bonner described it as a homily, his description has been challenged by F.L. Cross on the grounds of its style and its declamatory temper and ethos. It is, he argues, unique in Christian literature: in fact, a Christian Paschal Haggadah.

The style, with its abundance of rhetorical figures and its theatrical elements, derives mainly from the fulsome rhetoric of the second century Greek schools, already apparent in writers such as Maximus of Tyre, Favorinus, Lucian, and Polemo, and is designed to effect a fusion of rhetoric and theology. It would be surprising

(1) C. Bonner, The Homily on the Passion by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, 1940.
indeed if Christian homiletics were not influenced by the current hellenistic declamationes and impelled in the direction of rhetorical extravaganzna. There is some evidence of such influence prior to Melito, and its ultimate product was perhaps the kontakion of Byzantine times.

The approach of Dr. Cross in describing it as unique in the Christian tradition and in applying to it terms derived from the Jewish tradition appears to encounter certain hazards. On the one hand, it puts the document out of its proper perspective in the Christian tradition and on the other, it minimises the considerable gulf which separated the Jewish and Christian traditions even in Asia Minor in the second century. The Christian Pasch, for example, does not represent a simple continuation of the Passover feast. Moreover, even if it is legitimate to compare Melito's work with the Passover Haggadah, this in itself does not lead to the conclusion that it is not a homily, since that Passover Haggadah itself appears to have originated as a homily. Cross' suggestion has more point in relation to the subsequent use of the Peri Pascha, for its collocation in MSS tradition with various liturgical passages indicates the possibility of its later use as part of a relatively fixed liturgy.

The Peri Pascha was originally designed for delivery in a liturgical context, though Bonner's comment that it is "what would today be called a Good Friday sermon" is open to challenge on the grounds


(3) Vid. supra, p. 107.

that the liturgical setting is that of the Quartodeciman celebration in which the Cross and Easter are identified. Much scholarly debate has centred on the interpretation of the opening lines of the Peri Pascha which, *prima facie*, suggest not only the reading of Exodus 12 but the giving of some kind of interpretation in conjunction with it. Thus, on the presupposition that the lesson was read in Hebrew, Bonner suggested the activity of a lector and Zuntz a *meturgeman* at this point; (1) while, presupposing the reading in Greek, O. Perler suggested that a typological paraphrase accompanied the lesson and related it to Christ. (2) The homily itself was delivered at a later point in the festival, after the baptisms, the fast, the love feast and the eucharist had taken place. S.G. Hall, however, has challenged the whole basis of the debate by showing that in line 2 may mean, not "interpreted" or "explained" but simply "plainly stated". (3) No commentary or interpretation was given other than that contained in the Peri Pascha, which is thus seen to be basically an exegesis of Exodus 12 and the meaning of the Pasch.

Structurally, the document has affinities with what we have described as the thematic homily. The statement of theme is given at length in the prologue (3-72): it is the mystery of the Pasch, including the immolation and salvation, the type and realisation— the lines, in fact, on which the discourse is to be developed. The first main section (73-323) is primarily an exegesis of the Exodus story; the

---

(1) Zuntz, *On the Opening Sentence of Melito's Paschal Homily*, H.T.R., 1943, pp.299-315; Bonner was more hesitant about the use of Hebrew: *A Supplementary Note on the Opening of Melito's Homily*, H.T.R., 1943, pp.317ff. Others who accepted the hypothesis were Wifstrand, Jeremias, Manson, Lohse, Dugmore and Cross.

(2) *Meliton de Sardes sur la Pâque*, 1966, p.24f. Others who rejected the hypothesis of a Hebrew reading were Gärtner, Testuz, Perler, Cantalamessa and Hall.

second (325-522) explains "the plan of the mystery", salvation and redemption from the Fall to Christ; the third (523-766) deals with Israel's rejection of Christ and God's rejection of Israel, the favoured people, and the victory of Christ. The conclusion or epilogue (767-823) develops the notion of Christ's victory, which is an invitation to all to receive forgiveness. The structure of the Peri Pascha therefore presents no difficulty; its development is cyclic. (1)

What is striking about this homily, however, is that the almost bewildering variety of rhetorical figures and devices builds up into a highly lyrical work, a panegyric or encomium. This development is assisted by the fact that ancient rhetoric was much more poetic and musical than the modern mind readily appreciates - G. Gracchus, for example, attuning the pitch of his voice to a musical instrument. (2)

The Peri Pascha, prose form as it is, (3) would be recited ecphonetically, the intonation following the grammar of the sentences, which would be divided per cola et commata. No doubt, many early Christian hymns found their origins in this kind of rhetoric. (4) The Peri Pascha is certainly appropriate to the celebratory atmosphere of the great Quartodeciman Pasch, corresponding to the panegyrical discourses associated with both Old Testament and Greek festivals. (5)

(1) For a detailed analysis of this cyclic structure, cf. T. Halton, op. cit., p.249ff.
(4) Cf. the hymn fragment on the verso of the last page of Papyrus Bodmer; cf. also 1 Tim. 3:16; Eph. 1:3-14, and in the other direction the Kontakion of Byzantine times.
(5) Bo Reicke, op. cit., p.152.
(d) concluding observations.

Homiletic preaching is exegetical and didactic, and its virtual identification with the New Testament term *paraclesis* indicates its strongly nurtural and inspirational concern. It presupposes a scripture using community and a basic hermeneutical standpoint and was therefore appropriate to both Judaism and the early Christian communities. It is not accidental that as the homiletic tradition developed the "text" became the recognised starter. Even in the homilies reflected in the New Testament, the theme statement normally sets out the datum - be it scriptural formula, theological proposition or theological-ethical statement - which it is the purpose of the discourse to explore, elucidate, illustrate or otherwise apply to the lives of the hearers.

The homily makes its impact by establishing a rapport and community of interest between preacher and congregation. Its method borrows freely from the diatribe with its simulated dialogue, but particularly in Jewish circles active dialogue between teacher and congregation could erupt at any point. The development of the homily in the direction of monologue should be seen not so much as an accommodation to the hellenistic diatribe or to rhetorical exercises but as part of a process of evolution within a liturgical context, the starting-point of which in the Christian groups may be presumed to have been the active dialogue-within-community of the earliest period: the common search for truth within the *koinonia* (cf. Acts 2:42). When the community was sufficiently settled and established as to require a lead from a well-qualified speaker rather than the mutual contributions of equally endowed partners, the homily, possibly influenced by early charismatic preaching, became much more monologe. A parallel development is purely didactic: the question and answer of the
diatribal technique became the question and answer of the catechist.\(^1\)

A few significant homiletic methods may be underlined briefly.

(i) **Development by illustration.** This device was well used by the rabbis in what we have termed "list structure". Whether used antithetically or in systematic build-up, it has a cumulative effect that is particularly convincing when working within an accepted scriptural tradition from which the illustrations are extracted.\(^2\)

In recital form, the cumulative effect is enhanced by the impression of continuity which the recital gives - e.g., a chain of witnesses down the ages, or the outworking of God's purpose in history. The total impact, however, is upon the present time and circumstances, in terms of summons to a particular decision or course of action now (e.g., faith, endurance, repentance, obedience ...). Other illustrative devices include the use of parables, stories, metaphors or similes, with a view to bringing the hearer to decision or enabling him to gain deeper insight into the life-issues or faith-issues in question.

(ii) **Development by antithesis.** This is the most common structural device used in homilies, and it may reflect the fundamentally antithetical nature of religious language, viz., that when one affirms a theological proposition, one does so with specific or implicit reference to its opposite or antithesis: faith, not unfaith; grace, not law; love, not hate; endurance, not capitulation; or when one uses religious language, one is aware of the concrete component from which the language is derived and to which it stands in antithesis: light, bread, shepherd, vine; or the duality of judgment.

Thus, when Paul takes as his *datum* the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel to faith (Rom.1:16f.), he includes in that concept the antithesis of the wrath of God against unfaith and begins his development of the theme with this point. The writer to the Hebrews, in speaking of the Son as the heir of all things and as reflecting the glory of God, has in mind the antithesis he presents to earlier revelations (now seen to be secondary) and to angelic beings (now seen to be inferior), and so finds antithetical development the natural

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. the following chapter on *paraenesis* and *catechesis*.

procedure to be followed in his exposition. The Tannaitic rabbi, preaching on the theme of repentance, quotes the dictum, meaningful in certain contexts, that a man should not be ashamed of his companions or of what he has done; yet in antithesis to that dictum one may say it is better to feel shame in such contexts (i.e., to express repentance) rather than to suffer, say, from famine, where the suffering is not undertaken for a spiritual purpose. By antithesis again, certain kinds of fasts do have a spiritual function and they are to be commended.

Such evidence as we can glean from the gospels suggests that similar antitheses characterised Jesus' own expositions: the scripture speaks of the salvation of the Jews, but Gentiles may be preferred before them (Luke 4:25ff.); the bread that Jesus gives is not the same as that given by Moses but is the bread of eternal life (John 6:31ff.).

Thus the use of religious language is an art, and an appreciation of antithesis a basic skill which contributes towards mastery of the art. For the study of the homily, antithesis is much more than a mere rhetorical figure. It is integral to homiletic procedure and reaches to the heart of the meaning of the basic datum by eliciting the appropriate interpretative nuance.

(iii) Development by means of certain identifications. At least part of the purpose of homiletics is to help the hearer to make certain connections or identifications between his own life and times and the fundamental core of the religious tradition to which he belongs. Rabbinic exegesis attempted to take the Torah as revealed and recorded in the past and apply it to the conditions of the hearers, as relevant and necessary to their understanding of their present and future. Christian exegesis begins with the datum of a more recent past - the event of Christ, which must itself be related to the more remote past in terms of the fulfilment of earlier prophecy. But such "searching of the scriptures" designed to elucidate the Christ event is not merely an exercise in "pastness". To identify the Christ event as the action of God in fulfilment of prophecy is more than a statement of occurrence external to the believer. It is also a statement about the believer himself or his self-understanding. Thus, if one says "Jesus is Lord" one is in fact saying "I believe that Jesus is Lord": a statement which not only identifies "Jesus" with "Lord"
but also identifies the speaker as a believer in him. To make the identification "this is that ..." (τὸν ὁσφυτὴν ἀναγνωρίζει τῷ ...: Acts 2:16) in terms of the fulfilment of prophecy is to see certain events as eschatological and therefore of decisive importance to the hearers, for the very act of proclamation (whether in prophetic or homiletic form is not relevant at this juncture) involves the hearer in God's action and brings him to decision (cf. Acts 2:37f.).

Thus the homily is concerned to work out a whole web of identifications. At its simplest, it is concerned with the divine-human relationship, although in Christian homiletics there are three key points: the preacher, the hearer and Christ; but each one of these is involved in his own network of identifications that go to make up the complexities of the situation in so far as these are understood. Thus Christ can be identified with the Father, as is usual in the Fourth Gospel, or with the Logos or some philosophical role, or with a historic role in Israel. Each one of these is of ultimate or eschatological significance for both preacher and hearer, enlarging and transforming the web of relationships in his experience. The preacher and the hearer are constantly involved in an identification game centring on the question "Who am I?" or "What is my role in life?"; and the answer to that question is not other than the answer to questions about Christ.

A great variety of such identifications is made in the New Testament, many of them undoubtedly homiletic in origin. Thus Rome is "Babylon" or "the harlot", just as in Jewish homiletics Trajan was "the vulture". John is "the voice of one crying in the wilderness" or "Elijah". The "I am" formulae of the Fourth Gospel similarly identify Jesus with an Old Testament word or concept. Paul identifies Jesus with "the rock"; Melito identifies the Pasch with the Passover. The whole typological game is simply one special type of identification used for expository purposes. Clearly, such
identifications, though characteristic of the homily, are not peculiar to it. Here again, the homily continues and develops a process which operated in the earliest formative period of the Christian community.  

(1) Only a brief sketch of the subsequent history of the homily is possible here. The term *homilia* was used in Justin (Apol. 1:67); the N.T. normally uses *paraclesis*; after the 4th cent., *sermo* (or *sermo popularis*) was common: cf. G. Mohrmann, *Prædicare-Tractare Sermo*: *Essai sur la terminologie paleochrétienne*, La Maison Dieu 39, 1954, pp.105ff. The great homilists in the East included Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers and Chrysostom; in the West, Hippolytus, Ambrose and Augustine. Homily retained its exhortatory and exegetical emphasis (cf. Origen, *Hom. in Gen.* 10:5; P.G. 12:219) and could also be eucharistic. Down the ages its application and emphasis changed. The crusades were "preached" (Peter the Hermit, Bernard); monastic preachers included Francis and Dominic. In the later Middle Ages preaching was in great decline, but the prophetic strain in the Reformation was anticipated by Wyclif and esp. Savonarola. Expository, scriptural and christocentric preaching characterised the Reformers: "nihil nisi Christus praedicandus" (Luther). For Calvin the preaching of the word was the prime mark of the true church (prophetic, kerygmatic, didactic). Other movements which influenced preaching were puritanism, pietism, evangelicalism and liberalism. The contemporary picture is confused. On the one hand, preaching has been assimilated to certain folk cultures: cf. B.A. Rosenberg, *The Art of the American Folk Preacher*, 1970. It has been part of "establishment" evangelism (cf. Billy Graham) and "non-establishment" evangelism (cf. "the Jesus movement"); despite "kerygmatic theology", secularisation in the West has generally brought about a crisis of preaching: cf. J.A.T. Robinson, *The New Reformation?*, 1965, pp.32-53; and an insistence that the gospel must be proclaimed not merely in preaching but through community. For a historical review of the subject in Britain and America, cf. F.R. Webber, *A History of Preaching*, vols. I-III, 1952-57; also N.C.E., art. "homily"; R.G.G., art. "Predigt"; E.R.E., art. "Preaching (Christian)".
KERYGMA AND DIDACHE

CHAPTER THREE:
PARAENESIS AND CATECHESIS
PARAENESIS AND CATECHESIS. (1)

"So it is not a piece of paraclesis that I have produced for your benefit, but rather paraenesis ..." (Isocrates) (2)

"I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue". (St. Paul) (3)

1. Paraenesis in the Graeco-Roman world.

The paraclesis which Isocrates rejected as an adequate vehicle for the moral education of his young acquaintance Demonicus consisted of the kind of exhortatory discourse beloved of the sophists, those virtuosos of the art of eloquence and persuasion, whose aim in lecturing was primarily to give instruction to students on how to succeed in public life. (4) Though not without skill in this type of oratory, Isocrates adopted a more direct, instructional model for moral teaching: paraenesis, in which exhortation was intimately concerned with the practical problems of living.

This enthusiasm for moral teaching was, of course, shared by more authentic philosophers than many of the paraenetic teachers actually were themselves: by Socrates, for instance, whose view that virtue is knowledge of the good presupposes that it can be taught. Living, like Plato and Aristotle after him, in what T.V. Smith called "the glow and the afterglow of the Periclean age in Athens", (5) Socrates was

---

(1) Since we prefer not to use didache as a specific category, the problem of appropriate terminology is acute. "παραίνειν" (advise, recommend) occurs in Acts 27:9, 22 in a non-technical context but is a useful general term. "κατακλίζω" (give information, Acts 21:21, 24) means "instruct" in 1 Cor.14:19; Gal.6:6; Rom.2:18; Acts 18:25; cf. Luke 1:14, but because of its association with later catechetics the term catechesis alone might prove misleading. We have therefore opted for a conjunction of both terms. Other important terms include νουθεσία (admonition, instruction, warning) and παιδεία (instruction, discipline, nurture) but they have a more specialised reference than is appropriate for the general chapter heading.

(2) οὐ παρακαλεῖν ἐποίησε· ἀλλὰ παραίνειν: Isocrates, To Demonicus, 5.

(3) 1 Cor.14:19.

(4) The "protreptic discourses": ibid., 3.

(5) From Aristotle to Plotinus, 1934, p.111.
able to bring a certain optimism to his view of the world which was alien to later teachers but which provided the essential grounds of his teleology. Those later teachers, whether Stoics, Cynics or others, rejected what seemed to them the weighty and tortuous intellectualism of the Academy and sought for instant solutions. Yet such popular teachers did not entirely reject the work of the great philosophers, however impatient they were with their successors and imitators. But their philosophic concerns and their methods(1) were adapted for the popular market, and certain of the great philosophers themselves were taken as symbols of the philosophic quest and of virtue: Socrates, with what A.H. Armstrong calls "his straightforward and simple moral rectitude, his ease in well-doing";(2) Plato, with his theory of forms and anamnesis, his hints of otherworldliness, his myths and his recognition of the importance of emotions; Aristotle, with his analysis of ethics, his concern for teleology, his careful study of this-worldly phenomena and his relating of them to the transcendent, his stress upon disposition and contemplation. Examples from their careers, stories they told, and dicta which had become virtually fixed, philosophical tradition were the stock in trade of the teachers of the market place. The great fourth century philosophers represented a kind of reference library from which a teacher could abstract whatever material he wished; and the library was extended by the accretion of the leading teachers of the popular schools, such as Diogenes and Zeno.(3)

---

(1) Concerns such as the care of the soul, the intellectual and moral personality, the vision of goodness; methods such as the dialogue.
(2) An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, 1947, p.31.
(3) For a more detailed survey, vid. the previous chapter.
The paraenetic concern is to be clearly distinguished from the general, diatribal procedures which characterise paraelesia and are the forerunners of the homily, although there is a considerable area of overlapping. On the one hand, paraenesis can make use of diatribal features such as rhetorical questions and characteristically uses to great advantage various rhetorical figures. On the other hand, the diatribe, which is longer and more fully developed, may utilise within its structure several shorter units that are essentially paraenetic. But paraenesis itself, apart from its tendency to brevity or to a simple succession of imperatival units, is concerned with intimate, personal counsel on moral and spiritual issues, with down-to-earth practical advice as part of the education of the recipient. (1) According to Aristotle, it was the kind of teaching appropriately given only by the more elderly teacher, on matters of which he has some experience. (2) Its dominant characteristic was its adherence to the popular, gnomic wisdom, passed on from generation to generation and frequently embodied in ancient poetry and other traditions. Isocrates himself names Hesiod, Theognis and Phocylides as "the best counsellors of the conduct of men", (3) but gnomic utterances appear as early as Homer (4) and are so much in vogue by Euripides' time as to lend themselves to parody by Aristophanes. From the fourth century onwards, collections of such gnomic sayings, known as chreiai, were made for the sake of their general usefulness. (5) Such rule of thumb epigrams as γνωθί σεαυτόν and μη δος ἡμῶν, which in the hands of

(1) Xenophon made Socrates into an outstanding exponent of this kind of teaching.
(3) To Nicocles, 43.
(4) Cf. Odyssey 16:294. In prose, Heraclitus (6th cent. B.C.) and Democritus (5th cent.) should be mentioned. Cf. O.C.D., ad loc.
(5) Early chreiai were attributed to Theocritus and Demetrius.
the philosophers died the death of a thousand qualifications, (1) appealed to the paraenetic teacher by virtue of their brevity, pithiness and meaningfulness in the context of actual living. Associated with this tradition of popular wisdom were fables, aetiological myths and various kinds of anecdote, usually of a humorous nature.

A brief resume is given below of the formal characteristics of this type of _paraenesis_, selected particularly for their relevance to the present discussion.

(i) The Paraenetic Topic.

The word _topos_ - the connotation of which is essentially local: a geographical or physiological location, or a place in a book, a passage - acquires in rhetorical and philosophical discourse a special colouring. In rhetoric, it denotes a common-place - the proper subject of dialectical and rhetorical syllogisms - which may deal with such questions as justice or politics and may be of various, identifiable types. (2) In relation to _paraenesis_, it denotes a particular topic of moral concern.

Isocrates, in his _Address to Philip_, introduces a _topos_ on Heracles (a highly "topical" figure) by discussing the deficiencies of the traditional ways of treating such material. In fact, he sees here a _topos_ that is

"distinct and completely unworked, neither small in compass nor vacuous in content but loaded with the substance of many panegyrics and glorious deeds and crying out for a speaker who can do them justice". (3)

Had he been younger, the orator says, he would have singled out wisdom, ambition and justice as the surpassing qualities of Heracles. Being

(3) To _Philip_, 109.
older and desiring to be brief, he is content to give a recital of some of his exploits. (1) Finally he comments on the purpose of the topos:

"so that you may know that my speech is designed to exhort you to such deeds as ... your ancestors clearly picked out as the noblest". (2)

The speech in which this topos is set is paraclesis rather than paraenesis, but the nature and function of the topos itself is characteristic of the paraenetic topic. For an examination of Isocrates' use of the topos in paraenesis proper, one must turn to his discourse to Demonicus.

This discourse, which has been described as "a string of detached maxims", (3) is characterised by a certain looseness of construction and consists of a series of paraenetic topics or topoi, each relatively independent and generally imperative or gnomic in approach. Xenophon gives a list of such topoi in the teaching of Socrates: courage, wisdom, prudence, justice, madness, envy, leisure, kings and rulers: (4) together with a string of aphorisms on less momentous matters. (5) In Isocrates, the subject matter ranges from the ideals of honour, virtue, self-control and healthful enjoyment to the problem of correct dress and prudence in public life.

A minimal topos (6) may consist only of a sentence or so, devoted

---

(1) Vid. infra.
(2) To Philip, 113. Isocrates' purpose was to persuade Philip to assume the leadership of a united Greece.
(3) G. Norlin, in Isocrates I, Loeb series, 1928, p.3.
(4) Memorabilia III, ix.
(5) Ibid., III, xiiif. E.g., about taking offence when your greeting is not returned.
to one subject and including an imperatival or gnomic sentiment. (1)

Isocrates on the whole follows the imperatival type of topic.

"Act towards your parents as you would wish your children to act towards you." (2)

On several occasions he employs a reciprocal behaviour pattern of this "golden rule" type.

"What angers you when you receive it at others' hands, do not yourself do to other people." (3)

Marcus Aurelius can transcend the principle of reciprocity:

"Do not reciprocate the temper of ill-natured people, and do not treat them as they treat the rest of mankind." (4)

Sometimes the topos is compounded of a number of imperatives, each of them expressing a complementary duty.

"Fear the gods; honour your parents; show respect to your friends; obey the laws." (5)

The topos may, however, be extended by various devices, such as a clause:

"Don't take delight in violent laughter and don't engage in brazen talk, for the one is foolish and the other senseless." (6)

(1) In his Rhetoric II.21, Aristotle defined a "maxim" as a declaration relating to such universals as are concerned with human action and are to be accepted or rejected accordingly. Thus, "No man of common sense should have his children taught to be too clever" is a maxim, but if a motive or reason clause is added e.g.; "For they are idle sluggards and besides win envious hatred from the citizens" an "enthymeme" or rhetorical syllogism has been created. Aristotle's use of "maxim" includes gnomic material, such as popular proverbs and quotations from the poets, but he sometimes distinguishes "maxims" from "proverbs" such as "know thyself" and "nothing too much" in that a maxim may be advanced against these. He admits, however, to the popular nature of the maxim and to its ethical character. Accordingly, I prefer to classify all such statements as gnomic, including those that a teacher might himself compose, and to follow Isocrates in describing the extended maxim as a topic. The niceties of rhetoric are hardly relevant to an understanding of paraenesis.

(2) To Demonicus 14.
(3) Nicocles 61; cf. To Nicocles 38.
(4) Meditations, vii, 65.
(5) To Demonicus 16.
(6) Ibid., 15.
Further extensions by means of antitheses or contrasts, illustrations, similes, proverbs or quotations bring the topos up to the dimensions of a paragraph. Here is a typical example, on "material possessions":

"Do not make your aim the excessive acquisition of material goods, but the moderate enjoyment of them. Despise those who are eager for wealth yet are not able to make good use of what they already have, for they are like a man who has obtained a fine horse but is himself too wretched a horseman to ride it. Try to make your wealth something that is for use rather than a mere possession. It is something for use when people know how to enjoy it, but a mere possession to those who are able only to acquire it. Treasure what you possess for two reasons: so that you can withstand a great emergency, and so that you can help a good friend in dire straits. Otherwise, strive after wealth in moderation but not excessively." (1)

The cohesion of the unit is sealed by the repetition in the last line of the sentiment of the first line. Otherwise, one notes the continued use of imperatives, the causal extensions and the use of the simile. Other devices frequently used include questions, rhetorical or otherwise, sometimes providing a framework for the build up of the topos; (2) and conditional clauses, allowing discussion of hypothetical circumstances. (3) Occasionally, the topos may be introduced by the preposition περί, as Isocrates does with regard to his topos on Heracles. (4) Marcus Aurelius provides three examples in succession, of which the first is:

"About death: it means dispersion if there are atoms, but if the universe is a unity it means extinction or change". (5)

One limitation of topoi is their generality. Ethical teaching of any value, however, must be related to the real world where the

(1) Ibid., 27f.
(2) E.g., Marcus Aurelius, Meditations VII, 18, 66.
(3) Ibid., VIII, 47; Epictetus, Encheiridion, 14.
(4) τερι τον τον 'ομαλόν.
(5) Marcus Aurelius, op. cit., VII, 32; cf. 33f. Also cf. Epictetus, op. cit., 31. In the above instance, the philosophical commonplace takes the place of the gnomic utterance. Ethical interest is not excluded, however, for one's attitude to death is under discussion. The succeeding topoi are "About Pain" (τερι τον τον) and "About Glory" (τερι δοξα).
ideal is not always practical and where accommodations have to be made and tensions accepted. The topoi have a formula for dealing with the principle of relativity.

"Above all, beware of drinking parties. But if you have to attend one, rise and go before you are intoxicated ..." (1)

"Avoid banquets given by strangers or ignorant people. But if ever you find that you must take part, concentrate carefully on not adopting the manners of the vulgar." (2)

"One need not go often to theatres. But if it is ever proper for you to do so, do not show yourself a devotee of any man ..." (3)

In the event of one's being involved in less desirable situations, a particular course is recommended to obviate the worst ills that may result.

The advantage of the topoi lies in the direct, practical advice that it offers with clarity and a marked lack of equivocation. It assumes not merely a basis of authority - although the teacher's authority is a fundamental assumption - but also rational procedures; and by using figurative devices it can tease the mind into active thought. It also assumes the unity of thought and action, and is therefore a useful vehicle for the educationist like Isocrates(4) or the philosopher like Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius.

"Do not let accidents disturb, or external objects occupy your thoughts, but keep your mind quiet and disengaged, so that you have the leisure to learn something good and no longer ramble from one thing to another ..." (5)

Here the topoi seems perfectly appropriate for the communication of philosophic teaching in the context of philosophically-based paraenesis.

"What is death? It is a resting place from the vibrations of the

(1) Ibid., 32.
(2) Epictetus, op. cit., 33.
(3) Ibid.
sense and the swayings of desire, a stop upon the rambling of thought, and a release from the drudgery of the body."  (1)

In such paraenesis, an eschatological tone can emerge:

"let death and exile and everything else that is dreadful be kept daily before your eyes - but most of all, death; and you will never think of anything mean nor will you desire anything to excess."  (2)

The topos in hellenistic usage is thus an extremely flexible unit of paraenesis, capable of great variation of subject matter, treatment and tone, and related to practical and fundamental issues of living.

(ii) Topical figures.

The topos frequently includes various figures, such as simple or extended similes and metaphors, parables, allegories, fables and myths. The most common is the simile:

"For when the mind is seduced by wine, it may be compared to chariots without their drivers. Just as they are borne along in unruly disorder for want of the guides that keep them straight, so the soul is sent reeling when mental control is lost."  (3)

The simile not only illustrates the point of the topos but stimulates the mind to explore the image further in search of illumination.

Frequently, the simile is made the central constituent in the topos, being drawn, for example, from seafaring, the stage, the army, the world of animals or nature, town or country life, medicine or surgery, and the human body.

The background of such forms is to be found in Homer and the gnostic poets such as Theognis. (5) Plato tends to draw his material from the everyday world of typical happenings and human relations, or he uses myth. We find therefore the figure of the ship (Laws. VI.

(1) Ibid., VI, 28.
(2) Epictetus, op. cit., 21.
(3) Isocrates, To Demonicus, 27f.
(4) E.g., Epictetus I, 24, 19f.; 14:15; II, 14, 21f.; III, 25, 6-10 etc. The Stoic-Cynic diatribe makes widespread use of figures, mostly drawn from common life.
758a), analogies from music (Phaed.85e) and the animal world (Ap.30e), and the mythical battle of the giants (Soph.246a). His extended image of the charioteer and his horses is developed allegorically: the charioteer is reason, the black horse the sensual element in man and the white horse the rational or moral element (Phaedus 247-57). His figures are usually "interwoven stylistically into the flow of speech; they are not independent stylistic unities, as in the Gospels" (1). Aristotle categorises such figures as "examples" which play a supporting or "proof" role in rhetoric. They may be drawn from the sober world of historical event or from the realm of imagination, such as fables (2) and Socratic illustrations (3). Thus parabolic analogy draws upon observable reality and presents its material in such a way as to stimulate the minds of the hearers to acquire insight into the situation in question (4). Ancient rhetoric did not insist in practice upon a sharp differentiation between types of topical figure; Quintilian appears even to commend mixed usage to a certain extent (5).

The Roman historian Livy describes a historical situation in which Menenius Agrippa used the parable of the limbs of the body to help quell a revolt and reconcile the dissidents to the state (6).

Commenting on this well-known passage, E. Linnemann makes three points:

(1) Hauck, op. cit.
(2) Cf. Prodicus' tale of the choice of Heracles: Xenophon, Memorabilia, II, 21-34. The fable proper is a tale from animal life with a moralizing purpose, but can also be drawn from inanimate nature and human experience: cf. O.C.D., in loc. Horace uses it to good advantage: cf. Sat. II, 6, 79ff.; II.3, 299ff.; Epist. I, 7, 29ff.; I, 3, 19. The Greek collection of fables is ascribed to Aesop, the Latin to Phaedrus.
(3) A typical example of the latter would illustrate the stupidity of electing leading state officials by lot by inviting people to consider the results of choosing athletes in the same way. (Cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric II, 20).
(6) Livy 2:32.
"1. The parable is used to induce the listeners to make a decision after the mind of the narrator in a concrete historical situation.

2. The situation is characterised by the greatest conceivable opposition which exists between the assessment of the situation by the narrator and by the listeners.

4. The narrator, who has at his disposal nothing other than the power of language, is able to prevail upon his listeners, because through the parable he offers them a new understanding of the situation." (1)

In order that it may be effective, the parable has to use an acceptable image: viz. the interdependence of the members of the body and their essential coherence. It then suggests a relevant analogy with the situation which has polarised the antagonistic parties and is instrumental in reconciling the dissidents by inducing them to accept another dimension of reality as of overriding concern. To achieve that end, it has to bring them to the point of decision.

On the whole, there was a preference in the Graeco-Roman world for anecdotes and illustrations from everyday life, and well-known personages were also cited as pivotal examples in the paraenetic topos. Thus Marcus Aurelius:

"Alexander, Julius Caesar and Pompey - what were they when compared with Diogenes, Heraclitus and Socrates? These philosophers had insight into things and their causes, and the ruling principles they adopted were in accordance with their findings. But as for these great princes, what a load of cares they were troubled with, and to how many things they were slaves". (2)

Here the weight of the whole paragraph is borne by the initial examples. Socrates in particular is cited with great frequency as the exemplar of virtue. (3)

(iii) The "Two Ways".

The simple antitheses so common in the topos as well as in the

(1) E. Linnemann, Parables of Jesus, 1966, p.21.
(3) Epictetus, IV, 5.
homily lead to a distinctive motif in paraenetic teaching which is
singled out here because of the frequency with which it appears in the
various traditions and its correspondence to a deep-set dualism in
ethical teaching. In the Greek tradition, the "Two Ways" motif
probably derives from the antitheses of Heraclitus. (1) Hesiod gave
poetical expression to it:

"Vice even in great measure is to be had
Easily. Smooth is her road, and very near at hand her dwelling.
But before Virtue's door sweat is set by the gods,
The immortals. And long and steep is the road to her,
And rough at the first. But when you come to the top,
Easy then does the going become, difficult though it has been." (2)

Here, Vice and Virtue are goals; in Xenophon's account of Prodicus'
celebrated tale of Heracles they are guides, but the "two ways" are no
less clear:

"And Vice answered and said (as Prodicus tells): 'Heracles, do you
see how hard and long is the road to the joys which this woman
describes to you? I will lead you the easy and short road to
happiness'." (3)

This ethical dualism is to be found elsewhere among the poets (4) and
also among the philosophers, including Aristotle, in whose writings
the "excess" and the "defect" are set over against each other: for
example, prodigality and stinginess. (5) Pythagoras used the letter
"Y" to symbolise "the two ways"; (6) not, however, with the approval
of Lactantius, who held such a symbol inadequate to express the total
contradiction of good and evil, the one leading to light, the other
to darkness. (7)

The implications of this dichotomy for paraenesis are not hard to

(2) Works and Days, 285; quoted by Xenophon, op. cit., II.i.20.
(3) Op. cit., II.i.29.
(4) Especially in the gnomic poets such as Theognis, but also in
(5) Nicomachean Ethics IV, 1121a.
(7) Div. Inst. 6:3ff.
The teacher must attempt to give his pupils an understanding of the ethical issue and to encourage him to come to a decision about it. Even those who have started off on the true road must be attentive and watchful. Like the helmsman on a ship, one needs only to be distracted for a few minutes and disaster happens.

(iv) **Catalogues of virtues and vices.**

The rhetorical practice of cataloguing virtues and vices can be traced, at least in its negative form, to the Pythagorean and Orphic societies. In the latter, ethics and eschatology combined to produce the concept of future retribution for vice, in which the basic types were sin against the gods and disrespect for parents. On this basis, catalogues of vices are built up: injury to the stranger, murder, adultery, greed ... Similarly, from Pythagorean circles come the catalogues, attributed to Lysis and cited by Iambilicus, which expound ἀκρασία (intemperance) in terms of unlawful marriages, destructions, intoxications, unnatural pleasures and many other lusts; and πλεονεκρία (greed) in terms of thefts, burglaries, parricides, sacrileges, poisonings ... The Stoics, clinging to the notion that virtue is based on knowledge and vice on ignorance, listed the virtues as intelligence, bravery, justice and self-control.

---

(1) III.22.
(2) IV.3.
(4) Ibid. Cf. Iambilicus, De Vita Pythag., 17.18. Also quoted in Kirk, op. cit., p.120.
Similarly, passion could be analysed as grief, fear, desire or pleasure. Andronicus divided grief into twenty five forms, fear into twelve or thirteen, desire into twenty seven, and pleasure into five. Once again, the basic procedure can be seen in Aristotle, who makes restrained use of the catalogue method in establishing the mean between the extremes of excess or deficiency. A popular expression of it is to be seen in the game of draughts in which the individual counters bore the name of a vice. Similarly, lists of vices lent spice to the more bawdy scenes in ancient comedy. In different vein, catalogues of virtues in inscriptions suggest their use as funeral honours.

(v) The "Haustafeln".

The term Haustafeln, the accepted terminology for the "household codes" since the standard work on the subject by K. Veidinger, was used by Luther in his Shorter Catechism and subsequently appeared as chapter headings in his Bible. It denotes a type of paraenesis which not only occurs in the New Testament but has pagan and Jewish antecedents as well as a persistent role down through Mediaeval Christendom.

No Haustafeln in the strictly formal sense occur in the Graeco-Roman world, but some approximations to them are found and their general spirit is well represented. The accepted basis of them is

---

(2) Ibid., p.98f.
(3) Ibid., p.96f.
(4) Ibid., p.97f.
(8) Cf. Deissmann, *ibid*.
(9) *Die Haustafeln*, 1928. Pioneer work has been done by A. Seeberg (1903) and M. Dibelius (1911). It was popularised in English by K.E. Kirk (1931), P. Carrington (1940) and E.G. Selwyn (1945).
(10) Cf. Kirk, *op. cit.*, p.120, n.7.
the unwritten, moral law, "the unwritten and sure requirements of the gods", in Antigone's words; (1) and among these the Xenophontic Socrates highlights reverence for the gods and honour to parents, the sacrosanct nature of family relationships and the obligations of friendship. (2) Usually, such teaching includes injunctions of a general moral nature. Thus Pythagoras is reported to have instructed his disciples about duty to gods, heroes and men, and especially the aged and one's parents, with the additional injunction:

"to deal with one another in such a way as not to make enemies of friends but rather to make enemies into friends". (3)

In the same context are injunctions about respecting the law, not harming trees or innocent animals, avoiding excess of fat, and abstaining from beans because they cause flatulence!

There is evidence, however, of a family-type grouping related particularly to ethical teaching on obligation. Hierocles, according to Stobaeus, taught a code of ethics relating to parents, brothers, wife, children and slaves. (4) Epictetus has a famous passage in which the aspiring pupil comes forward and says:

"Speaking as a man of piety, philosophy and diligence, I want to know what my duty is to the gods, to my parents, to my brothers, to my country, to strangers". (5)

Musonius Rufus implies a hierarchy of duties:

"... to pay honour to the gods in fear and piety, and to men in justice and piety, and to honour fatherland before parents (parents themselves will want this if they are wise), and parents before friends and kinsmen ..." (6)

(1) Sophocles, Antigone, 454f.
(3) Diogenes Laertes VIII.23.
(4) Cited by Weidinger, pp.27-34, 41f. Cleanthes is also linked with such groupings: cf. Seneca, Epist. 94:4; cf. 95:45.
(5) II.17, 31; cf. III.2, 4; III.7, 25ff.; also I.29, 39; II.10, 10f.; II.14, 8.
(6) Pankratiae 5 (O. Hense, C. Musonii Rufi Reliquiae, 1905, p.139): cf. Ibid., 8
With the "honouring" included in such obligations goes an ethic of submission.

"Is someone a father? My teaching is that you should care for him and yield to him in all matters, submitting when he reproaches you and when he inflicts corporal punishment." (1)

The ethic of submission is regularly combined with more general ethical teaching about friendship, as cited above, or with the particular slant of a philosophical school. (2) On the whole, to speak of a hellenistic household code is to go beyond the evidence. (3) What is clear is that ethical duties were often thought of in terms of a sequence of duties connected with fundamental relationships, (family relationships in particular). With its roots in the piety and proverbial wisdom of the past, this type of paraenesis doubtless reflected a popular, common-sense hellenistic ethic.

2. Paraenesis in the Jewish tradition.

The Jewish tradition is differentiated from the Graeco-Roman in a number of ways, including its longer and closer contacts with the ancient cultures of Babylon and Egypt to which it owed, among other debts, the beginnings of its scribal class, but above all it is made unique by the distinctive religion that informed its every aspect and by the Torah which exerted a determinative influence on the total life of the nation. Thus in moral and religious education the learning of the Torah and the religious practices of Israel are of central concern.

"And these words which I command you this day shall be upon your heart; and you shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise ..." (Deut. 6:6f. R.S.V.).

(1) Epictetus, IV.30.
(3) This is to be more cautious than many scholars: cf. O.J.F. Seitz, in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible III, 1962, art. "Lists".
With the fixing of the Torah, and later of prophets and writings as well, in written form, the inherent danger of the apparent irrelevance or inadequacy of ancient prescriptions in relation to contemporary conditions underlined the need for rigorous interpretation to bridge the situational gulf. Within Judaism this task was accomplished in different ways by different groups, of which two will be considered briefly here.

In Pharisaic or rabbinic Judaism, an exegetical tradition based on the insights of successive generations of scribes emerged as a binding oral Torah, even taking precedence over the ancient written Torah since it was the contemporary and authoritative exposition of its meaning. The study of the Torah was not something isolated in academic backwaters but brought into the centre of life and normally pursued in conjunction with one's worldly occupation. To study the Torah was a supreme duty and benefit, although it was recognised that one could study it for the wrong reasons. So "relevant to life" was it considered that it appears something of a panacea. Above all, it is "a lamp to the feet, and a light to the path" (Ps. 119:105).

An exegetical and expository tradition of this type presupposed a highly developed exegetical system, which, in fact, operated on four bases: literal (peshat), allegorical (remez), expository (derash), and esoteric (sod). The most striking feature of this system is

---

(2) Nedahrim 62a; Sukkah, 496; Taanim 7a; cf. Cohen, op. cit., p. 139.
(3) E.g., it is an escort and an adornment on a journey, and a powerful antidote to sickness whether it be in the head, the throat, the bowels, the bones or the whole body: cf. Erub. 54a; Cohen, op. cit., p. 139.
(5) The first letters of each of these Hebrew words combine to form the word פַּדְרֵס (Pardes), "garden" or "Paradise".
the place it gives to flexibility and imaginative inventiveness on the basis of Torah, so that some word of counsel emerges for almost any situation that can be envisaged.

In contrast to the Pharisaic approach stands that of the Qumran community, organised as a holy fellowship dedicated to obedience to God and an ethic of perfection based on the Torah.

"Every man who enters the Council of Holiness, (the Council of those) who walk in the way of perfection as commanded by God, and who deliberately or through negligence transgresses one word of the Law of Moses, on any point whatever, shall be expelled from the Council of the Community and shall return no more ..."  (1)

The life of the community was regulated by the community rules, governing its congregational and deliberative procedures, its worship, and the individual lives of its members. (2) The teaching was authoritative and authoritarian. From the Community Rule, it may be deduced that the teachers, called "masters" or "guardians", were responsible for instructing the priests and the levites in liturgical matters, for giving exhortation to the community, and ensuring that the statutes of the community concerning its corporate life were known and obeyed. Penalties were fixed for every kind of infringement - from expulsion for uttering the divine Name frivolously during devotions or for slandering or defying the authority of the community, to ten days' penance for interrupting one's companion while speaking. But since the holy community centred on the Torah, biblical interpretation was of particular importance in the life of the sect, guiding and illuminating its understanding of itself, its purpose and its future in a cosmic context. By interpretation of the prophetic texts, the barriers separating past, present and future were transcended, the community and its situation becoming the focus of the

(2) In particular the Community Rule and the Damascus Rule.
prophecies. Thus, Isaiah 54:11c: "And I will lay your foundations with sapphires", is given an official and authoritative interpretation:

"Interpreted, this concerns the Priests and the people who laid the foundations of the Council of the Community... the congregation of His elect (shall sparkle) like a sapphire among stones". (1)

Apart from these fundamentally exegetical teaching traditions, there is in Jewish paideia a relatively independent paraenetic tradition that has many points in common with its Graeco-Roman counterpart without being antagonistic in any real sense to the exegetical type of teaching. Indeed, at certain points – the later part of Proverbs, for instance, or Sirach – they are effectively fused. The wisdom tradition has, of course, a long pedigree, reaching back far beyond the hellenistic period to the time of Solomon and the international hinterland of his scribal establishment. This means, however, that by the time of Sirach the wisdom type of popular instruction had become ingrained in Jewish paideia. To this type of paraenesis we now turn, using the framework we have already evolved as a useful analytic device.

(i) The Paraenetic Topic.

The emergence of the paraenetic topic in the Jewish world is closely bound up with the development of the wisdom tradition. Schmidt(2) presents the orthodox form-critical analysis that finds the basic unit, the mashal or proverb, in single-limbed verses of popular origin, such as:

"Out of the wicked comes forth wickedness" (1 Sam.24:13).
"Like mother, like daughter" (Ezek.16:44).

With the addition of a clause to this simple, gnomic statement – a comparison is often used – a beginning is made of the build-up to the

(1) Vermes, op. cit., p.228f.
double-limbed saying, frequently but not invariably employing parallelismus membrorum, that is so typical of wisdom literature. Such expansion was often prompted by poetic expressiveness and didactic necessity. A continuation of the process results in the multi-limbed saying, in which a number of limbs of varying types are attached to each other to produce a stronger instructional unit, frequently including considerations of motive or consequence. The final stage is the production of the more elaborate literary forms of the wisdom tradition.

This unitary view of the evolution of the proverbial tradition has been challenged by McKane, who identifies a two-fold base.\(^{(1)}\) The so-called "Proverbs of Solomon" (Prov.10:1-22:16) consist largely of paraenetic topics of the short, gnomic variety: for the most part, "independent sentences, each of which is intended to be a well-considered and definitive observation on a particular topic".\(^{(2)}\) According to McKane's classification, three types are to be distinguished.

"A son who gathers in summer is prudent, but a man who sleeps in harvest brings shame" (10:5).

This kind of saying is related to old wisdom and is concerned with the moral education of the individual. The use of the indicative mood and the impersonal but concrete nature of the observation are to be noted.

"Hatred stirs up strife, but love covers all offences" (10:12).

In this couplet, emphasis is placed on social concern and the harmful effects of certain kinds of behaviour on the community.

---


\(^{(2)}\) McKane, *op. cit.*, p.413.
"The Lord does not let the righteous go hungry, but he thwarts the craving of the wicked" (10:3).

Here the saying has taken on the colour of Yahwistic piety and represents a later stage of the tradition. Below this level of reinterpretation lies a saying of the first type.

These proverbs are akin to the proverbial sentences found in the Egyptian book Onchesheshony. They spring from the milieu of the countryside and country life, and possess a concreteness, practicality and earthiness that are to be expected from such a quarter. This background gives the proverb its peculiar flavour:

"... they have a special kind of concreteness in virtue of which their meaning is open to the future and can be divined again and again in relation to a situation which calls forth the 'proverb' as apt comment". (3)

On the whole the more generalised the proverb is, the less open it is to interpretation.

Even a cursory glance through the gnomic sentence literature of Proverbs confirms McKane's argument that it is essentially atomistic in character, and that the grouping of sentences, where it occurs, is secondary. But for the study of paraenesis, more significance must be attached to these subsequent groupings. The proverb, however brilliant when an intuitive hermeneutic is properly applied to it, can be pedestrian, puzzling or intellectually limiting if taken literally or improperly understood. It was inevitable that sooner or later proverbs should be built up into larger groupings and amplifications

(1) Ibid., pp.117-150.
(2) Another important source is the Assyrian teaching of Ahikar, over fifty parallels with Proverbs being noted by W.E. Oesterley, The Book of Proverbs, 1929. Characteristic themes in Ahikar are the need for discipline, moderation in speech, obedience to the king, prudence in business and personal relationships, the danger of bad company and respect for parents. Cf. McKane, op. cit., pp.156ff.
(3) McKane, op. cit., p.23.
or qualifications added. One type of grouping, which uses word jingles and Stichwörter, seems designed largely for mnemonic or artistic purposes; but identifiable units, formed by congruity of content, finally emerge as embryonic topics. Yet the full development of the topic was dependent upon the influences of the second type of wisdom statement, the instruction genre, which eliminated the elusiveness of the gnomic saying by replacing the indicative with the imperative and justifying its commands or exhortations in subordinate clauses expressing motive, purpose or consequence. The background of form is the scribal teaching of Egypt. Prov.22:17-23:11 is properly regarded as based upon the Instruction of Amenemope, while R.N. Whybray identified ten originally independent speeches on the Egyptian model underlying Prov.1-9. In Egypt such teaching came from the milieu of the elitist scribal schools and entered Israel through the civil service established in the reigns of David and Solomon and developed further by their successors. The instruction sentence in itself does not constitute a full paraenetic topic, although it often contains the germ of one; but when a grouping occurs around a central theme, then the topos may be said to have emerged.

(2) E.g., Prov.10:14f., in which the Stichwort is "ruin", and 10:16f., where it is "life".
(3) On "speech" (10:18-21) and "the fear of the Lord" (10:27-30).
(7) There was an organised literary wisdom movement in Hezekiah's court (Prov.25:1). Cf. R.B.Y. Scott, Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom, V.T.S. III, 1955, p.273. These Hakaim, however, are not distinct from the class of officials operating in Israel from David's day: cf. W. McKane, Prophets and Wise Men, 1965, p.42.
"Hear, my son, and be wise,
and direct your mind in the way.
Be not among winebibbers,
or among gluttonous eaters of meat;
for the drunkard and the glutton will come to poverty,
and drowsiness will clothe a man with rags". (1)

The rather severe imperatival form can, however, undergo modification.
In Prov.7, there is an instructional sequence at the beginning (1-5)
and at the end (24-27), but the centre of the chapter is taken up with
a delightfully descriptive passage on the "adventuress with her smooth
words". Other variations include the elaborate use of protases and
apodoses in chapter 2 and the more lyrical and hymnic style of 3:13-20:

"Happy is the man who finds wisdom,
and the man who gets understanding ..."

Instruction that originated as career guidance in ancient Egypt has
been adopted and adapted in Israel for the purpose of more general
moral education and ultimately for religious education.

The later wisdom book, Sirach, provides many examples of this
kind of paraenetic topic at a point of greater maturation, when
hellenistic influence had made its contribution to Jewish paideia.
In Sirach, the topics range from basic obligations to the poor through
a variety of precepts about everyday life to specific counsel for
magistrates and rulers (ch.10). A topos of a representative kind may
be quoted in full:

"Do not aim to be valiant over wine,
for wine has destroyed many.
Fire and water prove the temper of steel,
so wine tests hearts in the strife of the proud.
Wine is like life to men,
if you drink it in moderation.
What is life to a man who is without wine?
It has been created to make men glad.
Wine drunk in season and temperately
is rejoicing of heart and gladness of soul.
Wine drunk to excess is bitterness of soul,
with provocation and stumbling.

(1) Prov.23:19ff., R.S.V.
Drunkenness increases the anger of a fool to his injury, reducing his strength and adding wounds." (31:25-30, R.S.V.) (1) Sirach strives for balance in his paraenesis. Thus, in his treatment of wealth in the same chapter, he both warns against the anxieties and dangers it brings and commends the rich man who is not a slave to it but uses it charitably. (2) The characteristics of this type of *topos* include the use of the imperative to impart authoritative counsel, supported by a subordinate clause of reason; but in general there is more flexibility and openness about its use than in the earlier instructional models. The *topos* is built up largely through the use of couplets, but the topic represents a genuine unit, integrated by the developing theme (οίνος) that runs through it. There are general statements of a gnomic order, rhetorical questions, antitheses and comparisons, all of which contribute to the "intuiting" of the *topos* and to the possibility of its throwing light upon one aspect of the human situation.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are also of prime importance for the study of Jewish paraenesis. With the above passages on wine may be taken this *topos* from the Testament of Judah XVI:

"So, my children, observe the limit that applies to wine, for in it are four evil spirits: the spirits of lust, burning desire, profligacy and sordid love of gain. If you drink wine with a glad-some heart, with a sense of modesty and fear before God, you will live. For if you drink without such an attitude and in the absence of the fear of God, then drunkenness follows and shamelessness steals in ..." (3)

The paraenetic forms in the Testaments are adapted to the testamentary motif of the total work, and the "patriarch" in question speaks in the first person, illustrating his ethical teaching from his own

(1) Sirach 31:11b-32:6 is in fact a series of topoi on table manners.
experience and exhorting his "children" to "harken" or "keep his precepts" in the approved instructional manner.\(^{(1)}\) The ethical themes, however, are remarkably similar to those of Proverbs or Sirach. Thus, the latter part of the Testament of Judah includes topoi on drunkenness (XIV), adultery (XV), wine (XVI) and the dangers of love and money (XVII, XIX) and the beauty of women (XVII). The leading imperatives are frequently followed by a consideration of the consequences of disobedience, while for illustrative purposes the similes of the wisdom teachers tend to be replaced by the supposed recollections of the patriarch's experiences. At times, the ethical tone reaches sublime heights, as in the topos on forgiveness in the Testament of Gad (VI.3-7), which R.H. Charles described as "the most remarkable statement on the subject of forgiveness in all ancient literature":\(^{(2)}\)

"Love one another from the heart; and if someone sins against you, speak to him peaceably. Get rid of the poison of hatred and do not preserve cunning in your soul. And if he confesses and repents, forgive him. If he refuses, don't quarrel with him lest he should ever start swearing and you sin twice over ..."\(^{(3)}\)

Paraenetic topics in Test. Gad deal with hatred and envy (III-V), love and forgiveness (VI), and jealousy (VII).

Despite the frequency of such extended topics, it must be emphasised that continued use was made of the pithy maxim or imperatival admonition, either in isolation or in loose knit collections. This is evidenced not merely in Proverbs and Sirach, but also in such passages as Tobit iv and xii, and this type of utterance must be regarded as typical of much Jewish paraenesis.

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. Test. Judah, XIII. 1, 3-8.
\(^{(2)}\) Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1908, p.155; cf. p.xciiif. Christian influence has been suspected here, but it is not proved. Charles describes the high ethical stance as the "true spiritual child" of the O.T.: op. cit., p.XVII; cf. H. Thyen, op. cit., p.25f.
\(^{(3)}\) My translation of Jonge's text.
(ii) **Topical figures and illustrations.**

The "pure" mashal or proverb *par excellence* uses particular imagery or material from the concrete world to present a statement that is potentially meaningful for human existence.

"A son who gathers in summer is prudent, but a son who sleeps in harvest brings shame" *(Prov.10:5).*

Such a saying is open to interpretation; it can erupt into meaningfulness in a flash of inspiration in which the truth of the proverb, springing from the particularity of its own situation,\(^{(1)}\) is seen as applicable to another, comparable situation, i.e., that of the interpreter. It can then be further generalised or universalised:

"it is the testing or critical situation which constitutes the sifting process and provides a reliable indication of ability and character". \(^{(2)}\)

But as the wisdom tradition became less attached to folk lore and more consciously didactic, the imagery became definitive of the interpretation.

"A rich man's wealth is his strong city, the poverty of the poor is their ruin" *(Prov.10:15).*

The metaphor necessarily circumscribes the imagery and directs the mind to a particular interpretation, thus sacrificing some of the openness of the earlier type of mashal.

"Like vinegar to the teeth, and smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to those who send him" *(Prov.10:26).*

The success of the simile depends on the admissability of the premise of the comparison - here the irritant qualities of vinegar and smoke.

This in turn provides the clue to the interpretation of the

\(^{(1)}\) An agricultural milieu, in which harvests were periods of concentrated effort and every man's labour is essential.

\(^{(2)}\) McKane, *op. cit.*, p.415. Thus the original meshalim paradoxically combined particularity of situation with universality of application.
The further development of the didactic tradition leads in a number of directions. In the embryonic topos in Proverbs 7, the warnings against becoming involved with the immoral woman are reinforced in two ways: first, by an extended and evocative description in the most concrete terms of the woman's contrivances; and second, by a series of similes describing the total doom of any who becomes involved with her:

"All at once he follows her, as an ox goes to the slaughter, or as a stag is caught fast till an arrow pierces its entrails; as a bird rushes into a snare; he does not know it will cost him his life" (Prov.7:22f., R.S.V.).

In this topos we note the place given to illustration, as well as the continuing use of similes in which the tertium comparationis is of a typical, non-controversial nature. The extension of this type of simile leads to the similitude, the kind of parabolic language which relies on a typical situation or recurring event.

"Parable of a householder who had two cows, one strong and the other weak. Upon which of them does he place the yoke? Surely upon the strong. In the same manner God tests the righteous." (3)

By contrast, the "parable proper", i.e., considered as a more precise category, focuses upon one specific case that possesses intrinsic point.

"There were two men in a certain city, the one rich and the other poor. The rich man had many flocks and herds; but the poor man had

(1) The simile was used with evocative power in the literary and didactic traditions of many cultures. Albright cites this example from an Ugaritic text (V.T.S. III, p.5, quoted by McKane, op. cit., p.417):

"Like the feeling of a wild cow for her calf,
Like the feeling of a wild ewe for her lamb,
So (was) the feeling of Anath for Baal".

In Proverbs, similes can become rather precious, literary artifices: cf. 26:1-11.


(3) Genesis Rabbah, XXXII.3; quoted by Cohen, op. cit., p.119.
nothing but one little ewe lamb ..."

Nathan's parable (2 Sam.12:1-4) is the beginning of a paraenetic topic which achieves its impact by bringing David into active participation in the situation (v.5f.); and after the analogy between the parabolic situation and his own had been brought home to him (vv.7-12), he realises he has passed judgment on himself and sees his own conduct in a new light (v.13). The parable, therefore, depends upon the appropriateness and attractiveness of its narrative, carefully prepared and subtly developed by the narrator.

The parable was frequently used in the context of a paraenetic topic. On the topic, "charity helps the giver as well as the receiver", one account records a debate between R. Akiba and a Roman governor of Palestine in which the latter argued on the basis of the contention that if God loved the poor he ought to care for them himself. Further, since he does not do so, he must be offended at anyone who does. Improbably enough, the Roman told a Jewish-sounding parable:

"I will give you a parable: To what is the matter like? To a human king who was angry with his slave, imprisoned him and ordered that he was not to be provided with food or drink; and then a person goes and feeds him and gives him to drink. When the king hears it, will he not be angry with him? You are called servants, as it is said, 'Unto me the children of Israel are servants' (Lev.25:55)".

Akiba countered with another parable:

"I will give you a parable: To what is the matter like? To a human king who was angry with his son, imprisoned him and ordered that he was not to be provided with food or drink; and then a person goes and feeds him and gives him to drink. When the king hears it, will he not reward him? We are called children, as it is said, 'Ye are the children of the Lord your God' (Deut.14:1) ...". (1)

Other parables use the image of a man overboard and clinging to a rope-

(1) Baba Bathra, 10a; as in Cohen, op. cit., p.220.
to describe how one must cleave to the commandments: \(^{(1)}\) the image of the shorn lamb passing safely through water while the unshorn foundered - to describe the need to shear off some of your possessions for charity; \(^{(2)}\) and the image of the large lean cow which, when overfed, kicked its owner - to warn against overconfidence in prosperity. \(^{(3)}\)

The collection of rabbinic anecdotes in the Mishna and Talmud tends to divorce rabbinic parables from their original context and to set them alongside other anecdotes recording significant sayings or actions of the rabbis. In other words, they are caught up in a secondary, didactic medium. Clearly, in their original setting they contributed directly and decisively to the topic - frequently of a paraenetic nature - in which they were introduced. They were also used in exhortatory contexts, and in scholarly arguments, disquisitions or controversies. \(^{(4)}\) They were both widely used and regarded as important, didactic tools. R. Hillel was reputed to be particularly fond of using them. \(^{(5)}\)

"Do not underestimate the value of a parable, for through a parable a man can attain to understanding of the Torah. Like a king who has lost a gold coin in his house or a precious pearl - can't he still find it by using a wick that costs a mere penny? So don't underestimate the value of a parable ..." \(^{(6)}\)

The rabbis used stories and anecdotes of many kinds, including

---

\(^{(1)}\) Numbers Rabbah 17:6.  
\(^{(2)}\) Gittin 7a.  
\(^{(3)}\) Barachoth 32a.  
\(^{(4)}\) Cf. E. Linnemann, op. cit., p.20.  
\(^{(5)}\) Soferim 16:9; the authenticity of this tradition is defended by I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, I, 1917, p.95f.  
the fable - as in many other traditions. Allegory is also used for paraenetic purposes and represents an elaboration of the riddle (cf. Ezek.17:2), veiling the underlying reality while hinting at it and requiring a key to unlock its secret.

(iii) The "Two Ways".

"Two ways has God given to the sons of men, and two inclinations, and two kinds of action and two locales, and two ends. Therefore all things come in two, the one over against the other. There are two ways - of good and evil; included in these are the two inclinations in our hearts, discriminating them." (4)

This passage from the Testament of Asher points to the deep set duality in Jewish ethical thinking, which becomes even more pronounced with the intensification of eschatology and apocalyptic. (5) It is linked to the inherent antithesis in the ancient wisdom tradition between "the way of wisdom" and "the way of foolishness", "the paths of the upright" and "the paths of the wicked". This theme occurs, for example, in the topic that begins at Proverbs 4:10 - one of the topics identified by Whybray as dependent on Amenemope. In the Hebrew version it closes with this contrast:

"... The path of the righteous is like the light of dawn, which shines brighter and brighter until full day. The way of the wicked is like deep darkness; they do not know over what they stumble". (6)

(1) There is an Indian parable of the blind and the lame, in which the lame man climbs on the other's back to escape from the forest fire; a Jewish parable using the same materials but applied to the day of judgment, when body and soul will be judged together; and a Christian version in Epiphanius, probably derived from the rabbinic. Cf. Abrahams, op. cit., pp.93-97. The rabbis use fables which also occur in Aesop, such as that of the fox and the vineyard, beginning: "It may be likened to a fox which found a vineyard fenced around on all sides ..."; Ecclesiastes Rabbah, 5:14; cf. Cohen, op. cit., p.66f. Fables also occur in the teaching of Ahikar: Ahikar 117-20.

(2) A good example is Ezekiel's allegory of the two eagles (17:3-10), subsequently expounded with exact correspondences in vv.12-21.

(3) Charles reads τρόπους for τρόποις and translates "two modes (of action)"; op. cit., p.161f.

(4) Testament of Asher 1:3-5, tr. from the text of Jonge.


Yahwistic piety with its heavy underscoring of the "two ways" motif, may have produced or at least modified these verses, just as it certainly stimulated the additions to 4:27 in the LXX, which speaks of God as knowing "the ways on the right", while "the ways on the left" are crooked. Similar "two ways" material is to be found in the Old Testament. Psalm 1:6 contrasts "the way of the righteous" and "the way of the wicked"; and Jeremiah 21:8 runs: "Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death". The "two inclinations", the yetzer ha-tov and the yetzer ha-ra, are of course, fundamental to rabbinic anthropology. The rabbis gave priority to the question of choosing the right way, and one rabbi described the choice as between "the way to Eden and the way to Gehinnom".

The community of Qumran also reflected strongly this dualistic interpretation of life:

"He has created men to govern the world, and has appointed for him two spirits in which to walk until the time of His visitation: the spirits of truth and falsehood. Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light, but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the ways of darkness".

The "two ways" type of teaching is all too open to oversimplified ethical teaching and to instant, automatic judgments of a

---

(1) Cf. McKane, op. cit., p.309f.
(2) Later examples include 4 Macc.14:5; 1 En.94:1-4; 2 En.30:15.
(3) The specific dualism receives its earliest expression in the passage from Test. Asher cited above; cf. Charles, op. cit., p.16, 161f. Yetzer itself simply means "inclination", and is used in a neutral way in Sirach 15:4f. In the O.T., it can be directed to the good: Is.26:3; 1 Chr.29:18, but more usually to evil: Gen. 6:5; 8:21; cf. 2 Esdras 4:30f.
(4) Cf. Pirke Aboth, II.1.
(5) R. Jochanan ben Zakkai. Among other examples of the "two ways", 1 En.94:1-4; 2 En.30:15; Test. Levi 19:1; Test. Judah 20:1 may be singled out as particularly clear instances.
(6) The Community Rule III; as in Vermes, op. cit., p.75f. Cf. also the War Rule, in which the imagery symbolises the cosmic conflict between the powers of Light and Darkness.
sweeping or obtuse kind. Yet, as Kirk well illustrates, the writer of the Testament of Asher shows an acute awareness of the sophistication of ethical issues, such as the deceptiveness of appearances and the equivocal nature of human actions. People can combine the "two ways" in their own persons and actions: like the "merciful oppressor" or the "fasting adulterer". There is therefore a necessity to discriminate far more precisely than in terms of the broad, general categories; yet, when all allowances have been made, a basic duality remains in which the positive element is ultimately ascendant:

"Observe then, my children, the basic duality in the universe: the one thing standing in opposition to the other, the one hidden by the other. Death succeeds life, dishonour glory, night day, and darkness light. But the universe is under the sway of the day, and justice is under life; that is why eternal life waits upon death. And it cannot be said that truth is falsehood, or that justice is injustice, for all truth is under the light, just as the whole universe is under God". (2)

(iv) Catalogues of Virtues and vices.

Long before hellenistic influence affected Judaism, cataloguing was an accepted device in Israel. Jeremiah thundered in his temple sermon:

"Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, burn incense to Baal, and go after other gods that you have not known, and then come and stand before me in this house ...?" (7:9f.).

These are specific actions, recalling some principal points of the ten commandments and the necessity for single-minded loyalty to the covenantal God and his law. In later literature, the native Jewish and the imported hellenistic catalogue styles merged without difficulty. Thus, in the Testament of Benjamin the seven evils of which the sword is mother are listed as:

(2) Test. Asher 5:1-3, tr. from Jonge's text.
"first, envy; second, ruin; third, tribulation; fourth, exile; fifth, death; sixth, panic; seventh, destruction". (1)

A positive catalogue in the Testament of Issachar (ch.5) commends singleness of heart, guilelessness, minding your own business, love to God and your neighbour, compassion, industry and thanksgiving. The liturgy for the Day of Atonement included a catalogue of twenty-two vices resembling that found in the Didache and in Romans. (2)

A notable example occurs in the Community Rule of Quarban in association with the "two ways" motif. An extensive catalogue of the virtues of the "sons of truth" begins:

"a spirit of humility, patience, abundant charity, unending goodness, understanding, and intelligence; (a spirit of) mighty wisdom ...; a spirit of discernment in every purpose, of zeal for just laws, of holy intent with steadfastness of heart, of great charity towards all the sons of truth ..."

A corresponding catalogue of vices prompted by the spirit of falsehood begins:

"greed, and slackness in the search for righteousness, wickedness and lies, haughtiness and pride, falseness and deceit, cruelty and abundant evil, ill-temper and much folly and brazen insulance, abominable deeds (committed) in a spirit of lust, and ways of lewdness in the service of uncleanness, a blaspheming tongue ..." (3)

The fifth chapter of Pirke Aboth is built up essentially on the catalogue model, and the sixth catalogues not only the virtues of the man who busies himself with the study of the Torah but also the forty eight steps in the learning of it. (4) The catalogue method in Israel is thus used for a variety of teaching functions, but usually to commend certain actions and dispositions or to warn against the dangers of their opposites.

(1) 8:2, tr. from Jonge's text; cf. Charles, op. cit., p.206f. For ὁμολογία, "malice" or "envy" Charles reads ὅμοια, "bloodshed".
(2) Rendel Harris, The Teaching of the Apostles, 1886, pp.82-86.
(3) Vermes, op. cit., p.76f.
(4) Pirke Aboth 6:1, 6. Other examples include 2 En.10; 42:6ff.
(v) the Haustafeln.

The germ of the "household code" is apparent in the Torah. The implications of the fourth commandment, for example, are spelled out for:

"you, or your son, or your daughter, or your manservant, or your maidservant, or your ox, or your ass, or any of your cattle, or the sojourner who is within your gates ..." (Deut. 5:13).

And doubtless behind this stands the ancient tribal respect for family ties, hospitality and other social obligations that is reflected also in the wisdom tradition and its sources. This gains clear expression in Sirach, who speaks of obligations to friends, wife, daughters, children, parents, priests, the poor, the sick, women generally, servants and other social groups. (1) Tobit also contains more than a hint of this kind of paraenetic concern, especially in the fourth chapter in which Tobit gives fatherly advice to his son: duties mentioned include obligations to mother (3f.), God (5ff.), wife (12f.), brothers (13), employees (14), and other people including the poor and needy (15ff.). Philo offers a full allegorical commentary on the fifth commandment - "for old and young, for rulers and ruled, for benefactors and beneficiaries, for slaves and masters". (2) Josephus reflects the familiar sequence of relationships in his defence of the Jewish Law. (3) The rabbis had much to say about the upbringing of children and filial piety. (4) A poem falsely attributed to Phocylides and Graeco-Jewish in flavour contains sections devoted to

husbands and wives, parents and children, and masters and slaves. (1)

3. *Paraenesis in the ministry of John.*

In a previous chapter we identified John the Baptist as a prophet, and in this role he engaged in *didache* as well as *kerygma*. (2) Several passages suggest that this *didache* included what we have now identified as *paraenesis*: moral teaching of the counselling sort; and it may be legitimate to take Josephus' comments that John commanded the Jews to "exercise virtue", that is, to practise "righteousness towards one another and piety towards God", (3) as a recognition of John as a conspicuous teacher of this type. (4) The relevant material in the gospels, it must be remembered, has all been filtered through the process of Christian interpretation, making it extremely difficult to arrive at a balanced picture of John in his own right. Thus T.W. Hanson describes John's teaching as the true interim ethic, essentially an emergency measure until the coming of the day of the Lord (5) — which is certainly the way in which the followers of Jesus understood John's teaching, but is it fair to John or his followers? J.M. Robinson, in his review of the problem, also sets out what is fundamentally a solution of the problem of Christian eschatology, or the eschatology of Jesus, rather than a convincing treatment of John's


(2) See chapter one, on "Prophecy".


(4) On the other hand, Josephus' statement may be no more than a generalising summary in his hellenised Jewish fashion.

position. At this juncture, however, our concern is simply with the few examples of his paraenesis that have been preserved.

(1) The Paraenetic Topic in John's ministry.

In Luke 3:10-14 - in what source criticism called "L" and tried to link, none too successfully, with the circle of John's disciples (2) there occurs a block of three topics, dealing with issues raised by the crowds or by groups within the crowds. One, raised by the crowd in general, is concerned with sharing, with practical kindness to a neighbour, food and clothes being basic human requirements. The form of the paraenesis follows the model of the instructional wisdom saying, the content being typically Jewish (cf. Is.58:6f.; Prov.14:31). Similarly, the taxgatherers or customs men are advised to be honest in business transactions, and the soldiers on active service are given the three-fold counsel: no oppression, no extortion, and let their wages suffice them. Manson comments:

"John's positive teaching serves to mitigate the worst evils of an evil system; but it does not and cannot transform the system. It could relieve the sickness of society; but it was not the radical cure". (3)

But is this not pure Christian apologetic? Paraenesis is frequently practical rather than radical, but it is possible to argue that John's teaching is in fact a radical application of the Law to the situation in question. Elsewhere, John's prophetic impetus carried him to a completely radical interpretation of the Law in relation to Herod Antipas (Mk.6:18; Matt.14:4); and in the topical figures detectable in the tradition John's radicality is marked.

(1) A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1959, pp.116ff. But a more balanced picture emerges in G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, Eng. tr., 1960, pp.44-52, although one is not wholly convinced that justice has been done to John.

(2) None too successfully, because "L" would represent at best a Christian editing or extrapolation from the Baptist tradition.

(ii) **Topical Figures and Illustrations.**

Under paraenetic figures, we may list the image of the vipers (Matt. 3:7; Luke 3:7) scurrying for safety before a wilderness fire: so do the multitudes (Luke) scramble for the safety of the baptism before the onrushing day of judgment; the "offspring of the vipers", however, may have theological significance - it is more than a term of reproach or abuse. (1) The figure of the felling of the tree (Matt. 3:10; Luke 3:9) may have been suggested by the timber operations in the Jordan valley (cf. 2 Kings 6:1-4) but, like many of John's images, was also stock Old Testament usage (cf. Is. 10:33f.). John, like the later Jewish literature, (2) applies it specifically to the judgment to come upon the Jews. The metaphor of winnowing also combines the everyday life element with biblical imagery (Is. 41:15f.) to suggest the eschatological separation of righteous and unrighteous. Both chaff and fire imply familiar religious images in the Jewish milieu, as does "bearing fruit". (3) These examples give sufficient indication of a skilful teacher sensitive to the power of appropriate imagery, and borrowing freely the traditional images of the prophets and other religious teachers of Israel. (4)

(iii) **Other Paraenetic Features.**

Indications in existing material are slight. A "two ways" motif is implied in the eschatological separation of the righteous and sinners. There are no lists and nothing corresponding precisely to the Haustafeln, although the paraenetic topics in Luke 3:10-14 are addressed to discernible groups.

---

(1) Hanson, *op. cit.*, p.40.
(2) Cf. Sirach 6:2f.; 23:25; Wisd. 4:3ff.
4. Paraenesis in the ministry of Jesus.

The prime factor that governs the study of the paraenesis of Jesus is that it is available to us only through the paradosis of the Church. There are therefore certain difficulties even in reaching the basic data to be subjected to analysis. Penetration to that level has been attempted in various ways and with varying results. Source criticism distinguished and analysed the literary sources, assigning primacy to those which critical, comparative studies separated out as basic to the literary or fixed oral forms of the tradition, but it was nevertheless helpless in face of the gap between such forms and the actual paraenesis of Jesus. Form criticism examined this gap in some detail, elucidating the pre-literary history of the tradition and emerging with recognisable oral forms as the products of Church life, but it accepted to a greater or lesser degree the inevitability of the veil of opacity that shrouded the person and the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. New Testament interpretation was


now dominated by the concept of the kerygma of the early Church. It was axiomatic that the Christ of Christian preaching was not the historical Jesus, but the Christ of the faith and of the cult. The kerygmatic axiom has never been withdrawn, nor is it likely to be so; but certain pessimistic conclusions - historically speaking - which have been drawn from it have been challenged and rejected, as well as the inherent docetism which some have found in it. Thus the "new questers" - to fly a flag of convenience - have plotted a delicate, pioneering path from the entrenchments of the kerygma - taking care not to undermine or weaken the defences of that bastion - through the uncharted and explosive terrain of the early Christian no-man's-land to a vantage point from which they might view the contours of the life of Jesus of Nazareth. Meanwhile, as if to stress the danger of the entire enterprise, their colleagues engaged in redaction criticism have underlined the perplexing nature of the only evidence available to guide them by demonstrating that it was the work not of cartographers but of creative artists, not of scribal recorders but of contributing editors.

To be sure, not all the boffins in the strategic division of New Testament scholarship are agreed about the interpretation of the evidence. A certain polarity of approach is apparent. The "new questers", as we have seen, set out from the base of the kerygma, assisted by the high powered armament of form criticism; but their feverish activity has been checked to some small degree (or ought to

have been) by an icy Nordic blast emanating from H. Riesenfeld and B. Gerhardsson in their Scandinavian fastnesses, who suggested that the basic problem lay in coming to terms with the operation of *paradosis*, the essential connecting-rod between Jesus and the Church.\(^1\)

Broadly, however, the one school exaggerates what the other underplays. Both perspectives are to be respected; and, as our chapter on *Paradosis* will examine the Scandinavian case in greater detail, discussion here will be directed mainly to the "new quest" while bearing in mind the contribution of the other school.

The programme of the "new quest" is not easy to summarise, if only because it has under its purview the whole question of the relation of Jesus and the *kerygma*, and inevitably considerable diversity of approach has resulted. J.M. Robinson suggests as a first step the jettisoning of the elements common to Jesus' teaching and that of the early Church and the close study of - and this formula must be quoted as an *ipse dixit* - "those logia which are generally held to be probably authentic",\(^2\) since they contain no kerygmatic terminology. The price to be paid is already considerable: (i) any possible overlapping of Jesus' message and that of the early Church cannot be handled, at least at this point: it does not yield to this method of analysis; (ii) there is a heavy reliance on the authority of a few theologians (perhaps reducible to one), for Robinson admits in a footnote that in practice "one confines himself to the material which Bultmann in his *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* ... holds


to be the oldest layer and hence probably authentic";\(^{(1)}\) and (iii) the gap between "the oldest layer" and "the original" still operates as the final, iron curtain, to be slipped through when the guards of critical analysis are asleep. Robinson's next step is to deduce from the aforesaid "generally held to be probably authentic" sayings a "consensus as to the general direction and meaning of the message of Jesus", falling back once again on the "antecedent situation of scholarly research", in order to "attempt to work out the historical Jesus' understanding of existence".\(^{(2)}\)

N. Perrin, arguing that a thorough-going history of tradition is the presupposition of all such investigations, proceeds to identify three criteria which may help to clarify further the procedures of the "new quest":\(^{(3)}\) (i) the criterion of dissimilarity, by which an "authentic" saying of Jesus is recognised through its dissimilarity from the emphases of both Judaism and the early Church; (ii) the criterion of coherence, by which other material is seen to be "authentic" when it coheres with sayings that pass the test of the first criterion; (iii) the criterion of multiple attestation: "a proposal to accept as authentic material which is attested in all, or most, of the sources which can be discerned behind the synoptic gospels"\(^{(4)}\) - a proposal which gives Perrin not a few twinges of uneasiness, for logically it takes us back to the twin pillars of the documentary hypothesis, Mark and Q, and the insoluble problem of bridging the gap. Perrin, following H.K. McArthur, thinks it works better in relation to a much repeated motif in the traditions, always assuming that it

\(^{(1)}\) Op. cit., p.275, n.16.  
\(^{(3)}\) Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, 1967, pp.39-49.  
satisfies the criterion of dissimilarity - the motif of Jesus' attitude to tax-collectors and sinners is a case in point. Despite Perrin's continuing reservations - he describes this criterion as "somewhat restricted" - if we should conclude that in the end the motifs of Jesus' life-style and teaching style matter more than the attempt to recover his *ipseissima verba*, this may turn out to be an important criterion.

Robinson and Perrin, in their slightly divergent ways, end up at roughly the same goal: "authentic" material is to be found in the parables and in certain selected *logia* in which a distinctive view of the kingdom of God is presented. In recent years, Robinson observes with evident satisfaction, there has arisen a consensus of scholarly opinion on the issue, while Perrin attempts to prove the point by means of several detailed exegeses. In Jesus' view the polarity between the present evil age and the future *eschaton* is bridged by the fact that the latter is already exerting its influence as a present reality associated with his own activity; and this characteristic position is reflected even in the formal structure of some of his utterances, marking them out as distinctively his own.

Has the breakthrough been achieved? Has a bridgehead been established in the world of Jesus from which these scholarly commandos cannot be dislodged? The importance of the issue compels further discussion of it.

Perrin identifies three sayings as crucial, (1) one of which we shall discuss here in some detail:

"But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20; cf. Matt.12:28).

The saying is affected by editorial redaction, being placed in different contexts and undergoing alteration in the process. But even if Luke's form, on critical grounds the more authentic of the two, is accepted as "original", what conclusions can be drawn from it? Two issues must be distinguished: (i) by "original" can we understand that the saying originates with Jesus, as an authentic, distinctive verbum Domini?; (ii) does it give decisive support to the view that Jesus characteristically and distinctively related the kingdom to the present era, as opposed to Judaism and the early Church who did not? In answer to (i), the Sitz im Leben is clearly a ministry of exorcism, whether of Jesus or the early Christians. Whether it is more plausibly predicated of Jesus depends on our answer to basic phenomenological questions about Jesus' whole ministry - a point to which we shall return in due course. Equally, the phrase "the finger of God", which shows that the saying belongs to an exegetical tradition based on Ex.8:15, could indicate a hermeneutic applied by Jesus or the early Church in the manner of the pesher tradition of Qumran - again, the broader conspectus of his ministry is essential before a final decision can be made. With regard to (ii), Perrin strains his argument to show that this "present reality" view of the kingdom is distinctive of Jesus. He lines up a number of arguments, none of which is conclusive in itself. (1) To work on the basis of minute

(1) E.g., according to the synoptic tradition, Jesus uses "kingdom of God" to describe God's eschatological activity, while Judaism prefers to speak of "God reigning"; Jesus speaks of the kingdom as "coming", while Judaism seldom does so, preferring the word "establish"; Jesus uses kingdom of the blessings of salvation, while in Judaism "the blessings of the age to come" is preferred. The synoptics also appear to differ from the rest of the New Testament in relation to some of these instances. Finally, Perrin is willing to appeal to the authority of scholarly opinion both as to the "feeling of eschatological power" (Bultmann) and as to the authenticity of the saying.
linguistic variations would appear a doubtful procedure in view of the range of linguistic combinations associated with the eschatological hope in Israel; to do so is to be constantly in danger of failing to see the wood for the trees. The crucial question is whether the concept of the present reality of the kingdom is peculiar to Jesus. Perrin is clear on the point: "the reality of the presence (or immanence) of the kingdom to the present experience of a man is unparalleled in Judaism". If this can be substantiated, a further question must be raised about the reasons for Jesus' adoption of this concept.

Our first observation is that Judaism did indeed work with the concept of the present reality of the kingdom, particularly in a liturgical context.

"He who has to say the Shema while he is out walking must stand still and receive the kingdom of heaven. And what is the kingdom of heaven? The Lord our God, the Lord is One." (2)

In the rabbinic literature, there were elaborate regulations governing the precise manner in which the kingdom should be received, and it was also enjoined that one should first "have evacuation, then wash his hands, put on the phylacteries, and offer his prayers". This may well be the background to another saying of Jesus, held by Bultmann to be authentic:

"Truly I tell you, whoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child will certainly not enter into it" (Mk.10:15=Luke 18:17).

If so, Jesus has radicalised the concept of "receiving the kingdom"

(4) Ber. 15a.
(5) H.S.T., p.32.
by replacing liturgical observance with inward disposition. (1) The
dpoint to be noted, however, is that Judaism is very familiar with the
concept of divine kingship in the present: the yoke of the kingdom is
to be borne here and now in confessing God as King in morning and
evening prayer, walking in awe of him and doing loving deeds towards
one's neighbour. (2) What is striking in Luke 11:20 = Matt. 12:26 is the
identification of the exorcist activity of Jesus with the present
working of the kingdom of God. Two points are to be noted: (i) it
is the ministry or activity of Jesus that is the subject of interpret-
ation, rather than his person; and (ii) the "presentness" of the
kingdom is dependent on the interpretation of ἐφακαζων.

The verb ἐφακαζων has long been something of a crux interpretat-
ions in New Testament scholarship, largely because scholars
persistently try to press etymology into the service of theologizing.
C.H. Dodd argued that since ἐφακαζων and ἐγγίζων are both employed
to translate the Hebrew verb נaga' and the Aramaic מ"תא, meaning "to
reach", "to arrive", both verbs may be interpreted as implying
"arrival" when applied to "the kingdom" in a New Testament context. (3)

But Matt. 3:2 then becomes of critical importance, for here John the
Baptist proclaims that the kingdom ἐγγίζειν: does this mean that the
kingdom is realised in the preaching of John? Dodd dismisses this
difficulty by impeaching the trustworthiness of Matthew, without
suggesting any reasons for Matthew's error (4) - a rather desperate tour
de force. It is inherently more likely that Matthew found this

(1) I have attempted a discussion of this Locium in Receiving and
Entering the Kingdom: A Study of Mark 10:15, a paper delivered
(2) Ber. II, 2; Sifre Deut. 323; cf. Cohen, op. cit., pp. 4, 212.
(3) The Parables of the Kingdom, rev. 1936, p. 43ff.
saying attributed to John in the tradition and, while Luke, Mark or an
editor of "Q" removed it to obviate possible confusion, Matthew
retained it because he interpreted it in his own way - and his inter-
pretation of it was not that subsequently adopted by Dodd. The verb
itself contains an ambivalence, and when used in a religious context
this ambivalence is probably an essential part of its operation. (1)

A closer look at the tradition of John's preaching throws further
light on this problem. While Matthew was doubtless content to think
of John as proclaiming the approach of the kingdom, it is equally
likely that John in his prophetic intensity regarded his proclamation
as realising or actualizing the sovereign action of God in summoning
men to judgment. As in all prophecy, there is a dialectic of present
and future, though the tradition undoubtedly Christianises John's
references to the future. But the judgment is operational in the
present time. While Isaiah, making use of a similar metaphor, speaks
of judgment in the future -

"He will cut down the thicket of the forest with an axe,
and Lebanon with its majestic trees will fall" (Is.10:34);

John's summons to repentance marks the inauguration of judgment now:

"It is now that the axe is being laid to the base of the trees, so
every one that is not bearing good fruit is being cut down and thrown
into the fire" (Matt.3:10=Luke 3:9).

It is part of the prophetic role to actualise the divine sovereignty
and thus to anticipate the total sovereignty of God as ruler and judge.
Jesus is seen to continue, expand and deepen the work of John,
beginning in the same prophetic idiom as his predecessor; (2)

(2) The confused logion, Matt.11:12 (unlike Luke 16:16), appears to
support this identity of interest in John and Jesus: cf. E.
disciples are sent out to proclaim the same message (Luke 10:9, 11).

This emphasis upon the fact that, phenomenologically, Jesus' ministry is fundamentally prophetic sets the discussion about "realised" or "inaugurated" eschatology in a different perspective. Jesus is not primarily a theologian, systematising theological concepts and building up a particular Heilageschichte. By operating prophetically, he "sees" the divine activity in the contemporary age and actualises it in his ministry for those who encounter him. When a prophet speaks, God speaks; when a prophet acts, God acts. In the words and deeds of Jesus, the sovereign activity of God is brought within the ambit of man's experience (it "has drawn near" him, ἥγγεται); it is present as by an anticipation of the eschaton (ἐσχάτον). It is not yet come in a total, eschatological sense: for that, the verb ἐρχέσθαι is reserved. But watching for this ultimate "coming" is not the way to encounter its reality: through Jesus' ministry it is even now ἔρχεται (Luke 17:21), brought within the orbit of their personal experience. (1)

This renewed emphasis on the prophetic as a fundamental motif in Jesus' ministry is an essential introduction to a study of his paraenesis. In recognising it as such, we are not setting aside form criticism and its related disciplines, but we are asserting that their role is supplementary and in the background. The "new quest" rests on a much too narrow basis for our purposes: the area of uniqueness and the provable points of divergence in Jesus' teaching from Judaism and/or the early Church. This is in grave danger of producing a

(1) The translation "within you" is not only without parallel in Jesus' teaching about the kingdom (cf. Perrin, op. cit., p.74) but would be incongruous with the dynamic of prophetic encounter. It is, of course, quite different to speak of "the kingdom" being within you and to speak of the importance of inward disposition in relation to God's kingship.
caricature of Jesus' position, for the essential point about any
religious figure (not least one in the prophetic tradition) is his
ambivalence towards the religious tradition to which he belongs: the
creative tension, compounded of broad acceptance of its major foci and
new insights into their meaning, producing divergences from the
popular standpoints. Without this phenomenological emphasis, it is
all too easy, on the basis of source or form criticism, to make Jesus
into a theologian whose prime object was to expound the concept of
"the kingdom" to his followers - a latter day instance of the
insidious temptation to modernize Jesus, no longer as a Victorian
gentleman of liberal Protestant sympathies but as an enlightened
theologian with existentialist tendencies. (1)

The next step in our study is therefore to look at the major foci
in Judaism and trace the polarities in Jesus' position vis-à-vis each
of them, to see whether we may thus identify the significant contours
of his teaching and mission. The foci in question are: (i) Law
(Torah) and scripture; (ii) Covenant and covenantal people; (iii)
king and land; and (iv) temple and cult. No religious figure in
Palestine would have been credible unless he had come to terms with
such issues; nor would he have been a notable religious figure if his
attitude to them was purely conventional or typically sectarian.

(i) Law (Torah) and scripture. The Law of Moses represented
to the Jew the total demand of God and the total manifestation of his
grace. The sectarian responses were well defined: the Sudducees
held to the written Law, with its extensive cultic regulations, as
sufficient authority in itself; the Pharisees interpreted it by means

(1) Cf. O. Piper, Interpretation XV, 1961, pp.473ff., where he
describes Bornkamm's position as having for its focus "a unitary
God with Jesus as his first theologian"; cited with approval by
of the oral Law and so greatly extended its contemporary application and the casuistry necessary for its interpretation; the Essenes converted it into a Law of perfection, elucidated by their own peculiar eschatological hermeneutic. Jesus appears to have identified himself with none of these positions.\(^1\) Even if the precise content of Matt. 5:17ff. must on form-critical grounds be surrendered to certain circles in the early Church, the tenor of the passage may be retained as expressing or interpreting one necessary pole in Jesus' position; and the succeeding antitheses are set out by Matthew to demonstrate the complete operational polarity which Jesus demonstrated as he applied prophetic insight to the interpretation of the Law: a polarity between the givenness of the Law and its radical implications for living; between the verbal convention and the intentionality of the Law. Jesus' position comprises the poles of conservatism and radicality: thus is the Law fulfilled. The Torah, however, is wider than the Exodus events. It includes the creation theme, which produces a polarity between the created world as it is and the intention of the creator. The purpose of marriage is thus deep set in the created order: in the hardness of his heart man departs from it (\(\text{Mk.10:2-9}\)); men were meant to love one another and make enemies into friends (Matt. 5:44-48).\(^2\)

\(^{(ii)}\) **Covenant and covenantal people.** It is not relevant to discuss here how far Jesus thought of himself as instituting the new covenant in fulfilment of Jer.31:31ff., for that would raise acutely

---


\(^{(2)}\) R. Ben Azzai (*Sifra* on Lev.19:18) supplies the closest rabbinic parallel to this kind of theologizing, basing the obligation to love one's fellow men on the solidarity of the human race as in Gen.5:1. Cf. I. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, I, p.20.
the problems of the self-consciousness of Jesus and of the possible imposition of early Church theology upon Jesus, as well as the temptation to devise a Heilsgeschichte to suit our own theological interpretation. But for a religious teacher or community operating in the milieu of Israel involvement in covenantal language and conceptuality was unavoidable. John the Baptist had already condemned their misapplication in the interests of national complacency (Matt.3:9; Luke 3:8), and the tradition suggests that Jesus took a similar line (John 6:33, 39). In the controversies between Jesus and the Pharisees - and these are too frequently bound up with the basic motifs of Jesus' ministry to be ascribed in their entirety to later Church polemics - the understanding of the Covenant is the key factor in Jesus' concern for "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt.10:6; 15:24) and for people like Zacchaeus who "also is a son of Abraham" (Luke 19:9), and in his admittance of "tax gatherers and sinners" to table fellowship (1) - a point vigorously pressed in the parables (cf. Luke 15). In his interpretation of the Law, what is of significance is not that Jesus tended towards the school of Hillel rather than that of Shammai but that, as Mark shows clearly, (2) he emphasised the covenantal setting of the Law and made that regulate his understanding of it. Thus when in the debate about the greatest commandment Jesus quotes from the Shema (Mk.12:29) and his scribal discussant repeats it (12:32), the recognition is made that love to God and one's neighbour is the appropriate response to God's covenant love and takes precedence over prescribed cultic actions (12:33). Truly the scribe was "not far from the kingdom" (12:34) for, having accepted with Jesus

and the school of Hillel a holistic appreciation of the demand of the Law and Covenant, he was moving towards a radical understanding of what that entailed. The rabbis refused to subordinate the cult to the "love" principle, but Jesus — with the Markan scribe in pursuit — interpreted the central covenantal concept radically and applied it as a test of the validity of any given commandment of the Law. At a stroke the enormous superstructure of scribal casuistry was subordinated and the "love" principle given real precedence. Jesus' radicalizing of it had in fact set it free to operate in the life of individual and community.

(iii) Temple and cult. The positive pole can be deduced from the total picture of Jesus' activity: from the use Mark and John make of his observance of the festivals and the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as well as his synagogue activity which, for our present purposes, approximates to this classification. There is a positive element too in his concern for the nature of worship, which produces a familiar, prophetic distinction: significance attaches not to the mere act but to the inner disposition of the worshipper and to the quality of relationships he enters into (Matt.6:1-18; cf. 5:23f.). The negative pole is his attack on false or corrupt worship: hypocrisy (cf. 6:1ff.), ostentation (cf. 6:2, 5, 7, 16), inconsistency (cf.5:23f.; 6:15) — themes which recur in controversy. In the cleansing of the temple — apart from the special interests of the evangelists —

(1) Even among the more liberal, R. Simon goes only as far as saying: "The world stands on three things: on the Law, on worship, and on works of love" (Aboth 1:2); R. Hillel added to his "golden rule" summary, "The rest is commentary. Go and learn it": (Sabb. 31a; Aboth R. Nathan, 2:26). The rabbis were hesitant about such summaries lest they detract from the Law itself. Cf. I. Abrahams, op. cit., p.24.


(3) Cf. Hos.6:6; Amos 5:21ff.; Is.1:10-17, etc.
the polarity has become acute. Jesus' personal involvement is total, his identification with the prophets unqualified. Jesus has radicalized the intentionality of the temple institution and its cultus.

(iv) **King and land.** By Jesus' time, the Jews had lost the reality of both, the land being in fee to Rome and the Herods being no compensation whatever for the loss of kingship. The failure of national expectation to approach realisation and the apparent hopelessness of any temporal remedy was the major cause of the growth and proliferation of eschatological hopes in Israel, diversifying according to the interests and dreams of the various sectors of national and religious life and intensifying almost to the point of national obsession; but despite the realities of the situation the spirit of the Maccabees was fostered by zealot nationalism, which was eventually to lose the Jews even their right of residence in their homeland. Thus the situation was itself polarised, and to each of the given poles Jesus brought his own polarity. He could not ignore the zealot-type pole, for he was himself at times the object of its attentions; and although he rejected outright any bid for temporal kingship, his actions were sufficiently ambivalent to bring about his execution.\(^1\) The ambivalence was inescapable: even if, like Gideon, he proclaimed "there is no king but God", and even if, unlike Gideon, he avoided direct political action, he was in his prophetic role (to put it no higher) unavoidably the representative of that King on earth, the fountainhead of teaching and of the ferment of ideas which an occupying force inevitably regards with great suspicion, and the focus of a community with values and practices alien and even offensive to

---

those outside it - not least the "establishment".\(^{(1)}\) On the other hand, the popular eschatology and apocalyptic demanded his attention no less. For every Israelite, the future is in God's hands; and this concept can gain expression in various ways: in terms of judgment, consolation, consolidation, retribution, vindication, to name but a few of the more important. In Jesus' teaching, the total concept and the individual expressions of it are submitted to the test of prophetic scrutiny. With regard to the totality, he is concerned to clarify the demand of God upon men now - to bring the future, as it were, into the present, so that all life is lived in the presence of God; and to do this he may use either the language of decision (we might call it the "existential") or the language of apocalyptic.\(^{(2)}\) The individual expressions are equally scrutinized. Does the eschaton mean the vindication of the Jews and the extinction of the Gentiles; the acceptance of the punctiliously religious and the rejection of "publicans and sinners"; the establishment of a particular priesthood or the bringing of all nations to worship God? Who will sit with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven (cf. Matt.8:11)? Thus even apocalyptic is made to involve one's actions, thinking and living in the present.

Jesus' paraenetic teaching was one vehicle he used to elucidate


\(^{(2)}\) This, I think, is an inevitable conclusion from the structural logic of Jesus' position; and it is significantly reflected in many parables; cf. W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, Eng. tr., 1957. It is equally clear that much of Jesus' apocalyptic teaching was later engulfed by early Christian apocalyptic stimulated by the resurrection faith and by the identification of Jesus with judgment; cf. E. Käsemann, On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic, in New Testament Questions of Today, Eng. tr., 1969, pp.108-137, esp. pp.111-124.
the antinomies and polarities of faith and life. The echoes of his teaching in the tradition are, of course, confined within an alien structure — whether it be that of the gospels themselves, or of collections of logia, (1) parables, (2) or traditional pericopes. (3) To some extent, therefore, the form of some of Jesus' utterances has been lost along with their contexts — the Sermon on the Mount, for example, owes its total form to Matthew rather than Jesus, (4) but in other cases the tensile strength of Jesus' paraenetic constructions — especially in the smaller units — has withstood the pressures of transmission, editing and application to new situations. Our investigation now turns precisely to this problem: the form which Jesus gave to his own paraenesis; and in common with the phenomenological approach followed above, we enquire what use he made of traditional forms readily available to him.

(i) the paraenetic topic.

The basis of the paraenetic topic in Jesus' teaching, as in all its manifestations, is the gnomic utterance, the observation of practical wisdom such as:

"Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks" (Matt. 12:34b; Lk. 6:45b).
"Sufficient for the day is the day's own trouble" (Matt. 6:34b).
"The labourer is worthy of his hire" (Lk. 10:7b; cf. Matt. 10:10b).
"Those who are in good health do not need a doctor, but those who are ill" (Mk. 2:18).

Jesus was, of course, doing more than swapping folklore with his audience. These sayings are uttered in contexts which enable them to

---

(1) E.g., "Q", with its own theological or apologetic slant.
(2) Cf. Mark 4, Luke 15. Thus, some collections were arranged according to parabolic type or theme.
come to life, to be intuited, so that in turn they shed new light on their context. Thus the above examples, while in themselves mere pieces of popular folklore, acquire particular pungency and meaning in relation to explosive or delicate themes related to the life of God's covenanted people and their religious practices, such as the congruity of outward act and inward disposition, detachment from worldly security and worldly cares, the disciple's way of life, and Jesus' concern for publicans and sinners. The gnomic form\(^{(1)}\) can be applied even more directly to a specific, religious theme:

"No one who puts his hand to the plough and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God" (Lk.9:62).

"Whoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child will not enter into it" (Mk.10:15).

Following McKane's analysis of Old Testament wisdom sayings, we identify a second main group as instructional in form:

"Doctor, heal yourself" (Lk.4:23).
"Let the dead bury their dead" (Matt.8:22b, Lk.9:60).
"Be wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (Matt.10:16b).

Again, they are situationally intuited. Characteristically, the instruction form is built up into a fuller type by various additions, such as a reason or purpose clause:

"Do not be anxious about tomorrow,
For tomorrow will take care of itself" (Matt.6:34).  

---

\(^{(1)}\) Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p.69f. rightly distinguishes between constitutive motifs and those that are merely "ornamental". I should prefer to speak of motifs that are intrinsic to the form of the utterance as opposed to those that are not. Somewhat dogmatically, he takes the basic forms as "principles (declamatory form)" - our "gnomic" type; "exhortations (imperative form)"; and "questions". This terminology does not appear adequately grounded in historical research into the early and pre-Israelite tradition, such as that carried out by McKane. I do not think Bultmann's subdivision of the "principles" into "material formulations" and "personal formulations" possesses much significance. Nor do I always accept his general classification: "whom God has joined together let no man separate" seems to me to belong to the instructional form, whereas Bultmann smuggles it into the "personal formulations" of "principles": op. cit., p.74.
But after the long evolution of the wisdom tradition in Israel, there is no longer a sharp distinction between the gnomic and the instructional genres, and the instructional couplet in Matt. 6:34a is followed by a gnomic saying in 34b, which gives to the otherwise explicit instruction form an element of gnomic riddle. More usually, however, various devices such as parallelism, repetition, antithesis and the collocation of positives and negatives contribute to a slightly more extended topic, often perfectly balanced and employing the full rhythmic quality of elevated Semitic speech: (1)

"Do not treasure up earthly treasures, where moth and rust (?) consume, and where thieves break in and steal. But treasure up heavenly treasures, where neither moth nor rust (?) consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart also be. (Matt. 6:19-21; Luke 12:33f.)

Other devices include the use of conditional clauses (2) and temporal clauses. (3)

The gnomic form is capable of similar expansion: by parallelism and repetition, for example, as in Mk. 4:22 (and par.):

"For there is nothing hidden that shall not be manifested, and there is nothing secret that shall not be made manifest."

The extended gnomic base is seen in the topics on the divided kingdom (Mk. 3:24ff. and par.) and the good tree bearing good fruit (Luke 6:43f.), and even more clearly in the topic on wealth as a barrier to the kingdom:

(3) Cf. Lk. 14:8-10; 12-14.
"How hard it will be for those who have riches to enter the kingdom of God ... (the disciples react in surprise). Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God ..." (Mk.10:23ff.).

Here the repeated gnomic saying takes a more lyrical form, not uncommon in the wisdom tradition; but it is also linked with an element of comparison or similitude designed to operate as a kind of reductio ad absurdum - apparently one of Jesus' favourite devices, often associated with the use of the rhetorical question. (1) Two comments are called for here: (i) the wisdom type of paraenesis is closely associated with the logic of the parable, the germ of which is contained in such maxims as "look at the birds of the air ...", or "consider the lilies of the field ...", or in vivid pictures of typical behaviour in the observable world; (2) (ii) rhetorical elements are caught up naturally into the paraenetic type, whether or not designed for the purposes of reductio ad absurdum. Bultmann needlessly isolates some questions as a separate main section of logia, on the grounds that they occur in Proverbs also, both as rhetorical and as catechetical questions. (3) But these are merely variant forms of gnomic statement rather than a separate genre. Jesus employs a whole range of devices to enable the mind of his hearers to search for the radical answer, the deeper truth.

A typical structure for the extended topic may therefore be as follows:

(i) Instructional sentences, sometimes repeated for the sake of parallelism or strophic balance.

(ii) A statement of reason or purpose, subject to similar strophic adjustment.


(2) E.g., hypocritical behaviour in relation to alms (Matt.6:2ff.), prayer (6:5f.), fasting (6:16ff.), or right behaviour in terms of forgiveness (5:23f.). Cf. also Luke 6:39 - "He also told them a parable: 'Can a blind man lead a blind man ...?'"

(iii) Rhetorical question or questions.  
(iv) A conclusion or "punch line".

A beautifully balanced example of this topical structure occurs in Matt.7:7-11 (cf. Luke 11:9-13): "ask the Father"; and another example is Matt.7:1-5: "judge not ...". But, editorial and transmissional variations apart, the paraenetic topic is essentially flexible, and comparisons and antitheses in particular may supplement or replace the rhetorical questions or the subordinate clause. Antithetical topics include the cultically orientated passages on giving alms (Matt.6:2ff.), prayer (6:5f.) and fasting (6:16ff.).(2) When these are strung together under a general theme statement on piety and its dangers (6:1), there emerges a complex that might be described structurally as an incipient homily, thus indicating the close relationship between homily and paraenesis. (3) Another incipient homily is Matt.6:25-33, which is fundamentally paraenetic but in its total build up approximates to the more elaborate homiletic structure. (4)

Such paraenetic topics, clearly discernible despite editorial manipulation of various kinds, point to the distinctive paraenesis of Jesus; the distinctiveness lying not in the astonishing novelty of his materials - their content is drawn from the familiar, observable world of men or the familiar gnomic traditions of Israel - but in the


(2) Matt.6:7-14 appears editorially inserted at this point, though deriving in the main from dominical tradition: cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.133.

(3) This larger complex could have originated in the Church; Bultmann takes it to be a Church catechism. Since 6:8-15 is clearly an intrusion, it ante-dates Matthew, and it is possible - but perhaps not likely - that in its totality it comes from Jesus himself. There is certainly no good reason for objecting to the ascription of the various antitheses to him.

(4) There are certain editorial additions: certainly 6:27, possibly 6:26a; cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.81.
way in which he intuited them for his hearers, so that a new light was shed upon some aspect of their living, opening up new possibilities for them and imparting a share, however fragmentary, of Jesus' own flashing prophetic insight. This same insight, however, also probed to the radical depths of the scriptural and hermeneutical tradition in which Jesus stood; for whereas in the Jewish tradition generally scriptural exegesis tended to become syphoned off from paraenesis and reserved for the concentrated study of sectarian groups, Jesus assimilated it within the astonishing unity of his procedures. It is, however, by no means unlikely that much of Jesus' paraenesis was specifically directed to the community he had gathered round him, the righteous community whose standards and quality of life were markedly different from the world's: "it shall not be so among you" (Mk.10:43). Such an interpretation would be compatible with the contemporary, Judaistic background, consonant with prophetic practice and congruous with the content of his teaching. (1)

In these exegetical topics designed to interpret the Law (cf. Matt.5:21-48), a scriptural passage replaces the gnomic or instructional sentence as the datum which is to be intuited; and the process of intuition is inaugurated by advancing to the scripture sentence an antithesis to open up the deeper issues of meaning in radical fashion. What is new and arresting is not the formal method but the quality of the intuition, which indeed contrasts sharply with some of the additions to the original antitheses - additions which illustrate "the

(1) The early formation of a community of disciples round Jesus is attested by all the gospels, and the pattern seems to have been at least partly perpetuated in the apostolic age. Thus K. Stendahl writes of Matthew: "his Gospel more than the others is a product of a community and for a community": Peake, p.769. A similar claim can be made for the Johannine teaching.
tendency to depress enthusiastic demands to the level of a bourgeois morality". (1) Also the antithetical structure has been employed as a model to be imitated by the early Christian editors and teachers. Jesus appears to have applied this antithetical procedure to prohibitions (e.g., 5:21, 27, 33) but, unlike Bultmann, I can find no good reason for disallowing 5:38-39a, where the scriptural quotation approximates to a gnomic saying and, properly understood, carries an implied prohibition against excessive retaliation; and it is this which Jesus radicalizes.

The paraenetic topic was "tailor made" for Jesus' didactic requirements. He was no systematiser of theological thinking, no purveyor of ethical principles or legislative provisions. His procedure was aimed at giving insights into the real state of things, at engineering, so to speak, moments of truth that put his hearers under the necessity of decision. Hence his technique was to pick up a particular issue from life - a wisdom saying or scriptural quotation was frequently the opener - and let illumination come through the examination, comparison or discussion of it in concrete detail. His own insights have been compared in their operation to "gull-like swoops" or "lightning flashes". (2) The paraenetic topic was eminently adaptable as a means of helping his hearers to participate in this experience.

(1) Bultmann, op. cit., p.134ff.; thus, for example, in Matt.5:22 some mss. (incl. D, W and one hand of R) add "without cause", and v.22b disturbs the balance and even the meaning of the antithesis. On the other hand 5:31f.: "it was also said . . ." is clearly an addition; 5:39b-41 appears secondary when compared with Luke 6:27-35; and 5:43 seems an artificial construct from the same material. Catechetical needs probably impelled the early teachers to devise antitheses out of longer units.

(ii) topical figures and illustrations.

Such is the sophistication of New Testament usage that distinctions are felt necessary between similitudes, parables, illustrations and allegories.\(^1\) In briefest compass, the similitude focuses upon a typical situation or recurring event; the parable proper on one case that is particularly significant; the illustration is primarily a narrative that exemplifies; the allegory is a narrative which hints throughout at a level of meaning other than the superficial meaning, a key being required to unlock the encoded message. Such distinctions possess a certain usefulness and validity, but a measure of confusion arises because they in fact overlap in operation and the term "parable" is itself used both in a specific and in a comprehensive fashion. Thus the similitude (e.g., a comparison with the operational characteristics of leaven, mustard seed, grain) is certainly parabolic, though the so-called "parable proper" has to do with what one man did (e.g., "there was a man who held a great feast ...") and if the illustrative story of "the good Samaritan" were to be denied the title of parable, one would be forced to stop and enquire whether one were not talking nonsense; and although the distinction between parable and allegory is much firmer than in the other cases, parables show a strong tendency to develop into allegories.

As a step towards the clarification of this complexity, we propose to underline the general operational type to which all parables and related forms belong: they are topical figures - devices having a natural, spontaneous role within the paraenetic topic. This spontaneity arises from the fact that they are themselves extensions

\(^1\) Cf. E. Linnemann, op. cit., pp.3-8.
and expressions of wisdom teaching, and in their operational variety they reflect the flexibility and adaptability of the paraenetic topic itself. The term \( \pi\alpha\rho\varsigma\beta\alpha\lambda\gamma \) in LXX usage translates the Hebrew mashal, Aramaic mathla, and in fact, mashal is normally used to denote the proverbs and aphorisms of the wisdom tradition. What is of particular interest is to enquire whether the parabolic categories that have been detected correspond to the types of wisdom teaching we have noted.

The gnomic saying, which includes the riddle in its hinterland, moves at the level of the general and the typical and rests upon observation and insight, producing an image which when intuited opens up a new and meaningful perspective for the participant. This corresponds in the main to the similitude, which also requires to be intuited rightly in order that the tertium comparationis may become part of the insight-giving process. Inevitably this means that there is an element of puzzle about the similitude. Its meaning unfolds only to those "who have ears to hear". It is designed to tease...

---

(1) Cf. Manson, Teaching, 1955, p.59f. Jeremias, rightly suspicious (in our judgment) of the rigid categorisation of parables according to the above types, argued that the Semitic terms applied in a general way to all sorts of topical figures; cf. Jeremias, Parables of Jesus, Eng. tr., 1954, p.17f.; but Eissfeldt argued in reply that where mashal occurs it is used not as a comprehensive term but to denote a particular type of figure, although in different contexts it denotes different figures; cf. O. Eissfeldt, Das Maschal in A.T., B.Z.A.W. 24, 1913, p.35; also Linnemann, op. cit., p.131, n.1.

(2) It can also be used to denote a pithy taunt saying or byword (cf. Is.14:4) which sometimes shows a relationship to the lyrical "woe" form adopted by the prophets from wisdom models; cf. Hab.2:6; it could also have other forms of expression, like the vivid lament (Micah 2:4).

(3) E.g., in what way is the growth of the mustard seed relevant to my life and faith, to my understanding of my existence, or to my understanding of the reign of God? There is an element of wrestling with meaning: the answer may be found quickly or slowly.
the mind into active thought.\(^1\) It seems to me that the allegory is similarly related to the riddle, where the puzzle element is even greater. E. Linnemann describes its operation as communicating an evaluation of reality

"by placing a 'picture' in front of the 'reality', behind which this (apparently) disappears. Strictly speaking what happens is as if two tracings were laid one over the other, of which the lower one contains the outline, the upper one the colours: the allegory in its entirety allows the reality with which the author is concerned in the allegorical narrative to show through it". \(^2\)

Correspondingly, the riddle presents a word picture or jingle, the meaning of which will unfold when the key to its second signification is discerned.

The instructional saying possesses a concreteness and directness, as against the generality and allusiveness of the gnomic utterance. The element of comparison which it often contains is capable of development as the so-called "parable proper", which relies on the strength of a well-formulated narrative about a particular person or incident to make its point with force. Operationally, the illustration is separated from the "parable proper" by no more than a hairsbreadth. It is a narrative stage-managed to exemplify the actual issue in question (e.g., "the rich fool", Luke 12:16-21). The instruction saying which it illustrates might be formulated thus:

"Do not lay up for yourself treasures upon earth ...
But lay up for yourself treasures in heaven" (cf. Matt.6:19f.).

The "parable proper" is a narrative stage-managed to set an individual instance before the hearer as an indication of a general law to which he must submit (e.g., "the great supper", Luke 14:15-21; Matt.22:2-14). Its meaning for the original hearers might be paraphrased thus:

\(^1\) Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, 1935, p.16.
"Come quickly to the feast when you are invited, 
Lest your host invite others in your place and you be left outside".

Or, theologically interpreted:

"Now is the acceptable time" (cf. 2 Cor.6:2). (1)

The parables, indeed, give a strong support to the contention that
Jesus' paraenetic topics were not restricted to a traditional "wisdom"
base but included prophetic and theological data of prime concern to
Jesus' ministry. This is shown by the many parables designed to
afford some insight into the nature of God's kingly activity or into
his grace or judgment, but always in relation to the historical
situation, not as timeless truths. For example, they might arise out
of his discussion of major issues in his ministry, such as his table
fellowship with "publicans and sinners", (2) to which are related among
others the so-called "prodigal son" (Luke 15:11-32), "the labourers in
the vineyard" (Matt.20:1-16), and "the unmerciful servant" (Matt.18:
21-35). Every parable, like every "wisdom" saying, enshrines a
"cosmic disclosure" which may be intuited through the interaction of
the speaker, the hearer and the situation or picture of reality which
the parable or wisdom saying evokes. Parabolic discourse is, in fact,
so patterned as to have a certain direction-finding mechanism to
locate the area of potential disclosure, and this area may sometimes
be specifically designated, as in the parables of the kingdom. At
all events, the disclosure is cosmic: it has universal significance.

(1) Cf. E. Linnemann, op. cit., pp.88-97, where she also considers
later Church interpretations.
(2) Paraenetic topics related to this theme may well have been
numerous. The underlying Pharisaic topic may well have been
"birds of a feather flock together", while Jesus countered it with
"those that are well do not need a doctor, but those who are ill".
enough, Ramsay points out that "the parable of the sower is
given in the context of an imperative. 'Hearken. Behold.'
'Be on the look out for a challenge.'" (p.9).
(iii) The "Two Ways".

The "Two Ways" motif is an integral part of the construction of many parables, especially of those which operate on the basis of contrast. They include the parables of the wheat and the tares (Matt.13:24-30), the drag net (Matt.13:47f.), the ten virgins (Matt. 25:1-13), the last judgment (Matt.25:31-46), the two houses (Matt.7: 24-27; cf. Luke 6:47ff.), and the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31); while other parables work on an explicit contrast of two people: the two sons (Matt.21:28-32), the two debtors (Luke 7:41ff.) and, though less explicitly, the great supper (Matt.22:1-14; Luke 14:16-24), the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32) and the Pharisee and the publican (Luke 18:9-14). The use of this motif was therefore a basic procedure of Jesus' teaching, probably for several reasons. It is characteristic of the prophetic call for decision, as in Amos' call to "seek good and not evil" (5:14) or Joshua's challenge to "choose this day whom you will serve - Yahweh or other gods" (24:15). It is also part of the peculiar nature of religious insight to operate by means of antitheses and contrasts. Thus, apart from the parables, a strong "Two Ways" motif is present in the image of the broad and narrow way (Matt.7:13f.), while the antitheses of the Sermon approximate to this motif by contrasting the way of contemporary Judaistic practice and the way of radical obedience to God. The "Two Ways" represent not an ultimate dualism in the universe but the duality of obedience and disobedience, radical acceptance or effective rejection of the total demand of God. Thus, a characteristic prophetic practice is to balance beatitudes and woes, as Luke does. Once more, the astonishing unity and co-ordination of Jesus' procedures is apparent.

(1) Vid. supra, chapter one on Prophesteia.
(iv) Catalogues of virtues and vices.

A good instance of the catalogue procedure is found in Mark 7:21f., where Jesus is reported to have listed the vices which "come out of a man" and defile him. The Sitz im Leben of this passage in Mark, as in its truncated parallel in Matt.15:19, is controversy within the Church as to what foods defile: "thus he declared all foods clean", Mark observes (7:19b). Since this is an isolated instance of cataloguing in the Synoptics, it raises in acute form the question of whether the catalogue has simply been ascribed to Jesus by the teachers of the Church, who used the catalogue method extensively and who derived the ethical content from stock Jewish teaching. It is just possible that Jesus did use this form in controversy with the Pharisees or even the Essenes, to whose teaching it is closely parallel. A measure of cataloguing occurs in the prophetic saying contained in Mark 10:29f., but once again the likelihood is that the catalogue was a Christian interpretation, as in Luke 21:16. One cannot conclude that the cataloguing procedure was characteristic of Jesus or part of the closely integrated didactic methods outlined above; yet on occasion he may have approximated to it, if not in the passages cited above then in the succession of prophetic sayings such as the beatitudes which are naturally grouped together. It must be admitted, however, that the catalogue method, with its prosaic monotony, was more congenial to early Christian teachers than to the insight seeking procedures that characterised Jesus' teaching. (1)

(v) the Haustafeln.

The gospels do not record any instance of Jesus' use of a household code in his teaching. In fact, his attitude to the family had about it a disconcerting duality fully in accord with the polarity that characterised his thinking. On the one hand, the command to honour one's father and mother is radicalised (1) and is caught up in controversy with the Pharisees. On the other, radical obedience to God may mean departing from family groups and loyalties (Matt.10:37f.; Mk.10:29f.; Luke 14:26), which may be a barrier to discipleship, and the disciple may expect hostility from family groups thus divided (Matt.10:35f.; Luke 12:53). This latter teaching in particular may be coloured or created by early Christian experience but the creation of a group of disciples whose service to God took precedence over any other relationship appears authentic (cf. Matt.12:46-50, and par.). In these circumstances, it is not likely that Jesus found it incumbent upon him to initiate or reinforce social codes relating to the family, although the full sophistication of his position must be appreciated, for he is not hostile to the family unit as such. Family sequences appear in the teaching attributed to him (Matt.12:50 par., as well as Mark 10:29f.), but they are not related to Haustafeln.

5. Paraenesis in the early Church.

By virtue of its historical and phenomenological situation, the teachers of the early Church operated two, perhaps three, interrelated paraenetic bases. One was the Old Testament, the sole scriptural authority in the Church for a considerable time; the complex second base comprised both the paradosis concerning the

(1) Matt.15:3ff.; cf. also the discussion on divorce, 19:3-9.
teaching, ministry and death of Jesus, and above all the christocentric focus given to the entire community life by the resurrection faith and the acceptance of the Lordship of Christ. (1)

These bases formed a revelatory unit; but although paradosis is integral to the paraenetic base, affording as it does an authoritative point of reference, paraenesis is itself a creative process within the Christian community. It is not concerned merely to preserve the paradosis — that operation will be discussed in the next chapter. (2)

It uses the data of paradosis in a creative way, interpreting, developing and applying it to the general needs of the community or to the particularities of a given situation. Thus, the paradosis concerning Jesus and the Law (3) is applied by the early teachers to their contemporary situation, and the paraenetic point — "thus he declared all foods clean" — is even retained by Mark in his gospel (7: 19). (4)

The broad categories of paraenesis will therefore be illustrated from the Pauline corpus and from James, complemented by data derived from other parts of the New Testament.

(1) The paraenetic topic in the early Church.

(a) General paraenetic topics.

The extent to which paraenetic materials derive from "wisdom" and

(1) That other influences — from Stoicism to Zoroastrianism — may have been at work in the paraenesis is not at issue here. They do not form the basis of paraenesis, although they may colour it.

(2) Including the question whether paradosis is ever "merely preserved" or is always "applied" in some way in the Christian community.

(3) The question of the origin of this particular type of paradosis is not raised here: vid. supra, and W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp.208ff.

(4) So too, the writer of 1 Thess. takes a piece of apostolic paradosis of strongly paraenetic flavour — the authoritative instructions given as the foundation of Christian living (4:2) — and gives it the focal position in his paracladesis (cf. 4:1, 8).
and other traditional sources is well illustrated by much of Romans 12. "Hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good" (v.9) is a reproduction of a prophetic ethical motif, exemplified by Amos 5:15. The warning against arrogance and haughtiness (v.16) strongly reflects the wise man's abhorrence of being "wise in one's own eyes" (cf. Prov.3:7; 26:12). The prohibition on taking vengeance into one's own hands reinforces and interprets the Levitical injunction (Lev.19:18), and cites the Deuteronomistic "vengeance is mine" (32:35f.). The "wisdom" character of v.20 is indicated not only by its close rendering of Prov. 25:21f., but also by its reproduction of an image that, prima facie, seems on a lower plain than the rest of the paraenesis and which apparently derives from an Egyptian ritual of repentance.(1)

The confluence of authoritative, revelatory sources is illustrated by the fact that the teaching of Jesus is reproduced in context with Old Testament injunctions,(2) and the latter may even evoke recollections of the former.(3) Formally, the paraenesis of Romans 12, especially vv.9-21, resembles the hellenistic "string of detached maxims", with overtones of wisdom teaching of the Judaic instructional type. However, groupings are formed by linking two or three imperatives in a row, or by setting one against the other antithetically. Even the groups of maxims are not completely detached. They are characterised by a concern for right relationships on the part of members of the community of faith, although there appears no other logical thread to bind them together. The leading instruction concerns genuine ἰἀμα (v.9f.), to which is added a concern for

(1) Cf. T.W. Manson, in Peake, p.950.
spirituality (v.11f.), including practical help to community members (v.13). Thereafter, the instructions relate to relationships with persecutors (v.14), the joyful and the mourning (v.15), the community as a whole and the "lowly" in particular (v.16), and the most difficult relationship of all: with those at whose hands one has suffered wrong (vv.17-21). Paul has bound these paraenetic maxims into a unity of a particular kind, subsuming them under a general appeal which recalls the logic of the covenant within which the recipients stand (12:1) and spells it out in terms of a major antithesis (12:2), but it seems highly likely that both Paul and other Christian teachers made use of such individual units of paraenesis as occasion demanded. Thus, the recurrence of Deut.32:35f. in a homiletic context in Hebrews 10:30 suggests that this was a detached piece of Christian paraenesis which different teachers deployed in different ways.

Frequently, however, Paul works with well formulated paraenetic topics. D.G. Bradley has drawn attention to a block of four topos in Romans 13, "each of which could stand alone, and each of which gives a teaching on a problem of Christian life and thought", and a group of three topos in 1 Thess.4:9-5:11. In fact, Bradley is hardly justified in dividing Rom.13:1-5 from vv.6f. to form two separate topos, one on the subject of "temporal authority" and the second on "paying tribute". It is, of course, possible that such topos were frequently used separately, but Paul has employed them in a unitary topos on "the right attitude to civil authority", and the Stichworter to which Bradley points belong to the inner structure of the one extended unit. The structural pattern is typical of a well-developed topos. It leads off with a strong instructional sentence

which sets the tone of the whole topic (v.1a): "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities". This is followed by a supporting clause of reason (γὰρ: v.1b) and the drawing of a conclusion (εἰστὶ: v.2), which is itself supported by a further γὰρ clause (v.3a). Variation is now introduced by a rhetorical question (v.3b), which prepares the way for an imperative and a conditional promise (v.3c), justified by a γὰρ clause (v.4a). Then the antithesis is put by means of a conditional clause, an imperative and two γὰρ clauses (v.4b, c, d). A firm conclusion (διὸ) can then be drawn (v.5), which states the basic necessity to be subject to the civil powers. An additional practical consequence is drawn (διὰ τὸν γὰρ καὶ ... v.6a) concerning the necessity to pay taxes, with a γὰρ clause in support (v.6b). Finally, with a great rhetorical flourish, the concluding imperative rings out: "Pay all of them their dues ..." (v.7a); and these δρᾶσεις are spelled out in a beautifully balanced quotation:

τὰ τῶν φόρων τῶν φόρων,
τὸ τῶν τελῶν τῶν τελῶν,
τὰ τῶν φόρων τῶν φόρων,
τὰ τὴν πτῶν τὴν πτῶν.

What is remarkable about this topos is not its structure, which is unexceptionable, but the extreme generality of its procedure. There is no explicit appeal to the authority of revelation or to a central religious symbol. That is not to say that none is presupposed. That civil authorities derive their status and function from God is characteristic of wisdom teaching (cf. Prov.8:15f.), and the ethic of submission emanates from the same source (cf. Prov.24:21f.). Likewise, the teaching of Jesus is recalled in 13:6f. (1) In many topoi.

however, the central revelatory authority occupies the focal position. In Romans 13:8-10 (on *agape*), for example, a recital of some of the commandments culminates in Lev.19:18, as in Matt.19:19 also. In 13:11-14, a *topos* on an eschatological theme, the central symbol is the nearness of *συντρόφια* and the necessity to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ": "the only specifically Christian statements in the chapter", according to Bradley, although in view of the interlocking of Old and New Testament motifs in the previous *topos* his statement is misleading.

Bradley distinguishes a second group of *topoi*: 1 Thess.4:9-12, 4:13-18 and 5:1-11. Following a hellenistic form already noted, Paul denotes the first as *περί τῆς φιλαδελφίας*; the second as *περί τῶν κοιμώμενων*; and the third as *περί τῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν καρπῶν*. At this juncture, our concern is with what we have called the central religious symbol. In the first it is the command to love one another (4:9); in the second, the resurrection of Jesus (4:14a); and in the third, the coming of the day of the Lord "like a thief in the night" (5:2). In these passages, the focal concepts are drawn from the very life blood of the Christian community, its experience and tradition. They reflect the teaching of Jesus, the mighty acts of God in which he was wholly involved, and the expectation of the future which is coloured by the expectation of the past - as "the day of the Lord" in Amos - reinterpreted in the light of the event of Christ. The topics have, of course, been adapted for the epistolary form: "Concerning *φιλαδελφία*, you do not need anyone to write to you..." (4:9; cf. 5:1). For this reason, and also because of the fragmentated or partial manner in which parts of these *topoi* appear elsewhere, it

(2) *Vid. supra*.
cannot be concluded that Paul is using fixed units of paraenetic instruction, reproduced automatically and without reflexion. What is clear, however, is that such topoi, in their concern for a specific subject, their constant notes of admonition and counsel, the predictability of their construction and the consistency with which they revolve around, interpret or at least reflect a focal point of religious authority or revelation, represent basic paraenetic procedures, easily reproduced by less experienced Christian teachers without recourse to the mere repetition of fixed formulas. Comparing Paul's procedures with those of the hellenistic world in particular, Bradley writes:

"Paul as an itinerant preacher and teacher undoubtedly had his bag of answers to meet recurring problems and questions common to members of different Christian communities. And in the paraenetic sections of his letters where Paul says that though there is no specific need for a teaching, yet he is giving some considerations to bear in mind which might prove helpful, we find him conforming to the current practice of contemporary teachers. His paraenesis, which includes the form of the topos, is applied by Paul to anticipate any problem of faith or practice which he felt might cause concern among his churches. He says in effect, here is something we have found helpful; use it if it will help you. 'Therefore comfort one another with these words'". (1)

Turning now to James, we find a number of general paraenetic units, aimed at the edification of Christians in relation to topics of general concern. Two are presented here as examples.

**James 1:2-18 : Steadfastness in time of trial.**

There is the usual introductory exhortation (1:2ff.) stressing the joyful approach to trials, which can lead to maturity. This is followed by an antithesis, the positive element of which is reliance upon God (1:5-8), and the negative reliance upon material things that perish (1:9-11). In this way the teacher's exhortations build up to

(1) Bradley, *op. cit.*, p.246.
the central symbol: "Blessed is the man who endures trial" (1:12).
This is clearly based on Matt.5:10ff., but reflects other passages such as Rev.2:10. (1)  

Another antithesis throws light on the central problem of temptation: temptation is not of God (1:13) but comes from man's own desires, which lead to sin and death (1:14f.). A final exhortation reinforces the main thrust of the unit (1:15ff.).

This represents the standard pattern of general paraenesis in James. Its core or central symbol is thoroughly Christian, but in its build up it makes use of an Old Testament text

"The grass withers, the flower fades; but the word of our God will stand for ever" (Is.40:6ff.; cf.1:9ff.).

The thorough integration of this subsidiary motif with the entire unit is shown in the last verse, where the new creation is brought about by "the word of truth" (1:18). There is also a parallel with Qumranic teaching in the curious phrase "Father of Luminaries" (1:17). (2)


This paraenetic unit as it stands in James may have some claim to be situational, since it appears to be directed to those who were indulging excessively in the spoken word (3:1). But the topic is of such wide application that it is probably better to class it as general paraenesis. (3)

(1) For crown or wreath of victory, cf. 1 Cor.9:25; 2 Tim.2:5; 4:8; 1 Pet.5:4; Rev.3:11; for concept of reward, cf. Rom.8:28; 1 Cor.2:9; James 2:5.

(2) Cf. IQS 3:20.

(3) Kitton, following W. Barclay, prefers to separate v.1 from vv.2-5, so that the reference to teachers is not carried forward: op. cit., p.118. This, I think, is ill-judged, if only because the paraenetic unit in James characteristically begins with an exhortation. Whether James is adapting a topos on the tongue to a church situation is, of course, another matter. Reicke, op. cit., p.37ff., argues that the entire passage is concerned with the dangerous influence which the tongue (i.e. of the teachers) exerts over the whole group of believers.
The hortatory or admonitory introduction (3:1) leads quickly to the central point: it is the mature man who gives no offence in his speech and keeps tight control of his bodily impulses. The background of this focal teaching is probably Matt.12:36ff., a solemn warning on man's ultimate accountability for the words he utters. Thereafter a series of analogies illustrate the truth of this central teaching: the bit, the rudder, the forest fire, the cosmic conflagration (3:3-6). Here the writer, while perhaps taking cognisance of Stoicism, is reflecting mainly Proverbs 16:27: "his speech is like a scorching fire". With the help of a further simile, he draws pessimistic conclusions about the controlability of the tongue (3:7f.).

The practical outcome of this situation is that we often find ourselves blessing God and cursing men in the same breath, as it were (3:9f.), and against such inconsistency a strong imperative is issued (3:10b). Further biblically based analogies drive the point home (3:11f.).

The argument of this passage is more tortuous than in other units in James, and leans more heavily on the argument by analogy. Its use of philosophic jargon is also unusual. In other respects, however, the pattern of paraenesis is readily identifiable. From the hortatory introduction, it builds up speedily to a major symbol from gospel tradition, and this is reinforced by another gospel theme at the end. There is therefore no need to argue that this passage represents another document worked into the epistle.

The two examples given above bear out our contention that common paraenetic procedures were followed throughout the Church. Realms of

(1) Cf. Matt.7:16ff.; perhaps also Ex.15:23 (cf. Heb.3:8).
discourse further apart than Paul's and James' are hard to conceive within the early Christian communities. Yet whatever differences exist in emphasis and interpretation, there appears to be a whole field of paraenetic instruction in which their procedures are very close indeed.\(^1\)

(b) **situational paraenetic topics.**

The Corinthian correspondence supplies abundant testimony not only to the frequent necessity for paraenetic teaching to be directed to specific situations in the early Church but also to the manner in which Paul dealt with a variety of situations for some of which, at least, there was no ready-made authoritative ruling or theological principle available to him.

Thus, chapter 7 deals with specific questions raised in correspondence by the Corinthians themselves (7:1), the whole situation being introduced in topical fashion: "concerning the matters on which you wrote". One problem is that of sexual abstinence (7:1b), which leads in fact to a series of topics. The first of these (1b-7) is about sexual relations within marriage. Paul's discussion of it follows the principles of rationality, recognizing human weakness 7:2, 5 and the mutuality of the marriage relationship (3ff.).\(^5\) He speaks in an advisory rather than an authoritative

---

\(^1\) Other topics of general paraenesis in James include: (i) "the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God" (3:13-18), on the theme of meekness (cf. Matt.5:5, 9) with Is.32:17 as the major symbol; (ii) "aggressive passions and how to dissolve them" (4:1-12) in which two symbols work together: Matt.6:24 and Prov.3:34 (Bo Reicke calls this passage "a typical paraenesis or series of admonitions"); op. cit., p.45); (iii) "non-judgmental behaviour" (4:1f.), recalling Matt.7:1f. and similar passages; (iv) "against swearing"; cf. Matt.5:37; and (v) "on prayer and unction", in which Elijah is taken as the O.T. example; cf. also Prov.10:12.

\(^2\) I.e., rational arguments are advanced for the positions recommended; e.g., ἐὰν τῆς παρενεσίας ... (v.2); κρέατον γὰρ ἐστ ... (v.9).

manner (v.6). The major symbol of it is given at the beginning and the end of the topic (v.7; cf. v.1b). This procedure is carried forward into the next brief topic on the unmarried and widows (v.8f.).

A similar advisory note occurs in 7:25-40: "concerning the unmarried ..." (incl. widows, v.39f.), where according to rabbinic practice Paul affirms that he has no authoritative tradition (v.25). Paul, however, is ready to give his γνώμη (v.25) as one who is προφήτης and who has the Spirit (v.40b), both factors lending authority to his advice and put forward at the beginning and end of the topic respectively. Within that bracket a statement of the burden of his advice is given at the beginning and the end: in v.26 and v.40a, and is in fact the major symbol in the topic. The centre is taken up with rational argumentation, including the reasons on which it is based, (3) diatribal procedures, (4) and reflections of authoritative tradition, with overtones of eschatological teaching (vv.26, 29), teaching about anxiety (vv.32ff.; cf. Matt.6:25, 34), possibly the Martha and Mary story (Luke 10:35ff.), (5) and the acceptance of the domincal tradition on marriage (v.39; cf. Matt.19:4ff.).

Similar procedures are to be observed in the more complex topos which turns on the issue of "remaining in the state to which God has called one" (7:12-24). With reasoning and rhetorical argumentation, Paul relates his basic principle first to mixed marriages (12-16),

(1) κατὰ συγγνώμην rather than κατ’ εὐπροσωπίαν. Notice the concessional element in his paraenesis: 1 Cor.7:1f., 9, 28, 36, 39f., etc. This is strikingly similar to the hellenistic model noted above.
(2) The rabbi without an authoritative tradition must say, "I have not heard"; cf. Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, p.314. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:8.
(3) Cf. διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνίκητην (v.26a).
(4) Esp. vv.27-31; also 32-35, 36ff.; this shows how close extended paraenesis is to the homily.
then to circumcision (18ff.) and slavery (21ff.). What is remarkable is the repetition of the central symbol in vv.17, 20 and 24. This, in fact, is a Christian version of the rabbinic kelal verse. Paul has expounded a halakah, binding in all his churches. (2) He has also shown us how paraenesis develops on the basis of apostolic authority working through reasoned argumentation and evangelical or theological appropriateness.

"Now concerning food offered to idols ..." (8:1b): thus Paul takes up a topic which he is prepared to treat discursively and with scant regard to form. His material in 1 Cor.8-10, abounding as it does in analogies (9:7, 13, 24ff.), allegorical interpretation (cf. 10:1) and diatribal argumentation, suggests a Sitz im Leben in homiletic activity, although it is perhaps too loosely constructed as it stands to pass as a complete homily. Epistolary freedom has been used in the composition of these chapters. Romans 14:14-20, also part of an epistolary theme, gives a succinct statement of the paraenetic principles involved. First, there is the remarkable statement:

"I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it is unclean".

The background is the intense debate in the early Church on ritual practices and the will of Christ in relation to them, evidenced in Mark 7:19, Matt.15:20 and the bath-gol to Peter in Acts 10:15. To deal with this situation Paul needs to develop a complex principle that includes the recognition of the part the individual conscience

(1) There is a differentiation between vv.12-16 and 17-24 in that the laissez faire principle acceptable in relation to circumcision and slavery has to be modified according to the circumstances of the mixed marriage (cf. v.15).
(2) Cf. Gerhardsson, ibid.
must play as well as the primacy of concern for one's neighbour.

This one will not find in the Law of Moses (cf. Rom.10:4) but in the "law of Christ" (1 Cor.9:21), itself an expression of the primacy of love (Rom.14:15). One must emphasise the complexity of this principle.

"It is very difficult to interpret this otherwise than to mean that Paul accepts the concept of a messianic law (τὸ πρὸς Χριστόν), built on the foundation of a tradition of, and about the Lord, i.e., the gospel tradition, to the extent and in the form in which he had received it. We can at all events see from 1 Cor. that the demand that Gentile Christians should be taught to keep all that Jesus commanded ... was not confined to some "legalistic" group in early Christianity." (1)

This is the truth, but it is not the whole truth. It fails to do justice to the sophistication of Paul's position. Paul's use of the term "law" in relation to Christ is paradoxical: as paradoxical as the covenant "not in a written code but in the Spirit" (2 Cor.3:6). The "law" of Christ is the motive power and constraint in his life: "the love of Christ controls us" (2 Cor.5:14) - a love demonstrated in the total saving activity of Christ. This does involve the use of a tradition about Christ; even a messianic law. But paradoxically that law does not operate qua law - not, at least, for Paul. It operates as a guide and a criterion in relation to the contemporary situation; as an invitation to radical obedience to God, to radical openness to one's neighbour, and to a radical expression of ἀγάπη.

In the light of this kind of "law", other criteria such as "knowledge" or "liberty" are found inadequate: "knowledge puffs up but love builds up" (1 Cor.8:1b); again, "if your brother is being injured by what you eat, you are no longer walking in love" (Rom.14:15). Thus

the "law" does not tell you what you shall do in any situation. You must work it out under the guidance of the Spirit and the dictates of love, and in relation to the actual situation (cf. esp. 1 Cor.10:27ff.). You require for your guidance not a legal code ("the written code kills": 2 Cor.3:6b) but the insight that comes to those who are "εν χριστίνων": Thus consequences play an important part in Paul's ethical teaching: watch carefully how your actions affect others, lest you put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a "weaker brother" (1 Cor.8:9ff., 12f.; Rom.14:13, 20f.). Aims or goals represent another aspect of ethical awareness: aim at "peace and mutual upbuilding" (Rom.14:19), at "love" (1 Cor.14:1), at instructing others (1 Cor.14:19), at "the good of one's neighbour" (1 Cor.10:24). Such consequences and goals are pursued within the mutuality of relationships with one's fellow men, towards whom one acts for peace and with responsibility, and with God, to whose glory all things are done. Such moral sensitivity has to be expressed in the situation in which one finds oneself.

Paul's situational paraenesis is designed to help the Church members to work out individually and corporately what the law of Christ is for them in the midst of their predicaments. This is what lies behind the rambling chapters in 1 Corinthians "concerning food offered to idols" (8-10), with the more succinct Romans 14:10-23. 1 Cor.12-14 are also situational and deal with pneumatic disorders at Corinth. Yet while Paul would have his churches acquire moral insight and sensitivity, he also speaks as an apostle and one who has the Spirit. He points them towards relevant traditions, scriptural statements and dominical words. As in 11:2ff. and in ch.12, he advances helpful and suggestive analogies. But in the last analysis, if all fails, Paul's ruling is firm: "if anyone is disposed to be
contentious, we recognise no other practice, nor do the churches of God" (11:16). "Situation ethics" need not mean that the trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound.

Turning now to James, we discover that certain paraenetic units in his epistle are strongly situational in their orientation - particularly those which are designed to bring home to the hearers the inseparability of faith and works. Four examples are given below.

James 1:19-27: "Be Doers of the Word."

At first reading, this unit appears to have a general application to all conversation and social intercourse; and indeed, such a reference is never ruled out. There is, however, a strong suggestion in the text of a worship or church community situation, and Bo Reicke, pinpointing hints in vv. 18, 21 and 22 to the effect that it is for the most part recent converts who are addressed here, identifies a situation of high excitement in the church, where the young enthusiasts are too prone to talk, witness or condemn angrily in a kind of inspirational demagoguery (cf. 3:1). James would have them, first, listen rather than talk or rant; then, go out and live

(1) J. Fletcher has focused attention on this issue in his books, Situation Ethics (1966) and Moral Responsibility (1967), as well as in other publications. He takes the view that there are only three approaches to making moral decisions: the legalistic, the antinomian and the situational (cf. Situation Ethics, p.17); and he makes much of such New Testament material as corresponds to the last mentioned. His work, while stimulating, is open to criticism on several scores. For one thing, his selection of N.T. material is partial. The N.T. ethical procedures are much more varied than he allows: he tends to cite only what is convenient to his thesis. For another, he fails to analyse adequately the ethical criteria he uses to judge the rightness of action: e.g., consequences, motive, intrinsic rightness of action. (I acknowledge a debt here to helpful discussion with Ian C.M. Fairweather).

(2) It is treated in a general sense by C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.60f.; L.E. Elliott-Blins, op. cit., p.1023.


according to the word they have received. Such an emphasis on practical religion can be paralleled in contemporary Judaism. In James, there is strong emphasis on "the implanted word", suggesting that the central symbol is perhaps that of the Sower (Matt.13:3-9, 18-23, par.). However, the paraenetic unit is developed with customary variety, including the simile of the man who glances fleetingly at himself in a mirror, learning nothing from experience, and the man who confronts "the law of liberty" (2) and realises that he must persevere in loving actions. Consistency of faith and action is thus put at a premium, and in the final sentences the vanity of religion that is not coupled with responsible action is contrasted with religion "pure and undefiled" - the underlying motif recalling Matt.7:21ff. and perhaps Matt.21:28-31. The leading symbol appears at the crux of the unit (v.21b); the supporting symbol underpins the second part and provides a forceful conclusion.


Though very close to general paraenesis, this unit is classed here as situational because the vividness with which the incident in church is portrayed suggests that an actual occurrence, or a typically recurring feature, of church life is under review. The gold rings and fine clothing of one of the visitors suggest not only social but possibly also political rank. (3) It was all too tempting for the

---

(1) Cf. 1 Qp. Hab.7:11; 8:1; 12:14; 1QS 2:25b-3:12.
(2) The "law of liberty", a favourite expression of James (cf. 1:25; 2:12), refers primarily to the law of love (Lev.19:18). Even in Israel the Torah is conceived as a liberating influence. It brought "joyfulness and gladness of heart" (cf. Deut.28:47; Ps. 40:8 etc.); it took away "the yoke of worldly care" (cf. Pirke Aboth 3:8); and R. Jehoshua b. Levi is credited with the saying, "You will find no freeman but him who is occupied in learning the Torah" (Pirke Aboth, 6:2). For further discussion, vid. infra on James 2:1-13.
(3) Cf. Reicke, op. cit., p.27.
Christians to defer to such a potentate and try to secure his influential support. But the cost of so doing is great, as the writer shows diatribally: the introduction of class distinction based on human judgment (2:4), the abandonment of God's ways (2:5), making friends with God's enemies (2:6f.). The central symbol is then introduced: the "royal law" (2:8), the "law of liberty" (2:12). But by its very nature this law must be fulfilled without partiality - for to fulfil it in this way is to fulfil only part of it, and this is to detract from the total demand of God (2:9ff.).

The form of the paraenetic unit is clear: opening exhortation (2:1), illustration followed by diatribal discussion (2:2-7), statement of leading symbol (2:8), further discussion (2:9ff.) and concluding statement (2:12f.).

The attack on partiality is as familiar to the Old Testament (cf. Deut.1:17; Lev.19:15) as is the law of love itself (Lev.19:18), and is a characteristic of New Testament didache. God's choice of the poor as "heirs of the Kingdom" (2:5) suggests a reflection of Luke 6:20 (Matt.5:3), and there is a hint of "judge not, that you be not judged" (Matt.7:1f.) in 2:4 and 13. The central symbol is derived from the Law (2:8; cf. Lev.19:18), although it had, of course, filtered through the teaching of Jesus (Mk.12:28-34, par.).

James 2:14-26: "Faith alone is not enough".

This unit should also be related to the immediate church situation. It is misleading and probably irrelevant to see the function of the unit as a corrective to Pauline doctrine or a misunderstanding of it that has been spread abroad. The immediate situation

appears to arise from the fact that "God-fearers", who entered the church in considerable numbers, had to reorientate themselves from Pharisaic teaching directed to the Gentiles (which made them second class citizens of the synagogue community) to the gospel of Christ, which brought them full membership in the people of God.\(^1\) In their former role, it was sufficient to profess their monotheistic faith, while much of the Law did not apply to them. In the church, it cannot be accepted that one man may excel in faith without works; another in works without faith (2:18). Mere profession of faith is something even the demons can do (2:19). Something more is required than the pietistic "God bless you" at the close of the service:\(^2\) that "something more" is the practical work of religion, the expression of love and care that come from a living faith (2:16f.).

The build up of this unit presents a fine illustration of James' paraenetic usage: an introduction (in diatribal style, as it happens), leading up to a central paraenetic principle, which is then further illustrated or applied. The central principle is the indivisibility of faith and works, expressed in negative terms - "faith without works is dead" (2:17) - a formulation repeated in the final punch line (2:26b). The second part of the unit, however, uses Abraham and Rahab to show more positively how works must be the concomitants of faith (cf. 2:22). But, while the illustrative material is drawn from the Old Testament, it is hard to believe, in view of 2:15f., that the central symbol, though implicit rather than explicit, is not Matt.25:31-46 or some similar passage.

\(^1\) Cf. Reicke, op. cit., p.32f.
\(^2\) Cf. 'Ευλογεῖτε ἐν Κυρίῳ (2:16), the deacons' blessing at the close of communion (?).
James 5:7-11: Patience.

The situation suggested by this paraenetic unit is the manifestation of impatience by many Christians in view of the delay in the Parousia and the sufferings of various kinds which they have to endure in the interim. Combined with appropriate exhortations, the argument develops by analogy reminiscent of Matt.13:24-33 (cf. Mk.4:26-29). The central symbol is that of imminence of the Parousia and Judgment (5:8b, 9b). Subsidiary exemplification is drawn from the prophets (5:10) and Job (5:11).

The situational use of eschatologically orientated material is not confined to James. Mark 13 provides a good illustration of such paraenetic procedures. The writer is concerned about the consequences of the delayed Parousia for the morale and well-being of the church: for example, the distractions of false teachers (13:5f., 21ff.), wars and rumours of wars (v.7f.), persecution and trials (vv.9ff.), family divisions (v.12f.), and the destruction and desecration of Israel's sacred places (vv.14-20). Mark appears to build his paraenesis round prophetic utterances, some of which may be directly attributed to Jesus while others originate with church prophets. (2)

(2) The prophecy of the destruction of the Temple may be ascribed to Jesus with some confidence: cf. Mk.14:58; 15:29; Acts 6:14; it is also congruous with his attitude to the Temple and does not appear to have been written in retrospect (Josephus says the Temple was destroyed by fire: Bel.6:4, 5ff.): cf. R.McL. Wilson, Mark, in Peake, p.813. The chapter is widely held to derive from a "little apocalypse", usually taken as vv.6-8, 14-20, 24-27: cf. F.C. Grant, Int. Bib. VII, p.854. This earlier redaction may date to c. A.D. 70. V. Taylor underlines the "doctrinal and catechetical interests" which affected the material Mark used, the "genuine sayings of Jesus" embedded in it and adapted by the catechists, and the relevance of Luke 21 for the study of this chapter: Gospel acc. to Mark, p.499.
The presentation of the coming of the Son of Man(1) is part of the paraenetic technique (vv.24-27) into which parables have also been incorporated (vv.28ff., 34f.) together with a topic on watchfulness (cf. vv.33-37). Similarly, apocalyptic teaching in the Pauline letters, 2 Peter and Revelation is linked to specific developments within or affecting the churches.(2)

Finally, some account must be taken of situational paraenesis in 1 Clement, which is best described as a paracletic or hortatory letter but which does contain some readily identifiable topos. A considerable part of his letter deals with a situation of disorder and schism at Corinth, and stresses the required discipline and obedience.

"Not everybody is a general, colonel, captain, sergeant ... But 'each in his own rank' carries out the orders of the emperor and generals" (3)

One of Clement's topics is based on scriptural authority (45:2): note, he says, how the righteous are persecuted by the wicked, not vice versa, yet they faced such sufferings nobly (45:5). Examples are adduced: Daniel (45:6); Ananias, Azarias, Mishael (45:7). But God is the defender of true worshippers, and the faithful inherited glory and honour (45:7f.). Therefore, we must follow such examples (46:1). There follows a series of quotations, beginning with one whose source is unknown and proceeding through Ps.18:26f. to "the words of our Lord Jesus" (46:7) which the Corinthians are told to recall. (4) Interpersed among these points of reference are rhetorical questions and exhortation. The aim of the topic is to show how inconsistent their behaviour is with scriptural and dominical teaching.

(1) There is, of course, a doctrinal interest here but it is applied to the situation of unease in the church.
(2) Vid. infra on the Similitudes of Hermas.
(3) 1 Clem.37:3, tr. C.C. Richardson.
(4) They are Matt.26:24 and Luke 17:1f., with parallels.
He closes with a strong rebuke, focusing upon the consequence of their action:

"Your schism has led many astray; it has made many despair; it has made many doubt; and it has distressed us all. Yet it goes on".

This topic is succeeded by one with a specifically Pauline basis on the same theme (47:1). Clement recalls the earlier schism at Corinth with which Paul had to deal, but proceeds to a comparison of the two situations. On the earlier occasion the leaders to whom the factions gave allegiance were apostles or notable churchmen. But just think whom you are following now (47:4ff.). One or two individuals have brought the ancient Church of Corinth into revolt against its presbyters (47:6). Again he dwells on the consequences of such action (47:7). Things must change. A return to Christ in repentance is urged, and a resumption of brotherly love (48:1). Ps.118:19f. is cited as a central symbol: "open the gates of righteousness for me."
The gate of righteousness, explains Clement, is "the Christian gate" (48:4), to which he urges the Corinthians in tones reminiscent of Luke 1:75.

(c) basic paraenetic topics.

Both general and situational topics look to central symbols or major points of reference in the course of their argumentation or exhortation. It is a paraenetic duty to bring such central teaching into focus. A logical conclusion, therefore, is that the first kind of paraenesis which converts or a newly formed Christian group received would be concerned to communicate in direct fashion these central points around which their lives would henceforth revolve. That this is so is proved by the incorporation within certain epistles of recapitulatory passages which include precisely this kind of paraenesis. Among such basic paraenetic topics, as we have called
them, are found some which are primarily doctrinal and some primarily ethical.

1 Cor.15:1ff. is heavily recapitulatory, stressing Paul's first preaching at Corinth and the Corinthians' acceptance of it, and its absolutely fundamental position for their present existence and their salvation. This is *paradosis* of the first order (v.3), but is used here for paraenetic purposes, for Paul's teaching on the resurrection, which occupies most of ch.15, is grounded upon it. The content is given in recital form and is based on a formula which Paul himself received from the Church:

(1) that Christ died [for our sins] [in accordance with the scriptures],
that he was buried,
that he was raised [on the third day] [in accordance with the scriptures],
that he appeared [to Cephas, then to the twelve ...] (2)

Thus Paul sets forth ἐν πρῶτοις the basic datum of the faith, which represents the central doctrinal symbols, interpreting the life and fate of Jesus of Nazareth as messianic and of prime significance for salvation. (3) The symbols include within themselves the testimony of the apostles as eyewitnesses to the historical events of the death and burial of Jesus and as experiencing subjects of the para-historical resurrection appearances; together with the testimony of

(2) This passage will be discussed more fully in the next chapter on *paradosis*.
(3) There may be a question about the precise appropriateness of our term "central symbol", but it is at least a great improvement on the notional confusion which has followed in the train of C.H. Dodd's work on the *Kerygma*. Thus C.S.C. Williams: "For he (sc. Paul) had handed on to them among the most important facts (sic.) which he had received from the Church (in Antioch?) that Christ died for our sins as the O.T. scriptures foretold ..."; Peake, p.963 (underlining mine). To use "fact" in this way is to preclude the possibility of a proper understanding of religious language or of the nature of the *Kerygma* or of the problem of hermeneutics.
interpreted scripture and the positive interpretation of the death "for us". The symbols themselves are thus complex and compound, but the assent of faith to precisely this complexity of interpretation is essential to entry into the Church. Thus,

"if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom.10:9);

and "no-one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says 'Jesus be cursed'; and no-one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor.12:3). (1)

Paraenesis cannot but include instruction in such fundamentals as well as the further exploration and explanation of these meaningful symbols. That is what Paul does in 1 Cor.15:12-58. It is also what 1 Clement attempts in his topic on the resurrection (24f.). He first advances the basic symbol of scriptural teaching on the subject and above all the resurrection of Jesus himself (24:1). Supporting arguments are drawn from natural phenomena: the cycles of day and night, seedtime and harvest (24:3ff.); and the legend of the phoenix lends concrete illustration (25-26:1) before the final scriptural situations from Psalms and Job round off the topic.

Turning now to basic ethical paraenesis, we find the characteristic recapitulatory note in 1 Thess.4:1f., which points back to the fundamental paraenetic formulae for which we are searching. Against the background of life in a pagan city, which might well include sacred prostitution and phallic symbolism in its religious rites, the recent convert sorely needed basic and continuing instruction in "how one ought to live and please God" (4:1). Basic instructions (καταγγελία)

(1) A corollary of basic paraenesis is teaching directed at specific errors of doctrine or false teaching; but by their very nature these deviations are situational and are corrected in situational paraenesis or in epistles: cf. 1 Cor.15:12ff.; Gal. passim, the Johannine epp. etc.
were given through the Lord Jesus, and these interpreted the will of God and the meaning of sanctification for the converts (v.2f.).

Strong emphasis was placed on sexual morality: abstaining from immorality (v.3b), holding fast to monogamy "in holiness and honour" (v.4), avoiding unbridled lust in the manner of "the heathen who do not know God" (v.5), and respecting the rights of one's brother (i.e., other people v.6). The basic symbol is: "God has not called us for uncleanness, but in holiness" (v.7), which picks up vv.1ff. The writer reinforces this principle with a solemn warning (v.8; cf.v.6b).

Carrington and Selwyn justly point to the law of holiness (Lev. 17-26, esp.17-18) as the ultimate basis of this kind of teaching, not least since it was connected in Judaism with the initiation of a proselyte. The key verse - Lev.19:2: "Say to all the congregation of the people of Israel, You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" - is reflected in 1 Thess.4:3, 7 and is explicitly cited in 1 Pet.1:15f., a paraenetic passage of considerable interest. A comparison of the two passages, however, fails to substantiate the hypothesis of a common source, operating as a fixed formula at baptism or in catechetical instruction. It suggests rather common themes or motifs, the main points of which tend to recur in such paraenesis. These include, as an immediate consequence of the concept of holiness, a "separation" motif (as in 1 Thess.4:3 and 1 Peter 2:11), called by Carrington and Selwyn the "abstinentes clauses", applied particularly to "lusts" (τιμορθυμία : 1 Thess.4:5; 1 Pet.1:14), immorality (πορνεία : 1 Thess.4:3, cf. 1 Cor.5:9), uncleanness (ἀκαθαρσία :

(1) Or, "that each one of you know how to possess his body in consecration and honour": i.e., self-control and fidelity within marriage, chastity outside it. Cf. W. Neil, in Peake, p.999; also in his commentaries in the Moffatt and Torch series, ad loc.

(2) Cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p.369-72.
1 Thess. 4:7; cf. Eph. 4:19; 5:5) and wanting more than one's share (νθέωνεξι: 1 Thess. 4:6; cf. Eph. 5:5);(1) and these can be linked with respect and active concern for one's neighbour, in terms of ἀγάπη or φιλαδελφία (1 Thess. 4:9; 1 Pet. 1:22). In 1 Thess. 4, however, the latter theme occurs explicitly not in the basic paraenetic topic (4:1–8) but in a subsequent general topic on the theme of φιλαδελφία. We are left, therefore, with what appears to be a surprisingly negative emphasis in basic ethical paraenesis, with the positive side present largely by implication. This, however, corresponds with Luke's version of the apostolic decree (Acts 15:29).(2) When this type of paraenesis is put against the background of paganism, the reason for this emphasis becomes clear, for a precondition of Christian discipleship is detachment from the former ethos.

Selwyn's analysis is to be faulted on several counts. First, he pays no attention to the form of the actual unit which occurs in the New Testament but discusses verbal parallelism wherever he finds it. Again, he is too anxious to press what are after all fairly scattered and fragmented parallels into positive codes, particularly baptismal codes, although there are practically no direct references to baptism in them and little evidence of the formalism necessary to codification. Finally, the distinctive role he at times ascribes to Silvanus appears to rest on subjective criteria. It is virtually impossible to separate out the paradosis from the interpretation which one man is assumed to have given to part of it.

A brief comment may be added about 1 Peter. This composite

(1) Cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p.372f., and "Table I" on p.370f. As well as Leviticus, Psalm 15 also appears to be operative here: op. cit., p.373.
epistle(1) contains "holiness" paraenesis in 1:13-21, not unlike Thess. 4:1-8 in theme but with an eschatological overtone (vv.13, 17) and including a powerful statement of the atonement in the conclusion (vv.18-21). This is a highly developed form of basic paraenesis and, characteristically, it is followed by a short topos on brotherly love (v.22). I suspect that the next topos is in fact 1:23-2:3, on the subject of "the word of God" (v.23ff.) or "the gospel" (vv.1:25b; 2:3), in which Is.40:6-9 is a major symbol, and the image of the "new born babe" elucidates the proper attitude of the convert, after "putting away" undesirable practices (2:1), to the message of the Church. After the elevated song of the Church (2:4-10), (2) there is another "abstinentes" passage at 2:11, followed by an appeal for responsible conduct to outsiders. (3) Thereafter, the paraenesis is on the theme of subjection to the authorities, which will be discussed in due course.

(d) ecclesiastical paraenetic topics.

This kind of topic arises out of the institutional needs of the church and its ministry, and is in evidence particularly in the Pastorals. The noticeable departure in the form is that the topical imperatives are replaced by a verb expressing the wishes of the writer. Thus the writer issues a paracletic topos (παράκλησις ... 1 Tim.2:1) on the offering of various types of prayer (1 Tim.2:1-7), with a central theological symbol (2:3-6). The following topos (2:8-15) concerns the roles of men and women in the Church community: men should pray with "holy hands", i.e., their life should be consistent

(1) Cf. the previous chapter on "Homily".
(3) This occurred frequently in early Church paraenesis: cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p.373.
with their profession and should therefore be free from anger or quarrelling (2:8); women are instructed in the kind of behaviour expected of them (2:9-12). The *topos* again includes a theological symbol, that of Adam and Eve (v.13f.), in justification of the recommended position. This *topos* is introduced by the verb ἐφοσοῦν, which brings out the personal nature of the counsel.

A more distinctive type of ecclesiastical topic emerges with the delineation of the qualities of a bishop. It probably commences with the simple assertion: "if anyone aspires to the office of bishop, he desires a noble task" (3:1). Here the more usual topical imperatives are replaced by the verb ἐφοσοῦν followed by the infinitive, suggesting that the recommendations here are completely obligatory and possess even greater force than the counsel of the writer himself. Thereafter the form of the topic largely follows the catalogue principle.

Other topics of a similar type deal with deacons (3:8-13; and their wives presumably: cf. 3:11); widows (5:3-16) and elders (5:17-22). In relation to teaching elders, a scriptural principle is adduced concerning their maintenance (5:18). (2)

However, because the writer exercises personal oversight of his presumably younger ministers, the distinction between ecclesiastical and personal advice is a very fine one. Thus Timothy is given straight advice about how to deal with the legalists (4:1-5), about avoiding "godless and silly myths" (4:7), and about training himself in godliness (4:7b). He receives counsel about not letting his youth be an obstacle to his mission (4:12) and other practical matters that

---

(1) I.e., πιστὸς ἐ λόγος goes with the preceding verse; cf. A.J.B. Higgins, in Peake, p.1003.
(2) Cf. Deut.25:4 (1 Cor.9:9); Matt.10:10; Luke 10:7 (1 Cor.9:14).
pertain to the conduct of his ministry (4:13-5:2). But when he is told: "No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments" (5:23), the counsel has become purely personal. In the same way, Paul in his major letters frequently includes personal greetings and counsels in his concluding remarks to the community (cf. 1 Cor.16:5-20).

A further type of ecclesiastical topos is seen in 1 Cor.16:1-4. It follows the common opening formula: "Now concerning the contribution for the saints ..." (16:1). Instruction is given about systematic giving (v.2) and about arrangements for the dispatch of the offerings to Jerusalem (v.3f.). This particular topic moves at a purely practical level and no appeal is made here to any deeper theological principle. (1)

The second part of the Didache (2) consists largely of ecclesiastical topoi, most of which are introduced in the formal topical manner. The first major one is "about baptism" (7:1-4), and contains precise instruction for the preparation and execution of the rite. "About the eucharist" (9:1-10:7) includes an order of service for the sacrament, although concession is made to the spontaneity of the prophet (10:7). Between these topics, shorter injunctions are given

(1) It is supplied abundantly in 2 Cor.9, esp. 6-15.
(2) The "Two Ways" section (1-5) differs so markedly from this second part as to suggest a different origin, perhaps a Jewish moral code on which Barnabas also drew; and this would be in line with an early date for the complete Didache (A.D.60) suggested by J.P. Audet, La Didache, 1958. This is in sharp distinction from the pessimistic view adopted by many English scholars: e.g., F.E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache, 1938, who detects Montanist influence in the second ("Church order") part. This latter allegation is rightly rejected by C.C. Richardson, op. cit., p.164f. who holds that this part "was a late first century set of regulations about Church life", edited into the complete work about A.D.150.
about fasting (8:1) and prayer (8:2f.), in both of which the curious rigidity of the Didache is apparent. To distinguish Christians from "the hypocrites", the former should fast on Wednesdays and Fridays, not Mondays and Thursdays. They should not "pray like the hypocrites" (8:2) but should say the Lord's Prayer three times a day (8:3). Counsel is also offered concerning the treatment of itinerant teachers (11:1f.), and there is a full topic "about apostles and prophets" (11:3-13:7) which handles with considerable delicacy the vexed questions of distinguishing the false from the true. Further topics deal with the assembly on the Lord's Day (14:1-3), with the election of bishop and deacons (15:1f.), and with reproof and discipline within the community (15:3f.), while a concluding series of exhortations is eschatological in tone (16:1f). Thus Didache 6-16 provides the best example we possess of ecclesiastical topics, of which it consists almost entirely and the probability that these topics made up an originally independent paraenetic tract must be considered strong。(1) The greater institutionalisation and legalism influencing Church paraenesis in the post-apostolic age is apparent. (2)

(ii) topical figures and illustrations.

Since the paraenetic topoi which occur in early Church instruction are related in form to similar procedures in both the Jewish and the wider hellenistic world, the topical figure claims a place within them. They tend, however, to be less frequent, less consciously

(1) The tripartite division adopted by F.L. Cross, op. cit., p.9, seems completely arbitrary. He takes chs.1-6 as the first part; 7-10 as "a liturgical section"; the remainder as a "Church order". But ch.6 introduces the first of the topic forms which characterise the latter part of the work (cf. 6:3), while ch.14 is also "liturgical". Cross appears to have been influenced by a desire to find a liturgical manual of some kind. The sensible division would appear to be 1-5 and 6-16. The latter is entirely a Church order which may originate about the time of the Pastorals.

rhetorical or literary, than their non-Christian counterparts; and the parable, familiar in the Jewish world particularly and characteristic of Jesus, is no longer frequently used, at least in its pure form.

When the simile, extended simile and metaphor do occur, they are integral to the purpose of the topic and are not merely decorative. Thus the simile in 1 Peter: "Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk ..." (2:2) and Paul's extended simile in 1 Cor. 15: 36-44 are crucial to the respective arguments. An extended metaphor used for paraenetic purposes is "the whole armour of God", in Eph. 6: 10-17. Such figures are close to allegory and typology in their mode of operation. Thus in 1 Cor. 15:44 the figure is followed by the typology of the first and last Adam, while the metaphor of Ephesians is interpreted throughout in the allegorical manner.

The fate of the gospel parables in the early Church provides a

(1) Such extended figures have been described as standing "between the Jewish and the Greek tradition": W. Straub, Die Bildersprache der Apostels Paul, 1937, cited in T.D.N.T., V, p.760, n.107.

(2) Further examples of Pauline figures include: Rom. 13:12 "the armour of light"; 1 Cor. 5:8 "the leaven of malice and evil"; 1 Cor. 3: 2 "I fed you with milk". Much play is made of the use of the members of the body: cf. Rom. 6:15-19; of the body as "tabernacle", cf. 2 Cor. 5:1 and "temple", 1 Cor. 3:16f., 6: 19; and of slavery and freedom: cf. Rom. 6:20-7:25. Now we see through a darkened mirror: cf. 1 Cor. 13:12. Extended figures are drawn from the arena, cf. 1 Cor. 9:24-27; from agriculture cf. 1 Cor. 3: 5-10; and from construction work; cf. 1 Cor. 5:10-15. Paul's figures clearly draw considerably on the town life of the hellenistic world. The epistle of James, also rich in figures, retains the Palestinian ethos. He uses the simile of the "flower of the grass" fading in the sun's heat (1:10f.), and simile becomes parable in the figures of the mirror (1:23ff.) and the patience of the farmer (5:7f.). Analogies are drawn from the bit in the horse's mouth (3: 3), the ship's rudder (3:4), fire (3: 6), the domestication of animals (3:7f.), and the behaviour of a spring (3: 11), a fig tree (3: 12), or the properties of salt water (5:12). The work of rust and moth is used figuratively (5: 12f.), and countryside economics and exploitation appear in 5: 4f. James also makes considerable use of the biblical example (5:10f., 17).
useful indication of what was happening. The parables of Jesus were part of the *paradosia* and operated according to paradotic principles. Usually, any paraenetic function they had in the early Church was complementary to the transmission of the *paradosia*; the survival of the parables as we have them is due to such restraints. But occasionally a parable—the Sower is perhaps the best example—is expounded in such a way that the exposition is more meaningful than the original parable in the early Church situation. In fact, an allegory has been created, the key to which is readily available in early Church life (cf. Mark 4:14-20).

The third book of Hermas, often called his "Similitudini" (3) is particularly significant as an extension of this process. The paraenetic concern predominates. Each "similitude" might be called an apocalyptic *topos*, thus providing yet another manifestation of that flexible, didactic form. The centre of interest, however, lies in his use of imagery. The first similitude is parabolic:

"See, therefore, that like a man in an alien country you procure no more for yourself than what is necessary ..."

The third uses parabolic exegesis: the figurative trees are "like the men of this present world". The fifth contains an extended parable in story form (5:2), which is interpreted parabolically and paraenetically in 5:3 and then further expounded as an allegory in

---

(1) E.g., the transmitted parable of the lost sheep is set by Matthew in the context of exhortation to Church leaders to exercise faithful oversight of their flock (cf. Matt.18:14); and this kind of procedure—Jeremias calls it a shift of emphasis "from the eschatological to the hortatory interpretation": *op. cit.*, p.33—could lead to some modification of the parables themselves: cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp.31-36.

(2) For a discussion of the allegorization of parable, cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp.52-70; he takes "the hellenistic environment", "the Gentile mission", and "the delay of the Parousia" as important factors in the process.

(3) παραβολαὶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ μετ' ἐραυν.
5:4. In fact, the request for this further explanation arises because of Hermas' failure to understand the Shepherd's figure:

"If you set forth any similitudes without expounding them, they will be lost on me ..."

The allegory is then "unfolded":

"the above mentioned farm denotes the whole earth ..." (5:5).

Hermas now understands (5:7) and receives further paraenetic counsel. Thus in Hermas there occurs this curious linking of the parabolic and the allegorical which also occurs in Mark 4, with the emphasis on the allegorical.(1)

The writer of the Hebrews uses παραβολή to denote a symbol or figure: the debarring of Israel from the inner sanctuary in the Temple, while the latter existed, "is symbolic for the present age" (9:9; cf. 11:19). Barnabas uses it twice in relation to scriptural interpretation. Citing Ex.33:1-3, he explains: "It is as if it had been said, 'Put your trust in Jesus' ..." (6:10). Thus, the O.T. scriptures contain many riddles which must be interpreted allegorically if meaning is to be found in them for contemporary Christians. The latter need enlightenment, or at least as much as they can bear, for some deeper mysteries are beyond them, "since their meaning lies in parables" (17:2). The allegorical can therefore be associated with the gnostic; its meaning is unfolded by him who possesses γνῶσις.

The reason for this important shift of emphasis in the use of topical figures is to be found mainly in the eschatological position of the Church. Jesus' use of parables was a discovery method of an open type, in which a rapprochement between the experience of the speaker and the hearers was established as the starting point of an

(2) Cf. Barnabas 6:9; Hauck, ibid.
exploration which could lead to "disclosure". But the early Christian teachers, on the basis of their shared experience, recognized in the total Christ event the central symbol of the mystery of life and the universe; and it was to this central symbol that they had to direct their hearers. Hence allegory and symbolism to which a precise meaning was attached became typical procedures. This meaning, however, was not open to all (cf. Mk.4:11 par.); hence the emergence of a gnostic motif.

Christological allegory is not confined to paraenesis but occurs equally in homilies and other forms. The Fourth Gospel is the locus classicus of the gospel allegory, placed on the lips of Jesus. A good paraenetic example occurs in 1 Cor.12:12-31. The figure used is that of the familiar one of the body. The key to the analogy is given at the outset: "Christ", we have to discover, is a corporate entity sustained by the "one Spirit" (12:13). The argument is designed to show the interdependence of members and the "varieties of service" (cf. 12:5), and this type of paraenetic analogy appears to have been frequently used in the early Church (cf. Eph.4:11ff.; Rom. 12:4-8). The use of typology is likewise stimulated by the centrality of the Christ symbol. Thus the wilderness wanderings of Israel are to be interpreted typologically (1 Cor.10). The Rock from which they drank was Christ (10:4), and the whole episode provides warnings to us (10:6) and was written down for our instruction (10:11). Such

---

(1) Cf. E. Linnemann, op. cit., p.27; I.T. Ramsey, op. cit., p.6f.
(2) In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus speaks το τα ρφαμιάτα, which in this context denotes hidden or abstruse discourse of the allegorical type (which both ἔριδι and τα ρφαμιάτα can also denote): and this requires interpretation and understanding; cf. 10:5, where the reference is to the "Shepherd" discourse. Cf. also 16:25 - "I have said this to you in figures; the hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures but tell you plainly of the Father" (i.e., at the Parousia; but partly fulfilled at 16:29).
typological procedures thus show "how past events disclose the pattern of events to come". (1) They enable Paul to indicate typological patterns embracing both Old Testament data and Christ as Saviour or the Church as the New Israel; and in so doing he looks at the Old Testament "as it were with prophetic eyes". (2) His overriding purpose, however, was the edification and enlightenment of the Christian community.

(iii) The Two Ways.

"There are two ways, one of life and the other of death; and there is much difference between the two ways."

The first part of the Didache is the outstanding example of the important "two ways" motif in early Christian paraenesis, but before examining it more closely we note that New Testament ethical instruction made use of this motif also, even if in a more muted form than the Didache. The ethical dualism which it expresses in its more uncompromising form is not the absolute dualism of Zoroastrianism but the dualism of ethical choice. As such, it is implicit in conversion from one way of life to another, in the reorientation involved in moving from Judaism to Christianity and in adherence to spiritual rather than worldly values. It is therefore illustrated by 1 Cor.6:9ff., where Paul, making use of the conventional catalogues, contrasts the Corinthians' previous way of life and their new one: "Such were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified ..." Again, Judaism and Christianity are the two ways that stand in contrast:

(2) Schoeps, op. cit., p.233. Cf. Philo and Qumran, but the former was concerned with the internal affairs of the soul. Paul also applies typology to Abraham (Rom.4; Gal.3:16ff.) and the Passover (1 Cor.5:6-7). The close association of allegory and typology is illustrated by Gal.4:21-31. Cf. also Rom.9-11.
"Now before faith came, we were confined under the law, kept under restraint until faith should be revealed. So that the law was our custodian until Christ came, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a custodian; for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith" (Gal.3:23ff.).

Equally whatever "gain" Paul had in his former realm of discourse he now counts as loss for the sake of Christ (Phil.3:7). Finally, in terms of Christian nurture, Paul exhorts the Romans:

"Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind" (12:2).

The "two ways" motif, understood in the senses outlined above, is contextually appropriate to the life and experience of the early Church and may be held to have arisen spontaneously in early Christian paraenesis primarily for this reason.

Paraenetic teaching related to preparation for entry to the Church may therefore be expected to make use of the "two ways" in some form or other. When the major concern is with separating oneself from the ways of the ungodly, the negative side is stressed, sometimes exclusively, as in Acts 15:20, 29 and 1 Thess.4:3 and 5:22. It may well be that these passages represent only part of the motif that was actually in use, for in 1 Thess.5:8 the positive side is represented by the command to be sober and "put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation", while the Acts passage comes from a special context relating to the minimum burden to be laid upon Christians in terms of "abstentions". Full expression is given to the "two ways" motif by the formula of "put away ..." (ταραξοδοσια) followed by "put on ..." (σχηματισοντα),

(1) The ταραξοδοσια motif, which Carrington suggests is a Christian "holiness code", is designated by Selwyn as "Abstinentes clauses": op. cit., pp.372, 393.
(2) Termed by Carrington and Selwyn "Deponentes clauses": op. cit., p.366, 393-400.
which is strongly reflected in Col.3:8-12, Eph.4:22ff. and Rom.13:12ff. Selwyn, in characteristic manner, attempts a very fine distinction between the two negative commands which occur in close proximity in Col.3 and Eph.4. They are not, he says, simply two different ways of saying the same thing:

"for the first (i.e., ἀθανασία θεοτοκισμάτωσις) is a negative precept, a command to abstain or keep aloof, while the second enjoins an act of deliberate renunciation". (1)

This distinction appears to be exaggerated. In 1 Thess., one must "abstain" from every form of evil (5:22), while in Rom.13:12 one must "put away" the works of darkness. To stress that the first means "keep aloof" from something which one might otherwise consider approaching while the second implies shedding what one is at present involved with by a deliberate act of renunciation is to press etymology and pedantry too far. In any case, if the apostolic decree is to be taken seriously (Acts 15:20, 29), certain Gentile members would have to make a very serious act of renunciation if they were to obey its first injunction. Selwyn is justified in linking the "Abstinentes" clauses with the notion of a Christian holiness code, yet the "two ways" motif of "put away ...", "put on ..." also includes the notion of holiness (cf. Eph.4:24). That these two motifs were brought together for instruction purposes is obvious from Col.3 and Eph.4, and their connection with baptism is borne out by the imagery used. (2) Nevertheless, since no explicit reference to baptism occurs in the "two ways" passages themselves (in contrast to

(2) Cf. Odes of Solomon 7:10; cf. 10:10; 13:2; 33:10; Col.3:10; Eph.4:24; Gal.3:27.
e.g., Gal.3:27), Selwyn is probably not justified in designating them as "baptismal catechisms". They have, in fact, more to do with ongoing Christian nurture than they have with baptismal instruction. Clearly, the "two ways" motif in question represents a developed stage of such instruction, but Selwyn is too anxious to think in terms of codes or relatively fixed catechetical formulae. What the evidence points to is not to an independent form of Christian paraenesis but to certain motifs at work within Christian paraenesis.

The "put away ...", "put on ..." motif is one prominent and important example of the "two ways" type which recurs in a number of ethical tonoi. Another motif - Selwyn actually uses this term - which occurs in similar contexts is that of darkness and light. Yet another, closely associated with the "put away ...", "put on ..." motif and with the "death and resurrection" motif, is the contrast between the "old man" and the "new man". The antithesis between law and faith (or grace) has been mentioned above; associated with it are life and death (e.g., Rom.7:9ff.).

There is therefore a whole series of "two ways" motifs, interlaced and crisscrossing, in early Christian paraenesis, but it was left to the writer of the Didache to spell it out with unrelieved explicitness:

"The way, then, of life is this: first, you must love God your creator; second, your neighbour as yourself; and whatever you would not have others do to you, you must not do to them ..."

(1) Selwyn, op. cit., p.391 presents a Table on "Baptism: its nature described", but with some exceptions (e.g., Rom.6:4) most passages refer to the conversion or the renewal of the individual rather than to the sacrament as such. Selwyn recognises four metaphors which describe such a change: rebirth, new creation, old man/new man, darkness/light (p.392), but still persists with his hypothesis of a primitive baptismal catechism.

(2) For details, cf. Selwyn, op. cit., pp.376-382.

(3) E.g., Rom.6:6; Col.3:8ff.; Eph.4:22ff.; cf. Gal.6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17.
"The way of death is this: first, it is wicked and accursed ..." (there follows an extensive catalogue of vices).

With the Didache, the "two ways" motif operating on the "life and death" model can be described as codified. Unlike the New Testament examples given above, it is spelled out in a systematic, legalistic form, and its source must surely be Jewish Christian circles. As K.E. Kirk implies, Paul might well have had nightmares had he been able to return and see the legalism and formalism of second century Christian teaching. (1) It was undoubtedly at this time that the Didache came into its own, although the "Two Ways" part may well come from a relatively early period in the life of the Church. It is incorporated with modifications in Barnabas, where it is called the ways of "light" and "darkness", and is also known independently in a Latin translation. (2) The situation was obviously thought to demand a direct, authoritative paraenesis, giving a clear answer to the enquirer and the convert as to what the Christian life involved in practice. The deeper reasons, the theological motivation, are not in question on the whole. Separated from Judaism, the Church had to show that it had no less an ethical concern. Confronted with the Gentile world, it used well tried and accepted paraenetic categories. The "two ways" motif lay ready to hand, exploited by Judaism, used in the gospels and represented in various ways in early Christian teaching. It was but a short step to formalise it and present in successive, imperatival topics what the Christian way of life involved and what it excluded. (3)

(2) Cf. C.C. Richardson, op. cit., p.162. It is also found in Arabic in the Life of Ochnudi (5th cent.).
(iv) **catalogues in early Christian paraenesis.**

As already noted, catalogues are found in much *paraenesis* within the New Testament. Jesus made relatively little use of them, as far as our evidence suggests, and this follows from the essentially inductive or "discovery" type of teaching he so often used. Paul finds catalogues useful as concise summaries or examples of his meaning or sometimes for elucidating a "two ways" motif. The latter usage is well illustrated by Gal. 5:19-21, where the basic contrast is "the works of the flesh" and "the fruit of the Spirit". Here the conventional catalogue is combined with characteristic Pauline flair and insight. Another example occurs in Col. 3:5-8, 12, 14. But Paul can also apply it to a single motif, usually the sins of the flesh as in Rom. 1:29f., 1 Cor. 5:10f., and 2 Cor. 12:20. He is undoubtedly using conventional ethical concepts and didactic practices from both Jewish and Greek worlds, and the catalogues are probably whole or partial citations of commonly accepted groupings.

A particular link with the Greek tradition is his frequent use of τὸ καλὸν and τὸ ἀγαθὸν, recalling the καλοκαγαθία of the Greek moralists.(4) Even the formula "faith, hope and love" is a brief catalogue, which may be a Christian reply to a gnostic catalogue such as "faith, hope, knowledge and love".(5) Titus has "faith, love, patience" (2:2). Other catalogues are concerned with the trials of

---

(1) Cf. also the description of the ideal bishop in Titus 1:6ff.  
(2) Also 1 Cor. 6:9ff.; Eph. 4:31ff. ("two ways"), 5:3ff; 1 Tim. 1:9f.; 2 Tim. 3:2ff. The catalogue thus occurs in genuine Pauline and pseudo-Pauline writings.  
(3) Cf. the parallel between 1 Cor. 6:9f. and the "vice" counters in a Roman gambling game, and that between Rom. 1:29 and the confession of sin on the Day of Atonement.  
an apostle (1 Cor.4:11ff.) and the afflictions of the faithful (2 Cor. 6:4-10), and the convention can have considerable rhetorical appeal (cf. Rom.8:35-39; 2 Cor.11:22-29). That its use was not confined to Pauline circles is illustrated by 1 Pet.1:2 - a typical "put away" catalogue - and James 3:15-18.

The balance and restraint which for the most part characterises the New Testament use of catalogues is not always preserved in the post-apostolic age, in which the prevailing legalistic formalism and the desire for dogmatic clarity at the expense of theological or ethical nicety found in the catalogue a useful instrument and means of expression. The "way of death" set forth in the Didache as "wicked and thoroughly blasphemous" is characterised by a catalogue of twenty-two vices very similar to Rom.1:29f. and, according to Rendel Harris, the sins confessed by the pious Jew on the Day of Atonement.

Polycarp avails himself twice of catalogues of vices in his letter to the Philippians (2:2; 4:3), using the "refraining from" type of introduction but hinting at a positive counterpart in both cases (2:2f.; 4:3a). Hermas has a whole array of catalogues, most of which are well balanced. In the Mandata 5:2, he catalogues the qualities of equanimity and contrasts them with the operation of anger and bitterness; in 6:2 he lists the respective qualities of the angels of righteousness and iniquity, again following the "two ways" motif to some extent; in 8:3-5 there is an extensive catalogue of evils from which one must abstain (thirteen in number) and their consequences; but good works are also catalogued, together with their consequences. Those who keep these commandments will "live with God". In the Similitudes 6:5, the "pleasures that are hurtful"

(1) Teaching of the Apostles, 1888, pp.82-86.
are listed in contrast to the "pleasures that bring salvation to men"; and in 9:15 the names of the "more powerful virgins" (Faith, Continence, Power, Patience ...) are contrasted with the women clothed in black (Perfidiousness, Incontinence, Infidelity, Pleasure ...).

(1) Hermas' catalogues cannot therefore be charged with being merely negative in content, and Kirk seems to neglect this equilibrium in castigating post-apostolic teaching in general as lacking the balance of the New Testament. This, he maintains, had certain long-term consequences.

"It gave a strong impetus to the dualistic tendency which found its ultimate expression in rigorist asceticism; whilst at the same time it encouraged the ordinary Christian to be content with a tepid ideal of blamelessness - of being void of offence - rather than to aspire to a life of positive well-doing and progress". (2)

The first of these consequences is the product not simply of cataloguing but of a combination of that procedure and the "two ways" motif - the ultimate product of antithesis. The second consequence comes about not because the catalogues are always negative but because the paraenesis which uses them fails to give adequate insight into the religious and theological motivation of the good life.

(v) the Haustafeln.

The so-called Haustafeln are to be found principally in Col.3:18-4:1; Eph.5:21-6:9 and 1 Pet.2:13-3:7. (3) The close relationship of the Haustafeln in Colossians and Ephesians is bound up with the problem of the relationship of the two epistles. For the rest, there is a similarity of general approach and sentiment which on

(1) Among the Apologists, cf. Aristeides, Apology 15, and Justin, Apology 1:14-17.
analysis has been shown to consist of three readily identifiable strata: (i) a theological superstructure, representing the distinctive contribution of a Christian theologian or theological school (e.g., Paul, Peter): (ii) common elements of Christian interpretation, representing the broad community view; (iii) a basic substratum representing virtually an international ethical consensus on fundamental relationships and obligations. (1)

The assumption is probably too readily made that we are dealing here with "code" material. It is admitted that "no actual codes used in education survive from antiquity" but "their germs" can be traced in the Jewish and Greek worlds. (2) Nevertheless, conjoined with the assumptions that the motif of the "two ways" and the device of the catalogue are examples of "codes" (though this is hardly the case, as we have indicated above), the presumption is made that the Haustafeln rest on a code of hellenistic origin, fusing Greek and Jewish traditions, although no such code per se has been found. (3) What is found is the recurrence of teaching on - for example - a "family" theme; and it is hardly surprising that such teaching deals with the relationships of husbands and wives, parents and children, and masters and slaves - as in the poem attributed to Phocylides; (4) or that similar teaching is found in poetry and ethical teaching from early stages in both Greek and Jewish cultures. (5) Added to this is the fact that apart from the special case of Colossians and Ephesians

(1) Cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p.437f. The groups are civic obedience, slaves and masters, wives and husbands, parents and children.
(2) Selwyn, op. cit., p.421.
(3) Cf. K. Weidinger, Die Haustafeln, 1928 - an important monograph which, significantly enough, applies the German concept of "house tables" to describe and interpret the ancient ethical phenomena in question.
(4) Relevant lines cited in Selwyn, op. cit., p.422.
(5) Vid. supra.
where some kind of inter-dependence may be assumed, variations in order and terminology are such as to suggest flexible usage and to indicate that it is preferable to speak of prominent, ethical motifs, rather than codes, concerning relationships within households and the duties of citizens towards the state.

The Haustafeln are interesting from a sociological as well as an ethical point of view. Popular, unwritten laws or ethical teaching in the folk idiom are conservationist in their intention and operation. The institutions of society, such as family and state, are regarded as sacrosanct; hence popular wisdom stresses obedience, or proper subordination, to authority — to "the establishment", in modern jargon. Some reciprocity is expected from the figure of authority. Rulers are expected to act responsibly towards their subjects, and heads of households to the various people within it, from the wife downwards. The ethical assumption is that it is always right to "do good", i.e., to behave morally, and to inculcate good citizenship and filial responsibility.

For various reasons, the early Church found this kind of ethical motif useful in certain circumstances. Ethically, the faith of the Church enriched the notion of "the good life", with its definition of ἀγαθός and its concept of grace; but it did not break radically with the concept of ethics found in either the Greek or the Jewish world. Practically, the Church teachers recognised that a straight-forward, general guide to behaviour had its uses for the instruction of ordinary people, especially recent converts. Apologetically, it was useful to identify with accepted notions of "good citizenship" whenever possible and to make a good impression on the outside world and "the authorities", thus countering widespread misunderstanding and allegations of subversive tendencies.
From the point of view of form, the Haustafeln not only approximate to the topos but are frequently sandwiched between other topoi. Thus in 1 Peter, topical instruction on "abstaining from the passions of the flesh" (2:11) and "maintaining good conduct among the Gentiles" (2:12) is followed by the injunction to "be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution" (2:13). Various other topical injunctions are introduced in context with the Haustafeln motifs:

"Live as free men, yet without using your freedom as a pretext for evil."
"Live as servants of God."
"Honour all men."
"Love the brotherhood."
"Fear God."
" Honour the emperor." (2:16f.).

There is therefore no difficulty in introducing either Christian commonplaces or theological reflection into the Haustafeln material. But what is in fact happening is that the Haustafeln material is being used not as a Christian code but as Christian paraenesis in topical form. Thus, in 1 Pet. 2:18-25 there is a topos on submission even to the overbearing, for in suffering injustice with patience one has God's approval and follows the example of Christ. The Colossians Haustafeln passage is an integral part of an extended topos on Christian behaviour (3:12-4:6), the injunctions on household relationships, treated with scrupulous reciprocity, serving as particular examples of the required level of conduct. Romans 13:1-7 is a topos on "the right attitude to civil authority". (1) In 1 Tim. 2:1-7 the Haustafeln motif, though distinguishable, has given place to the Church's ministry of prayer and intercession in an ecclesiastical topos with an evangelical concern. Titus 2:1-10 is another

(1) Vid. supra; cf. Bradley, op. cit., p.244f.
ecclesiastical *topos* which subdivides the Church group into "older men" "older women", "young women", "younger men", "slaves" - and also "yourself": Titus receives a personal admonition (v.7) concerning his ministry. (1) There may well be a sociological nuance in some of these divisions; the "young men" of the hellenistic gymnasia were a recognised social group (cf. 1 Jn.2:13f.). But, particularly in view of the personal admonition to Titus, it appears that the writer has simply identified what he considers to be significant age and status patterns in the Christian community.

Our conclusion is that it is undesirable to separate the Haustafeln from Christian *paraenesis* as a whole. Far from being simply a borrowed or reinforced code, the Haustafeln motif is utilised in paraenetic topics, and where the content appears to the writer to lack adequate Christian symbolism he supplies the deficiency in a variety of ways, from the minimal but significant "as is fitting in the Lord" or "fearing the Lord" (Col.3:18f., 21) to the elaborate theology of government (Rom.13:1-7) or the example of Christ in suffering (1 Pet.2:18-25).

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

Finally, the relationship between *paraenesis* and *catechesis* requires some comment. Are these terms to be identified for practical purposes? (2) Were they originally identical and subsequently differentiated? Is *paraenesis* essentially a general term and *catechesis* a term used specifically for instruction in the basics of the faith and induction into the Christian community?

---


In the New Testament both terms are used to describe teaching procedures, with κατηγορία tending to place emphasis on basic instruction in the content of faith. Thus catechesis was particularly appropriate to baptismal candidates and was reflected in the service. A developmental process of learning was recognised: one has first to learn the στοιχεῖα, the letters of the alphabet, so to speak (cf. Heb.5:12), just as a child has to take milk before he reaches the stage of solid food (5:13; cf. 1 Cor.3:2). But later catechetical procedures cannot simply be read back into the apostolic age. The concept of spiritual development that appears to underlie much of the New Testament is richer and more flexible than the catechesis of the Didache, for example; and since instruction was continued after baptism within the κοινονία of the church (cf. Heb.5:12ff.; Eph.4:13-16), it would seem unlikely that preliminary teaching was markedly different in quality from later instruction. Both probably drew upon the resources of prophetic preaching (cf. Acts 2:14ff.), Christian midrash (8:27-39) and paraenesis in the broad sense (cf. Eph.4 ραισία) as well as upon church life in general. At the same time, certain emphases were particularly appropriate to those preparing for baptism: for example, basic paradosis which had to be handed down "as of first importance" (cf. 1 Cor.15:1ff.); basic christological material which supplied the motif for the Christian way of life (cf. Phil.2:1-11); the Christian interpretation of scripture (cf. Acts 17:2ff.); and ethical teaching of the "two ways" type which related well to the decisive change which baptism

(1) Cf. Rom.2:18; 1 Cor.14:19; Gal.6:6 (= διακονάλαι of 1 Cor.12:26; Eph.4:11); 2 Cl.17:1.
(3) Trinitarian formulae appear before long and have implications for catechesis: cf. Matt.28:19; Did. 7; Justin, Apol.1:61; Hippolytus, Apostolic Tradition 21.
The story of the Ethiopian eunuch exemplifies one type of catechesis, an important element in it being scriptural exegesis (Acts 8:30ff.). The method of catechising depends here on dialogue: "About whom, pray, does the prophet say this ...?" (v.34). The western text supplies the next catechetical step, which the writer of Acts may have taken for granted: the candidate is brought to the point of decision and confession of faith. At this point, liturgical overtones are rightly suspected in the text. The catechist says: "if you believe with all your heart, you may (sc. be baptized)". The catechumen replies: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (v.37). Baptism follows. If, with Cullmann, we recognise the evolution of confessional formulae through catechetical and liturgical practice, we may also discern the evolution of a catechetical method through dialogue and other rhetorical elements, and also through the liturgy, especially of baptism.

Basic, doctrinal catechesis may be detectable in 1 John, with its characteristics of brevity and antithetical parallelism. O. Piper observed: "The simplicity of expression would indicate a desire to be helpful to people of little education". Piper is thinking of such phrases as "God is love"; "let us love one another"; or "God is light and there is no darkness in him". However complex the background of such statements, their final expression is simple and easily memorised.

(1) Equally, catalogues of virtues and vices and the Hausafeln provided guidance for recent converts, as did topics of a general or specific nature. But in making this observation, one has practically said that almost all paraenesis was relevant to catechetical instruction.


(3) Cf. Justin Apol.1:61; De Speq.4; De Corona Mil.3. A third century baptismal questionnaire is also found; see below.

(4) 1 John and the Didache of the Primitive Church, J.B.L. LXVI, 1947, p.442.
The style lends itself at many points to catechetical adaptation.

Thus, v.4:13 in catechetical form would run:

Q: "how do we know that we abide in God and he in us?"
A: "by this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his own Spirit".

Yet in the New Testament catechetical forms exist only in embryo and there appears to be little trace of special adaptation for beginners.

Basic teaching had to be reiterated for the benefit of the community as a whole: "I would remind you, brethren ..." (1 Cor.15:1); "You know what instructions we gave you through the Lord Jesus ..." (1 Thess.4:2).

There is need for recall: "You did not so learn Christ" (Eph.4:20).

Catechisms of the more formal type began to emerge in the post-apostolic age. Thus the Didache presents a formalised version of the "two ways" motif as basic ethical instruction (cf. 1-6), together with explicit teaching on the sacraments (7-10) and on eschatological matters, including prophecy (11-16). The Epistle of Barnabas contains teaching on the sacraments in association with the theme of the fulfilment of prophecy (cf. 1-16) and has also ethical instruction of the "two ways" type (cf. 17-21). There are hints of a catechism used at the service of baptism in Irenaeus, and his exposition of the history of salvation as basic instruction can be regarded as the precursor of later catechetical procedures. Tertullian, whose treatise on Baptism was influential for later catechesis, reveals a question-and-answer format in the liturgy of the sacrament, the candidate's response being "Credo". Cullmann cites a third century interrogatio de fide which shows a catechetical structure related to

(3) *De Corona Fil.*, 3.
the emerging form of the Apostle's Creed.\(^{(1)}\) The catechetical schools which began to appear in the late second century saw the catechising of candidates by the bishops in the house churches and the "handing over" of the creed.\(^{(2)}\)

The subsequent development of catechesis can be sketched here only very briefly. Origen in his school at Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem with his *Catechetical Lectures*, John Chrysostom with his eight baptismal catechises, Ambrose with his *De Mysteriis* and his *De Sacramentis*, Theodore of Mopsuestia with his sixteen *Catechetical Homilies* and, above all, Augustine with his *De Catechizandis Rudibus* illustrate the Church's concern for basic doctrinal, moral and sacramental teaching.\(^{(3)}\) Augustine had a lasting influence on subsequent catechesis. His use of groups of seven articles as a mnemonic device; his three-fold division of doctrine in terms of faith, hope and charity (the *Enchiridion*); the narratio of the story of salvation in six aetates or epochs, the seventh being eternity; the subsuming of the ten commandments within Christian morality - these are but some examples of features which were to influence catechetics for many centuries. Indeed, Augustine's fondness for mystical reflection was instrumental in causing his imitators to neglect the biblical basis which he everywhere assumed, to the impoverishment of Christian teaching in general. The adoption of the norm of infant baptism resulted in catechesis becoming predominantly post-baptismal, but its substance remained essentially adult.

Handbooks of catechetics were common throughout the Middle Ages, and the breaking down of the material into question and answer becomes explicit in Andreas Althaner's *Catechismus im Frag und Antwort* (1528). The Reformation saw the emergence of numerous catechisms in this form: Luther's *Kleiner Katechismus* (1529); Calvin's *Catechism* (1541); the Heidelberg (1563); Craig's (1561); the New (1644) and the Larger (1648).\(^{(4)}\)

---

\(^{(3)}\) Cf. also the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and the *Catechetical Discourse* of Gregory of Nyssa.
\(^{(4)}\) There were also a number of shorter catechisms for teaching and examining children prior to admission to the Lord's Supper: the best known include the Little *Catechism* (1556) based on a short Genevan catechism (1553); Craig's Short *Catechism* (1592); the *A.B.C.* (1641); and the famous Westminster Shorter *Catechism* (1648). For modern Roman Catholic catechisms, *vid.* *N.C.E., in loc.*
More important for our purpose is the question of the nature of catechesis. J. Daniélou takes it to involve the systematic exposition of what is implicit in the kerygma and in the Christian life. Thus catechesis, standing between kerygma, the first proclamation of the message, and homily, conveys the deeper, spiritual appreciation that comes through integration in the community and participation in the sacraments. On this view, catechesis is teaching that is at once complete yet elementary: complete or comprehensive in a way that kerygma is not; and elementary in a way that homily is not. It is properly associated with baptism and is a vital part of the total process of the induction of the individual into the community. It is the firm and indispensable basis on which the whole edifice of the spiritual life may be built. It represents a stable tradition in the church, going back to the time of the apostles but not to be confused with scriptural tradition. It is the oral transmission of the revelatory data fundamental to the Christian faith.

We have already indicated that Daniélou's threefold analysis of Christian communication as kerygma, catechesis and homily is less than satisfactory. Certain further observations may be advanced here. His treatment of catechesis is undoubtedly appropriate to Church practice, especially Roman Catholic practice. Its weaknesses lie in the assumption that between missionary preaching and homiletics within the community there stands only one category, catechesis, which is designed primarily to elucidate the content of the faith and is minimally concerned with the situation of the learner. The flexibility of paraenesis, especially situational paraenesis, has been lost. Again, for the study of Christian communication before the fixing of the

canon of the New Testament, the discontinuity between paradosis operating within scripture - that is, in effect, early Christian paradosis - and paradosis operating through the Christian teachers is unhelpful. What requires elucidation is the process of paradosis which, however closely linked it may be with what we have called paraenesis, is to be distinguished from it in several important respects. What Danielou shows us is not so much the nature of early communication as how the Church subsequently regarded it.

T.F. Torrance has attempted a weighty defence of the method of catechetical instruction. From the outset, Torrance is suspicious of "modern educational theories" which, indebted as they are to Aristotle, Comenius and Pestalozzi, give prominence to "naturalistic development". Pointing to "the personal nature of the Truth" and "the radical nature of evil and the need for reconciliation with the Truth", Torrance continues:

"Both of these demand a profounder conception of the 'objectivity' of the Truth than modern educational theory has favoured - where by 'objectivity' is meant that Truth is something that encounters us and even when we know it retains its objectivity over against us, resists every attempt to subdue it to some form of our own subjectivity, even when knowledge of it becomes inward and intensely personal". Such observations prepare the way for a defence and advocacy of subject dominance in Christian education. The learner must adapt to "the nature of the object"; he must learn to ask the right questions and "to allow himself to be questioned by the Truth and so to have questions put into his mouth which he could not think up on his own, and which therefore call into question his own preconceptions". He must be fed with information - more than he can grasp at the time; indeed, he must be fed with Christian doctrine "from a very early age" in order to "preserve and cultivate wholeness" in his life. He must be given, at an early age, the basic tools with which to understand Christian revelation; trained in Christian doctrine "from the earliest" so that he has "eyes to see, ears to hear, and a heart to

(1) The School of Faith, 1959, pp.xxi-xxxi.
understand the whole message of the Gospel". (1) Such indoctrination has its essential Sitz im Leben in the community of the Church. A final observation of Torrance's indicates the perspective:

"The Truth has to be communicated to the learner in his setting in life where he has to adapt himself to the Truth in order to apprehend it, but strictly speaking that requires the adaptation of his setting in life to the Truth, for it is only in togetherness with his fellows that he can fully and adequately apprehend the Truth". (2)

While several important points are well made by Professor Torrance, (3) some aspects of his presentation give cause for alarm. His tendentious handling of modern education on the one hand (4) and of the educational achievements of the Shorter Catechism on the other (5) is incongruous with the scientific concern he professes. Despite the fact that one is left in no doubt that a particular catechetical method is being advocated as relevant and proper for today, no account is taken of the historical and sociological reasons for the discontinuation of such instruction in most areas during the last century, nor of the nature of society and the relation of Church and society today. Despite the recognition that instruction has to "be accommodated to the peculiarities of the learner in regard to age, previous education, etc." (6) no real place is given to developmental factors in the educational procedures under discussion. The advisability of giving a young child instruction "long before his mental powers can grasp the

(3) Particularly his recognition that "Truth is something that encounters us and even when we know it retains its objectivity over against us", (p.xxiv); yet he proceeds to speak as if Truth were embodied in the catechisms, ready for our appropriation. Another important feature is his stress on self-questioning or self-criticism in catechesis (p.xxxv), for this is bound up with the emergence of the new self-understanding that is part of the Christian way.
(4) To suggest that modern educationists who strive to bring to fruition the latent capacities of the child are necessarily presupposing some form of the Orphic myth is quite indefensible: as is also the writer's attempt at semantics: edu care (sic); cf. op. cit., p.xxvii.
(5) Such achievements are not to be denied but must be recognised as only one side of the picture. The other side is represented by repressive or perverted characters such as Wringhim in Hogg's Confessions of a Justified Sinner or John Guthrie in Lewis Grassic Gibbon's Sunset Song; or, in sober history, by the attitude of ecclesiastical authority to Robertson Smith or Macleod Campbell.
meaning of it all" (1) has been decisively challenged by modern 
research. (2) At times the viewpoint appears purely reactionary or 
misinformed. (3) But perhaps the most disquieting feature of all is 
the arid intellectualism, the lack of feeling for the nurture of the 
whole personality, which comes primarily through human relationships 
and has its roots in agape. Is there not apparent here a much too 
narrow view of the Incarnation? The Living Christ is not an article 
of a creed or a doctrinal proposition but a power at work in the lives 
of people, older and younger, and channelled through people as part of 
the ministry of reconciliation. Perhaps we need to be reminded of 
some of the basic affirmations in 1 John.

Catechesis, either in its earlier flexible form or in any of its 
later stereotypes, is unable to fulfil the complete role of Christian 
education. It represents part of the teaching that supplements the 
nurture which operates experientially from the birth of the child in a 
believing home or from first contact with believers. In so far as 
catechesis in the New Testament can be distinguished from paraenesis 
as instruction in the basics of the faith, it selects for systematic 
study, memorisation and appropriation the focal elements in paraenesis

(3) Thus, it is said of history that "the sheer importation of factual knowledge is a primary prerequisite" (p.xxxvii), whereas the modern approach to history tries to obviate the mechanical transmission of inert data by encouraging discovery methods and using the "patch" technique to stimulate insight into life situations. It therefore follows "from the historical involvement of Christian Truth" (to use Torrance's language) that the "real life situations" of the biblical events are to be explored as the essential groundwork of further reflexion upon and insight into religious meaning. It is in this way that the "radical dichotomy" between "the realm of the image" and "the realm of the idea" is to be overcome. Other criticisms are equally damaging. The claim that the catechetical method "so stretches his powers that it helps him to reach beyond his grasp and then grasp beyond his former reach" (p.xxxvii) is merely rhetorical. Elsewhere, Torrance apparently commits the cardinal error of supposing that unless the child is fed data by the teacher he has nothing to think about! (p.xxxvii).
(as well as in other forms, such as propheteia and paradosis), and therefore operates with data in abstraction from any particular context.\(^1\) A mastery of such data is only one stage of Christian training (but not necessarily the first). The goal of the training is not that the catechumen may become a theologian (the Church is not an army of theologians) but an informed and committed Christian.\(^2\)

For this to happen, the data of catechesis must be related dynamically to the situation of the catechumen. Thus we see that catechesis, in so far as it represents basic instruction, is properly effective only when it is put to work in the applied area of paraenesis and of Christian living and discipleship.

\(^1\) We must beware of regarding these abstractions or doctrinal propositions as themselves objective Truth unsullied by contagion with the human situation. At most they bear witness to the Truth, which in a sense becomes Truth for a man only in the objectivity-subjectivity of address and response, encounter and commitment.

\(^2\) Also important in basic instruction is the acquisition of certain skills, such as the interpretation of scripture. Here homiletics in practice can also give guidance. There must be, however, a certain openness about the procedure - an openness to God, to the Spirit. Indoctrination into a closed system can inhibit rather than assist the exploration of scriptural truth, since any answer is predetermined by the conditioning.
KERYGMA AND DIDACHE

CHAPTER FOUR:
PARADOSIS
"I commend you because you ... maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you" (1 Cor.11:2).

"So then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter" (2 Thess.2:15).

A concept of tradition (paradosis) is virtually inseparable from any historical nation or community, whether the tradition is supremely religious, as in Israel or the Christian Church, or mythopoetic, as in the Homeric sagas; whether it is ancient, like the teaching of Confucius, or comparatively modern, like the thoughts of Mao tse-tung.

Importance may attach both to the final deposit which confronts contemporary man - often a deposit formalised at some point in the transmission and regarded as more or less sacrosanct or inviolate; the process of transmission itself - how and by whom it is handed down; and finally to the origin or presumed origin of the tradition. Illustrations of paradosis in operation in the Greek and Jewish world will now be offered in brief, and a more extended study will be undertaken of paradosis in the early Church.

Paradosis in the Hellenistic world.

Greek culture differs from Hebrew in that it has no overriding concern with a paramount revelation given and received historically. Tradition nevertheless operates within the culture in relation to ancient epic and gnomic poetry. Here the origin is less important

---

(1) A basic precept of Daoism is "remember your history".
(2) As in Jewish Law - not one jot or tittle shall pass from it; or the record of Christian revelation - nothing may be added to it. For modern secular ideologies, cf. N. Harris, Beliefs in Society, 1968, p.53.
(3) One might instance Papias or John, the Islamic tradition, and the extraordinary care in textual transmission shown by Jewish and Christian scribes.
(4) Cf. the Torah as "the books of Moses"; "the Lord" in Christian tradition.
than the substance. "Homer" is a shadowy figure at best. (1) The poems were probably composed for festival use and were seen to contain excellent educative material. (2) Apart from the rhapsodes, every schoolboy in Athens had to perform prodigious feats of memory as part of his education in the poets. After he had mastered the alphabet and could understand the written word, the pupil was confronted by "the works of good poets to read" and compelled to learn them by heart with a view to moral improvement. His teacher chose

"such poems as contain moral admonitions, and many a narrative interwoven with praise and panegyric on the worthies of old, in order that the boy may admire and emulate and strive to become such himself". (3)

Rote learning was the basic way of receiving and absorbing such tradition, which was presumed to have important implications for moral improvement. Nicerates is reported as saying:

"... my father, designing to make a virtuous man of me, ordered me to get by heart every verse of Homer; and I believe I can repeat you at this minute the whole Iliad and Odyssey". (4)

The important Socratic qualifier is that mechanical recitation by itself is of little avail: it must be accompanied by understanding and by close attention to meaning. Although Plato was dissatisfied with the moral content of the poets, (5) Socrates is sometimes

(1) Herodotus placed Homer, with Hesiod, about 400 yrs. before his own day; i.e., c.850B.C. (ii,55,2). Scholars have suggested dates as far apart as the eleventh and the sixth centuries, the modern trend being towards a later date (e.g., c.750-720B.C., suggested by T.B.L. Webster: From Mycenae to Homer, 1960, p.282). The poems of Homer seem to have become the property of the Homeridai, who in preserving them for recitation also modernised them. Written copies may have circulated from the 6th cent., and as Athens was the centre of this literary activity Attic forms invade the text. For a summary of the "Homeric Question", cf. H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Literature, 1934, r.p. 1964, pp.34-46.


(3) Plato, Protagoras 329e.

(4) Xenophon, Symposium III.5.

represented as championing traditional values, and he speaks of "the ancients" who "handed down the tradition" as "our betters and nearer the gods than we are". (1) Here we may have no more than a rhetorical device, but it does illustrate an awareness of tradition in operation. (2)

The reception of a tradition by concentrated study, memorising, attaining to insight and finally giving practical expression to what one has learned can be illustrated also from rhetorical education. In sophistic training such as that given by Protagoras, concentrated study was devoted to the rules of rhetoric, and a complete repertoire of stock rhetorical items – phrases, commonplaces, proems and exordia – was memorised. This rhetorical armoury was completed by learning model discourses developed by the masters of rhetoric to illustrate the use of figures and themes. But the ultimate aim was to acquire skill not in merely repeating the traditional material but in applying it with suitable improvisation to concrete situations as they arose – the kairos doctrine of Protagoras and Gorgias. (4)

The elementary books of rhetorical training, called Progymnasmeta, throw some light on the handling and application of traditional material. An important element in them is the chreia, defined by Theon, a teacher of rhetoric of the first or second

(1) Philebus 16c.
(2) Cf. Critias 113b, where the speaker carefully identifies the source of his tradition.
(3) A stock proem derived from a comparison of three orators consisted of a four-fold plea for a kindly hearing for the defence: (i) any defendant is at a disadvantage; (ii) accusations are frequently false; (iii) truth or falsity can be established only by an impartial hearing; (iv) slander is dangerous – in Beck's words, "clear proof of a common teaching tradition"; Beck, op. cit., p.144ff., following D.A. Adams, Lysias. Selected Speeches, 1905, pp.169ff.
century A.D., as "a concise and pointed account of something said or done, attributed to some particular person". The focal element in rhetorical (i.e., "persuasive") discourse was thoroughly memorised. It was received as tradition well tried in the heat of contention. When known and understood, it was then put to work in new ways.

Theon observed:

"Students give themselves practice on chreia by reproducing, by varying, by adding, by inverting. We expand them and compress them. As well as this we construct and reconstruct them. The method of reproducing is obvious. Someone has uttered a chreia: we try, to the best of our ability, to convey the meaning in the most telling form whether by using the identical words or others". (2)

Taylor comments that the chreia is primarily a historical statement, and thus avoids the use of mythological data. (3) It is therefore genuine tradition but is designed for flexible use. Although received memoriter, it may be re-presented in such a way as to underline its intrinsic truth or convey that truth with maximum impact in a given situation.

By contrast, in the milieu of the mystery religions a much less flexible understanding of tradition emerges, for the "mysteries and solemn rites" (Wisdom 14:15) are transmitted as a sacred trust to be kept inviolate and observed scrupulously. The locus classicus occurs in Diodorus Siculus:

"Zeus desired that the other of his two sons might also attain to honour, and so he instructed him in the initiatory rite of the mysteries, which had existed on the island since ancient times but was at that time, so to speak, put in his hands; it is not lawful, however, for any but the initiated to hear about the mysteries. And Iasion is reputed to have been the first to initiate strangers into them and by this means to bring the initiatory rite to high esteem". (4)

(2) Taylor, op. cit., p.85.
(4) V.48,4, tr. C.H. Oldfather (Loeb).
Tradition in Israel.

It has rightly been said that Judaism is "torah-centred". An essential part of this torah is written (scripture), itself compiled during and after the Exile of manifold traditions which recorded and interpreted Israel's history and faith from the foundations of the nation and from creation itself. But a fixed authoritative tradition requires explanation, interpretation and application to new situations - in fact (though this verbalisation may be avoided) supplementation. Precisely how this was done depended on the tendency within Judaism with which one was identified; for at least from the Greek period onwards a certain fissiparous tendency was evident in Judaism, and such incipient fragmentation is important for a study of Jewish paradosis.

There was priestly paradosis - at the turn of the ages, Sadducean. The ritual and sacrificial requirements of the torah (as in Leviticus 1 and 3) fell far short of providing detailed instructions for every aspect of the rites. As G.F. Moore put it,

"... the whole elaborate and splendid ritual as it was developed in the use of the temple was preserved and transmitted only in tradition until after the worship ceased with the destruction of the temple in the year 70". (2)

There was apparently in the Greek period a written record of this tradition, a book of gezerot, the abolition of which Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism celebrated - perhaps for more than one reason. The Pharisees objected to the fact that it was written (3) as well as to

(3) Written tradition might have been seen as staking a claim to greater authority; perhaps also the Pharisaic tradition at this point was less accustomed to writing as a basic form of communication than the priestly circles.
its Sadducean content. (1) Again, Moore writes:

"For the performance of the solemn psacula of the Day of Atonement the directions in Lev.16 are altogether inadequate; the actual conduct of the priestly rites must always have been directed by priestly tradition". (2)

The Samaritans may be mentioned here, as the perpetuators and exponents of ancient observances and practices, the self-styled "Keepers of the Truth". (3) Gaster writes:

"It is impossible to assume that the Samaritans deliberately and systematically evolved a code of laws of an eclectic character ... The Samaritan priesthood would surely not have gone to the Jewish priesthood to derive from them the method of interpretation and the strict application of the letter and the spirit of the Law, if they wished to maintain their independence and decry the Jews as heretics and apostates". (4)

Whether in connection with their distinctive calendar, Mt. Gerizim, the use of the tetragrammaton, the technique of sacrifice or marriage and divorce, the Samaritans understood themselves to adhere to traditions handed down by the elders and their forefathers, the "Pure Ones". (5) For example:

"According to Samaritan tradition, the secret of the calculation of the new moon was first given by God to Adam, and was transferred from generation to generation until it came to Moses, who passed it on to Phinehas; he was the first to establish the Samaritan calendar according to the astronomical calculation of the meridian of Mount Gerizim". (6)

The Qumran sectaries were forced by the nature of their movement to be supremely conscious of their immediate historical tradition, stemming from their founder and the events which brought the community into being, and the traditions of Israel, which were understood as relating to themselves in a unique, eschatological fashion.

Possessing written documents which may have been both official and

(2) Ibid., p.251f.
(4) M. Gaster, op. cit., p.65.
(5) Ibid., pp.69ff.
(6) Ibid., p.66.
"secret" in that they were authoritative in and the private concern of an intimate community, they resembled both Sadducees and Samaritans in certain respects in relation to tradition.\(^1\) The Community Rule, which may date from the 2nd century,\(^2\) seems to have been a teacher's handbook, containing liturgical directions, a homily, statutes relating to initiation into the community and regulative of its life and discipline, as well as a poetic section on religious duties and holy seasons. The Damascus Rule also contains a homily and a list of statutes which suggest that this document may have related to the feast of the renewal of the covenant.\(^3\) The Messianic Rule\(^4\) and the War Rule have an eschatological orientation which suggests an affinity to the "scrolls of secrets" characteristic of apocalyptic circles in Judaism.\(^5\) Also important among their writings are the commentaries on scripture, which operate in several different ways. The fundamental procedure is to expound the text verse by verse, as in the Commentaries on Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk and the Psalms: the exposition being introduced by the phrase, "interpreted, this means ..." By this method the teacher relates scripture to the present situation so that in the mutual interplay of meaning light is shed on both; in particular, the eschatological and doctrinal position of the community is seen as scripturally ordained and interpreted. Thus, on Hosea 1:5, we find:

"And what is the high place of Judah? (Is it not Jerusalem?) (Interpreted, this concerns) the Teacher of Righteousness who (expounded the Law to) his (Council) and to all who freely pledged themselves to join the elect of (God to keep the Law) in the Council of the Community; who shall be saved on the Day (of Judgment)....\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) For the affinities between Qumran and the Samaritans, cf. J. Macdonald, \textit{op. cit.}, p.33.
\(^3\) \textit{Op. cit.}, pp.95ff.
\(^5\) Cf. Gerhardsson, M.M., p.31f.
\(^6\) As in Vermes, \textit{op. cit.}, p.231.
But other types of interpretation afford even greater flexibility. The *Genesis Apocryphon*, for example, reinterprets the biblical story by reading into it much contemporary material and representing it in vivid, imaginative terms, often in the first person. The *Midrash on the Last Days* is designed to apply texts from 2 Samuel and Psalms to impart the peculiarly Essenic teaching on the community as the true priesthood of the temple and on the two messiahs. Thus at Qumran, two important processes operate together, as in other forms of the midrashic tradition. One is the preservation and transmission of the sacred text itself; the other is the pesher tradition, which makes maximum use of the possibilities which the text suggests: possibilities suggested by the sound of the words, various kinds of word association, various readings, the already existing midrashic traditions, and situational analogies intuitively perceived. In this way the incomparable riches of scripture are appropriated and communicated.

The Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition, which was to be predominant after the fall of the temple and the Qumran sectaries, reached back to Maccabean times and largely took over from that point the scribal tradition that had been evolving at least since the Exile in Babylon. To be sure, there is a certain difficulty in working back from Mishnaic times (not to mention Talmudic) to the period before the fall of the temple, (1) yet there is impressive consistency in the rabbis' handling of and general attitude to scripture and tradition. The primary distinction they made was between *torah*, written

---

scripture, and midrash, authoritative tradition; but the latter was
— or came to be — divided in a similar way. Thus Gerhardsson points
to the distinction between relatively fixed, oral tradition, consisting
of basic midrashic texts with certain halachic and haggadic
passages, and complementary exposition (talmud). Thus there is a
constantly expanding oral tradition, as talmud texts surround the
mishnah to produce "a new concentrated text which is itself in need
of interpretation".

Underlying this concern for tradition were common educational
presuppositions, techniques and emphases. The parental teaching
function had long been supplemented in Israel by a scribal tradition
related to international culture and taking root in Israel from the
time of David and Solomon. A scribal training school probably
existed in Jerusalem at least by the time of Hezekiah, probably in
the temple precincts. The house that Wisdom built in Prov.9:1 may
in fact be a direct allusion to a seven pillared house used as a
centre of instruction, in the temple or elsewhere. Other groups
possessing a degree of literacy were priests, prophets, levites and
temple singers. The hellenisation of Palestine brought a rash of
Greek schools, fashionable with the richer classes but strongly
resisted by the traditionists who regarded even Samaritan education

(2) Ibid., cf. the further terms gemara, the fixed commentary
complementary to talmud and sebara, the appreciation of doctrinal
meaning.
(3) Cf. R.N. Whybray, op. cit., p.19; S. Mowinckel, Psalms and
(4) Cf. Qiryat-soper ("scribe city") or Qiryat-seper ("book city"): perhaps named after its scribal school, or from its paper trade:
as infinitely preferable, (1) but despite this Greek culture left an indelible mark even on those Jewish circles which most opposed it. The method of disputation which the Pharisees developed in their own fashion was most probably derived from Greece, (2) and the Sadducean ethos of Ben Sirach is permeated with Greek influence, as is evident in his portrait of the ideal scribe. (3) First century Judaism had therefore absorbed much Greek and cosmopolitan influence while preserving its distinctive Jewish ethos, and accordingly Jewish educational presuppositions and procedures were not unrelated to or inconsistent with those of the wider international circle. The scribes - who are by no means limited to Pharisaic circles (4) - shared a common professional and educational standpoint.

The principal characteristics of this educational milieu are neatly summarised by Gerhardsson:

"... the learning by heart of basic texts; the principle that 'learning comes before understanding'; the attempt to memorise the teacher's insissima verba; the condensation of material into short, pregnant texts; the use of mnemonic technique, which was fairly simple in early Tannaitic times, but which by the end of the Amoraic period had become highly complex; the use of notebooks and secret scrolls; the frequent repetition of memorised material, aloud and with melodic inflexion, the retention of knowledge by these methods - not to mention the idea of the teacher as 'pattern' and the pupil as 'imitator'. " (5)

That the transmission of tradition was governed by these presuppositions can hardly be questioned, the rabbis mechanizing somewhat the process of reflection and systematization. Yet their object was to avoid the "woodenness" of inferior education, such as mere memorisation. Their aim was to promote insight and discover new truth.

(1) Cf. Aboda Zara, 15b.
(3) But he was a man of very wide sympathies: his borrowing was cosmopolitan, not simply Greek.
Accordingly, "to describe the way in which oral Torah is transmitted is to describe a complicated interplay between basic solidity and complementary flexibility".\(^{(1)}\) Halachah statements could in fact be formulated by pupils according to the teacher's basic position, and the actions of a rabbi could be used as paradigms for teaching purposes. Tradition is thus seen as a living organism, constantly growing under carefully regulated conditions around a living heart.

**Jesus and Paradosis.**

Two questions are to be distinguished: (i) Jesus' involvement with Jewish paradosis, and (ii) Jesus as the fountainhead of a new, Christian paradosis. In practice, these questions overlap to a certain extent.

Paradosis is the immediate issue at stake in Matt.15:1-20 (cf. Mk.7:1-23). As it stands, this passage is no doubt composite, deriving its precise form from early Christian teaching and editing. But from the phenomenological viewpoint, the issue was inevitable in the context not merely of the Palestinian Christian churches\(^{(2)}\) but of the ministry of Jesus and the disciples' community; for the issue is directly related on the one hand to the paramount question of the interpretation and practice of the Torah and on the other to the distinctive life-style of Jesus and his disciples. The halachic question of handwashing indicates Jesus' lack of sympathy for the "tradition of the elders",\(^{(3)}\) at least on this issue. V. Taylor rejects Bultmann's criticism that the scribes' question is not answered: the answer in Mark, based on Is.29:13,\(^{(4)}\) is "a devastating

\(^{(1)}\) Gerhardsson, M.K., p.93.
\(^{(2)}\) Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., p.18.
\(^{(4)}\) The form of the text is probably derived from LXX and therefore from Church teaching, but Taylor argues that the same point might well have been established from the Hebrew text: Taylor, Mark, p.337f.
answer" and "comes to grips with the main issue and answers with a decisive 'No'". Mark understands Jesus' position to be a rejection of "the traditions of men" which effectively obscure the real demand of God (7:8; cf. v.13). This is completely consonant with the radical nature of Jesus' paraenesis discussed in the previous chapter and with his prophetic activities. Matthew is essentially in agreement with Mark's point (15:3) but elects to illustrate it by means of Qorban (15:4-9; cf. Mk.7:9-13).

Mark adds an appendix consisting of similar kinds of sayings, the hub of which, v.15, "could belong to the oldest tradition" (Bultmann) and "is unquestionably genuine" (Taylor). Taylor notes that it states the basic principle, adopts as its form Semitic antithetical parallelism and is calculated to provoke thought by means of its parabolic nature. Matthew reports the offence taken by the Pharisees and Jesus' reply, which shows once again his rejection of the Pharisaic tradition as it was then held to operate (15:12ff.). The form of the later verses (Mk.7:18b-23; Matt.15:16-20) is conventional in Jewish and Greek paraenesis and adds little to the passage as a whole apart from underlining the notion that Jesus taught the disciples as a separate group - an inevitable implication, one would think, of having a disciples' group at all.

Did Jesus then act as a rabbi? Here again, one must be aware of the inherent polarity in Jesus' procedures, for the failure to recognise this has led to much critical confusion and acrimony. B. Gerhardsson argued that Jesus taught as a rabbi and that his

(4) Vid. supra.
disciples were instructed as students of a rabbi and subsequently formed what was virtually a rabbinic academy. (1) To maintain such a position, he tended to play down the importance of Mk.1:22 (Matt.7:29): "he taught them as one with authority, and not as their scribes". Even if this is an editorial "frame" passage, (2) it is also an important interpretative clue which the writers are offering their readers. Like the scribes, Jesus taught; but he did not teach as the scribes did: he was distinguished from them by that which identifies him rather with the prophetic, pneumatic or charismatic, with what A.N. Wilder calls "immediacy, directness and spontaneity". (3) Yet Wilder fails to preserve Jesus' characteristic polarity when he denies that he had a conscious concern with catechetics - a statement difficult to reconcile with the evidence surveyed in the last chapter. And M. Smith, in his sweepingly negative review of Gerhardsson's work, shows complete insensitivity to the refined nuances of Jesus' position when he claims, against Gerhardsson, that the New Testament demonstrates "the loss of any reliable record as to Jesus' attitude towards the Law" and speaks of "the mess of contradictory scraps of evidence which the gospels preserve". (4) Subsequently, Gerhardsson sought to retrieve the balance:

"There must be a middle way. We need not represent Jesus and the early Church as more unique or more conforming than they were. To regard Jesus as a Jewish Rabbi among many Jewish Rabbis and the early Church as a Jewish sect among many Jewish sects is certainly as far from the historical truth as to call Jesus 'vollig allein in seiner Zeit, sterneneinsam in seinem Volk'". (5)

(1) Cf. M.H., p.201.
(2) Cf. T.T., p.25.
(3) Form History and the Oldest Tradition, in Neotestamentica et Patristica, 1962, p.8.
(5) T.T., p.31. The reference in the last line is, of course, to E. Stauffer (Die Botschaft Jesu damals und heute, 1959, p.10).
Something of this creative tension is seen in practically every aspect of Jesus' life. He ceases to act typically of a rabbi precisely at the point where he appears to act as a prophet and vice versa. He is much concerned with the Law of God, yet the flashing insights into its full implications and the spelling out of its meaning in radical fashion, whatever form the individual parts of his teaching may have taken, defy any total categorisation such as "rabbinic". He tends to transcend or qualify any one category that is offered as a description.

The recognition of this fact renders difficult any attempt to characterise Jesus' relationship with his disciples as simply that of a rabbi and his pupils. At least, that is not the only possibility open to us: a prophet also tended to be the leader of a group of disciples. Structurally, the group will be ordered according to the character of its leader. If Jesus did not teach as the scribes did, his community was not simply a scribal one. If Jesus emphasised radical penetration into the religious issue in question, his disciples were instructed in such a way that it became possible for them to share the insight and develop the faculty of discernment. That the disciples were able to remember many of Jesus' sayings - unforgettable as they must have appeared - is extremely likely. That they were, as Gerhardsson implies, drilled in the technique of repetition is unlikely, despite the pervasive educational practice; for such a practice would fit awkwardly with the intentionality of Jesus' teaching. Thus in Matthew, Jesus' teaching on religious devotion is characteristically set over against the misuse of religious practices (cf. 6:1-18), and the type of prayer he commends is set over against mechanical repetition (6:7). The disciples, therefore, appear to have received not a set model but a specimen of brief,
meaningful prayer and to have been exhorted to pray after that fashion. Thus the prayer pattern is not given primarily as paradosis but as paraenesis, designed certainly to be a guide for religious practice but also to be part of the insight giving process into which Jesus was admitting his disciples and which might be frustrated by mechanical methods. And this remains true even for the context Luke provides, in which Jesus inducts the disciples into the practice of prayer in response to their request. (1)

What is evident is the tendency for Jesus' paraenesis to become paradosis in the hands of the disciples engaged in their mission.

It is true that the much edited versions the gospels present of the

(1) The Lord's prayer has at least two forms in the N.T. In Matt. 6:9-13 a fuller form is transmitted together with a doxology that is certainly secondary. E. Lohmeyer, following and extending the work of C.F. Burney (The Poetry of our Lord, 1925, p.115), has argued for an original in Galilean Aramaic, in rhyme as well as metre: The Lord's Prayer, Eng. tr., 1965, p.27f. The Matthaean form is followed closely but with some divergences by the Didache, which may therefore be held to represent a broadly similar tradition (ibid., p.16). The shorter Lukian version, Lohmeyer argues, provides another pattern of metre and rhyme in Aramaic, this time without overtones of the Galilean dialect (ibid., p.28f.). Even without Lohmeyer's Galilean hypothesis, it is clear that the traditions cannot be harmonized (ibid., p.30). This fact would seem to militate against the hypothesis that Jesus deliberately inaugurated paradosis or employed mechanical methods of transmission. It strongly supports the view that his teaching, even of the Prayer, was essentially paraenetic. As C.F. Evans put it: "... even the simplest and most repeated act of the Christian, the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, cannot now be just a repetition of what Jesus once taught, precisely in the words in which he taught it, but only the recitation of what has resulted from the interpenetration of the words of Jesus with the minds and spirits of his first disciples": The Lord's Prayer, 1963, p.15.
mission of the twelve concentrate attention on the proclamation of the kingdom in word and action: the mission is essentially prophetic, an extension of Jesus' own ministry. But the transmission of the paraenesis of Jesus would appear incidental to it. It is Jesus rather than the twelve who is "teacher". Mark relates that the "apostles" (sic) reported to Jesus on their preaching and teaching (6:30), but apart from the overlay of later vocabulary and interpretation the reference to "teaching" in this context appears to be the work of healing and exorcism for which the disciples had been commissioned (cf. 1:27). In other words, a teaching ministry involving the transmission of Jesus' paraenesis as Christian paradosis belongs to the period after his death. There is no suggestion that the intimate discussions Jesus had with his disciples were primarily directed to the establishment of such a paradosis. Such evidence as we possess is directed to the encouragement of deeper insights into the mysteries of God's ways or the meaning of Jesus' teaching and mission or the momentum of historical events. The disciples' questions about parables are not directed to the clarification of their external form but to the elucidation of their meaning and purpose - or so the evangelists understood them to be. (3) Questions dealt with in this way are concerned with the disciples' failure to

(1) Mk.6:8-11; cf. Matt.10:5-16; Luke 10:2-12. Bultmann encounters his familiar formgeschichtliche cul de sac in commenting on this passage. He says that it "must also in the end be included among the regulations of the Church", but Mark was aware that it no longer represented contemporary missionary practice and made it into "a charge for the mission of the Twelve during the ministry of Jesus": H.S.T., p.145. Apparently, any missionary charge must have emanated exclusively from the Risen Lord. Yet behind the gospel redactions there stands the possibility of a phenomenologically appropriate prophetic mission on the part of the disciples in Jesus' life time.


(3) Cf. Mk.4:10 par.; 7:17; Matt.15:15.
cast out an evil spirit (Mk.9:28; cf. Matt.17:19), with the Elijah expectation (Mk.9:11; cf. Matt.17:10); with the interpretation of the marriage law (Mk.10:10); with the end things (Mk.13:3f.; cf. Matt.24:3; Lk.21:7); and, above all, with the prospect of the Cross—a prospect so unthinkable that the disciples are unable to comprehend it and their rapport with Jesus breaks down over the issue.

That the teaching offered by Jesus on these points has been coloured by later Church concerns is transparent, but that does not detract either from the contextual appropriateness of the issues to the ministry of Jesus or from the essentially paraenetic nature of his procedures (e.g., Mk.10:23; 35-45). The later perspective is sometimes clearly indicated or expressly affirmed. The disciples "did not understand the saying" (Mk.9:32), which was only clarified by subsequent events. "When ... he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had spoken." (1) Only when this latter step has been taken can it be said that paradosis has come into being. Christian paradosis would appear to consist, at least in part, of the words (paraenesis), actions and fate of Jesus, understood afresh in the light of the resurrection faith and formulated according to situational exigencies by the early Christian preachers and teachers.

Paradosis in the early Church.

The early Church is indicated as the crucible in which Christian paradosis was finally compounded. The final and only sufficient catalyst was the resurrection faith, as Luke effectively shows in his resurrection narratives in which the risen Christ instructs the

disciples in the reinterpretation of the scriptures from a Christo-centric standpoint (24:27, 44f.) - a reinterpretation which recalls his teaching "while I was still with you". Reinterpretation (1) and recollection (2) are thus two basic procedures: a point heavily underlined by John:

"These things I have spoken to you, while I am still with you. But the Counsellor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you" (14:25f.).

The creative element of this faith, embracing past, present and future from a new standpoint, operates with the new and active Christian community as its base and locale. Scandinavian scholars (3) have rightly emphasised the significance of Acts 2:42 -

"And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers".

The didache thus takes place within the koinonia that is itself characterised by its table fellowship - a significant link with the former disciples' group presided over by Jesus (4) - and its intense devotional life. Here, as the apostolic teaching, now compounded of many elements, is corporately shared and explored, new insights emerge under the guidance of the Spirit (cf. John 4:25) and the manifold Christian paradosis is shaped on the anvil of didactic necessity. For, as Matthew makes clear, the apostolic ministry inaugurated by the risen Christ is characterised by a teaching mission (28:19f.), conducted in the paradoxical presence of the Christ who has been taken from them.

But while this outline of the origins of paradosis may thus be sketched in lightly, a bolder description of it is dependent upon a more detailed investigation of an area that is already something of a battle-ground of critical conflict. Some of the more important issues will now be reviewed.

It will be generally allowed that Luke presents a highly developed theology of salvation. Gerhardsson, however, protests against the

"extremely tenaciously-held misapprehension among exegetes that an early Christian author must either be a purposeful theologian and writer or a fairly reliable historian". Gerhardsson may be justified in castigating the more extreme forms of this dichotomy: in rejecting the notion, for example, that Luke's work is no more than a magnificent piece of creative or imaginative writing directed to evangelical ends. But it appears that Gerhardsson is in some danger of confusing faithfulness to religious tradition with a historical concern to know the Jesus event wie es eigentlich gewesen. Christian paradosis, as we have already noted, inevitably contains a high degree of religious interpretation, including theological reflexion and prophetic insight. It is concerned primarily not with the Jesus event but with the Christ event, although the former may to a greater or lesser extent be found in the latter. Thus while it may be true that Luke's modifications of Mark's material are minor, his use of Mark indicates not a primarily historical judgment about the accuracy of his material but a theological and religious acceptance of it — through

it one may "see" and "hear" Jesus the Christ (1:1). To enable one
to do so to even greater advantage and reach an understanding of
"the truth" of the Christ event (Luke 1:4), Luke includes not only
the teaching tradition of "Q" but also other traditions which under-
line the cosmic significance of Christ - from Adam to the Ascension,
as it were. Gerhardsson rightly says that "what we know as Lucan
theology may have been common creed in early Christianity, or in
parts thereof"; (1) but he confuses the issue by talking of "the
reliability of Luke's account" or of its being "a source of reliable
information", (2) thus smuggling in what appears to be a simplistic
view of religio-historical tradition.

Several particular issues call for comment at this point.
(1) Jerusalem. To be sure, Jerusalem was the centre of the
world for the Jews (as Mecca for the Muslims); Jesus' ministry
reached its climax there (in the context of a Passover celebration,
be it noted), and the early Church had its original focus there (but
also possibly in Galilee). (3) The Christian tradition therefore
included a positive and negative attitude to Jerusalem: the city of
God, and the city of rejection. In the highly critical times of
the early Church when "the last hour" had come, Jerusalem with its
rich religious and scriptural import, became inevitably the focus of
much reinterpretation and discussion in Christian circles. Thus
there developed ideas of the Church as "the true temple" and of "the
new Jerusalem" as an eschatological concept. It is in Luke's works
that the story of Jesus the Christ and of the Church are linked

(3) Cf. Mark 16:7 and the Galilean hypotheses advanced by Lohmeyer,
Lightfoot, Elliott-Binns and more recently Marxsen.
together with Jerusalem as the critical focus: a total structure which presupposes a later standpoint and perspective. Gerhardsson appeals to Luke 19:28-21:38 as "built on an older collection of traditions concerning Jesus". (1) This proves nothing: the gap to the original situation remains. The hub of the passion story is at least equally early, yet Mark does not end up with the focus on Jerusalem but on Galilee. Even in the Lukan tradition, strong evidence is found of a later, accumulative tradition rather than simply an early, monolithic one. Thus Luke 19:39-44 (peculiar to Luke) contains a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem which is partly derived from the *nesher* activity of the early Christians on scriptural texts (2) and also appears to reflect knowledge of the event itself. Luke is doubtless faithful to his traditions; but those traditions come through a community in which intensive reinterpretation was constantly taking place "in the Spirit" (cf. 1 Cor.14), and in consequence the traditions he uses do not necessarily lead one back by an uncomplicated historical route to the self-understanding of Jesus or the earliest community. (3)

(ii) "The Twelve" and the Church in Jerusalem. "The twelve" play a significant part in Luke's account (Lk.6:13; 6:2), being maintained by the election of Matthias (Acts 1:15ff.). They are essentially witnesses to Jesus in his life, death and resurrection. It is worth noting, however, that they bear witness particularly to the resurrection (cf. Luke 24:36-53), which marks the point at which their minds were open (24:45), so that all their memories of Jesus

(2) Cf. Is.29:3; Ezek.4:2; Ps.137:9.
are filtered through this new understanding. Therefore, the disciples' witness - and the \textit{paradosis} which came from them - concerning the life and teaching of Jesus from the days of the Baptist onwards cannot be regarded as a matter of simple transmission on the rabbinic model. Their principal role is to "preach the word" or "preach Christ", especially his resurrection; but that commission most certainly includes teaching. And that some of their teaching was related to that given by Jesus - effectively turning his \textit{paraenesis} into Christian \textit{paradosis} - will be immediately conceded. Matthew, who stresses the apostolic teaching mission launched by the risen Christ, is particularly concerned to include a mass of Jesus' own teaching as the Sermon on the Mount.

But Gerhardsson is anxious to give "the twelve" a role in Church order and unity which is hard to sustain on the evidence of the New Testament. Luke may be reasonably consistent in his use of the term "apostle", but it is strikingly different from Paul's;\footnote{Cf. Gal.1:11-17; 1 Cor.9:1f.; 1 Cor.12:12. W.D. Davies questions the assumed consistency of Luke: the fact that he refers to apostles other than "the twelve" (Acts 14:4, 14) cannot simply be brushed aside: \textit{op. cit.}, p.472.} and while Paul's can by no means be taken as normative in the Church, Luke's has all the appearance of being governed by a rigid concept of salvation history: Paul does not qualify as an apostle in terms of Acts 1:21f. Allowance must therefore be made for variations of viewpoint in the Church - Luke is not wholly representative.

Nevertheless, "the twelve" have a symbolic role in the Church: this Paul accepts as much as anyone (1 Cor.15:5). The symbol, current in Judaism, would appear to have been employed by Jesus in relation to the group he formed around him. But was it any more
than a symbol in the early Church? As M. Smith observed, "We have
thirteen or fourteen names for Jesus' reportedly twelve apostles...". Did "the twelve" in the Church form an ecclesiastical, administrat-
ive or collegiate entity? It appears highly doubtful. Paul
recognises a Jerusalem authority, headed by James (the Lord's
brother), Cephas and John (Gal.2:9); but this does not accord with
the list in Acts 1:13, for which James, of course, would not qualify.
Yet James appears to have been the presiding authority in Jerusalem
and to have attempted to exercise some oversight over the churches
of Judaea and beyond (cf. Gal.1:22; 2:12). "The twelve", there-
fore is at best a shadowy entity, doubtful in composition and
obscure as far as later history is concerned. (3) It was an emotive
term, useful for later writers indulging in the grand sweep. So
Justin:

"From Jerusalem there went out men, twelve in number, into the
world - unlearned men, with no ability in speech; and in the power
of God they preached to every race of men". (4)

"The twelve apostles depend on the power of God, as the twelve
bells hung on the high-priest's robe; and through their voice all
the earth has been filled with the glory and the grace of God and of
his Christ." (5)

Consequently, the symbolic "Twelve" does not provide Gerhardsson
with the base he needs to meet the demands of his hypothesis on the
transmission of tradition through a unitary central agency. (6) This

(1) Op. cit., p.171. Curiously, Davies tends to minimise the
significance of this fact: op. cit., p.473.
(2) It is a weakness of Davies' discussion of "the twelve" that he
cites Paul's attitude to "the pillars" apparently as support for
the authoritative position of "the twelve", whereas in fact, the
composition of "the pillars" militates against the centrality of
"the twelve": op. cit., p.472f.
loc. Cf. A.N.C.L. IX i.130ff. J. Foster, After the Apostles,
1951, p.23, n.37.
(4) Apol.1:39.
(5) Dial. with Trypho, 42.
(6) But "the twelve" may well have some importance for the
transmission of certain traditions: vid. infra.
symbol apart, however, the Christian community at Jerusalem undoubtedly possessed influence and authority.

(iii) The early Christian churches and their traditions. A study of paradosis in the Sitz im Leben of early Christianity involves an assessment, however brief, of the church groups involved in its formation or preservation and in its transmission. The Synoptics agree that Peter, James and John were the inner core of the disciples' group that accompanied Jesus of Nazareth. Luke attempts to continue this tradition in Acts (1:13), but it is Peter and John who predominate. There is silence about James until his death (12:2). The adherents of this earliest Christian group were predominately Galilean, noted for their distinctive accent (2:7) and written off by many as "uneducated, common men" (4:13) though perhaps not wholly lacking influential backing. A. Harnack, who provides a good example of "the saner type of source criticism", argued for two Jerusalem sources for the earlier chapters (1-5); of which the more primitive comprised material in Acts 3. Whatever conclusions may be drawn about whether these were written or oral sources, or Aramaic as opposed to Greek, the doublets in the earlier part suggest the use of several sources, which reflect the work of a Galilean group characterised by a high degree of pneumatic activity and intense community life.

Several considerations strengthen the hypothesis that the most primitive Christian church was probably a Galilean hasidic group in

---

(5) Interestingly enough, F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake suggest that one of the sources may be a continuation of the Markan sources used by Luke in the compilation of his gospel.
Galilee. The death of Jesus had occurred during what was ostensibly a Passover pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Behind the "scattering" of the disciples may lie their disordered and bewildered return to their own province, where their fellowship with Jesus was renewed. (1) This Galilean group was characterised by pneumatic experiences, including encounters with the risen Lord, an intense eschatological expectation related to their own area (cf. Mark 16:7) and a strong attachment to the memory of Jesus in Galilee. (2) The group, however, did not consider itself isolated from Judaism by reason of its messianic beliefs, and some of its members would naturally return to Jerusalem for the recognised festivals, including Pentecost, in which the evocative symbol of the feast, combined with pregnant memories of Jesus, set the stage for pneumatic experiences of a particularly explosive intensity. (3) The result was a Jerusalem group, or groups, with a Galilean core. Meanwhile, the native Galilean group continued in its home area and probably provided the permanent but obscure milieu of at least some of the original "twelve". In support of this hypothesis, one might cite the evidence of Mark, which closes with the

(1) The opposite view is taken by W. Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus, 1956, pp.47ff., in which he ascribes the return to Galilee in the other gospels as derived from the editorial work of Mark. Marxsen's view, for which there is no real evidence, was rightly rejected by W. Schmithals, Paul and James, Eng. tr., 1965, p.33, n.66. Apart from the evidence of the traditions, intrinsic probability favours the return to Galilee.


(3) This is not to deny a high degree of theological interpretation by Luke himself in his Pentecost narrative: cf. the chapter on propheteia, supra. But it is to insist that Luke was using genuine tradition, which he worked up for his own purposes. Cf. E. Haenchen, op. cit., pp.185-89, who describes the earliest Christians as living a quiet, devout life in Jerusalem. Such intense devotion takes place within a narrow circle, not in mass evangelism.
expectation of the return of Jesus to Galilee and bases the major part of Jesus' ministry on what appears to be a Galilean aretalogy of mighty deeds stamped with the peculiar  
(1) of Jesus of Nazareth. The Galilean setting of many resurrection appearances is also relevant, together with the fact that even Luke admits to the Galilean composition of the primitive Church nucleus. Luke's insistence upon Jerusalem as the locus of the resurrection appearances and the beginning of the Church can be largely ascribed to his propensity for apologetic and theological schematisation, although he undoubtedly constructed his picture for the most part from selected traditions. The Galilean hypothesis also accounts for the pristine insistence on "the twelve" and their subsequent disappearance from the scene as understood by Luke.

This emphasis upon the importance of Galilean Christianity does not necessarily detract from the significance of the Jerusalem church or the possibility that a notable peak of pneumatic intensity effectively launched it as a Christian community. If Gerhardsson overstates the case for Luke's historical accuracy, that is no reason for assuming that the general contours of the evangelist's picture are wholly imaginary. Thus despite Luke's theological motive for emphasising the unity of the Church, he describes a deep cleavage within it, of which the dispute about the provision for widows was only a symptom:  
(2) the fundamental issue was the potential

---

incompatibility of the "Hebrew" and "Hellenist" ways of living.\(^{(1)}\) In short, "Hebrew" Christianity remained Torah-centred: the Torah was the focal point of reference, the central symbol, while the designation of Jesus as Messiah, Judge and the supreme teacher of the Torah in no sense invalidated the Torah or the position of Moses. Of this type of Jewish-Christian \textit{paraenesis}, the letter of James is an outstanding example.\(^{(2)}\) The hellenistic Jews exhibited a notable variety of emphases in relation to the observance of the Torah, even circumcision being omitted in a number of cases.\(^{(3)}\) Such hellenistic Jews were present in Jerusalem in such numbers as to justify the creation of hellenistic synagogues in the city (cf. Acts 6:9). The holy city attracted them like a magnet, whether for reasons of pilgrimage, business, study or retirement. Some of them were undoubtedly affluent and the "strangers from Rome" (2:10) were doubtless Roman citizens as well.\(^{(4)}\) The primitive Christians obviously made considerable inroads into this influential constituency and probably derived from it considerable economic strength (4:34-37) and administrative skills (6:5f.). Such Christians were probably more mobile and possessed wider contacts than most Galilean Christians, while their own more flexible attitude towards the Torah gave them scope for a

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. Schmithals, \textit{on. cit.}, p.26f. The precise nature of the division has been much discussed. For the suggestion that "Hebrews" spoke Aramaic or other Semitic language, with possibly some additional knowledge of Greek, while the other party spoke Greek only (or at any rate no Semitic language), cf. C.F.D. Moule, \textit{Once More, Who were the Hellenists?}, Exp. T. 70, 1959, pp.100ff. But the cleavage goes deeper than this: a particularly explosive issue was the attitude to the Law: \textit{vid. infra.}

\(^{(2)}\) This judgment is not influenced by the attribution of the letter to James; it springs from the analysis of the \textit{paraenesis} contained in the letter - cf. the previous chapter on \textit{paraenesis.}


more radical interpretation of the Christ event and a more aggressive policy of evangelisation. The result is a bitter clash with their fellow hellenistic Jews, which brought the intervention of the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem and the first persecution of the "Hellenists" at their instigation.\(^1\) The crucial issue lay in the suggestion of change in "the customs which Moses delivered to us" (Acts 6:14) - a suggestion which undermined the national, let alone the religious, foundations of the Jewish people and earned the fanatical opposition of all who, like Saul of Tarsus, were "extremely zealous for the traditions" of their fathers (cf. Gal.1:14). Thus, the "Hellenists" were clearly distinct from the "Hebrews" within the Christian community although a fundamental breach is avoided through their common loyalty to Christ as Lord: the fact that Peter, a "Hebrew", has good relations with the "Hellenists" is sufficient to indicate that diplomatic relations were not broken off within the Christian camp.\(^2\) The "Hellenists", however, incurred the wrath of their fellow Jews by appearing\(^3\) to reject the Law, Moses and the Temple (Acts 6:11, 13f.) and so jeopardise the whole Jewish national establishment as recognised by the Roman imperial authorities.\(^4\) This

---

\(^1\) We may compare the later disturbances among the Jews at Rome, which prompted the Emperor Claudius to banish them from the city: Suetonius, \textit{The Twelve Caesars}, Claudius 25.\(^5\)

\(^2\) The fact that "Hellenist" widows were said to have been shabbily treated in the "daily ministration" may suggest that there were certain tensions between the groups, and the "Hebrews'" freedom from persecution may indicate that the separation was recognised by the wider Jewish world: cf. Haenchen, \textit{op. cit.}, p.268.\(^6\)

\(^3\) Luke stresses that the charges were trumped up: Acts 6:11, 13; cf. 21:28. While this doubtless accords with Luke's apologetic purpose (Haenchen, Schmithals), it may also point to genuine misunderstanding by the Jews of the "Hellenists'" meaning, certainly presented with all the extremism of enthusiasm. In the case of Paul, even some of James' group were suspicious.\(^7\)

was the basic reason for the persecution, which was judiciously
directed against the "Hellenists" and not the "Hebrew" Christians of
Jerusalem.(1) Astonishingly, Schmithals insists on describing
Stephen and Paul (!) as "antinomian", taking the charges against the
former and rumours James heard about the latter as substantially true
and caricaturing Paul's own understanding of the Law in the process.
To square his hypothesis with the evidence, he is forced to deny that
such an antinomian group could arise in Jerusalem, and to assume an
origin around Antioch and a subsequent transfer to the city where the
parousia was expected - all of which is admittedly contrary to Luke's
account.(2) Schmithals seems deliberately to play down the strength
of the hellenistic Jewish community in Jerusalem. Other tendentious
arguments include the suggestion that Saul operated as persecutor not
from Jerusalem but from a base in Syria or beyond, for he was "still
not known by sight to the churches of Christ in Judaea" (Gal.1:22).
But this refers to Paul's activity as a Christian and an apostle: as
such, he had no contact with the Palestinian churches. They knew
only too well of his former activities, although since they were
"Hebrews" the persecution had not been directed at them; and they
rejoiced in his conversion to "Hellenist" Christianity. Paul's
rabbinic training had been in Jerusalem. The Jewish authorities kept
a watchful eye over religious developments in the provinces (cf. Matt.
15:1; Mk.7:1), and appear to have had extradition arrangements with
the republic of Damascus.(3) Luke's description of Saul's

(1) In this sense "except the apostles" (8:1) must be understood.
was no such arrangement with Caesarea: cf. Acts 12:19; 21:8.
persecuting work is inherently more probable than Schmithals' attempt to rewrite it in the interests of his particular hypothesis of Christian origins. It is likely that the Damascus Christians against whom he was moving were of Galilean origin or influenced by Galilean Christianity; and it may well be that some of the scattered "Hellenists" found their way to Galilee (Acts 9:31). But there is no reason, other than tendentious argumentation, to hold that Stephen's persecution has been antedated by Luke and deliberately placed before Saul's conversion - except that this point is inconvenient for Schmithals' thesis. (1)

In addition to the "Hebrew" Christians of Jerusalem and Judaea and the Christocentric Diaspora mission of the "Hellenists" there arose from the latter the Gentile mission (2) identified above all with Paul and launched from Antioch (cf. 11:25f.; 13:1ff.). The impossibility of such missionary enterprises being sealed off from contact with one another led to the apostolic assembly at Jerusalem, which was designed to reach a measure of agreement on the fundamental issue of the observance of the Law, circumcision being something of a touchstone in the dispute (Gal. 2:1-10). The compromise that was effected suggested that, theoretically at least, the missions became more distinct: "I to the uncircumcised, Peter to the circumcised" (2:7f.). That at any rate was Paul's version of it, although he was obviously not precluded from evangelising those Jews of the Diaspora who by their own action or that of their family had already separated

(1) Cf. Schmithals, op. cit., p.35f.
(2) For the view that it was a truly Gentile mission associated with Paul's understanding of the messianic age, vid. H.J. Schoeps, op. cit., pp.229f. The view that Paul went first to the synagogues and only subsequently to the Gentiles is highly suspect and attributable to Luke's peculiar theological and apologetic aims: cf. Schmithals, op. cit., p.59f. The starting point of his mission in a town is frequently and understandably the "Godfearers".
themselves from the practising Jews of the synagogues (cf. 2:3).\(^{(1)}\)

Haenchen is probably correct in seeing Paul as one of a deputation sent from Antioch (despite the "revelation" which Paul claims as his only motivation: Gal.2:2) because of pressure from Jerusalem to carry out the rite of circumcision. The problem lies in knowing who is supposed to be circumcised: all converts, Jew and Gentile (cf. Gal.2:4f.), or only those Jewish converts who had not been already circumcised (like Titus)? Schmithals presents a good case for taking this emphasis on circumcision as primarily political rather than theological;\(^{(2)}\) but while logically that would not involve the circumcision of Gentiles, other motives were doubtless at work, leading the Judaizers to make more extreme demands and disrupting the Christian koinonia as in "the unfortunate incident in Antioch" (Gal.2:11ff.).\(^{(3)}\)

In fact, the pressure from Jerusalem probably arose because the very existence of the Jewish Christian church there was in jeopardy. James the son of Zebedee had already perished (Acts 12:2); Peter had had a narrow escape (12:4ff.); and James the Lord's brother must have lived in constant danger. The only policy was to be as conciliatory as possible to "those of the circumcision": i.e., the Jewish authorities,\(^{(4)}\) who had already suppressed Stephen and any who appeared to undermine the Law. Paul, though doubtless sympathetic on this point, felt that Peter and his supporters were betraying the very nature of the gospel (Gal.2:15ff.); hence there could be no compromise. The apostolic assembly had not succeeded in working out a policy that could readily be followed in all circumstances.

---

\(^{(1)}\) For a complete discussion of these issues and possible objections to this solution, cf. Schmithals, op. cit., pp.38-62; also Haenchen, op. cit., pp.464-68.


\(^{(3)}\) Schmithals' phrase.

\(^{(4)}\) Following Schmithals, op. cit., pp.66ff.
The result - and this is in fact in keeping with the assembly's decision - is that the missions do separate considerably, though there is no suggestion of a total breakdown of diplomatic relations or of the underlying unity of the Church as a whole. The picture at Corinth - "I belong to Paul", "I to Apollos", "I to Cephas" and perhaps even "I to Christ" (1 Cor.1:12) - probably becomes more and more representative of the Church situation in which Diaspora Jews and Gentiles make up the total community. The mention of Apollos (cf. Acts 18:24) is symptomatic of a greater fragmentation than has often been recognised, and in addition gnostic tendencies, both within and outside the church, are to be reckoned with. Paul knows well that the problematic element in the church is the safeguarding of its unity (cf. 1 Cor.1:13ff.). In face of this evidence, Gerhardsson's argument for a monolithic ecclesiastical system centred on Jerusalem as the seat of the highest doctrinal authority is doomed to failure. The partial parallels he draws between Acts 15 and the general sessions at Quaran or the Sanhedrin or other rabbinic assemblies provide a commentary on Luke's understanding of how such a session might have operated, rather than on a given historical occasion.

(1) The prominence given to Alexandria has suggested to some that Apollos' teaching was coloured by the allegorism of that city: cf. F.J. Foakes-Jackson, Acts, 1931, p.174; to others that he was the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews (Luther; more recently, T.W. Manson, The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews, BJRL 32, 1949, pp.1ff.). F.F. Bruce tentatively suggests a Galilean origin for his message: op. cit., p.382. Haenchen concludes that he was "a missionary quite independent in his work and thought, whom Paul faced with considerable reserve": op. cit., p.556. The evidence of Acts 18:24-19:7 suggests an eschatological preacher of repentance in the tradition of John, possibly influenced also by the early teaching of Jesus. Luke's purpose is to induct him completely into apostolic Christianity.

(3) Manual of Discipline, VI.8ff.
Indeed, he was writing at a time when the Church had perhaps received a considerable influx from some of these quarters in the period immediately before 70 A.D. (1)

E. Haenchen has outlined the clear import of the apostolic decree. Derived from the Holiness Code in Leviticus 17f., which was designed to enable Jews and foreigners living in Palestine to do so amicably and without defiling the land, its injunctions probably reflect the guide-lines adopted by the Godfearers of the Diaspora in ethical and ritual matters. (2) This raises the question of whether it was Luke or James that appropriated them for the service of the Christian community. It is not impossible that it was James, as Luke relates; but if Acts 15:6-30 is to be identified with Gal.2:1-10, (3) then considerable weight must be placed on the "much debate" of Acts 15:7. The outcome of such argumentation is frequently open to different interpretations, and Paul is much more concerned with the agreement he reached with the apostles not in open session "but privately before those who were of repute" (Gal.2:2). The great debate in open session has probably been written up by Luke for apologetic purposes, and Paul was probably willing to tolerate its findings because of the Jerusalem church's vulnerability to political pressure from the Jews. The approach reflected in the "decree" - to what has been sacrificed to idols, for example - was not Paul's way of handling such issues (cf. 1 Cor.8-10; Rom.14); but he could be reasonably content in the circumstances to put up with such a deliverance in place of one relating to circumcision.

(3) Vid. Appendix B.
What conclusions can be drawn about the traditions current in the diverse sectors of the early Christian communities? We have already indicated the importance of Galilee where, in keeping with the pneumatic and eschatological emphasis of that Church, the traditions were built up in aretalogical fashion around the "miracles, portents and signs" (Acts 2:22) that characterised much of Jesus' ministry in those parts and indicated the divine θεοσύνη with which he acted. The Markan passion story(1) is narrated in the context of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Mk.10:33) with Galilee as base (8:27; 9:30ff.; 10:1, 32) and the expected return of Jesus to Galilee (16:7); it is therefore also likely to reflect traditions current in that Church, or at least a combination of the Galilean and Hellenist traditions, for Galilee had good communications with the Diaspora to the north west and north east as well as with Jerusalem itself. (2) Matthew's passion story appears largely dependent on Mark's, apart from his own paraenetic additions (3) - the Galilean base was obviously acceptable to Syrian Christians. The Lukan story in which localities lose their geographical significance and acquire a symbolic meaning (4) is more or less dependent (5) on Mark: perhaps a variation on the Galilean-hellenistic tradition, with more emphasis on the hellenistic and compatible with Caesarea as its location. Perhaps the theological schema of the

(1) It is a confident conclusion of the Form Critics that the passion narratives circulated as continuous entities from an early date though there is no unanimity as to their extent: cf. K.L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919, pp.305ff.; M. Dibelius, on cit., pp.178ff.; R. Bultmann, HST, pp.262ff.; V. Taylor, FGT, pp.44-62.

(2) Antioch springs to mind at once as the centre of the wider mission (Acts 13:1ff.). For what it is worth, Mark had connections there, although he was Jerusalem based (13:13). Like Peter, he was a "Hebrew" with close connections with the hellenistic mission.

(3) E.g., further stories about Judas (26:14ff.; 27:3-10) and Pilate (27:19, 24ff.); the earthquake and resurrection of the just (27:51ff.).


evangelist is also indebted to the same milieu. Luke certainly stresses his debt to those who were in a position to give an authentic exposition of the traditions (Luke 1:8f.). The degree of divergence of the Johannine tradition suggests a virtually independent tradition, characterised by the theological teaching and interpretation of the evangelist or his source and assigned variously by scholars to a hellenistic, Palestinian or Samaritan origin.

Why the diversity in the passion story? In all churches, there was a variety of reasons, all of them basically paraenetic, for telling the story of Jesus' death. There was an exegetical reason: its narration accompanies the searching of the scriptures for prophetic testimony to such an event, and on occasion the two processes influence each other. There was a didactic reason, aiming to develop the atoning significance of his death - e.g., he "died for our sins" (1 Cor.15:3); he "gave himself a ransom for many" (Mk.10:45). There was an apologetic reason, for the Cross was a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles (1 Cor.1:23): the telling of it in a restrained and meaningful way could contribute to the overcoming of such difficulties. There was a liturgical reason: so central was the Cross in the Christian faith that a recitation of the passion story was required in worship - not least as a Christian focus in the

(2) Cf. V. Taylor, op. cit., p.53f., who notes affinities with Luke and opts for a hellenistic base; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p.96ff., argues for a background in southern Palestine (although the gospel was published in a very different milieu); C.H.H. Scobie, The Origin and Development of Samaritan Christianity, N.T. S. 19, 1973, pp.401-09 reviews the debate about the Samaritan affinities of the Fourth Gospel and takes it to be the product of the Galilean and Samaritan Christian communities which stood in a direct line with the Stephen-Philip mission.
liturgical celebration of the mighty acts of salvation wrought by God, corresponding to the Exodus story in the Passover. (1) Hence the transmission of this paradosis of the passion was qualitatively different from a semi-mechanical process within a small, quasi-rabbinic community. It was a lively, creative process, conserving the memory of the past, not as inert data but as gospel, presenting to the contemporary hearer the gospel of Jesus through a specific aspect of his life and ministry. (2) Thus paradosis was valued because of the authentic witness it bore (cf. 1 Cor.15:1ff.) and its paraenetic and homiletic usefulness.

The Torah centred Christianity of the "Hebrews", who are met with particularly in the Jerusalem church, appears to receive expression in the epistle of James. The paraenetic units focus upon or reflect the constant study of the scriptures (i.e., the Old Testament) and the development of a distinctive pesher tradition (cf. 2:18-26) incorporated in what are probably homiletic summaries (2:14-26; 5:7-11, 13-18). The basis on which this tradition operates is the recognition that Jesus is Lord and Christ (1:1) and will come soon as Judge (5:7, 9). The Torah centred teaching tradition is therefore constantly informed by the authoritative, messianic interpretation of scripture, which appears in explicit form at 5:12 (cf. Matt.5:37) and possibly 5:17 (a reflection of Luke 4:25?) but which may also be detected at many points of the epistle. Jerusalem would therefore prize the


(2) Much confusion attends the usual formgeschichtliche type statements of this point: cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.25; K. Kähler, op. cit., pp.60ff.; H. Zahn, The Historical Jesus, Eng. tr., 1965, p.77. What should be stressed is the qualitative, not the quantitative aspect. The gospel, undiluted and unqualified, confronts us in each pericope.
traditions which showed Jesus as the true teacher of the Torah (e.g., Matt.5:17-6:18). These include the distinctive interpretation of the Mosaic Law and the right attitude to worship (including Temple worship: 5:23), detachment from the world and undivided loyalty to and dependence upon God (6:19-7:27), together with a strong emphasis on the practical expression of faith in life (7:21-27; cf. 25:31-46). Such traditions were, of course, shared with the hellenistic churches, especially in view of antinomian allegations against them and their essentially different theological orientation; and it may well have been in a hellenistic milieu that "Matthew" edited the traditions to produce the Sermon on the Mount as the messianic Law prefaced by the beatitudes as the "new commandments". (1) Luke also finds the material in currency in his churches but edits it in a different way.

Finally, the material peculiar to Matthew and Luke - the birth stories are a case in point - is best understood as hellenistic Haggadah designed to interpret for believers the doctrinal significance of the coming of Jesus as Messiah and Saviour. The hinterland from which its concepts are drawn is very wide indeed, including (in Luke) prophetic oracles and songs, different genealogies in both groups designed for theological purposes and the concept of the virgin birth which may well have Zoroastrian affinities.

(iv) Paul and tradition. Paul, the erstwhile scribe steeped in the traditions of his people (Gal.1:14), (2) had come to write off all such assets for the sake of Christ (Phil.3:5ff.). (3) Consequently,

(3) This "writing off" has an interesting parallel in the Talmud (b. Bab. Mes.85a) where R. Zeira is said to have fasted 100 days in order to forget the Babylonian Talmud and prepare to learn the Palestinian Talmud instead: cf. Gerhardsson, M.M., p.168, n.5.
there is an ambivalence in his attitude to Christian tradition. Inevitably, something of the rabbinic attitude to tradition was transferred to his new milieu. In Paul's epistles, O. Cullmann observes, "we find the whole Jewish paradosis terminology, and, what is more, we find it used in a definitely positive way".\(^1\) On the other hand, the focus of his new faith was Christ, through whom came his calling as an apostle without human mediation (Gal.1:17). In his preaching, teaching and every other aspect of his ministry, Paul must remain true to that calling, not least in face of any traditions, no matter how authoritative they may appear to be, which contradict or are incompatible with that primary revelation. When Paul withstood Peter to his face at Antioch, he was rejecting the table halachah which had proceeded from Jerusalem and which Peter and Barnabas were prepared to accept.

Such ambivalence should put the modern critic on his guard against forcing Paul's use of the vocabulary of paradosis into a preconceived mould or otherwise failing to appreciate the nuances of his expressions. What is significant is not that Paul uses this vocabulary but how he uses it.\(^2\) An unfortunate example of woodenness in modern exegesis is provided by O. Cullmann and E.B. Allo when they fasten on to the και which occurs in 1 Cor.15:1, 3 and 11:23, and take it to indicate mediation wherever it occurs in this way.\(^3\)

\(^{(1)}\) The Early Church, p.63.
\(^{(2)}\) The use of the vocabulary of paradosis is not in question: e.g., παραδοσιαν (1 Cor.11:23; 15:3), παραλαμβανειν (1 Cor.11:23; 15:3; Gal.1:9; Phil.4:9; Col.2:6; 1 Thess.2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess.3:6); παρεδωσεν (2 Thess.3:5, and in plural 1 Cor.11:2; 2 Thess.2:15); in addition, κατεχειν is used in 1 Cor.11:2; 15:2, κρατειν in 2 Thess.2:15, κατακειμαι 1 Cor.15:1, and περιπατειν και in 2 Thess.3:6. These can all be used as technical terms in relation to the handling of tradition.
\(^{(3)}\) Cf. Cullmann, op. cit., p.63f.
It is true that in 1 Cor.15 the phrases "which you also received" and "which I also received" indicate the notion of a chain of tradition: I received, and what I received I passed on to you (in preaching 15:1) so that you received it as I did. The beginning of the chain, as far as this passage is concerned, is unspecified. In 1 Cor.11:23, however, the immediate context differs in more respects than a simple interchange of verbs. Here Paul's concern is with the origin - whether immediate or not - of the paradotic chain, i.e., "the Lord", and the καί in "what I also handed on to you" indicates the next link in the chain: Paul not only received it, he also passed it on. It does not in any way suggest mediation in this passage, other than that Paul mediated the tradition to the Corinthians. If Paul received this tradition through mediation of some kind, the καί does not express that fact here. Allo's suggestion that it means "I received the tradition in the same way as I handed it on to you - by mediation" is a tendentious exegesis.

(i) 1 Cor.15:3ff. represents a classic instance of Paul's use of tradition. It has been studied so frequently that we may confine our observations to a minimum:

(a) J. Jeremias, among others, has suggested not merely that Paul is here using an earlier formula but that traces of Aramaic forms point to a Jerusalem origin. Aramaisms are notoriously difficult to detect with complete assurance and in any case permit only the most general conclusions to be drawn as to place of origin. Gerhardsson pours scorn on attempts to refer the basic formula to the hellenistic church, but his difficulty arises from the fact that he assumes an apostolic college dwelling in remote isolation in Jerusalem. When

(1) Cited by Cullmann, op. cit., p.64.
(2) Die Abendmahlsborte Jesu, 1949, pp.95ff.
this chimera has been removed, the hellenistic church is seen also to have apostolic leadership and counsel. The source of Paul’s basic formula is more likely to have been Antioch or the church in Syria or Arabia. In Gal.1:18, Paul refers to a conference with Peter, not a two-week crash course on basic Christianity. (1)

(b) It is impossible to determine with certainty where the received formula ends and where Paul’s commentary begins, as will be seen if even part of the passage is set out in phrases:

that Christ died (for our sins) (in accordance with the scriptures);
that he was buried;
that he was raised up (on the third day) (in accordance with the scriptures);
that he appeared to Cephas (then to the Twelve) ...

It is tempting to take only the unbracketed phrases as the original core, although the testimony to the resurrection most probably included the total witness of the Twelve as well as the individual witness of Peter (Cephas) and the other additional phrases may well come from Paul’s source rather than from himself. Again, it is impossible to say how many of the other recorded witnesses to the resurrection belong to recognised church formulae and how far Paul has simply listed others known to himself to underline the resurrection theme on which he is about to expand. Certainly v.6b is Pauline comment, as are vv.8ff. Several points emerge from this key passage. Undoubtedly, it implies a tradition recording the passion of Christ, which interpreted the memories of the disciples messianically and soteriologically through continuing pesher activity on the scriptures.

In fact, Paul points back here to the very crucible of the Christian

(1) Contra Gerhardsson, M.M., pp.297ff. Despite G.D. Kilpatrick’s case for taking ἰστηρίζων Κηφᾶν as "to get information from Cephas": H.T. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson, 1959, pp.144f., the meaning is not certain: cf. N.E.B.: "to get to know Cephas".

(2) B. Lindars, op. cit., pp.75-137.
faith. To this was added the resurrection element, which also included pesher activity (1) but which involved the validation of the basic claim by means of the citation of the apostolic witness, and each recorded witness implied the existence of a corresponding "legend". To these Paul, apologetically yet proudly, adds his own witness. From Paul's presentation of these data can be deduced the reason for the fact that the passion story existed in separation from the story of the resurrection. The former was essentially a unity (though expandable); the latter was from the beginning a fragmented witness to the living Lord offered by individuals and groups on the basis of their own experience.

(c) The context in which Paul introduces the paradosis in 1 Cor. 15 is particularly important. He begins what is in effect a homily on the theme of resurrection by recalling the εὐαγγέλιον, the good news that formed the content of his original preaching to the Corinthians and the ground of their salvation. Yet it is not the εὐαγγέλιον as such that he wants to discuss at this point: i.e., Christ crucified as the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:18, 24), or the grace of God in Christ through whom by faith comes justification and peace (Rom. 1:16f.; 5:1). His initial invitation to recall the εὐαγγέλιον is subsequently modified by the phrase τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην εἰς ἐν, the anacoluthon and repetition of the main verb making clear what Paul actually wants to talk about: "by what discourse (in what terms) (2) I preached the gospel to you". Remember, he says, what was involved in my presentation of the gospel: the

(1) Ibid., pp.32-74.
(2) Literally "by what word". Many translations - notably, N.E.B. - obscure this important aspect of Paul's thinking by their tendency to paraphrase.
tradition of the cross and resurrection that I myself received and passed on to you. The Corinthians had no intention of deserting the gospel, of "believing in vain"; but they had—so Paul had heard—seriously and indefensibly modified part of the tradition which was inseparable from the preaching of the gospel, viz., the concept of resurrection (cf. 15:12ff.; 35), and this is his concern in this homily. The *paradosis*, therefore, is not the gospel itself but the essential accompaniment and presupposition of the gospel. It presents data which must be conveyed to and grasped by the hearer if he is to understand the basis on which the gospel can be proclaimed. Doubtless Paul was aware of much of this *paradosis* when he persecuted the church, when it appeared to him to undermine the foundations of Judaism, elevating Jesus above Moses and deserting "the traditions of our fathers". His conversion involved the revelation of the gospel of God's grace to him; and in that light the *paradosis* took on a different complexion. In this new understanding he received assistance from his fellow Christians, initially at Damascus and subsequently in other areas as well. To fail to see this distinction between *paradosis* and gospel is to caricature the preaching of Paul, as was done by those who took *kerygma* to be the essence of the gospel and identified its content with paradotic units.(1)

(ii) A number of paraenetic passages in Paul contain ostensible claims to dominical origin. These may be briefly reviewed:

(a) 1 Thess.4:15 - "this we tell to you by the word of the Lord" (ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου). The context is eschatological expectation and apocalyptic paraenesis, in which the major symbol of the death and resurrection of Christ has already been adduced (4:14).

(1) Cf. C.H. Dodd and our observations in the Introduction to the thesis.
The dominical reference in 4:15 seems to be designed to emphasise the meaning of that symbol in relation to the particular problem of "those who have fallen asleep" (v.15b; cf. v.14b). What is meant by "the word of the Lord" here? It need not indicate either a saying of Jesus, or a special revelation given to Paul, or an already existing Christian tradition - and these represent the solutions normally suggested. (1) It is Paul who is doing the telling (λέγων), and he does so "by the Lord's word": that is, perhaps, with the authority of prophetic preaching but, even more, by the authority of his apostolic office, in and through which the Lord is revealed to the nations (cf. Gal.1:16). There was clearly much concerned discussion of the end-time in the early Church. The imagery employed was largely derived from the study of the scriptures and related to the concept of the parousia of Christ (4:15f.; cf. 1 Thess.2:1). (2) This pesher activity, combined perhaps with some traditions originating with Jesus' ministry, produced the eschatological traditions of the early Church, which were also caught up and expounded apocalyptically by prophets and visionaries. Here, however, Paul appears to be issuing a clarification of the tradition as demanded by the situation rather than merely repeating traditional elements. Paul was not simply a passive recipient of pesher tradition: he was a most active contributor when necessary. The utterance is therefore dominical in the sense that the Lord speaks through the apostle whom he commissioned.

(1) The language used does not imply a saying of Jesus (nor is one of this kind known to us) nor a special revelation, which Paul would in all probability have indicated; and since the problem seems to arise from a gap in Christian tradition, it is not particularly sensible to look for the solution in that quarter.

(2) In this passage, the traditions appear derived from Mic.1:3; Joel 2:1; Exod.19:16ff.; Zech.14:5; Dan.12:2; Is.26:19a; 27:12b, 13a. Elsewhere, Paul draws from such traditions, as in 1 Cor.15. Cf. Matt.24:31.
Cor.7:10f.; 9:14. The prohibition of divorce is ascribed with impressive emphasis to the Lord as distinct from Paul: that is, a dominical source is expressly affirmed over against an apostolic source. This appeal to dominical paradosis is largely a matter of paraenetic reinforcement: here, for the purposes of this particular piece of paraenesis, the dominical court of appeal (or central symbol) is totally free from ambivalence. However, this dominical symbol appears to consist of the "clear meaning" of Jesus' paraenesis — in particular, his radical exegesis of the law of Deut. 24:1-4 — rather than a fixed, oral utterance or halachah, which is impossible to unravel from the considerable New Testament evidence on this theme. (1) Jesus does appear to have radicalised the teaching of the Law on divorce, and the implications of his teaching were further thrashed out in the early Christian communities, as can be seen in Mark's two-fold pronouncement on the subject (10:9, 11) and in Matthew's exception (5:32; cf. Mk.10:4f.; Lk.16:18), which probably arose from exegesis of Deut.24:1 as much as from the need to resolve practical problems. Thus, in using paradosis, Paul's concern is with the meaning rather than exact formulae. He has indeed "counted as loss" much of his rabbinic teaching, replacing it with the insight afforded by the Spirit. This insight enables him to give much more detailed advice in his own name — "I say, not the Lord" (1 Cor.7:12) — concerning issues about which he has "no command of the Lord"; but he does not simply offer an opinion which his hearers may disregard at will. (2) He gives his aima (7:25; cf. v.40) as one in whom the Lord has placed trust (v.25), as one who believes he has the Spirit of

(1) Cf. Matt.5:31f.; 19:19; Lk.16:18; Mk.10:2-12; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.397f.
God (v.40). (1) The whole passage has to be taken most seriously as apostolic paraenesis in which dominical paradosis, containing the clear sense of Jesus' teaching, is incorporated where possible as the authoritative, contemporary demand of the Lord. (2)

Similar observations may be made in relation to 1 Cor.9:14. The paradosis contains a dominical principle, based on a metaphorical interpretation of Deut.24:15 that the labourer should receive the wages he has earned. The issue is raised by Luke in relation to the mission of the seventy (10:7) and by Matthew in relation to the mission of the twelve (10:10), but apparently the question of sustenance is in view here rather than actual wages which are expressly ruled out in Matt.10:8. In fact, the dominical origin here is rather more obscure than in the case of the discussion of divorce. The issue was obviously a topic for the pesher activities of the early communities. Deut.25:4 provided one proof text (cf. 1 Cor.9:9ff.; 1 Tim.5:18). The gnome, "the labourer is worthy of his hire", may represent the substance of an utterance of Jesus, reflected particularly in Luke 10:7 and repeated in 1 Tim.5:18. Paul's version is strongly coloured by the early Church vocabulary of mission. Here again, his procedure is to reproduce the tenor of what he understands as dominical paradosis, without paying particular attention to its original form. The

(1) Cf. Cullmann, op. cit., p.74: "this grace to be trustworthy refers to the apostolic office".
(2) Notice the play on the tenses: "I give charge, not I but the Lord" (7:10); the Lord speaks through the apostle who mediates and makes contemporary (present tense) a dominical command already given. Where no such command has already been given, the Lord speaks anew through the apostle (7:25). Where the Lord has expressly commanded in the past, the past tense may be used (9:14) and the command is made contemporary in the apostolic paraenesis. Considerable confusion has been caused by the tendency of scholars to treat such data theologically instead of recognising the hermeneutical principles Paul was assuming.
statement of dominical command is in fact a useful paraenetic device.

(c) 1 Cor.11:23-26. Just as Paul drew on primary traditions concerning the death and resurrection of Christ for his presentation of the gospel (1 Cor.15:1ff.) and on exegetical traditions for his didactic ministry (1 Thess.4:15; 1 Cor.7:10; 9:14), so he also makes use of tradition concerning liturgical practice in the Church. In 1 Cor.11, the immediate context is provided by the divisiveness and abuses evident in the Agape and the Lord's Supper at Corinth. These Paul endeavours to correct by supplementing his direct counsel (vv.17-22) with a picture of right practice. When confronted with problems and deviations from the norm in church practice, Paul can adopt a variety of approaches. Sometimes his appeal is to an evangelical or theological principle, such as ἀγάπη (1 Cor.14:1) or "the mind of Christ" (Phil.2:1-5), or to a recognised standard of teaching (Rom.6:17) or tradition (2 Thess.3:6). In 1 Cor.11 he appeals strongly to the "traditions" which he had delivered to the Corinthians (v.2) - i.e., Pauline traditions which establish a norm for practice within his churches (cf.14:33b), deviations from that norm being simply unacceptable (11:16). At v.23, Paul introduces the tradition that defined liturgical practice in relation to the Lord's Supper by a careful statement of what Jesus did at the last supper. The paradosis itself has been shaped by liturgical use, for every item (with the exception of the phrase "on the night when he was betrayed" - simply the identification of time) relates directly to cultic practice: the giving of thanks, the use of the elements, the interpretation of their symbolism, the repeated command to "do this in remembrance of me" (vv.24,25; cf. 26), and the proclamation of the Lord's death until his parousia. Appropriately, the account is succinct and clear in an austere way. It is nothing short of
astonishing, therefore, that Cullmann should describe this *paradosis* as "a factual account of the last meal of Jesus" and should suggest that it in no way represents "a case of theological interpretation".

The most that can be said on the historical side is that the liturgical tradition Paul uses points to one meal which Jesus had with his disciples "on the night in which he was betrayed" as having particular significance; and whenever that has been stated, the element of interpretation is strong. What form that original meal took, how far Jesus himself on that occasion was responsible for the interpretations that were subsequently attached to it and how uniform early church practice was from the immediate post-resurrection period all represent extremely complex questions which cannot be dealt with fully here; but their very complexity is sufficient to deter us from accepting the simplistic view of Cullmann cited above. In other respects Cullmann's view is highly sophisticated. Despite his adoption of what appears to be a simplistic historical model, he rejects the commonly held view that "from the Lord" in 1 Cor.11:23a refers to the historical Jesus as the first link of a chain, and opts for the exalted Christ, not however operating through a special vision or through the first "conversion" experience but through the tradition.

"The formula of 1 Cor.11:23 refers to the Christ who is present, in that he stands behind the transmission of the tradition, that is, he works in it." (6)

(5) The Early Church, p.67.
Thus traditions that convey words of Jesus and events in his life stem from the exalted Lord; and while Cullmann accepts identification of the exalted Lord and the earthly Jesus (i.e., they are one and the same person), he does so in such a way as to appear to subordinate the latter to the former.

The difficulty lies in the fact that Cullmann telescopes several types of scholarly investigation into one impossible unity. For example, a basic distinction must be made between the historical question of the form and development of Christian *paradosis* and the hermeneutical question about how such *paradosis* operates in a given situation. From the historical point of view, the pericope of 1 Cor. 11:23ff. involves a recollection of the last supper preserved and developed in relation to the common meals of the Christian community and overlaid with the language of Christian sacramentalism. From the hermeneutical viewpoint, it presents the contemporary demand of the Lord to the Corinthians - the Lord who is the source of the tradition and operates in it, the Lord whose historical fate (v.26) must be proclaimed - i.e., preached by word and action as gospel, saving event - "until he comes" as the glorified Lord in his *parousia*. Paul has the freedom to make use of the *paradosis* for his own purposes, which are primarily paraenetic. On the whole, therefore, his use is more akin to the hermeneutical than the historical: the latter appears only as part of the dominical symbol on which his liturgical *paraenesis* focuses. Cullmann's error, if we may presume to call it such, arises out of his own desire to produce a theology of *paradosis*, thus introducing yet another perspective which confuses important procedural distinctions and linguistic or contextual nuances.

The difficulty of appraising Cullmann's interpretation without caricaturing it is well illustrated by W.D. Davies' points of detailed
criticism. In relation to 1 Cor.7:10, 12, he asks: "... is it correct to interpret the verse to mean that the exalted Lord is now commanding (v.10) or refusing to command (v.12)?"(1) This appears to be a rather smart misinterpretation of what Cullmann was trying to say. In v.12, Paul has to avail himself of his apostolic prerogative not because the Lord is refusing to speak but because he has not done so. If Cullmann can say of dominical tradition, "the exalted Lord ... now proclaims ... what he had taught his disciples during his incarnation on earth",(2) then his understanding of v.12 is that, in the absence of such prior teaching, the apostle speaks as one who is "trustworthy" (v.25) and who "has the Spirit" (v.40).(3) Through the apostolic interpretation the will of the Lord, who has not spoken before on this matter, is clarified. I fail to see how Davies can claim that v.12 (sic) can refer to "a past commandment of Jesus still in force". The sophistication of Paul and Cullmann causes quite enough difficulty without Davies adding mischievous comment.

Again, Davies discusses "what should never have been questioned, namely, that the term 'Lord' stands in Paul for the historical Jesus in 1 Cor.11:23".(4) This assertion is supported by reference to 11:26 which, he says, must (his italics) refer to the historical Jesus. But, as we have seen, this verse refers to both the historical and the

(3) Davies suggests that Paul nowhere regards the Spirit as "the source of ethical commandments, although it is that of moral power" (op. cit., p.359f.). But he does regard it as the source of his *gnome* (7:40), and this must be treated seriously: it is not just a casual opinion. Does a *gnome* ever become an *ιντολή* or *ιντολαία* ? In 1 Cor.7:6, Paul makes clear that he is not giving an *ιντολά*Γι, but he does so in a way that assumes it would be within his power to do so if he thought it right. For apostolic *paraenesis* as *κυρίον ἵντολαία*, cf. 1 Cor.14:37.
glorified Lord, and Davies made this same point in an earlier comment. His conclusion that "any distinction between 'the Lord' and 'the Lord Jesus' in 1 Cor.11:23 is unlikely," though couched in less dogmatic terms than his previous sentence, is equally vulnerable. His basic weakness arises from his insistence on ignoring the paraenetic function of the pericope, thus obscuring the fact that there is inevitably a two-fold nuance to "Lord" in that verse. Operationally, Paul was perhaps not particularly aware of this distinction when he wrote the sentence but would undoubtedly have unravelled it if he could have been challenged by a modern critical scholar - a fate which he was mercifully spared. On the other hand, if Davies were concerned simply to indicate that there is an appeal to the historical Jesus in these verses, whatever other overtones may also be discernible, then we would find it difficult to disagree and feel confident that Cullmann would also. However, such over-writing on Davies' part suggests that he, no less than Cullmann, has his own particular axe to grind. This centres on his thesis that "for Paul the Person and Words of Jesus had assumed the significance of a New Torah", an identification never made explicitly by Paul. One accepts entirely that Paul could conceive of himself as being "under the law of Christ" (1 Cor.9:21), although it is important to note the particular linguistic game Paul is playing in 9:20f. He had undoubtedly a prime concern for "the standard of teaching" (Rom.6:17) that defines the Christian way of life, but here again a metaphorical word game is being followed out, and Paul more usually links the question of Christian living with the Spirit (cf. Gal.5:16-26). We would not deny that "the Christian life

(3) Rom.6:16ff. Paul himself says he is "speaking in human terms" ( ἄνθρωπος ) v.19.
as Paul understood it was lived within a formative ethical tradition".

Paul's paraenetic procedures suggest a readiness to appeal when appropriate to dominical tradition and, despite a number of difficulties, this involves the recognition of a tradition of the teaching of Jesus. Nevertheless, his whole ministry involves the "transmission of Christ" (cf. Col.2:6). His life, his preaching, his *paraenesis* are embraced by the unity provided by his life "in Christ"; and just as all true rabbinic teaching is held to derive from Moses, so all Christian communication transmits Christ, whether or not it enshrines a specifically dominical utterance or action. This transmission of Christ, however, is inseparable from the transmission of an understanding of life which commands the response of the recipients of the message:

"Therefore, since Jesus was delivered to you as Christ the Lord, live your lives in union with him. Be rooted in him; be built in him; be consolidated in the faith you were taught; let your hearts overflow with thankfulness. Be on your guard; do not let your minds be captured by hollow and delusive speculations, based on traditions of *man-made* teaching and centred on the elemental spirits of the world and not on Christ" (Col.2:6ff., N.E.B.).

The writer to the Colossians stresses the fundamental importance of Christian *paradosis* and the understanding of existence given in it; but he also warns against the perversion of this *paradosis* by means of the substitution of "man-made" as opposed to God-given content at its centre. Christ is God's secret embracing "all God's treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col.2:2ff.) and with him is fulness of life (2:10). *Paradosis* cannot operate as the vehicle of God's revelation nor bring man a true understanding of himself if Christ, the key to that revelation, is supplanted by another, less worthy focus, implying a different self-understanding. Authentic Christian *paradosis* is

(1) Davies, op. cit., p.365.
(2) *Sayings of the Fathers*. 

---

(1) Davies, op. cit., p.365.
(2) *Sayings of the Fathers*. 

---
therefore vitally important for the communication of the gospel. (1)

It remains only to present a fully worked-out example of Christian paradosis in its various aspects.

An Example of "Paradosis" worked out in detail.

The intention of this final section is to illustrate by detailed analysis the various forms, settings and operations of a selected unit of paradosis and the problems inherent in identifying and interpreting them. The child pericope in the gospels afford the scope necessary for such an investigation. They consist of the "blessing of the children" narrative in Mk.10:13-16, Matt.19:13ff., and Luke 18:15ff., and that of "the child in the midst" in Mk.9:33-37, Matt.18:1-5 and Luke 9:46ff. The composite nature of these pericope should assist rather than mitigate against the usefulness of the enquiry. The first step, however, is to investigate the structure of these pericope as they occur in the gospels, and the tradition history that lies behind them.

The Structure of the Child Pericope.

The pericope of "the blessing of the children" is transmitted as a biographical apophthegm (R. Bultmann) or pronouncement story (V. Taylor), and culminates in the expected verba Christi (Mk.10:14; Matt.19:14; Lk.18:16). Several features of the narrative suggest that it is essentially a floating pericope: (2) there is no explicit subject for προσέφυρον, no reference to time or place, and no context beyond that of the string of catechetical material devised by the

---

(1) B. Gerhardsson, K.K., p.301 stresses "the transmitted Christ" as a comprehensive designation for the tradition of Christ as a whole, but concentrates too much on the possibility of an underlying collected and redacted gospel. He discusses the question of the understanding of existence involved in this notion only as a parallel to the O.T. phrase "walk in the Torah".

evangelists. (1) Mark’s ἐναγκαλισθένης implies, and Luke’s τί γερέφη specifies, that the παιδία in the περιγραμα are young children. (2) The emphasis, however, is clearly upon Jesus’ pronouncement (Mk.10:14b and par.) and this is well integrated with the immediate context. By contrast, the act of blessing (Mk.10:16) is only briefly noticed by Matthew (19:15) and omitted by Luke, although in all cases the narrative may be said to assume it.

Mark and Luke also include a saying of Jesus (Mk.10:15; Lk.18:17) which is loosely related to the preceding utterance of Jesus but which nevertheless has a different orientation since it is an "entrance saying". Matthew’s omission of this verse in his account of "the blessing of the children" (he has it at 18:3) confirms the suspicion that it did not originally belong to any of the contexts to which the evangelists assign it. This is yet another floating logion.

The structural peculiarities of Mark 9:33-37 and par. are not so easily disentangled. Synoptic study suggests a fair degree of independent development, but all three agree in having the dispute about greatness as the starting-point (Matthew in very muted form; 18:1), and "the child in the midst" as the focus. While Mark and Luke, however, concentrate upon the acceptance of the child and Jesus’ identification of himself with it, Matthew develops the theme of the child as the model of greatness, incorporating a form of the "entrance saying" (18:3) and appending a short acceptance/identification logion (18:5).

Matthew’s narrative betrays the process of development and

---

(1) Cf. V. Taylor, Mark, p.415.
(2) παιδία perhaps designates in general children up to the age of twelve: τέκνα possibly has a wider application, including adolescent and adult offspring; cf. E. Trocmé, La Formation de l’Évangile selon Marc, 1963, p.161, n.157.
redaction which has shaped it. Circumstantial details are eliminated; the disciples' dispute becomes a mere question: the floating logion (Mk.10:15) is introduced as a generalised statement (ὅς τὰ παιδία), particularised and further interpreted by the succeeding logion (ὅς τῷ παιδίῳ τοῦτο). The acceptance/identification logion serves as the transition to the "offences" logia which follow it in Matthew and to which it is the positive counterpart. The whole narrative is skillfully edited and thoroughly Matthaean: "kingdom of heaven" occurs in vv.1, 3, and 4. (1)

The element of redaction in Luke's narrative contrasts with Matthew's but it is equally strong. The dispute is clearly indicated (9:46), and Jesus described as comprehending its nature immediately (9:47). The symbolic action is accompanied by a full acceptance/identification logion which is specifically directed to the child in question (τοῦτο τῷ παιδίῳ; 9:48), the point being that true greatness lies in showing acceptance to the weak and dependent, whom the παιδίον symbolises. Luke rounds off the narrative with a

(1) A difficult problem is presented by the phrase ὁς παιδίον: is it to be taken as nominative, in apposition to the subject, or as the object of the verb in apposition to "kingdom of God"? W.K.L. Clarke, E.T. Problems, 1929, pp.36ff., has opted for the latter alternative: "whoever refuses to receive the kingdom when it comes to them in the form of eager boys pressing forward for a blessing ..." (cf. Mk.9:37). This line of interpretation is supported by C.J. Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus, 1941, p.230 f.; Life of Jesus, 1948, p.145. E. Trocmé, op. cit., p.161, n.157, also inclines towards it: "On aurait donc ici une comparaison entre l'accueil fait au Royaume par les auditeurs de l'Évangile et l'accueil qu'on fait à un enfant ...", and links this with the early church problem of missionaries' children, discussed below. Trocmé's exegesis is certainly more convincing than Clarke's, for the latter has to resort to paraphrase to justify his rendering; but even Trocmé has to admit that Matthew does not understand the saying in this way and has misled all subsequent interpretation! On the whole, it is safer to opt for the more traditional construction, taking ὁς παιδίον in apposition to the subject; "as a child receives it" (velut puerulus, Vulgate; ut puerulus, Beza). This leaves the question of religious meaning open to interpretation.
characteristic "punch line", which brings the narrative back specifically to the question of greatness but seems to assume several unstated steps (e.g., to show acceptance to the weak is to act in the spirit of humble service, is to "receive" Jesus, is to be truly great).

Mark's more loosely constructed narrative may afford a better clue to the earlier stages of this material. The detailed, circumstantial account of the disciples' dispute contains an apparently awkward link, 9:35, where Jesus calls the twelve to him despite the fact that he is already in discussion with them, but some commentators have refused to recognise a seam here. (1) More significant, however, is that the whole narrative of vv.33-35 adopts the form of a self-contained pronouncement story ending at πάντων δικός. (2) The major problem then becomes that of the link with vv.36f.:

(i) It has been suggested that there is a complete hiatus at v.36. (3) The dispute about greatness is quite separate in early tradition from "the child in the midst" theme, although they possess a certain similarity and may be grouped together. Matthew and Luke, in different ways, combined the two to make a rather strained unity. There is no allusion in Mk.9:36f. to the theme of greatness.

(ii) The hiatus at v.36 has been denied. (4) In a dramatised parable, it is suggested, Jesus demonstrates the reversal of values expounded in v.35. He shows acceptance and warm affection to the and encourages the twelve to identify themselves with him in similar

(1) Mark may simply be introducing the pronouncement of Jesus with due solemnity; the disciples' embarrassed silence (v.34) may also account for the awkwardness, or simply editorial compression.
(2) Cf. V. Taylor's cautious acceptance of this: ibid.
(3) T.P. Glasson, following Wellhausen, regards vv.33-37 as a record of two incidents: Exp. T. 59 (1947-48), p.166. Cf. also Holzmann, Schmidt, Meyer, Taylor. The awkwardness of the text is reflected in some MSS: v.35 from καί λέγει is omitted by D, d and k, and the verse is omitted by Tatian.
action and thus "receive me and him who sent me". But does this really illustrate v.35? The παιδίον theme although close to the "humble servant" motif of 9:35, is subtly different from it. In fact, it requires an effort of thought to disengage from the theme of 9:35 and begin to follow the trend of 9:36f. The acted parable centres not on the παιδίον, whom one would have expected to be the model διάκονος in terms of 9:35, but on the action of Jesus in receiving him. And if the παιδίον is in fact not a child but a humble "famulus", the most junior servant in the house at Capernaum (Mk.9:33), the confusion is even worse, because the only possible object in setting him in the midst after the logion of 9:35 would be to say "become as this παιδίον" (cf. Matt.18:3f.). The balance of evidence is therefore against the essential continuity of vv.35 and 36.

(iii) M. Black finds the clue to the connection of these verses in the underlying Aramaic. If, as he demonstrates, both διάκονος (9:35b) and παιδίον (9:36a) translateタルヴァ, which has the double meaning of "servant" and "boy", then "the child in the midst" episode centres upon a dramatised play on the wordタルヴァ, in recognised prophetic fashion (cf. Jer.1:11; Amos 8:2). It is "a true 'mashal', an enigmatic comparison requiring interpretation". Further, the floating Mk.10:15 could be anchored in this context, with the meaning: "whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a servant shall not enter into it".

This interpretation involves the transposition of Mk.9:37 and 10:15, to make, in both cases, a much more straightforward sequence. Supporting evidence for this transposition may be found in the

unexpected use of the participle ἐκαλομένος in 9:37; it occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Mk.10:16. The child _pericopae_ are now separated clearly and simply into "the blessing of the children" ("acceptance and identification" motif) and "the child in the midst" ("servant" motif).

But if this was the original form of the tradition, some faulty editing is presupposed; and further, one must presume also a failure on the part of the transmitters of the tradition to preserve or even to recognise the true nature of the material with which they were dealing. Of course, we do not know that the ταῖδιον was in fact a servant — still less can we identify him as a servant in the household (Peter's?) at Capernaum. It is possible that the original meaning was "child"; and that greatness in the kingdom presupposes renouncing every form of adult pride and making a new beginning, like a ταῖδιον. It may be that, instead of Jesus positing the double entendre in a _mashal_, there was a bifurcation of interpretation at an early stage in the oral transmission. Against this, there is the plain fact that Jesus did use paronomasia in his teaching and that a _mashal_ of this type would have been entirely characteristic. The balance of probability favours the ascription of the double entendre to Jesus.

Assuming this to have been the case, how are we to account for the complex and fragmented diversity of the gospel traditions? As is well known, the many _pericopae_ and _logia_ which comprised the tradition of the early Church were hammered out on the anvil of its missionary and catechetical work, and supplied, shaped and maintained by the "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (Lk.1:2). Traditions emanating from Palestine and an Aramaic speaking milieu must have been translated not as an integral whole by an "official" panel of translators, but piecemeal, as it were, by the Greek speaking teachers in
the course of their work.

Granted that the Aramaic word *talya* was the link between Mk.9:35 and 9:36, the teacher who, thinking and speaking in Greek, uses *diakonos* at v.35 and *paidion* at v.36 is tending to lose sight of the original word association, but develops other associations as he ponders his material. Jesus' action in setting a *paidion* in the midst reminds him of how Jesus showed acceptance to children; the participle *év

*καλισάμενος* marks the transition to the "blessing of the children" theme. Mark's narrative therefore represents what came to be the accepted Greek version of the *pericope* in question; Luke further edits it in characteristic style.

Matthew, however, retains something of the Aramaic tradition, though his narrative is highly developed and contains no parallel to Mk.9:35 (did Matthew use a "western" text?(1)). He does, however, use the peremptory *προκαλεσάμενος*, "summon" (18:2) and his entire narrative can readily be interpreted in terms of "service". He reveals his own brand of word association at 18:5. There, *paidion* is a link between the previous narrative and the "little ones", "disciples" at 18:6ff.

This solution cannot be anything other than tentative. In particular, Matt.18:3, which is not integrated into Matthew's narrative with complete success, must not be assumed to be the earlier form of Mk.10:15 (Lk.18:17), for there is no evidence to support such a conclusion. In the gospel tradition, it is clearly a floating *logion*, and in its Markan (Lukan) form it may have been interpreted in rabbinic terms rather than in terms of service.(2)

(2) Vid. infra.
The Palestinian setting of the incidents.

The pericope of "the blessing of the children" is most open to investigation in terms of the original, Palestinian setting. The gospel writers, without specifying place or time, assign the incident to the context of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. Joachim Jeremias, however, locates it "with fair certainty" on the evening of the Day of Atonement. He bases this conjecture on a passage of the Babylonian Talmud which relates how the elders (i.e., the scribes) blessed, exhorted and prayed for the children on that evening, "that they might one day attain to knowledge of the Torah and to good works". The disciples rejected the children and those who brought them because Jesus was being treated as on a level with the scribes.

Prima facie, the gospel narratives contain affinities with the Talmudic passage, but questions requiring examination include (a) the significance of the act of blessing; (b) whether the gospel writers show any awareness of a connection between this incident and the Day of Atonement; and (c) the extent to which Jesus' action accords with the rabbinic tradition.

(a) Blessing is an element characteristic of Israel. "It is the entire power of life, the strength underlying all progress and self-expansion". The man who is "full of blessing" constantly

(1) Of this type of biographical apophthegm, E. Trocmé observes: "Dans la plupart des cas, l'origine palestinienne de ces historiettes ne fait aucun doute, pas plus que leur utilisation comme illustrations dans la prédication": op. cit., p.30.

(2) Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, 1960, p.49.

(3) Soph.18:5.

(4) Matthew speaks of "laying his hands upon them" (10:13, 19) and "praying for them" (10:13). Mark describes Jesus' actions as "touching" (10:13), "taking them up in his arms", "blessing" and "laying his hands upon them" (10:16). Luke has "touching them" (16:15). Matthew in particular shows resemblances to the Talmudic passage, and the others are consonant with it.

(5) Pedersen, Israel, its Life and Culture, 1926, I, II, p.212; cf. also pp.182-212.
imparts the strength of his blessing to others, for it radiates from him, and the weaker man joins himself to him to acquire a share of this creative energy. It was thought particularly appropriate for children to receive such a blessing, and the parental blessing of their children became a Jewish sabbath custom. (1) The blessing of the holy man was particularly sought, and in the estimation of many contemporaries, Jesus came into this category. The evangelists give prominence to his touch; even his garments can convey his blessing. The disciples form a psychic community around him, sharing in the power that comes from him; and his blessing is that which will enable them to accomplish the purpose to which they are called. Eric F.F. Bishop recalls that when Sadhu Sundar Singh visited the Near East, there was a repetition of the bringing of children to the holy man, ordinary people adopting a similar attitude to the guardians of the children in this passage. "If any story rings true to Palestine ... it is this." (2)

The Talmudic passage cited by Jeremias, therefore, highlights one rabbinic expression of this Jewish practice of blessing. It does not prove that the incident occurred on the Day of Atonement.

(b) Was the Day of Atonement in the minds of the gospel writers? In Mark, the blessing of the children occurs on the journey through Judaea towards Jerusalem (cf. 9:39; 10:1; 10:32). The same is true of Matthew (16:21; 19:1; 20:17ff.) and of Luke (17:11; 18:31). The time of the Jerusalem visit is fixed by the Passover as the month of Nisan (March-April). The Day of Atonement, however, falls on 10 Tishri (Sept.-Oct.). The gospel writers therefore seem unaware of any connection between this pericope and the Day of Atonement,

(2) Jesus of Palestine, 1955, p.201.
although this does not rule out Jeremias' suggestion, for the arrangement of topics in this part of the gospels is thematic rather than chronological. The evangelists, in placing the episode in the journey to Jerusalem associate it with the wider context of the Passion, which in its turn involves the idea of atonement (cf. Mk.10:45), but this renders the connection with the Talmudic passage very tenuous indeed. The alternative explanation, however, that the incident arises out of the protective attitude of the disciples towards Jesus amid the tensions and pressures of his final pilgrimage, is unconvincing and seems to reflect a modern rather than an ancient attitude.\(^1\) It is more likely that they were objecting to the role that Jesus was being asked to fulfil.

Jeremias' suggestion remains interesting and valuable. The incident has a certain affinity with rabbinic practice, but the case for ascribing it to the Day of Atonement is not proven.

\(^{(c)}\) In the rabbinic tradition, the particular blessing which the scribes gave is the impetus to study the Torah. The rabbis, indeed, have many pleasant sentiments about children,\(^{(2)}\) but the underlying assumption is that if a child does not learn the Shema, the Torah and the sacred tongue from the time that he can speak, it would have been better that he had not been born.\(^{(3)}\) The gospel accounts of Jesus' action present a marked contrast. Naturally, he was aware that the children in question were children of Abraham, and that they would learn the Shema, the Torah and the sacred tongue, and there is

\(^{(1)}\) Cf. Rawlinson: "The disciples wish to spare the Master from being troubled, as one might wish to safeguard a famous man from the embarrassing solicitations of autograph hunters today": The Gospel According to St. Mark, 1925, p.136.
\(^{(3)}\) Tosefta, Hagigah 1:2.
no reason to doubt that this had his approval; but the indignation of Jesus at the disciples' action, his strong imperatives "Let the children come to me", "Do not forbid them", and his action in blessing them suggest that he was concerned to show acceptance to the children themselves. "Hardly anything is more characteristic of Jesus than his attitude to children", (1) on whom he placed "an emphatically high evaluation". (2)

Yet the incident is more complex than that. When Jesus identifies the child-like ("such") as the possessors of the kingdom, the whole incident, in its unity of word and deed, becomes a symbolic gesture in the prophetic tradition, (3) essentially similar to the "parable" of the talys. The possibility that they are doublets is ruled out by the different situations they reflect, the one being concerned with children, the other with a boy servant. Their ethos is Palestinian, their idiom Semitic; and in style and nuance they may well reflect something of the individuality of Jesus of Nazareth.

Finally, J.M. Robinson has claimed that the floating logion (Matt. 18:3; cf. Mk.10:15; Luke 18:17) illustrates a structuring tendency in the individual logia ascribed to Jesus which reflects the dialectic relation of tension inherent in the eschatological polarity of Jesus' message, (4) and helps to distinguish such logia as dominical rather than ecclesiastical. We have already found reason to question the application of theological criteria to the problem of form, (5) especially when considerations of religious phenomenology appear to be

(2) A. Oepke, T.D.N.T., art. πάπια.
(5) Vid. supra, where the matter is discussed fully in the previous chapter.
expressly omitted. It is when Jesus' procedure is recognised as basically prophetic that Robinson's contention that in his preaching and teaching he brings the hearer to confront the eschaton in the present acquires the strength of contextual and operational appropriateness. The formal structures he uses are not in themselves distinctive, but he imbues them with prophetic eschatological concern. The floating _logion_ in question can therefore be assigned to the setting of Jesus' ministry. Without discussing the _talva_ possibility, Robinson concludes that "the Matthaean variant" represents the older form, partly because it is the more Semitic (following Jeremias, not Black) and partly because it is reflected in John 3:2, 5 and Justin, Apol.1.61.4. But the Markan (Lukan) form contains an interesting rabbinic type expression, "receive the kingdom of God", which is pressed into service in the subordinate clause of the "entrance saying". This form is therefore no less Semitic and no less contextually appropriate; and since it is in fact the more distinctive and difficult of the two versions, it may be the older. Robinson's assumption that the Markan (Lukan) form is a baptismal formula will be examined below.

The child _pericopae_ in the Church.

The story of "the blessing of the children" occurs in Mark as part of a series of teaching units dealing with divorce (Mk.10:1-12), children (vv.13-16) and possessions (vv.17-31), comprising what

---

(1) _Vid. supra_, on Paraenesis and cf. Erubin 13b, Shabbat 127a.
(2) This is true also of the beatitudes, where in certain Jewish circles their formal structure was already influenced by eschatology or apocalyptic: cf. Tobit (LXX) 13:15b.f. (13:14 RSV).
(3) Art. cit., p.279.
Jeremias calls "a little catechism" for use within the Church. The catechetical material on children is designed to help Christian parents carry out their responsibility to bring their children to the Saviour. On the other hand, Matt.18:1-5 is part of an extensive series of teaching units on the theme of discipleship. These pericopae have, however, been assigned to more specialised teaching contexts, and a discussion of these is important for the understanding of how paradosis operated in the early Church.

(a) As the Markan catechism indicates, the child pericopae were applied naturally to the acceptance, care and nurture of children within the Church. Children raised several problems for the Church from the earliest times. There was the problem of children of mixed marriages (cf. 1 Cor.7). In Paul's discussion, the position of a child of such a union was not in dispute: it was axiomatic that the child of a believing parent was ἱγνώς, and Paul assumed that the Corinthians must think likewise. This axiom may, in fact, be compounded of several elements, such as particular notions of the operation of the "holy"; but the strength of Paul's assurance may well derive from dominical paradosis such as that under review here, which set forth unequivocally the Lord's acceptance of young children.

E. Trocmé has made the interesting suggestion that Mark may have had the missionary situation in mind. While the missionary gave up most worldly things for his calling, the evangelists play down the necessity for him to leave his wife (cf. Mk.10:29f.; Luke 18:29; but contrast Matt.19:29). Consequently, the presence of young children

(2) Cf. Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians (ICC), 1911, p.142.
in the missionary household may well have caused some embarrassment or objection in the early Church. Mark takes the child *pericopae* as emphasising the appropriate attitude to such children and as indicating that the missionary should not be separated from them.\(^{(1)}\)

Another aspect of the child problem arose from pagan society. The extent to which child exposure and infanticide were practised in the Graeco-Roman world is well known and fully documented.\(^{(2)}\) "The exposition of children was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity", wrote Gibbon; and again: "the Roman empire was stained with the blood of infants".\(^{(3)}\)

The Church from the beginning refused to condone such practices and in due course it was in the van of the attack. Its first duty was to cleanse its own membership of any taint of infanticide.\(^{(4)}\) Abortion and infanticide were equated with murder.\(^{(5)}\) Justin Martyr condemned infanticide as "wicked" an offence to man and God. He pointed to its results: a life of prostitution for the child who survived, and an increasing pool of vice in every nation.\(^{(6)}\) Tertullian and Lactantius\(^{(7)}\) continued the protest, and a council at Ancyra in A.D. 314 imposed a ten years' penance upon women who "commit fornication and destroy that which they have conceived, or who are employed in making drugs for abortion".\(^{(8)}\) Finally, the constant pressure exerted by the Church, allied to enlightened pagan opinion, made

\(^{(3)}\) *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, XLIV; cf. XIV.
\(^{(4)}\) Barnabas 19:5; Didache 5:2.
\(^{(5)}\) *Ibid.*; cf. Athenagoras, *Embassy for the Christians*, 35; Clem. Alex. Paed. 2.10.96; 3.4.30; *Strom.* 2.18.92.
infanticide a crime liable to the heaviest penalties under the Cornelian law. Linguistically, it is difficult to prove a direct connection between the child *pericopae* and this issue. For example, the father acknowledged his child and thus saved it from exposure by lifting it up (*ἀναγκάλισθαι*). (1) This verb, however, does not occur in the child *pericopae*. Twice Mark uses *ἀναγκάλισθαι*, which might suggest "putting one’s arm around" (2) someone, rather than "lifting up", although in the case of young children the latter sense is regular.

By the nature of the action, it implies acknowledgement and acceptance (cf. *δέχεσθαι*, Mk.9:37 and par.). It may well be that the Church, in its constant struggle against infanticide and its attendant ills, found in the child *pericopae* a direct "word of the Lord" on this subject, but the linguistic differences suggest that they were neither invented nor shaped to meet this situation.

(b) As the floating _logion_ in its dual form (Matt.18:3; Mk.10:15) indicates, the _παιδίον_ was used as a model for adult emulation in some sense, both by Jesus and the early Church. There is undoubtedly a "servant" tradition in the gospels, indicative of the development of a _διάκονος_ goal (e.g., Mk.10:43; Jn.13:12-16); and as we have seen, Matt.18:3 may have belonged to or been associated with this strand of teaching. But it is the child model that is developed extensively in the early Church, especially in relation to regeneration, the new life in Christ. The dominical tradition itself appears to be concerned with the renunciation of adult self-sufficiency (Matt.18:3; MK.

---

(1) Cf. Plutarch, _Anton._ 36:3; P. Cxy. 37.6f. describe how a boy foundling was literally picked up from the gutter. By a natural development, the word comes to mean "adopt" (Acts 7:21).

(2) άνακάλη denotes the bent arm and is frequently used to denote anything closely enfolding: L&S _ad loc._ However, άναγκάλισθαι (άναγκαλίσθαι) meant in Homer "to lift up in the arms", and this notion cannot be denied to άναγκάλισθαι: cf. L&S, A&G, _ad loc._
cf. Mk.10:15) and the return to a new starting-point, like a child at the beginning of life. At this point, the metaphor diversifies in early Christian teaching. Basic to it is the idea of the sinlessness of the child. (1) Thus, Barnabas (6:11) speaks of those forgiven by Christ as being of a new type, having "the souls of children, as though he were creating us anew". Paul himself defined precisely the sense in which the Corinthians should be like children: not in their thinking but in relation to evil (1 Cor.14:20). Hermas receives the exhortation to "be sincere and simple-minded, and you will be like little children, who do not know the wickedness that destroys the life of men". (2) 1 Peter, on the other hand, thinks not only of the child as being free of malice, guile and other evil but as longing for true nourishment, which comes from the kindness of the Lord (2:1ff.). There is clear evidence, therefore, of a ἴδια ταύτησι or similar formula used as a salvation motif, linked with a concept of saving grace, forgiveness, turning from evil, or nurture, and suggesting the genuine simplicity and openness of the pure in heart. All such paraenesis is influenced by paradosis and reflects the understanding of human existence given in the child περικοπαί.

Thus Clement of Alexandria wrote:

"The Lord himself makes clear the intention of what was said, when he says: 'Unless you turn and become as these children, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven'. Here he is not speaking allegorically of regeneration, but is commending to us for imitation the simplicity of children". (3)

To present this paradosis as essentially setting forth a particular quality for imitation has its dangers. It is close to mere moralism

(1) For rabbinic parallels, cf. Tanhuma, Ber. 7; Rab. Anth., p.301f.; Str.-B. IV, 469.
(3) Paed. 1.5.12.
and fails to reflect the element of response so central to Jesus' teaching. The moralism of works is explicit in the Similitudes of Hermas, where the writer's commentary on the child *pericopae* suggests that the childlike live in the kingdom of God "because they have not by any act profaned God's commands" (9:29.1-5). Both Clement and Hermas have a close knowledge of the *verba insissima* of the "child" *paradosia* but neither convincingly represent its true intention. Hence the essence of Christian *paradosia* lies not in the mere transmission and reproduction of words or formulae - "the letter kills" might be cited here - but in the transmission and interpretation of the fundamental meaning and intention. (1)

Hence it was undoubtedly an authentic insight which led John to express the "entrance saying" explicitly in terms of regeneration (3:5; cf. 3:3). (2) By abandoning the verbal form of the traditional protasis and exercising his prophetic freedom to lay hold of other forms of expression, John preserves the regenerative nuance of the *paradosia*. Instead of the rabbinic "receiving the kingdom as a child" (Mk.10:15; Lk.18:17) or the Semitic ἐστιν ἡ ματια (Matt.18:3), he works with the notion of "birth from above" (3:3), which is clarified, with the help of Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus, in terms of a new birth "by water and the Spirit" (3:5). (3) The specific reference is to birth "of the flesh" and birth "of the Spirit" (3:6), both of which are necessary for the

---

(2) Cf. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John, 1971, p.135, n.4. The concept of "the kingdom of God" occurs nowhere else in John. Bultmann claims that John's version or the source he used represents a hellenistic form of the dominical saying.
(3) It may well be that the abandonment of the earlier Semitic forms of the protasis had already occurred in hellenistic circles and that John's contribution was to transform "the idea of 'being begotten from above'", which was in the source he was using, into "the idea of 'rebirth'": cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.136, note.
concept of regeneration. While we reject Jeremias' arguments from linguistic circumstance\(^1\) that a reference to baptism is necessarily entailed here, his statement of the actual meaning cannot be faulted: "a complete new beginning of life is the precondition of anyone's finding admission under the rule of God".\(^2\) Thus *paradosis* is preserved not through literalism but by careful exegesis and interpretation which penetrates to the intention of the *logion* and expresses more fully its understanding of human existence in relation to the reign of God. In the continuing transmission of *paradosis*, this Johannine or hellenistic form is reproduced by Justin,\(^3\) carefully retaining the Semitic apodosis, and also by Clement of Alexandria, who knows both traditions.\(^4\)

(c) The connection of the child *periconae* or *logia* with baptism has been argued for by a number of scholars and assumed by others.\(^5\) A distinction must be made between the rite of baptism as the *Sitz im Leben* of some or all of these passages and their application to infant baptism. Some observations have already been offered on the first question. The *pericona* are interpreted in terms of regeneration, and the earliest explicit applications of them to baptism, apart from a passage in Tertullian which is something of a special case,\(^6\) are to be found in the Apostolic Constitutions (6.15.5) and the Pseudo

---


\(^3\) Apol. 1.61.4.

\(^4\) *Protrepticus* 9.62. It is also reflected in the Pseudo Clementine Homilies 11.26.2 and Recognitions, 6.9.


\(^6\) *De Baptismo* 18:5 resists the application of this passage to child baptism. It may well be that the use of the "blessing of the children" *pericope* was first applied to baptism only in connection with the growing demand for infant baptism in Tertullian's day.
Clementine Homily (11.26.2). The confident conclusion may be drawn that the child pericopae as they stand in the New Testament carried no baptismal overtones - the evidence for their use in that connection is much too late - but possibly some of their derivatives (cf. John 3:3, 5) carry the merest suggestion of baptismal practice. When baptismal controversy about the administration of the rite to children flared up, as it did in Tertullian's time, isolated elements of the passages were frequently cited for the purposes of argument: for example, "let them come to me; forbid them not" (as well as quotations wrested from wholly different types of context, such as "give to everyone who begs from you"),\(^1\) and the manner of their use indicates the secondary applications of the passage to this theme. There appears in fact to be a progression in the use of these pericopae through the notion of regeneration to the question of baptism. It should be noted that the closer the various passages are tied to Matt.18:3, the less likely it is that they can apply to the baptism of young children: only adults can "turn about and become as children".

Another element in them that has been treated in abstraction is the phrase "hinder them not", which has been taken as evidence that the "Jesus and the children" pericope was bound up with the practice of infant baptism.\(^2\) Cullmann in particular argued that the frequency with which this term occurred in a baptismal context (cf. Acts 8:36), suggested that it was in fact a technical term from a baptismal formula, in which the question was put: τι κολύτε; and the answer was: οὔτεν κολύει or ἔστιν (Acts 8:37).\(^3\) This baptismal formula "gleams through" the story of Jesus and the children. Though

\(^{1}\) Cf. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 83f.
it had originally nothing to do with baptism, "those who transmitted this story ... wished to recall to the remembrance of Christians of their time an occurrence by which they might be led to a solution of the question of infant baptism". (1)

If Cullmann's contention is correct, then neither Mark nor Luke can be regarded as typical of "those who transmitted this story", for their inclusion of the floating logion gives the pericope a different nuance and indicates that they were not thinking of infant baptism here. The emphasis in the pericope is on the verba Christi, rather than on the act of blessing as such. (2) Moreover, as Aland indicated, the preponderate use of καθεσμόν in the New Testament has nothing to do with baptism. "Only where baptism is expressly mentioned does an interpretation of καθεσμόν as a terminus technicus for baptism seem possible to me". (3)

Admittedly, this pericope occurs in baptismal controversy at least by the end of the second century, but even if it had been used earlier in this connection it need not have been applied only to infant baptism. Tertullian uses it in connection with baptism in later childhood or adolescence. (4) While the Lukan use of τι (ἐβεβήν) (18:15) might argue for infant baptism in this context, to account for Luke's terminology by appeal to infant baptism alone is to work on the basis of mere assumption.

The argument, therefore, that this pericope was used in the early Church primarily as a sanction for infant baptism, falls short of proof. It does not appear to have been shaped by baptismal

(1) Ibid., p.78.
(2) Mark's description of the act of blessing is curtailed by Matthew and omitted by Luke.
(4) De Baptismo, 18:5.
considerations, but its subsequent use in baptismal contexts suggests that the understanding of human existence and of dominical practice which it enshrined contributed to the interpretation of the baptismal sacrament.

(d) That the transmission of paradosis consists of more than the mere presentation of verbal formulae is indicated - in addition to the case argued above that the preservation of meaning involves interpretation and, if necessary, the expansion or alteration of the external form - by the fact that heretical groups, who deliberately preserved a recognisable impression of the traditional form, frequently destroyed the paradosis by imposing an interpretation incompatible with its authentic meaning. For example, the Martyrdom of Peter contains the following passage: (1)

"Unless you make the right as the left, the left as the right, the upper as the lower, and the back as the front, you will not know the kingdom."

The tradition is recognisable in the overall structure and in the apodosis in particular, where the introduction of the verb "know" (significantly) is the only important alteration. The transformation of the protasis is effected by means of gnostic speculations: Peter's crucifixion position reproduces the head-down posture of primaeval man in his flight from heaven to earth and symbolises the corresponding transvaluations essential to the mature gnostic. The paradosis has been destroyed because its basic understanding of human existence and of Christology has been replaced by an alien gnostic motif. Essentially the same interpretation is offered in the various forms that occur in the Acts of Philip. (2) Gnosticizing speculation is pushed

---

(1) Martyrium Petri 9:40.
(2) Acta Philippi 54 in the Gamma, Theta and Delta texts.
even further in the Gospel of Thomas. Here the "entrance saying"
from the child pericopae is interpreted in terms of the bisexuality of
the primal man, whose image the regenerate Gnostic receives. (1)

"The result is a logion all but transformed beyond recognition,
were it not that the hint provided by the basic structure is confirmed
by the introduction, in which it becomes clear that the logion grew
out of the saying about the children". (2)

The preservation of part of the original tradition more or less intact
is irrelevant to the authenticity of the total logion, for the
criterion of that authenticity is to be found neither in the literal
preservation of the logion nor in its freedom from interpretative
licence but precisely in the extent to which it transmits an under¬
standing of human existence consonant with that presented by Jesus in
word and action, in life and death. When that criterion is met, the
paradosis is proclaimed as the authentic word of the living Lord. (3)

(1) Cf. J.N. Robinson, The Formal Structure of Jesus' Message, in
(2) Ibid., p.109.
(3) In the Church, paradosis remains an important if controversial
function. J.A. Fichtner rightly indicates that the crux of the
R.C.-Reformed Church debate lies in "the question of the inter¬
relation of scripture, tradition, and the Church" (N.C.E., in
loc.). Our study has concentrated upon the early traditions,
prior to written tradition and canon, and later developments can¬
ot be traced in detail here. R.C. theologians place emphasis
on the Church as the bearer of tradition, through the Fathers, the
faithful, the liturgy and the magisterium; on the developmental
aspect of tradition, which led to the definitions of doctrines
such as the Immaculate Conception (1854), papal infallibility
(1870) and the Assumption of Mary (1950); and on the comple¬
mentary nature of scripture and tradition (cf. the Council of Trent,
1546), divine revelation having an oral and written presentation
by the Church (cf. Vatican Council II, 1962). But the Reformed
churches do not escape the dilemma of paradosis. The principle
of sola scriptura has its dangers if used in isolation. The
dependence of scripture on early oral tradition has been under¬
lined by the formgeschichtliche Schule and by modern scholarship
in general; and while the primacy of scripture must be safe¬
guarded, it is widely recognised that some place must be given to
the continuing witness and interpretation of the Church. At any
rate, paradosis, like our other main categories, represents a
continuing concern in the contemporary Church (cf. R.F.C. Hanson,
KERYGMA AND DIDACHE

CONCLUSIONS
It now remains briefly to draw together the elements of _kerygma_ and _didache_ that have been discussed in the previous chapters by relating them to the crucible of early church life and experience in which they were fashioned and refined, and by considering their nature in the light of the foregoing analysis. Our discussion may be conveniently condensed under various headings relating to the experience of the early Christian communities.

(i) **Their experience of Jesus of Nazareth.** Throughout the spectrum of community life and practice and theological or evangelical understanding, the early Christian communities were united in preserving a vital link with Jesus of Nazareth through the witness of those who had been his close associates and disciples. The community of disciples gathered round Jesus is a focus of attention in all four gospels, and Luke's definition of "the twelve" includes their witness to the ministry of Jesus (Acts 1:21f.). That the disciples' understanding of Jesus was revised from time to time and finally underwent radical revision strengthens rather than weakens the significance of their experience and memory of him.

"One way of describing the Church is to say that it is the community which remembers Jesus; but one can equally truly define Jesus (in the only significant meaning of that name for the Christian) as the one who is remembered. It is only as he is remembered that he has meaning for either Christian theology or Christian devotion. In a word, the human existence of Jesus, insofar as it has continuing being and importance, is a memory of the Church." (2)

(1) Cf. Mk.1:16-20 (a pericope placed at the beginning of Jesus' ministry; Matt.4:18-22; Lk.5:1-11; Jn.1:35-51; also Mk.6:7-11 par.

(2) J. Knox, _The Church and the Reality of Christ_. 1963, p.50, quoted here because it expresses in a potent way the importance of the memory of Jesus in the Church. The weakness in Knox's position - the compromising of the possibility of conceiving of the historical Jesus apart from the Church's interpretation - is to be frankly recognised: cf. H. Anderson, _op. cit._, pp.107-114; R.S. Barbour, _op. cit._, p.44 refers to Knox's position as "this plausible but disastrously dangerous doctrine".
The concept of memory is of vital importance in this context. Our memories of the past are highly selective: much experience is apparently dismissed or buried in the sub-conscious. But significant experience impinges on the consciousness and memory, and the more permanent the significance the more open to reinterpretation and restatement the recollection becomes. The process of memory is thus inseparable from interpretation. The selection of an incident as memorable or unforgettable (even when the selection is virtually forced on one by the nature of the experience) is itself part of the interpretative process; and the conscious mind continues to explore such data for as long as they retain their significance. The developments associated with the Church's memory of Jesus — e.g., as expressed in Christology — are but extreme examples of this process: extreme, because the person remembered was of such decisive significance and because the subsequent experiences of his followers impinged weightily upon their appreciation of his significance and so upon their memory of him. Thus his life and ministry are inseparable from his death and are remembered in the light of it; his life, ministry and death are inseparable from his resurrection and are remembered in the light of it.

The equally important converse is that this process of developmental understanding is rendered possible only because of the impact of the historical Jesus upon his followers. The gospel has its roots in the disciples' experience of Jesus in the days of his ministry, when even within the community he formed around him he stood clearly over against them as "Master", "Teacher", and provoked in them by his words and actions — by the totality of his being, so to speak — a constant questioning as to the significance and nature of his person and mission. "Christianity was born", wrote Paul Tillich, "...
the moment in which one of his followers was driven to say to him, 'Thou art the Christ'.\(^1\) The gospel writers firmly place this confession in the context of Jesus' ministry, and the significance of this fact far outweighs historical difficulties in the Caesarea Philippi pericope. The early Christian teachers and writers recognised that it was both possible and necessary to "read back" Christian origins into the life of Jesus, and while they did so in the light of the resurrection faith with all that it entailed they also differentiated the situations in various ways. This differentiation could take the form of what Wrede called the "messianic secret" in Mark; or of the disciples' slowness to understand and proneness to misunderstand; or of the developing process of mission culminating in the post-resurrection "Go therefore and make disciples ..." (Matt.28:19); or of the Christ baptized by the Spirit effecting through ministry, death and resurrection the baptism of the Church with the same Spirit. Many models are possible, and many models were utilised; but all testify to the impact of Jesus upon the disciples in that primal community.

In fact, their "reading back" corresponds in no small degree to his "pointing forward", and the articulation of their message to the earlier articulation of his. His propheteia proclaimed the defeat of Satan and called for repentance in face of the actualisation of the kingdom. Their propheteia proclaimed similar eschatological realities in the light of the death and resurrection of the Messiah. His propheteia involved communion with the Father; their propheteia involved communion with the Son, and through the Son with the Father.

---

\(^1\) Systematic Theology II, 1953, p.112. Significantly, Knox transfers this moment to the resurrection experiences: op. cit., p.78.
But their propheteia is possible because of him; not because of his propheteia alone but of his total impact upon them and significance for them. His paraclisis or homiletic practice demonstrated from scripture the eschatological approach of God to man; theirs demonstrated this approach in the event of Christ — "proving from the scriptures that he was truly the Christ". This is again dependent on their awareness of his impact upon them, as well as on their memory of his exegesis of the scriptures. His paraenesis remained in their memory as paradosis but as paradosis that was active and illuminating, not a passive deposit; and their paraenesis included the transmission and use of this paradosis in order to convey the basic understanding of human existence which he had given them. But this paradosis included much more than his verbal paraenesis. Every event in his ministry was a "teaching"; hence the evolution of paraenetic forms expressing and illustrating "the mind of Christ" from individual situations in his ministry and in terms directed to the early Christian context.

One conclusion of our research must therefore be the impossibility of excising the historical Jesus from Christian experience or from the Christian message. The fact that he becomes available to us through the Church's memory of him does not render any less significant the objective fact of his existence or, still more, his standing over against the Church — both pre- and post-resurrection — as Master and Lord. He is never swallowed up in the Church's work of interpretation; he always remains sovereign. (1) The creative impulse in the expression of the gospel in all its major aspects is derivative from Jesus' own practice and from his total impact upon his followers.

None of the spiritual experiences that fell to them is credible apart from the initial data of experience with which he provided them and which were capable of progressive or subsequent exploration and reinterpretation.

(ii) Their experience of the Risen Christ.

The memory of the early Church embraced not only the disciples' recollection of Jesus of Nazareth whom they confessed to be Christ, but also their experience of the Risen Christ. This was encapsulated within Christian paradosis in terms of their martyria or witness to him. Their total "memory" of him thus included two distinguishable but closely linked elements. The resultant distinction within continuity is well attested by Luke's statement of apostolic qualifications (Acts 1:22; cf. 10:39, 41), but the two-fold experience befall a larger number than the hypothetical "Twelve" since there had to be an election from suitably qualified candidates. The witness to the resurrection can be referred to a relatively large company of witnesses, although in the gospels there is a strong tendency to restrict the number, no doubt for dogmatic or theological reasons. (1) In an expanding Church, however, immediate personal experience of this kind was denied to a growing number of people: in some circles it was even stated that no further appearances of this primary kind were possible after the Ascension. (2) The deficiency was made good by the paradosis that conveyed the essential witness. Paul himself was dependent on such paradosis for his knowledge of Jesus, even if by

(1) Cf. 1 Cor. 15:5-8, esp. v.6. Apart from the Emmaus story, Luke has "the eleven ... and those who were with them" (24:33) and includes "the women and Mary the mother of Jesus" and "his brothers" (Acts 1:14). The tendency, however, (apart from Paul) is to emphasise the unique witness of the disciples and their close associates, but this is still wider than "the Twelve".

(2) Cf. the Lukan understanding of "apostle" as opposed to the Pauline.
special dispensation he became a witness to the risen Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8ff.). Yet such is the nature of paradosis in operation that the recipient is not placed in the position of a second class citizen within the Church, for paradosis comes "from the Lord" and lays the foundation of salvation. A disadvantage appears only if one has pretensions to apostolic office, for the apostle - if Luke is to be trusted in his interpretation - is considered to be a contributor to the witness which the paradosis enshrines in its two-fold basic christological aspects, rather than as dependent on derivative knowledge in either of these spheres: hence Paul's insistence, albeit apologetically, on his own experience. This apart, the early Christian understanding of the issue is clear: "blessed are those who have not seen yet have believed" (Jn.20:29).

Thomas, because he had "seen", believed. The resurrection is then primarily a matter of belief: that is, essentially the response of faith to the crucified Christ as Lord. The apostolic martyria points to the primal, apostolic response of faith, which occurs in the context of visual experience of the Risen Lord: it is a seeing-believing, but it is none the less an act of belief for all that, as Matthew appears to hint in his narrative (28:17). The verbal symbol ἔρχεται suggests the language of epiphany, as in the Septuagint; and the language of epiphany points to a disclosure of God in action for those who have eyes to see. The total apostolic experience is thus a seeing-believing-understanding. Only in this sense does the unfortunate but frequent description of the resurrection as "a fact" have validity.

The disciples' experiences of the Risen Christ can therefore be conceived as a specific, identifiable element in the whole chain of experiences by which they came to confess him as both Lord and Christ. Equally, it must be recognised that if the resurrection element is viewed in complete isolation it is meaningless. Thus the antithesis of separability and inseparability is crucial to an appreciation of the resurrection in the complex of the birth of the Christian faith. Failure to recognise this has led R. Bultmann to stress almost exclusively the inseparability of cross and resurrection:

"faith in the resurrection is really the same thing as faith in the saving efficacy of the cross". (1)

Their separability is only minimally in view:

"the events of Good Friday and Easter Day are two separate events only from the standpoint of man in time; in their eschatological character they are a single indivisible event". (2)

Although the Easter faith is seen to be the means whereby the Church surmounted the scandal of the Cross, no attention is paid to the origins or stimulus of that faith. In terms of the study of Christian origins, we are left helpless at the very point where scholarly elucidation is most needed: humanly speaking, how did these bewildered men extract from the crucible of their shattered expectations materials with which to fashion a new, victorious faith? Bultmann is, of course, justified in rejecting the view which stresses the separability of the resurrection to the extent of using it as the final "fact" which decisively sets right the record of the Cross and "proves" the truth of the kerygma. His sensitivity on this point has led him unreasonably and unnecessarily to reject Paul's procedure in 1 Cor.15:3-8 as "fatal", and thus to delete part of the apostolic

(1) Kerygma and Myth I, p.41.
(2) Ibid., p.112.
martyria which was an integral part of the apostles' raison d'être as well as of Christian paradosis. The citation of their witness does not prove the validity of the resurrection faith but is an inalienable part of the preaching which from the beginning summoned men to faith and salvation (cf. 15:1ff., 11). By its very nature, the apostolic experience of the Risen Christ was not open to all (cf. Acts 10:41); hence their witness to it was essential and entered the paradosis (cf. 1 Cor.15:3-8).

J. Knox has given clear expression to the importance of the experiential aspect of the disciples' new awareness of Jesus' contemporaneity. They received or experienced the Spirit of Christ:

"the personal reality of him whom his disciples remembered together they were now experiencing together as a present fact". (1)

The verbal symbol "resurrection" is the Church's way of linking together the memory of Jesus who lived and died with the contemporary Christ who is a reality in the midst of the koinonia. The life of the Church stands in essential continuity with the resurrection faith of the disciples (of this we shall have more to say anon). For the believer, the resurrection per se is that act of God by which the Church first became aware of and experienced the contemporary power of the crucified Christ as Lord and was so launched on its manifold life and mission.

"It is the moment when after Jesus' death a group of his disciples recognise in a divine Presence wonderfully new and strange, the very one they have known and loved: 'It is the Lord' (John 21:7). In this moment of recognition the Resurrection (whatever it may be conceived to be in and of itself) became for the first time a historical fact, and the Church, which had been in process of 'becoming' since Jesus' first disciples were gathered about him, came finally into actual being." (2)

It would appear reasonable to describe such an experience as

(2) J. Knox, op. cit., p.79.
belonging to the prophetic tradition. Prophetic revelations, however, stand in a chain of experience, with experiential antecedents as well as successors. The prophetic tradition in the early Church is, at least in part, the successor to the resurrection epiphanies. The gap between "seeing" the Risen Lord after his death and "seeing" the glorified Lord apocalyptically in anticipation of the final consummation is very small, as any discussion of 1 Cor.15:8 should show; while revelations vouchsafed to Christian prophets are frequently revelations of or through Christ. Hence the resurrection appearances may be likened to the visions of the Christian mystics, although their eschatological primacy and cruciality is unquestionable. Their true antecedent, however, is not as Selwyn suggested the disciples' awareness of the empty tomb but their experience of Jesus of Nazareth whom they had already confessed, albeit haltingly, as the Christ. In this prophetic denouement, the power of Jesus as Messiah and Lord is revealed to them experientially, transcending what had seemed the terminus of his death by the renewal and deepening of their fellowship with Jesus and transforming the negative of that death into the triumphant positive of the Cross as saving power: all this and more is included in this supreme epiphany, communicated through the complex objectivity-subjectivity of prophetic awareness.

The nature and operation of the resurrection faith directly affected the formation and preservation of Christian paradosis. As the memory of the past relationship to Jesus was the prerequisite of participating directly in the primal visual experience which inaugurated the new, deeper relationship (cf. Acts 10:41), so now the latter

---

(1) E.G. Selwyn, The Resurrection, in Essays Catholic and Critical, 1926.
(2) See Appendix 'C'.
(3) See Appendix 'C'.
established a new and later standpoint from which all previous memories were scrutinised and revised. The reconstituted Church, while sharing this common standpoint, was aware of the emergent two-fold perspective on Jesus (i.e., the contemporary awareness of the risen Christ, and the recollection of Jesus of Nazareth) and of the necessity to recount its experiences both for mutual edification in the further quest for meaning and for the instruction and induction of new members into the Christian communities. Hence Christian paradosis comprehended the transmission, as appropriate, of Jesus' teaching in word and action and the narration of these events and experiences which led up to the reconstitution of the Church; but inevitably, as we have seen, these two strands influenced each other. The former was presented as the sayings and doings of the confessed Messiah and Lord; the latter was influenced by the memory of him who sat at table with publicans and sinners, who showed compassion to the needy and contended with the religiously conventional and the religiously arrogant. The resurrection cycle also possessed affinities with other epiphany narratives that eventually found their way into the gospels - the baptism and transfiguration narratives in particular; but since it consisted of various "witness" accounts supplemented by sundry legendary accretions, (2) it never attained the formal regularity or consistency of the passion narratives. But the paradosis about "the things concerning Jesus" was not merely informational. It did supply essential data: that is one function of didache. It also had its kerygmatic emphasis, its proclamation of "gospel": the good news.

(1) So P. Tillich, op. cit., pp.156ff.
(2) Such as the empty tomb stories (more than one: cf. Mk.16:1-8; Jn.20:11-18); the resurrection of the saints (with appropriate appearances: Matt.27:52f.); the bribing of the soldiers (Matt. 26:11-15).
of a saving event wrought by God in space and time, the focus of which
was Jesus, Messiah and Lord. Hence the emergence in due course of
"gospels", drawing heavily on this very paradosis (cf. Mk.1:1); hence
also Paul's gospel of salvation which draws no less heavily on the
paradosis which he had received and delivered to his churches "as of
prime importance" (1 Cor.15:3). Finally, paradosis with its intimate
relation to "gospel" is seldom merely historical or biographical,
merely descriptive, merely legendary or mythological: it is "unto
edification", presenting the hearer with the option of identifying
with Christ, of "having the same mind as was in Christ Jesus" - of
being crucified and rising to new life "in Christ".

(iii) Their experience of the Spirit.

In the primitive Palestinian-hellenistic communities of the
Church, pervasive apocalypticism abundantly testifies to pneumatic
activity or to what E. Käsemann has called "post-Easter enthusiasm". (1)
Jewish Christian apocalyptic, which contributed to the first articula-
tion of the resurrection faith, also fostered early Christology and
ecclesiology, both of which stand in the paradoxical relationship of
continuity through discontinuity with the person of Jesus and the
disciples' community of pre-crucifixion days. In the intensely
hasidic, prophetic koinonia of the post-Easter period, Jesus is seen
as the Son of Man whose coming in glory as Judge is imminent and
before whom the life of discipleship and witness must be lived out in
the interim (cf. Mk.8:38). The dying Stephen, in an access of the
Spirit, proclaimed: "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of
Man standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7:55f.). The primitive

(1) On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic, in New
hellenistic Jewish community had thus inherited basic Christological concepts from its Palestinian brethren. The corresponding ecclesiology represents the self-understanding of the community expressed in an eschatological frame of reference and in terms derived from Judaism: the holy remnant of Israel, the people of the new covenant, the community of the Spirit who manifests himself in ecstasy, healing, exorcism and judgment. Within this community, the apostles, the "pillars", the "Twelve", the prophets exercise authority in the name of the Lord whose divine rule is mediated through them. Yet this community of the last days found a significant forerunner in the earlier community of disciples gathered round Jesus. It too was the "Twelve", with perhaps three main pillars; it too focused upon Jesus and in his name preached the message of the kingdom and cast out devils. In the light of Easter, early Christian prophecy now took up those tantalizingly open, future orientated hints of Jesus himself and explored them and gave new expression to them in the post-Easter situation. Consequently, the memory of Jesus' words and works underwent the process of reinterpretation and re-presentation which is evident in its final expression in the gospels. Cases in point are the Son of Man sayings and the Passion narratives, which are coloured to a greater or lesser extent by post-Easter apocalyptic. Moreover, the ministry of Jesus is conceived in a way which suggests the heightening of those pneumatic elements which were doubtless present in his activities but which are even more characteristic of primitive Church life. He was "a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst" (Acts 1:22). Mark makes use of the appropriate aretalogies but in the light of a more mature eschatology he seems concerned to correct the primitive over-emphasis on Jesus as a wonder-worker. Luke also possesses a fully worked out eschatological
framework in which, however, the operation of the Spirit retains an important place. Matthew reveals in his eschatological viewpoint the influence of a strong ecclesiology. Hence the gospels provide evidence of the acceptance of the data of pneumatology in relation to Jesus and the whole Christ event, but they modify and refine its elements in accordance with the purposes of the evangelists.

Prophetic elements in Johannine circles give impetus to the development of a refined rather than a crudely primitive eschatology, in which the quasi-magical operation of the sacrament, still discernible "between the lines" as it were, has been controlled by the grammar of the word of Christ as gracious summons and the response of man in love and obedience. This eschatology is therefore informed by paradosis operating kerygmatically and didactically, and it includes a dialectic of past, present and future, together with the christological paradox of continuity and discontinuity. Thus, Jesus must "depart out of this world" (Jn.13:1), yet his disciples will not be left ὑπὸνομος: "I will come to you" (14:18). They will see what the world, rejoicing at his departure (16:20) cannot see (14:19); they will "see" him in the communion they will have, through the sacraments and loving devotion, with the Father and the Son (14:23). This mystery is clarified by the sending of the παράκλητος (14:26), the Counsellor and Helper, in the Father's name. His function has a two-fold expression: to "teach you all things", a phrase which suggests that the disciples' explorations, searchings and questionings will be capped by the insights born of the Spirit; and to "bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you", a phrase underlining the importance of memory, of dominical paradosis, as interpreted by the Spirit. Thus pneumatic disclosure situations and tradition interpreted accordingly present a formidable twin strand in early Christian experience as understood in the Fourth Gospel. The
twin strand is in fact so interwoven that the inherent discontinuity of the historical Jesus with the Church is wholly submerged in the contemporary Lord who speaks directly through the evangelist as the Resurrection and the life. Whatever elements of paradosis were drawn into this prophetic crucible serve - when they reappear in the new product - to present the anti-docetic, christological motif of the gospel or to develop a particular doctrinal nuance. To "keep my commands" - a basic imperative in the Fourth Gospel - means not so much "keep the teaching I formerly gave you" as "keep the commands I am giving now". Thus the experience of the Spirit or Christian prophecy contributed largely to the articulation and shaping of the Johannine tradition.

Paul, also standing in the prophetic tradition by virtue of his calling, strongly subjects pneumatic experience to kerygmatic and didactic control. Not only is "boasting" of "visions and revelations" unprofitable (cf. 2 Cor.12:1ff.) - for the apostle's calling is not to boast but to preach the gospel - but the "spirits of prophets" are to be subject to apostolic didache (1 Cor.14:33). Yet, as H. Käsemann has shown, Paul was engaged in a complicated and far-reaching reinterpretation of eschatological data. The pneumatology of Corinth so stressed the present salvation effected in baptism as to eliminate all thought of future hope and end, and thus conceived of the Christian faith as virtually a mystery religion. In reply, Paul reinforced the notion of future eschatology and exhorted his hearers to wait upon God with faith and thanksgiving (cf. 15:57) and with dedication and devotion in practical service (cf. 15:58). Here, the raw material of his didache is apocalyptic, but it is employed to modify the excesses

of pneumatology. A similar situation is provided by the Thessalonian church and Paul's response to it. In both cases, Paul offsets the emphasis on the pneumatic present as the time of realised salvation with its possibilities for pneumatic antinomianism by stressing its genomenological status: i.e., it is the time for "becoming", for "growth" as the sons of God in response to the Spirit (cf. Rom.8:14; Eph.4:15). It is the time when the earnest of salvation is known in the Spirit: the totality belongs to the future. The believer has indeed died with Christ in baptism but he is raised not to immediate perfection in the realms of glory but to the life of faith and obedience to Christ: "newness of life" (Rom.6:4). The present is the time for moral and spiritual union with Christ. It is in the future that the believer will share in the totality of the redeemed cosmos.

All this indicates the importance of the tool which Paul found in apocalyptic married to the motifs of the gospel. It possessed value only in so far as it related to paradosis (cf. 1 Cor.15:1-11), interpreted the action of God kerygmatically (i.e., it was a call for response in terms of a total reorientation of the personality to him), and was spelled out in terms of Christian paraenesis, with the emphasis on the new life. This controlled apocalyptic then became powerful didache operating against gnostic or mystery type apocalyptic and its associated excesses and contributing to the maturation of Christian theology. Other contexts which elicited apocalyptically informed didache included the problem of the delay of the parousia (cf. Mark 13) and persecution (cf. Revelation, passim).

Thus, whether we think of pneumatic experiences in general or the sacraments in particular, similar tests apply. The observation of the Lord's Supper provides the occasion for the articulation and recital of the appropriate paradosis by which the celebration and the participants
are alike guided. Baptism is interpreted kerygmatically and intimately associated with paraenesis. Pneumatic experience, if it is to be more than ecstatic revelling, is informed by Christian paradosis and results in Christian utterance or illumination. It might be said of the Christian prophet that he has received much and therefore much is expected of him.

(iv) Their experience of mission.

The mission of the Church, integrally related to its eschatology, can be divided for convenience into three phases, although a degree of overlapping and conceptual variation must be allowed. The first is that of the pristine Jewish Church - the Palestinian mission, which completes the work of the original disciples' mission in the days of Jesus' ministry and was charged with the renewal of the covenanted people in readiness for the coming of the Son of Man: "truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel before the Son of Man comes" (Matt.10:23). The second is the hellenistic Jewish mission, reaching out from Palestine into the Diaspora and probably characterised by the twin notions of the restoration of Israel and the conversion of the nations to the Zion-centred rule of God. The third is the Gentile mission. That some such divisions were accepted at least as working rules is shown by Paul's reference to his "gospel to the uncircumcised" in contrast to Peter's "gospel to the circumcised" (Gal.2:7).

In terms of the articulation of paradosis, the Palestinian mission occupies an important position, for the analogy of the mission of Jesus and his disciples and that of the Palestinian church was so close that the latter could identify with the former and the former could be identified with the latter. Hence many pericopae concerning Jesus and
his ministry can most readily be assigned to this Sitz im Leben, while the original disciples' mission is described in terms wholly appropriate to the Palestinian church mission (Mk.6:7-13; Matt.10 passim). This identity of mission produces situational doubles entendres. "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mk.9:1). What is the reference here? To the resurrection and the post-Easter power of the Spirit? Or to the Parousia? The eschatological emphasis is accompanied with manifestations of prophetic activity, such as exorcisms, baptisms as the seal of eschatological salvation and teaching material for mission purposes with strong prophetic or apocalyptic overtones (cf. Matt.10:20, 31, 41). According to Luke, the Jewish authorities regarded the Christian mission as the work of a sect or αἵρεσις (Acts 24:5, 14) of a notably pneumatic character: "by what power or in what name did you do this?" (4:7); but the pneumatic inspiration is translated into well articulated teaching. (2)

It is in the hellenistic mission that the gospel is couched in such terms as to cause consternation among or give offence to the Jews. Prophetic proclamation converts the data of visionary experience into doctrinal formulation supported by the witness of faith: "This Jesus God raised up, and of that we all are witnesses" (Acts 2:32). "He is the one ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead" (10:42). In the Palestinian mission such proclamation was caught up in the eschatological movements of the Son of Man; it was therefore acceptable in

---
(1) For convenience, the Galilean mission is treated here simply as an aspect of the Palestinian mission, although a degree of separate-ness almost certainly existed and the Galilean mission probably extended quickly to certain areas of the Diaspora.
terms of current Jewish apocalyptic. But the hellenistic mission singles out Jesus the Lord in a way that suggests his pre-eminence over Moses and the Law, so that the uniqueness, status and cultus of Israel are threatened (cf. Acts 6:11-14). The result is the painful break with the Jews, with its manifold consequences for the Christians: persecution (cf. Acts 8:1), to be countered with Christian didache on an apocalyptic basis (cf. Mk.13 passim); anti-Christian propaganda, to be countered by Christian apologetic which could use attack as the best means of defence (cf. Acts 7:1-53); the emergence of a less Jewish Christian standpoint, with the Lord in sovereign position in community life and cult, and the severance of ties with Jewish worship; and the opening of the gates to the Gentiles, though not without a tense internal struggle as to the terms of their admission to the people of God. The raw material of their concepts remained hellenistic Jewish. Thus Luke presented a refined eschatological framework in which Jerusalem was still the focal point, but the mission which develops from it is open-ended. Matthew presents his gospel in the framework of an appeal to the Jews to see Jesus as Messiah, but he too concludes his gospel on the note of universal mission ("all nations") under Jesus as sovereign Lord and Enabler until the Eschaton (28:18ff.). Both gospels also include a treatment of the Incarnation in terms derived from the wider contacts of the hellenistic Jewish world as well as from prophetic teaching within the hellenistic church. (1)

It is in the context of mission that one is to find the Sitz im Leben of Q. E. Käsemann has stressed the inadequacy of regarding this collection of teaching as originating within the community in connection with procedures of mutual edification, for it contains no

Passion material. (1) But the sayings of Jesus provide equipment for the task of mission, not least the Palestinian mission as evidenced by Matthew 10; and the material Matthew presents in the Sermon (5-7) contains overtones of the Jewish Christian milieu which may not wholly derive from the evangelist. Without advancing a simplistic solution on the lines that Matthew represents the Jewish and Luke the hellenistic version of this material, it is reasonable to hold that versions of it in various groupings circulated in both areas since the messianic interpretation of the Law was of the utmost importance to both.

The main impetus given by the Gentile mission to the articulation of the Christian faith was partly theological and partly paraenetic: theological because moving beyond the narrower confines of Judaism the Gentile mission, spearheaded by Paul whose own creative contribution was great, encountered in strength the Gnostic thought-world which necessitated the reinterpretation and re-presentation of the faith; paraenetic, because the energy and pneumatic capacity of Gentile converts had to be channelled towards "the new life in Christ" as against legalistic or antinomian tendencies. Less innovation was required in relation to the fundamental data of the faith: that was largely supplied by the established paradosis.

Thus in a many-sided way, the experience of mission represented a major impulse to the articulation of the Christian message both as kerygma and didache.

(v) Their experience of "Koinonia".

Experience of the Spirit befalls not so much individuals as the total community, the eschatological community, open to the Eschaton and to the powers of the Eschaton. Even the prophets who underwent an

apparently individualistic experience, such as John on Patmos on the Lord's Day, were essentially part of this community which they supported and by which they were supported. In the context of the primitive eschatological community, where pneumatic experience, signs and wonders abounded (2:43-47) Luke stresses the notion of radical sharing (v.44f.): "they had all things in common". This notion of sharing should be used to illuminate another of Luke's statements in the same context: "they continuously devoted themselves to the teaching of the apostles and to their fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to the prayers" (v.42).

Gerhardsson rightly emphasises that this activity is not to be understood merely as "passing on teaching" or "delivering addresses" but rather in terms of "doctrinal discussion" in which the apostles played a leading part; and further, that the discussion was based on a text of scripture and possibly paradosis concerning Christ. (1) That such discussion ran parallel in some important respects to rabbinic procedures - such as by appeal to migra or mishnah - is highly probable. One important function of the continuous study within the koinonia was the articulation and ordering of Christian midrash, the Christian interpretation of the scriptures, and this presupposed in turn the articulation and ordering of Christian paradosis concerning Jesus which shed new light on the interpretation of scripture and was correspondingly illuminated by it. It was precisely this rich tradition, affording a new midrashic standpoint in the life and ministry of the Messiah, which wholly differentiated Christian midrash from rabbinic Judaism and the Qumran sect, although in some ways it resembled the latter. (3)

(1) M.H., p.244f.
(2) Ibid., p.254f.
(3) Ibid., p.331f.
Gerhardsson's pioneer work, however, becomes one-sided when he exaggerates these suggestive parallels to the extent of describing the early Christian Church (kept ruthlessly to the singular) as an apostolic collegium; and also when, in reaction to the Form Critics, he plays down the pneumatic character of the koinonia. Neither the apostolic teaching function in Acts 2:42 nor their preaching role in Acts 6:2ff. provides a basis for the hypothesis of a collegium. On the contrary, the first passage occurs in a context in which the emphasis on koinonia presupposes a sharing, an active participation on the part of the whole community in a common search under apostolic guidance: a mutual edification, in which the insights and revelations to all believers had a place. It is as inappropriate to this context to conceive of the teaching or discussion being the preserve of a narrow apostolic coterie as it is to presuppose that only the apostles offered prayers. The early Palestinian groups are probably best described as hasidic in their pattern of behaviour rather than as resembling the gnostic pneumatic of Corinth, but in their total involvement in the koinonia of teaching and worship one may allow a fair measure of correspondence. In his later book, Gerhardsson summed up the matter in a more balanced manner:

"It would of course be a grave mistake if we were to regard the work carried out on the Word by the first Christians as a purely intellectual activity of the modern, secularized academic type. But we should be almost equally mistaken if we were to underestimate the rational mechanisms which were obviously operative in the activity of the early Church. Early Christian enthusiasm was not without its logic ..." (1)

Lest we be charged with imbalance of another kind, let it be stated that the apostles had of course an extremely important contribution, not only as preachers and leaders of devotion but as the prime

(1) T.T., p.46f.
witnesses who safeguarded basic paradosis relating to Jesus, and as regulators of the Church's message in its various stages of articulation as well as of the Church's life. What must be allowed for are the insights and the constant explorations of meaning taking place in the koinonia as a whole.

This "work on the Word", to use Gerhardsson's phrase, was derived from the practice of the original community gathered round Jesus, whose charismatic approach, which invited the designation "messianic", laid the foundations of the paradosis of Torah interpretation which came to have such a prominent place in Matthew's Sermon (cf. Matt.5:17-48) and also in anti-Pharisaic polemics (for the oral Torah had also to be reckoned with). From such dominical exegesis was also derived some understanding of eschatology and of discipleship. The next phase of this "work on the Word" was precipitated by the death of Jesus and belongs to what we might call the "embryo Church". It is accurately reflected in Luke's resurrection story set on the Emmaus road:

"O foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (24:25ff.).

Apart from the Christian concept of the Risen Christ or the Spirit of Christ as interpreting the scriptures for his followers, the focus of hermeneutical attention is upon the divine necessity for Christ to suffer and enter into glory. I am unable to follow B. Lindars in his

(1) The characteristic formgeschichtliche dilemma confronts us here: is not this earlier dominical exegesis swallowed up in Church exegesis, and is it therefore not unattainable? So far as detailed exegesis is concerned, there is some weight in this objection; but in general, a charismatic or messianic figure like Jesus in a Judaic environment could not avoid involvement in the kind of exegesis which is described in the gospels. To doubt his general responsibility for it is to conjure up a phenomenological impossibility.
isolating of the resurrection as the unquestionable datum, the starting-point for all Christian work on the scriptures.\(^{(1)}\) There is a sense, of course, in which this is true; but it obscures an important dimension of the issue, all the more so when Lindars places total emphasis on the apologetic side of scriptural interpretation. The starting-point for the earliest Christian searching of the scriptures is the death of Jesus and the desolation of the disciples, as the Emmaus story clearly indicates. The reinterpretation of the crucifixion as being in some sense "for us" is intimately associated with the dawning realisation that it was "in accordance with the scriptures" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3f.); and this realisation is equally associated with the linking up of suffering and glory,\(^{(2)}\) which in turn is bound up with the awareness that the Christ who suffered and died is in intimate contact with his disciples now — sometimes even in visual contact with them.

Given their experiences and training, it is not surprising that in their desolation the disciples should turn to scriptural study and discussion: that was a characteristic prophetic response, as the prophets of the Exile, for example, clearly demonstrate, and some of the Psalms corresponded to their mood with extraordinary precision. Hence the disciples' "work on the Word", like their experience of Jesus, partially antedates and prepares them for the momentous and mysterious complex of experiences which led to the launching of the Church's mission. These experiences not only confirmed them in their search for a positive understanding of the Cross (in this connection, Isaiah 53, Zechariah and a number of Psalms were particularly pregnant with meaning) but themselves required to be interpreted and articulated in

terms of the scripture. Thus their pentecostal access of pneumatic experience was interpreted in terms of Joel 2:28-32; their resurrection experiences in terms of Ps.16:8-11. Lindars observes:

"We have to imagine something like the commentaries discovered at Qumran, consisting of text and comment after each verse, or group of verses. The break in the Joel citation may be a sign that a comment was inserted here." (1)

The part played by such exegesis in the articulation, as distinct from the defence, of the faith is evident in the use of Ps.110:1 (cf. Acts 2:34f.). To quote Lindars once more:

"The psalm states that 'The Lord said unto my lord, Sit then on my right hand ...' The early Christian exegete supposes that, in order to sit at God's right hand, it is necessary first to go up to heaven, where God is. We may conjecture that the psalmist himself would have thought an earthly throne entirely adequate for this purpose, according to the usual conventions of the ancient 'enthronement psalms'. But the Christian assumption would undoubtedly have been shared by all disputants, as it was the normal idea in late Judaism. Therefore the words cannot apply to David himself, who only sat on an earthly throne and died a natural death. But Jesus passed from death to life. God raised him up through the gate of death to the place at his right hand. He is actually enthroned there, as literally as such a phrase will allow without degenerating into crude anthropomorphism. It is a risen and ascended Lord who has been seen by chosen witnesses. On account of this literal fulfilment of Ps.110:1, Jesus can be styled 'Lord' (LXX)."

The interpretation of scripture had therefore an extremely important influence on the articulation and development of Christian doctrine - not least on Christology and eschatology. If Psalm 110:1 encouraged the articulation of Christological meaning in terms of exaltation or ascension, Hosea 6:2 - "on the third day he will raise us up" (LXX: ἀναστησόμεθα) - encouraged the language of resurrection and the use of the motif of "the third day". Mark consistently applies this verb to the resurrection of Jesus (8:31; 9:31; 10:34), although he prefers the formula "after three days". Luke also uses ἀναστήσει three times

---

(1) Op. cit., p.37. Lindars does not mean, of course, that actual commentaries were written but that there grew up a tradition of commentary on specific texts.

(18:33; 24:7, 46), but in his parallel to Mk.8:31 he substitutes ἐστάνει (9:22), the verb Matthew consistently prefers. The verb ἐστάνει was used in Sirach (48:4) of raising a corpse from death and Hades and a similar use is found, though in a negative sense, in II Kings 4:31. It was also used in the LXX of the future resurrection of the dead (Is.26:19; Dan.12:2). Its concreteness possibly appealed to the early Christians. (1) It suggests the rousing of the dead as from sleep (2) and is used of Jesus' raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk.5:41). It is possibly preferred eventually as the more theologically appropriate word, ascribing the resurrection to the act of God in raising Jesus. Propositions to the effect that ἐστάνει, as possibly more true to Hebrew conceptuality, was therefore the earlier form while ἐστάνει and cognate forms sprang from the Greek-speaking Church are no more than assumptions. In fact, Hosea 6:2 would appear from a very early point to have contributed to the interpretation of the disciples' post-crucifixion experiences and may well have been associated with a logion of Jesus recalled with particular pungency at this time. What can hardly be disputed is that the resurrection was "in accordance with the scriptures" and therefore understood and articulated in the light of them. This concept was first developed within the koinonia. Once this meaning has been established, it becomes with the Cross (the death of Jesus interpreted by faith) the focus of the Christian proclamation, but it is never abstracted from the context of the visionary appearances that, together with the death of Jesus, provided basic data for interpretation. Therefore, the apostolic martyrria cannot be eliminated from the kerygma. The resurrection

faith, thus articulated, was kerygmatically propounded in the context of mission and was also a theologumenon capable of further refinement in discussion and teaching within the established koinonia and in mission work. Such refinements are in evidence throughout the New Testament, not least in Luke, John and Paul.\(^1\) Equally, the material was shaped for apologetic ends, to refute those who sought to discredit the central claims of the Christian teachers and preachers.

The process of articulating and elucidating the meaning of the Christ event was diverse. The worship of the community was an important contributor to it. Acts 2:42 expressly indicates the breaking of bread and the prayers. In the light of the modern discussion of the Lord's Supper, it may be concluded that the practice of "the breaking of bread", i.e., of a common meal with a religious significance, had its roots in the table fellowship of the earlier koinonia of Jesus' ministry; and that its association with the last expression of such table fellowship, i.e., the last supper in the context of the Passover and the immediate prelude to the death of Jesus, was particularly strong and evocative, leading to the exploration of symbolic meaning in terms of Christology and eschatology but being informed throughout by the "memory" of the disciples articulated as basic paradosis. To the last supper of the old era must be added the first meals of the new, post-Easter situation, which appear to have exercised some influence on developing practice. Hence there emerges the paradox of solidity and fluidity in the sacrament. The solidity lies in the givenness of the practice (which nevertheless admits of some variation) and of the

\(^1\) Luke and John, for example, both present a highly refined but quite different approach to the identity or separability of the resurrection and ascension (glorification) of Jesus and the giving of the Spirit.
historical setting that gave rise to it. The fluidity lies in the freedom of interpretation which it afforded the koinonia: a freedom ranging from Jewish motifs - the Passover and Covenant symbolism above all - to proto-Gnostic concepts discernible even in Paul's exposition. Both the solidity and the fluidity (and there was an interplay between them which does not render the historian's task any easier) were important for the articulation of Christian meaning in relation to the death of Jesus: the former safeguarding the historically based paradosis within the confines of liturgical form, the latter bringing to bear a wealth of religious insight and imagination to the elucidation of the mystery of Cross and atonement in an eschatological setting. Thus even in the development of the central concepts of the faith there is an interplay between the community itself - in its common or shared self-understanding, its reflective processes, its openness to the transcendent as expressed in Christ - and the Christ event as an objective reality over against itself. Their common self-understanding was informed by and doubtless increasingly expressed in the prayers. Based on Jewish models they retained something of that flavour, as can be seen in the Didache; but as the Christian koinonia became independent of Judaism, the language and spontaneity of Christian devotion and pneumatology developed the scope of the prayers (cf. Acts 1:24; 4:23, 30; 12:12), which became more characteristically Christian utterances. A similar process can be discerned in early Christian hymnody. Developing from a basis mainly in the Psalms, the Christian hymns quickly expressed pneumatic or prophetic insights and emotions, and were even the means of transposing gnostic speculation into the service of Christology. Since they were closely associated with basic confessions of the Church's faith, they were used for paraenetic and apologetic purposes.
Through such many-sided experiences-within-community, the followers of Jesus came to conceive, articulate, communicate and develop their message. "Their" message only in a paradoxical sense: for while they undoubtedly struggled towards understanding and articulating it, there was always a sense in which it was "given" or a sense in which they were "led into truth", for the object of their message transcended their full comprehension and "blinks" or insights into reality came not by human contrivance but through openness to the transcendent. In the concrete reality of Jesus the Christ, the transcendent had been expressed in human terms, as "good news" in word and action. The meaning of the whole Christ event had been apprehended by the disciples as "good news" through word and action. The "word" was largely the paradosis originating with Jesus; the "action" was many stranded: the "action" of the death of Jesus, of the resurrection experiences and the Spirit, of common meals and "remembering", of searching the scripture, and of the koinonia as a whole. The proclamation of the Christ event as "good news" was now to be accomplished in similar fashion, in word and action.

Preaching and teaching are actions as well as words, but since they are seldom completely separated from the verbal content of the activity we will continue to use these terms in that sense here. By "action", therefore, is meant the activity of the koinonia in its common life of worship, witness and service: its life of agape. This is the living out in community of the "good news" of God's agape expressed in Christ as the ground of salvation (cf. Jn.3:16), and as such it is basically "evangelical". No hermeneutic is valid unless it is directly related to the expression of the gospel in community action: to nurture within the community and mission to the world with the community as base.
The verbal expression is as essential to the community base as the community base is to the verbal expression. On the one hand, the gospel must be proclaimed "not in word or speech only but in deed and in truth" (cf. 1 Jn.3:18); on the other, the experience of the Christian koinonia must be translated into intelligible terms for the purposes of edification (cf. 1 Cor.14:1-19), evangelism and apologetic exposition (cf. Acts 2:14ff.). The basic forms of such utterance have been examined in the foregoing chapters in terms of propheteia, paraclesis and homilia, paraenesis and catechesis, and finally the paradosis which informs them all and to the shaping and preservation of which they all contribute. There is, we must conclude, no brief formula, no list of items, which provides a neat summary of the kerygma (any more than the book called "the Didache" provides a neat summary of Christian didache) that would allow us to assign the forms of articulation studied above to one or the other. Propheteia might seem primarily related to kerygma, the proclamation of the central event of revelation, yet the prophet is also concerned to teach, to explain the right understanding of that event, and he may adopt ethical teaching as the vehicle of his admonitions or apocalyptic teaching as the means of relating future expectation to the present time of crisis or decision. The homilist may be thought of as primarily a teacher, an expositor with the practical aim of exhortation to righteous living or of promoting understanding through the exposition of scripture. Yet in so doing he is never far removed from the kerygmatic, from proclaiming the summons to faith in response to the grace of God or in view of his judgment. Paraenesis is supremely didactic, yet related to a kerygmatic core, which we have termed the "major symbol" in the foregoing study. Paradosis similarly might appear expressly didactic, yet in 1 Cor.15:3-11 Paul cites paradosis as the basis of kerygma. Thus
Christian utterance tends to be both kerygmatic and didactic. Nor is one necessarily prior to the other. The common view that kerygma is primary and didache secondary is uncommonly wooden and imperceptive. It takes one possible model — that a man first hears the kerygma and, having responded positively to it, is nurtured on didache — as the only or at least the regulative pattern. Yet didache may be a preparatio evangelica, whether unconsciously — as perhaps was the case with Saul of Tarsus — or consciously, as was almost certainly the case with the disciples in the immediate post-crucifixion period. In the evolution of the Christian faith, didache in the form of paradosis stemming from Jesus (and the world view it implied) and in the form of scriptural midrash informed by particular experiences of the earliest Christian communities was certainly the precursor of kerygma understood as Christian proclamation.

We are therefore proposing not to confine discussion to the traditional territory of hermeneutics but to consider the broad question of the communication of the gospel today and to discuss the latter in terms of complementary and mutually supportive kerygma and didache.

Kerygma as the address of God to man, as the proclamation of Christ, as the invitation to a new understanding of the self and a new orientation of the personality, as the setting forth of the possibilities of the Christian way — kerygma in all these inter-related senses is vital and focal, and its challenge must never be weakened. The church that lives on "cheap grace" is a church that has forgotten its kerygmatic basis.

But kerygma is not a sufficiently wide and flexible term to encompass the entire hermeneutical task. This is where our appeal is to didache, which is in itself a more flexible and many-sided procedure
than *kerygma* and which can reinforce the latter so that it becomes more truly kerygmatic. Consider the following:

(i) One of the great problems in Christian communication today is to find sufficient common ground on which to proceed. In the Jewish world in which the message was first compounded, the concepts of God, religion, judgment and salvation were in common coinage; and the Gentile world, with the bankruptcy of its traditional religion and its search for individual freedom and salvation, could relate easily to such language and conceptuality – the task made easier by the cultural exchanges that had in effect married the Jewish and the wider worlds over the years. Today, a symptom of the so-called post-Christian society is the indifference towards or even the rejection of the linguistic and conceptual residue of "Christendom". Solutions advocated for the resolution of this problem have included the total acceptance of the "biblical" world-view as the price of gospel truth, and the existentialist approach, stressing the notion of self-understanding. Neither is in itself satisfactory, for the former superimposes the ancient world-view and its linguistic and conceptual elements upon the modern – indeed it tries to replace the latter with the former – thus denying the integrity of contemporary understanding of the world and man's place in it; while the latter, the existentialist, though of great value, is in the last resort too restricted and one-sided.

A basic task of Christian *didache* is to establish a linguistic frame of reference in which Christian communication can occur in the modern age. This would include the clarification of what men mean – or might mean – when they speak of "God", "providence", "good and evil", "religion": in short, when they use religious language or even
contemplate the puzzles it presents. (1) It would also involve the discussion of terms not used in religious discourse but related to religious concern: such as the growth and development of the human personality, obsession, fixation or group therapy. The approach to ultimate questions - even the possibility of there being ultimate questions - is through human language and discourse. In fact, since language expresses man's thoughts about himself in his world, the transition to the discussion of human existence as such is readily made. Equally, the discussion will extend to the events which the kerygma proclaims, for they are always the central points of reference for the Christian. What has to be fought for is their relevance to the modern situation.

Thus, since we claim that the gospel presents a new way for mankind, we must recognise that there is in the experience of mankind a "pre-understanding", an awareness of the human predicament that can be developed through dialogue and which the gospel must address and illuminate if Christian communication is to take place. The task of eliciting such a "pre-understanding" is that of didache, but at some point in the discussion the didache will become kerygmatic.

(ii) Since the witness to the gospel is contained in the scriptures (and likewise the definitive expression of the gospel in Christ), hermeneutics in the narrower sense of scriptural interpretation comes into its own. The classic situation for the practical outworking of

(1) It is to be noted that in modern society, which increasingly tends to be multi-religious as well as secular, a useful contribution to such problems may come through a dialogue of religions. Cf. N. Smart, World Religions: A Dialogue, 1966; Reasons and Faiths, 1958; The Religious Experience of Mankind, 1971. R.C. Zaehner, Concordant Discord, The Interdependence of Faiths, 1971.
such procedures is within the Christian community, where there is a recognition of the value of attending to what the scriptures say; but since secularization has its effects within the church as well as outside it, and since we no longer live in a society where an auditory message is received with rapt attention, much more care has to be given to the elucidation of the meaning. Thus, in worship and in conjunction with the sermon or address, a modern Christian midrash is indicated. Proper study of the text and sympathetic understanding of what the ancient writer was trying to say to his own situation are essential steps. Next, the examination of the human, relational affinities which link the modern age to the ancient open the way for hearing the scriptural message with a new freshness and relevance to modern times; and this can be further applied to the human personality, situation and predicament, individually and communally, through the rationality and imagination of the exegete or the common resources of the discussion group. Basically, these steps are not incompatible with existentialist hermeneutics, although no claim is made for the particular validity of the existentialist analysis of human existence; and they are also in line with the "relational hermeneutics" of J.S. Glen.  

(iii) The aim of didache, whether as exploration of modern man's self-understanding or as midrash, is kerygmatic. At the heart of the process of Christian communication stands the kerygema proper, the proclamation of God's grace in Christ (it is capable, of course, of starting from a variety of points: e.g., incarnation or atonement). Here is that which encounters man, questioning the adequacy of his

previous self-understanding and setting him in a transcendental perspective, though one expressed in human dimensions through Jesus Christ. But this means that the *kerygma* is inseparable from the *paradosis* which conveys the data necessary to the intelligibility of the proclaimed message. To be sure, *paradosis* may have a didactic function in filling out the proclamation through subsequent teaching: the building of the superstructure of more extensive and deeper knowledge of the central figure of Christ. But *paradosis* is no less present in the proclamation itself and is in any case essentially kerygmatic. The matter may be expressed in this way. When *paradosis* is presented as something that must be learned, remembered and explored, it is essentially *didache*. In 1 Cor.15 it operates in this way, for it is the specific object of recall (15:1) and is subsequently explored at depth in relation to its resurrection content. When it is presented as part of the proclamation designed to bring the hearers to the response of faith and the assurance of salvation, it is *kerygma*. It operated in this way on the occasion of Paul's original "preaching of the gospel" at Corinth (15:1f.). Yet these two distinctive procedures are never wholly separate: the *kerygma* is implicit in the *didache*, and the *didache* is intimately associated with the *kerygma*.

Such a hub of preaching-teaching is central to all Christian communication, leading as it does to the exposure of the hearer to those events in time and space in which God has acted for the salvation of mankind.

(iv) *Paraenesis* is important both for introductory and nurtural purposes. Various types have been analysed above. The most flexible and inherently valuable paraenetic procedure is possibly the situational,
in which an analysis of the contemporary situation of the hearer is
interumental in relating him to the kerygmatic core of the faith and
thus presenting him with an opportunity of revising his life-style
accordingly. Here once again didache and kerygma coalesce, but it is
worth noting that the effectiveness of the kerygma is here dependent on
the thoroughness and appropriateness of the didache. General
paraenesis also has its place, for the Christian needs to know the
contours of the terrain he is traversing as well as the particular
situation with which he is involved at any one time. Even general
rules, like the Haustafeln, have a certain limited usefulness. By
catechesis and didaskalia, on the other hand, one understands instruc-
tion in the basic elements of church faith and practice, directed in
the first instance to catechumens and presenting in rudimentary form
the core of didactic, kerygmatic, liturgical and practical concern.
As this is the presupposition of Christian understanding, there must
always be adequate reinforcing of such fundamentals within the
Christian koinonia.

(v) We have suggested above that propheteia is in some respects
the mother of articulated Christian utterance. Does it have a
continuing role? On the one hand, it might be said of propheteia, as
T.S. Eliot said of the use of words, that each venture is:

"A new beginning, a raid on the inarticulate,
With shabby equipment always deteriorating
In the general mess of imprecision of feeling".  (1)

What matters when the prophet has spoken is not that one should repro-
duce his experience, but that one should heed his message. Paul, with
his plea for "five words" spoken "with the mind" in order to "catechise"
others (1 Cor.14:19), heavily underlines the point. Speaking with

(1) In the second of his "Four Quartets".
tongues may be no more than luxuriating "in the general mess of imprecision of feeling". Prophecy, however, contributes its articulated utterance to Christian didache, which then becomes the object of attention. On the other hand, the affective side of man has always been involved in the appreciation of religious meaning, whether in prophecy or mysticism or in the various levels of devotion, worship and prayer; and perhaps today when there is a strong reaction among young people against arid intellectualism and academic abstruseness a greater attempt should be made to cultivate the spiritual gifts (1 Cor.14:1) as Paul recommends despite his awareness of how easily they can be misused. Certainly, meditation and worship in all its aspects belong within this tradition, and Christian education and nurture have tended to be equated too exclusively with instruction. Moreover, the intellectual and the emotive combine in creative imagination, without which the task of Christian communication is gravely impaired. Propheteia can point the way here, for out of his sensitivity to man's total situation and the reservoirs of religious meaning which lie within it the prophet struggles in thought and feeling with the immense possibilities which by their very nature bid fair to defy full comprehension and articulation until by a kind of supreme orgasm the word that needs to be uttered is finally delivered as kerygma and as didache, bringing the dimension of the transcendent into encounter with the human. In the last analysis, such creativity and vision is required if the Christian message is to have continuing relevance in a rapidly changing world. Instruction in the catechetics of the past is not enough.

(vi) Our final paragraph takes us back to the koinonia, the common fellowship within which the Christian message was originally fostered and articulated. Behind that first message there lay common exploration of meaning, discussion, study, argument, devotion - always
under the guidance of the Spirit, with an openness to the transcendent. The message, once uttered, was always supported and lived out by the community, so that the community in its common life was an instrument of evangelism as much as its message. And its message was further developed - by Justin, Tertullian, the Alexandrians, the later Fathers and many more. These two aspects - living out the message, and its further development - are perennial. Learning by doing, by participation, by involvement is the most immediate form of learning, and one particularly appropriate to such themes as discipleship and commitment. The church is under constant obligation to respond more fully to the gospel of Christ, so that it is more truly his Body, an extension of his incarnation and instrument of his ministry of reconciliation. It is also under obligation to be less of an institution, more of a community, in which people can learn the freedom and support of the love of Christ. But a church that is truly alive and led by the Spirit is also impelled to further exploration of the meaning of its faith and way of life - and not merely through its theologians but through its common life and fellowship. Koinonia is intimately associated with didache (Acts 2:42). Despite the doctrine of the Spirit who can teach the church "all things" (Jn.14:26), and despite the reformata semper reformanda of the Reformation, there is always a tendency to rest on the faith and formulae of the past and to take up defensive positions against an aggressive modernity. We have tried to identify the sense in which the past is always with us - whether as paradosis or as some other form of historically conditioned didache or as kerygma, the proclamation down the ages of the gospel event. We have also tried to indicate that the communication of the faith is not complete until the Christian community allows its experience of life to be enriched and its insight quickened by the Spirit so that it can give new utterance to what the Spirit is saying to the churches (Rev.2:7).
APPENDIX A.

PROPHECY AND THE MISSIONARY PREACHING IN ACTS.

It is a tribute to Luke's skill as a writer and editor that
"the ecstatic pneumatic speech and the non-ecstatic discourse of
Peter are intimately linked, making the story of Pentecost one great
unity". (1)

The model of which he made at least partial use, we suggest, is that of
ecstatic utterance and its hermeneia. How then are we to assess these
sermons in Acts which have been treated on occasion as the repositories
of the primitive *kerygma*, the immovable Archimedean point on which the
whole superstructure of the faith is deemed to rest? Does prophecy
indeed operate in them as a creative force? Do they represent the
basic forms of Christian preaching? A brief review of scholarly
opinion will set such questions in perspective.

F.C. Baur and the Tübingen school have underlined the fact that
the evidence of vocabulary and style, the recurrence of common elements
and their theological compatibility with the writer's own thinking, all
point to highly stylised compositions devised by Luke and intruded upon
his narrative at carefully selected points.

"Like the choral passages in the Greek drama they explain to the
reader the meaning of the events." (2)

A. Seeberg represents a middle-of-the-road position, viz., that the
brief, schematic forms which recur in the sermons and provide the basis
of the apostolic preaching in Acts are parts of a primitive catechism
or creed already well established when Paul was writing his letters. (3)

At the other extreme from the Tubingen school is the scarcely defens-
able conservatism of F.H. Chase or even F.F. Bruce. (4)

The central issues in a debate which is certainly repetitious and
sometimes circular may be termed "Class A" points, and are as follows.

(A1) There is the much discussed and relevant issue of the use

---

(1) E. Haenchen, *op. cit.*, p.175.
    86f., 90.
p.295: "It is a moral impossibility for them (i.e., the sermons)
to have been conceived and composed by him (i.e., Luke)"; quoted
also by Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p.405; - a position hardly compatible
with the findings of *Redaktionsgeschichte* today. As for F.F.
Lecture, 1942): given his assumptions, it is not difficult to
anticipate his conclusions.
of speeches in antiquity: broadly speaking, the tradition of classical historiography from Herodotus to Tacitus. In it, speeches are not only used but also frequently discussed, \(^1\) although it must be recognised that Luke's practice requires comparison with first century models rather than a generalised view of the whole tradition.

Josephus is a Jewish offshoot of this hellenistic tradition. But, as B. Gärtnert has pointed out, \(^2\) neither the classical historiography of Thucydidès or Polybius nor its Judaised version in Josephus offer a convincing parallel to Luke's procedure in Acts, in which events are interpreted as taking place under the providence of God, apostles and church are directed by the Spirit, and a didactic and apologetic purpose runs through the whole narrative, including the speeches. This historiographical type is much more distinctively Jewish and finds its true precursor in I and II Maccabees, which in turn reflect the historiography of the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler.

In I Maccabees the speeches, which "are for the most part the author's own work", \(^3\) are of several different types. The commonest types heighten the dramatic quality of the narrative; they consist mainly of short pronouncements or verbal exchanges, which serve to present the two sides of a dispute. Other types include prayers, possibly reflecting a liturgical tradition; and short utterances "more like winged words than anything else". The whole approach contrasts with the Greek tradition in its lack of interest in lengthy, complex speeches or psychological interpretation or the various devices for which the Greek writers used speeches. On the other hand, it does recall Old Testament writings such as Ezra and Nehemiah; in its poetical quality it reflects Hebrew prophetic rhythms, and has overtones also of Judaistic homiletics. \(^4\) The farewell speech of Mattathias (ch.2), almost a microcosm of the total theme of the book, presents an exact formal parallel to Stephen's speech in Acts 7 and to several Old Testament passages such as Deut.29 and Josh.24. The short pronouncement is exemplified by Gallio (Acts 18:14f.); Demetrius (19:25ff.) and Tertullus (24:2-8) briefly present the anti-Christian position in the continuing logomachy. Pithy "winged words" occur at 25:12 and 26:28.

---

\(^1\) Cf. Polybius, 36:1; 12:25; Diodorus, 20:1ff.
\(^2\) The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, 1955, p.27ff.
\(^3\) B. Gärtnert, op. cit., p.19.
Acts 4:24-30 is a prayer, which may well reflect liturgical usage in the early church. Thus, a striking parallelism must be accepted in "the view of history, the particular composition of the speeches, and the underlying purpose of the words". (1)

(A2) The language and style of the speeches are Lukan.

"Even those persons who incline to consider the speeches in Acts close approximations to addresses actually given by Peter, Stephen and Paul will probably admit that the voice is the voice of Luke." (2) This stylistic point, however, is quite far-reaching and includes the use of the speeches at strategic junctures throughout the book, as Dibelius has successfully demonstrated. (3) The speeches pinpoint major issues in a vivid and gripping manner; they illustrate the outworking of the theme of the book as a whole and help to present a unified picture of the growth and advance of the church.

"It would seem to follow," comments C.F. Evans, "that our estimate of the speeches as a whole cannot be separated from our estimate of the plan of the book as a whole, which plan was the author's own conception, and this will apply in some measure to our estimate of any one of the speeches." (4)

(A3) There is beyond question a set of recurrent dogmatic or doctrinal concepts - we hesitate to say "formulae", which would appear to beg the question - a fair selection of which is to be found in every major sermon attributed to Peter and Paul, especially in the first half of the book. (5) They also invite comparison with corresponding concepts in Paul's letters.

In addition to these three focal points, which we shall regard as having almost axiomatic weight, there are certain subsidiary arguments of a more dubious or even tendentious nature, which may be designated "Class B points".

(B1) An Aramaic source underlies the first fifteen chapters of Acts. Since C.C. Torrey first expounded this theory, (6) it has undergone a process of systematic reduction. An important stage in the reduction was reached with the recognition that most of the evidence for Aramaisms came from the speeches. Could it be, then, that the

(1) Gärtner, op. cit., p.29.
(2) Cadbury, op. cit., p.407.
(3) Vid. infra.
(5) For example, vid. Gärtner's "seven points or articles" in the "scheme of standard topics": op. cit., p.30.
(6) The Composition and Date of Acts, 1916.
speeches are undergirded by an Aramaic source? But, as Cadbury pointed out, the use of the Septuagint in the O.T. citations in the speeches tells against Torrey's theory, and since then the theory of an Aramaic original has been still further reduced. (2)

(B2) The "primitive theology" of the speeches is a clear indication of their authenticity.

"No archaeological tour de force, it is thought, could enable the historian to orient himself so completely in the past, nor could he try to do so." (3)

It is indeed unlikely that Luke deliberately adopted archaic theological expressions; it is equally unlikely that what he wrote was in fact primitive or archaic in his time. His use of ὤν τὸν ἁίων (4) sometimes represented as such, is used by the Didache, 1 Clement, Polycarp, and Barnabas; (5) similarly, ὁ Ἰσχαῖος occurs in the latter part of the New Testament and Barnabas; (6) συμφ is to be found in the pastorals and the Fathers, and ἔκχυτος in Hebrews 2:10 and 12:2.

"... The possibility cannot be ruled out that, in order to speak of Jesus in such terms, it was not necessary for Luke to do anything more than to reproduce something of the form and contents of the general run of preaching in his day, as we catch glimpses of it in what, for want of a better term, we may call the 'deutero-Pauline' writings, and in the Apostolic Fathers." (8)

(B3) Correspondencies in language and thought between Paul's speeches in Acts and his letters point to the authenticity of the Acts accounts and the objectivity of the data which Luke has used. The case finds its strongest evidence in Acts 20:18-35, the address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. By a simple extension, it may be argued, as Dodd did, that the non-Pauline speeches meticulously avoid the use of Pauline phraseology. (9) But Cadbury showed that the latter assumption was by no means justified and that the speeches showed affinities not merely with the writings of the speaker but equally with those of other Christian leaders. (10)

---

(5) Did.9:10; 1 Clem.59:2ff.; Pol. Mart.14, 20; Barn.6:11; 9:2.
(6) 1 Jn.2:1; 1 Peter 3:18; James 5:6; Barn.6.
(7) 2 Tim.1:10; Tit.1:4; 2:13; 3:5; Ignatius (Magn. Proem.), Polycarp (Phil. Proem. and Mart.19).
(8) C.H. Evans, op. cit., p.41.
(9) The Apostolic Preaching, 1936, p.33f.
speech, parallels are to be found with the pastorals and the catholic epistles, and the genuinely Pauline echoes could be attributed to the writer's general familiarity with Paul's style and the speech's likeness in subject matter to certain parts of the Pauline letters. (1)

(B4) Since Luke in his gospel kept close to his sources in transmitting the speeches of Jesus, there is every reason to believe he acted similarly in Acts. (2) Dodd, who advanced this argument in a sentence, referred somewhat tendentiously to Luke's earlier work as "composing the discourses attributed to Jesus Christ": tendentiously, because the verba Christi were certainly subject to a special process of transmission that was hardly applicable to apostolic preaching, which was continuous and derivative. Moreover, Luke was clearly bound by an already established model in writing his gospel, whereas in planning and writing Acts he must have regarded himself as relatively free to determine the design and technique which best suited his purpose. (3)

What then of the form of the speeches themselves? It is, of course, important to note that there are different types of speeches in Acts. F.F. Bruce identifies the categories as evangelistic, deliberative, apologetic and hortatory. (4) Our concern here is primarily with the first category, the great missionary sermons attributed to Peter and Paul.

C.H. Dodd (1936) attempted to use the methods of synthesis rather than analysis, in order to posit a universal, formalised kerygma in the early church. His work, presented in a vigorous and popular manner, is frequently regarded as virtually inaugurating a new era in English criticism, although it is in fact heavily indebted to earlier scholarship.

The attempt to transcend the merely analytic, though admirable in itself, constantly leads Dodd dangerously near to begging the question.

(1) The great difficulty in working out a firm case on the evidence of such corresapondencies or the absence of them is illustrated by the fact that the more discriminating critics become increasingly aware of the danger of arguing in a circle: Cf. C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p.34, n.1.

(2) C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p.30.

(3) Cf. C.F. Evans, op. cit., p.27.

or ignoring vital points of differentiation. For example, Paul undoubtedly uses a number of formulae which had gained currency in the hellenistic churches. Beyond that, it may be said that they represent religious or doctrinal concepts that would be accepted throughout the church. Dodd claims that

"Paul's preaching represents a special stream of Christian tradition which was derived from the main strain at a point very near its source" for Paul spent a fortnight with Peter three years after his conversion and Dodd does not suppose that they spent all their time talking about the weather. More to the point, however, is whether Peter devoted his time to drilling Paul in previously formulated Christian tradition, or whether their conversations centred upon the fundamental concepts of the Christian gospel. The evidence does not allow a definite answer to be given to this question, but equally a definite answer should not be assumed. This issue reaches its crisis in the following passage:

"No doubt his own (i.e., Paul's) idiosyncracy counted for much in his presentation of the Gospel, but anyone who should maintain that the primitive Christian Gospel was fundamentally different from that which we have found in Paul must bear the burden of proof." The confusion here is again between the total message of preaching (i.e., its inner meaning, its basic concepts) and the particular formulae in which it is couched. Theoretically, the church was united on the first issue, although in practice major problems arose, such as the status of circumcision. In the matter of formulae, there must have been widespread variation, as is apparent if we compare Paul with the Johannine tradition, or Apollos. Undeterred, Dodd proceeds to construct, albeit tentatively, the outline of the primitive kerygma on the basis of the recurring formulae. Yet one can be reasonably sure that no such kerygma ever existed. What we find in Dodd is an artificial and unreal construct which consists only of a list of recurring concepts in the apostle's preaching and teaching.

Dodd approaches the speeches in Acts by means of a number of "Class B points" but finally concentrates on one single "Class A point", viz., the recurring phrases. With the help of the Aramaic source

(1) The Apostolic Preaching, 1936, p.27.
(3) Cf. Appendix B.
(5) Vid. infra.
theory, he takes Peter's speeches to represent "the kerygma of the church at Jerusalem at an early period", (1) and contends that they can provide a "comprehensive view of the content of the early kerygma", which can become even more comprehensive by conflation with elements from the supposed Pauline kerygma. (2)

As a corrective, a brief comparison with the Johannine tradition may help to set the Pauline and Lukan representations of early formulae and traditions in a better perspective. No less than the others, the Johannine tradition claims to represent the original message and its integrity must be respected. Thus Dodd's procedure of taking the kerygma of Paul and Acts as basic and looking for points of comparison in the Johannine literature does less than justice to John. (3) Our concern is with a basically Johannine kerygma.

"This is the message we have heard from him and proclaim to you, that God is light..." (1 Jn.1:5).

"This is the message which you have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another" (3:11).

The primitive kerygma, in Johannine terms, is concerned with "confessing the Son" and "receiving the Father" (2:23f.), with whom the faithful have "fellowship" (1:3). It speaks of God as light, and of living and moving within the light, as He is within the light, so that men may have fellowship one with another and be cleansed by the blood of Jesus Christ (1:6ff.). It thus effects a more completely integrated kerygma - didache pattern than the other traditions. Yet the Johannine view of tradition is the reverse of simplistic. To preach the gospel involves more than echoing primitive formulae or transmitting stereotyped tradition. The original message moves forward into a new age in which the eschaton proclaimed by Christ is in process of realisation. Therefore the "old commandment", without ceasing to be the "old commandment", also becomes something of a "new commandment" (2:7f.). Here is a highly sophisticated appreciation of the way a living tradition preserves itself by moving forward, whereas any attempt to save it by the use of stereotyped formulae would result in its ossification and loss. Living tradition creates that "fellowship" which unites the human agents with the Father and with the Son Jesus Christ (1:3). Moreover, the flexibility of the Johannine

(1) Op. cit., p.34.
kerygma is illustrated by the fact that it can operate from different starting-points with equal ease: for example, it may begin with the Incarnation as base and move forward, or with the Atonement as base and move backwards and forwards from that point.

The fons et origo of the Johannine tradition is "that which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life - the life was made manifest, and we saw it, and testify to it, and proclaim to you the eternal life which was with the Father and was made manifest to us" (1:1f.).

The tradition recalls and proclaims, not stereotyped formulae but the meaning of the eschatological event of Christ. As Dibelius observed of the Acts tradition, it is not the words but the event that is sacred. Since modern trends in scholarship tend to bring the date of the Fourth Gospel nearer to that of Matthew and Luke, it is no longer possible to make the plea that John's kerygma represents a late aberration from the orthodox norm, however individualistic it may be held to be. While it is possible to examine the historicity of its narratives, the fundamental issue from the point of view of our study is to recognise the distinctive Johannine kerygma or kerygmata as relevant to the problem of the articulation and proclamation of the gospel of Christ, and in so doing to obviate the danger of imposing on the New Testament material a tidy "kerygmatic" formula extracted from Acts and Paul. The kerygma is always greater than any particular manifestation of it.

Returning now to the speeches of Acts: M. Dibelius (1944) stressed their integral association with the total plan of Acts and the freedom with which the writer must have handled their composition.

"He desires in Acts (in quite a different sense from that in Luke's gospel) to be an author who has complete freedom of action, who can compose freely (as far as the speeches are concerned), arrange the material, omitting or completing as he wishes, and in the way which literary convention permitted to such an author. Scholars have constantly emphasised his participation in contemporary culture, but without vigorously drawing also the consequences; in particular, it is impossible

to understand the intention behind the speeches and their significance within the Book of Acts unless they are regarded as compositions of the author." (1)

Since Dibelius appealed to the model of classical historiography and the similar model followed by Josephus, his conclusions are subject to modification in the light of the researches of E. Gärtnert and the more typically Jewish historiographical tradition represented by I Maccabees. Yet this does not appear to neutralise the point Dibelius made, but simply to lend a particular colouring to it. Luke marshalled his material, both narrative and speeches, to demonstrate the outworking in history of the providence of God. The speeches, Dibelius points out, tend to be repetitious, even following roughly the same order. The fundamental scheme consists of the following elements: kerygma or message, scriptural proof, and exhortation to repentance. (2) The intentional similarity of tone emphasises the writer's desire to show the oneness of Christian preaching (cf. 1 Cor.15:11).

On the whole Dibelius builds his case on what we have termed "Class A points", appealing only to the "Class B" notion of archaic forms of speech and primitive theology. He does put some weight, very properly, on 1 Cor.15:3-8 as a primitive formula leading back to Paul's early days in the hellenistic churches of Damascus or Syrian Antioch in the thirties of the first century. As a formula, it does not appear to reach back through the Aramaic language barrier: it is a hellenistic Greek production. Dibelius remarks perceptively: "The text was not holy, but only the history to which it bore witness". In fact, the various formulae and traditions that gained currency show unexpected variations at focal points, such as the first appearance of the Risen Lord. The tradition was a living thing, designed to expound the focal events which were the basis of all preaching and the guarantee of salvation, and in fulfilling its function with the necessary flexibility variations occurred in the emergent formulae. What did not change was the fundamental motif of the revelatory events; i.e., the life, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. (3)

---


(2) From Tradition to Gospel, p.17.

(3) By "life" one means not a chronological account but rather the fact that he did live, and also that he lived a certain kind of life: cf. Phil.2:6ff.
R. Leijs (1947) takes as the central theme of the apostolic preaching the proclamation that Jesus, by virtue of his resurrection, is Saviour and Lord (Theme I). Two others are closely related to it as immediate derivatives: the apostolic witness to his death and resurrection (II); and forgiveness of sins through faith in his resurrection (III). To these are added a further two themes which appear only in relation to Jewish or Gentile elements in the audience: the continuity of the Old and New covenants, the promises to the fathers finding fulfilment in the resurrection of Jesus (IV); and finally, the accession of the Gentiles themselves to these promises (V).

Leijs claims that every speech in Acts, with the exception of the discourse of Peter before the election of Matthias (1:16-23) and those of Peter and James at the council of Jerusalem (15:7-11, 14-22), includes at least four of these themes and sometimes all five of them. The speeches cannot be said to correspond to any Greek literary genre, with the exception, perhaps, of Paul's defence of himself before Felix (24:10-22) and Agrippa (26:1-23), which ends "dans le meilleur ton de la politesse hellénistique", recalling Luke's own style in his gospel prologue. Other apparent exceptions do not bear examination. Paul in fact follows a biblical theme in his short speech at Lystra (14:14-17); and the Areopagus speech, for all its familiarity with Aratus and the Stoics, ends in an "accumulation of horrors" as far as a Greek audience is concerned: repentance, judgment, resurrection. Admittedly, in its general adaptation to hellenistic forms it is nearer the epistles than other speeches are, but in its deliberate intellectualism it stands by itself. Do the speeches show Hebraic influence? In the citation of scripture, a superficial resemblance to rabbinic exegesis may be seen, but the sermons cannot be termed rabbinic or synagogue.

"Les apôtres comme leur Maître, parlent d'autorité et laissent aux rabbins leur chicanes." Leijs is forced to the conclusion that the novelty of what they proclaimed rendered inadequate any already existing rhetorical or dialectical form and had to create its own form of expression. The apostles are "witnesses of the God who became man and

---

(2) Cf. Ex. 20:1; Is. 37:15. If his "argument from nature" recalls hellenistic piety, it also recalls Ps.145:16 and 147:8; cf. Jer. 5:24.
who talked with them"; their purpose is to add their witness to that already known by their hearers: the witness of the prophets. The apostles and the prophets of the Old Testament stand together as witnesses, "and their only eloquence comes from the invincible certainty of their faith".

Bo Reicke (1953) attempts to develop a close parallel between the preaching of Jesus and that of the apostles. The major themes of the apostolic kerygma were in fact provided by Jesus: that he was "Servant" and "Lord" (the "central thesis"), that his life showed him to fulfil these titles (first "main proof") and that the scriptures testified to him (second "main proof"). The apostolic kerygma, however, added "two further and novel proofs" of Jesus' Messiahship: "the established fact of the resurrection", and "the miracles which showed the power of his risen life". Then follows the conclusion, based upon the stated arguments, that Jew and Gentile alike must repent. The total framework of the sermons suggests a "logical scheme which is typical of arguments designed to persuade, namely (1) thesis, (2) proofs, (3) conclusion".

In attempting to identify some form of continuity between Jesus' preaching and that of the apostles, Reicke is insisting on a valid point. The question must be raised, however, whether the continuity of mission which undoubtedly exists should be sought in the themes of the apostolic kerygma. Reicke's contention that the latter was fundamentally a reiteration of the autokerygma of Jesus appears much too narrow a basis in view of the revelatory event comprised of the cross-resurrection complex. In fact, Reicke relegates the resurrection to the status of an additional proof - hardly a typical apostolic emphasis; while to speak of it as "an established fact" is to isolate and abstract this element from the total nexus of salvation events as well as to beg the philosophical question of facticity. Moreover, to represent the sermons as persuasive arguments, each with identifiable thesis, proofs and conclusion, is to force them into the crustacean bed of a preconceived form. The "thesis" is not always stated; the order of "proofs" is variable; individual items may be omitted; and the "conclusion" is an appeal rather than the product of logical argument. Reicke's classification is therefore to be rejected.

---

(1) Reicke, op. cit., p.138f.
(2) Vid. Appendix C.
B. Gartner (1955) begins with Dibelius' classification of the speeches of Acts in two groups. Both agree that the second group comprises missionary sermons; but while Dibelius understands the first group in terms of Greek historiography Gartner advances the view that its proper antecedent is Jewish historical writing, such as I and II Maccabees, and suggests that the view of history, the composition of speeches and the underlying purpose of the words is strikingly similar in each. Just as the speeches in profane histories reflected contemporary rhetoric, so the missionary sermons reflect the characteristic style and content of apostolic preaching.

"A certain type of sermon had plainly been evolved during the expansion of the Christian mission in the time of the apostles; and it is this type, a kind of codified sermon, that we find in Luke." (1) Following Dodd's procedure somewhat closely, Gartner concludes that the sermon type found in Acts "exemplifies the apostolic message as promulgated by Peter and Paul". (2) Admittedly, Luke may have given them their outer form,

"but this does not prevent us from thinking that he had reliable sources, and that he really gives specimens of the apostolic message". The sermons have a common nucleus, and a consistent message (the common "Class A point"), but they also show traits of individuality. He is prepared to distinguish three or perhaps four types: the message of Peter and Paul to the Jews, the "propaganda speech" by Stephen, Paul's Gentile preaching, and perhaps Paul's farewell speech in Ephesus. Sometimes their association with the context is weak (as in Acts 13); sometimes it is impressive (as in Acts 17). Finally, he suggests that it is not impossible to conceive of Luke actually doing historical research. (Like the "individual trait" argument above, this type of point should perhaps be put in a "Class C" category).

While Gartner has supplied a most useful interpretative key by indicating the affinities of many speeches in Acts with I and II Maccabees, he appears to overreach his evidence in attempting to draw conclusions which accord with his relatively conservative presuppositions, and the language he uses at certain points suggests an element of unease. The only conclusions he is entitled to draw are (i) that Luke stands in the tradition of Jewish rather than Greek historiography and (ii) that the major sermons of Peter and Paul may reflect something

of contemporary missionary preaching. However, we find no examples of complete sermons, either contemporary or early apostolic, but only "a kind of codified sermon"; and in terms of historicity, his arguments hardly justify much advance on the positions of Cadbury or Dibelius.

This survey of the more notable recent discussions of the speeches in Acts would be incomplete without reference to the work of U. Wilckens (1963) and E. Haenchen. Wilckens' survey of the speeches in 2:14-39, 3:12-26, 4:9-12, 5:30-32, 10:34-43 and 13:16-38 issues in the conclusion that there is broadly speaking, an underlying unity of structure which can be traced to the fact that they are set forth as "typical examples of apostolic preaching in the Jewish situation." But whereas the hellenistic preaching represented by 14:15ff. and 17:22-31 follows a course also evident in 1 Thess. 1:9f. and Hebrews 5:11-6:2, formal parallels for sermons addressed to Jews are not forthcoming, nor do they accord well with any deductions that might be made concerning an early Jewish mission. Accordingly, the question is pointedly raised as to whether these sermons are not simply constructs of Luke, setting forth his theological viewpoint in a historical perspective. The final redaktionsgeschichtliche comment may be given to Haenchen:

"Let Acts be read in continuity, but omitting the speeches. Then the reader will notice to how great an extent these speeches give the book its intellectual and spiritual weight. Without them Acts would be like a gospel consisting only of miracle-stories, without any sayings of Jesus. The speeches in Acts, different as they are in provenance and value, correspond in some way to the discourse material in the gospels. In this the greatness of Luke's talent becomes clear, even if we entirely discount such a masterpiece as the sermon on the Areopagus. They are not merely accounts of Christian proclamation but themselves offer Christian proclamation, and that even though, with the exception of Stephen's speech, they are but speeches 'in miniature' (Dibelius), which can be read in two or three minutes. That they nevertheless have the effect of real speeches, not mere outlines, should never cease to waken our astonishment and admiration."

What conclusions are to be drawn from the discussion?

(1) The speeches of Acts, designed so effectively by Luke, are literary in character: "literary compositions thought out to the last detail". In certain cases (e.g., 14:15ff.; 17:21-31), Luke avails

---

(1) U. Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte, 1963; the 14th German edition of E. Haenchen's monumental commentary on Acts appeared in 1965, completing about twenty years' work.
(5) E. Haenchen, op. cit., p.62.
himself of appropriate missionary themes. In the earlier, basic sermons, he provides what is in effect a recital of the christocentric events of salvation which is as similar to the formulae occasionally cited by Paul as it is different from Johannine terminology.

(ii) In presenting what Haenchen has so rightly described as convincing speeches, Luke in fact makes use of the already rich tradition of scriptural midrash in the Christian communities—a midrash which operated creatively from the earliest period in the discovery and articulation of Christian meaning and which supplied basic material for the Christian homiletic tradition. Luke undoubtedly allowed overtones of Christian preaching—midrash, proclamation of the Christ event, various points of Christian propaganda, eschatological appeal—to bring to life his sermonic constructs.

(iii) Luke himself considers the basic speeches—Peter's, for instance—as the hermeneia accompanying the disclosures of the Spirit, whatever form these may have taken. Hence propheteia is fundamental to his concept of the message. The apostles bear prophetic witness to the one total revelatory event that comprises the life, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus—a two-fold witness, directed to Jesus as a man and to his resurrection. In prophetic experience, what is witnessed must be proclaimed: hence the proclamatory aspect of the sermon. The proclamation is characterised by eschatological urgency, for judgment is part of God's activity in relation to man: hence the admonitory emphasis in the sermons. But with proclamation and admonition there is promise, for essentially the message is good news (cf. Is.40:9), and to the repentant there is the offer of hope and salvation.

(1) Cf. B. Lindars, op. cit., pp.36ff.; and vid. Chapter Two.
APPENDIX B

PAUL AND THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM: A PARTIAL REVIEW.

The council, or assembly, of Jerusalem is at the centre of one of the long-standing and still unresolved problems of New Testament scholarship. A full review of the debate, historical and contemporary, is impossible here; but in order to make some observations on one important aspect of it, a beginning will be made with the position advanced many years ago by J.B. Lightfoot. Following Irenaeus (3.13.3), he identified the unit in Gal. 2 with that in Acts 15 and in support of this thesis spelled out the cumulative weight of geographical, chronological, personal, disputational and consequential factors, while recognising certain residual difficulties in the proposed solution: the apparent discrepancies in the two accounts, Paul's silence on his second visit (Acts 11:30) and his omission of the apostolic decree itself. Modern scholars frequently combine their acceptance of the Gal. 2 = Acts 15 equation with marked scepticism concerning Luke's handling of the apostolic decree. O. Cullmann transferred the passing of the decree to a later time; the author of Acts erred in connecting the decree with this particular council at Jerusalem. E. Haenchen found the source of the four requirements not in an apostolic decree but in a later document falsely ascribed to the apostles and utilised by Luke. G. Bornkamm writes: "Paul's account makes it quite


certain that the 'apostolic decree' can never have been part of the resolutions of the assembly"; (1) and his reasons for this somewhat dogmatic assertion include the fact that, in Paul's own words, the apostles "added nothing to him" - i.e., they imposed no further requirement on him (Gal.2:6); and that Paul makes no mention of the decree in his Corinthian correspondence when one might have expected him to do so. Further, if the decree had been passed in the form in which Luke gives it, the subsequent quarrel at Antioch is difficult to account for. All of which seems to add up to a very cogent case. But is it correct? Does this radical criticism in effect take an easy way out of the difficulties presented by the New Testament evidence and in so doing miss some of the nuances of the central, religious debate? The thesis presented briefly here is that a critical but less cavalier treatment of the sources can afford deeper insight into the structural peculiarities of the situation and the ambivalences of the protagonists - not least, Paul.

The issue in question arose from the Gentile mission, an extension of the "Hellenists'" mission. How far were uncircumcised Gentiles (cf. Acts 15:1, 5; Gal.2:3) who followed a way of life alien to the Jews to be accepted into full membership of the Church without condition (other than confession of faith in Christ and baptism in his Name)? Alarm was felt not merely at the prospect of the Church being overrun by people alien to the Jews in race and way of life but at the effect this kind of procedure would have - perhaps was already having - on the Christian community in Jerusalem. As Schmithals has suggested, the hellenisation of the Church was seen by the rest of the Jews as subverting their political and national uniqueness and identity, which were essential to the privileges the Jewish nation and faith enjoyed within the Roman Empire. (2) Although a member of a deputation from Antioch (Acts 15:2; cf. Gal.2:1), (3) Paul went to Jerusalem primarily because he was moved to do so ("I went up by revelation"), for he thought it essential to get assurances from the leading apostles that the Gentile mission would

(3) The Western text states that "those who came from Jerusalem" commanded that a delegation including Paul and Barnabas be sent up: a specific summons. Even if this unlikely step had been taken, it would still be consistent with the sophistication of Paul's thinking for him to claim that he went up "by revelation".
not be undermined, whatever formula might be necessary in face of the
political situation in Jerusalem.\(^{(1)}\) This assurance he won from
"those of repute" in private conference (2:2, 9), with the additional
suggestion – though one difficult in practice – that the missions to
Jew and Gentile should as far as possible be treated separately. In
the wider community there was much heated debate (Acts 15:7),\(^{(2)}\)
possibly reflected in Gal.2 in the demand that Titus be circumcised:
a demand which Paul may well have resisted with success (2:5).\(^{(3)}\) But
it is clear from his manner of writing that Paul was concerned with his
private conference with the apostles rather than with the public debate.\(^{(4)}\)

Several important perspectives are to be distinguished:

(i) Luke, who had no knowledge of or interest in Paul's private
discussions, viewed the debate from an apologetic, ecclesiastical
standpoint. He was not particularly concerned with the central
question of circumcision (cf. Acts 15:1, 5) since it was no longer
relevant to his generation of Christians but he was anxious to exploit
fully the apologetic value of a not unimportant occasion, his contention
being that Christianity deserved no less than Judaism to rank as a
religio licita. Tendentious elements in his account may be seen not
only in his formalizing of early Church procedures\(^{(5)}\) but also in his
theologizing of Jerusalem itself,\(^{(6)}\) and in the fact that he plays down
the main findings of the conference and plays up the four requirements
to the extent of repeating them in full in the space of a few sentences.\(^{(7)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) The question was not about the validity of Paul's apostleship or
mission but about whether uncircumcised Christians were to be
accepted into full membership of the Church and enjoy equal status
with the circumcised Christians. If a negative answer was given,
Paul would consider he had "run in vain", although doubtless he

\(^{(2)}\) \(\gamma\varepsilon\tau\sigma\iota\alpha\) can mean "strife", "dispute", but also "doctrinal debate":

\(^{(3)}\) This is not absolutely certain. In part, the solution depends on
the nuance one finds in "compelled". Cf. F.C. Burkitt: "Who can
doubt that it was the knife that really did circumcise Titus that
has cut the syntax of Gal.2:3-5 to pieces?" Christian Beginnings,
1924, p.118. In part, it depends on one's view of the integrity
of the passage: T.W. Manson held that vv.4 and 5 describe an
incident that occurred later: op. cit., p.67.

\(^{(4)}\) The word \(\alpha\varepsilon\tau\sigma\iota\alpha\) in Gal.2:2 may refer to the large assembly, but
the verse is admittedly difficult: cf. O'Neill, p.27f.


\(^{(7)}\) Cf. also Acts 21:25.
Also, he gives no adequate account of the admitted split between Paul on the one hand and Barnabas and John Mark on the other (15:37-40).

(ii) James can be seen as fulfilling a dual role. The kinsman of Jesus, he is head of the prestigious church at Jerusalem, and he is president of an assembly at which not only the Jerusalem congregation but also other apostles and delegates from Antioch are present. In the latter capacity, it falls to him to sum up the findings of the assembly and give the official judgment, which falls far short of the demand that Gentile Christians be circumcised: they are not to be troubled in this way. But as an astute leader well aware of the importance of the issue for his own church in Jerusalem, he was bound to attempt to save the day by putting forward safeguards against any antinomian interpretation of the decision, which would have been offensive to Jewish and Jewish Christian sentiment. On the basis of Luke's evidence, he did this by issuing a four-fold halachah consisting of the minimum requirements that could be laid upon Gentile converts and circulated by letter in the appropriate areas.

(iii) Peter, the leader of Jesus' disciple group and the safeguarder of dominical tradition, reflected his master's openness to outsiders. Peter's original position vis-à-vis the Gentiles, therefore, was not one of careless laxity but of deliberate policy. In the messianic age, the barriers between Jew and Gentile are broken down: a point developed at some length in relation to Peter by the writer of

(2) The four provisions of the decree figure among the seven "Noachite precepts". There is some evidence in favour of a three-fold formula, involving the omission of "things strangled" (Western text) or of "unchastity" (p.46), but this can hardly be held conclusive (despite P. Carrington, op. cit., p.14f., and E.G. Selwyn, op. cit., p.372). The regulations were open to reinterpretation in the church, and subsequent Christian catechesis is the obvious Sitz im Leben of moralizing tendencies which took "blood" to mean not the blood of animals but "murder", and which appended a version of the "golden rule". The regulations, which might well have existed in Christian circles before James lent them his authority, are directly derived from Jewish practice (cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism II, p.74f.), the sanctity of which had been underlined in the Maccabean struggle (1 Macc.1:47ff.; 62ff.; 2 Macc.6:18-7:41; cf. T.W. Manson, op. cit., p.71f.).
Acts.\(^{(1)}\) The clash with Paul at Antioch arose because Peter reverted to the more traditional Jewish position of separation from Gentiles at table. This reversion, which was supported on the whole by the hellenistic Jewish Christians among whom were noted Paulinists ("even Barnabas"), can only be explained by some exceedingly weighty consideration.\(^{(2)}\)

(iv) Paul was satisfied that the demand for the circumcision of Gentile Christians had been resisted and that he had been given carte blanche by the apostles to pursue a virtually independent Gentile mission. The important occasion for Paul was his tête-à-tête with the leading apostles; he gives no clear evidence of concern for an involvement in the general session. Indeed he can exercise a certain detachment from halachah as essentially the resolution of the Jerusalem congregation and James as pertaining to the treatment of the Gentile problem outwith his own sphere of influence. In any case it would have been improper for him to have attempted to interfere with it. In the situation of Jerusalem and Judaea such regulations were understandable and necessary, and Paul himself no doubt regulated his practice in appropriate ways when in the holy land or when circumstances rendered it necessary.\(^{(3)}\)

If our interpretation is correct, the official emissaries dispatched from Jerusalem to Antioch had a double duty: to report the actual decision of the assembly concerning the circumcision issue, and to deliver the Jerusalem letter concerning appropriate Gentile practice.\(^{(4)}\) The former, we may deduce, was received with acclamation; the latter was noted. It goes without saying that Luke, whether deliberately or because of the sources available to him,\(^{(5)}\) has effectively eliminated any such distinction.

The subsequent development of the plot at Antioch is virtually ignored by Luke but treated fully by Paul (Gal.2:11ff.). The traumatic event is triggered off by the arrival of certain men from

---

\(^{(2)}\) G. Ogg, op. cit., pp.89-98.
\(^{(3)}\) Cf. Acts 21:26; 1 Cor.9:19-23.
\(^{(4)}\) The version of the letter given in Acts 21:25 contains no reference to the circumcision question.
James (2:12), (1) who deliver a message of such authority concerning the observance of the Jewish food laws that a leading apostle such as Peter and "even" such a Pauline sympathiser as Barnabas alter their practice in relation to table fellowship and presumably therefore inter-communion (2:12f.); and it is clear from Paul's account that the Jewish Christians of Antioch agreed with their action. Up to this point, regulations concerning Jewish food laws were clearly not observed at Antioch, at any rate, by Peter and his associates; a position consonant with either the non-existence of the so-called apostolic decree or of its limited scope as a Jerusalem halachah. The case for the latter alternative becomes overwhelming when the reaction of Peter and the others to James' messages is given due weight, for if it had been an entirely new set of regulations issued on James' authority alone such instant compliance could not have been expected. But if James, in desperate straits because of political pressure in Jerusalem from "the circumcision party" (2) now writes to underline the fact that this halachah was given in the context of an apostolic assembly and had therefore the force of an apostolic decree for all churches, the dramatic turn-about at Antioch becomes comprehensible. (3) The chairman of the assembly has clarified part of the proceedings, and the majority at Antioch accept his authoritative ruling and probably sympathise also on grounds of expediency. This left Paul very much on his own, for the new development represented an important imposition. He steadfastly refuses to countenance the regulations now that they have acquired this unacceptable interpretation nor will he compromise his radical obedience to first principles - the gospel of justification by faith in

(1) The text is difficult: cf. O'Neill, op. cit., pp.37ff. I think the usually accepted readings can stand, but cf. Manson, op. cit., p.70.
(2) I.e., the Jewish authorities: cf. Schmithals, op. cit., p.66f.
(3) T.W. Manson supposed that James' message was something like this: "News has come to Jerusalem that you are eating Gentile food at Gentile tables, and this is causing great scandal to many devout brethren besides laying us open to serious criticism from the Scribes and Pharisees. Pray discontinue this practice, which will surely do great harm to our work among our fellow-countrymen", (op. cit., p.72). But this is altogether too weak. The normal practice of Peter must have been well-known, nor was such conduct as his unheard of in the Diaspora even among Jews who had no messianic beliefs. Such a mild letter could hardly have produced a dramatic change. There was positive danger to James and the brethren in Jerusalem from outraged, politically-conscious Jews - that was one factor. A clarification of the apostolic nature of the requirements was, we suggest, another.
Christ alone, not by works (2:16): a basic concept about which Barnabas and Peter hardly needed to be instructed. He will not, he insists, build up again those things he has already torn down (2:18). And he argues his case directly with Peter: "opposed him to his face" (2:11). It was not for this that Paul had agreed to separate missions to Jew and Gentile. He had no intention of allowing Gentile Christians to be second class citizens (Christian ἐκθέτως, as it were) within the Christian fellowship; for it was cardinal to Paul's understanding of the faith that "Christ is not divided" (1 Cor.1:13). Much of Paul's trouble in Galatia, Corinth and elsewhere may be directly related to the unfortunate and, we suggest, secondary interpretation given to the Jerusalem halachah by perhaps all the churches except those under the direct oversight of Paul — and even they were constantly threatened by it. Incidentally, this same interpretation shows why Paul, faced with demands for circumcision by Judaizers in Galatia, could not simply in G.H.C. Macgregor's words, "quote the decision of the council to the Galatians in order to clinch his argument with the local Judaizers", (1) for if the decision saved him from the Scylla of circumcision it broke him on the Charybdis of the food laws. Hence he must base his argument wholly on the gospel. More immediately, the tensions engendered by the Antioch situation are well illustrated by the withdrawal of Barnabas from the Gentile mission.

The men from James who precipitated the Antioch crisis brought a message concerning food laws, not concerning circumcision (2:12). But the decision of the apostolic assembly did not put an end to the demand for the circumcision of Gentile Christians in certain circles, possibly reflecting a Pharisaic — in particular a Shammaite — background. (2) Their activities persisted in Galatia, and Paul has this situation in the forefront of his thinking when he writes his letter (cf. 5:2-12). Since they represent a challenge to his apostleship and his gospel, he gives a recital of his calling and his relevant contacts with the apostles including the crucial visit to Jerusalem and its disturbing aftermath. Of course he must select from the totality of his experiences: he cannot give a wholly comprehensive view in such a concise form. Much has been written about his omission, on our view,

of any reference to his second visit to Jerusalem (Acts 11:30). Here let it suffice to point out that it is characteristic of Paul to discount or ignore what seems to him irrelevant at the time of writing. Thus in 1 Cor. 1:14 he discounts the irrelevance of who baptized whom and only partly corrects his sweeping statement in an afterthought (v.16). (1)

Our whole argument serves to indicate and illustrate the complexities of language and its infinite capacity for tendentiousness. A statement is truly meaningful only when placed in its proper context and related both to the intention of the speaker and his audience's capacity to interpret the words he uses. Appropriate clues to these factors may be found in the structure of the situation in which he speaks and which he addresses. Our reconstruction can appeal to no higher criterion than that of possibility or perhaps probability - though some may call it tendentious! At least it may serve to some extent to prize the lid from the boiling cauldron of early church debate and offer a corrective to modern tendencies to oversimplify the workings of apostolic authority. This was probably neither the first nor the last time that Paul found himself constrained to adopt the posture of "Here stand I: I can do no other"; but it was certainly the most dramatic and possibly the most important for the Christian church. (2)

---

(1) In fact in Galatians 1-2, Paul is concerned (i) with the initial contacts with the apostles, so that he can make it clear that his commission did not come from them; and (ii) with his contacts after fourteen years, when his apostleship and message were under scrutiny because the very success of the Gentile mission had rendered more acute the problem of circumcision. For modern scholars to agonize over literal inconsistencies is unimportant; what is vital is to detect the characteristics of Paul's thinking processes.

(2) The substance of this appendix was given as a communication at the Fourth Congress of Biblical Studies, Oxford, 1973.
APPENDIX C.
THE RESURRECTION: PROBLEMS OF LANGUAGE AND MEANING.

The particular concern of this study has been with the articulation of those experiences and insights which befell the disciples in their resurrection faith and which coloured every subsequent expression of the gospel. The problems of transferring their insights and convictions into language designed to communicate intelligibly to the cross-section of Jewish and hellenistic society with whom missionary contact was made— even to assist the mutual exploration of what these momentous experiences implied — represent the hub of difficulty around which scholarly debate has revolved. Without attempting anything approaching a comprehensive review of that debate, more detailed comment is offered here on some aspects of that problem particularly related to the concern of our thesis.

The empty tomb, which in the later coordination of events came to play the part of a link between Jesus dead and buried and Jesus resuscité, is not to be taken as the first, irrefutable, concrete "fact" which impinged upon the dulled wits of the disciples and started up thinking processes which were a sort of divine preparation for encountering the Risen Lord. The empty tomb tradition appears in fact to be late in origin rather than primitive(1) and to accord with conventional ancient notions of assumption or exaltation to heaven. It is in context with the notion of the opening of the tombs and the resurrection of the saints in Matt.27:52 in consequence of Jesus' victory over death.(2) Consequently, if the absence of any explicit reference to it in the recital of basic paradosis in 1 Cor.15:3-8 is explained by the suggestion that it is implicit in the mention of burial (v.4), this is not because of a historical tradition about the empty tomb but because of Jewish and, indeed, hellenistic presuppositions about the nature of bodily resurrection.(3) The whole notion of the empty tomb rests therefore on a mythological basis, despite the efforts of biblical theologians to prove the contrary by ingenious

(1) Cf. M. Goguel, La Foi à la Résurrection de Jesus dans le christianisme primitif, 1933, p.213ff.
(2) Cf. 1 Cor.15:20-23; Rom.8:29; Col.1:18; cf. M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, 1953, pp.66ff.
(3) Cf. Ezek.37.
Consequently, there is little point in making such mythological data the object of dogmatic or apologetic speculation. W. Künne, for example, asserts that "the Judaic thought-world appears to be chiefly materialistic and concretely historic" (op. cit., p.93), but that thought-world is curiously elevated as "biblical" and beyond the ravages of time, while the opponents of such a policy are dismissed as Platonizers. Equally, there is little point in submitting the data of the empty tomb legend (for such, on the basis of our analysis, it must be) to extended historical investigation in an attempt to uphold its historical credibility. This is like arguing that the discovery of a number of empty tombs in Jerusalem datable to C.A.D.30 substantiates or increases the credibility of Matt.27:52. Theologically and hermeneutically the attempt to underpin the resurrection faith by appeal to the empty tomb is to be deprecated since it shifts attention from the true miracle and mystery of God's dealings with man through Christ to the time-conditioned conceptuality of first-century Judaic man. The compulsion felt by the early Christians to articulate, rationalise and coordinate their insights in whatever ways they could may be said to have arisen in several contexts: that of post-kerygmatic didache for neophytes; in the course of Christian apologetic designed to clarify such questions as "How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?" (1 Cor.15:35); and in Christian discussion within the communities from earliest times as their "hearts burned within them" in response to their experiences (cf. Luke 24:32). Inevitably, such activities led to the externalisation of the resurrection in terms of the empty tomb, and in course of time the evangelists were to develop such notions in their own ways. In fact, all the evangelists point away from the tomb to the living Christ.

(5) So R.H. Fuller; but the assumed subordination of didache to kerygma characteristic of kerygmatic theology since Dodd is not to be accepted without qualification.
In the synoptic gospels, there are indications that the tradition is being used not so much as circumstantial evidence of the resurrection of Jesus but as the means of transferring veneration for one who was dead (cf. Mk.16:1; Matt.28:1; Lk.24:1) to one who was the living and reigning Lord: "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" (Luke 24:5). In John's gospel, the narrative is concerned with the deduction that "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we do not know where they have laid him" (20:2). The resurrection faith itself comes through epiphanies.

The epiphanies or appearances clearly represent the principal part of the machinery whereby the resurrection faith came to be established in the disciples' consciousness. The distinction must be kept between the resurrection faith per se and the means whereby it came about. The former is a theological and hermeneutical question, concerning a unique, "once-for-all" event; the latter belongs to the study of Christian origins. Both are concerns of our study, because both are involved in the articulation of the gospel.

In approaching the study of the disciples' experiences, it is essential to attempt to find a classification or categorisation which will shed appropriate light upon them as religious phenomena. No historical experience is ever totally new, unparalleled or unclassifiable, any more than the emotions or responses it evokes are unique. In terms of religious phenomenology, the complex of psychic experiences denoted by the term προφητεία is indicated. (1) This is studiously to avoid dissolving the resurrection experiences into mere subjectivity, as was done in various ways, for example by rationalists and naturalists (2)—often with more than a suggestion of hallucination on the part of the disciples. It is equally to reject the notion of theologizing their subjectivity as in the famous "telegram from heaven" approach of T. Keim (3) and B.H. Streeter (4)—an approach which, we freely admit, is not as naive as it first seems. Also to be rejected is the bestowal of objectivity on mythological concepts which cannot

---

(1) Cf. Chapter One.
(3) History of Jesus of Nazara, 1867 onwards.
(4) Foundations, 1910.
bear it, as has been done by many scholars of whom J. Orr, K. Barth and W. Kühneth may be taken as representative. We agree with E.G. Selwyn to this extent, that both subjective and objective elements are involved in experiences of this nature, but cannot follow him in his treatment of the empty tomb or in his curious combination of psychological and mythological thinking. The liberal approach has been updated by H. Grase and W. Marxsen but the difficulty of existentialist neo-liberalism is that the resurrection faith is, so to speak, plucked out of the air. Those critics influenced by Bultmann delight in an obscurantist approach to the primary resurrection experiences. Thus Marxsen: "How Peter discovered this (so. that the cause of Jesus continues) we can no longer definitely say. Later, people said that Peter discovered it by seeing Jesus. This may be the case. I do not know. But anyone who claims to know better must be able to produce his evidence. " And again, "The way in which Peter's faith was sparked off after Good Friday is unimportant." There is here a complete subordination of questions of Christian origins to an overriding theological and hermeneutical concern, amounting in fact to a failure of critical analysis. The positive point he and the post-Bultmannians, like their master, make is that in the resurrection faith the kerygma of the Cross emerges as the message of salvation: the good news of the power of self-giving love to overthrow the power of self-assertion; the good news of the divine seal of approval, the divine "yes", given to the life-style of Christ; the good news that the future can be faced not in fear or despair but with hope and expectation born of the "nevertheless" of the resurrection faith; the good news that sets man free to live to the glory of God. Yes. This is one aspect of the resurrection faith; and in encountering (evolving?) that message the disciples encountered Jesus as the Word of God. Granted that this experience "is not to be understood as an unambiguous theophany. Nor is it to be seen as an exercise of arbitrary power on the part of God. The mystery in which God clothes his condescensions towards man is not set aside in the resurrection": (6) What then were the elements of this

(1) The Resurrection of Jesus, 1906.
(2) Essays Catholic and Critical, 1926.
(3) Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte, 1956.
experience? Undoubtedly, there were subjective elements in it. Renan was not wholly wrong when he wrote "ce qui a resuscité Jesus, c'est l'amour", but he was far from giving a satisfactory account of the resurrection experiences. In another direction, M.C. Perry's application of evidence from parapsychology has acted like indirect, off-stage lighting to throw into relief certain suggestive parallels, but it does not illuminate the central concern. The language of the Easter appearances, as Professor H. Anderson has pointed out, is that of epiphany, of revelation. Now the classical mechanism in the experience of Israel for receiving this is the heightened perception, spiritual intensity and religious sensitivity of prophecy. And there is an objective as well as a subjective aspect to prophecy. What was encountered was not a figment of their imaginations. It was one whom they had known and loved and confessed as Christ during his earthly life, and whom they last remembered in the dereliction of the Cross. It was he who now invaded their consciousness not as one "among the dead", imprisoned and terminated by the past, but as one "raised up", "glorified", "victorious": pointing to the future with that hope, vitality and assurance that had characterised his former life and infecting them with this outlook as he had done before. Not that the resurrection faith in any way stands in simple continuity with the life of Jesus. The break marked by the Cross is too traumatic for that; the revelation of the Risen Christ too overwhelming. Part of the prophetic mechanism for apprehending his presence was undoubtedly apocalyptic, and the processes of cognition halting and in need of development and correction. "We bar our own access to the primitive Easter kerygma if we ignore its apocalyptic context", E. Käsemann has observed. The apocalypticism of the disciples centred on "the return of Jesus in the role of the heavenly Son of Man", which was indeed "the central hope which the original disciples derived directly from the Easter experience and constitutes, as such, their own peculiar Easter faith". Thus it was that the Easter happening came only at a relatively late date to be restricted to Jesus himself; originally, however, it had been understood as the dawn of the general resurrection and therefore interpreted apocalyptically and not as an isolated

(1) Cf. The Easter Enigma, 1959.
(3) Ibid.
wonder". (1) This may be so, and Matt.27:52 may be cited in support of this view. Yet is it not at least as likely that the primal resurrection was that of Jesus? Can it be doubted that his appearances were of overriding significance? (2) May it not be that the notion of the general resurrection was even deduced from Jesus' resurrection? Kasemann is right to indicate that development took place in the concept of the resurrection in the disciples' thinking. Soon the process of reinterpretation embraced the ministry and death of Jesus. It is in this context that the Cross can be seen as "for us" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3), that the earthly suffering and the glorification of Jesus can be held together as saving event, that the christology of incarnation and atonement can be developed and the Christian life defined by the motif of cross and resurrection. Thus, in conjunction with the affective aspects - the elevated mood and dynamic perceptions of prophetic experience - there came into play the cognitional aspects of the new faith that was being engendered. In a limited way, the problem of the hen and egg appears here. "Did the great expectations of the disciples revive because they knew Jesus lived, or did and does Jesus live because their hopes had revived?" (3) It is as inadequate to make the resurrection faith a simple deduction from the appearances of Jesus as it is to make the appearances merely subjective impressions produced by the new faith that had developed in the disciples. The phenomena are best understood as concurrent processes, although the visual manifestations seem mainly restricted to the earlier span of experience while the cognitive aspect of the faith develops over a longer period. Yet even here there is need for caution. The appearances are certainly held to have been early, although the origin and validity of "on the third day" are disputed. (4) Equally, there came a time when the revelation was felt to have been effected in its pristine form - a conviction associated both with the inauguration of the apostolic mission, so that the community was now giving of what it had received, and with the virtual cessation of the appearances. One rationalisation

(1) Ibid.
(2) At least, the operational point for the emergence of the Christian faith was reached not with general apocalyptic ideas but with the emergence of the notion of the primacy of Jesus' resurrection.
and schematisation of this process was carried out by Luke, although all the evangelists handled it in their own way. Yet all such formalisation is open to qualification. The outworking of the meaning implicit in the new faith continued throughout the apostolic age and in a sense has gone on ever since. And the acute awareness of the presence of the Lord - even with visual manifestations - cannot be denied either to Paul and others "born out of due time" or even to later generations. Such experiences may be described as secondary and derivative, compared with those which contributed directly to the formation of the official apostolic martyria; they may be described as the operation of the Spirit or as mystical. But qualitatively, are they different (and what would such a distinction mean?)? Religiously, are they less valid? Is there not an essential continuity between these early formative experiences and at least the high points of Christian devotion down the ages? "One cannot," observes J. Knox flatly, "belong to the Church without knowing the concrete meaning, what Paul calls the 'power' of the Resurrection . . . The Church affirms the Resurrection because its own existence as the community of memory and the Spirit is the essential and continuing meaning of the Resurrection. The forms of kerygma and didache which expressed the gospel were instinct with this "essential and continuing meaning", for in the whole complex of early Christian experience the transforming power of the Word was heard. Wherein then do we differ in practice from the position of Marxsen and the post-Bultmannians in general? Simply in this: their position, with its exclusively kerygmatic emphasis, its equation of the resurrection with the Cross as eschatological event, its abstruse existentialist conceptuality, appears to me so academic and intellectualist as to conjure up the picture of the post-crucifixion disciples' group as one enormous "think-tank" aiming to produce that Entschlossenheit, that Augenblick of existentiell decision, by which they would be reoriented from the Entfremdung of their Verfallenheit to a new, authentic Selbstverstandnis. Yet if there was anything remotely like this "think-tank", it was a small community of disciples, instinct with pregnant memories of their past master and characterised by a deep spiritual devotion, who felt rather than thought their way towards the realisation of his living presence in

their midst. Our insistence on taking seriously the phenomenon of their spiritual struggle and experience is not to find some objective "proof" of the validity of the claims of their resurrection faith but to stake a claim for the place of the emotions as well as the intellect in religious experience and hold out for the essential continuity of these primary experiences with the subsequent experience of the Church. It is also to insist on taking seriously the problem for the study of Christian origins which the rise of the resurrection faith poses: Bultmann and his followers - uncharacteristically in some ways, but understandably in the light of their philosophical presuppositions - opt out of it to a considerable extent. Further, it is to keep in mind certain important phenomenological, hermeneutical and philosophical considerations. One of these is that worshippers and believers within the Christian tradition have throughout the ages found themselves apprehended by the presence of Christ: and not merely through the various forms of proclamation of the word - and I am the last to object to the primacy of this element - but through the mystery of worship and meditation, involving the affective side of man, the aesthetic, the mystical, the capacity for self-transcendence. Some such elements have been present in Christian experience even from the birth of the resurrection faith. Again, the interpretation of the gospel today must not be allowed to founder in an intellectual ocean. Modern urbanised man, and modern urbanised youth in particular, is aware of the threat to his existence inherent in the brutalizing, depersonalizing and manipulative powers of remote bureaucracy, factory productivity, competition for jobs and material success, the consumer society, mass media and mass education, state omniscience, institutionalism and the whole perplexing gamut of science-based civilisation. In his protests and frustrations there is evidence of a quest for more spiritual values which he finds obstructed not by an ancient world view but by the world view imposed on him by the society in which he is living. The Church appears irrelevant to him not so much because of the mythology that envelops its message as because of its institutionalism, its seeming authoritarianism, its apparent compromising of its own spiritual values for those of the established power structure or for the group dynamic of the social unit. In this welter of disadvantage, the modern churches have much to relearn from the birth of their own faith, the resurrection faith: involving as it
did the discounting of the world's evaluation or that of conventional religion and the search, both cognitive and affective, for the other-worldly values of self-giving love, joy, hope and peace, which they found personified in the vital figure of the resurrected Christ, with his blessing: "Peace be with you" (Jn.20:19, 21, 26). The West is indeed materialistic, but let it not be supposed that the spiritual is to be found in the East or Eastern religions alone. Meditation, contemplation, the orientation of the human spirit to spiritual things has been part of the Christian tradition from the beginning, and await rediscovery or reinforcement. Today some young people are finding inspiration through the highly emotional, non-intellectual "Jesus" movements and in communes. Both are symptomatic, perhaps, of a vacuum in the conventional organs of Christianity today. Both were present in the early Church in recognisable form, but they required - as today - direction from the cognitive understanding of the gospel which, as embodied or personified in Christ, places value upon the "secret discipline",¹ the temporary apartness of devotion and meditation, but not on the vacuity and nihilism of the permanent "drop-out"; for the risen Christ impels mission, reengagement with the world in the spirit of peace (Jn.20:21) and in the ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor.15:18f.). Thus the resurrection experiences combined affective and cognitive elements with commitment and vocation. The articulation and exploration of the primary data involved further rational procedures. "This translation into words", R.H. Thouless observed, "is the intellectualisation of the experience which gives birth to a religious doctrine".² The articulation and the intellectualisation, both essential, have to pay the price of accommodation to available linguistic and conceptual conventions and eventually incur, almost inevitably, the rigor of formalisation and authoritarianism. The latter must simply be shed by critical scholar and religious interpreter alike as soon as their inflexibility is felt as a dead weight rather than a useful guide: the former, the convention of language, must be lived with and understood. Hence one hesitates to subscribe in full to Bultmann's programme of demythologizing, especially where it involves the translation of concrete, this-worldly images into the

² _An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion_, 1924, p.31.
language of existentialist *gnosis*. Some scholars have observed that Bultmann is more extreme in his attitude to myth than Heidegger, that his objections to it are extravagant and that "he overestimates the intellectual stumbling-block which myth is supposed to put in the way of accepting the Christian faith".¹ To be sure, the time-bound conceptual clothing of resurrection language is not sacrosanct; and with the decease long ago of the ancient Jewish thought-world, the Christian understanding of the resurrection must now take account of the possibility that the bones of Jesus of Nazareth lie buried in Palestinian soil. Yet this reversal of ancient conceptuality should not become part of a new *gnosis*, the avant-garde creed of emancipated "modern man". I am no whit better off (as Paul might have said) for believing one thing rather than the other. Such corporeal concepts were designed originally as helps to imagining or visualising the miracle of the resurrection. Today, if any man feels they are so (and not everyone corresponds with Bultmann's definition of "modern man") he should not be debarred from availing himself of the traditional symbols. Tillich's jibe that such a position is both absurd and blasphemous is altogether too strong:² one would be constrained to agree only if they were presented as part of a formalised, authoritarian code. If, on the other hand, anyone felt such symbolism erected a barrier to belief or to finding meaning in Christ or the gospel, let him jettison it at once, for a "help" that is no longer a "help" is worse than useless. What matters is that the gospel - of love, joy, peace, hope, freedom, community, salvation - should be presented in such a way that people can overcome such linguistic hurdles and be raised from the frustration, hopelessness and false values of bondage to "the things that perish" to the new life of spiritual power, peace and concern for "things eternal".

Finally, a philosophical point: if, as we suggested, God was, so to speak, content to make use of the immanent processes of men's consciousness and experience - including their imagination - in the apperception of this greatest miracle, then the immanent sphere is the arena in which the transcendent may be perceived or detected. It was alike the scene of the incarnation, atonement and the glorification of Christ. It is the arena in which Christ still appears in the cry of

---

the hungry and oppressed, in the stirring of the spirit of humanity, in the communities and relationships of love, trust, devotion and spiritual searching, and in the miracles of grace, forgiveness and healing. It is the realm of the past and present from which men are raised in hope and confidence for the future.
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