

**THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN
ATTITUDE TO THE STATE
AS REFLECTED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS**

**A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of Divinity
The University of Edinburgh**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy**

**by
George Irvine Hopton**

October 1, 1966.



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate..... GEORGE I. HOPTON.....

Address.....

Degree..... Ph.D...... Date..... May 9, 1967.....

Title of Thesis..... THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO THE STATE AS REFLECTED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS......

This thesis finds Jesus' attitude to the state normative for the whole period of the New Testament writings. The most important state for him was not Rome but the Jewish theocracy. He was greatly concerned that the latter entity would see its political responsibility in terms of the prophetic image of the suffering servant.

The development of Israel as a state is traced, as is the vision of the future ideal state which, described in frankly political terms, motivated the Jews to seek recovery of independence and power, an era of peace and prosperity, of fidelity to God and his law, and of justice and brotherly love among men.

The period leading up to New Testament times is seen as an era of crisis for the Jewish nation. External forces threaten its cohesion. Some of its citizens want to compromise with intrusive foreign cultures; some want to retreat to a pietistic enclave; some counsel rebellion. Jesus' answer to the crisis was in the prophetic tradition. It was to challenge the preconceptions of political morality which lay behind each of the options, and to ask men to consider themselves citizens of a kingdom whose ethic is love. In fulfilling their duty to the higher righteousness they would be good citizens of present states and exert tension on the present systems which could lead to their transformation.

All the books of the New Testament are dealt with in the chronological order of their composition. In deciding what evidence is applicable to the subject, several themes which relate to the attitude to the state are kept in mind.

Order is judged to be one such category. The existence of man in society is possible only when chaos is overcome by unity and order. Yet the goal of order is continually threatened by external invasions and by the attempt to introduce heightened ethical demands into society.

Eschatology is another important subject because, depending on the type of eschatology which was stressed in a particular writing, we may ascertain a particular attitude to history. In some cases history is taken seriously as the normal realm of a Christian's activity. In others a non-dynamic view of history is adopted with its resultant lack of responsibility for the state.

Passages dealing with universalism are also important reference points for this subject. Each person's basic political philosophy arises out of his attitude to the particular entity to which he is attached. There was a prophetic attempt to expand this consciousness toward a universal outlook in New Testament times.

Attitudes under persecution and the theme of national identity are also dealt with fully, as is the dominant New Testament theme of suffering love. Jesus had been a loving, suffering servant within the life of his own nation. The early church understood its responsibility to society in terms of being a salty presence within history, of seeing that the kingdom ethic exerted a judging, transforming tension upon the ethic of measurable duty by which the states of the present world live.

TO MY
PARENTS

INTRODUCTION

The subject of the relationship of church and state is one that has received wide attention among theologians in recent years. Therefore, no claim can be made that this thesis investigates a previously unworked field of studies. It did seem, however, that several considerations helped to justify yet another approach to this important subject. In the profound studies of many of the European scholars, there was a hint of a bias traceable, it was felt, to the tragic experiences of many European nationals with totalitarian regimes. Did their work not overly stress the apocalyptic identification of the state with demonic powers?

Again, it was felt that ecclesiastical doctrines of church and state had often been founded on a period of history which followed the time of the canonical writings - a time when the church had become a self-contained imperium in imperio. Perhaps a helpful contribution could be made by a study which confined itself to the New Testament period, and which sought to find there, not well-defined doctrines, but attitudes and impressions.

Again, it was felt that an approach which was at once more tightly focussed on what Christians thought and felt concerning the state - as opposed to an objective study of pagan-Christian relationships - and also broader in terms of the data considered relevant for political questions would

provide fresh insights. It is hoped that there are some.

Again, it seemed that some studies had dismissed Jesus as having made no important contribution to the subject other than the enigmatic "tribute to Caesar" pronouncement. Others had assumed that Christianity had no interest in the state, viewing it simply as a restrainer of evil when it came into the thoughts at all. This thesis offers itself as a contribution toward an understanding of Jesus' attitude as the normative one for the New Testament Community. It does so by trying to show that the most important state for Jesus was not Rome but the Jewish theocracy, and that he was greatly concerned for the political health and moral obedience of that entity.

The idea of pursuing this subject was first proposed by the late Principal Walter Bryden of Knox College, Toronto, whose incisive theology has influenced two generations of Canadian Presbyterian ministers. On my arrival in New College, Edinburgh, Professors William Manson and J.H.S. Burleigh gave guidance concerning the scope of the study. Then, while the fascinating months of research continued, my tutors, Professors J.S. Stewart and W. S. Tindal, generously offered many helpful criticisms and suggestions.

Works referred to in the footnotes are in the briefest form possible. Fuller information concerning them may be found in the Bibliography. All English Biblical references are given in the Revised Standard Version.

My grateful thanks are offered to those patient librarians who helped me, particularly Dr. Lamb of New College and Rev. George Douglas of Knox College, Toronto. Miss E. R. Leslie, Secretary at New College, showed a courteous interest in all her overseas charges which was most reassuring. The original typing was done by Mrs. Mary Beckett, and the final task capably accomplished by Mrs. Arabey.

A special word of thanks should go to the Students of the SCM at the University of Toronto. They encouraged me to take up work on this thesis again, and helped me to finish by taking some of my job responsibilities on their shoulders over the last two months.

SCM Office, Hart House,
University of Toronto.
1966.

C O N T E N T S*
- - - - -

| | <u>Page No.</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| INTRODUCTION | |
| CHAPTER | |
| I "The Constitution and Development of Israel as a State" | 1 |
| II "The Mounting Crisis of the Jewish Nation" | 23 |
| III "The Attitude of Jesus to the State" | 65 |
| IV "The Developments of the Apostolic Age" | 108 |
| V "St. Paul's Attitude to the State" | 137 |
| VI "Further New Testament Writings" | 169 |
| VII "Summary and Conclusions" | 282 |
| APPENDIX | |
| SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY | |

* Please refer to the numbers at the centre of the page.

CHAPTER I

THE CONSTITUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL AS A STATE

In the comparatively short period of time represented in the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon, Israel was transformed from a clan alliance into a state.¹ In retrospect the writers of Israel's theology put the constitution much earlier,² but at this time she developed the characteristics which political theorists would recognize as belonging to statehood.³

The historical causes of the development are easy to trace. The Philistines were expanding into the interior, putting pressure on Israel to find a better way of defending itself than the patriarchal alliance. But, this is hardly enough to account for the changed intellectual and spiritual temper reflected in the quite prolific writing which this era produced. For Israel to have emerged as a state so rapidly there would need to have been two things: strong internal forces of cohesion already at work; and, a leader of sufficient charisma and initiative to establish a strong central authority.

1 Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, 36.

2 Exodus 19:1,2.

3 These characteristics will be noted in the sections that follow. For them, I have followed R.H. Lowie, The Origin of the State, W.C. MacLeod, The Origin and History of Politics, and F. Oppenheimer, The State: Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically.

On examination, the internal or horizontal cohesive forces seem strong indeed. The sense of common blood is, of course, the first and most persistent force of community, and Israel has this sense.¹ There is also a strongly felt need for order demonstrated in the writings of Israel. Political theorists believe this to be one of the strongest forces tending to political organization.² So we note with interest the way in which Israel's theologians deal with creation. In Deutero-Isaiah³, the picture we get is of the divine power struggling with the dragon of chaos. In Genesis I the story moves on from chaos to cosmos by the driving back of the waters. And, in the same passages of Isaiah which deal with the creation of the natural world, Jahweh is pictured as creating Israel too. Clearly, there was a strongly felt need for order which looked to nationhood as a redemptive possibility. As for the cohesive force of cultural mutualities, the third important category referred to by the theorists, there can be no doubt that the Jahweh cultus more than filled the bill for the emerging state of Israel.

The vertical force providing central authority, another prerequisite for the swift development of the state, was provided for the most part by David. A former professional

1 von Rad, op. cit., 46.

2 Reinhold Niebuhr, The Structure of Nations and Empires, 4ff. has a good section on this.

3 e.g. Is. 51:9 ff.

soldier in the body of retainers organized by Saul, his elevation as king over Judah, and his appointment over the united tribal groups of Israel and Judah, are represented as acts of political acumen.¹ The shrewd choice of Jerusalem as a place of residence that would tend to unite the two major clan groups seems to have been his own idea. David knew how to use force to achieve unity, but seems also to have been aware of its limitations.²

It might almost appear that Israel had given up the earlier idea of Jahweh's sovereignty over her in favour of a king after the manner of other nations. But to believe this, would be to underestimate the power of the sacral tradition. David looked upon his wars as wars of Jahweh, and his own personal adherence to Jahwism was never in doubt. We shall examine in a later section the peculiar theocratic emphasis which Israel's doctrine of kingship always contained.

So far, we have briefly sketched the development of a nation which was like the development of other oriental models. The state centered in Jerusalem carried out the normal functions of any state - legislative, administrative, and judicial.³ It seems to have found ways of carrying out

1 II Sam. 5:1-3.

2 see Niebuhr, op. cit., 9, for a discussion of the place of force in achieving community.

3 Oppenheimer, op. cit.

these functions, however, in a way that incorporated the religious insights of its earlier life. The legislative function was carried out by the monarch, but, he shared his throne with Jahweh, the supreme law-giver. The divine commandments, seen as the helpfully directing will of God conducting his people through history, were the basic law of the state of Israel. The function of administration was served by a new division of the territory into districts in David's time (I Kings 4:7ff.) and by a growing staff of officials. The administration of the temple cultus appears to have been a part of their responsibility also. The judicial function as practiced in Israel most clearly illustrates the theo-political character of this state. The law was God's will for order. The authorities who had the normal administration of justice at the gate were thought to require the charismatic gifts and closeness to God of the prophets. In earlier times, the prophetess Deborah's administration of justice was charismatic (Judges 4:4ff.) and something of this requirement for judging always remained. Indeed, it was considered right and proper that the radical prophets should undertake the judging of the monarchs themselves.

We have been trying to get at the distinctiveness of Israel's constitution as a state. Another way of putting it is to say that this people had a conception of an ideal state

which was derived from their apprehension of Jahweh's absolute will for unity, order and justice. No matter what the actual conditions of the time show about Israel's political life, she holds tenaciously to the vision of the nation as it should be, ruled and directed by God. To be sure, it was not some abstract ideal of what a state should be like which could be applied to any nation. The ideas of election and covenant come in.¹ This people felt that they had been laid hold of by the living God. What is more, the success of the dynasty of David convinced them that it was as a nation that Jahweh had called her into special relationship.

In retrospect, it seemed to the Jews that the decisive event was the clan's deliverance from Egypt under the leadership of the prophet Moses. This marked the theological birth of the nation as opposed to the historical beginning which has been mentioned above. For the devout Hebrew, the hour of covenant for his nation was the day when "on the third new moon after the people of Israel had gone forth out of the land of Egypt, on that day they came into the wilderness of Sinai.....and there Israel encamped before the mountain."² What happened there was the "accompaniment of the historic act of redemption by which Jahweh took Israel to be his people."³

1 H.H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, offers a handy summary.

2 Ex. 19:1-2. The same event is pictured in a slightly different way in Deut. 8:2ff.

3 H.W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, 187.

For Israel, the supreme medium of revelation is always history, and, Jahweh's words are always part of the historical act.

You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself.¹ Now therefore if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.²

This passage shows clearly what Buber has called the theological constitution of Israel. "The period whose loftiest thought has given shape to the Eagle Speech was concerned not with religion, but with God and people; that is with God's people on the basis of political and social realism; with what might almost be called a pre-state, divine state..... Unlimited recognition of the factual and contemporary kingship of God over the whole national existence is what is required of Israel, in the midst of the historical reality, by the message which found its form in the Eagle Speech."³ Even after Israel's days of political power seemed over for ever, the conviction that they had an obligation as a people remained.

1 Buber contends that this was no mere figure of speech but that it contains the ideas of election, deliverance, and education. Moses, 102.
 2 Ex. 19:4-6.
 3 Buber, op. cit. 109.

"The conviction of the Hebrews that they were a chosen people is the one permanent, as it is the most significant feature in their history."¹ It can be readily understood that pious orthodox who were under such a powerful constraint to recognise Jahweh as supreme ruler would have trouble adjusting to any native monarchy which looked too much like that of other nations.² After all, as Moore points out, the title "king" was probably first used in Israel in reference to God.³ We should not be surprised to find Israel's theologians expressing embarrassment and hesitancy in the face of the historical success of the monarchy in Israel.

The Monarchy and the Ideal State

In the period of the judges, there is evidence that the religious climate did not favour the idea of kingship. When the men of Israel asked Gideon to be their ruler, he replied, "I will not rule over you; Jahweh will rule over you".⁴ However, as the tribes struggled with problems of unity and defence, political realism made them look again at the advantages of central authority.

-
- 1 Henri Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, 339.
 2 W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, 354; see also Note 1 on this page for references to the use of the title "king" for God in Jewish literature.
 3 G.F. Moore, Judaism I, 401; cf. Is.43:15, 44:6; Zeph. 3:15.
 4 Judges 8:23.

Various men are represented as being called at this time to meet a variety of political needs.¹ Eventually, the monarchy was formed. The earlier account of this event says that Jahweh saw the necessity of a king to save the people from the Philistines², and that he gave instructions for Samuel to anoint Saul. It was also on divine instructions that Saul was replaced by David³. The later account (P)⁴, on the other hand, says that the kingship was originated because the people wickedly desired to imitate foreign nations⁵. The priestly writers had no doubt become disillusioned by the actions of later rulers and wanted to indicate their belief that only the ideal state with its conception of God's direct rule was worthy of Israel's support.

In fact, the Hebrew development of Kingship was strikingly similar in many ways to that which occurred in other oriental lands. This has been persuasively argued by the so-called myth and ritual school, represented by Sigismund Mowinckel, Ivan Engnell, S.H. Hooke, and, to a

1 Judges 4:6-9; 6:15; 13:3-5.

2 I Sam. 9:16.

3 I Sam. 16:1-13.

4 For the division of I and II Samuel into two strata see Norman H. Smith, "The Historical Books", in The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley, 97.

5 I Sam. 8:4-9; 19-20.

lesser extent, A.R. Johnson¹. In the East generally, the king was the divine sine qua non of the community. In him all the desires and hopes of the nation were centred; from him, the citizens derived their health and well-being. In Israel too the king achieved great importance, both politically and psychologically.

On the other hand, kingship was by no means a uniform conception throughout the East, as Henri Frankfort has shown in an important study². "If kingship counted in Egypt as a function of the gods, and, in Mesopotamia as a divinely ordained political order, the Hebrews knew that they had introduced it on their own initiative, in imitation of others, and under the strain of emergency."³ And again: "The transcendentalism of Hebrew religion prevented kingship from assuming the profound significance which it possessed in Egypt and Mesopotamia."⁴ The Hebrew monarchy was, in the last resort, responsible for^{to} Jahweh⁵. When it forgot this limitation, it could be spoken of as seducing the people of Jahweh away from their rightful king⁶.

1 The first two named are Scandinavian scholars. See Mowinckel, Psalmestudien, I - VI (1921-4), and Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. A.R. Johnson and S.H. Hooke both have contributions in The Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke.

2 Kingship and the Gods.

3 ibid, 339; cf. I Sam. 8:19-20.

4 ibid, 343.

5 A.R. Johnson, "The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Apocalyptic", in The Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke, 80.

6 II Kings 21:9-12.

Nevertheless, the king did gain an important place not only in Israel's political life, but in her theological thought concerning her ideal constitution. The reported dying words of David give a good idea of the Hebrew concept of kingship - high and yet limited.

When one rules justly over men,
ruling in the fear of God, he
dawns on them like the morning
light, like the sun shining
forth upon a cloudless morning,
like rain that makes grass to
sprout from the earth.¹

Moore says rightly of the Jews, "They held to the revelation in their hands in which the royalty of God was the confidence of the present and the hope of the future."²

The Exile and Its Consequences

Jerusalem was destroyed in 586 B.C. by Nebuchadnezzar, and the cream of Israel's citizenry was taken off to captivity in Babylon. The period of the Davidic monarchy was thus brought to a decisive conclusion. Never again, except for brief periods of Maccabean kingship between 142 and 63 B.C., were the Jews to be free from alien suzerain authority. However, the former time of ascendancy remained in the historic consciousness of the Jewish people and played its part in shaping their attitude to political questions. They could

1 II Sam. 23:3-4.

2 G.F. Moore, op. cit. I, 432.

always believe in the possibility of a kingdom to be restored to them by the Lord's hand. This hope helped to maintain their religion and their nationality.

The atmosphere in Israel following 586 B.C. was understandably one of apathy and despair, but when the Persian king, Cyrus, conquered the region in 538 B.C., his enlightened policies caused a surge of hope. The Persian ruler's attitude towards the cultic practices of subject peoples was something quite new in the ancient East¹. Ordinarily the resistance of native populations was broken by decrees insisting that they observe the official cult of the empire in question. Cyrus' edicts recognized the cultic practices of subject peoples². Persian rule also protected Judea from aggression, kept order within her borders and allowed the Jews almost full autonomy in their community and religious affairs³. The Jews for their part were peacefully submissive, and, made great progress in adjusting their thinking in the light of the bitter events they had experienced. The codifying of the final edition of the Pentateuch was the work of this period⁴, and in it Judaism felt secure enough in its internal

1 von Rad, op. cit., 85ff.

2 Exra 6:3-5.

3 Norman H. Smith, The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, 17-9.

4 Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, 46.

religious life to think in terms of proselytizing¹.

Better Times in the Historical Future: The מְלִכּוּת שְׁמַיִת

Recent events had frustrated Israel's political hopes. So now orthodox Jewish doctrine began to look for the realization of the ideal theocratic state in a future time somewhat distant from the present, but related to it historically. Many names have been used to refer to this concept. Moore prefers "messianic kingdom", Dalman, "sovereignty of God".² Most theologians use "kingdom of God", being careful to define their meaning. מְלִכּוּת שְׁמַיִת, the phrase as it appears in the Old Testament³, means kingly rule more than it does a territory governed by a king, although the latter meaning cannot be entirely excluded. Therefore, Dalman's translation "Herrschaft" meaning "rule" but having the secondary meaning of "territory governed" is a good rendering. It is sometimes helpful in conveying the meaning to use "sovereignty of God" or "sway of God", keeping in mind B. Weiss' fuller definition, "the full realization of the sovereignty of God"⁴, which preserves the idea that the nation was aware that her ideal constitution was as yet unrealized.

The kingdom would come one day. The gap between the ideal and the actual would be closed. This was the popular

1 Is.42:lff.; 49:lff. cf. G.E. Moore, op. cit., I, 228.

2 Gusfaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, 9lff.

3 as in Psalm 145:11-13. The N.T. uses ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, which is preferred by Matthew, or ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

4 B. Weiss, quoted in Dalman, op. cit., 94.

belief. The change of fortunes for the better was associated in Israel with the first day of the great autumnal Feast of the Ingathering, known also as the "Day of Jahweh"¹.

Jeremiah showed his real disappointment when one "Day of Jahweh" came and went without any change that would make God's sway apparent. "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."² Indeed there was much murmuring among the people when conditions were more unfavourable than usual. As Buber notes in a characteristic generalization, "Always and everywhere in the history of religions, the fact that God is identified with success is the greatest obstacle to a steadfast religious life."³ But in Israel, expectations continued in a spirit of too easy optimism. Jahweh, it was believed, would soon give a sign that he was on the side of his people⁴.

The prophets, beginning from pre-exilic times, also knew of a Day of Jahweh, but their thinking began less with a vision of conditions in a Golden Age, and more with an apprehension of the ethical righteousness of Jahweh. The prophets blasted the optimism of the people⁵. Jahweh's Day, they said, would not necessarily be bright. Because of the backsliding of the people it could be a day of

1 Oesterley, The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period, 121.

2 Jer. 8:20.

3 Buber, op. cit., 88.

4 Amos 9:13; Hos. 1:10; 2:18-19; Is. II:6-7; 30:23-4; 35:12; 65:25.

5 William Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 50, uses similar language to describe Jesus' proclamation of the coming of the kingdom.

"darkness and not light"¹. "God is ruling now", they seemed to say, "And this is apparent because of the just punishments he is meting out to his wicked people".

On a deeper level, however, the prophets showed that they shared the popular expectations of a future better time. Jeremiah looked at the harsh events of the exilic period, and saw Jahweh acting in them, but in such a way that he was preparing them for dominion. Jeremiah talked of the "very good figs" (Jer. 24:2) who were to endure the exile and return fitted for great responsibilities. Deutero-Isaiah comforts the returning exiles and tells them they can now look forward in confidence to the future (Is. 40). The future reign of God is here anchored to a specific event that was coming fairly soon, the establishment of a restored and righteous Israel.

Notwithstanding all this, the prophets developed no neat theodicy as apocalyptic was to fashion one at a later period. Rather inconsistently they made a double proclamation. On the one hand, they never admitted that God's sway was not actually being exercised on the earth. All that the people complained of as evidence of Jahweh's weakness, the prophets claimed was evidence of his righteous judgment and

1 Amos 5:18.

abiding purpose. Jeremiah saw even the exile as shaped according to God's will.

It is I who by my great power and my outstretched arm have made the earth with the men and animals that are on the earth, and I give them to whom-ever it seems right to me. Now I have given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, my servant..... So do not listen to your prophets, your diviners, your dreamers, your soothsayers, or your sorcerers, who are saying to you, "You shall not serve the king of Babylon"... Do not listen to them; serve the king of Babylon and live."¹

In this passage we have a justification of Jahweh's action in present history, but also, when the prophet mentions the present need to live, we have a future more perfect day also in view. And this future cast is the other consistent emphasis in prophetic proclamation. The prophet tends to picture events in the nation's future in which Jahweh will make his reign even more apparent.

The future cast of prophetic thought does not mean that at this time the Day of the Lord was eschatologically conceived. There is not yet any indication that an end to the present order of things is envisaged². This is true even when the Day is described as being preceded by cosmical

¹ Jer. 27:5,6,9,17.

² Emil Schürer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, II Thiel, 499-500.

catastrophies. In such descriptions, it is the transcendence of God in his holiness which is proclaimed, and not that the world where he rules is separated by a deep gulf from this one, as is the case in later apocalyptic dualism.

The Ideal Leader: Messiah

Running parallel to the development of the idea of the coming ideal state is the development of the idea of an ideal ruler for the theocracy, associated most often with the term "messiah". We have noted that the king was very highly regarded in the monarchy period if he was not actually granted divine status. The studies of the myth and ritual school enable us to see that many of the early passages traditionally interpreted as referring to wonder-working, future messiahs, cannot now be so regarded. Originally, messianism was not eschatological, and there is one strain throughout the post-exilic period that never becomes eschatological. It is this strain that concerns us here. Much of the messianic language of the prophets is what Engnell calls, "elaborate king ideology"¹. It offers descriptions and praises of actual reigning monarchs².

Orthodox views of the messiah developed in two stages.

1 Ivan Engnell, "The 'Ebed Yahweh' Songs and the Suffering Messiah in 'Deutero-Isaiah'", in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Vol. 31, No. 1 (January, 1948).

2 Examples of passages in this category: Is. 9:6ff; R. Smith, however, says this is description of ideal king; Is. 11:1-9; 32:1-8; various actual kings have been suggested as approximating to these descriptions, e.g. Hezekiah.

First there was a belief that the Davidic line would somehow continue to sit on the Judaeian throne. Jeremiah promised that if righteousness and justice were done in the nation, then there would "enter the gates of this house kings who sit on the throne of David" (Jer. 22:4). Even after the monarchy had ended Ezekial said, "And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them" (Ez. 34:23). The fact that after 586 B.C. the royal house had a living representative in Jehoiachin, kept the hope of a continuance of David's line bright. The passage of time brought no reality to the dreams, however, and this stage of the messianic expectation ceased.

A slight future cast, such as had changed the theocratic ideal, changed the belief that Jahweh had established David's line forever. A representative of David's line was now looked for at a time in the historical future. This future scion would restore the rule of God and the fortunes of the nation. "The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light" (Is. 9:2ff). The cause of the great light could certainly be a Jehoiachin, or other youth recognized as a rightful source of hope. It seems most likely that this passage is an example of a description of a futuristic - but not eschatological - messiah. In this stage of development

the change in fortunes is not brought about by the messiah; that is, he is not a heil-bringer. Jahweh is seen as the one who acts decisively on behalf of his people, and the messiah is simply the one who will rule in the future ideal time. By 520 B.C. Haggai and Zechariah were pointing to Zerubbabel as the scion of the house of David, giving him the title of נֶצֶחַ or "branch". Cyrus too, because he accompanied an historical change for the better, had the terms "branch" and "anointed" applied to him (Jer. 23:5-8). This bears out our contention that the orthodox were straining to see, in history, signs of Jahweh's rule.

Throughout the developments we have tried to sketch in the last two sections there was a strong emphasis on the high ethical standards that would obtain in the future reign of God. To be sure most of the pictures of the ideal age to come are bluntly national and political in their terminology. It is natural enough to find the Hebrew depicting the יְשׁוּעַת מְלֹכֵי in terms of the hazily-remembered ascendancy of David's reign. But we should also note that the frankly political picture of the future ideal state contains, as Moore has pointed out¹, all of these features: "The recovery of independence and power, an era of peace

¹ Moore, op. cit. II, 324.

and prosperity, of fidelity to God and his law, of justice and fair dealings and brotherly love among men, and of personal rectitude and piety." And surprising though it seems, Jeremiah was able to envisage a reign of God that was not dependent on a restoration of the nation's fortunes. His community was broader than Israel. Thus he even exhorted those in exile to seek the peace of Babylon. This kind of attitude opened up the way toward the concept of a universal kingdom of God. It also made possible more positive attitudes to states other than Israel in the days to come.

The Restoration

The thinking that produced the theology referred to in the previous sections had an ethical staying power which ensured that the concepts would continue to exert a strong influence even into New Testament times. It did have the disadvantage for many Israelites of being too ambivalent about the actual community of which they were a part. As we have seen earlier, man's need for order is a strong political force, and this must have been one of the things that prompted a further modification in Israel's political thinking about herself. She now began to accept the limited horizons which history had given her, and to organize a

tightly-knit, self-confident community within the narrower limits. The development can be traced in Ezekial, Haggai, Zechariah, and Ezra.

In the closing chapters of Ezekial we get a picture of what the ideal state of the return from exile is to be like. It is a surprising picture, for the prince is mentioned only once, and then in an unimportant role. Ezekial seems to think that in a small community with no real political status, strong religious leadership would be more effective in maintaining Israel's ideal constitution than would the monarchy. In Ezekial's thought therefore, the priest becomes the all important figure, and the Temple cultus the supreme mode of carrying on the overlord-servant relationship between Jahweh and his people.

The change in emphasis is dramatically underlined in Haggai and Zechariah. To begin with, these books echo the great expectations of the return voiced, for example, by Deutero-Isaiah¹. In Haggai we read that the rebuilding of the Temple is to be accomplished under the dual leadership of Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, and Joshua, the high priest. In the oracles of Zechariah², this dual leadership is again mentioned. The later visions of Zechariah, however, have no

1 Is. 40-55.

2 Following S.B. Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic, 93ff., where a distinction is seen to exist between the oracles of the first chapters and the visions of the same sections.

place for the messiah at all. Between the two times of writing, Joshua the high priest has assumed full leadership of the people, and is pictured as having mediatorial access to Jahweh equivalent to that of the angels¹. The state of Israel has come to look "less like a state and more like a church"², and the transition is reflected in the writings of one man within a fairly short time.

Ezra tells of the development of the new church-state during the Persian period. He was himself a member of an old priestly family, and a functionary of the Persian civil service responsible for dealing with Jewish religious matters³. He thus had a good position for setting in order the cultic affairs of the state. His goal was a strict reformation of a Temple-centered community, based on the law-book which he brought with him. He was rigorously opposed to mixed marriages, and drew the line of Israel's community boundaries most narrowly.

Von Rad claims that Ezra's restoration marked the birth of Judaism and decries the resultant loss of historical dynamic.

"The most serious aspect of the whole process was that in understanding

1 Zech. 3:7.

2 Bevan, Jerusalem under the High Priests, 7.

3 von Rad, op. cit., 88ff.

the law in this way¹ Israel parted company with history, that is, with the history which she had hitherto experienced with Jahweh.....Once she began to look upon the will of Jahweh in such a timeless and absolute way, the saving history necessarily ceased moving on. This Israel no longer had a history, at least a history with Jahweh. From now on she lived, and served her God, in as it were, an enigmatic (beyond history). She was of course thus severed once and for all from solidarity with the rest of the peoples. Because of this radical separation, Israel became suspect in the eyes of the other peoples - she actually became hated and drew upon herself the grievous reproach of μισία."2

1 von Rad refers to the view of the law which made it that which Israel was bound to serve, rather than the view which saw the law as God's gift for the service of the people as they made their way through history.

2 von Rad, ibid, 91-2.

CHAPTER II

THE MOUNTING CRISIS OF THE JEWISH NATION

In the previous chapter we traced briefly the constitution of Israel as a theocracy, in theory and to a certain extent in fact also. We pointed to the rigorously moral attitude of the Hebrew prophets for whom the goal of political life was the honouring of Jahweh and the doing of his will. We also mentioned the circumscribed theocracy of the restoration, with its inward look but also with what seemed a real chance to preserve the Jewish nation. In this chapter we have to note that in none of the four stages of her political life that were to follow - under Alexander of Macedon, the Seleucids, the Hasmoneans, or Roman rule - was she to find satisfactory ways or ordering her political life or of fulfilling Jahweh's moral purposes for her. Instead, there was a crisis which grew more and more acute and left her restless, angry, bewildered and barren in turns.

Alexander and Hellenism

When, in 334 B.C., Alexander of Macedon "pressed forward

to the ends of the earth, and took spoils from many peoples",¹ a new chapter of history began for the Jews. The far-reaching effects were not immediately apparent, but only began to be realized under the Ptolemaic dynasty².

It is sufficient for our purposes to make three comments on Alexander himself. First of all, he treated his conquered peoples and their strange customs with respect³. Josephus tells us that he even stopped in Jerusalem to sacrifice on his way to Egypt⁴. Secondly, it should be noted that Alexander brought with him a zeal for Hellenization, the result, no doubt of a thorough schooling at the hands of Aristotle and other philosophers of Athens. Isocrates gives us this estimate of the conqueror's cultural interests:

I hear everyone say of you that you are a friend of mankind, a friend of Athens, and a friend of learning, not foolishly but in sensible fashion. For they say that the Athenians whom you admit to your presence are not those men who have neglected

1 1 Macc. 1:3; see also Dan. 8:5-7.

2 Ptolemy was one of the four successors - the one who was to control Judaea - referred to in Dan. 8:8: "Then the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly; but when he was strong, the great horn (Alexander) was broken, and instead of it there came up four conspicuous horns toward the four winds of heaven."

3 E.R. Bevan, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, 3, makes this very plain with regard to Egypt.

4 Antiq. II, viii, 3-5. There is some doubt regarding the reliability of this testimony. Assuming a kernel of truth, the two principals, Alexander and the High Priest Jaddus, are at least symbolic of attitudes. That of Alexander would suggest respect for Jewish customs, that of the High Priest would suggest that the Jews showed no violent antagonism, but rather, were respectfully submissive.

their higher interests and have
a lust for base things, but
those rather whose constant
companionship would not cause
you regret.¹

Thirdly, his policies of colonization, such as his practice
of leaving behind companies of soldiers who couldn't keep
up with forced marches², led to mingling of ideas and
philosophies, and to a more universal outlook on the part
of all people.

The spread of Hellenic culture, following as the almost
inevitable result of Alexander's policies, was of immense
importance for the whole of Western civilization. There is
much evidence that the Greeks were early aware of the supe-
riority and potential power of their way of life. Isocrates
said in 380 B.C. that "she (Athens) has brought it about
that the name 'Hellenes' suggests no longer a race but an
intelligence, and that the title 'Hellenes' is applied rather
to those that share our culture than to those who share a
common blood."³ There is also ample testimony from scholars
in our day that the Hellenes did not over-estimate their
influence.

The world of Hellenism was a
changed and enlarged world...

1 Works of Isocrates in Loeb Classical Library, Vol. III,
Letter 5, To Alexander, transl. Larue van Hook.
2 Snaith, op. cit., 17.
3 Panegyricus 50 in Loeb Classical Library, transl. George
Norlin.

the idea emerges of an oecumene, or "inhabited world" as a whole, the common possession of civilized men; and for its use there grows up the form of Greek known as the koine, the "common speech" which was also used by many Asiatics. Greek might take a man from Marseilles to India, from the Caspian to the Cataracts. Nationality falls into the background.¹

That Judaism did not escape this cultural invasion is evidenced in the necessity for a Greek translation of the books of the Law in the next century, as well as in the reported horror of the orthodox when the broad-rimmed τρεταδους was worn in Jerusalem and Jews were seen visiting the γυμνασιον. In this period there were many who were impressed by the new political concepts of Greece. These were friendly to the new power, adopting some aspects of its way of life. Others began to feel that the subtle Greeks were exercising a lordship over the Jews of a type that could never be accepted.

We cannot doubt that Hellenism had a persuasive influence on Jewish life. We note several important changes. First, beginning with the Jewish state under the Ptolemies in the third century, B.C., there was a marked development in administration which shows the Greek influence. By the second century we encounter a kind of senate called by the Greek name

¹ W.W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, 3.

name ἡγεμονία. This body probably represents a development from the hereditary aristocracy which had leadership functions in the Persian period¹. Later on, the ἡγεμονία developed into the συμβούλιον or Sanhedrin.

Secondly, the thought of the period shows a growing universalism which opened the Jews to contact with other nations. Hecataeus of Abdera tells of the venturesome ones who began the migrations that resulted in Diaspora. "But not a few of the other Jews as well came to Egypt of their own accord, for they were attracted by the excellence of the country and Ptolemy's liberality."²

Thirdly, one of the most characteristic signs of Hellenic culture, the Greek-type city, was introduced into Palestine under the Ptolemies, and seems to have been popular³. A.N. Sherwin-White in his recent excellent Sarum Lectures⁴ has shown that the development of the πόλις in Judaea did preserve some distinctively Jewish elements, but he confirms the view that Hellenic culture strongly challenged the native tradition at this point.

1 Ezra 5:9; Neh. 2:16; 4:19.

2 Josephus, Antiq., XII, i.1. Cf. Cont. Ap. 1:186ff. For archaeological reasons for taking Hecataeus' testimony as being worth-while, see note "B" on Page 6 of Vol. VII of the works of Josephus in Loeb Classical Library; translation notes by Ralph Marcus.

3 Bevan, Ptolemaic Dynasty, 72.

4 A.N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament 123-7.

Fourthly, there was a growing laxness with regard to religious rites and beliefs which points to Hellenic influence. An extract from the letter of Aristeeas, a Hellenistic Jew, serves to show how Greek philosophy had broadened the Jewish outlook. "The God who gave them (Jews) their laws is the same who presides over your (Ptolemy's) kingdom, as I have succeeded in learning after much study."¹ Of course there were efforts designed to stem the tide of Greek influence, notably the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. This great effort was put forth to strengthen a faith under attack. It is remarkable because of the fact that there are so few marks in it which belie Hellenic influence. "Greek elements of the LXX-type are merely superficial and decorative, while the Jewish elements are deep-lying, central, and dominant."² Nevertheless, that the effort was necessary at all is a strong indication of the crisis of Judaism which was developing. Nor did the Greek influence peter out. It was an incident with a Hellenizing slant which sparked the Jewish War in 66 A.D.³

During this period there were two attitudes to Greek influence in evidence. One group, particularly strong among the Diaspora, were broad-minded about belief and more and

1 Antiq. XII, ii, 2.

2 Ralph Marcus, quoted in Pfeiffer, op. cit., 183.

3 War, II, xiv, 4-5.

more lax in observances¹. Another section of Judaism reacted to the cultural threat by holding even more strictly to the commands and promises of God. This group were to divide further in the second century as we shall see. There were to be those known as Hasîdim, or pious ones, who put their emphasis on strict obedience to God because they thought this was the condition for the restoration of the Davidic age. There were also those who thought they had to meet the force of Hellenic culture with tough, unyielding force of arms. This group was to be called the Hasmoneans after the family which led the resistance movement.

The Seleucid Period

Under Seleucid rule the problems of the Jews were much the same as in the previous period. The crisis continued, with mounting tension. The burden of taxation, though fairly heavy under the Ptolemies, became more oppressive under the Seleucids because of the heavy indemnities Antiochus III (223-187 B.C.) had incurred in wars with Rome.

The internal strife over the best attitude for Jews to take to Hellenism continued. There was bitter political

¹ War, VI, 420-2.

rivalry between the Oniads and Tobiads, both of which parties came from the ruling aristocracy, and both of which were pro-Hellenist. The difference came in the degree of Hellenizing implicit in their policies. The Hasidim supported the Oniads who were the true high priests. Antiochus tended to favour the more Hellenistic Tobiads.

Antiochus IV, an unlucky ruler whose ambitions had been squelched by Rome, turned to the consolidation of his position in lands already his, such as Judaea. The chief obstacle, as he saw it, to the unification of his empire was the Jewish religion, and so he began a policy designed to stamp it out. Jewish sacrifices were abolished. The books of the law became a forbidden possession. In 168 B.C. he even despoiled the Temple, setting up a statue of Jupiter Olympias, the "Abomination of Desolation". Antiochus IV appears often thereafter in Jewish literature as a type of the Anti-Christ¹, Daniel calls him a "contemptible person to whom royal majesty had not been given."²

Many Jews probably obeyed the harsh proscriptions³. Many others, associated with the Hasidim, decided to defy

1 Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, 88ff.

2 Daniel 11:21.

3 1 Macc. 1:43, 52-3.

the decrees. One may get some idea of the fine spirit of the Hasîdim in the dramatic scene described in the third chapter of Daniel¹. When the king heard that the three young Jews would not worship the image which he had set up, he delivered his ultimatum: "But if you do not worship, you shall immediately be cast into a burning fiery furnace; and who is the god that will deliver you out of my hands?" The steadfast answer of the young men was the answer of the pious ones of the little state of Judaea to the king who had proscribed their religion.

Behold, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he will deliver us out of your hand, O king. But if not, be it known to you, O king, that we will not serve your gods or worship the golden image which you have set up.²

Humanly speaking, Judaism might well have been wiped out by attrition had not another attitude to the monstrous state of Antiochus Epiphanes developed. This new attitude was not unlike that of the Hasîdim in its conservative view of the Law and in its determination to hold fast to the Covenant, However, it decided not to wait passively for

1 The author of Daniel is generally believed to be a member of the Hasîdim writing during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. For the reasons for so dating the book, see Montgomery, I.C.C. and S.B. Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic, 178 f.

2 Daniel 3:15-18.

God to break in with a miraculous relief for his people. Instead, a segment of the population decided to defy openly the royal edict.

Thus we come to the remarkably successful rebellion led by an aged priest, Mattathias, and his five sons, which made possible a brief period of national independence for Judaea. The revolt was pursued with relentless purpose. Apostate Jews were attacked, infants circumcised, pagan altars torn away. Judas Maccabeas, one of the five sons, engaged Syrian forces in battle in 165 B.C. and did well enough to achieve the lifting of the edict forbidding Jewish practices. Finally in 142 B.C. Simon Maccabeas obtained practical political independence for the Jews.

The Hasmonean Era

One might expect that joy would be unconfined in the Jewish nation that had thus achieved its goal of a restored statehood. Some were extremely exultant. I Macc. 14:4-15 indicates a writer who looked on the next years as a glorious age.

And no one was left in the land
to fight them
And the kings were discomfited
in those days.

And he strengthened all that were
brought low of his people;
He sought out the Law,
He put away the lawless and wicked.
He glorified the sanctuary,
And multiplied the vessels of the
Temple.¹

Simon was wise and prudent. He entered into relations with Rome, and consolidated his kingdom, even extending her borders.

However, not all were enchanted with the dream as realized. As Bevan notes, "The general conscience of Judaism soon allowed the memory of Judas and his brethren to fade... (and) ... ultimately abstained from putting any book of Maccabeas in the sacred canon². We may well look for the reasons for this. Undoubtedly one reason was the political instability of the period. There was constant strife among the leaders and between them and the surrounding powers³. Also, it is likely that the orthodox had become so used to authority residing in the Temple that they could not get enthusiastic about a development which saw John Hyrcanus assume the title of king. At any rate the internal strife of the nation went on, indicating a dissatisfied population. Under the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, (101-75 B.C.) the

1 I Macc. 14:13-15.

2 Bevan, Jerusalem under the High Priests, 99.

3 Bevan, The House of Seleucus, Vol. II, 238ff.

main positions in the party strife are represented by the Pharisees and the Sadducees, so we will attempt to compare and contrast their ideas.

The Sadducees had proceeded from the ranks of the priests. They bore the proud name of PIRES, the priest whose family had exercised the sacred office since Solomon's day. They were traditional in their attitude to the law and to the place of priesthood. Through the years they had come to hold the important civil positions, and they were thus well placed for financial gains. Politically, they were compromisers. They sought to run an orderly administration, collaborating with foreign power where it seemed necessary. Later on when Jews of revolutionary spirit were disturbing Jerusalem, the Sadducees hailed the Roman governor as their protector.

The Pharisees had a lower status, having originated as a group of lay members of the Sanhedrin, but they had the major public support. Their paramount concern was the law, which they regarded as a "system to be applied to every department of life and to be worked out in detail accordingly."¹

¹ G.H. Box, Judaism in the Greek Period, 50.

It seems likely that the name of the party had its origin here. Although scholars are uncertain of the sense in which it was applied,¹ the name comes from the root meaning "to separate". They were separated from other members of the Sanhedrin in their view of the law; they were also separated from others because of the strictness of their obedience to the law. Their teaching was that all actions should be based on the law, either as expressly enjoined or implied in the text. Jewish distinctives could be preserved by such a circumspect attitude, and perhaps the Jewish nation should be satisfied with the achievement of so modest a goal.

The Pharisees' major influence on politics was to encourage safe, unpretentious attitudes. If the government of the time allowed them to carry out the requirements of the law, they did not agitate for more concessions. They believed that the hand of God moved in all history, or as Josephus put it, the Pharisees "make everything depend on fate and on God".² Hence in times of persecution the Pharisees encouraged the people to submit to chastisement at the hand of God. But the Pharisee was also tied to the vision of the ideal theocracy and so, though quietist still,

1 For some of the various views, see Hastings E.R.E. IX, 832; Lauterbach in J.Q.R., new Ser. VI, 578; Schurer, Geschichte, II Theil, 296-7.

2 War, II, viii, 14.

often burned with resentment over the brazen Gentiles who usurped Jahweh's place.

The picture is of a nation split by party enmity, dissatisfied with its political life. There was little popular support for the Hasmoneans as the period came to a close. The final proof of this came when an embassy arrived from the Jewish people to ask Rome to relieve her of the rule of Hasmonean kings altogether¹.

The Roman Era

Many Jews were glad when Rome took more direct responsibility for ordering the land. The Psalms of Solomon record their attitude when Pompey marched into Jerusalem in 63 B.C.

The Princes of the land went to meet him with joy: they said to him: Blessed be thy way! Come ye, enter ye in with peace. They made the rough ways even, before his entering in; they opened the gates of Jerusalem, they crowned its walls.²

Others, notably the Pharisees, were not in favour of alliances with foreign governments, and called the Roman

¹ Antiq. XIV, iii, 14.

² Psalms of Solomon, 8:18-19.

rule a just judgement of God.

According to their sins hath he
done unto them,
For he hath left them in the
hands of them that prevailed.¹

One can therefore understand why the Jews always presented a troubling administrative problem for Rome. Rome's policy was to use any cohesive force at the local level to bring about stability, and therefore tended to try to work with, rather than against, Jewish sources of power. On the other hand, rebellions emanating from the factious populace, prompted a more tough minded attitude. Juster describes the choice in a famous passage. "On voit donc le dilemme: persécutions ou privilèges.....Et ce dilemme se posait chaque fois que les juifs passaient sous une nouvelle domination."² As we trace briefly the history of Judaea in the Roman period, it can be seen that both attitudes were taken from time to time.

Pompey made no effort to stamp out Jewish religious practices, but allowed Hyrcanus II, the High Priest, the title and power of an Ethnarch³. The Jewish state became a division

1 Psalms of Solomon 2:7. These psalms are Pharisaic in authorship and date from about 63-48 B.C. See G.B. Gray, "Introduction to the Psalms of Solomon" in R.H. Charles, ed. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. II, 625ff.

2 Jean Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, Tome I, 213.

3 Ἐθναρχὴς is the Greek form of כְּנָזִי, chief prince, or patriarch. Moore, op. cit., I, 234, says that in Origen's time it had become an office "in no way different from that of a king of a nation". The ethnarch could even condemn men to death.

of the Roman province of Syria at first, but in 47 B.C. Antipater was of such help to Caesar that the Jewish people was recognized as an ethnos¹, and was allowed to conduct its own courts of justice.

Of Antipater's three sons, only Herod came to power. He had sided with Rome in the latter's struggle with Parthia and reigned as King of the Jews from 37 -4 B.C. He lashed out at any symbols of the Jewish independence hope because they were threats to his power, but he tried not to tramp on the religious sensibilities of the people. Great cities were built in his reign and magnificent edifices were added to Jerusalem², including a restored Temple.

In 4 B.C., when the people were freed from what they regarded as Herod's heavy oppression, his sons were too weak to cope with them; Archelaus, ethnarch of Judaea, suppressed riots only by killing three thousand Jews. In Galilee a certain Judas broke open an armory to equip his followers for revolt. Another firebrand, Simon, burned the royal palace at Jericho. In Judaea a shepherd-king raised a private army which dared to attack Roman troops. The governor of Syria needed to send two legions to rescue the one legion under

1 The Greek ἔθνος and its Latin equivalents natio, gens, and populus, signify that in the eyes of Roman law the ones described are not merely "adherents of a peculiar religion, but members of a nation who carried with them from the land of their origin into every quarter where they established themselves their national religion and their national customs." Moore, op. cit., I, 233. See Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, II, 20; 1,416.

2 War, I, xxi, 1-7.

attack in Jerusalem. The bloody revolts came to an end with harsh punishments being meted out to participants¹.

In A.D. 6, the dissatisfied aristocracy were able to have Archelaus dethroned and replaced by the direct Roman rule of a procurator of equestrian rank. The land was no longer a subdivision of Syria; instead the procurator was directly responsible to Rome and the gathered taxes were directly payable to the Emperor². The people felt the efficiency of direct Roman rule and serious disturbances again became a commonplace. Gamaliel, the Pharisee, unfavourably recalled one such disturbance and its failure³. Judas of Galilee had called the people to arms. The challenge of his crusade probably brought about a division among the Pharisees who had all been pacifists until now. Later on, Sadduk seems to have had something to do with joining the men of Judas' temper into a new party called the Zealots. They were like the Maccabees in their willingness to fight. In their devotion to God and His Law⁴, they were representatives of the extreme right wing of the Pharisaic party. The policies of this new party, reverting, as they did to those of the Maccabeans, led to a long series of political insurrections and ended in the complete destruction of the Jewish political hopes.

1 Antiq. XVII, ix-xi; War II, 1-6.

2 "Render unto Caesar", Matt. 22:21 thus has a literal meaning now in Judaea which it never had before.

3 Acts 5:37; Antiq. XVIII, i, 6.

4 Antiq. XVIII, i, 1; cf. J.S. Riggs, A History of the Jewish People, 248ff.

The first three procurators ruled with considerable harshness. The last of these, Pontius Pilate, was sent out at a time when Aelius Sejanus, the favorite of Tiberius and a militant anti-semite, was reaching the peak of his power at Rome. This may have accounted for some of the incidents which inflamed Jewish opinion. In any case, Pilate brought military standards with the emperor's image into Jerusalem. He expropriated the sacred money of the temple in order to construct a needed aqueduct. He set up votive shields in the old palace of Herod. Needless to say there were petitions, protests, raw anger from the Jewish side.

After Tiberius' death in 37 A.D. his heir Gaius Galigula became emperor. He gave his friend, Herod Agrippa, power in the region of the north east and the title of king. Galigula came to believe he was a universal god and at one point ordered that a huge statue of himself as Zeus Manifest should be set up in Jerusalem. Herod Agrippa narrowly averted a serious uproar by persuading Galigula to rescind the order.

The elderly emperor Claudius was determined to bring peace and acted with considerable forbearance toward the Jews.

He issued an edict instructing Alexandrians to leave off persecuting the Jews of their city. He gave Judaea to King Agrippa in the hope that a native ruler could bring peace. Unfortunately Agrippa died in 44, and there was a reversion to government by procurators and a continuing of strife. A prophet named Theudas raised a mob for a Zealot uprising¹. In Rome there was almost constant rioting among the Jewish populace. The situation of the Jews, never ideal, was deteriorating rapidly.

Claudius was poisoned in 54, and Nero succeeded as emperor. Nero decided a Jewish-Gentile dispute in Caesarea in favour of the Hellenes and this was undoubtedly one immediate cause of the Jewish War. The procurator Festus (60 - 2) did his best as a peacemaker, but the flood of bitterness was in full flow and he had little effect². Finally the match was thrown into the dry straw. In Caesarea, where Nero had decided an earlier dispute in favour of the Gentiles, the Greeks had built markets by the Synagogue entrances, and had openly ridiculed Jewish worship. "The steady-going and peaceable^e members of the congregation were in favour of immediate recourse to the authorities; but the factious folk and the passionate youth were burning for a

1 Antiq. XX, v, 1.

2 Antiq. XX, viii, 10.

fight."¹ The Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians all tried to stem the course of events. R. Henina, the Sagan of the priesthood, typified the alarm that these groups felt at the growing anarchism when he advised in the year A.D. 66, "Pray for the welfare of the government, for if it were not for the fear of it, men would swallow one another up alive."² But this warning came too late. A long and costly war ensued. When Titus finally ended it in A.D. 70 with the destruction of Jerusalem, only the three towers of Herod's palace were left standing in that completely destroyed city.³

The Jewish Response to the Mounting Crisis

It may be said with some justice that in six centuries of political domination by others, none of the postures of Judaism had proved both acceptable to her religious sensibility and successful in practical politics. Such a dismal record must have brought forth responses from various sections of the nation. We have indicated some of these as we went along in our story. At least one important response which took place on the ideological level must be looked at in greater detail.

1 War II, xiv, 4-5.

2 quoted in Moore, op. cit., I, 114.

3 War VI, vii-ix; VII, i-ii.

The Apocalyptic Literature. The majority of these writings were occasioned by times of trouble, notably the pre-Maccabean and Maccabean periods, and the time of Roman authority. Whenever the contradiction between the promised ideal time and present circumstances became unbearably great, the apocalyptic tendency was strong. The literature flourished in those times when the Jews came closest to despairing of the ideal state, when God seemed to have given up the care of His people. It has been said that it is a protest literature, crying out against what could not be tolerated, giving encouragement to the people to resist what had to be resisted. The Book of Daniel is a good illustration of this; its protest was against the Hellenism of Antiochus' reign. As Frost says, "In the all-pervading atmosphere of Hellenism the Jew was taken with a sense of claustrophobia and panicked into apocalyptic."¹

Theodicy. If the occasion of apocalyptic was persecution under overlords, its peculiar content can be seen to come from its origin in the struggle which the prophets had always had in times of distress in working out an acceptable theodicy. That the righteous should prosper was a doctrine of the law and the prophets. This followed from the belief

¹ Frost, op. cit., 235.

in God's covenant with Israel and belief in his righteous and all-powerful nature. The prophets had come to various conclusions as they wrestled with the basic problem. Ezekiel believed, for instance, that every man was recompensed in this life; but the most successful of the prophetic theodicies were less consistent in their schemes. However, none of the prophetic theodicies could have been entirely accepted by the people in the face of overwhelming catastrophes.

To be sure, the prophetic foretelling of judgment and doom had been fulfilled in heaped up measure. But not so their talk of better times just ahead, after the exile¹. "The contrast between their (the Jewish people's) actual political condition and status, and the vast and grandiose aspirations based on these beliefs (covenant and election) constituted the central religious problem of Israel from the first attempts at solution in Isaiah's time to the period of the apocalyptic solution."² Before the Maccabean period there had been many writings on theodicy which had an agnostic tinge about them, notably Job and Ecclesiastes.³ That apocalyptic was in some measure successful in its

1 Jer. 23:5 f.; 24:5ff.; 25:11; 29:10; Is. 40-55.

2 S.H. Hooke, "The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic", Labyrinth, 217.

3 Charles, op. cit., 24f.

wrestlings with the problem may be judged from the fact that it seems to have put an end to this type of writing in a period when it might well have increased.

"Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"¹

This was the question that seared the heart when it appeared that God had spurned His people. The answer of apocalyptic to this question would be curious indeed if we were to look for its origins in previous Jewish writings alone. The evil situation was seen to be due to sin, but not the sins of the people at which the prophets had pointed an accusing finger. It was the sin of angels and not men that was responsible². This is not to say that apocalyptic was not ethical. I Enoch could say,

"But walk in righteousness, my
sons.
And it shall guide you on good
paths,
And righteousness shall be your
companion."³

However, these writers believed with Deutero-Isaiah that the punishment hardly fitted the crime. And so the belief arose that it was not the individual wrongs of the nation which had caused her shame.

1 Gen. 18:25.

2 I Enoch 6:1 ff.

3 I Enoch 91:4.

This answer of apocalyptic can be seen to have its origin in Ezekiel, who, according to Duhm and Charles¹, was the father of the strain. In Chapters 38 and 39 we find the people attacked by Gog, an enemy who commands a host of peoples of the north. While these peoples were real enough antagonists, Gog himself is a symbol of the absolute enmity of the power of evil. Gog represents the supernatural anti-Jahweh forces which are in league with Israel's enemies. We might well ask where such a conception arose.

To be sure, there was a solid orthodox background for the question that the concept tried to answer. The prophets had seen the necessity for future improvement of Israel's fortunes if Jahweh's honour was to be upheld. But on this line pessimism was bound to take hold when oppression grew heavier. Zechariah 9-13 reaches the low ebb in this trend. Deutero-Isaiah and the other orthodox prophets of his day, believing as they did that God would bring the future national blessedness in this age, had been prepared to say that Jahweh was the author of evil.

Where the apocalyptic hope was different was in the fact that it abandoned this age. "As the horizon of the

¹ Charles, op. cit., 38.

Jews broadened and they saw their relative position among the nations of the world"¹ they perhaps saw the impossibility of gaining any lasting supremacy in the normal way. And so a belief arose in an "age to come" (אגרא עולם) which throughout apocalyptic literature is contrasted to the present world (הנה עולם). The apocalyptic doctrine of the reign of God came to depend very heavily on a dualism - a dualism which we cannot doubt came from Persian sources. In Zoroastrianism the Jews found, fully developed, a system which did not ascribe evil to God, and which accounted for evil purposes through the belief in a world of angelic mediators, who are in some sense free to be placed under the will of God or the will of his adversary.

Therefore, for purposes of theodicy, the apocalyptists had found just the answer they wanted -- the only answer that seemed to fit their circumstances. They could point the martyrs to the world to come, the transcendent world where God alone reigns. It was not a future world, as much as one that would come from above, breaking off history with cataclysmic events. Schurer explains the difference between the earlier orthodox hope and the later apocalyptic hope in

¹ Battenweizer, "Apocalyptic Literature", in The Jewish Encyclopedia.

these words, "Für die spätere Anschauung werden Gegenwart und Zukunft immer mehr zu reinen Gegensätzen, die Kluft zwischen beiden immer schroffer, die Auffassung immer dualistischer."¹ Apocalyptic opened the doors into this transcendent world; it threw a bridge across the great gulf so that people in this world where evil still exists and must inevitably persist, could see the world to come where God alone is ruling.

The Persian Contribution to Apocalyptic. While the Persian ideas were the form only, and while the real prophetic impulse came from the heart of Judaism, we must recognize the Persian influence as an important one. Its main contributions are three: dualism, determinism, and angelology.

We can see the curious mixture of Hebrew background and Iranian-Babylonian influence in the answer of one of the canonical apocalyptists - the writer of Is. 24-7 - who lived perhaps about 250 B.C.² He saw the clue to the mystery of Jahweh's apparent inaction by going back into the prophetic writings. In Ezekiel he found that the shepherds had been denounced as causing Israel's troubles³. Under the influence

1 Schürer, op. cit., II, 502.

2 Frost, op. cit., 143.

3 Ez. 34:1 ff.; Ezekiel was probably here denouncing the princes or perhaps the priests.

of Iranian dualism this writer interpreted these shepherds as angelic rulers of the world, who would be punished along with the kings of the earth as being evil powers in league with the earthly powers and perhaps inciting them to act.

On that day the Lord will punish
the host of heaven, in heaven,
and the kings of the earth, on the
earth.

They will be gathered together
as prisoners in a pit;
they will be shut up in prison,
and after many days they will
be punished.¹

In the apocalyptic writings proper, such as I Enoch, this dualism of angelic powers usurping the sway of God, became fully dualistic in the sense that the earthly cosmic order now was seen to have its counterpart in the heavenly order². Most of the apocalyptic authors are either caught up into heaven or have messengers from this transcendent sphere³.

This raises the question of how far the Persian ideas were impressed on the apocalyptic mind. We have seen that the orthodox side of Judaism knew no dualism; where there are heavenly beings, they are the absolute agents of Jahweh;⁴

1 Is. 24:21 f.

2 Hooke, *op. cit.*, 219.

3 See Daniel 4:13, 23; 10:13, 20, 21; I Enoch 12:2,3; 20:1; Rev. 11:19; 15:5.

4 e.g., Gen. 16:7 ff.

where there is action in History, it is always Jahweh who acts¹. Buber says of the earlier stages as well, that the "Israelite religion knows no Satan; if a power attacks a man and threatens him it is proper to recognize Jahweh in it or behind it, no matter how nocturnally dread and cruel it may be."²

Evil power in the apocalyptic literature became something different from evil deeds, and so we are compelled to see the Persian influence in the matter of dualism³. Dualism is perhaps a comprehensive term which makes possible, if it does not actually contain, the other extraneous contributions of Iran, determinism and angelology; these have a distinctive part to play in the attitude to the state, so they will be briefly described.

Determinism. It need hardly be said that orthodox Judaism did not know the concept of determinism. When the prophets longed for the reign of God they knew that the question of the sin of the people must enter into the

1 e.g. Jer. 27:6; Is. 45:7.

2 Buber, op. cit., 58.

3 The religion of Iran and its influence on apocalyptic have been so thoroughly discussed in so many works that it was felt unnecessary to go into the matter in detail. Suffice it to say that the overwhelming majority of writers recognize the influence. Oesterley, op. cit. 74ff. deals quite adequately with any serious objections to the view.

possibility of its coming, as well as the Divine mercy. When the orthodox were baffled, they cried, "Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or as his counselor has instructed him?"¹ They did not enquire further. When they were weary they cried, "O Lord, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked exult?"² They did not presume to know how long.

A view of history that was completely different from that of prophecy will be recognized in Zoroastrianism. This religion saw the duration of history as being a fixed period of time, determined by God before the creation. History was a chunk of time twelve thousand years long, divided into phases or world epochs³. No matter how evil the present epoch happened to be it had to run its course.

It was no wonder that to men like Daniel, who felt the prophetic impulse to screw the courage of those faithful to the covenant to the sticking point, this idea had an attraction. Especially would this be so if it were believed that an epoch in which evil reigned was about to finish its predestined course to give way to an entirely satisfactory epoch. It is no accident that Daniel provides us with examples

1 Is. 40:13.

2 Ps. 94:3.

3 Oesterley, op. cit., 88.

of the prophetic spirit as well as with one of the most rigidly deterministic schemes. The prophets would have gone no further than did Daniel when he said that God had weighed the kingdom in a balance and found it wanting; they would have agreed that judgment should be exacted of the kingdom by its division among the Medes and the Persians¹. But when Daniel says "This is the interpretation of the matter: MENE, God has numbered the days of your kingdom and brought it to an end",² he is clearly accepting a foreign determinism which the prophets never envisaged. In his prophetic zeal to give heart to the faithful Hasîdim, Daniel goes on to see his role as one who uncovers the plan of the ages. It was not for him to see the dangers of foreign doctrines to the future religion of his people. Any promising material, he felt, could be used in the prophetic spirit to say to the faithful, "Courage, for the end is near!"

Events had suggested to Jeremiah that the course of the exile could not run more than seventy years, after which a dramatic change for the better would occur. We cannot deny that it was also a reading of events which made Daniel prophesy that the end of history would come after the people had been

1 Dan. 5:27, 28.

2 Dan. 5:26.

given into the hands of the fourth beast for "a time, two times, and a half a time". This is usually interpreted as being three and a half years¹. If we see the fourth beast as Antiochus Epiphanes, and the time of Daniel's writing as being about the time of the latter's proscription of the Jewish religion, we cannot doubt that it was a theological necessity for him to see the end as imminent. But by using the form of Zoroastrianism, Daniel gave to apocalypticism its greatest weakness - a rigid determinism. It became normative for apocalyptic not to see the hand of God in history, but rather to see events as having to suit themselves to mystical numbers. A few examples from later apocalyptic will illuminate the point.

IV Ezra contains this dialogue:

Then I answered and said: How long and when shall these (be coming to pass)?

For our years are few and evil.

And he answered me and said

.....

Were not these questions of thine asked by the souls of the righteous in their chambers: How long are we (to remain) here: When cometh the fruit upon the threshing floor of our reward? And to them the archangel Jermiel made reply, and said: Even when the number of those like yourself is fulfilled:

For he has weighted the age in a balance,
And with measure has measured the times,
And by number has numbered the seasons:
Neither will he move nor stir things,
till the measure appointed be fulfilled.²

1 Dan. 7:25. See Montgomery, I.C.C., in. loc.

2 IV Ezra 4:33-37; trans. by G.H. Box in Apocrapha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R.H. Charles.

I Enoch also shows a determinism of this type when he pictures Jahweh as foresaking the sheep, and handing them over to shepherds whose tenure of office must run its course¹.

The Angels. We noticed that the apocalyptic answer to the problem of theodicy was that the evil situation of the Jewish nation was caused by the sins of supernatural beings. Such a belief was possible only because of a view of the transcendence of God which could not see him coming directly into contact with the world. Instead, he was thought to have given all efficient power into the hands of intermediate beings. Thus the Jews could believe that it was not God who had forgotten how to be gracious, but his angelic servants. These had gone against instructions and allowed Israel to fall to a low place.

Where did this intermediate world of angelic powers come from? There was a native Hebrew belief in angels, but it cannot account fully for the apocalyptic hierarchy. In Genesis 16:7-14 the phrase אֱלֹהֵי שָׂרָי is used to denote God revealed to human sense; in other words, the term here means

1 I Enoch 89:51 ff.

little more than "theophany". Later there are instances when the concept is used of beings distinct from God, - for example, those angels which Jacob saw in his dream at Bethel (Gen. 28:12). The divinities that are mentioned in Gen. 6:1-4 as אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי must also be reckoned with, as they were later interpreted as angelic beings, members of the heavenly court. Elsewhere in the Old Testament we meet the Seraphim and Cherubim of Is. 6, and the hosts of Jahweh, so there is no need to look further afield for beginnings of angelology.

The post-exilic period saw a new emphasis however, and a steady development of the idea which can only be accounted for if we note the strikingly similar ideas of the Persian religion. For one thing, the angels come to have a personality of their own, quite distinct from that of Jahweh. They were thought to be divided into ranks of descending importance, with archangels at the top of the hierarchy. To complete the indications of their differentiation from Jahweh, personal names were added to the chief among them. For another thing, the Persian influence enabled the Jewish writers to read back a dualism into their own native beliefs. While the Satan of Job had been quite a neutral figure, ethically speaking, he became less so in Zech. 3,

until in I Chron. 21:1 he becomes the adversary of God as well as of man¹. But it is not until I Enoch that the world of angels came to its full development. Here the earlier Hebrew concept of שְׂרָפִים '12 is interpreted as referring to wicked powers opposed to Jahweh. They are members of a great host wholly opposed to Jahweh and his followers. It would only be fair to the apocalyptists to point out finally that Hebrew monotheism was alive enough within them to cause them to see this world of evil things as bound in some way by Jahweh's greater power (I Enoch 89:60).

Even with this brief survey of Persian influence, it should be obvious that apocalyptic effects a striking change of style when compared with the prophets and psalms. In another sense apocalyptic is the rightful successor to prophecy². In a period when orthodoxy had reduced to stagnation the ethical tension of Judaism, when the voice of the prophet had died in the land, who was there to lead the people to see the dangers of Hellenism? Or in the symbolic language of Enoch, who was there to open the eyes of the lambs to the wickedness of their shepherds? It was

¹ Snaithe, op. cit., 134.

² See M.J. Lagrange, Le Judaisme avant Jesus Christ, 70ff.

the kind of task the older prophets would have felt called to undertake, but it was the apocalyptists who stepped in and zealously did the job. As Rowley has seen, it is hard for us to compare the answers of prophecy and apocalyptic to the question of theodicy, for the group addressed in each case is different. The pre-exilic prophets addressed those whom they condemned as disloyal, while the apocalyptists spoke to those whose loyalty to God was causing them to be persecuted¹. Therefore the apocalyptist was convinced, as the prophets never had been, that the righteous do suffer in this life; he was driven by his belief in the living righteous God to say something comforting to the loyal Israelites, and felt that it could best be said in the dualistic other-worldly language of Persia.

What was the Messianic Hope of Apocalyptic?

Where there is an ideal figure connected with the age to come it is only fitting that he should be of the same theological dimension as the transcendent age to come itself. The development indicates that he is a definitely apocalyptic figure. In Daniel 7 the phrase וְיִשְׁרָאֵל is used, meaning simply "man". However, the words are given a fuller meaning

¹ Rowley, op. cit., 20. f.

by two associations. First of all, in verse 18, we read that the kingdom is given to the "saints of the Most High", that is to the faithful children of Israel. This then is the Danielic meaning of the phrase. The faithful martyred saints rise on a cloud to the Ancient of Days and there receive a heavenly, everlasting kingdom. If there is a connection between the Son of Man concept and the national messiah it is here, in the fact that while the old national hope is abandoned, the martyred saints are given charge of an everlasting apocalyptic kingdom. These saints then, represented by the phrase "Son of Man", receive charge of the final kingdom much as the Davidic messiah would have been placed over the ideal state had it come.

Secondly, we see that the "man" symbol is set over against a "beast" symbol in a normal apocalyptic device. Animals represent the earthly kingdoms but "one like a man" represents the heavenly kingdom. W. Manson is right in seeing a connection here with the angelic ideal (Dan. 7:27). When the Danielic figure is individualized in I Enoch it is necessarily as an angelic, semi-Divine person. There is also a possibility that the term was given some content at the time when the Similitudes were written by various Zoroastrian Elect-One figures¹. The Dead Sea Scrolls have

1 T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, denies this possibility.

recently made us aware of a central figure in the Community of the New Covenant called the Master of Justice, who bears a striking resemblance to the Enochian Son of Man¹.

Whether or not there is a strong connection between the Son of Man figure and the messiah before the time of Jesus is a question that is still being debated by scholars. Glasson would say that there is. "The Enochian Son of Man is an understandable extension and fusion of the two familiar lines of development -- that of the Messiah and that of angelology."² If some sort of linking of two strains is admitted, it seems likely that the Son of Man owes more to the apocalyptic strain and so he is more recognizably an angelic figure suitable to apocalyptic than a national messiah³. The same emphasis on the transcendence of God which had necessitated the intermediate world of angels, made it possible for the Son of Man figure to assume a position much closer to the throne of the Lord of Spirits than the Davidic messiah ever had in the Jahweh-centered world of orthodoxy.

The two main differences between the orthodox messiah and his apocalyptic counterpart are these: the former had

1 A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, Transl. E. Margaret Rawley.

2 Glasson, The Second Advent, 25.

3 This is the emphasis made by Matthew Black, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature", Expository Times, LX, (1948) 14.

never been the sine qua non of the ideal theocracy, while the latter holds the centre of the stage in the apocalyptic scene. Again, the national messiah had exercised, or would exercise in the future, a rule in history. He would be a military figure ruling in might over the nations, while the Son of Man was one who would judge the works of men and angels at the last, but would do nothing to overthrow the lawless rule of the evil spirits over the Jewish nation in the contemporary historical epoch. Thus the Son of Man is seen to partake of the determinism and other-worldly dualism that influenced the apocalyptic attitude to the state.

Influence of Apocalyptic on Jewish Attitude to the State.

Apocalyptic writings were tracts for the times. Arising as they did when the fortunes of Israel were very low, they cannot be judged by their content alone, but must be seen alongside the purposes that called them forth. It must be remembered that the purpose of the writings was to inspire courage, to say to those who were persecuted for the sake of God's own rule, "Do not give up your ideal. Be resolute, endure to the end, for it is about to happen!" Connecting the Book of Daniel with the historical hotbed of its origin -

the days of the Abomination of Desolation - we must see that whether it gave courage to the Hasîdim to die passively at the hands of the Gentiles rather than be traitor to Jahweh, the head of the true state, or whether it gave courage to the small bands of Jahweh patriots under the Maccabeans to resist actively the foreign domination, apocalyptic was here a living prophetic voice. Its faith was that God would not allow evil to persist, so that its presence was a sign --as it is in every age --of the nearness of the eschaton. Thus, as in Daniel, wherever apocalyptic was strongly linked to an historical movement, it maintained at least something of the orthodox positive attitude to the ideal state.

Its more noticeable contribution to the Jewish attitude to the state was in heightening the already observed negative attitude of orthodoxy to the state organizations other than Israel. This is not surprising when we notice that apocalyptic grew out of orthodoxy at points in history where the evil nature of the state made the orthodox position seem too mild to the pious. Try as they might, in Daniel's time, they could not paraphrase Jeremiah's words in Chapter 27 with reference to their own situation, "I am the Lord who has given these lands

into the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes: therefore serve the king of Syria, and live." It was obvious that to serve the commands of such a king would not be life for the covenanted ideal state, but death. In recognizing the surd quality of evil then, they took the first step in the establishment of dualism. Evil power became for the apocalyptists something different from evil deeds. As early as Ezekiel this power was symbolized in Gog, and while Gog is a mythological figure dwelling in a mythological land, there is no doubt that Ezekiel sees him in league with the Gentile nations of the north, the real, historical foes of Jahweh's people (Ez. 38:1 ff.). The writer of I Enoch 72-90 also makes a similar association. In Chapter 89 the evil angelic rulers of this age are clearly linked with the Gentiles, the lions, tigers, wolves and hyenas of the vision. In the eagle vision of IV Ezra¹, the eagle is clearly the Roman Empire, and it is typical of the violently negative attitude of apocalyptic that it is destroyed by the Most High² in an other-worldly setting.

Therefore thou shalt disappear,
O thou Eagle,
and thy horrible wings,
and thy little wings most evil,
thy harm-dealing heads,
thy hurtful talons,
and all thy worthless body! ³

1 IV Ezra 11:37.

2 S.H. Hooke, op. cit., 228, says that the eagle is defeated by the messiah, but it is extremely doubtful that the Davidic messiah would have been at home in the exotic world of apocalyptic.

3 IV Ezra 11:45.

Other Responses to the Crisis. In addition to the development of apocalyptic, there were at least three other responses which came from within Judaism. First, there was friendliness. The hereditary ruling class had found the foreigners to be reasonable men. Policies of co-operation and integration fitted in best with their temperament and could be expected to yield some dividends in terms of the maintenance of Jewish traditions. Secondly, there was the essentially negative response of the orthodox. Duty to God was the important thing for this attitude. As long as they were allowed to observe their religion, and thus preserve some semblance of being God's people, they would quietly endure the foreign power. One cannot help but feel there was self-deception in this attitude. For instance, the orthodox didn't protest when Roman taxes were paid indirectly through the Sanhedrin, but they were concerned about giving tribute directly to the emperor because this destroyed the appearance of an independent theocracy, which was important for their peace of mind. Thirdly, there was the response of revolt. The Maccabean Hasidim, and later the Zealots, sensed that it was inconsistent to hold the orthodox views on the coming of the reign of God and at the same time ignore those who usurped God's place. One could applaud

this response more if the rebellions could be seen to have a coherent purpose. Instead they appear to have only the negative goal of hurting those who cause the national frustrations. W. Manson had much evidence for making this judgment: "Judaism, both in its moralistic and apocalyptic directions had virtually put the God of salvation beyond the bounds of the existing world order."¹

¹ W. Manson, op. cit., 151.

CHAPTER III

THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TO THE STATE

We have sketched the mounting crisis for Israel in the preceding chapters. The strife-torn nation had a measure of autonomy, but not enough to realize the high position to which she felt called. The situation for most of the orthodox was one of intolerable frustration. Some of these cautioned submission because the Lord would surely act soon on behalf of his people; others could not contain the desire to revolt. Some groups curried favour with the hated overlords to maintain selfish privileges. Jesus was born into this nation at this time. It is most natural that we should expect Jesus' teaching to be relevant to this situation, and that we should find his attitude to the state to be primarily an attitude to the Jewish state of which he was a member¹.

However, there have been scholars who have denied to Jesus any interest in the political bedlam of his time. They

1 Among those who have recognized that the state conception included more for Jesus than pagan Rome are S. Liberty, The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry; S. Dickey, The Constructive Revolution of Jesus; Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus. Especially insistent on the point is C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 35.

would picture him as an apocalyptic figure with no interest in earthly affairs, or as a high-minded mystic too concerned with moral and spiritual truth to concern himself with the burning questions of Israel's national purpose¹. Because of these interpretations we must look for evidence that from Jesus' side the historical picture we have sketched was the context in which he saw his ministry placed.

The Context of the Ministry of Jesus.

All three synoptists testify to the fact that Jesus linked his mission to that of John the Baptist. When John's work was stopped because of the enmity of King Herod, Jesus took up his ministry in words which suggest a continuation of the Baptist's characteristic appeal. We have enough evidence to know that John's mission was to the nation, collectively viewed. He said that the crisis had almost reached its climax, that the axe was laid to the root of the trees (Matt. 3:10). The fruit of repentance was what was required, before it was too late. He addressed the leaders of the nation. It would not do for them to rest on the claim of being the chosen of God in Abraham (Matt. 3:9). All classes of people were addressed; the meanness

¹ e.g. A. Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, 119 f; E. Troeltsch, Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, I, 59.

of their political dealings was exposed, as is plain in Luke 3:10-14, where tax collectors are told to "Collect no more than is appointed you", and soldiers are cautioned to "Rob no one by violence or by false accusation, and be content with your wages". John's movement did not seem to have any blueprint to offer the nation, but he did see the national sins clearly. After John was arrested Jesus began to preach, "The kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel" (Mark 1:15). We will see later that Jesus' message was more far-reaching than John's, but there is no reason to suppose that he directed it to a different audience. Once again the target of the preaching was the citizenry of Israel. In the Sermon on the Mount the often-used terms "brother" and "neighbour" could be suitably rendered as "fellow-Jew". The indication is that it is no vague "anyman" whom Jesus is addressing, but one who belongs to the entity known as Israel¹.

The baptism, with its story of a ripening messianic consciousness², also strengthens the position we have taken about the context of Jesus' ministry. The weight of evidence suggests his was a consciousness of being a national messiah. Jesus' affirmative reply to Pilate's question, "Are you the

1 Alan Richardson, ed., A Theological Word Book of the Bible, 77 ff., 158.

2 Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, 159-61; 226-36, gives a succinct description of the scholarly battles which have raged over this point.

King of the Jews?" (Matt. 27:11), coming at the climax of his ministry of obedience to the Father's will, further confirms the position.

The synoptists are probably correct in suggesting that this consciousness reached its culmination at the Baptism, where Jesus heard the words coming from heaven, "This is my beloved Son."¹ If these words hark back to Psalm 2:7, "You are my son, today I have begotten you. Ask of me and I will make the nations your heritage", as has been suggested, then we are justified in seeing in the Baptism a fusion of two sides of the messianic consciousness². There is probably prior consciousness of close filial association with the Father in Heaven. The words "This is my beloved son" would also recall the day in the wilderness when God had taken the nation for his own beloved son. So that Jesus' personal mission would be closely linked in his own mind with that of the true Israel. It may be that the filial aspect of "Son of God" is prior, and that the phrase is rarely used in the Old Testament to designate the national messiah;³ still, we would be wrong to view it on this occasion as divorced from its strong "associations with the sonship of all Israel,

1 Matt. 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22, if genuine, more completely echoes Psalm 2.

2 W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, 77, 125-6; cf. Matt. 11:27; Luke 10:22.

3 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2; 89:26.

and that of the messianic king regarded as a national leader."¹ Indeed there are passages in the gospels where there can be no doubt of the use of the phrase as a synonym for the messiah. A good example is the question of the High Priest while Jesus is being tried before the Sanhedrin: "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mark 14:61).

All three synoptists place the temptation narrative after the baptism. This is to be expected because the story of the temptation is spiritual experience of Jesus at the time of the beginning of his mission, thrown into parabolic narrative form for the instruction of his disciples². He told his disciples about his victory over the temptation to present himself as a certain kind of political messiah, so that they would not fall into the same trap³. Many current interpretations do not attempt to relate the inner spiritual struggle of the temptation to the prior consciousness of messianic mission. When the attempt is made, in line with the synoptists' placing of the narratives together, the replies of Jesus to the Tempter can be seen as standing for the rejection of several popular solutions to the problem of Israel's national destiny. At the very least, we would have

1 Liberty, op. cit., 53.

2 T.W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, 55.

3 J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, 123. There have been a bewildering number of interpretations of the temptations. A good summary is found in J.B. Berry, The Temptations of Jesus, 23 ff.

to agree with S. Liberty that "the proposals of the Tempter and the response of the Tempted would show to the contemporary Jew that the scene had been acted on the national stage."¹

The words at the Baptism evoked a strong identification of Jesus with his nation, Israel. The Temptation narrative continues the identification while maintaining Jesus' individual messianic consciousness. Appropriately enough, Jesus' temptation can be seen from one standpoint as a re-enactment of Israel's own calling².

Israel's calling

Deut. 8:2-3. - And you shall remember all the way which the Lord your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, that He might humble you, testing (LXX $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$) you to know what was in your heart.....And He humbled you and let you hunger.

Temptation Narrative

Matt. 4:1-3. - Then Jesus was led up by the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted ($\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$) by the devil. And He fasted forty days and forty nights, and afterward He was hungry, and the Tempter came and said to Him, "If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread."

1 S. Liberty, op. cit., 47; C.J. Cadoux first accepted Liberty's interpretation, The Early Church and the World, (1925) 35, then rejected it in a more cautious mood as "farfetched", The Historic Mission of Jesus, (1941) 170-1; Berry, op. cit., regards the interpretation as spritely, ingenious, and apt, but does not adopt it as his own, even though he advances no argument against it. Other writers have accepted it, e.g. Simkhovitch, op. cit., and L. Dougall and C.W. Emmet, The Lord of Thought, 115 f. Whether or not it appears far-fetched to our ears today, I feel it answers to the political situation sketched in the preceding chapter and corresponds to the attitude to native policies which Jesus exhibited on other occasions.

2 O. Holtzmann, The Life of Jesus, 150 f.

The similarities could be elaborated, but it will not be necessary. Just as Israel long ago had been tested in the wilderness to see whether she had learned to trust in God alone for her constitution and life before she could enter in and possess the promised land, so Jesus, conscious of being identified with his people as Son of God, is similarly tested before preaching the coming of the Kingdom of God with power. Each of the groups within Israel had convictions about the proper course to be followed in the national emergency, and now Jesus brought them under the scrutiny of the Father's absolute will.

"If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread."
But he answered, "It is written 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.'"¹

The setting of the first temptation is the desert, where Israel wandered when she was on the brink of extinction. There she knew what it was to long for bread. It was there too that she learned that men need more than bread to sustain them. They live too by the promises of God -- the words going forth from his mouth that give a hopeful shape to the future.

¹ Matt. 4:3,4. The order preserved in Matthew is here taken as more original than that of Luke. See Berry, op. cit., 17 ff.

In Jesus' day, the Sadducean priestly class was one group that had concentrated its efforts on material survival at any cost. Through their policies of conciliation they had done very well, materially speaking. But Jesus saw that this attitude on the part of any leader would end in the death of the nation anyway, for Israel had been constituted with promises that she would be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Ex. 19:4-6), that she would be an instrument of salvation for the Gentile nations (Is. 45:23). Without this vision she would be nothing.

Then the devil took him to the holy city, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, "If you are the Son of God throw yourself down; for it is written, 'He will give his angels charge of you', and 'On their hands they will bear you up lest you strike your foot against a stone.'" Jesus said to him, "Again it is written, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God'."

The setting of the second temptation is the temple porch, the geographical and spiritual centre of the theocracy. It was the natural place to meet the pious Pharisees and their revolutionary offspring, the Zealots. These groups could not be accused of forgetting the promises of God. Their remembrance of God's promises might well have led them to quote Psalm 91 to Jesus just as the devil did. God had

promised to give his angels charge over the nation. If Jesus was the Son of God, could he not start a holy war against the Gentiles in confidence that God would intervene and bring victory? The Zealots had already cast the nation down from the temple peak, so to speak, in abortive rebellions. Foolish or not, this precipitate kind of action put the onus on the Almighty to prove whether he was with the nation or not. But Jesus sees that this is one of Israel's ancient sins, that of putting God to the test, tempting him as they had done in the wilderness at Massah and Meribah (Deut. 6:16). So Satan is rebuked, "You shall not tempt the Lord your God."

Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and he said to him "All these I will give to you if you fall down and worship me." Then Jesus said to him, "Begone, Satan! for it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'"

The setting of the third temptation is the mountain, also a significant location in terms of Israel's constitution. The policies of the two parties of orthodox and official Judaism had been found wanting. Were these the only avenues open to the attainment of the promise expressed in Psalm 2:7, "You are my son, . . . Ask of me and I will make the nations

your heritage"? It is noticeable that in the third temptation the preface, "If you are the Son of God", is missing. This is not strange if it is the Herodians who lie behind the third temptation, for they could hardly be thought to represent the true Israel. They did, however, aim at the object of Israel's vocation, and felt that policies of friendship to Rome and compromise over the religious understanding of Israel's life were small prices to pay for a position of increasing power among the peoples of the East. The Herodian conception of the state represented an open avenue of escape from political frustration, especially since the idea of a strong, friendly Judaea fitted in so well with Roman plans for the administration of the provinces¹. Anyone who espoused this policy would have the help of a powerful ally in gaining further dominion. The drawback was that the position involved coming to terms with Rome and abandoning the prophetic redemptive mission to the Gentiles. The true implication of Herodian policies was graphically illustrated in 4 B.C. when the first Herod caused the image of the Roman eagle to be placed over the temple gate. The temptation involved in this compromise

1 Claudius in A.D. 41 established Herod Agrippa I in the same position as Herod the Great had been in, showing that the Herodian way was a live option for Rome at any rate. It is significant testimony to the importance of their way that they are frequently mentioned in the gospels.

Jesus turned aside in the ancient theocratic formula of his people, "You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve."

The Teaching and the Crisis.

We have tried to show that Jesus set his mission within the context of the crisis of national purpose which beset Israel at that time. We must now look further at what his attitude was to the crisis. One of his parabolic sayings goes, "I have come to cast fire upon the earth; and would that it were already kindled."¹ Without attempting a detailed analysis, the parable conveys a clear suggestion. Jesus was not a teacher who viewed the crisis dispassionately, offering patient expositions of his system of thought. He saw himself as dynamically involved in the crisis; what he was saying and doing was actually bringing the crisis closer to its climax.

¹ Luke 12:49. In the preparation of this chapter much weight has been given to the evidence which the parables give concerning the attitude of Jesus. The creative work that has been done on the parables by C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, and Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, for instance, give renewed confidence to those who feel that it is possible to get behind the layers of kerygmatic preaching to the attitudes of Jesus. Jeremias uses an approach which suggests that historical reality is picture reality. That is, at certain points, test holes can be sunk through the strata of accretion and a valid picture of Jesus' understanding of his mission can be seen. The improving methods of source-criticism in related fields has caused people like the Graeco-Roman historian, A.N. Sherwin-White, to urge New Testament scholars to use their source material with greater confidence. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 86 ff.

His attitude to those who would not recognize the crisis is seen in the parable of the children in the marketplace. In Matt. 11:16 the children sitting (καθημένοις) have cast themselves in a passive role, preferring to sing dirges and play flutes rather than joining in with their more active playmates¹. The parable is followed by a passage which, by its form, must be part of the same early material²:

John came neither eating nor drinking and they say "He has a demon"; the Son of Man comes eating and drinking, and they say, "Behold a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!"

John and Jesus were involved in a movement which had direct relevance to the crisis. Many of the leaders and the people waste their time in captious criticism of the asceticism of the one and the high-living of the other.

There are a surprising number of the parables which relate to the crisis. "It may be too late already," is the message of some³. "This hour presents a challenge for resolute action", is the related message of others⁴. It is significant too that Jesus foretold developments in history which were in the direction of calamity. He himself would

1 E.F.F. Bishop, Jesus of Palestine, 104.

2 C.H. Dodd, op. cit., 24 f.

3 The parables of the ten virgins, Matt. 25:1-12; Luke 13:25-27; the great supper, Luke 14:15-24; Matt. 22:1-10; the closed door, Luke 13:24-30.

4 e.g. The parables of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke 16:19-31; the two houses, Matt. 7:24-27; Luke 6:47-49; the return of the unclean spirit, Matt. 12:43-45; Luke 11:24-26.

die and his followers would suffer persecution. The Jewish people and their temple would be brought down (Mark 13:30; Matt. 23:35-36). The saying, "I have come not to bring peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34), must be interpreted in this context of a situation in which he was determined to be involved, and which was moving toward calamity.

Many of the parables and parabolic actions of Jesus contain specific condemnations of the stance of the leaders of the nation in the face of the crisis. The Pharisees are the likely targets in the parable of the talents (Matt. 25: 14-30). The third servant confessed that he had been afraid to risk his master's capital, and had carefully hoarded it. He undoubtedly expected to be commended for his prudent and cautious attitude. Instead, he is blasted with the rebuke, "You ought to have invested my money!" The application to the Pharisees certainly fits. They were the ones who had built a hedge about the law in order to keep the nation from sinking into the broad sea of Hellenic-Roman culture. To abandon their policy of attention to separate development would constitute a risk no doubt. But without that risk, the stored up moral capital of Israel would find no use, and itself become barren¹.

¹ Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, 376.

The pious were criticised also for not being universal enough in their attitude. The main point of the parable of the great supper (Matt. 22:1-14; Luke 14:16-24) is that the invited guests refuse to come and the invitation then goes out to others. As with other parables, such as the labourers in the vineyard (Matt. 20:1-16), this one is told against the attitude of Jesus' critics and opponents. The admission of the lower classes and of the Gentiles is part of Jesus' vision of the kingdom. It is not sufficiently part of the attitude of the pious. In Jesus' view they were "blind guides!" indeed (Matt. 23:16, 24).

The Saddusaic priesthood comes in for its share of criticism too. In the very difficult parable of the unjust steward,¹ we have a sarcastically drawn portrait of the scoundrel who did very well for himself through sharp practice, and then expected to be commended. It is likely that the Sadducees, who had dealt fast and loose with their sacred trust as they tried to secure their place in Roman favour, would be recognized by Jesus' hearers. The force of Jesus' anger was directed at the same group when he said that they had made of their sacred trust, the temple, a robbers' den (Matt. 21:12, 13). Even Tacitus, the pagan

1 Luke 16:1-7. Difficult, that is, from the standpoint of trying to get at the main thrust of the teaching. Its picture of the activity of a scoundrel is straightforward and undoubtedly drawn from life.

historian, knew of their policy of self-aggrandizement:

The Hasmonean line of kings, recovering their throne by force of arms..... banished citizens, destroyed towns, killed brothers, wives and parents, and dared essay every other kind of royal crime without hesitation; but they fostered the national superstition, for they had assumed the priesthood to support their civil authority.¹

J.H. Robinson² mentions the fact that at this time the temple was a sanctuary for those who had wronged a Gentile. It is just possible that this was in Jesus' mind when he contrasted the universal house of prayer, what the temple should be, with the den of robbers, the sheltering place of the wicked that it was. The use of the word ληστώνες, which has more of the meaning of piracy than of simple robbery³, leads us to see the priests as plunderers, taking money into their cosy den which was garnered from a system designed to give riches to the world. And this at a time when the crisis of the nation would lead many to seek help from the temple. No wonder the priests receive the full force of Jesus' wrath, what Robinson calls "perhaps the strongest condemnation Jesus ever passed on contemporary Judaism."

Israel's True Purpose.

Jesus' condemnation of the nation and its leaders was

1 Tacitus, The Histories, V, viii

2 J.H. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, 171 f.

3 Richardson, ed. Theological Wordbook, cf. Is. 56:7; Jer. 7:11.

strongly expressed. But what did he want Israel to do and be? A short answer is that he wanted her to become a decisive, dynamic force in the history that was being made. "You are the salt of the earth; but if salt has lost its edge, how shall its saltness be restored? It is no longer good for anything but to be thrown out and trodden under foot of men" (Matt. 5:13).

A longer and perhaps more certain answer can be gleaned from an examination of Jesus' favourite description of his own ministry. We have seen how at his baptism he identified his own mission with that of the nation. So when he describes his own vocation he is also telling us what he would like Israel to be. Out of the messianic ideas grouped together and undifferentiated in popular hopes, he chose two figures in particular with which to identify his mission. Both of these, the Son of Man and the Servant of the Lord, were, in part at least, associated with community expressions of the remnant. Since the latter idea had in mind a small band exerting its influence through its attention to obedience in righteousness, we can immediately rule out the thought that Jesus' intention was to bring about a political revolution and restore the Jewish state with himself as king¹.

¹ Several attempts have been made to substantiate this approach, e.g. R. Eisler, The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist.

The phrase "Son of Man" was connected originally in Daniel with "the people of the saints of the most high"¹, that is with the redeemed and restored Israel. This Israel would, at the end of the reign of the beasts, be the possessor of a universal dominion². It can be seen that in choosing this figure Jesus asserted the ultimate importance of God's reign. He did not want Israel to forget or tone down any of the promises or responsibilities that God had given her³. The one who uses this phrase as a self-designation is bound to be confident about the final outcome of the present crisis. He has about him an unmistakable authority (ἐξουσία). His exorcisms are viewed as the power of the Son of Man already active in the world⁴.

In seeming contrast to the exalted figure of the Son of Man, is the humiliation of the Suffering Servant, the other favourite Old Testament reference point to Jesus. There is, however, a drawing together of the two phrases as Jesus uses them. Quite a number of the Son of Man sayings have as their predicate words which we would most naturally relate to the role of humiliation⁵. Also, there is an

1 Dan. 7:26 ff.

2 By the time that the Similitudes of Enoch were written, the term Son of Man had gained messianic significance, so that it is not surprising that Jesus should have used the phrase in reference to himself, as Dalman, op. cit., 250 f. believes to be the case.

3 J.R. Coates, The Christ of Revolution, 42 ff.; 78-84.

4 Luke 11:20; Matt. 21:28; see Otto, op. cit., 131-137, and H. Weinel, Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, 203 f.

5 Mark 10:45; Luke 19:10; Mark 8:31.

objective similarity at some points. Corresponding to the humiliation and suffering of the Servant there is the war which the fourth beast makes on the saints (Dan. 7:7 ff.); corresponding to the everlasting kingdom given by God to the Son of Man there is the final victory and vindication of the Servant (Is. 50:7 f.; 53:10). In employing the highly ethical Servant songs to delineate his mission, Jesus says that he expects Israel to be the spokesman and representative of the righteousness of God. She is to be redemptively active, suffering if need be, in the midst of the turmoil of the time.

It must have been clear early in his ministry that the nation and its leaders had no intention of embarking on the way of the Suffering Servant¹, but Jesus could not abandon the path for that reason. Being among men as a servant was not a matter of expediency for Jesus. It was the Father's will. There are indications that throughout his ministry he was conscious of being the Suffering Servant -- he came into Jerusalem not as a David or a Judas Maccabeas, but "lowly and riding upon an ass" (Matt. 21:5; cf. Zech. 9:9) -- and that he understood what it might cost him. Before he went into the Garden of Gethsemane, Luke

¹ See F. Jackson, and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 289.

reports that he quoted with reference to himself, the words of Is. 53:12; "He was reckoned with the transgressors", surely an indication that his servant consciousness was strong as he entered the days of the passion. He would, in the final hours, and with a new urgency, be calling men to repent and take up his way. Hence he made sure that he would not be taken and killed quietly as the chief priests would have liked (Mark 14:1). This intention of Jesus to say something through the manner in which he underwent arrest and punishment probably accounts for the repeated requests to the disciples to watch while he prayed, and also for the strange word about the swords (Luke 22:35-38). The fact that two swords were judged to be "enough" indicates that the only defence envisaged was against a possible stealthy assassin.

At supper on the evening of his arrest he had taken the servant's role again and he washed his disciples' feet. He had held up before them the symbol of suffering, the cup. Soon he was condemned and put to death. But in living out the love ethic himself through the greatest crisis an individual can face, he had said in the clearest way possible to those of his nation who could hear, "Follow me." We must

now see in greater detail what was involved in the ethic of the kingdom of God which he enjoined.

The Ethic of the Kingdom of God.

Mark begins the story of the ministry with a summary statement, of Jesus' preaching, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel" (Mark 1:15). Matthew gives us a much longer summary of the kingdom preaching in what has come to be called the sermon on the mount (Matt. 5:1-7,28). By comparing this with a similar summary in Luke (Luke 6:17-49), and testing it all against the parabolic teaching, we can gain a sufficient knowledge of the ethical teaching of Jesus to know where the main emphasis lay.

Jesus was born and bred in the midst of the Israel of God. We may assume that he embraced the orthodox idea of the ideal theocratic state with positive zeal. He believed that his people possessed an inspired law and were inheritors of many glorious promises. In short he was a religious patriot¹. As such he aimed in his teaching to charge the people to repent, and become obedient servants of the reign of God. It was the whole nation that was addressed². Thus

1 H. Weinel, Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat, 6.
2 C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 26.

we find the strategy in the first part of the ministry was to cover as much territory as possible¹. Only after the Galilean towns fail to respond does he concentrate on the capital and nerve centre of the nation, Jerusalem². But the idea throughout is to make the greatest impact possible on the total national life.

It must also be pointed out that his teaching of the kingdom shows the influence of apocalyptic³. Beginning his preaching with the words, "The time is fulfilled", he definitely showed his familiarity with the apocalyptic vocabulary⁴. There is no need to cast around for explanations of this fact. Undoubtedly there were many among the various parties of Judaism who were willing to expound the orthodox view of the kingdom. Jesus possibly felt that as none of these were drawing forth from the nation the necessary repentance, a more vivid and startling presentation was necessary. Whatever else we may think of apocalyptic, its dramatic language could divert men's attention from the welter of political squabbling for a moment, and perhaps, help them to see their political ideal in a fresh way.

1 Mark 1:38; 6:7-14; Matt. 15:24.

2 Matt. 11:20; Luke 10:13.

3 The world of scholarship, aware of the claim that Jesus accepted current apocalyptic ideas since A. Schweitzer's monumental work, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, see especially 222ff., has on the whole, if with reservations, accepted it.

4 W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom, 66ff.

We must resist the idea that because Jesus uses apocalyptic, complete renunciation of the world is implied¹. Apocalyptic became a new thing in his hands, for he owed more to the vital religion of the prophets, to their concern for justice and purity of politics, than he did to it.

In the Hebrew prophets an intense apprehension on the righteousness and faithfulness of God led to the casting of their message into the form of an annunciation of world judgment coming and of the Lord being exalted in that day. In Jesus, but in purer and more positive form, this process repeats itself. His vision of the Kingdom projects the intense inwardness of his spirit's realization of God².

Jesus may be said to bring the developed transcendental kingdom of apocalyptic into vital relationship with the world again. When this happens a tension is developed between the absolute standards of the one and the relative standards of the other, and from this tension the new morality comes³. Contemporary Judaism, both in its orthodox and apocalyptic strains, was teaching that duty was measurable. The performance required was of the order of this world. In Jesus' proclamation of the royalty of God, the performance required is of the order of heaven. A new and higher righteousness is enjoined upon men still living on this earth. Men are brought face to face

1 e.g. Ronan, Jesus.

2 W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 107.

3 R. Neibuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics, 8, 31.

with God's absolute and immediate claim to sovereignty. The future reign of God is brought into line with present historical forms and institutions, and they are judged and put under a tension which is the beginning of redemption for them.

To understand Jesus' ethic right it is necessary to see his own relation to the higher righteousness. He is living by the higher righteousness and so his own actions become a sign that the future kingdom has come already¹. Or to use the words of Jeremias, we must see that in Jesus there is a "recognition of an eschatology that is in process of realization"². When he comes in contact with systems of ethics which are appropriate to this age, as for example the law of Judaism interpreted by the Pharisees, or the laws of the secular civil government, he appears to have a negative attitude to them. But this is not altogether the case. They may be quite suitable and useful from the standpoint of the lower order. It is only when the kingdom has come near that their deficiency is apparent. The sermon on the mount gives us a valuable account of Jesus' attitude to Jewish law. "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them, but

1 See C.H. Dodd, op. cit., 147; also Bright, op. cit., Ch. 7.
2 Joachim Jeremias, op. cit., 230. He gratefully records his gratitude to C.H. Dodd for this insight.

to fulfil them" (Matt. 5:17). The word which the Revised Standard version translates by "abolish" is ἀπόλλυμι. This word commonly means "abolish" or "annul", or "destroy", but the meaning in this case is perhaps more nearly rendered by "to disappoint hopes" or "to frustrate the purpose of".¹ The word for "fulfil", πληρώω, when used in opposition to ἀπόλλυμι, means "to bring to completion", or "to bring out the full intention of something"². Also instructive for the use of this word is the meaning that it has in Matt 9:16, where it is used of the placing of one piece of cloth into another to "fill it up". Thus what Jesus means is that he has not come to frustrate or annul the purpose for which the Law was given, but rather to fill up and heighten the Law to its absolute expression. In other words, the new righteousness does not enter into competition with the old. It begins where the old leaves off³. Anyone who has been faithful in the "little" which the Law requires, is not to be rebuked, but he is the one to whom the "true riches" can most safely be entrusted (Luke 16:10-12).

The same sort of relationship exists when it is the rule of a secular state with which the disciple of the kingdom

1 G. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, 393.

2 J.Y. Campbell, "fulfil", Theological Wordbook, ed. A. Richardson, 87 ff.

3 John R. Seeley, Ecce Homo, Fifth Edition, 89 ff.

has to do. In a passage where the heightening of the demands of the Jewish Law is the chief subject (Matt. 5:17-48), the disciple of the kingdom is also told to exceed the requirements of the Roman occupation forces. "If any man forces you to go one mile," has reference to the labour which occupation troops could require of the subject population. The one who would follow Jesus must go beyond the minimal duty to the state, and go the extra mile (Matt. 5:17).

Thus it is not true, as the Apocalyptic school alleges, that the high righteousness counseled in the Sermon on the Mount is proof that Jesus renounced all responsibility for this world. The citizen of the heavenly kingdom goes beyond what is required of him by the institutions that are passing away, but he does not renounce or annul the Law or the secular instruments of civil government.

The ethic of the kingdom, then, is one in which the moral ideal of love achieves such a purity that it seems more clearly related to the holiness of God than it does to the goodness of which man is capable. The requirements of love may be easy to discern, but they become troubling

when they are made applicable to conditions of this life. That Jesus intended such application is clear from several points on the records. When he began his teaching in Nazareth, Luke reports that he read from Isaiah:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me
because he has anointed me to preach
good news to the poor.
He has sent me to proclaim release
to the captives and recovering of
sight to the blind,
to set at liberty those who are
oppressed,
to proclaim the acceptable year of
the Lord.¹

This could be read as an eschatological vision of a futuristic kingdom. But Jesus goes out into the towns and villages and begins to meet society's needs at the very points mentioned in the vision. Thus by his action he makes the absolute standards of the other-worldly kingdom relevant to the Judaea of his own day.

Are we to understand then, that the ethic of the sermon on the mount was seriously intended to motivate the ordinary citizen's conduct in the arena where attitude to the state governs his day to day actions? Were the Jews of Jerusalem and Galilee actually expected, not only to drop their vindictive spirit where Romans were concerned,

¹ Luke 4:18-19; Is. 61:1-2.

but to exchange it for an attitude of love? If the situation should arise where one was struck on the face by a bully in the uniform of the Roman legions, was the follower of Jesus' teaching meant literally to turn the other cheek? (Matt. 5:39)

Some would say "No", because the behaviour required is patently impossible¹. Those who hold this view say that the social justice which Amos preached represented a possible goal for society, but pure love transcends historical possibility. It must be admitted that Jesus was apparently not concerned over the exact degree of attainability of his teaching². He said what he believed to be right. Here is what a man ought to be able to do if he loved, trusted and obeyed God completely. Thus in the parable of the good Samaritan, Jesus portrays a despised half-breed going beyond his ordinary responsibility to actions of generous love. His final words to the scribe, who it will be remembered asked a question about the limits of his responsibility, are "Go and do likewise." He seems to be using the parable to say, "If a Samaritan could show such a selfless love, it ought to be possible for one who has the spiritual capital of Israel behind him to do at least as much."³

1 Reinhold Niebuhr, op. cit., 31ff. comes close to this position, though he holds out for the relevance of the ethic nonetheless.
 2 G. Harkness, Christian Ethics, 63.
 3 J. Jeremias, Parables, 202-208.

Others would say that Jesus' ethic was meant for individuals in the context of a small, isolated community, but that it is naive to think that he had in view man in a developed social context¹. Against this view it should be stated that the gospel was preached in the context of the kingdom of God, a concept which throughout the history of the Jewish people had the connotation of a real political and social organism. Even in the most extravagant apocalyptic descriptions, political elements were seldom lacking².

Another group says that Jesus' teaching is an interim ethic. It contains precepts that are given to a small group of disciples for the very unusual and short period of history that Jesus believed there would be before normal conditions ceased altogether. The stringent rules were intended to save men out of the present evil age which was shortly to pass away³. But to those of this mind two things must be said. First there is no evidence that Jesus suggested that he was saying something of temporary relevance. On the contrary, he is reported to have said, "Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away."⁴ Secondly, while he certainly believed that a crisis was developing that could lead to catastrophe, the events which pointed

1 J.S. Mill, Essay on Liberty.

2 K. Barth, Church and State, trans. G. Ronald Howe, has commented on the fact that even in the Book of Revelation it is a city of God -- a political entity -- that comes down out of heaven. Rev. 21:2.

3 J. Weiss, Predigt von Reich Gottes, quoted in W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom, 102. M. Dibelius, Sermon on the Mount, 52.

4 Matt. 24:35; cf Luke 16:17.

to this were historical events. It must be admitted that the crisis adds urgency to his plea for a new righteousness, but it in no way removes the disciple who wants to obey God from the context of the crisis. There would be no crisis at all unless the ethic of the kingdom was meant to bear on the present situation. However long protracted the age before the consummation, a new, heroic standard is urgently needed,¹ and will continue to be needed.

There is no indication in the records that Jesus believed the methods of love would always or immediately "work" in human society. With regard to his own future, and that of his contemporary followers he foresaw that they would not². Yet there is no easing of the requirement of complete faithfulness to the reign of God. There must have been some loss of heart among those who were met with such a stern challenge. On one occasion the disciples said to Jesus, "Who then can be saved?"³ His answer, "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible", shows an attitude which is its own answer to those who doubt the relevance of his ethic. It should also be said that he understood how his preaching could lead to despondency. For many of the parables

1 S. Neil, "Civilization", Biblical Authority for Today, ed. A. Richardson and W. Schweitzer, 323 ff.

2 Matt. 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; Matt. 10:34-36; Mark 13:12; Luke 12:51-53.

3 Matt. 19:25; Mark 10:23-27.

seem designed as encouragement. Those who do his will are like a city set on a hill that can't be hidden¹. If they have even the small amount of faith represented by a grain of mustard seed nothing will be impossible to them (Matt. 17:20).

What did Jesus' Ethic Mean in Practical Terms for the State?

(A) For Israel

"No one puts a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old garment, for the patch tears away from the garment, and a worse tear is made" (Matt. 9:16). In this saying and others of a similar meaning Jesus shows at the same time his belief that the new kingdom is of a higher order altogether than the older Judaism, and that a considerable deference and respect is still due to that old order. Though he preaches the kingdom ethic to the nation, he shows a surprising respect for the offices and functions of the leaders of the people². He could, as we have seen, heap scathing criticism upon them for not administering their sacred trust aright³, but even this condemnation implied a positive approval of their state function, properly carried out. The account of the

1 Matt. 5:14. The Gospel of Thomas, 32, has a variant of this which reads, "A city which is set on the summit of a high hill, and on a firm foundation, cannot be brought low, nor can it be hidden."

2 Mark 5:22; 15:43; Luke 14:7; 23:50; Matt. 17:24.

3 Matt. 23:23; 17:42.

exchange concerning the payment of the temple tax¹ helps us to assess Jesus' attitude to the present forms of the Jewish theocracy. He asks Peter, "From whom do the kings of the earth exact tribute? From their sons or from others?" The answer expected is, of course, "From others." Jesus' attitude is critical, then, because the way in which the Jewish state is exacting tribute from the people makes it plain that it is not the true kingdom² where God's relationship is characterized by his calling Israel "My son". Nevertheless he goes on to pay the tax. Even that temple which treats its children as strangers deserves a limited recognition from those who accept the kingdom ethic.

However, if the old order deserved a certain respect because of the measure of order and justice it had provided for former generations, its style of governing was no longer suitable in Jesus' view, now that the kingdom had come near. Nor would a patch job, an improving of existing practices here and there, meet the demands of the crisis. There was a need for some community to show what a truly righteous society looks like, and what nation had better qualifications than the Israel of God. In other words, the absolute ethic was

1 Matt. 17:24-7; this passage cannot be taken as incontrovertably genuine. Streeter, The Four Gospels, 504, says it reads like an adaptation of a popular folk story such as might reflect a problem in the church at Antioch. However, it is not intrinsically inconsistent with what we know of Jesus' attitude to the Temple. See S. Matthews, The Social Teaching of Jesus.

2 Note the equation of the temple authorities with "kings of the earth."

not meant in Jesus' understanding for the individual only. The state too was constrained to enter in at the strait gate. John had preached justice to the state's servants, and many would claim that this is all that the state can be expected to dispense. Jesus expected the ethic of love to have practical relevance for the life of the state. There is seen to be an inner and vital connection between the service of God in the community of disciples and the service of God in the broader society of men¹. In Jesus' view the kingdom had come. The new vintage was a present fact. There was therefore, an obligation upon every citizen who cared about the crisis of his time, to align himself with the higher values, and to seek ways of bringing Israel itself into line with the higher righteousness.

We do not have as much information as we would like on the kind of practical action that was envisaged to bring about the desired end. Two things, at least, can be said with a fair degree of certainty. First, a revolution or uprising of the Zealot kind could not be part of the strategy. Although Jesus was probably crucified on the ground that he

1 E. Brunner, in Justice and the Social Order, 114 ff., claims that justice is the business of the state and justification that of the church, and admits no inner connection. G. Rosadi, The Trial of Jesus, 145 f. says the crucifix will always be out of place in a civil court. Against these, W. Manson, in Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, 120, says "The Christian law is the ideal towards which the life of the state must ever tend."

constituted a threat to the peace, both Herod and Pilate are reported to have understood he was against revolt¹. Secondly, as a consequence of the higher ethic, practical actions should be undertaken with the aim of bring reconciliation into the strained political relationships of the time. The citizen of Israel is to set aside the resentment he feels at Roman occupation, and learn again "the things that make for peace" (Luke 19:42). He is to adopt a policy of "loving enemies", and "turning the other cheek". To do this would mean a change of present actions, the taking of a dynamic initiative, and so "non-resistance" does not adequately express what is envisaged. To cower and shrink away when a Roman bully struck one on the cheek might be designated correctly as "non-resistance". To love the wrongdoer, and turn one's cheek that he might strike again, is a positive action which shows disapproval of his style of authority, and aims at purging the hatred from a relationship in which the other is seen as enemy². For a Jew, to undertake such action would require a complete change of heart (μετανοία). Nevertheless, we cannot doubt that Jesus intended the policy to have practical application, for there was in his own

1 Matt. 27:23; Luke 23:4,14; see H.P. Kingdon, "Had the Crucifixion a Political Significance?" The Hibbert Journal, XXXV, 557, (1936-37). O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 8ff., says Jesus was crucified as a Zealot.

2 An example of the policy of non-resistance to Rome is found in Josephus, Life, 4-5, where the reason for such a policy is that the author has seen the physical impossibility of putting up a good fight. His non-resistance was with a "heart of hate", and an arm "that did not dare to strike". Simkhovitch, op. cit., 45.

intimate band of disciples a Roman civil servant and at least one Zealot¹.

(B) For Pagan Government

We must first make clear once again that the Roman administration could not be a primary concern for Jesus' mission. In that section of the synoptic narrative which deals with the Galilean ministry Rome appears not at all. Only when the scene changes to Jerusalem do we find the Procurator, his troops and tribunal, and the machinery of taxation². We gather that the Galilean court of Herod Antipas is more to the forefront of Jesus' thinking.

These governments, when they are in view, do receive condemnation from the standpoint of the kingdom ethic, but it is of two kinds. First, there is a condemnation of the administrations where they are seen to be bad even judged by standards appropriate for the old order. In the parables there are several references to non-Jewish legal practices, such as imprisonment for debts, selling one's wife, and torture³, which both Jesus and his hearers would agree are inhuman⁴. There is an indication of outraged justice over Herod's execution of John the Baptist, whose authority was

1 H.P. Kingdon, op. cit., 562 f.; see also O. Cullman, op. cit., 8ff.

2 Sherwin-White, op. cit., 138 f.

3 Matt. 5:25; 18:25; 18:34.

4 Jeremias, op. cit., 180.

from heaven (Mark 6:16), and when his disciples warn Jesus that Herod plans the same fate for him, the anger pours out. "Go tell that fox", he begins, and goes on to contrast the rule of Herod with the rule and authority which the casting out of devils implies (Luke 13:32). The references to the Romans which are undoubtedly from the most primitive strata of our sources are vague and brief. They appear in Jesus' eyes as "Gentiles", or "sinful men", sometimes assumed to be persecutors almost by the nature of their function, but usually with some negative judgment implied¹. This first sort of condemnation is not intrinsically of a kind that could not have come from a good Stoic moralist.

Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that the evidence does not support a view held by some that Jesus made a positive identification between Rome and the kingdom of Satan. Loisy is one of a number of continental scholars who have taken the view that he did. "Il (Caesar) n'appartient pas à l'économie définitive du règne de Dieu, et son pouvoir tombera, comme il convient, avec celui de Satan, dont il est, à certains égards, le représentant."² The only clear inference in the gospels that Satan is in control of the nations is in

1 Mark 13:9 ff; 14:41; Luke 6:32 f. 24:7; see the article "sin" in Richardson, Theological Wordbook, 228. One of the biblical meanings of "sinner" is simply "heathen" but all related terms used to describe Romans have a negative connotation.

2 A. Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptique, I. 231.

the third temptation where the Adversary is represented as saying of all the kingdoms of this world, "I give them to whom I will." However, it is extremely doubtful that a boast of the Devil heard by Jesus can furnish proof that Jesus believed the boast to be founded on fact. Satan can influence governments to take up specific policies, but his power can be broken also¹, which would not be the case if Jesus had made a strict apocalyptic identification.

A second kind of rebuke is given to the pagan governments from the point of view of the kingdom ethic. This is one in which the exact justice of the state and the enforcement of it, even when acceptably administered, are judged as being inferior ways of ordering society. We are going to look at two examples of this kind of rebuke which show how the kingdom ethic could have consequences of a practical kind for the state.

First, there is an incident which shows Jesus' attitude to the civil function of judging. He is asked to mediate in a dispute of two brothers over some land². He shows that the best way to deal with the situation is to get at the inward side of the trouble. He tries to root out the covetousness

1 Matt. 4:1-11; Luke 11:21 f.

2 Luke 12:13-15; cf. 6:37; I am following the interpretation of S. Neil, in "Civilization", Biblical Authority for Today, 335 f.

in the hearts of the brothers, and thereby condemns the way the state courts would have handled the dispute.

Secondly, there is an incident in which the traditional and universally accepted way of ordering a society, the hierarchical system of power, is questioned. The sons of Zebedee come to Jesus because they want to sit on thrones, and he says, "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you."¹ This is not simply a sentiment in a republican vein, but a criticism from the point of view of the higher righteousness of the methods of war and coercive justice which the lower order uses to keep the peace. In place of this system, Jesus suggests one based on the idea of servanthood and brotherly love.

The two incidents that have been mentioned leave Jesus open to the charge that any practical bringing to bear of his higher righteousness upon the historical-political plane would lead to anarchy. Is not coercion necessary for order?² Loisy's objection may be considered typical of those that are frequently made: "Un pays où tous les honnêtes gens se conformeraient à ces maximes, au lieu de ressembler au Royaume

¹ Matt. 20:25 f.; cf. Luke 22:25.

² A.T. Cadoux, Jesus and Civil Government, 19 ff. sets down in summary form the evidence that Jesus disapproved of coercion.

des cieux, serait le paradis des voleurs et des scelerats."¹

Part of the reply that must be given is that of C.J. Cadoux, "Loisy had forgotten what happened to the 'scelerats' and 'voleurs' whom Jesus dealt with."² But Cadoux's answer does not answer fully enough the charge of anarchy.

Some consideration should be given to the fact that Jesus recognized that new wine cannot be poured into old bottles. Until the kingdom comes in its fulness, a conditional reprieve must be given to the forms of society suitable to the world that is passing away. Although Jesus announced that the kingdom had already come, there was still a "not yet" quality about it. It had come our length³ but had not burgeoned fully into time. Jesus therefore, at certain times in his ministry, accorded a relative approval to instruments of justice and forms of government which do not embody the ideals of the heavenly kingdom, but which nevertheless make their claim on us while the end of this age is not yet come. There is an obvious tension created by the overlapping of the old and new ages. But we can see from the saying about the cloth and the new wine that the tension was not to be allowed to have a destructive effect. Instead it was to become creative in the

1 quoted by C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 47.

2 ibid. It must also be said that in cases where the law of the state is seemingly set aside, as in the case of the woman taken in adultery, John 7:53; 8:11, it is for the purpose of gaining a goal similar to that which the state legislation aimed at reaching.

3 W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 44.

lives of individuals and seminal communities.

That Jesus should recognize even in a subsidiary way the claims of the lower order is by no means unimportant. It was no part of his mission to inculcate loyalty to the lower righteousness, but neither was his kingdom entering into competition with the lower righteousness. At the worst the old became obsolete when the new arrived. In a later age, hatred of society became one of the main charges levelled at the young Christian community. The leaders of the community felt that, on their understanding of Jesus' teaching, the charge was false. In defending against the charge, they almost always quoted Jesus' saying about tribute to Caesar. As it is the most important evidence we have of a positive attitude to Rome¹, we will examine its meaning with some care.

And they sent to him some of the Pharisees and some of the Herodians to entrap him in his talk.

And they came and said to him, "Teacher, we know that you are true, and care for no man; for you do not regard the position of men, but truly teach the way of God. Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?" Should we pay them, or should we not?" But knowing their hypocrisy, he said to them, "Why put me to the test? Bring me a coin and let me look at it." And they brought one. And he said to them, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" They said to him, "Caesar's". Jesus said to them, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."²

1 J. Westbury-Jones says in Roman and Christian Imperialism, 57, that Jesus showed no hostility to the actual Roman Empire. This can be substantiated by references to his courtesy to the Gentile officials, and by inference, from the fact that he made no vituperative comment when he was told that Pilate had slain a revolutionary band of his countrymen.

2 Mark 12:13-17; cf. Matt. 22:15-22; Luke 20:20-26.

The passage appears in all three synoptic gospels. Even the form critics are satisfied with its genuineness¹. In it we are told that a group of Pharisees and Herodians were trying to trip up Jesus on one of the burning questions of the day. The presence of the Herodians might seem strange since Archelaus had been deposed in 6 A.D. But there probably was quite a strong group who wanted a revival of the kingship, something which did in fact occur in 41 A.D. The adversaries seem to have sized up their man well. Their description of his viewpoint, "We know thatyou do not regard the position of men, but truly teach the way of God", corresponds exactly to the position we have taken about his championing of the reign of God. And their assessment leads them to expect that such a view might get him into trouble with the authorities. So the trap envisages that he will lose no matter what he answers to the question about paying tribute to Rome. If he says it should be paid, he will lose his nationalistic followers. If he says it should not be paid, they will be able to report him to the emperor's men. Of course, things do not go as they expect and his clever answer leaves them amazed.

What is the significance of the passage? First, we must see that the real focus of the exchange does not rest on the

¹ M. Dibelus, From Tradition to Gospel, E.T. by Bertram Lee Woolf, 43, 290; cf. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, 477-80.

Roman emperor, but on the leaders of Israel. This passage is further evidence of Jesus' criticism of the kind of rule they were giving to the people. They had a policy of working within a limited conception of the traditional theocracy. They lived with the illusion that they were Jahweh's champions. So it is almost comical when Jesus unmasks their hypocrisy by pointing out that the money they would hesitate to give to Caesar has the image of Tiberius stamped upon it¹. The implication is that they are not realistic enough about the actual political facts of life obtaining. They might have had in their minds the idea of Jewish messianism that the temple was the only lawful place to bring tribute. To pay the tax through the temple might save their pride, but the facts were that to a great extent the Jewish theocracy had been eclipsed by Roman power. Indeed, a comparison between Jesus' words on this occasion and what he said about temple taxes suggests that he placed both imposts in the same category, as elementary civic duties that should be carried out. Secondly, the words, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" do indicate an important, though limited approval of the Roman authority. The Pharisees and Herodians had enquired, "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν)² to pay taxes to Caesar?" Jesus replies that

1 Hans von Compenhausen, "Church and State in the Light of the New Testament", E.T., John C. Campbell, Biblical Authority for Today, ed. Allan Richardson and W. Schweitzer, 293 ff. In Matthew's account Jesus asks not just for a coin, but the coin of the taxing. The suggestion is that the Roman tax could only be paid in Roman coin, and that other currency was in use.

2 Vincent Taylor, op. cit., 216.

it is not only permitted, but it is a positive duty
(ἀποδοτε)¹. "Give back to Caesar what is his."

Most authorities agree that the first part of the paradigm indicates a positive attitude to the ordering of society,² but that the second part about giving God what belongs to him shows that Jesus' primary concern was still the reign of God and its higher righteousness.

Pontius Pilate, Procurator of Judaea, was responsible for maintaining order within its borders. He is reported to have heard the charges against Jesus and to have declared, "I find no crime in this man."³ One wonders if this judgment was wrong and that of the elders correct. "He stirs up the people."⁴ To be sure, he did not consciously aim at rebellion or anarchy. But he did speak of the terrible crisis that faced the nation, and he did declare and personify the reign of God; it would be a catalyst present in the historical process which would be a disruptive and not a stabilizing

1 S. Liberty, op. cit., 100.

2 e.g. P.S. Watson, The State as a Servant of God, 33 ff.;

W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, 119 f.

Some others claim that the saying is a clever evasion meant to cover up his anti-Roman sentiment, or that the problem concerned merely the handling of pagan currency, e.g. Weinel, Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat, 9 ff.; Herbert Loewe, Render unto Caesar; O. Holtzmann, Life of Jesus, 432 ff.

In view of all that has been said about Jesus' view concerning the dynamic relationship between the realm of the higher righteousness and that of the lower order, it seems hardly necessary to refute the position that is sometimes taken which claims that Jesus' saying justifies the mediaeval theory of the two empires, the sacred and the secular.

3 Luke 23:4; John 18:38, 19:4.

4 Luke 23:5.

force. "The working of leaven in the dough is not a slow, imperceptible process. At first, it is true, the leaven is 'hidden', and nothing appears to happen; but soon the whole mass swells and bubbles, as fermentation rapidly advances. The picture is true to history. The ministry of Jesus was like that. There was in it no element of external coercion, but in it the power of God's kingdom worked from within, mightily permeating the dead lump of religious Judaism in his time."¹

¹ C.H. Dodd, op. cit., 144.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE

In this chapter our intention is to show the historical developments which form a background to the apostolic period. The writings which we will be examining in greater detail later on show us the Christian attitude of the state from within a particular context. The context, in turn, is part of a historical trend. We will understand better what the writings say if we see them against the background of the differentiation of the Christians from Judaism, and with a knowledge of the character of the persecutions.

A. The Differentiation from Judaism.

Harnack long ago pointed out the rather obvious fact that the New Testament writings reflect a progressive weaning away from Judaism¹. Yet this statement hardly does justice to the complexities of the situation. It is true that in the earliest times the disciples went day by day to the temple (Acts 2:46), while just after the turn of the century the

¹ Adolph von Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity, 55.

writers blame the Jews as a people for their misfortunes and look to no earthly city. But the development did not happen at the same rate in every part of the Christian community, or without many severe strains and conflicts.

The visible expression of the divine theocracy had been important for Judaism's confidence in herself. The temple, its priestly ruling class, the Sanhedrin, all these had provided security for those who believed that God had made them his own people and would one day give them dominion over the Gentile nations. There could be some contentment as long as these distinctive features told the Jew he counted in the unfolding of God's plan. The feelings of the early followers of Christ cannot have been very different at this point, but the first writings nonetheless reflect the attitudes of people who were moving away from the securities of membership in the limited state of Judaea. At the end of the apostolic generation, most sections of the church had stepped "outside the camp", and stood separated from Judaism and the pagan world alike as a "third race", looking to an invisible king (Hebrews 11:27; 13:13), and to a Jerusalem in heaven (Rev. 21:2) for the symbols of their citizenship.

The first chapters of Acts, representing the conflation

of two Aramaic sources, give the most primitive evidence for the followers of Jesus. They existed, according to this source, within the Jewish nation probably as a Synagogue of the Nazarenes¹, and probably regarded as a new sect. They departed somewhat from Jesus' intention that they should continue to announce the nearness of the kingdom, exhorting the nation to repent and live by the new righteousness. They became more nearly orthodox in their eschatology. They believed that the messiah was coming to set up a national kingdom on the holy hill (Acts 1:6). Their distinctiveness was that they believed Jesus to be this coming one. They lived a life in which they had all things common, apparently waiting for the prophecy of Malachi 3:1 to be speedily fulfilled, "The Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple." They won many to their ranks², but at least at the first these must have been Jerusalem Jews of orthodox beliefs and behaviour, for there is no hint of a split between Hebrew Christians and Hellenistic-Jewish Christians; nor did the Jewish authorities deny them the right to use the temple premises.

However, the leaders of the people did show themselves jealous of the success of unauthorized religious leaders such as Peter and John³. They asked these two by what authority they

1 F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 301 ff.

2 Acts 1:15; 4:4; 6:7.

3 Acts 4:13 ff.; see Niven, The Conflicts of the Early Church, 50 ff.

healed and taught among the people. The answer of the disciples showed that great as was their respect for the offices of the theocratic leadership (Acts 4:8), the spirit of God was upon them, and they were entrusted with a divine commission. "Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you rather than to God, you must judge" (Acts 4:19). The leaders of the people would not have questioned the right of the Nazarenes to obey God rather than men, but they would have insisted on their own right to interpret God's will to uneducated men such as these.

So it was Peter and John, conservatives both in their attitude to Judaism, who sowed the seeds of differentiation from Judaism when they made known their belief that a new gift of prophecy had come upon them. Because of the outpouring of the spirit, the right ordering of the Christian community's life within the framework of the temple could not for long be considered an indispensable concern. Peter and John saw that pentecost created a new situation. Thus while they and their friends were slow to move out, they had in a limited sense seen the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus as a new wine, and the theocratic hierarchy of Israel as an old wineskin.

Stephen represents another stage in the differentiation.

He seems to have more closely understood the meaning of Jesus' messianic mission, with its call to a new absolute obedience which was to be brought to bear on all men. He came into prominence at a time when the community was adding large numbers of Jews of diaspora birth. On their introduction the system of "having all things common" apparently broke down. This is not surprising as it was probably a mixture of a sincere attempt to practice love on a practical level and an irresponsible scheme arising from belief in the nearness of the end. At any rate the newcomers complained that their widows were coming short in the daily distribution (Acts 6:1). The incident suggests that tension had developed between the "hebrews" and the "hellenists". To remedy the situation seven men were chosen to wait on tables, each with a Greek name, and Stephen among them. Seen from one point of view, the attempt to put ethical concerns in a primary position in the thinking of the Christians led to a disorder in the common life that became intolerable. This in turn caused them to concentrate on the ordering of their own community, and a new administration with a new group of leaders emerged.

Strangely enough, we do not hear any more of the administrative function of Stephen's group in Acts, but we

do hear of the members of this group as preachers and evangelists. A differentiation becomes apparent between the seven and the twelve¹, with the former considered more obnoxious by the Jews than the latter.

Stephen's teaching, characteristic of the new group, may be summarized briefly². In his sermon of defence he used the term Son of Man, the only reported use of the phrase in the New Testament outside of Jesus' use of it. Jesus had suggested through it that he was going beyond orthodox nationalist views. His kingdom knew no bounds. Stephen took up this more-than-Jewish, universal term as he was about to die. He exhorted the Jews to follow Jesus out of the past into a glorious new age. The temple and the law were but stages in God's dealing with his people. Practical questions about the further place which the law might have before the new age comes, were sub-sumed in the urgency of Stephen's appeal.

His teaching seemed remarkably close to that of Jesus. It brought death from those close to the temple on the charge that the Jews had levelled at Jesus, "This man is blaspheming."³ While the Hebrews were clinging to their ingrown nationalism

1 F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 308.

2 C. von Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, I, 62 ff.

3 Matt. 9:3; cf. Acts 6:11.

and the Hebrew Christians were sheltering under Israel's institutions, Stephen saw the Son of Man on the throne of the Universe¹.

After Stephen's death one group continued to adhere closely to the temple and orthodox ideas about the messiah's coming. Another, the hellenist group, was scattered from Jerusalem; in Samaria and the towns of the coast we catch glimpses of Philip anticipating the Son of Man's coming by preaching of his universal mission². The relations between the Nazarene sect and official Judaism could not have been cordial from this point onward, although until 68 A.D. there was always a party in Jerusalem which was not offensive to Judaism. Later on, when Peter and his followers were constrained to follow Stephen's example and move outside the camp, the conservative group rallied around James the brother of Jesus.

The world mission inaugurated by Stephen reached Antioch in Syria, this city becoming the first centre of outward-moving Christianity. Here it was that the Gospel was first preached to Greeks³. Barnabas became convinced that what was happening in Antioch was good, and he brought Paul, the erstwhile persecutor, to join in the work there.

1 Dan. 7:13-14.

2 Acts 8:4 ff.; note especially that Philip guides the Ethiopian eunuch to an understanding of Is. 53:7-8. This shows that the hellenist group saw the link between Jesus' roles as Son of Man and Suffering Servant.

3 A. von Harnack, op. cit., I, 52 ff.

Paul, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and also as a citizen of an Hellenic city of no mean repute, contributed more than anyone to a healing of the breach within Christianity. Yet he also contributed much to the process of differentiation from Judaism. As a Pharisee by training, he could not be content with the slight to the law which Stephen's teaching had expressed. Paul recognized in the fullest way the historical significance and necessity of the old dispensation. He believed that as God had given the law, only he could relegate it to a position of lesser validity. But Paul worked out a doctrine that God did just this by fulfilling it in the life, death, and resurrection of his Son. Thus while not preaching extensively on Jesus' concept of the kingdom¹, he did follow Jesus in teaching that the gospel freed men and brought them to a new life which was on a higher level than life under the Law. He also believed that the natural law of conscience on which the constitution of nations was based, was a revelation of God as well as was the Law of Israel². The man of Tarsus therefore went out into the Roman world and preached to Jew and Gentile alike, "Christ crucified" (1 Cor. 1:23). "Paul wrecked the religion of Israel on the cross of Christ, in the

1 J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, 293 f.

2 A.B.D. Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul, 50.

very endeavour to comprehend it with a greater reverence than his predecessors."¹

Paul's preaching was indeed intended to treat of the Jewish law with reverence, but he was firm in his refusal to bring Gentiles to Christ through the Law (Gal. 2:4ff.). His determination grew as the first journey progressed (Acts 12), and the author of Acts impresses on the reader the fact that Jewish opposition now really began in earnest. Jews and Jewish-Christians alike were shocked at his gospel. The Jews felt that he was teaching treason against the Jewish state, imperilling its favoured position² by saying that the Law was no longer valid.

The Council of Jerusalem which took place about 49 A.D. may be seen essentially as a vindication of Paul's mission to the uncircumcised³. He clearly won his point with regard to the circumcision of Gentiles. However, as regards social intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians, Paul was seen to be at odds with Peter, James, John and Barnabas⁴. These latter apostles apparently gave their assent to a position which was basically unsound. The Gentiles were to

1 Harnack, *op. cit.*, I, 56.

2 Niven, *op. cit.*, 60ff.

3 Gal. 2:1 ff. may be taken as a more historical account of the council than that of Acts 15; see F. Jackson and K. Lake, *op. cit.*, V, 195 ff.

4 *ibid.*

become Christians without obligation of keeping the law, while Jews becoming Christians were to obey its every precept with great zeal. Although the date of the Epistle of James must still be regarded as uncertain, it is likely that it represents the feelings of those who allied themselves with James in this and succeeding crises, and who wanted to counteract some of the Pauline emphases¹.

We can be fairly certain that few Jews would be unaware of the separate existence of Christianity after Paul's success in winning the approval of the Jerusalem apostles in 49 A.D. for his Gentile Mission. It is also probable that most Jews would be happy about the differentiation. To be sure, good relations existed between Christians and Hebrews in Jerusalem for some time to come,² but such was not the case elsewhere. At about the same time that the disciples met in Jerusalem to establish Paul's stand on circumcision, Claudius is said to have expelled the Jews of Rome who had been rioting at the instigation of one Chrestus³. This has traditionally been taken to mean that Christians had disrupted the synagogue in Rome with their gospel of the Christ⁴. This view would confirm what is on other grounds altogether probable, that Rome had not come

1 F.J.A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, 147 ff.

2 Hegesippus, in Eusebius, H.E., II, xxiii, 5, 5, 7.

3 Suetonius, Claudius, XXV, iv; Orosius, VII, vi, 15, 16, confirms the date as 49 A.D.

4 Acts 18:2 would seem to confirm this interpretation.

to view Christianity as a separate religion as yet. Soon Paul's mission to the Gentiles was taken up by others who had formerly confined their work to the Jews. Peter, in all probability, advanced beyond the agreement of Jerusalem sometime in the decade 50-60 A.D., and began work in Asia among the Gentiles¹.

In the following decade, the process of differentiation was speeded. Some, if our dating and placing of Hebrews is correct², were still placing strong reliance on the securities of the Jewish theocracy. But in Jerusalem, James was put to death by the priests who took advantage of the absence of the procurator in 62 A.D. to perform the deed³. With the outbreak of the Jewish War (66-70 A.D.) and the destruction of the temple, most Jewish Christians would be finally forced to turn away from Judaism. However close they had been to the cultus centre, they could not own the name of Jesus and take part in the bloody Zealot insurrection which he had expressly repudiated. The tradition that the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem departed in 68 A.D. to Pella⁴ fits in very well with the probabilities. After this event many Christians believed that God had judged Jewish refusal to accept his Christ, and the Jewish state was seen to have no further part in his plan. The way was thus

1 E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter.

2 see appendix. Here reasons are given for thinking that it was written to Rome about 60 A.D.

3 Josephus, Antiq., 20:9:1.

4 Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., 3:5:3.

left open for Christian writers to describe their divorce from Judaism in dogmatic language. The story of the gospel can now be told as a tale of the mounting opposition of the Jews to Jesus until they crucify him¹. The Jews can be pictured as an iniquitous people, "the synagogue of Satan"².

One striking fact, important for this study, should be commented on briefly at this time. In the long process of being weaned away from Judaism, the Christian community seems to have found a polity which made it secure and confident in the pluralistic society of the Graeco-Roman world. There is a contrast between the post-70 A.D. apocalypses of Judaism, and the Christian writings of the same period. There is a marked political pessimism, as Box has pointed out³, in Jewish writing such as 2 Esdras. The Christian Revelation, and indeed the earlier Jewish apocalypses, seem to rest on a more confident ideology⁴. We shall have to examine the proposition in greater detail later on that Christians had followed the advice of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews and put their hope in an invisible king and a heavenly city.

B. The Persecutions.

Let us begin our enquiry into this important subject

1 Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, 515.

2 Rev. 2:9, 3:9.

3 G.H. Box, The Ezra Apocalypse, xxxii ff.

4 H.B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, xxvi.

by asking how we would expect persecutions of Christians to have developed if we had only the evidence of Roman attitudes up until the emergence of Christianity as a separate entity, and the rather meagre evidence of the Christian writings of the New Testament to go by. After this we can move to what must be considered the primary evidence of the descriptions of the persecutions which come from the period. In following this procedure we will have some basis for comparison and some check on our findings.

Roman attitudes can be examined in four important areas. First, Romans viewed their religion as the ius divinum, an essential part of the fabric of Roman life, the cohesive foundation of the state¹. Peace, unity, and order were the benefits derived from the appropriate ceremonials. As we have seen earlier² every state is a system of power which owes its existence not only to vertical authority and force but to horizontal cohesive influences. Roman religion filled the latter function. Romans believed their power came from their gods, who were a heritage from antiquity³. The lower classes, however, found the old Roman religion bare, puritanical, and lacking in emotional content⁴. This made the alien Greek and Oriental religions interesting

1 Cicero, De Nat. Deor., 3:5.

2 see supra, ch. 1.

3 Cicero, De Nat. Deor., 3:5-9.

4 Robert M. Grant, The Sword and the Cross, 11.

to them, and from time to time these flourished to an amazing degree. Some, notably the Bacchic cult and the cult of the Egyptian gods Serapis and Isis, were so popular that they were never properly controlled. Yet it is clear that the policy of the Senate was to suspect those who introduced foreign cults of subversive activities, of undermining the order of the state; and where no policy of suppression worked, foreign divinities were adopted as Roman gods. We would expect Christianity to draw suspicion just for being an alien cult.

Secondly, it is clear from Roman history that there was nothing systematic about attempts at official suppression of religions. Some would claim that only strange religions, such as Druidism or Christianity, which gave rise to scandalous, disruptive, or seriously non-conformist behaviour, (scelera, or flagitia), were suppressed¹. At any rate the actions taken were sporadic, and often appeared as pragmatic decisions of the governor at some point where popular feeling about the religion threatened to bring about disorder².

Thirdly, the evidence shows that the Jewish religion

-
- 1 Hugh Last, "The Study of the Persecutions", Journal of Roman Studies, 27 (1937), 90 ff; also A.N. Sherwin-White, "The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again", Journal of Theological Studies, 3 (1952), 199-213. This is a landmark article in the study of the persecutions, and we shall be referring to it again.
- 2 G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" Past and Present, 26 (1963), 19f. This article too has been taken as very significant for the subject.

was treated as a special case by Rome, but one that caused more and more official exasperation as events moved on to 66 A.D. Under the early emperors Jews were exempted from military service. Most procurators of Judaea treated the religious customs of Israel with respect. Claudius in 41 A.D. explicitly restored privileges that had been lost under Gaius Caligula. Occasionally, action was taken against the Jews under special circumstances. Thus in Tiberius' reign, an edict of the Senate in Rome forbade the practice of Jewish customs. Four thousand Jewish freedmen were sent to Sardinia for police duty, and other Jews and their proselytes were sentenced to be expelled from Rome unless they would agree to apostatize¹. The Roman attitude to Jews generally was ambivalent. On the one hand the Jews were thoroughly hated for the monotheism and attendant exclusiveness of their beliefs, which left them in Graeco-Roman eyes open to the charge of atheism (ἄθεόςτης)². On the other hand, their rites had the advantage of being very ancient³, and a grudging admiration was given to them for preserving their religion so tenaciously. We would expect Christianity to be met with the same mixture of hatred and respect, with the accent coming increasingly on hatred and impatience as rebelliousness in Judaea increased.

1 Grant, op. cit., 38 f. The point about recantation is important and will come up again when we look at Pliny's letter to Trajan.
 2 W.H.C. Frend, "The Persecutions: Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church", Journal of Eccl. History, 9 (1958), 141 ff.
 3 Tacitus, Hist., 5:5.

Fourthly, we know from our examination of Roman history that the provincial governor was a more important figure than the emperor as far as the persecutions were concerned. He was the one charged with the preserving of order in the province. The orders (mandata) he got from the emperor were in general terms; he was to take care to rid his province of "bad men" (mali homines)¹. We could expect that Christians would often come within this category, particularly when we remember how often the communities mentioned in the New Testament are said to have been inflamed by the presence of the Christian teachers.

Again, when we look at the evidence of the Christian writings, we note three things of importance. First, we have already noted some of the events in the struggle of Christianity to differentiate itself from Judaism. In many local communities the issues were hotly debated. Disturbances often resulted². It is to be expected that these local disturbances, which were dealt with by local administrations³, or by church or synagogue authorities, did come to the attention of the governor, and that repeated incidents would impress the name of the sect on his mind.

Secondly, we will see in later chapters that Christians are often found writing defenses of their moral purity.

1 de Ste. Croix, op. cit., 16, and the references he mentions.

2 Acts 6:8-7; 60; 9:1-2; 12:1-19; 13:45-51; 14:2-6; 17:5-9, 13-14.

3 Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 71-98.

Exhortations to live blameless, circumspect lives abound. It follows that someone must have been accusing them of despicable behaviour. We would expect to find charges of this kind associated with the persecutions.

Thirdly, there are Christian writings, notably Luke-Acts, which try to show that Christians are loyal to the state, that Roman authorities, on investigation, have consistently upheld this position. This would lead us to another conjecture, namely that there was a feeling abroad throughout much of the empire that the Christian religion implied disloyalty.

What were the Persecutions Like?

We must now turn to see what did in fact happen, according to the evidence. Before 64 A.D., we have very little more than our surmises to go on. There are local incidents involving imprisonment, and at least in the cases of Stephen and James, Christians were put to death¹. But these incidents point to Jewish enmity arising from a horrified reaction to the Christian's blasphemy and his strenuous missionary endeavour. Stephen's death was more of a lynching than it was an official action. So the incidents are evidence.

1 Acts. 6:8-7:60; Euseb. Hist. Eccles, 2:23.

for the Jewish-Christian strife we have referred to and not for the persecutions proper. There was a report according to Suetonius, to the effect that in 49 A.D. there were riots in Rome instigated by one "Chrestus"¹, and that certain people were expelled at this time from Rome². Again, this seems to be a case of a Jewish-Christian quarrel which came to the attention of the authorities as a problem of order³.

A new stage in the persecutions, as far as the Roman government was concerned, came with the great fire of Nero's reign. It broke out in July of 64 A.D. and destroyed a large part of the city. Religious measures were taken to calm the excited populace. Sacrifices were offered to Juno, first on the capital, then at Ostia. But rumours persisted that Nero himself had started the blaze because he needed space for the construction of his Golden House⁴. It is likely that Nero falsely accused the Christians of arson to escape the charge himself⁵. Those who admitted they were Christians, together with many more who were informed on, were rounded up and put to the torch. Tacitus tells us that they were convicted

1 Suetonius, Claudius, 25:4.

2 Acts 18:2.

3 see Frend, op. cit., 153.

4 Tacitus, Ann., XV.44.5, Hist. V.5.

5 The Jews might have been the obvious scapegoat. It has been suggested that the Empress Poppaea, possibly a proselyte to Judaism herself, was the one who suggested the Christians as an alternative group which would satisfy the needs of Nero and herself. See J. Lebreton and J. Zeiller, The History of the Primitive Church, II, 309.

not so much of the crime of "incendiarism" as for their hatred of the human race ("Odio humani generis"). He faults them also for being guilty of abominations ("flagitia") so even though he disbelieved the official charge, he thought they deserved punishment. It must be significant that people like Tacitus and Suetonius¹ were willing to see the Christians falsely punished. Surely it indicates that there was a widespread antipathy in Roman society to the Christian community. Nero's trick could not have worked so well if the people he was intending to fool did not already believe that Christians were capable of arson or any number of other horrid crimes. The mention of their hatred of the human race is the old charge of exclusiveness which had been levelled at the Jews and indicates the Christians were still very much associated with Judaism in pagan eyes.

The conviction of the Christians was very important for the years to follow. Whether the officials believed the arson charge or not, the fact that it had been applied successfully to a sect with a particular identity, meant that that sect now had the status of being at least anti-social, and possibly also criminally dangerous. When the Christians were being rounded up for Nero's trial they were asked if they confessed

¹ Suetonius, Nero, 16.2.

to being Christians. It is likely that this would be one of the questions asked in any subsequent persecution, and that persecution "for the name" was a real possibility from this time on¹. It is extremely doubtful, however, that there ever existed an institutum Neronium which made Christianity unlawful².

After this event, we must assume a pattern of sporadic persecutions in which Christians were punished either for being Christians or for anti-social crimes associated with the name. The number of victims and the severity of their punishment probably lessened after the slaughter in Nero's reign. This was certainly true at Rome³. If persecutions increased in frequency anywhere it was probably in the provinces.

Before we come to the good evidence we have for persecution in the year 112 A.D., it is necessary to look at the theory that persecutions varied in severity depending on whether there was a "good" emperor or "bad" emperor on the throne. Roman historians have discounted this possibility⁴. Their arguments for the relatively more important position

1 However, it is probable that Christians were not sought out for prosecution simply "for the name". See Trajan's directive to Pliny on this at a later period.

2 Many Church historians, e.g. H.M. Gwatkin, Early Church History to A.D. 313, 83, have favoured this idea. But Trajan wrote to Pliny, Letters, X, 96.97., saying he knew of no definitely prescribed rule for dealing with Christians.

3 Frend, op. cit., 153.

4 Both de Ste. Croix, op. cit., 19f. and Sherwin-White, op. cit., 204, speak against it.

of the provincial governors in regard to persecutions are convincing. But Church historians have often favoured the theory, choosing Domitian as their favourite "bad" emperor. The Christian apologists early ranked him with Nero as a chief persecutor of the faith¹. He is said to have vigorously fostered the state religion, encouraging particularly the cult of the emperor². It is true that certain cities of Asia were honoured to bear the title NEUKOPOS which signified that they had received the right to possess a temple of the Caesars³, and that the cultus grew and flourished at the time of Domitian. Ephesus had four such temples, Pergamus and Smyrna three each; of the seven churches addressed in the Apocalypse, all but two had temples of the Caesar. So we can understand the negative feelings of the writer of the Apocalypse and succeeding Christian apologists where Domitian was concerned. However, from this point of view, he was pursuing a policy of conformity meant to strengthen the empire⁴, a policy no different in kind from that of his predecessors. And it is true that there is a singular lack of evidence that persecutions increased in his reign. There are some incidents. The Apocalypse mentions

1 Melito, writing c.175 A.D., quoted in Eusebius, H.E. IV.26. 190; Tertullian, Apol. V.4.

2 B.F. Westcott, "The Two Empires: The Church and the World", essay in The Epistles of St. John, 255-6. Cf. S. Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, 451-3, 533 ff., A.J. Rayner, "Christian Society in the Roman Empire", Greece and Rome, XI (1942), 33, 113 ff.

3 V. Chapot, The Roman World, 194.

4 E.J. Merrill, Essays in Early Church History, 155; Cf. H.B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, ixxxv.

one who fell in Pergamus before the time of writing¹. In the last year of his reign, Domitian put to death his cousin, Titus Flavius Clemens, and banished this man's wife, Domitilla. The charges against them were atheism, running after the customs of the Jews, and despicable laziness². Archeological evidence could be read as tending to confirm the traditional view that they were Christians³. However, this and other evidence that will be brought out later merely corroborates the idea that what was happening in Domitian's reign was typical of the sporadic persecutions which had been taking place since 64 A.D. at least, and in no way marks an apex in bestiality.

Pliny's celebrated exchange of letters with Trajan, which probably took place at the end of 112 A.D., is perhaps our best evidence for the nature of the persecutions. Pliny wrote to Trajan because he was doubtful about the procedure he had followed in putting Christians to death⁴. He had been taking a certain line with "all persons brought before me on the charge of being Christians". He had "asked them in person if they are Christians". Then if they persisted in their confession of being Christians he ordered them to be punished.

1 Rev. 2:13.

2 Suetonius, Domitian, XV.1.

3 R. Lanciani, Pagan & Christian Rome, 335-45.

4 Pliny, Letters, X.96.97 (Penguin Books, 1963).

At the time of writing the number of cases was increasing and certain questions bothered him. Should distinctions be made between Christians on grounds of age? Should a retraction of beliefs be grounds for a pardon (this has been his policy)? And is it "the mere name of Christianity which is punishable, even if innocent of crime, or rather the crimes associated with the name"?

Trajan's reply mentions the "persons charged with being Christians", and says it is "impossible to lay down a general rule to a fixed formula". He doesn't answer Pliny's question about whether persecution was for the name or crimes associated with the name. He does say that if anyone denies he is a Christian, and makes it clear by offering prayers to Roman gods, he is to go free. Christians "must not be hunted out", and anonymous denunciations are to be ignored.

All of this should help us answer the important questions. Christians were being persecuted in increasing numbers in the provinces. Admitting to Christianity in itself was enough to bring death. But a governor had sufficient discretionary power that he did not have to convict unless he believed, as Pliny did, for instance, that there were crimes of attitudes associated with the name which were worthy of punishment.

Taking the Pliny-Trajan exchange as key evidence also helps us to decide about some of the views of the persecutions that have been put forward, as Sherwin-White shows in his article¹. He suggests that there have been three main opinions about the persecutions. One saying that there was a general enactment forbidding the practice of the Christian religion. This view, favoured by French scholars, placed the time of the law variously in Nero's or Domitian's reign. A second opinion started with Mommsen and his favouring of some form of coercitio as the prevailing mode of persecution. This theory says that Christians were punished by provincial governors in virtue of their ordinary power, derived from their imperium, of enforcing public order at their own discretion. Those who hold this view often talk of direct "police action", of arrest and punishment without the ordinary forms of trial. A third opinion says that Christians were persecuted for known offences such as incest, magic, illegal assembly, and perhaps especially for treason -- a charge based on their refusal to worship the emperor as divine.

Sherwin-White then goes on to show why Roman historians have largely discounted the first and third opinions².

1 Sherwin-White, Art. Cited, 199 ff.

2 Space does not permit a reproduction of his argument. It has received the approving comments of many scholars.

Pliny's letter is a key piece in his argument both times. The letter seems explicitly to rule out the theory that has been a popular one more recently, namely that Christians were accused of a complex of offences, including the introduction of a new cult, which together were construed as maiestas, and were prosecuted under the extension of the treason law as it operated under Tiberius¹. There may have been some cases of Christians being found guilty on the charge of maiestas, as Tertullian alleges², for a governor who knew that the leader of the sect had been executed as "King of the Jews" and who had read or heard about the Apocalypse might well believe that the objective of the sect was political power. At any rate it seems clear that within the New Testament period there was no hunting out of Christians based on an edict which found their cult treasonous.

Trajan's instruction not to actively seek out Christian victims for persecution, raises the important question of how Christians did get into the unhappy position of facing the governor's judgment. Here Sherwin-White, both in his Sarum lectures and in his later article³, has convincingly argued that under the cognitio process all that was needed was a

1 Sherwin-White, art. cited, 204 ff. This article convincingly demolishes many previous theories about the basis for Christian persecution. It finds a refinement of Mommsen's coercitio theory the most satisfactory.

2 Tertullian, Apol., 10:1; 28:3ff.

3 Sherwin-White, art. cited, 199ff.

prosecutor (delector), and a charge¹. Capital trials under this process did not require as a basis for prosecution any reference to a specific crime set forth in the detailed civil law (ordo)². The prosecutor could make any charge he wished, though as he had to make it convincing or suffer himself, he would no doubt take some care. If he had knowledge that Christians had been punished for belonging to their religious group on previous occasions, he might very well make this the basis of his charge. Under the cognitio extra ordinem, which was the usual process for what we would call criminal law, a magistrate had wide use of his own discretion. He could fix any penalties he wanted, including the death penalty, or he could dismiss the charges. The power to conduct a criminal cognitio was part of the power of coercitio inherent in every governor's imperium.

However, the process cannot be seen in a narrow sense, except where minor offences are concerned, as simple "police action". When it was used it was as a proper legal trial in the fullest sense. The sequence of events would be somewhat as follows: the prosecutor or complainant acting on his own

¹Roman scholars have strongly criticized theories that charges of belonging to a collegia illicita, E.T. Merrill, op. cit., 52 ff., or of being guilty of specific crimes such as cannibalism, played any significant part in the persecutions. As far as the collegia illicita theory is concerned, recent evidence suggests that the Christian groups had property rights and were allowed to meet. See Sherwin-White, art. cited, 211 f.

² Sherwin-White, book cited, 13-15, and passim.

initiative would make an accusation before the governor that a certain person was a Christian; the name, because of previous information concerning anti-social behaviour associated with it, would act as a pointer indicating a person whom it was proper for him to coerce; this he does using cognitio as the procedural form.

It is important to try to see where the religious aspects come into the persecutions. Sherwin-White rather plays down the notion that the character of the Christian religion had much place as a cause of the persecutions. In referring to Pliny's letter, he says that the real offence in the eyes of the governor was contumacia. When the Christians were asked to obey the reasonable request of doing homage to di nostri they obstinately refused, and their obstinacy in the face of authority became their real offence¹. De Ste. Croix takes issue with this theory, pointing out that the "sacrifice test" at this time was not so much a "test of treason" which was being used to liquidate Christians, as it was a reasonable way out which was being offered the people who did not seem to be bad men in the governor's eyes². Another telling argument of de Ste. Croix's is that the first group condemned by Pliny,

1 Sherwin-White, art. cited, 210-212.

2 de Ste. Croix, op. cit., 18 f. An interesting argument between the two scholars takes place in a later issue of Past and Present, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted? An Amendment: A Rejoinder.", 27 (1964), 23-33.

those who admitted they were Christians, were never given the chance of sacrificing to the gods. It was only those who denied being Christians who were given the chance of proving their loyalty. In de Ste. Croix's view, it is important to see that even though Pliny acknowledged that Christians were not guilty of flagitia they were still disgusting. He argues that it must have been the religion itself that Pliny found abhorrent.

The present writer believes it would be difficult to prove either contention. What seems to be more important as far as religion and the persecutions are concerned is the view that the general public had of the religion of Christians. For it will be remembered that the initiative in the prosecutions came from this quarter. Here it seems clear that the monotheistic exclusiveness of the Christian religion angered and disturbed the populace¹. The average member of society looked upon religion as the business of performing cult acts which kept the goodwill of the gods on their side. While there were no legal obligations in the early years to participate in the cult, public pressure would undoubtedly be strong to do so. When misfortunes overtook the community it would not take very long for blame to

1 Tertullian, Apologia, 40:1-2.

fasten itself on the exclusive Christians, who had abandoned the ancient religion of their fathers and remained aloof from the official cult. A governor would probably not be so superstitious in his attitude, but he was concerned to build up the state religion¹, and he would have no reason to turn a deaf ear to the complaints of religiously-incensed delectores.

A last word about the tests of treason. As we have said before, they do not seem to have been used in the New Testament period in any kind of "police action" campaign against Christianity. When Christians did find themselves before the chief magistrate, the tests would impose a grave hardship however. They were willing to pray for the emperor, but the "reasonable" requests could not have seemed easy to them. It is no wonder that the tests figure so prominently in the Christian references to persecution. In our period it is unlikely there were any tortures used to force Christians to perform the cult acts. As de Ste. Croix points out, "the aim was to make apostates, not martyrs"². It is also unlikely that voluntary martyrdom played any significant role in the New Testament period³, although we shall discuss some passages in Chapter 6 with this concept in mind.

1 Pliny, Letters, 10:96.

2 de Ste. Croix, op. cit., 20.

3 Frensd, op. cit., 143.

CHAPTER V

ST. PAUL'S ATTITUDE TO THE STATE

It would be impossible to describe Paul's attitude to the state in a simple, systematic way. Paul never allowed himself to be hampered by the necessity of maintaining a consistent position in the face of each new situation he encountered. He trusted that, having the mind of Christ, his views would at least be consistent with the will of God, if not in the eyes of the logician.

We are fortunate that so much of Paul's correspondence is available to us, and that so much of it is spontaneous teaching delivered to communities with specific problems. Almost all authorities would agree on the authenticity of Romans,¹ and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Philemon¹. The evidence against the authenticity of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philipians and Colossians does not seem conclusive², but we have not used these books without comparing the doctrines contained there with what is found in the first group of epistles. Ephesians is certainly doubtful, but has been

1 D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, xiv.; Jas. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 393.
 2 F.W. Beare, "Introduction to Colossians", Interpreters Bible, 11:133 ff.

left out of consideration because it does not in any case add any new evidence on attitude to the state. The Pastoral Epistles, while admittedly containing Pauline material¹, have been left to the next chapter because they reflect the political attitudes of Christians of a later period. The dates of the writings probably range from 52 A.D. for 1 and 2 Thessalonians to 61 A.D. for the captivity epistles².

The epistles and the biographical material in Acts cast light upon an apostle who travelled widely in the Roman Empire during the differentiation from Judaism and the beginning of the persecutions referred to in the previous chapter, and upon the Christian communities to whom he ministered during these crucial years. In the process of differentiation from Judaism, Paul played the decisive part. His attitude to the Jewish Law was less than decisive perhaps³, but he was emphatic on his stand that Gentiles should come to Christ directly. Thus, given the fact which to Paul was self-evident, that Jews and Gentiles were one in Christ, his teachings can be seen as leading inevitably to a divorce from Judaism. If Paul was conservative in his attitude to the temple and the law of Moses, his was not the conservatism of the earlier disciples who waited for Jesus to restore a political dominion to the Jews⁴. It

1 W. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles, (I.C.C.) xxxi.

2 see appendix on the dating of New Testament writings.

3 Cf. Acts 25:8; Gal. 5:2 ff.

4 A. Robertson, Regnum Dei, 59.

grew rather from his aversion to divisive strife. Nevertheless, he did not conciliate to the point of compromising the freedom and truth of the gospel, and therefore drew the hatred of the Jews to himself. He may be said to have borne scars typical of those inflicted on many in the church's conflict with Judaism. Though he did not live to see the final short, sharp break with the Jewish theocracy which the destruction of Jerusalem caused, he did turn the eyes of the Christians away from earthly securities to the things above, where Jesus, the Messiah, is seated at the right hand of God (Col. 3:1).

In the conflict with Rome, the account of Paul's life reflects an early stage of development. It points out the fact that from the pagan side, social hatred was the first reaction against Christianity, and that this hatred and consequent persecution at the hands of the populace did not quickly spread to a similar official reaction. Trying to live according to the new righteousness of God led to difficulties. If a Christian associated with non-Christians his scrupulous morality would evoke disgust and astonishment¹. If he retired to the seclusion of his own community, he was charged with secret abominations and hatred of society. Paul's letters reflect the early troubles of the Christian community in this regard. I Cor. 8, for example,

1 C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 94.

reflects the difficulty confronting the members who were invited to attend pagan banquets. Paul's advice seems to be not to refrain from intercourse with the pagan world where conscience will possibly allow it¹. He saw this intercourse as an opportunity which it was essential for the Christian to use to bring the gospel of love to bear upon society. If society was disturbed by the Christian witness and turned to persecute the community, the disciple was to stand fast and return good for evil. Thus Paul set the tone for the Church's struggle with Rome. He did not let Christians forget the Lord's cross. Paul himself suffered persecution from pagans. It would appear that this began from the lower orders of society and that his activities were brought to the attention of the authorities by an angry populace. In Philippi, the healing of a slave girl whose malady was being used for the gain of her owner had accomplished this (Acts 16:19 ff.) At Thessalonica also, the people first, and only afterward the civil authorities, became incensed at Paul's actions (Acts 17:8).

The evidence of Paul's life supports the view that Christians endured their sufferings with patience, and cannot be said to have had a bitter attitude to the state. Roman

1 1 Cor. 8:12; 5:9-11.

justice can be said to have been kinder than the Roman populace, but Christians were exhorted to pray that all who persecuted them might be blessed (Rom. 12:14). If the average Christian was in danger of falling away from this high attitude to the Roman state, it was not for want of a good example from the apostles, of whom Paul said, "When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we try to conciliate" (1 Cor. 4:12-13).

A. Background to Paul's Thought.

As he tells us himself, Paul was "of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee, as to zeal a persecutor of the church, as to righteousness under the law, blameless" (Phil. 3:5-6). It is not our purpose to establish all that this side of his background meant for Paul's teaching. This has been done elsewhere¹. It might be helpful, however, to set down some of the Old Testament and Hebrew ideas which seem to have influenced his attitude to the state.

First, there was the doctrine of a divine Providence ruling directly over all events of history. Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah had seen Jahweh as using even those rulers who

¹ e.g. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, 32 ff.; A.B.D. Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul, 27 ff.; D.E.H. Whiteley, op. cit., 1-16.

did not know him for the fulfilling of his purposes¹. For Paul too, there was a strong sense of the overruling sovereignty of God. Wherever possible he saw the hand of God in history. The places where the angelic mediaries are particularly emphasized are problem areas in Paul's thinking about historical development, but we shall have to come back to this point later. In the Roman Empire and in the working out of history there was much that seemed simply providential to Paul. It came as a result of God's creatorship². "All things work together for good" (Rom. 8:28), was a statement that Paul was to qualify and theologize about many times, but it was a basic attitude which came from deep in his spiritual heritage.

Secondly, his Old Testament heritage of the doctrine of the Fall, combined with the belief in supernatural evil powers which came from late Jewish apocalyptic, made him stress the sinfulness of mankind³. He could speak of "the present evil age" (Gal. 1:4). There were some differences with regard to evil between the Jew and the Gentile, but basically each individual human being had been affected by the fall of Adam. "All had sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:9). Because man was sinful, Paul saw that for as long as this age lasted, evil must somehow be restrained. The Law had this restraining

1 see supra, Chapter 1.

2 R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 228 ff.

3 Whiteley, op. cit., 45 ff; G.B. Caird, Principalities and Powers, 17 ff. Also interesting as a doctrine of evil related to Paul's is that of the Manual of Discipline, in The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect., ed. and E.T., T.H. Gaster, 53.

function in Judaism. Paul could not doubt that the law which ordered the known society of the whole earth had also been given the function of being the agent of God's wrath against evil. The state could then be regarded as an organization whose purpose is to enable fallen men to make the best of a fallen world¹.

Thirdly, Paul inherited from his Old Testament background, and particularly from the Pharisaic interpretation of it, a strongly positive attitude to the ideal state of Israel. When Cullmann says that the theocratic ideal was expressly rejected as Satanic², he is surely overstating his case. We may agree that Paul expressed his hope for the future of society in eschatological visions of Christ's victory, and that this resulted in a negative judgment of sorts. Karl Barth clarified the issue by using a helpful mathematical illustration. He likened the existing order, the law, the state, and the various other constituent parts making up an orderly society to $(+a +b +c)$. This does receive an eschatological judgment which is indicated by a divine minus sign placed outside the bracket³. However, in many of Paul's utterances he is speaking about what he sees in the world inside the brackets, during the intermediate time before the end. And when he speaks in this way his attitude to the

1 Whiteley, op. cit., 53.

2 O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 9.

3 K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, 482.

Jewish theocracy is positive. It was surely because of ardor for the traditions of his fathers that Paul volunteered to fight the Christian sect¹. He apologized when he was told he had rebuked none other than the High Priest, quoting from the law, "You shall not speak evil of a ruler of your people."² While the present age lasted, there was in Paul's view something good and God-given in the solidarity and interdependence of the various strata of Hebrew society. However, he was not blind to the truth that a similar solidarity existed in the Roman Empire, and as the Jewish theocracy gradually lost its importance for the Christian community, the Roman system became for him the undisputed representative of the kingdoms of this world.

Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, but he was also a fully-aware member of Graeco-Roman society. Proud of his birth in the commercial city of Tarsus, he reacted with integrity to the culture and customs of the hellenic world. He had enough of the spirit of the exilic prophets to see that God was the God of Gentiles as well as Jews³, and saw himself as debtor to Greeks and barbarians. Neither was he afraid to formulate questions in his own mind about the spiritual state of the pagan world. We must now look briefly at some of the ideas Paul held which were common to the prevailing culture.

1 Paul S. Minear, "Paul the Apostle", Interpreter's Bible, 7:206.

2 Acts 23:5; cf. Ex. 22:28; Zech. 6:13.

3 Rom. 2:14; 3:29.

First, Paul seems to have been influenced by certain ideas in Stoic thought¹. The Stoic believed that the whole universe was one well-ordered polity. Seneca could say, "We are members of a great body."² This doctrine probably tended to support and augment Paul's own native doctrine of divine providence. The Stoics believed that their universal polity depended for its existence on the σπερματικός λόγος or generative reason rather than on a transcendent God. Paul apparently accepted some such theory of the naturally-founded order of their world, and saw in it the Gentile equivalent of the Law. He could not, however, but attribute to the one God of history the act of planting the generative seed of the Graeco-Roman world, and this of course enabled him to be positive in his attitude to the state.

Secondly, there is the fact of Paul's Roman citizenship. It has been much discussed elsewhere³, so we will not take time here. Suffice it to say he was proud of the distinction and showed no hesitation in using his citizenship to further the propagating of the gospel⁴. It should not be forgotten either, that travel was at its safest when Paul's journeys were made⁵. He would not be unaware of the fact that Roman law had made it

1 J.R. Glover, The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire, 38. Also, surprisingly, A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, 315.

2 Seneca, Epp. 95.

3 Jean Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, II, 15, E. von Dobschutz, The Apostolic Age, 44 ff.; and in a fresh and authoritative way in Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 144 ff.

4 Acts 16:35 ff.; 21:39; 22:23-9; 23:10-2; 26:32; 28:19. Weinel, Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat, 29, rightly says that this fact alone cannot be made to infer patriotism.

5 Kidd, op. cit., 7.

so. Paul had said once that the things which had happened to him had all tended to further the gospel (Phil. 1:12). Of these happenings not the least in Paul's view was his birth as a Roman citizen, and this must have affected his attitude to the state.

Thirdly, we must make mention of the prominent place which the angelic powers had in Paul's thought. No doubt modern disbelief in the reality of the spirit world has caused this important aspect of Paul's thought to be underplayed¹. But it has been forcefully brought to our attention by a series of scholars, beginning with Martin Dibelius², and including Karl Barth³ and Oscar Cullmann⁴.

Briefly, the position is this. Spirit beings were thought to belong to the temporal order of the world; they came with its creation and would depart with its passing. These invisible beings in some way, "not to be sure as mediators, but rather as executive instruments of the reign of Christ, stand behind what occurs in the world."⁵ It will be seen that if Cullmann is right, there are important implications for Paul's understanding of the ἐξουσία in Rom. 13:1, and consequently for his

1 J.S. Stewart, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology", Scottish Journal of Theology, 4 (1951), 292-301.

2 Die Geisterwelt im Glauben Paulus, (1909).

3 Church and State.

4 Christ and Time, and The State in the New Testament.

5 Cullmann, Christ and Time, 192.

attitude to the state. Cullmann would agree that the state is included in Paul's reference to the "powers that be", but he would maintain that Paul's emphasis is on the angelic powers behind the state, and that these are seen by Paul as being under subjection to Christ. This double reference interpretation of the ἐξουσία is important for Cullmann because it enables him to reach a "satisfactory" interpretation of Paul's attitude to the state. He admits¹ that he has felt constrained to find the key of interpretation which would bring Romans 13:1-7 with its ascription of a thoroughly positive role to the state into harmony with 1 Cor. 6 with its recognition of the state's provisional and problematic character, and indeed with Rev. 13 where the state is represented as the beast from the abyss,

Clearly, when a scholar feels under this kind of constraint, his exegesis could suffer. At any rate, Cullmann has been roundly criticized. A useful summary of the criticism is contained in Morrison's exhaustive treatment of the subject². We will refer to two important points which have been made. First, the New Testament evidence does not support the view which Paul is alleged to have taken, that the hostile spiritual powers which stand behind the state were re-commissioned, after being subdued, to a positive service of Christ. Further, Morrison has been quite devastating

1 The State in the New Testament, 113.

2 Clinton D. Morrison, The Powers that Be, 40-54.

in his criticism of the Christological aspect of Cullmann's Rom. 13 interpretation. He claims that the governing authorities have not been outwardly affected in any way by Christ's victory. If they are God's servants it is not because Christ's death, resurrection and ascension have changed them. Christ's already accomplished victory is, outside the church, "not only unknown, but without consequence."¹ Secondly, Cullmann's theory is not seen as necessary to an understanding of the positive words of Rom. 13. Many who favour the new approach to the passage express sentiments like those of Cranfield, "It is still difficult to understand why Paul could write quite so positively about the authorities."² Others have pointed out that historically the obvious meaning of the passage is rooted in the Jewish prophetic, apocalyptic and wisdom traditions, which understood the power of foreign rulers to be from God, and knew that he had often used human rulers for his own purposes³.

But we are getting ahead of our argument. The main purpose of this section is to show elements in Paul's thought. One main virtue of Morrison's work is that he has singled out the positive contribution of Cullmann and his school. He has shown with a

1 ibid, 115-122. C.E.B. Cranfield, A Commentary on Romans 12-13 64 f. is not entirely convinced by Morrison's argument and argues for a Christological understanding of the state. This is something different however from Cullmann's assertion that the civil powers can be viewed positively because they are in some way objectively bound, and on a Christological leash.

2 Cranfield, op. cit., 63. Italics his.

3 von Campenhausen, referred to by Morrison, op. cit., 51.

wealth of evidence that there was, as Cullmann claimed, a common Graeco-Roman concept of the state in which rulers were seen as divinely appointed, with their own important place in a hierarchical cosmic system of spiritual powers¹. He therefore makes the cautious judgment that just because a particular passage does not explicitly affirm the relationship between civil rulers and spiritual powers is no reason for doubting that the belief is part of the context of the communication. We would certainly agree with Morrison to that extent, but would want to maintain that the context of a saying might indicate whether the emphasis was being placed on activity in the supra-historical plane of the angels or on the plane of the ordinary events of history.

B. Exposition of Key Passages.

We must now give our attention to some of the Pauline material which is prime evidence for his attitude to the state.

(i) II Thess. 2:3-7

"That day will not come, unless the rebellion (ἀποστασία) comes first, and the man of lawlessness (ὁ ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἀνομίας) is revealed, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God. Do you not remember that when I was still with you I told you this? And you know what is restraining him (τὸ κτεχόν) now so that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; only he who now restrains it

1 ibid, 99.

(ὁ κατέχων) will do so until he is out of the way."

Three questions need to be answered. What is the ἀποστασία? Who is ὁ ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἀνομίας? What and who respectively are το κατέχων and ὁ κατέχων? The occasion for the teaching is clear enough. The Thessalonian community was in a wild state of disorder over false beliefs concerning the parousia. The phrases "to be shaken" (ταρτεῦσθαι) and "to be exited" (θροεῖσθαι) are strong words implying violent, tragic, disturbance. There is also a suggestion that the disorder came from the freedom that was the concomitant of the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom. Paul writes to clear up the misunderstanding so that the community can be restored to normal order. He knew that they would accept the teaching that the Day of the Lord could not come until after the ἀποστασία, because he had told them this before. It was part of the eschatological programme which he and the community had as common belief. The word could mean political rebellion¹, but the idea of a religious falling away is more likely. The word is used in the LXX always in this sense. It is also used in 1 Macc. 2:15 where Antiochus Epiphanes is pictured as trying to get the Jews to take up Greek customs. If we remember how the Jews looked back on the great crises of their history in

1 J.W. Bailey, "I and II Thessalonians", Interpreter's Bible, XI, 327. B. Rigaux, Les Epitres aux Thessaloniens, has a very full survey of the varying interpretations.

order to understand both the present and the future, as for instance with the exodus and the return from exile, and we further remember that the early Maccabean period was seen as a time of deliverance¹, then we can quite easily imagine how the apostasy of the Hellenizing Jews became one of the stock features of the age of deliverance. The apostasy would occur in some form, raised to the nth power, on the Day of the Lord². Paul need not have believed anything more specific than this, to have believed that such an event would occur soon and that it would be readily identified by the Christians.

The same kind of speculation can be attempted with the identity of the man of lawlessness. If we are right in supposing that the rebellion was related in Paul's thinking to the blasphemous policies of Antiochus Epiphanes, then the comparatively recent attempt of Gaius Caligula to have his statue placed in the temple (c. 40 A.D.) could have prompted Paul to believe that the Roman emperor might indeed become like an Antiochus. We need not think that Paul had any particular Roman emperor in mind. All that was necessary was the fear that recent history might easily repeat itself. We cannot be sure of these conjectures, but at the very least these events are the kind which were in the background of his thinking. It might be observed that it is probably

1 see supra, Ch. 2.

2 Whiteley, *op. cit.*, 236.

significant that in this period when there were the inevitable community disruptions which came with the attempt to live by the gospel, Paul's figure of the anti-Christ is pictured as a man of lawlessness. Order must have been one of their most keenly felt needs.

There are more contentious problems connected with the meaning of the two restrainers, neuter and masculine. This much is clear. Since they are already functioning as restrainers, the words must refer to specific and concrete things or persons. The oldest interpretation, that of Tertullian, which identified ΤΟ
ΚΑΤΕΧΟΝ with the Roman Empire, is still the best to the mind of the present writer, for the simple reason that historically the law of Rome did keep a restraining hand on the rebellious tendencies of the Jews as no other known force was able to do¹. The logic of this approach would lead us to think of the masculine restrainer as the head of the system of restraint, the Emperor. The latter will hold the lawless energy in check for a limited time only, "until he is out of the way." The picture we get, then, is of an emperor using the ordering power of law to hold back disorder. When he is out of the way another emperor comes on the scene, this time a man like Antiochus or Caligula, who will provoke the apostasy which is the sure sign of the parousia.

¹ Cf. Milligan, St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, and Morris, Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Cullmann has opposed solutions of this kind. He suggests that the neuter restrainer is the preaching of the gospel and the masculine restrainer Paul himself¹. The most obvious criticism of this theory is that Paul would hardly think of himself as disappearing from the scene according to God's plan and at the same time expect to be found alive at the Lord's coming (I Thess. 4:15). Cullmann admits that his theory is rather shaky, but goes on to say adamantly that "the state cannot be the subject of discussion"², in the passage in question. "Even if my own explanation of this passage should not be valid in any case, the reference of the ΚΑΤ'ΕΧΩΝ to the State must be considered the least likely hypothesis. The whole late Jewish and early Christian apocalyptic (also II Thess. 2:4 in the same section we are considering!) thought of the Empire as a satanic embodiment. It would therefore be a remarkable confusion of thought if II Thess. 2:6 ascribed to the Empire the role of him whose task is to arrest the work of Anti-Christ."³ We need not admit to remarkable confusion, if in verse four we see that the state is seen as presently functioning to preserve order. However, we cannot be sure we have read Paul aright. Perhaps there is some confusion here. We would only say that a confused scheme might be reasonably expected when it is remembered that Paul writes to deal with an

1 Cullmann, Christ and Time, 145 ff; The State in the New Testament, 64 ff.

2 Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 64, italics his.

3 ibid, n.7, 64.

urgent situation at a time when there was still fluidity in ideas about the parousia. We can be sure that Paul's intention was to bring calm and normalcy to the community at Thessalonica, and we can be reasonably certain that the Roman power figured in this thinking both as a present good and a potential evil.

(ii) I Corinthians 2:8.

"None of the rulers of this age
(ΤΩΝ ἄρχόντων του αἰῶνος
τουτου) understood this;
for if they had, they would not
have crucified the Lord of Glory."

This is a classic expression of the idea that demonic, invisible powers stand behind all earthly happenings, using human beings as their effective agents¹. In this case Cullmann is surely correct in assuming a double reference. Paul clearly tells us that he is talking about "hidden wisdom", knowledge of the causation of events that has come to him through the spirit. This secret knowledge is to the effect that Christ is the power of God overruling the events of history and the powers that stand behind the events, for his purposes. Obviously, the crucifixion to which Paul refers² took place on the historical plane with Caiaphas, Pilate, and Herod having a part in the event. So they are clearly in view. But Paul foresaw the possibility that the rulers of this age to whom he referred might have understood

1 Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 63; Morrison, op. cit., 43.

2 Cf. Acts 3:17; 13:27.

the secret wisdom. As this is impossible for earthly rulers, there must also be a reference to the angelic powers who cause events like the crucifixion according to some strategy of theirs. And in this example of Paul's thought the transaction on the angelic level is the most important. As we have contended, this doesn't necessarily mean that the emphasis is on the same plane everywhere that Paul speaks of rulers or powers. He is not bound rigidly to any one apocalyptic scheme¹.

(iii) I Corinthians 6:1.

"When one of you has a grievance against a brother, does he go to law before the unrighteous instead of the saints? Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?.... Do you not know that we are to judge angels?"

In speaking of the Thessalonian community we drew attention to the disruption of the common life. A similar disorder was apparent in the Corinthian church. The reasons are not hard to find. Paul mentions the libertine attitude which the gospel had inspired. Some were saying "All things are lawful" (1 Cor. 6:12). There was also party strife as the community sought to find the charismatic leader who could bring order to their life (1 Cor. 1:12 ff.). This led to more disorder.

We may well ask what was being attempted in the early groups of Christians at places like Thessalonica and Corinth.

¹ J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, 47; cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 62 f. where the author argues that Paul's eschatology developed.

Obviously some attempt was being made to apply the absolute standards of the kingdom to the present (1 Cor. 6:9-11). The tension thus created can reside in the individual as he moves about the world, but social scientists say that it is much more likely that a counter community will form. Such a community is able to approximate the new standards because it can discipline its members, and there is mutual encouragement because all are following the same ideal. There can be variations in the degree of separation of such a community from the rest of society. The Qumran community of which Paul must have been aware¹, was set very much apart. Paul wanted the Christian communities to order their own internal life according to the kingdom ethic, but he also wanted Christians to maintain intercourse with the world. We would expect to find the communities in difficulty from time to time because what they were attempting was certainly difficult to achieve. We would also expect to find Paul taking time in his letters to encourage and exhort, and that is what we do find in I Corinthians. Paul begins by holding up to his readers once again the theocratic ideal. No man is to lead them. Christ is their leader (I Cor. 1:13-17). Then he continues with instructions which are intended to restore the community to its true practice in all manner of practical things.

It is in this context that we should read Paul's advice that the community bypass the pagan lawcourts and settle their

¹ Whiteley, op. cit., 229.

disputes before the saints. This is the proper way of regulating life when one is living by a standard that judges both men and angels. It is from this point of view, also that Paul speaks of the Roman magistrate as unrighteous (ἀδικαίος). When it was the world's standards which were in view, as we have seen, Paul did use and appreciate the Roman courts¹. In spite of the context of his passage however, it must be noted that the tone of Paul's communication about the state here is negative compared to the section we will examine next.

(iv) Romans 13:1-7.

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities (ἐξουσίας). For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of him who is an authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain; he is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer. Therefore one must be subject not only to avoid God's wrath but also for the sake of conscience. For the same reason you also pay taxes, for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. Pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.

¹ e.g. Acts 21:27 f; 23:30-35; 24:1-2. See Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 48 ff.

It is altogether likely that Paul included this section in his letter¹ because he knew of anti-state feeling in the church at Rome. Although Nero's persecution was five years away, the attitudes of the Christian sect which made them suitable scapegoats in the eyes of the populace were probably already in evidence. They were thought to have anarchical opinions, and with some cause if they were anything like the believers at Corinth and Thessalonica. In the same section in which this passage occurs, Paul exhorts the Christians to maintain high ethical conduct in the face of slander and persecution (Rom. 12:9-21). This suggests that there was a certain amount of tension between the community and Roman society. Jewish Christians no doubt maintained the old bitterness in their attitudes, especially as increasing pressure was brought to bear on their homeland. Paul admitted to the church that the Romans had brought them persecution (Rom. 12:14), but he cautioned against an attitude of vengeance (Rom. 12:19). Then he went on to make his remarkably positive statement about the state.

In interpreting the passage we must first examine the meaning of the ἔφευγον². On the basis of such a seemingly small matter wide divergences of meaning have been found in Rom. 13:1-7. Karl Barth, for instance, has seen the passage as expressing no positive approval of civil government, but simply

¹ see Cranfield, op. cit., 61 ff. for a summary of the argument that this section is in its natural context.

a negation of revolt as the Christian way of combatting the evil nature of the state¹. On the other hand it has been interpreted as a completely positive affirmation of the divine nature of the state's authority². We have already stated our conviction that while Paul's world view included in an hierarchical structure both political authorities and heavenly powers, both planes of activity do not receive equal emphasis on every occasion when he refers to ἐξουσία. The context makes it clear that in I Cor. 2:5 he sees the activity in the heavenly sphere to be of prime importance. It is true that in Paul's writings ἐξουσία carries the special meaning of spiritual powers consistently, with the exception of Rom. 13. The exception should not cause difficulty though, because in the other references ἐξουσία appears with a catalogue of at least two powers, always in relationship with the term principality, and in Christologically-oriented passages. None of these things is true for Rom. 13. Indeed, in this passage there is no reference to Christ at all³. Without any indication that the word receives here a special meaning, we must interpret it as containing its usual meaning, namely the political authorities⁴. This does not rule out the contention of Cranfield⁵ and Morrison⁶ that heavenly powers might still be involved in the communication

1 K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, 475 ff.

2 e.g. Sunday and Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans, 369 ff.

3 see Morrison, op. cit., 42 ff. and the extensive cross references contained there.

4 Kittel, Christus und Imperator, 49.

5 op. cit., 68.

6 op. cit., 99.

to Paul's hearers. But the reference to such a mundane matter as taxes in vs. 7 makes it clear that in this instance Paul has most clearly in his focus the historical activity of political rulers. In any event almost all commentators agree that what is imparted is that the Christian should live in subjection to the state power¹.

The next point we should notice is that the powers exercise an authority which is from God. Paul does not challenge the commonly accepted view of all men of the Graeco-Roman world that the state structure is part of the order of the cosmos. But by referring to God six times in this passage he makes an important theological point -- Secular governments are of divine institution. This, of course, is orthodox Jewish doctrine².

"Rulers are not a terror to good conduct but to bad." This phrase brings up the question of whether Paul believed that the state authorities had received natural illumination about good and evil. In Romans 2:14, Paul suggests that pagans have a knowledge of God through his work in creation and a knowledge of the principles of right and wrong, "a law written on their hearts"³. Paul probably believed that the state powers too had been given a natural illumination so that their judgment would agree in a sufficient sense with the Christian's estimate of good and evil⁴.

1 Whiteley, op. cit., 230.

2 C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, 210.

3 Whiteley, op. cit., 58 ff.

4 Cullmann, Christ and Time, 201.

"He is God's servant for your good." What particular benefits is Paul thinking of here which the state renders to the church? Civil government supports the cause of right and enforces just retribution on wrongdoing. These are benefits rightly enough. But one cannot help feeling that it was once again the benefit of order which Paul was thinking about primarily. It is clear from many other Pauline passages that he considered order (Ταξις) to be one of the great virtues. His illustration of the interdependence of the various parts of the body (I Cor. 12; Rom. 12:4) was used as an analogy of the Christian community, but the solidarity of the different parts as they fulfilled their differing functions must also have appealed to him as he thought of the larger community of all men. Thus he said that everyone should remain in the station in which he was called (I Cor. 7:20). In the interests of order, Paul himself remained at his trade; if any pressure was exerted on society it would be the pressure of love overcoming evil with good. Paul could never favour the breaking down of an orderly society in an external way. Onesimus, he counseled, should return to his station in life as a slave, even though Paul would have that station transformed through love (Philemon 5:16). In Paul's state passage we cannot doubt that the command to obey is based to a great extent on respect for orderliness of the Roman system, which in turn can only be seen as part of the Divine orderliness of the universe. It has been pointed out that four of the words

at the beginning of the state passage are compounded from the root τάξις, order. These are ὑποτάσσονται, τεταχμένους, ἀντιτάσσονται, and δικταγή ¹.

"Be subject, not only to avoid God's wrath, but for the sake of conscience." The word conscience (συνείδησις) is interesting for it is a stoic word closely allied in meaning to the idea of a law implanted by nature in human hearts. The natural morality was to Paul, "a revelation only less complete, and a command only less binding than the law of Moses itself."² But the word could refer to either the state or the Christian. If it refers to the state then the meaning is similar to the one we have brought out above. Namely the authorities have a sufficient knowledge of good and evil, so they should be obeyed. More likely it refers to the natural moral sense of the Christian³, as opposed to the absolutized version of right and wrong contained in the kingdom teaching. Therefore there is an element of conviction in the Christian's decision to be in subjection⁴. His positive attitude is not merely the result of fear.

"Pay all of them their dues." Here the passage is summarized and grounded, if there was any doubt, on the thoroughly mundane plane of taxation. It is likely that Paul had Jesus' logion

1 O. Cullmann, op. cit., 201.

2 J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, 58.

3 C.A. Pierce, Conscience in the New Testament, 105 ff.

4 John Knox, "Romans", Interpreter's Bible, IX, 605.

"Render unto Caesar" in mind when he phrased things in this way. There is the common reference to taxes and the common use of ἀποδοτε, "give back"¹. It is even possible, but difficult to prove, that the one to whom φοβος is due is God². If this were true the parallel would be striking indeed.

In summary then, Paul's attitude to civil government as we understand it from this passage is this: it is a part of the moral natural order which has its divinely appointed place in the cosmos; the degree of relationship or the manner of relationship between it and the reign of Christ is, in this passage at least, in some doubt.

(v) Colossians 1:16-17.

In him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities or authorities - all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.

Here is a passage, unlike the preceding one, in which Paul sets forth his thoroughly Christological understanding of reality. Paul believed that the created universe, with all its physical and spiritual existences, is an unfolding of the plan of God in Christ³. All things hold together (ἑνεστέθηκεν)

1 Cranfield, op. cit., 78.

2 ibid, 81.

3 F.W. Beare, "Colossians", Interpreter's Bible, XI, 165 f.

in him. The verb here is in the perfect tense, so the belief is expressed that the universe is an ordered system. This idea in itself would not have surprised pagans. It was almost universally assumed that the universe and its powers were knit together into an order¹. But when the Christian said what he believed the end and purpose of the order in which the state participated to be, he was making a surprising statement. For he was stating that the meaning of all things was to be found in relationship to one who was among men as a loving, suffering servant. Christological affirmation, as Morrison has correctly shown, cannot have any direct effect on the political organisation². It has its effect as a secret knowledge which belongs to the church. Encouraged to know about Christ's overruling of all creation, the church proclaims his gospel and becomes effective among men in their social and political lives.

C. The Mind of Christ.

If in Romans, Paul went enthusiastically beyond the approval which Jesus had given to the state, he could not consciously have gone beyond the Spirit of Christ. In evaluating the importance of the various influences in Paul's life, it is all too easy to minimize his debt to his Lord³. In Chapter Three it has been argued that Jesus' attitude to the state was demonstrated by his

1 Morrison, op. cit., 111.

2 ibid, 117, 138.

3 W.W. Bryden, The Spirit of Jesus in St. Paul, 13 ff., 218.

taking up the role of Suffering Servant. In doing this he repudiated the attitude of vengeance against the Gentiles which was normal for most of Judaism. By ministering in love even to enemies, the political tensions of his day were to be overcome. Such an attitude was disturbing to the authorities; when they found ways to bring him to trial, he did not defend himself, but, "as the lamb before the shearers is dumb, he opened not his mouth" (Acts 8:32). Paul must have known of this emphasis in Jesus' life, and of the attitude to the state that it implied, for the larger passage in which Rom. 13:1-7 is set (Rom. 12-15) begins with the exhortation, "I appeal to you ... to present your bodies as a living sacrifice". To people undergoing persecution at the hands of the populace, this was a very real exhortation to follow Jesus by displaying in their lives his characteristic attitude to those who opposed him.

Jesus, in his teaching on the kingdom, had spoken of the future Rule of God as if it were bursting into the present. There was always something "already come" about the kingdom as well as something "not yet". At any rate Jesus asked that man living in the world should at the same time enter the kingdom and live by its standards, which were in line with the standards of this world, but raised to absolute expression. In the world it was wrong to kill, in the kingdom it was wrong to be angry

with another. Enemies were to be loved. Struck on one cheek, the other was to be exposed to insult. Men, seeing God's absolute will done on earth, would thereby be disturbed, and social and political attitudes would be renovated. Paul was true to his Master in passing on this kind of teaching to Christians undergoing trials. Paul's teaching retained the familiar double aspect of the kingdom, although it translated the vocabulary into terms more comprehensible to a Gentile¹. If there were differences they were that for Paul, the present intermediate stage of history seemed more firmly established, and that although Jesus was no anarchist, Paul seemed to lay more stress on order as a virtue. But the strenuous absolutes of Jesus' kingdom teaching appear in undiminished force in Paul. Jesus said, "Turn the other cheek", and Paul, "overcome evil with good" (Rom. 12:21). Jesus said, "Love your enemies", Paul, "Bless those who persecute you" (Rom. 12:14). Jesus said, "Blessed are the peacemakers", Paul, "So far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all" (Rom. 12:18).

Paul enlarged somewhat on the positive effects on society of meekness under persecution, and gave his explanation of how this comes about. The Christian shames the action of his enemy by his obviously superior reaction to it. By loving his enemy the Christian "will heap burning coals upon his head" (Rom. 12:20).

¹ J.S. Stewart, op. cit., 293.

Eventually evil is overcome by good, hatred by love. Paul is of two minds as to whether this process of witnessing to society by following Jesus' ethical absolutes will necessarily lead to persecution. On the one hand, theoretically, so to speak, it should not. Love fulfills the law, going beyond its minimal requirements, but it does not break the law. "Love does no wrong to a neighbour" (Rom. 13:10). That is why Paul can be so insistent in writing to the Romans that they conduct themselves "becomingly as in the day" (Rom. 13:13), so as not to give the slightest real provocation to Roman law. On the other hand there is a realization that the absolute demands of the Almighty are always disturbing to the natural man, and will undoubtedly cause some difficulties. In the face of this possibility, Paul gives the Christians no other teaching than that of Jesus, "Repay no one evil for evil" (Rom. 12:17).

Jesus had also taken for himself the role of Son of Man, thereby pointing to his sure victory over those who opposed him, even though he consistently sought nothing for himself and patiently bore all enmity (I Cor. 13:4). Paul, too, laid stress in his teaching on the Lordship of Christ, on the victory of the One who suffered the death of the cross. In Colossians and Philippians especially we see Paul's estimate of the stature of Son of Man. Because he humbled himself, taking the form of a

Servant, God has now highly exalted him, so that he reigns over all created beings (Phil. 2:5; Col. 1:5 ff.; 3:1 ff.). Paul teaches that the ordinary Christian should be prepared to suffer in like manner, and that he will be raised with Christ to participate in his victory. It is in this context that Paul develops his magnificent Christology. It is determinative for attitude to the state only in so far as it gives assurance of Christ's victory to those who were facing a cross if they followed Jesus and the apostles in maintaining Christ-like attitudes. Such apparently were the Philippians to whom Paul addresses an epistle containing a strong Christological emphasis, for he writes to them, "It has been granted to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake, engaged in the same conflict which you saw and now hear to be mine" (Phil. 1:29-30).

CHAPTER VIFURTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

This study does not propose as a thesis that Christian attitude to the state began at one point and proceeded in a straight line to another. However, it was thought appropriate to deal with the remaining writings in some approximation of their order of composition. In this way, if there are any observable trends in Christian attitudes which are explainable as responses to the political developments of a particular period, they will stand out more clearly. It was thought best not to include lengthy sections on the evidence for the dating of the various books in the sections that follow. An appendix gives the reasoning behind the order that has been followed.

A. HEBREWS

Questions of the date, authorship, and destination of this epistle are by no means settled. Many interesting theories concerning authorship have appeared in print, but none of the accompanying proofs are conclusive, and at any rate the question is not of vital concern for us in this study. An analysis of the author's thought would lead us

to assume that, culturally at least, he was a Hellenist, with a background of non-conformist Judaism as an additional possibility.¹ The letter is sent to the Ἑβραίοις. This indicates that it is Jewish Christians of a particular locality who are addressed.² The present writer accepts this view with confidence. He is also convinced that the particular community was the congregation at Rome,³ although it doesn't seem necessary to go along with Manson's refinements and talk of a Hebrew minority within the Jewish-Christian church at Rome. The community was being tempted by the deferment of the parousia and pressured by various kinds of social persecution, to retreat from their distinctively Christian position and merge their identity in the Jewish environment to which they had originally belonged.⁴

As far as date is concerned, we can say with some certainty that Hebrews was written before 95 A.D., as I Clement appears to have been familiar with the letter.⁵

-
1. F. F. Bruce, "'To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes,'" New Testament Studies, 9(1962-63), 217 ff.
 2. See M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, 78 f., on the general use of Ἑβραίοις to designate Jewish Christians.
 3. W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, sets forth the evidence for this view in detail. F. F. Bruce, op. Cit., supports Manson's arguments.
 4. Bruce, op. cit., says that it is likely that the Jewish Christians addressed were non-conformist in religious background. The present writer agrees with Bruce that it would be outstripping the evidence to call them Essenes.
 5. Clarke, op. cit., 6.

Most commentators would not assign a date as early as c.60-63 A.D.¹, which is W. Manson's preference, but this date does justice to the historical references found in the letter, and cannot easily be discounted on the basis of clear evidence. The temple service is represented as still continuing at the time of writing,² so that we should most naturally judge the epistle to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem in the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. Those addressed have already undergone one "hard struggle" (Heb. 10:32 ff.), the description of whose obloquies would very closely suit the type of persecutions suffered in the expulsion of the Jews by Claudius in 49 A.D. If this is the event referred, it would have to be sufficiently in the past at the time of writing to make it natural for the writer to speak of recalling to their minds "the former days." In addition, he reminds them, "In your struggle against sin you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding your blood" (12:4). Considering the solidarity which the writer attributed to the Christian community as a whole, he could not have said this to any group at Rome unless the time was before 64 A.D. It is also apparent from the letter that tensions between the community and the pagan society had been intensified prior to the writing, so that a date near the beginning of the decade is not at all unlikely.

-
1. see appendix on dating.
 2. Heb. 8:4 ff; 9:6;9; 10:1 ff.; 13:10 ff.; on this point see E. C. Wickham, The Epistle to the Hebrews, xviii ff., and B. F. Wescott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, x lli.

At any rate, it is clear that the historical setting for the readers included persecution or the fear of persecution (12:4), and the remembrance of persecution (10:32 ff.). If the time was the early sixties we know that the Christian position vis a vis both Rome and Jerusalem was speedily changing. At Rome the abuse of the populace was directed with increasing force against the Christians; the latter's supposed abominations were more and more frequently brought to the attention of the authorities. It must have been increasingly clear that a crisis was coming for Christians. They were beginning to stand forth in Roman eyes as a people professing a religion different from Judaism, but one that was equally monotheistic and exclusive. They were clear in their own minds that they could not coalesce with the pagan community. A clash with Rome must have seemed inevitable. Jerusalem was involved in a very hot nationalistic struggle with Rome at the time. We might not expect that a closer association with Israel would be an attractive prospect for Christians, but apparently it was. Judaism did have a modus vivendi worked out between itself and Rome which guaranteed a certain toleration. To a group which must have been disappointed by the failure of the parousia to come and set things right, there could also have been an attraction in the psychological security which the theocracy and its temple cult offered. Whatever the reasons, there was a group preparing to go back to Judaism at the very point where history was forcing a separation. The writer recognized an extremely

serious crisis in the situation, saying that it was as crucial for the readers as the Exodus was for the children of Israel.

What was the Christian attitude to the crisis to be? As far as threatened persecution is concerned, the author seems to take it for granted that his readers had been instructed. They are to "stand fast," "strive for peace with all men" (12:14), and let no "root of bitterness" (12:15) defile their thinking. The author seems to take the danger of apostasy more seriously, and his exhortations on this point are more detailed and practical. But whether the chief danger be persecution or apostasy, the letter as a whole is the author's response to the historical situation.

CHRISTOLOGY

Hebrews is a christological argument in the sense that it is concerned throughout to portray Christ as priest.¹ The author is not particularly interested in the eschatological timetable of events. He does not worry about the pre-existence or post-existence of Christ. He is much more interested in showing how the timeless realities have been revealed within this world of time and sense, and how they can be appropriated directly by the Christian through the act of worship. His world view is extremely dualistic.²

-
1. Alexander C. Purdy, "The Epistle to the Hebrews", Interpreter's Bible, 11:586 ff.
 2. E. F. Scott, The Varieties of New Testament Religion, 222.

That is to say, he doesn't look for the kingdom on the historical plane. The world lies in the power of the evil one. The author has nothing in common with the older messianic hopes which looked forward to a messiah who would bring the kingdom of God on earth. So his message of hope and his exhortation to stand fast in the face of persecution and apostasy do not rest on a dynamic view of history. He does set forth for his readers what must have been a strengthening and comforting thought, namely, that there is direct access to God, direct membership in the kingdom, through the way of worship which has been opened up by Jesus, the priest of God.

EXHORTATION

The exhortations of Hebrews directed to Christians in crisis, can be divided into four sections. First, the author impresses on his readers the terrible finality of apostasy. They have progressed on a journey, as it were, following Christ out of and beyond the times appointed for the temple and the law. It had been a dreadful crime to break the law of Moses. How much more dreadful to spurn the Son of God by turning back on the journey (10:26-31). Indeed, to adopt once again the Jewish attitudes would be tantamount to crucifying Jesus,¹ for they would thereby be identifying themselves with those who had done the deed.

1. Heb. 6:4-6; W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 87.

Secondly, he recognizes the argument, probably used by those addressed in the letter, that the harsh events of its history prove that God is not with the church. To this he replies, "God is treating you as sons; for what son is there whom his father does not discipline? ...For the moment all discipline seems painful rather than pleasant; later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it" (12:5-11).

Thirdly, he reminds them of their own steadfast courage in former days, when they "endured a hard struggle with sufferings, sometimes being publicly exposed to abuse and affliction, and sometimes being partners with those so treated." In this time of trial, they had joyfully accepted the plundering of their property. The reason, he reminds them, that they were able to do all this was that they had their eyes fixed on "a better possession and an abiding one." The eschatological hope had sustained them; now again when they had need of endurance it would be folly to revert to the less well-founded hope of Judaism; they must not "throw away" their "confidence"(10:32-39).

Fourthly, he elaborates on the eschatological hope that has served them in the past and from which he exhorts them not to turn away.¹ It was faith in the unseen things that sustained all the great hero-prophets of Israel.

1. E. F. Scott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 104, 169 ff.

Typical of the many examples cited of the faith that moves forward, forgetting visible and earthly securities because of its vision of the heavenly, is the characterisation of Moses. "He considered abuse suffered for the Christ greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt" (11:23-28). Facing danger from the anger of the king of Egypt, "like one who saw the King Invisible, he never flinched."¹ Jesus too, for the joy set before him, perfected the faith of former generations and pioneered the faith now required of his followers, by enduring the cross, despising the shame, and finally going through the eschatological veil to sit down at the right hand of God. They are to consider "him who endured from sinners such hostility against himself" (12:3), so that their weak knees might be strengthened and their drooping hands lifted up (12:12).

Relevance of the Exhortation for Attitude to the State. We have in this letter an exhortation that a group of Hebrew Christians remain steadfast. It might be argued that the emphasis on the eschatological end of their calling precludes any serious consideration on the part of the author of a positive attitude to the earthly state. He clearly shows that he thought the world evil, and that would mean the world organized as a pagan society (11:7). The epistle contains no explicit recognition of any other

1. Heb. 11:27, in Moffat's translation.

polity than that of heaven. And this polity was the one to which the Christian should attach himself with positive loyalty. For the author, there is no continuing city here below. Therefore it may be doubted whether any attitude to the state can be imputed to him. But several things should be noted in this regard.

First of all, it should be recalled that even Paul, who expressed a positive approval of the civil government, could, when thinking primarily of the kingdom of God and its relationships, speak of civil judges as unrighteous. This epistle, with the eschatological hope continually in view, could not be expected to treat in any detail the Christian obligations to the earthly state.

Then, it should be noted that it seems to be understood by the author that the true Christian attitudes in the face of possible official action are known; there is no indication that the community addressed had not been maintaining these correct attitudes. Indeed, they are praised in this respect insofar as the past is concerned.

However, although nothing detailed with respect to attitude to the state is set forth, there are hints that the Christian polity here described, oriented to heaven as it is, still has within it elements which make it introduce a tension into the normal political relationships of this world. Just as loyalty to Jerusalem was the stable centre from which the Jew ventured forth to form his characteristic attitudes to Gentile states, so the author seeks to

wed his readers to an even more stable and enduring--though invisible--capital from which they can venture out to exhibit typically Christian attitudes to pagan civil authority.

The Christian polity set forth in this epistle has two stresses. It was meant as a replacement for the Jewish polity and so not unnaturally it contains elements of the characteristic Jewish separatism, which had no real interest in the redemption of the world.¹ In this stress of the polity of the epistle there would be no attempt at transforming the governments of this world; this side would only envisage the setting up of a more or less self-contained community by the side of the pagan state. But the other stress of the polity is that somehow the community as a whole is to take the place of the Christian individual, and is to exhibit to the pagan state by its ethic based on love for one another that the pagan state lives by a lower standard. The bearing of abuse in the interest of exerting a positive effect on Roman society is often implied in the epistle. How like the Sermon on the Mount teaching are these phrases: "See to it that ...no root of bitterness spring up and cause trouble"; "Strive for peace with all men!"(12:14-15).

1. Heb. 11:7; C. J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 90, notes that Hebrews speaks only of love for the brotherhood.

The traditional Christian attitude also called for special care to be taken that no real cause be given for the slander and obloquy that led up to persecution; there is a brief exhortation here as well "that no one be immoral" (12:16). No doubt the epistle would contain more of this kind of teaching if it were not understood as part of that in which the community was to stand fast.

This letter is important for our subject in that it gives us one of the most detailed accounts we have of the kind of exhortation which steeled the courage of Christians as they approached conflict with Rome. It was a teaching which relied heavily on the eschatological hope in the unseen consummation of history, and on direct access to the God of comfort. Among the Hebrew Christians of earlier times, as we have seen, this hope was associated with the temple and God's establishment of Israel's reign over the nations. This letter shows how the Hebrew group within Christianity was exhorted to step outside the camp unto Jesus. "Let us go forth to him outside the camp, bearing abuse for him. For here we have no lasting city" (13:13-14). The Christian is not to regard Roman society as permanent or secure, and what is more, even Jerusalem cannot be so regarded. It would be difficult to overestimate the courage that was required at the moments of crisis in the church's history for Jewish Christians to obey the summons, and become, as far as this world was concerned, stateless sojourners in an alien land.

B. ACCORDING TO MARK

The John Mark mentioned in Acts 12:12 is thought by most scholars to be the author of the second gospel.¹ But the work adds nothing in the way of particular information about Mark, and we know very little from other sources that could help us in our interpretation of his writing. So let us move quickly to consider the destination and historical setting of the writing.

The gospel was written for a group of believers who were part of an important Christian community which was passing through a period of stress.² Most commentators say that the church at Rome was the community involved, and perhaps more particularly the Gentile section of that church.³ The gospel contains many Latinized words and forms of speech; it explains several Aramaic expressions as one would to a foreigner. In addition, the testimony of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and the Anti-Marcionite Prologue is that Rome was the locus of the writing.

The date of Mark is a particularly crucial question. Scholars are generally agreed that it was written sometime

-
1. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 26-32. These pages contain a cogent summary of critical opinion on all points.
 2. F. C. Grant, "The Gospel According to St. Mark", Interpreter's Bible, 7:633.
 3. Mark 7:3 ff.; 11:13; 12:42. B.W. Bacon, Is Mark A Roman Gospel? and V. Taylor, op. cit., both make a convincing case for Roman destination.

between 60 and 75 A.D. But the historical context changes quite dramatically at several points within this period and it is important to attempt a closer approximation to the time of writing. Vincent Taylor decides on a date of 65 or 66 A.D., basing his argument on the fact that the emphasis on persecution which is so pronounced in the book would not be so great if it were written before the Neronian persecution. It cannot be doubted that persecution is one point of historical reference that helps us place the gospel in its context. The type of persecution suffered under Nero is of the same kind as that mirrored in the parts of Mark which refer to persecution. In Nero's time Christians were chosen as scapegoats because people believed they hated society. Once the original charge was made, false testimony was commonly made against the Christians, and if they were not actually persecuted "for the Name," they were fully aware that their hardships were the result of their association with the Christian teaching.¹ Mark 13:9-13 tells Christians that they will be delivered up to councils; they will stand before governors and kings for the sake of Christ; children will rise against their parents and put them to death; they will be hated as followers of Christ.² Mark 4:17 is an expository passage

-
1. H.B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 284.
 2. V. Taylor, op. cit., 509, shows from the classical sources that in the reign of Nero many Christians were in fact delivered up and witnessed against by those close to them.

that also seems to refer to Neronian persecution, and points to the fact that many in the Roman church were losing their faith in the hard times. In several hortatory passages (e.g. 8:34-37) Mark emphasizes the necessity of persevering in one's confession until death in order to save one's soul. This would support the validity of the tradition which held that in Nero's time several prominent apostles as well as many ordinary Christians became martyrs. We cannot place much confidence in the tradition which said that Mark himself was put to death,¹ but its existence shows that Mark's gospel was early associated with the church's struggle with Rome. This kind of evidence leads the majority of scholars to say that Mark was written for a martyr church, to teach and encourage a proper Christian attitude among believers who might soon be called to enter the arena themselves.

This position, as far as it goes, cannot be seriously disputed. But the persecution alone does not explain all the special Markan references. Perhaps within the general context of persecution, another specific event was the immediate cause of writing. Working on this premise, S.G.F. Brandon has recently come forward with an attractive and reasonable theory.² He began by looking for an event at

-
1. Swete, *op. cit.*, xxvii ff., says the tradition is late, possibly fourth or fifth century.
 2. S.G.F. Brandon, "The Date of the Markan Gospel," New Testament Studies, 7(1960 - 61), 126 ff.

Rome within the period between 65-75 A.D. He found that in the year 71 A.D. the new emperor Vespasian and his son Titus celebrated the destruction of Jerusalem by staging a great procession through the streets of Rome. Josephus gives a good account of the event¹ which was obviously meant to enhance the prestige of the Flavian dynasty. Prominent in the procession were huge floats which displayed trophies from the temple at Jerusalem -- sacred vessels, temple curtains, and all. It is easy to imagine the effect that this would have on Christians who were thoroughly familiar with their origins. They would want to take measures to preserve the primitive traditions of their own faith, because historical source of their tradition and authority had now visibly disappeared. They would want to prove that their faith did not implicate them in the thoroughly discredited cause of Jewish nationalism. Again, the destruction of the temple would seem to them the latest event in a series that included natural cataclysms, persecutions under Nero, and civil wars which came at the end of the latter's reign. Eschatological expectations would be excited. The leaders of the church would have to find ways of controlling the disturbed feelings of the community. Passages can be found in the

1. Josephus, Wars, 7:116-162.

gospel which correspond to each of these tentative reasons for writing, as we shall see. At any rate we can be quite sure that the gospel was produced with the persecution in mind. The additional possibility that it was written after Vespasian's dramatic procession cannot be lightly dismissed.

Teaching for Persecution

In order to speak to the dire need of the Roman congregation, Mark chooses from his sources carefully, making three main points of emphasis. First of all, he seems conscious of the false charges of immorality that were the reason for Christians being chosen as scape-goats. In the face of these he emphasizes the need for absolute purity (7:21-3) so that no cause be given the Romans to pursue their hurtful propaganda. We may infer from Mark's straightforward handling of the trial before Pilate that Rome did not yet believe that Christ or his followers were politically dangerous. Rome's procurators and magistrates were the servants of expediency in what they were doing, and Mark obviously felt that with notable Christian effort at purity and guilelessness, repairs could still be made to the relationship.

In the second place, Mark does not allow followers of Christ any sympathy for the violent Zealot reaction against Rome that was sweeping through the Jewish world at

this time. Throughout the gospel there is evidence that Christianity is well-advanced in the process of cutting loose from Judaism.¹ In the account of the trial before the priests (14:53-65) there is no word of sympathy or even of understanding concerning the role of the representatives of orthodox Judaism. The evidence fits in well with the theory that the Christian community felt nothing but dismay at the nationalistic attitudes which had led to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem. The Barabbas account shows the same emphasis. It shows signs of having been worked over in later times more than any other part of the passion narrative.² Certainly political revolutionaries of the Barabbas type had increased in number by the time of Mark's gospel. The στρατιωτης of Mark 15:7 is a late Greek word meaning "Partisan" or "revolutionary". Mark's treatment of this section shows that any such tendencies among Christians were to be discouraged.³ Yet another example of Mark's attitude appears in his listing of the names of the disciples (3:14-19). It was his practice to transliterate Aramaic names or expressions and to add translations of them for the benefit of his Gentile readership. But to have done this for Simon the Caananite he would have had to follow his

1. Taylor, op. cit., 88.

2. Taylor, op. cit., 580.

3. S.G.F. Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, 186-205.

designation with the phrase, "that is, the Zealot." Apparently he could not, at this time, bring himself to do it.

The third point that Mark makes to the Roman church is his opinion about how Christians should react to slanders and violence. It may be seen in the account of Jesus' mockery by the Roman soldiers (15:16-20). Romans would be used to the Imperial pomp accorded to the Emperor. Therefore, the combination of mimicry and abuse in the mock honours accorded to Jesus after his trial would be especially bitter to them. As the soldiers kneel and say, "ΧΑΙΡΕ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥ" the Roman Christian would hear those other words, "Ave Caesar, victor, imperator."¹ Surely Christ could not bear such injustice, even worse than that which the populace and Emperor had shown to them! But the simple lesson of Mark's account would make its impression. Jesus was silent in the presence of injustice, ignominy and railing; he was royal and steadfast even in death. Mark seems to say that in such a time of persecution, heroic virtues are necessary. He includes some of the most stringent sayings of Jesus in order to call forth from the congregation, faithfulness, and courage, and calm. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow me. For whoever would save his life, will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's, will save it."²

1. Taylor, op. cit., 586.
2. Mark 8:34-5.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF MARK.

Mark cannot be said to favour any one title for Jesus, unless it be the simple name itself.¹ Prophet, lord, teacher, Christ, are all used in a most natural way. Of those titles which have a more theological content, Son of Man and Son of God,² call for comment here. Both these titles lend themselves to Mark's intention of portraying a divine being who appeared in human form. Son of Man, having its origins in Daniel 7 and similar apocalyptic writings, carries with it the picture of a heavenly being coming with might upon the clouds (14:62). Son of God also carries with it the idea of Jesus' supernatural origin and divine dignity.³

Mark's Christology is a high one, but it cannot be learned from titles and theological usages, so much as from the total impression of action which the gospel gives. Mark's Christ is one whose Messianic destiny is declared through his actions. And his actions speak of power and authority. His humanity is real enough,⁴ but hidden behind his humanity is the figure of one who rules with power. Indeed, κυριος, used 10 times in Mark, is the word which best characterises his Christology. So to Christians

-
1. used 81 times.
 2. used 14 and 5 times respectively.
 3. cf. Ps. 2:7.
 4. He is moved in the presence of human suffering (1:43), limited in knowledge of historical events (13:32), angry with hypocrisy (3:5).

whose life and faith seem in danger of being snuffed out by the superior power of Roman society, Mark reveals the picture of one who is victor. The triumphant leader's way is prepared (1:3). Titles are used to show that he has the final dominion (e.g., 1:7, Mighty One). Mark emphasizes Jesus' authority over evil spirits and diseases (2:10; 1:27). Everywhere the Victor triumphs over Satan and his forces. When the role of the Victorious Messiah takes him finally before his earthly judges, he confidently proclaims that his triumph is assured (14:62). Mark does not minimize the reality of the suffering that the Son of Man had to endure in his conflict with sin (15:34), but the note of joyful triumph even breaks through the passion narrative and the gospel closes exultantly, if abruptly, on the note of victory over death (16:6).

Mark's Use of Apocalyptic

Beasley-Murray has recently published two exhaustively researched volumes dealing with the history of the interpretation of Mark 13.¹ His main purpose in writing is to discount the Little Apocalypse theory, and to show that much of the contents of the chapter have a

1. G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, and A Commentary on Mark 13, 1-18.

high claim to authenticity as words originally spoken by Jesus. He achieves his objectives to a very limited degree, showing that Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple is a believable possibility in light of his use of apocalyptic on other occasions. But despite all his arguments, 13:14-22 seems clearly to be a borrowing from an earlier apocalyptic tradition which was concerned with the desecration of the temple.¹ At the very least we can be sure that this chapter demonstrates that Mark used apocalyptic elements and thought forms in composing his gospel. Our main concern will be to discover how these elements were used by him and what his use tells us of his attitude.

First, in a very general way, the Christian use of apocalyptic usually came at times of extreme difficulty. Fatalistic time limits and predictions of the destruction of enemies could always be counted on to bring encouragement of a sort to those who found it difficult to see a purpose in their sufferings. If our conjectures about the setting of this book are correct the church at Rome was in the kind of situation which customarily called forth apocalyptic writing.

Secondly, because of the way in which older apocalyptic writings are mixed in with the author's own

1. F. C. Grant, The Gospels, 53, 100 f., also Brandon, op. cit., 133 f.

composition, we can be certain that Mark 13 contains some glimpses of contemporary events. At the beginning of the chapter (13:1-4) Jesus is reported as foretelling the destruction of the temple. But verse 14, which is the climax of the series of events leading to the fulfillment of the prophecy tells of the desecration of the temple only.¹ The only logical explanation for this is that Mark used an earlier element which referred to the kind of desecration which had been experienced by the Jews at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and which since Gaius Caligula's attempted desecration c.39 A.D. was a constant, fearful possibility. If we go along with a date of 71 A.D. for the moment, a further inference can be made. For in the year 70 A.D., according to Josephus,² the Roman troops had entered the temple, erected their standards in the court, and acclaimed Titus, their commander and the emperor's son, as Imperator. At this point in history the abomination did stand where it ought not.³ It is reasonable to expect that Mark saw this real event in relation to the apocalyptic traditions he was handling. It is even possible that the verse contains a veiled reference to Titus. As an

-
1. See Beasley-Murray, Commentary, 60 f. for a discussion on the history of the interpretation of βδέλυμα.
 2. Josephus, Wars, 6:316.
 3. B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, 291.

indication of this Vincent Taylor cites the use of the masculine participle ἔρτηκότες to qualify the neuter βῆμα, the vague location of the event, the warning ὁ ἀναγιγνώσκων νοεῖται and the general atmosphere of reserve which marks the passage.¹ Certainly if Mark was referring to the emperor's heir, a certain discretion would be absolutely necessary. It might be inferred from this that Mark was at least suspicious of the attitude of Imperial Rome toward his own faith. He held no particular brief for the temple theocracy, but he wanted Christians to be on the alert (13:32) against the possibility of official action against the Christian religion.

Thirdly, Mark handles his apocalyptic material in such a way as to confirm his readers' expectations of the parousia, while at the same time calming the hysteria of those who believed the last days were upon them. Mark has the disciples pose a question to Jesus after his prediction of the destruction of the temple. "Tell us, when shall these things (plural) be?" Jesus had foretold only one event. The question indicates the excited interest of Roman Christians in the eschatological timetable at the time of writing. Many things had happened in the few years previous that could have been expected to excite belief in an imminent parousia. There had been civil war of sorts as

1. Taylor, op. cit., 511.

Galba, Otho, Vitellius and Vespasian fought for imperial power. There had been revolts in Gaul and Judaea. Earthquakes, always present in any recital of final woes, had taken place in the preceding decade at Laodicea and Pompeii.¹ There had been many martyrdoms in 64 A.D. and possibly in the years following. Mark leads them through a recital of events and recollections that they knew only too well, coming to the desecration of the temple which had most recently confirmed them in their belief that the end was near. But towards the end of the chapter he is intent on controlling their urge to know the exact time, and their preoccupation with signs of the end, and to get them to concentrate on spiritual readiness for the end instead (13:32).

Lastly, Mark's use of apocalyptic is of such a nature that it suggests he held a dynamic view of history. For many apocalyptists the time between Jesus' death and resurrection and his coming again was little more than a time when events of prognostic significance take place. Thus they tend to systematize historical events, relating the various categories to the end.² At first glance Mark appears to do the same thing. But he inserts into his

1. Brandon, op. cit., 137.

2. Revelation, 6, shows a typical systematizing of history.

apocalypse a prediction of the mission to the Gentiles (13:10)¹. In doing this he shows that the history between Jesus' death and parousia is significant. It is the time in which God's plan of salvation for the Gentiles is being worked out. Thus later on in Mark's account, at the moment of Jesus' death, the curtain of the temple is torn in two and a Gentile soldier makes the confession which no earthly being has uttered up to now, that Jesus was the Son of God (15:38).

The Christians whom Mark addressed faced a desperate situation in their relationship with the state. To them Mark wrote a gospel of Jesus Christ. He did not offer them mere comfort, however, or escape from their historical situation as a thoroughgoing apocalypticist would have done. He tries to calm their eschatological excitement, and face them with their task in history. For it is Mark who depicts clearer than anyone else in the New Testament that faith always means discipleship, following Jesus.² It is he who preserves most clearly the connection, original with Jesus, between the heavenly Son of Man and the Way of the Suffering Servant.

1. Eduard Schweizer, "Mark's Theology", New Testament Studies, 10 (1963-64), 430 f.
2. Ibid, 432.

C. THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

Barclay Newman has rightly protested the ease with which interpreters favouring the contemporary historical approach to the Revelation have reconstructed the historical setting of the work.¹ They begin well enough by accepting the date of the writing with which most commentators agree, that is toward the end of Domitian's reign, or between 93 and 96 A.D.² He complains that they then launch out, armed with the composition date and the polemic which the Christian tradition has directed against Domitian, to make vague allusions in the Apocalypse prove their concept of what the history of Domitian's time must have been like. Carrington³ was also uneasy about a too enthusiastic use of imagination on the part of some commentaries. The bald statement of Martin Rist is perhaps one example of such lack of caution. "It is obvious that Revelation was written at a time when the Christians of Asia Minor, and probably other places as well, were being persecuted by the Roman officials for their refusal to worship the emperors, both living and dead, as gods and to worship Roma, the personification of Rome, as a goddess."⁴ Ethelbert Stauffer's book on the

-
1. Barclay Newman, "The Fallacy of the Domitian Hypothesis," New Testament Studies, 10 (1963-64), 133 ff.
 2. This study accepts the view of the majority too. See appendix on dating. Newman, ibid., relies heavily on the testimony of Irenaeus, Against Heresies, 5:30:3, in approving the date.
 3. Philip Carrington, The Revelation of St. John.
 4. Martin Rist, "Revelation", Interpreter's Bible, 12:354.

subject¹ is another example. It surely contains many excessively chauvinistic attempts to put the state in a bad light. So we will try to be careful.

We have noted previously in this study that persecutions were not, in Domitian's reign, as violent as under Nero, nor as widespread as under Trajan.² We know that there were some. John mentions his own banishment (1:9) to Patmos and the martyr-death of one Christian (2:13). No doubt he expected increasing pressure of this kind. In the section on I Clement the probable pattern of persecution at Rome at this time is described. The victims were mainly people of prominence who posed a threat to Domitian, and they were dealt with one by one. This doesn't necessarily mean that the same pattern obtained in Asia Minor. There is evidence that the Asiarch located at Ephesus, whose responsibilities included the arranging of liturgical festivals in honour of the imperial lord and god, was particularly zealous in promoting the rites.³ The province of Asia had in fact received special favours for the way it had supported the cult. And even though the state cult was designed to inculcate political loyalties, and to bind the diverse peoples of the empire together, Christians believed religious principles were at

1. Ethelbert Stauffer, Christ and the Caesars, 147-192.
2. See Chapter 4.
3. Stauffer, op. cit., 172.

stake, and tended to see the persecutions, in Asia at least, against the background of the clash between the heavenly liturgy and that of Satan.

Perhaps it would be incautious to say more about the actual historical context than this. But from the point of view of the Christian community more needs to be said. We have seen how in the apocalyptic tradition there was always a fear of the state making a direct attack on the sanctuary of God. From Hasmonean times right through to the time of Mark's gospel, the idea of an Antiochus, a Caligula, or a Titus standing where he ought not, had been enough to cause great spiritual and mental suffering. With this kind of background even a slight change of policy would be enough to send waves of new fear passing through the Christian community. But it would not necessarily affect all in the same way. And we should not be surprised to find the writer of the Apocalypse taking a more serious view of the obligations to the emperor cult than for instance, the writer of Luke-Acts. The Apocalypse is important not only because it contains evidence for the history of the persecutions, but even more because it tells us how some Christians felt at the time, and what their attitudes were in the face of the policies of Rome.

We know very little about the author. It is unlikely that he was the apostle John. The writer speaks of

the twelve apostles as if he were not one of them (21:14), and the tradition indicates that the son of Zebedee was killed by the Jews before 70 A.D. It seems not improbable that there was a circle of teaching originating with John and existing in Jerusalem until its destruction in the Jewish War.¹ This group witnessed the terrible destruction of the city. Soon after, shocked by what it had seen, and with latent attitudes to Judaism and the Roman state crystallized, the group moved to Ephesus as a new base for its activities. According to this theory the writer was a later John, perhaps the John the Elder mentioned by Papias, who belonged to the circle. This hypothesis would account in some measure for the extreme hatred of Rome encountered in the Apocalypse. Those who had survived even limited contact with the Jewish War could naturally be expected to hate the invaders, especially as it seems likely that the Christian group frequented the temple awaiting the Lord's return. It would account for the use by this group of the categories of apocalyptic dualism, which alone could explain such a devastating triumph of Anti-Christian forces. It would also account for the Jewish vocabulary and style of writing in Revelation which R. H. Charles' exhaustive study confirmed.²

-
1. J. Estlin Carpenter, The Johannine Writings, 43 ff. See also C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, 426.
 2. R. H. Charles, Commentary, 1, xxxiv - xxxvii.

The Author's Purpose

The section which contains the letters (2:1-3:22) reserves the greatest praise for those groups of Christians who have held fast to the name and who have not denied the faith (2:13). It follows from this that at the time of writing there had been apostasies widespread enough to cause John to worry. We can only guess at the pressures that led to this situation. Perhaps the commentators are right who claim that the government made worship of the emperor compulsory at this time.¹ Perhaps the social pressure of neighbours and family who resented the reluctance of Christians to join in community acts was enough to induce apostasy or a lukewarm attitude to the faith. At any rate, in the mind of the author, the situation was serious enough. We can point to four of his objectives.

First, he wrote so that the strength of his vision might be a source of encouragement for those who were thinking of abandoning the faith. The strongest possibility would appear to have been a return of Christians to the worship of the synagogue, now once more at peace with Rome (2:4,9; 3:9). He thus poured scorn on those who said they were Jews but were in reality a synagogue of Satan. Secondly, he tried to make martyrdom into an

1. e.g. M. Rist, op. cit., 354.

attractive thing. The alternative to apostasy seemed to be death for many Christians, and John claims that death is the better choice. Martyrdom meant eternal rewards; worship of the emperor meant eternal punishment. He was in a good position to ask his fellow believers to suffer, for this is the course he had taken. "I John, your brother, who shares with you in Jesus the tribulation and the kingdom, and the patient endurance, was on an island called Patmos on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (1:9). Thirdly, he wrote to put in a sharper focus the alternatives which were open to the Christian. One could worship either Caesar or God, be wholly devoted to the word of God or a patriot of the state, but there could be no middle ground. Lastly, his purpose was quite simply, to protest. He was angry at the blasphemous pretensions of Domitian and wrote to voice his opposition to the cult. He was constrained to say, on behalf of the true Lord and King, the final "No!" to a state which he saw as demonic. On this last point, it should be noted parenthetically, that Cullman,¹ Barth², von Campenhausen³, and Stauffer⁴, among others, have as a

-
1. The State in the New Testament, 78 f.
 2. op. cit., 77 ff.
 3. op. cit., 199 ff.
 4. op. cit., 175 ff.

key part of their doctrine on the state a theory that there was a clear-cut boundary between legitimate states and those that posed as redemptive institutions, and that the line of demarcation was commonly known and accepted by Christians generally. This theory enables them to maintain that the New Testament is thoroughly consistent in its attitude to the state; that Paul, who dealt with a state which knew how to distinguish between good and evil, would have been just as strong in his condemnation as John, had the state exceeded its proper bounds in his day; that John had maintained a Pauline approval of Rome up until the point where he saw her becoming idolatrous.¹ The New Testament evidence will hardly support such a view. If we can speak of a line at all, we have to acknowledge that it was subjectively drawn, at different places by different Christians.

The Author's Use of Apocalyptic

Many readers are disturbed to come from the other writings of the New Testament into the presence of undiluted apocalyptic. William Manson speaks of its climate as being amazingly out of keeping with the general

1. The scholars who have most strongly supported this view have been concerned with the very important task of working out a Christian attitude to the German national-socialist state of Hitler. For this purpose it was necessary to find where this state, in a historical sense, "crossed the line" to become idolatrous.

New Testament presentation.¹ What were the considerations behind John's use of apocalyptic? First, we must remember that at times of great crisis or tension in Jewish history, it had become customary to send out "apocalypses" which purported to give a revelation of that which was shortly to come to pass.² After the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, Jewish Messianic hopes were livelier than ever, with a resultant increase in the output of apocalyptic oracles. Gog and Magog were familiar figures in Jewish or Christian circles. The Fourth Book of Ezra was written about A.D. 90³. The slowly-developing Christian tradition had never completely forsaken apocalyptic forms. Paul and Mark had each found the language suitable for their purposes on occasion. It's dualism and fatalism gave comforting relief to the pressing problem of theodicy which persecution and hardship caused to simple folk. Its extravagant symbolism made it possible for hard-pressed Christians to crown with words their victorious Lord, whose victory was still not everywhere apparent. It should not be surprising to find John using this vehicle for his thoughts and to find him borrowing copiously from previous Jewish or Christian apocalypses.⁴

-
1. W. Manson, Jesus and the Messiah, 157; see also Kidd, op. cit., 77.
 2. see supra, Chapter 2.
 3. Frost, op. cit., 38.
 4. A.S. Peake, Commentary on the Revelation, 28 ff.

The second consideration behind John's use of apocalyptic is the one most often mentioned. The language of apocalyptic, unfamiliar to pagans, would serve as a kind of code for the spreading of this obviously subversive document. On reading this book today one wonders if John was cautious enough, and if Mommsen was right in saying that John indicated, more than he expressed, his unpatriotic hopes.

The Revelation and the Jewish Nation.

We have noted how the Christian differentiation from Judaism happened slowly. At first the Christians seemed content to be seen as a part of Judaism, enjoying that feeling of confidence which the visible outlines of a Theocracy could still give, and being protected by the lenient laws which favoured Judaism throughout the first half of the first century. Then, in the decade A.D. 60-70, Christians dissassociated themselves more noticeably from Judaism, and particularly from its revolutionary sentiments at that time. Now, at the time of the writing of the Revelation, the differentiation is absolute. Several factors led to this condition. It appears that many Jews had played the part of informer during the recent troubles of the Christians. Josephus is one prominent Jew who had probably done his share of damage to the Christian name at Rome.¹ The Jews of Asia did similar

1. Antiq., 18:3.

damage to the cause in the region around Ephesus.¹ The Christians remembered with particular clarity at this time that it had been leaders of the Jewish religion who had pointed the finger of accusation at Jesus in the court of Pilate.

And so, the thing that von Harnack saw as inevitable from the beginning,² did take place. The Revelation depicts the Jews as a fellowship of hypocrites. With considerable venom, John opposes emperor worship and Jewish propaganda alike (2:9; 3:9). The polity of Jerusalem is no longer a secure background for the Christian world view. Henceforth, the centre and capital of Christianity is a New Jerusalem which is seen by the eyes of faith, and which God will one day send down from Heaven (21:2).

Identification of Rome as Satanic

In 12:1 - 14: 20 John makes a positive identification between Satanic forces and the Emperor, his provincial political high priest, the Asiarch, and the government itself. After describing the advent of the true Christ (12:1-12), John brings onto the apocalyptic stage the enemies of the true Christ. First, the dragon, or

1. Stauffer, op. cit., p. 174.
2. von Harnack, op. cit., 67 n. 1

Satan, God's enemy from the beginning and now the enemy of God's Son (12:3, 7-17), appears. Satan tries to prevent the birth of Christ, but his power cannot match that of the blood of the Lamb of God (12:11), and in any case, his power to hurt those who bear their testimony to the Christ has only a short duration (12:12). Angry at the eternal city of God, the woman (12:1), Satan decides to make war on the church (12:17).

Standing on the sands of the sea, Satan appears to signify his kinship with the next figure, the beast that rises out of the sea (13:1). This is most certainly the Emperor Domitian. He appears coming up out of the sea, where a visitor from Rome would first appear to an Ephesian. Blasphemy, the chief fault of Domitian in John's eyes, is the conspicuous attribute of this beast (13:1, 5). The beast is said to make war on the saints (13:7), and to receive, like Domitian, the worship of everyone save the Christians (13:8-10). One of the heads of the beast had received a mortal wound (13:3), which could be a reference to the death of the Imperial Prince.¹

1. Some commentators, e.g. Rist, *op. cit.*, 363, argue that the first beast refers to all the emperors, and that the wounded head is a definite reference to the Nero redivivus myth. I think it more likely that John was immersed in his own time and its problems, and not disposed to make generalizations that covered a broad sweep of past history.

If our identification is correct, John makes several charges against Domitian. He claims that force is used to bring about the worship of the Emperor (13:4). He attributes to Domitian the sly treachery of the leopard, the ruthless cruelty apparent in the clawed foot of the bear, and the haughty presumption one hears in the roar of the lion (13:2). Certainly, John could have found no more suitable images to voice his polemic against the Emperor than those of Jewish apocalyptic.¹ Also, only apocalyptic, with its dualism, could give an answer to the question, "Why had power been given to such a man to blaspheme and to persecute?" Satan, not God, had given the necessary power, throne, and authority to the beast (13:2).

Another beast is introduced in 13:11. This beast comes, not from across the sea, but from the land (13:11), and is therefore most probably the local authority representing Domitian, the Asiarch. The second beast is he who causes his people to worship the Emperor's image (13:12), and causes to be slain all who will not obey (13:15). Because of the marks printed on the coinage which the second beast issues locally, all who would buy and sell are forced to bear the mark, the name and the number of Domitian.²

1. Peake, *op. cit.*, 28.

2. Rev. 13:17; Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 179, presents a good case for the cryptic number 666 referring to the official imperial name as it was stamped on coins. Whether 666 merely represents a number which makes pretensions at being the perfect number, triple seven, it seems certain that the name, mark, and the number are all associated with Domitian.

Another apocalyptic actor appears later in the Revelation, in Chapter 17. She is the woman clothed in purple and scarlet who sits upon a scarlet beast (17:3-4). Some features in her portrait are not readily explainable. Perhaps John has borrowed a Jewish polemic against Cleopatra for his purpose and retained some of its figures. However, in his hands, the woman is the Roman Empire. She sits on the seven hills of Rome (17:9). The whore sits on many waters (17:1), which are the peoples and lands bordering on the Mediterranean (17:15). The rulers of the empire make war on the Lamb (17:14), but the Lamb will triumph, and she whose name is Babylon, shall fall (18:1-3).

Christ the True Lord God.

John's vision is at once a confession of faith in the true Christ which refutes the Emperor's claim to divinity, and a picture of the true worship of Christ in Heaven, which appears as similar to the contrived cultus of Domitian, but which mocks the latter by its obvious superiority.

Christ appears first in Revelations as the Son of Man of the Synoptic Gospels. He comes "with the clouds," a being of glory who causes the nations to tremble before him (1:7-8). The main point of the first chapter is one which John feels will deal a crushing blow to the Emperor's dogma. The true Christ is the firstborn of the dead, the one possessing the keys of death and Hades (1:18), and so

he is the obvious superior of earthly kings (1:5f).

A considerable portion of the Revelation is devoted to a clever mockery of the worship of the Emperor. If any of his readers are tempted to join in the ceremonies of Emperor worship, John tries to show them a ceremonial worthy only of their contempt. The state worship was carried out at great gatherings in the sports stadia and other public places. We know many of the features of its ceremonial. The Empire's games began with a reading of the imperial decrees, followed by ascriptions of praise to the one issuing the decrees. A sealed parchment roll is known to have been carried into the royal box by the Emperor or his representative. The roll was the letter of investiture, signifying the authority which can bid the drama of the sports arena to unfold itself. The main event of the day was often a horse race, with four or six teams competing, each distinguished by its own colour. And often, when some cruel slaughter of humans or animals was the attraction, the signal to begin would be given by the tipping of a sacrificial bowl by the Emperor or his representative.¹ Additional events could be mentioned. But these are conspicuous ones which John parallels in his description

1. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, 180-6, is the authority for these details and also for the theory of their relationship to the heavenly worship.

of the heavenly worship. The heavenly worship is shown as superior in every way, but perhaps particularly because the Heavenly Messianic games have eschatological significance. The imperial games are by contrast mere empty show.

Parallel to the imperial decrees are the messages which the heavenly Emperor sends to the seven churches (1:4; 2:1-3:22). Contrasting the glory of Domitian and the shouted praise of the masses which he received, is a glory and a praise of a different order. John is treated to a vision through the open door of Heaven, of the heavenly throne room (4:1-8). He hears an ascription of praise which is of an altogether higher order than the cacophany of the stadium throng. "Worthy art thou, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honour and power, for thou didst create all things, and by thy will they existed and were created" (4:11). In this quotation and in many similar ones that could be presented, we find terms applied to God and his Christ which were imitated from the phraseology of the cult of Domitian.¹ Of those titles and acclamation which the court poets mentioned as among the favourites of Domitian, are many which have their counterparts in the Revelation: holy (3:7; 6:10);

1. Weinel, Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat, 18-23, was one of those who saw this borrowing as signifying the early Christian resentment of Emperor worship; C. J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 102-170, also noted the point.

power (4:11), glory (7:12; 18:1); honour (4:11); blessed (22:7); worthy (4:11; 5:9); come and do not delay (22:12, 20). The sealed parchment roll is contrasted in the Revelation by the eschatological roll in Heaven whose seals keep hidden the secrets of creation and the meaning of history. It is an easy thing, John insinuates, to bid the races in the arena to commence. But only One who is truly worthy can begin to unfold the dramatic happenings of the last days (5:2, 3). The apocalyptic mystery of the race in 7:1-8 is in contrast to the usual races of the Empire's stadia. The four horses and their riders foretell the doom of the Roman rule.

The Parthian races up with his bow and wreath of victory, and there is none to withstand him. The anti-Caesar rides his red horse, swinging the sword of civil war, that mankind may bleed to death. Then there comes prancing one with a balance in his hand, so beloved by the imperial politician, but he brings regulation and confiscation. Then Death himself rides upon a pale horse, and smites mankind with famine and plague.¹

If, John further insinuates, the Emperor can tip a bowl from his lofty stadium box and cause some wretched criminals below to struggle to the death, then it should be realized, when the bowls of Heaven are poured out the wrath of the true Lord God reaches all men (15:7-16:21). In this and in all the comparisons he made, John sought

1. Stauffer, op. cit., 184f.

to make one main point. Domitian, and his dogma of divinity, and his cultus, are all ridiculous when placed beside the true Christ, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David" (5:5), who shares the throne of Heaven with the Father (3:21).

It is true that the Christ who emerges from the parts of the argument of John that we have examined so far, while an altogether formidable and powerful figure, bears little resemblance to the Christ who forgave Roman soldiers from the cross, and stood meekly before the bar of Roman justice. Some writers have even despaired of finding in this book any true picture of Jesus; that is, one which includes his role of Suffering Servant. Is it true, as William Manson has said, that the Revelation "occludes the lineaments of the Saviour"?¹ Against this view, we can point to three counter-indications. First there is in Chapter 12 what amounts to a miniature gospel, presented in apocalyptic language. The birth, the struggle with the devil, the passion and death, the exaltation of the Christ are all outlined. Secondly, the Lamb of God is the true apocalyptic symbol of the Suffering Servant. The Lamb it is who quietly, willingly sacrifices itself for the good of others, and there is no denying that the figure is a frequent one in the Revelation. Then in the third place, it is noteworthy that if the

1. W. Manson, Jesus and the Messiah.

Revelation has any secondary heroes, they are the martyrs slain for their testimony to the Christ. The bearing of scorn and hurt with the positive intent of thereby witnessing on behalf of a higher, better kingdom, is a Christ-like attitude which is held forth in the Revelation as the best attitude a Christian can take to a hostile society.

When this has been said, however, it must be acknowledged that John is a pitiless parodist, and a hater of prodigious talent. He has no doubts that the Empire which is responsible for his imprisonment is under the control of demonic powers. Therefore he can give free rein to his powers of scorn and sarcasm. He is quite sure that his scorn is matched by a divine scorn of the Harlot clothed in scarlet and royal purple. The remarkable hate with which he views self-glorified Rome, may have come about because of the bad experiences he had had, but must also be attributed to the character of the man himself. It is interesting to speculate about the extent to which the original John had put the stamp of his character on the community at Ephesus. The gospels call the apostle and his brother, "sons of thunder," and one passage quotes the same fiery two on an occasion when the people would not receive Jesus: "Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them" (Luke 9:54). At any rate, if we acknowledge a particularly vehement hater as the author of the Revelation, we must attribute to the average Christian of his time a more lukewarm attitude (3:15 f.). It is probably true that the

Christians of Asia were not faulted by John for being pro-Roman, but because their attitude was passive. John's polemic has the intention of calling them to join in a spirited proclamation of war against the Satanic state cult. The weapons would not be swords or spears, but steadfast testimony and courageous dying.

Finally, we must comment on the extent to which the Revelation is a book of victory. Its main usefulness in the early church might well have derived from the evident faith of John in the certainty of the victory of the true Christ. In apocalyptic fashion, John predicted that the time of suffering for the Christians would soon be over, and that the dirges would soon be sung over fallen Babylon (18:2,3). It cannot be doubted that in the Revelation are the dualism and the fatalism which derived originally from Persia. But they appear more as figures of speech than as dogmas. The note of victory seems to break through the rigid dualism. For John, Satan was a real power, but he was bound by the One who held the final power (20:1-3). The powers were not equal, so Christians could take heart that though they suffered now, their trust was in the Strongest.

D. I CLEMENT

There is almost universal assent to a date for these writings of 95 - 96 A.D.¹ As far as authorship is concerned, all we can be sure of is that our Clement was a leading presbyter-bishop of the church at Rome² who had certain responsibilities as a kind of foreign secretary. The letter was written to the church in Corinth which was suffering serious internal dissensions. Slim as these facts are, they point to the importance of the letter for our subject, for here is a letter by a responsible Christian leader who lived in Rome during the time of Domitian.

Historical Setting

We have already referred to the fact that there is a lack of any solid evidence for a view that has been popular with church historians, that persecution reached a second peak of violence under Domitian.³ J. B. Lightfoot has contended⁴, for instance, that Domitian was a persecutor even greater than Nero. The Christian tradition linking the two emperors is an old one, going back to Melito of Sardis.⁵ Perhaps we would do well to look at

-
1. See appendix on dating.
 2. Cyril C. Richardson, "Clement's First Letter," *Early Christian Fathers*, 36 f.
 3. see supra Ch. 4
 4. J. B. Lightfoot, Clement of Rome, 1:105-15.
 5. Eusebius, H.E. 4:26.

the known facts about Domitian, his personality and his methods of holding power. This might give us some indication of what might have disturbed the Christians so deeply.

The salient points concerning Domitian have been set out in a recent article by L. W. Barnard.¹ He is known to have been capricious and cruel in going after his victims. In 91 A.D. he had a vestal virgin buried alive. In 93 A.D. Agricola was his victim. He is known to have been concerned to build up his own prestige in the eyes of the people, and conversely to have been extremely jealous of any who appeared to challenge his power. Early in his reign he hunted out those of republican spirit in the Senate. He hounded the nobility with an obsessive spirit. Anyone of note was his enemy. Suetonius summed it up when he said, "His poverty made him grasping and his fears made him savage."² He did not, however, like Nero, attempt to get the masses on his side against "public enemies". He singled out his victims one by one. Hegesippus³ tells the story of how the grandchildren of Jude were brought before him. When Domitian learned that they owned no property, and that the kingdom of Christ which he had heard about was

-
1. L. W. Barnard, "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian," New Testament Studies, 10 (1964) 25 ff.
 2. Suetonius, Domit. 3:2.
 3. Eusebius, H.E., 3:30.

not temporal or earthly but celestial and angelic, he despised them, commanded them to be dismissed, and by a decree ordered the persecutions to cease. This story illustrates well the picture of Domitian's character which we get from the secular historians. Here is a man who was quite capable of liquidating individuals whom he found threatening, but who might not have found it personally necessary to carry out wholesale persecutions.

When we turn to I Clement itself, the references to persecution seem to support the view which has been taken on the basis of the other evidence. At the outset, Clement apologized for not writing sooner, and gave as his reason "the sudden and successive misfortunes and accidents we have encountered" (1:1). Millburn, in a strong dissent from the usual view,¹ explained the verse as referring to internal troubles in the church at Rome. Elliott-Binns, on the other hand, said that the references are to Nero's time.² Both writers seem to be refuted by the manner in which Clement refers to the persecutions. For there is an historical progression in his references. In the fourth chapter he mentions the persecutions of Joseph by his brothers and of David by Saul (4:9,13). Then in chapters five and six he moves consciously to the

-
1. R.L.P. Milburn, "The Persecution of Domitian," Church Quarterly Review, 139 (1945), 154-64. In this article he says at one point, "I Clement contains no allusion whatsoever to persecution at Rome or anything of the kind."
 2. L.E. Elliott-Binns, The Beginnings of Western Christendom, 102.

examples of the "most righteous pillars" Peter and Paul, who were the heroes "nearest our own times" (5:1), and of "the great multitude of the elect who by reason of rivalry were the victims of many outrages and tortures" (6:1). This has as its most obvious reference the events of Nero's reign. Clement then comes by another natural stage to the events of his own day. "We are in the same arena, and involved in the same struggle" (7:1). At the time of writing persecution was by no means a thing of the past, but it was also different from that of former times which claimed a great multitude of the Christian community.

Again, the jealous aspect of Domitian's personality emerges clearly from the record of his life. Here, in I Clement, it is noteworthy that the sins of envy and jealousy are constantly mentioned. The facts are consistent with the view that Domitian's actions against Christians had underlined for the writer the destructiveness of these emotions, and that they were thus to the forefront of this thinking at the time of writing.

Again, Domitian seems to have been most concerned about people of some power and reputation. He was scornful of the peasant grandson of Jude. Is there evidence that the Christian congregation at Rome contained any notable citizens by the end of the first century? Bishop

Lightfoot argued strongly that there is,¹ and developed an attractive theory that has been widely followed, that two of the emperor's known victims, Titus Flavius Clemens and his wife Flavia Domitilla were in fact Christians. The couple was indeed socially prominent and potentially powerful. Titus Flavius was a cousin, his wife a niece of Domitian. At one time their sons were designated as heirs to the Empire. But within a year of nominating Clemens as his colleague in the consulship, Domitian had put him to death and banished his wife and daughter. Suetonius suggests that the victim's fault was his "contemptible indolence," which could conceivably refer to a spiritually motivated reluctance to perform certain civil duties. Dio Cassius is more specific in stating that the couple were accused of atheism.² This charge could refer equally well to Jews and Christians. If for no other reason than the fact that Christians were still a small group relative to Judaism, it is more likely to assume that the pair had been attracted to the synagogue.³ At any rate the efforts of such as Barnard to press for a Christian identification seem to fall short of positive proof.⁴ The archeological evidence is, at best, uncertain.

1. Lightfoot, op. cit., 1:29-30.

2. Dio, 67:14.

3. E. M. Smallwood, "Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism," Classical Philology, 51 (1956), 1-13.

4. Barnard, op. cit.,

The contention that because Judaism was a religio licita, the description "atheism" doesn't fit, will not stand up. The evidence suggests that this was precisely the charge that was laid against the monotheistic and exclusive Jewish community.¹ There is nothing in I Clement that can be taken as evidence of the Christian identity of the pair. There is a similarity of name between our author and the nobleman. This could indicate that our Clement was a freedman of the Clemens household,² which in turn could indicate a link with the Christian community, but all of this is conjecture. Whatever the religious identity of Titus Flavius Clemens and Domitilla, however, we do know that Domitian struck out at prominent atheists, and he could very well have included Christians among his victims.

From all the evidence, it appears that Domitian's persecution resulted from his own insecure position. Out of jealousy he perpetrated a succession of political assassinations. This fits in very well with the picture we get of the "series of sudden and repeated misfortunes" which prevented Clement from writing.

Church Order

As Clement tried to explain to the Corinthian

-
1. Friend, op. cit.,
 2. N.K. Lowther Clarke, The First Epistle of Clement, 9 f.

church the cause of their difficulties, he laid particular stress upon the spirit of strife, sedition and anarchy which had of late been amongst them (3:3). This is rather typical of the author. For him the great goal of community life is peaceableness and order, and he spends much of his time on exhortations to this end. Chapters 9 and 10 contain examples of obedience. Chapters 13 to 15 speak of the need for humility, obedience and peaceableness, 19 and 20 give various reasons for subordination, and 46 to 48 show the author's abhorrence of schism. Paul, too, placed great emphasis on order, but there is a clear difference in emphasis here. Where Paul saw the need for order arising out of the undivided nature of Christ (I Cor. 1:13), and took the pragmatic view that an orderly cosmos was necessary to the preaching of the gospel (Rom. 13:4), Clement tends to see an untroubled community as an end in itself. He shows this by his arguments which point to the permanent order of nature (20), and to the admirable organization of the Roman army (37).¹

It is not surprising, then, to find a greater emphasis than earlier books show on the internal organization of the church. Clement is in favour of a hierarchical setup in which the laity is to be strictly subordinated to a duly elected clergy class. In addition to

1. Cyril Richardson, op. cit., 38.



reflecting a growing concentration on the inner life of the local congregation, Clement shows us a community whose leadership is very conscious of belonging to the same larger entity, the church, as other groups. There are at least two reasons for these trends. First, earlier Christians had made ethical demands which had been disruptive of community life. They had in consequence been persecuted by the populace. They now needed to work out their new style of life in the comparative security of their own group. Secondly, as the Jewish state gradually disappeared as a political reality, the Christians needed the security of belonging to an entity which was at least analagous to the nation Israel.

Eschatology and the State

The opening words of the letter speak of the church of God "living in exile in Rome". The community portrayed thinks of itself as having its true locus in heaven, and being a temporary colony of aliens within earthly society. So for this writer there is still a certain eschatological tension between the future kingdom and present existence (23:5; 50:3). But it is also true that Clement seems to envisage for the average Christian, a life in the world of normal length, and this in turn means that he thought it necessary to make more or less permanent arrangements about coming to terms with the world. It may also account for his unusually cool attitude to a persecuting state power.¹

1. Clarke, op. cit., 43.

It should be noted that Clement gives no evidence of lingering bitterness concerning the Neronian persecutions. He makes reference to the large number of the elect who perished (6:1) at that time, but goes on to state calmly and without a trace of malice, "We are in the same arena" (7:1). In a prayer near the end of his letter (61), he goes farther in his positive attitude to the state than any book of the New Testament. There is no doubt in Clement's mind about the source of the state's authority. "You, Master, gave them imperial power through your majestic and indescribable might, so that we, recognizing it was you who gave them the glory and honour, might submit to them, and in no way oppose your will." He prays that Christians may be subordinate both to God and to the rulers and governors of earth (60:47), the most developed form yet of the traditional teaching of the later church concerning the two realms of Nature and Grace, over both of which God is the sovereign. He even prays that the rulers may receive personal blessing of health, peace, harmony and stability.

However, it must also be pointed out that Clement recognizes the responsibility of ministry which the realm of Grace has in relation to the realm of Nature. In describing the examples which Peter and Paul gave to the church, Clement says that one of their most important functions was in bearing their witness before rulers (5:7). And in his prayers he asks that God will grant to rulers

those gifts which will bring about an improvement in the quality and moral tone of their rule (61:2). One of the great problems of Christians in the later New Testament period, and indeed in all times, was the question of how they could exert a healthy influence on the standards of righteousness of their society while maintaining a somewhat other-worldly stance. Clement suggests two approaches. Christians could demonstrate the virtues of humility, obedience, and forbearance, when persecutions brought them into contact with the state. They could also exercise a positive ministry in the prayers which the community offered on behalf of the secular powers.

E. LUKE - ACTS

It is not possible to establish the date of the writing of Luke-Acts with any precision. We have assigned it to a late first century position in agreement with the reasoning of C. K. Barrett, who has recently published a helpful survey of present emphases in Lucan studies.¹ Somewhere around 95 A.D. would seem to fit in well with the probabilities.² Another recent authoritative analysis, that of J.C. O'Neill,³ sets the date even later - somewhere between 115 and 130 A.D. However the exact chronological date is not as important as is the place which Luke-Acts takes in the development of New Testament thought. The Christian communities at Luke's time of writing had reached a point where they needed a fresh understanding of their relationship to the historical process. Luke attempted to provide this new point of view, and so from the standpoint of the development of thought it is fairly easy to place Luke properly with respect to the other New Testament writings. We will return to this point later.

In all of the work which has recently led to a better understanding of Luke-Acts, the questions of

-
1. C.K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, (London, 1961), 62.
 2. See appendix on dating.
 3. J.C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, (London, 1961), 25.

authorship and destination, given prominence formerly, are not seen as crucial. The author might well be Luke, the physician companion of Paul, as some have argued.¹ But it has seemed more important to identify him as a serious theologian and historian, one of the important teachers of New Testament times, and not simply as an arranger of material from various traditional sources.² Similarly, not much attention has been given to the search for the precise identity of Theophilus. It has been assumed that the use of the word ΚΡΕΤΙΤΟΣ means that he was an official of some kind,³ that ΚΑΤΗΧΗΘΗΣ simply means 'informed' without implying that he was a Christian,⁴ and that his name suggests that he was a Gentile. But quite beyond these considerations, recent study has built up a strong case for the position that the general destination of the writings was the community of well-educated members of Graeco-Roman society,⁵ and that Luke had an evangelistic purpose in addressing them. It goes without saying that he was taking upon himself a difficult task, for Christians had a reputation in many circles for being the scum of the empire -- superstitious, anti-social, immoral people. Difficult or not, he went

-
1. T.W. Manson, The Life of Jesus: A Study of the Available Materials, Vol. 28, No. 2, 7 ff.; von Harnack, op. cit., 80.
 2. Barrett, op. cit., 51 f.
 3. Jackson and Lake, op. cit., II, 175.
 4. Kidd, Op. cit., 51 f.
 5. O'Neill, op. cit., 168 f.

at it with a will, mentioning in his writing any prominent citizens who were known to have had peaceful and happy associations with Jesus or the Christian leaders.¹ Some of the people mentioned in Acts are: Dionysius the Areopagite (17:34); Gallio, proconsul of Achaea (18:12); some unnamed asiarchs who are called friends of Paul (19:31); Claudius Lysias, who wrote to Felix on behalf of Paul (23:26); and Publius of Melita, who is undoubtedly a nobleman (28:7).² He further indicated in the examples of Cornelius and Sergius Paulus (13:7), and Publius (28:7) ff) that some well-placed Romans had adopted Christianity as their faith in its earliest days. There may have been subsidiary purposes, such as asking that Christianity be given the favoured position in Roman eyes which Judaism had always enjoyed,³ and it may be that part of Luke's message was intended for the Church,⁴ but the original estimate holds good.

Luke receives his important place in the development of New Testament Christianity by virtue of his bold

-
1. Dobschutz, The Apostolic Age, 51; C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 163.
 2. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, 158-160, has an interesting section showing that Luke's use of Latin names conforms to the correct usage among the upper classes in the late first century empire.
 3. B.S. Easton, Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers.
 4. O'Neill, *op. cit.*, 177.

re-interpretation of the primitive eschatology. This point has been forcefully made in the work of Hans Conzelmann.¹ Briefly, the argument claims that Luke historicizes the earlier eschatology. History was obviously continuing. The parousia had not come, a fact which must have been problematic for Christians holding to Paul's teaching. Luke solves the problem by setting forth his view that the redemptive history has been ordered by God in continuous sections, in the middle of which stands the time of Jesus. The next section is that of the church. This is determined by Christ through the Spirit. Conzelmann comes to this position after a detailed comparison of Luke's treatment of eschatological material with the treatment of the same material in the earlier writers. For example, in his story of Pentecost Luke quotes from Joel to the effect that the outpouring of the Spirit is a sign of the last days.² In his source the eschaton is clearly a quick, sharp end of history, but for Luke it becomes the last epoch, a period in which the church finds its existence and one that stretches out ahead as a continuous historical roadway.³ The Spirit for Luke is no longer the eschatological gift, but a present, helpful substitute for the final salvation, one that enables the Christian to pursue the important evangelical task of the present epoch.

1. The Theology of St. Luke.

2. Acts 2:17 ff.

3. Conzelmann, op. cit., 95 f.

It follows from this important point that Luke-Acts attaches considerable importance to the historical process. It has been shown that he alone, among the gospel writers, is imbued with the idea that a strict chronology is important in setting forth the gospel.¹ He sees the importance of relating the beginning of Christ's ministry to "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar,"² and knows that it is similarly important for Christians in his day to see their own mission in the context of the peculiar historical conditions of the time. Thus we find him facing forthrightly the two main conflicts of the church which were outlined in Chapter 4, those with Judaism and the Roman Empire. It is by this route that Luke comes to the apologetic interests in his writings. He sees the church with respect to redemptive history. She occupies an epoch where her task is clearly evangelistic. He sees the church as set in the world also; so she needs a policy which will result in a practical working out of relationships on the historical plane.

That Luke contains apologetic interests has been widely recognized. However, there has been no unanimity concerning the nature of the interests. Some have seen Luke's main purpose in writing as the defending of the church against charges of sedition;³ some have limited

1. Sherwin-White, op. cit., 166 f.

2. Luke 3:1.

3. Bertil Gartner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, quoted in Barrett, op. cit., 30.

it more specifically to the defence of Paul;¹ some have seen it as being an anti-Jewish polemic, pure and simple;² T.W. Manson has said that the writings are "a public defence of the Christian church against the suspicion of being mixed up with the rebellious Jews, and a public assurance that the Christian gospel was no seditious propaganda but a message of universal peace and good will."³ Whatever the assessment is of the conflicting theories, surely Conzelmann is right in claiming that for Luke the apologetic stance is something basic.⁴ It is not taken for any isolated or particular reason. Luke is not concerned to gain official recognition for a struggling sect. He is concerned to wipe away all mental obstacles which educated Romans might have which would prevent them from embracing the Christian faith.⁵ Thus his apology deals with Jewish and Roman questions on a broad plane, in such a way that a basis will be laid for the Christian faith to proceed with its historical task.

The Apology Regarding Judaism

Luke's task as a theologian-historian was to show how the original band of Jewish disciples was led in logical steps to take up the task of the universal mission to the Gentiles. The movement in Luke-Acts is from

-
1. H.J. Cadbury, Beginnings, V, 297 ff.
 2. A. Loisy, The Birth of Christianity, 44 ff.
 3. op. cit., Vol. 28, No. 2, 24.
 4. Conzelmann, op. cit., 138.
 5. O'Neill, op. cit., 169.

Jerusalem to Rome. Luke claims that those who began the mission were not apostates but rather loyal representatives of genuine Judaism. The redemptive history required a beginning of the mission within Israel. Thus Luke sets the first two chapters of the gospel in the temple. Here and in the apostolic sermons in Acts the theme is that there is no historical break between Israel and the church. But as we have seen, the process of differentiation from Judaism had been going on for a long time at the period of writing. The split must have reached a point where reconciliation was impossible. So Luke now calls on the Jews to make good their claim to be "Israel". When they fail to do so in his judgement they become "the Jews" in a derogatory sense, and are the subject of extensive polemic. Thus we find Luke stressing in his gospel the ingratitude of the Jews concerning Jesus' ministry,¹ and making clear as he quotes Jesus' words that Israel's place will be eclipsed one day.² In the passion narrative Luke represents the scribes and pharisees as deliberately lying and using underhanded methods in order to bring Jesus before Roman law.³ In Acts the polemic content is even greater.⁴ Many passages show the unjustified Jewish suspicion and hatred where the Christian apostles were concerned.⁵ Paul's semitic background is not stressed

1. Luke 13:31-3; 19:12-15; 19:41-4; 22:35-8; 23:6-12; 18-23, 27-31; 17:11-19.

2. Luke 3:7-9.

3. Luke 20:20 ff.

4. von Harnack, *op. cit.*, 49.

5. Acts 4:5; 12:1; 21:18-29; 21:32-3; 28:17 ff; 18:12.

to the extent that his Roman citizenship is, and his language is dressed up to minimize the Hebrew connection.¹ Luke also tries to make it clear that Christians do not share the anti-Roman, rebellious attitudes which had recently caused the government so much trouble. This is seen, for instance in Luke 23:18 ff. where Luke makes it plain that the Jews, in making charges against Jesus, are masking their own rebellious sentiments. Thus, on the basis of his basic view of the Christian place in redemptive history, Luke paints, for Roman eyes, the picture of a people who are the inheritors of a monotheistic religion which had in former times merited respect, but who are sharply differentiated from the Jews of present history.

The Apology Concerning Rome

We have noted the difference in the view of history that existed between Luke and the earlier New Testament writers. This helps to account for the fact that Luke sees the state as a more permanent factor in the Christian's environment, an institution worthy of a very serious consideration. So we do not find Luke viewing the state as merely a necessary instrument for keeping order in the short time left for history to run. It is not a question for him of asking Christians to observe elementary civic duties. Rather the state is seen as the most important part of the historical environment in which the Christian works. Attitudes and accommodations must be worked out which are of a more permanent variety.

1. M. Dibelius, Paul, 30, gives Acts 16:37 as an example.

In line with his over-all purpose, Luke wants to make three things perfectly clear to his hearers. First, because his writings to state emphatically that Christianity's aims are non-political. In Luke 3:19 we read of John's imprisonment by Herod. Luke's account makes no suggestion that politics were involved. It was merely a case of Herod being sensitive to John's moralizing. Luke's account of the entry into Jerusalem is also devoid of political meaning, as Jesus goes directly to the temple in Luke's account and limits his activity to that context (19:37-40, 45-47). In the passion narrative when the Jewish leaders press their charges that Jesus is implicated in the revolution of the Galileans (23:2 ff), Luke depicts Pilate as very quickly deciding that he is innocent. The non-political nature of the title "King of the Jews" seems to be taken for granted by Luke (23:3), who reports no long conversation on the meaning of kingship such as occurs in John's gospel (John 18:33-38). In short, Luke's account of the trial of Jesus could well be seen as his answer to a Gentile's question "Is it not true that your leader was tried and condemned by a Roman court for sedition?" for his picture of the trial is of a miscarriage of Roman justice.¹ It is interesting to note that, in the two books, Jesus or one of the apostles is described as being under trial a total of fourteen times. Where justice rules the courts,

1. T.M. Parker, Christianity and the State in the Light of History, 17; V. Taylor, op. cit., 577.

Luke reports that the verdict is "There is nothing worthy of condemnation." Acts has been constructed in such a way that the acquittal of Paul is its climax.¹

Secondly, if Luke is insistent on the point that Christians are not guilty of sedition, he also piles up the evidence to show that Christians are not guilty of the charge of being anti-social. Luke mentions many prominent Romans and several wealthy, conservative Jews as people with whom Christianity has had peaceful intercourse.² More important for his refutation of the anti-social charge is his mention of tax collectors and soldiers who have had friendly and normal relations with the new movement. In Luke 7:2 we have an appealing picture of a centurion who addresses Jesus as Lord with extreme politeness, recognizing him as a man of authority like himself. Moreover, as he tells the story, Luke adds a bit of flattery of the centurion, "He is worthy," which is not found in the parallel accounts of Matthew and John. Where the other gospels have "tax collectors and sinners," Luke's reading at one point is "tax collectors and others."³

Thirdly, he uses his writings to set forth a very positive view of Roman justice. Before we discuss in some detail the accounts of the trials which demonstrate this contention, something should be said about Luke 12:11-12 and Luke 21:12-19, both of which refer to Jesus'

1. Jackson and Lake, *op. cit.*, 186.

2. Luke 8:3, 40; 23:50; Acts 5:34; 13:1.

3. Luke 5:29. For other relationships of this type see Luke 19:2; Acts 10:1; 21:32-33.

predictions that his followers will be brought before kings and governors, and both of which contain enough distinctive additions from Luke's pen to indicate that he is, in part at least, describing incidents in the persecutions of his own day. If this is so, we note that for all his positive attitudes to Roman law, he did not advocate that Christians cringe or cower before their judges. He sees the public persecution as a time for the bearing of testimony (21:13). The Christian in such a position can hold his head high; he will be given wisdom which the authorities will not be able to withstand or contradict. In short Luke believes the Christian should confess himself to be one, with the confidence that Roman law will see that it is not threatened, and that they will gain their lives (21:19).

In the trial of Jesus, it is of course clear that Roman justice consents to his condemnation and crucifixion. But Luke makes it understood that the accusation, which comes from the Jews, is a fabricated lie (23:1 ff.; 20:20 ff.). Three times the Roman governor confirms the innocence of Jesus, saying, "Why, what evil has he done? I have found in him no crime deserving death; I will therefore chastise him and release him."¹ Taken as a whole, Luke's narrative demonstrates that the Empire appreciated,

1. The last phrase indicates that the record is faithful at this point. Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*, 35, has shown that the trial of Jesus was a cognitio extra ordinem, where the magistrate is quite free to proceed as he likes. One of the options that was often taken was to chastise and release the prisoner.

in a way which the Jews did not, the non-political character of the kingship of Jesus.

In Acts, the trials of Paul illustrate the same point. In the scene where the Jews bring Paul before Gallio, the proconsul of Achaëa (18:12) we have a classic picture of the ideal functioning of Roman justice. The official immediately saw through the weak charges of Paul's detractors and declared that no trial was necessary. This is the point which Luke wants to emphasize to his Gentile readers. The trials and persecutions were not necessary, as they would discover if they could see, as many a Roman judge had already done, how baseless were the charges being made. The whole account of the trial before Felix is a story of the protection and fairness afforded a citizen by the Roman law. First, a Roman tribune with a troop of soldiers rescued Paul from a crowd of Jews who were going to kill him (21:27 ff.). Then it is shown that Felix insisted on a scrupulous adherence to the proper procedures of justice. "I will hear you when your accusers arrive" (23:35). Felix is then depicted as giving Paul a fair and full hearing, after which he is most reluctant to condemn. It was only to do the Jews a favour (24:27) that he left Paul in prison. The procurator Festus is also depicted as a man eager to prove the fairness of Rome's lawcourts. He rebuked the Jews at Jerusalem from a rather lofty position when he said that "it was not the custom of the Romans to give up anyone before the accused met the accusers

face to face, and had opportunity to make his defense concerning the charge laid against him" (25:16). Festus brought Agrippa and Bernice in on the trial, and when it was all over they said to one another, "This man has done nothing to deserve death or imprisonment" (26:31). He makes it clear that he would gladly hand over the entire proceedings to the Jews but is prevented by the Roman system from doing so. As Acts draws to a close it is confidence in the justice of the Emperor that forms the great climax of the narrative. As Conzelmann rightly remarks, "There is no suggestion whatever of any weakening of this confidence."¹

Christ's Universal Role

The fact that for Luke the parousia was no longer imminent led him to work out a doctrine that God and Caesar, Christianity and the state, need not be involved in any real conflict. It must have been a difficult case for him to put convincingly to a Roman. The latter might well ask, "Do not the universal aspirations of your religion make it a threat to the Empire?"

Luke doesn't evade the question, or deny the universal goal. His response is a remarkably bold one, namely that Christianity is suited to being the religion

1. Conzelmann, op. cit., 144.

of the whole world. In fact all of his apologetic can be seen to have this one aim in mind. By demonstrating in his narrative that Christianity was politically unambitious, and religiously the true inheritor of the promises of Israel, he was making the point that it was a religion which deserved the serious consideration of a Roman. He made it seem appealing by showing that Jesus and the church had been guided inevitably by the Holy Spirit of God; that the guidance had resulted in a slow, peaceful, but impressive growth;¹ that in spite of all the setbacks Christians were a force to be reckoned with. He tried to make it plain to the Gentile, by the underlying movement of the narrative from Jerusalem to Rome, that God had designed and prepared the gospel for him.

Luke anticipated the Gentile fears that Christianity posed a threat to the empire and answered them in two ways. First, in his writings there is a partially worked out doctrine that the two empires are coeval.² At least there are attempts to explain how the kingdoms differ (e.g. Luke 22:25-7). Secondly, his narratives often demonstrated his belief that wherever the kingdom of Christ has come, Rome has been benefitted. At the beginning of his gospel he suggests that Jesus' birth in the reign of Augustus was

1. Barrett, op. cit., 65, has shown that Luke reveals in Luke 4:16-30 the whole pattern of the divine purpose as he understood it.

2. C.J. Cadoux, op. cit., 179.

an omen of good-will and peace for the Empire. He shows symbolically that Herod and Pilate became friends because of the presence of Christ (Luke 23:12). Similarly, in the shipwreck narrative in Acts (27:14 ff.), Paul's strong presence is depicted as being helpful to a large company of Roman soldiers. Luke's argument is bold indeed at this point. "It is true," he says in effect, "that from his birth our Lord was hailed by the angels of heaven as the bringer of peace to all men. But he has no quarrel with Caesar, and who can fear a universal king who brings benefits to men, who has indeed brought peace to the Roman Empire?"

In working out his missionary strategy Luke developed a theological position which was an important communication to the church of his day. Luke believed that Jesus' intention was to establish the relevance of the gospel for the Gentile world. So he assigns the story about the question of the disciples just before Jesus' ascension to an important place at the beginning of his second book (Acts 1:6-8). The disciples had asked the question of those who cherished apocalyptic hopes centred in Jerusalem, "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" He told them to abandon such hopes and to prepare to receive the power that would take them on their evangelistic mission out from Jerusalem to the end of the earth. There is much truth in O'Neill's assessment, "Luke believed that God had prepared the church to receive the educated and the

politically powerful, as well as the poor and the outcast, and he wrote Luke-Acts to persuade men at the centre of power to abandon their lives to the service of the kingdom of God."¹

1. O'Neill, op. cit., 177.

F. THE JOHANNINE GOSPEL

Many volumes have been filled with evidence and conjectural reconstructions concerning the authorship of the fourth gospel. Barrett's commentary contains the best and most comprehensive summary to appear recently.¹ Yet when all the evidence has been sifted there is a disappointingly small residue of assured findings. We are forced to agree with Dodd that the question of authorship is incapable of decision.² John, the son of Zebedee, must almost certainly be ruled out as a possible author, but even here there are some who still find Westcott's massing of internal evidence in favour of the traditional authorship convincing.³

The question of dating the gospel is a difficult one also. The rather wide limits of 90 - 140 A.D. have good support,⁴ and this spread can probably be narrowed to 90 - 120 A.D. because of the indications contained in the Rylands and Egerton papyri.⁵ It is by no means certain that Ephesus was the place of writing, although this position has received the strongest critical support over the years. The cases for an Alexandrian or Antiochan

-
1. C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, 3-124.
 2. C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, 16.
 3. B.F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, v-xxi.
 4. Barrett, op. cit., 108 f.
 5. Dodd, op. cit., 424.

location are certainly no stronger than that for Ephesus.¹

If the foregoing questions remain rather clouded, we can reach some conclusions about the origin of this gospel with more assurance. First, C. H. Dodd's book² has gone a long way toward establishing the nature of the historic tradition upon which the author drew. It was shaped in a Jewish-Christian environment which understood very well the political and religious climate of Jerusalem in the years before the Jewish War. It had a first-hand knowledge of the geography of the southern region around Jerusalem, with a corresponding vagueness and lack of interest as far as the north was concerned. It had a metropolitan point of view which one would not expect to find in a work originating outside of Judaea unless there were special reasons for it. And it is a tradition which is distinctive and primitive enough to cause us to take John's gospel seriously as a source of historical data. Secondly, the author must have been thoroughly familiar with both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic.³ The eschatology of apocalyptic changed considerably in his handling as we shall see. John is not so much concerned to unveil

1. Barrett, op. cit., 109 f.

2. Dodd, op. cit., E.C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, 58 ff. stressed the fact that theology and history could not be separated in this work but also showed how important it was for the author that Jesus' life was grounded in history.

3. Barrett, op. cit., 26 f.

the future as he is to reveal the heavenly truth. But his kinship with apocalyptic writers is real and important. Thirdly, the author achieves a masterly fusion of two diverse strains of thought, one closely related to rabbinic Judaism and the other to Hellenistic philosophy.¹ We will want to look more deeply into the implications of this fact later on. At the moment it is enough to point out that the intellectual environment in which the author lived, and the current controversies in which he was immersed, can be expected to colour his handling of the historical tradition to a considerable degree. This has been so well established by the commentaries that it hardly seems necessary to mention it.

All of these things lead us to think that the reconstruction which we assumed in the section on the Apocalypse forms as reasonable an hypothesis for the background of the gospel as any other. A school formed in Jerusalem around the teaching of the apostle John. At the time of the destruction of Jerusalem or thereabouts it migrated to Ephesus. One pupil composed the Revelation, another was responsible for the Epistles, and another, who was the boldest and most imaginative of the group, one widely read in the Old Testament, in rabbinic writings and in Greek philosophy, composed the Gospel.²

-
1. C.H. Dodd, The Gospel According to St. John.
 2. J. Estlin Carpenter, The Johannine Writings, 255 f. Barrett, op. cit., 113 f. gives considerable support to this kind of reconstruction also.

The Attitude to Judaism

Differentiation from Judaism has been seen to have been one of the burning issues for almost every writer of the New Testament. The gap between the groups widened from decade to decade, but there had always been some Christians who had continued to hope that Jesus' mission would be fulfilled, and that the Jewish nation would repent and begin to live according to the new ethic of the kingdom. The author of Matthew's gospel, for instance, felt obliged to define the church's opposition to Judaism and proclaim her mission to the Gentiles without finally abandoning the hope that Israel would repent.¹ For the author of the fourth gospel such hope is completely dead. This book, unlike the synoptics, contains no element of suspense regarding the reception of Jesus by the Jews. Their rejection of him, and the separation of his way from theirs, are regarded as accomplished facts from the outset. The writer places the account of the destruction of the temple and of Jesus' anger at those in charge, at the beginning of his account (2:19) instead of near the end of the ministry where it appears in Mark (11:15-17). This gospel indicates that the Jerusalem worship will disappear like the Samaritan before the worship that is in spirit and truth which came by Christ (4:16-25). The Johannine Jesus announces his departure to a region where the Jews cannot come, and

1. G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Chapter 6. See also J.C. O'Neill, op. cit., 91.

he leaves them to die in their sin (8:21). The writer has spread throughout the gospel accounts of Jesus' rejection by the Jews. These build up to the climax of the trial scene (7:45-52; 8:12-59; 10:19-40; 12:37-50; 18:12-27; 19:14-16). The dependability of the trial narrative as history is probably quite high, but the writer's apologetic interest is displayed quite clearly. His desire is to emphasize the innocence of Jesus before Roman law and the responsibility of the Jews for his conviction.¹ There is a comparative underplaying of Pilate's culpability and an overplaying of the villainy of the High Priest in the interest of making the Jewish nation the unmistakable villain of the piece. Further, the author shows by his consistent use of the phrase "the Jews", instead of the particular designations - "the Pharisees," "the Sadducees," "the Herodians" - which are found in the synoptic gospels, that he believes the whole nation to be at fault and not merely some section of the leadership.

The extremely negative attitude toward the Jewish nation may be explained in part by the closeness of the relationship which had existed originally between the Johannine school and the leaders of the temple in Jerusalem. Enmity is often most bitter among former friends. But there is also a basis in the strongly held belief of the author that there remained no true Jewish nation which could claim the promises of God. By their rejection of

1. V. Taylor, op. cit., 577.

the son of God the Jews had shown that they were children of darkness. Another mark against them was that they had failed to remain true to their inherited belief in the theocratic nature of their nation. The fourth gospel makes the climax of the trial of Jesus the words of the Jews in answer to Pilate's question, "Shall I crucify your king?" The chief priests, who had inherited the mantle of David and the Hasmoneans, reply, "We have no king but Caesar."¹

Thus for this writer the Christian community had gained by default the status, prestige and responsibility which had formerly belonged to the Jewish theocracy.² That the nation to which Jesus had specifically directed his mission had to all intents and purposes ceased to exist for at least a section of the church at the turn of the century, must be taken as a very serious and disturbing development. With its passing there also passed some of the positive concern of Christians for the health of society as a whole.

Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel

As the New Testament period progressed the delay of the parousia became a greater problem for Christian thinking. Paul believed that the end would come suddenly and quite soon. But after some fifty years of living in the expectation of the end, and of believing the present period of history to be an insignificant interim, some re-evaluation became necessary on the meaning of the time

1. John 19:15, Gwatkin, op. cit., 49.

2. von Harnack, op. cit., 71.

of the church. Either history had a positive meaning in the purpose of God, or Christians would have to find a way of transcending history, of escaping the present.

In the thought world of the writer of the fourth gospel there were two strains of thinking which represented, in some sense, a flight from history; apocalypticism and Hellenic gnosticism. The author can be shown to have known both strains well, and to have been considerably influenced by them. Apocalypticism robs history of its meaning because of its moral dualism combined with a rigid predestination. And at times the author gives the impression that he believes the world is divided into two groups, those who come to the light and those who prefer darkness. Those born to the flesh seem destined to live by its appetites and have no chance of joining the children of the spirit (8:44). In this view the whole world lies in the power of the evil one, and because the writer shares this view to some extent he inevitably sharpens the distinction between the Christian community and the world, and comes close to denying a positive importance to present history. Gnosticism escapes the problems of present and future time by rising above them to a high plateau where there is a mystical apprehension of timeless truth.¹ Here again the author shows evidence of being influenced. Salvation for him seems at times to be merely a present experience given by God to men, instead of

1. Compare the functioning of worship in the thought of the writer of Hebrews. See this chapter, section A.

the result, measurable in some objective way, of a present or future act of God. For the gospel, to know God is to have eternal life (17:3); to know the truth is to be set free (8:32); Jesus knows the Father, and his ministry is the communication of this knowledge (14:18; 17:26). Again, the writer comes close, in the distinction he makes between eternal and temporal categories, to a gnostic denial of history.

However, the thought of this writer is rich and complex. It contains other elements which constitute an affirmation of the importance of the world in the present time. It is of great importance for this John that Jesus of Nazareth lived and died in the midst of the Jewish nation.¹ It is significant for him that the Word became flesh, that Jesus came to save the world (12:47). The fact that his theology is so strongly incarnational goes a long way in offsetting the other-worldly dualism we have noted. But he could not be satisfied to present a simple account of Jesus' life. He was constrained to present several facets of truth about Christ at the same time, in the manner of a painter like Picasso. It was necessary for him to find a new way of expressing the truth that in Jesus Christ the new age had come, but that it had done so in such a way that it still remained to come. He had to find a way of expressing the truth about the life of

1. Hoskyn, op. cit., 53 f.

the Christian which was lived between these two points of time. One way he found of expressing the tension between realization and hope was by mixing the tenses of his verbs. "The hour is coming and now is"(4:23), he wrote, with regard to the possibility of true worship. Worship and every other aspect of Christian life partake of the same paradoxical quality which is found in Jesus Christ. Jesus is the messiah and he will be the messiah. The Christian partakes of eternal life and thus has a foretaste of heaven, but he does not yet live in heaven. Thus the author checks the danger of a non-historical mysticism, and gives meaning to the present as a time of anticipation and hope.

Attitude to Society

There is no suggestion in this gospel of the kind of hatred of Rome which characterizes the Apocalypse. But it does assume an aloof, lofty attitude toward the world. And here "world" was not a complete abstraction, but contained the meaning, as Westcott pointed out, of "the most definite power which received worship at Ephesus in the time of John."¹ The kingdom of light is on a plane so much

1. Westcott, op. cit., 268. The term κοσμος, for the Johannine school, has both a general and a particular meaning. It is the world of external sense stimulated by the natural appetites, by the craving for wealth and desire; it is the world of man, ruled by the Devil, whose works are evil and whose principle is death. In a more particular sense, there are anti-thetic passages where the world must surely be society organized as a state and with the sphere of authority of the governing power, e.g. John 17:14, 16, where the "world" is spoken of as exhibiting an active hate of the Christian community.

higher than that of the world that it does not seem of great importance to the children of light what Roman law is like, or what Rome's governors are doing. The line circumscribing the fellowship doesn't seem to bisect at any important point the circle which contains the world. If it did, the author implies, Jesus would not have submitted to being handed over to the Jews; he would have given his servants orders to fight (18:36). The passive attitude which this passage suggests belongs more to the writer of the Gospel than to Jesus. Jesus waged a warfare with evil whenever he met it in the ordinary life of his time, albeit with other than conventional weapons. The fatalistic dualism which influenced the Gospel writer says that because the lines between light and darkness are finally drawn, warfare would be futile (13:2,27). The best course is passively to accept what happens in the "world," and to live as much as possible within the fellowship of the Christian fold. The pictures of the Good Shepherd in the Synoptic Gospels are based on different ideals from the one in John. The one picture is of a shepherd who sets out to search for the wanderer, heedless of danger or weariness. The Johannine picture stresses the safety of those within the fold (10:17 f.). And it is surely completely out of character for Jesus to be represented as refusing to pray for the "world" (17:9). The doctrine here seems to be that the "world" in all its senses is a region where the

spirit of untruth rules, and where the spirit of grace cannot be helpful.¹ The Gospel's seeming isolation from responsibility for the "world" represents a rejection of any responsibility toward the state. From one aspect at least, it is a simple either-or choice for the reader of the Fourth Gospel - either a worldly Emperor or an Everlasting King.²

It is true that some sort of divine appointment of governors is suggested in Jesus' reported words to Pilate, "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above."³ But this is surely not the same kind of Divine appointment which Paul and Peter speak of - an authority to restrain the evil elements in society as a kind of agent of God's will. Here Pilate receives his power in the way that the beast of Revelation 13:7 had received his power to persecute the saints. It is the sort of permissive power which is necessary in a dualistic view of life - a power which may or may not be in line with the Divine will.⁴

Positive Elements

We have emphasized the way in which the writer of this gospel is disposed to picture humanity as divided into two camps. In his thinking, Jesus does not come to

-
1. C.H. Turner, op. cit., 191.
 2. von Campenhausen, op. cit., 229, n.1.
 3. John 19:11.
 4. C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 181.

seek and to save but to reveal the deep-seated cleavage between those born of God and those born of the devil, between those who hunger for the words of life (1:27; 6:68; 9:36), and those who love darkness (3:19; 6:26; 12:43). This does make for a rather barren attitude to society. However, several emphases of the gospel help to balance the prevailing attitude.

The supreme moment of Christ on the cross is the time which judges the whole world (12:31). It is the dividing point of history, bringing glorious light to some, to others the gloom of darkest night. So Jesus says, "For judgment I came into this world" (9:39). Yet paradoxically the gospel also says that this was not the ultimate aim. "I came not to judge the world," Jesus is reported to have said, "but to save the world" (12:47). So the writer is not callous to the fate of society at large, although his doctrine of how the saving is accomplished is a little hard to follow. The Good Shepherd lays down his life, not "for the world," but for the sheep which belong to him (10:11, 14). How does it benefit the sheep, let alone the "world", that the Shepherd falls prey to the wolves? The key is that the One who thus proves himself to be no hireling (10:13), is given power to take his life again (10:17). As he begins his heavenly life, he has power to bestow love on the brethren, and to commence the task of reaching out with his salvation to the "other sheep" (10:16).

The writer's belief about the situation of the church in his own day appears behind his narrative. He believes the task of the church to be the eventual winning of the "world" to faith in the Son and obedience to his ethic of love. But the task must move forward in stages. At the turn of the second century, circumstances - there are hints of persecution continuing at the time of writing (10:12; 14; 15) - are such that the immediate task is to strengthen the brotherhood. To this spiritual upbuilding the gospel is dedicated, although there are ample references to the eventual goal (e.g., 13:35).

Another indication that the Christians of c. 100 A.D. had not abandoned the attitude of concern for society that Jesus had shown, is in the passages which tell of the gift of the Holy Spirit (14:15 ff). The writer exhibits a complete confidence that the Spirit will guide Christians into those actions which Christ would approve. If the Christians will withdraw into the fellowship in the present crucial times, and unite with the Son, the Father will give them a Counsellor (14:16). The Counsellor will undoubtedly show them, when the time is ripe, the next stage of their mission to the "world". There is a hint from Thomas' words in 14:5 that Christians were, at the time of writing, in a quandary about the way they should act and the goals they should seek. The writer assures them that Christ is the Way (14:6). It is understandable that in the passages

following, where the writer is thinking particularly of the Way which Christ took as he met the challenges of the world, we have some of the clearest indications of attitudes to society which had been normative for Christianity throughout the New Testament period. When Christians walk in the Spirit, Christ's glory will be manifested to the "world". It will be shown forth in lives which bear as their fruits, love, joy, and peace (14:1-11). It will be shown in lives that are willing to sacrifice and serve (15:12-17). It will be manifest in lives that show a quiet confidence amidst troubles and persecutions (15:18-21).

G. I PETER

This important letter was written to the churches of Asia Minor, probably near to the time of Pliny's letter to Trajan,¹ that is, about 112 A.D. It is the work of an unknown author who followed the widely accepted practice of adopting as a pseudonym the name of a great apostle.² The purpose of the letter is what makes it important for us, because it was sent in order to encourage Christians undergoing the actual shock of an extensive persecution (4:12). Not only this, but it has long been recognized that the long section from 1:3 to 4:11 is material from an earlier baptismal sermon.³ This section has much to say about sufferings and trials but it reflects an earlier stage in the persecutions than the letter proper. So I Peter as a whole can be expected to provide valuable evidence.

The reasons which F. W. Beare has set forth for linking the letter with the persecutions mentioned in Pliny's correspondence with Trajan, seem altogether convincing.⁴ The internal evidence in the letter further

-
1. See appendix on dating.
 2. F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, 24 ff. For the view that the apostle himself stands in a more direct relationship to the authorship see E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 3 ff.
 3. B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, 129 ff.; Beare, op. cit., 6 ff.
 4. Beare, op. cit., 14.

confirms the view because it reflects a period in which persecutions were heightened just as Pliny's letter does. In chapter 4 we noted that the very fact that Pliny wrote for instructions indicated that persecutions had been, up until this time, sporadic and without the basis of an established procedure. Pliny went on to describe a situation in which a considerable number of Christians were being brought to trial, and indicated that accusations were multiplying at the time of writing. In the first section of I Peter there are references to trials (1:6), to suffering unjustly (2:19 ff.) and to suffering for righteousness' sake (3:14 ff), which are all of an unspecified nature, but 4:12 ff. breathes the atmosphere of a crisis that was immediate and distressing for the Christian community. The earlier section indicates the kind of persecution that could have come from the community.¹ The later section is quite compatible with an official and widespread persecution.

Sojourners: I Peter 2:1-12

This thesis has had much to say about the security which the idea of the theocracy gave to Jews of all periods as they thought of themselves in relation to other powers. We have also pointed out the disorder that often resulted in Christian communities that had lost the security of

1. See C.E.B. Cranfield, The First Epistle of Peter, 8.

their Jewish identity. Here, one of the author's aims seems to be the re-establishment of a secure identity for the harrassed Christians. Theirs, he says, is the privilege of belonging to the new Israel. They are "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people" (2:9).

But what does this mean about their relationships with the world? The readers are referred to as παροίκως and παρεπίδημοις. The former word emphasized the fact that a Christian is a sojourner, a resident alien in this world. The latter word emphasizes the transitoriness of life on earth. Both words occur in the LXX version of the words of Abraham in Genesis 23:4, so there can be no doubt that they express the author's ideas concerning citizenship in the new Israel. A Christian's true and primary citizenship is in heaven. This would undoubtedly be an encouraging world view to hold for one who faced death at the hands of the earthly powers. "In this rejoice, though now for a little while you may have to suffer various trials" (1:6).

However, this high citizenship had its responsibilities too, and these related very much to practical action in society. The Christian is part of a new diaspora.¹ The first diaspora had the temple and polity of Jerusalem as its centre. The Christians addressed in this letter were

1. I Peter 1:1. Von Harnack, *op. cit.*, 240, says that this is the way primitive Christianity saw itself as being politically and socially involved.

scattered and dispersed in a hostile world as aliens. Their home country was the heavenly one. But they were aliens with important responsibilities in the place where they were. Seemly behaviour was needed. They were to maintain such good conduct among the Gentiles that the latter would have no cause to speak against Christians as wrongdoers, yet would be forced to see their own actions against the backdrop of the final judgment.¹

"Be Subject": I Peter 2:13-17

Here we come to a pronouncement on the Christian's duty to the civil authority that is reminiscent of Paul's Romans 13 passage. There is certainly some degree of dependence on the earlier passage, but the differences are neither negligible nor uninteresting. The doctrine that the ἔθνη get their power from God is not repeated here, but it is not directly challenged.² The duty of subjection is reaffirmed, but it is "for the Lord's sake." One is submissive to the authorities because of one's relation to divine authority, not, as Paul suggests, because the state has some intrinsic quality that makes its

-
1. I Peter 2:12, See von Campenhausen, op. cit., p. 308, for a good description of the way in which Christian morality exerts its influence upon the world.
 2. Beare, op. cit., 114.

judgements valid, or that its authority is derived from God. In fact the author of I Peter doesn't seem interested in theories of civil administration at all. He puts the accent on the responsibilities of being a heavenly citizen, which responsibilities include subjection to earthly rulers.

We have seen that Paul left himself open to ambiguities by his use of ἔξουσιαι. Here there is a much more specific reference to the emperor and his governors. However this is not so much a difference as a confirmation of the way in which Paul's meaning should be taken. The two passages are also similar in their appraisal of the chief function of the state. It is for the restraining of disruptive and evil tendencies in society.¹

This weighing of similarities and differences hardly gets at the most striking thing, which is a difference in tone between the two passages. I Peter seems less enthusiastic about according the state a place in the divine hierarchical ordering of the cosmos.² For this author the state is more clearly a human institution.³ A further indication of his slightly different attitude is found in 2:16 where, in the midst of his exhortation to obedience, he gives an aside concerning the nature of

-
1. I Peter 2:14; C.E.B. Cranfield, op. cit., 59.
 2. Among those who have noted this difference are: Weinel, op. cit., 18; C.J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 107; Selwyn, op. cit., 110.
 3. I Peter 2:13.

Christian freedom. It is as if he were conscious of criticisms being made of subjection codes¹ and ethical handbooks by those who had found real freedom in Christ. He says in effect, "You have indeed an inner freedom, but in receiving it from God, you acknowledge yourself to be his servant; and in obedience to your sovereign in heaven you should, without compulsion, and with full freedom, submit to the authorities who are established on earth. Freedom is no excuse for evil."

In Paul's doctrine, the state was a part of a hierarchy of power whose pinnacle was the Almighty himself. In the view of I Peter the state is seen to have an important function, but it is clearly different from the kingdom of heaven, and has no great importance for the spiritual life of the Christian. This means that Peter can be less enthusiastic than Paul about the place of the state, and at the same time more specific about enjoining a positive duty toward it. Thus Peter distinguishes between what is due to the Emperor, honour, and the attitude which one feels toward God, holy fear.² Christians, in Peter's view, have a positive responsibility to the state, and are not told merely to acquiesce in a passive obedience.

-
1. See W.K.L. Clarke, New Testament Problems, for the possible relationship of both passages to a circulating subjection code.
 2. I Peter 2:17; cf. von Harnack, op. cit., 259.

Before Magistrates: I Peter 3:15-17

This passage brings into focus one of the most persistent problems of the early Christians. Without real justification they were often charged by their fellow citizens with being wrongdoers and evil men. But in the earlier stages of persecution reflected in the first section of the passage, at least, they felt that if their accusers were to charge them before a magistrate, the Roman official would vindicate them and put their accusers to shame. At any rate this is what the author of I Peter suggests will happen,¹ although it must also be pointed out that he exhorts his readers to be sure that they maintain good conduct (2:12) so that their conscience really will be clear (3:16).

The visual picture afforded by this passage is strikingly similar to the one which we saw when we were examining the evidence for the persecution in Chapter 4. The phrase ΠΛΥΤΙ ΤΩ ΑΙΤΟΥΝΤΙ is more likely to apply to a judicial interrogation than to casual questioning.² So I Peter envisages the situation of a Christian before the governor. The reference in "those who revile your good behaviour," is to the prosecutor (delector) who had to come forward with charges before there could be a trial under the judicial process which

1. John Knox, "Pliny and I Peter", Journal of Biblical Literature, (1955) 187 ff.

2. Beare, op. cit., 128. cf. Acts 25:16.

we decided on other grounds to be the one used in the persecutions. This must be the meaning of the reference because the hope is expressed that this person will be put to shame, presumably by the decision of the governor in the Christian's favour. Moreover, the attitude which our author enjoins on Christians brought to trial agrees well with the attitude of those whom Pliny tells about in his letter to Trajan. The section as a whole confirms the view we have taken on the manner of the persecutions, and testifies to the Christians' confidence in Roman law as well as to the growing antipathy of the public to the expanding sect.

Since Christ Suffered: I Peter 2:21 ff:3

If the Christians expected to be vindicated by Roman law, it is also true that they expected there would be, at the very least, occasional miscarriages of justice (3:17), and that they might have to endure much suffering for righteousness' sake before society became convinced of their harmlessness. With this in mind the author devotes much of his letter to telling his readers about the main spiritual armour for their ordeal. Their protection will be increased by remembering that Christ chose for himself the role of suffering servant. "Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought" (4:1)¹. Nowhere outside the synoptic gospels do we have such a clear portrait of the

1. Cf. Phil. 2:5.

suffering servant figure as in I Peter. The descriptive language is often taken directly from Deutero-Isaiah,¹ but the reference is clearly to the historical Jesus who used the gentle, peaceful persuasion of loving service when he faced an unsympathetic society in his day. The author of I Peter is close to the mind of Christ when he tells Christians to have the same attitudes of gentleness (3:15), kindness, and lack of guile (2:22) when they face the hostile citizens and governor of Pontus and Bithynia. They become sharers of Christ's sufferings and reproach, but they are strengthened to know that they are living by the will of God (4:2). The writer finds the chief significance of Christ's death in the motive power which it gives to disciples faced with hard decisions. He suffered death as an innocent man. He endured his suffering patiently, without bitterness or retaliation. Christians can find in him the will to follow.

The Fiery Ordeal! I Peter 4:12-19

As the letter proper begins, we are conscious of a changed atmosphere. We are no longer hearing about the correct attitudes for Christians to take in a comparatively hostile pagan environment. We are in touch with a living situation in which persecution is causing real terror. There is a feeling that the change for the worse has come upon the community quickly. Thus the writer says, "Don't be surprised" (ἄετιζέσθε), as if the organized persecution had come as a numbing shock, and they were at a loss to understand how such a strange thing could be

happening to them. The author reminds them that their ordeal is wholly in keeping with their decision to share the sufferings of Christ.

In the face of the new fiery ordeal, the author has five things of importance to say to them. First, he asks his friends to face their persecution squarely, without self pity, and alert to the possibilities of glorifying God through their patient bearing of it. It is a blessing to be reviled for the name of Christ. Secondly, he says it is foolish to be a martyr for the wrong reasons.¹ Christians at this time were being vilified for imagined immorality and crimes against society; the writer knows that persecution for these things may well be unavoidable. But believers must not give reason for being persecuted as murderers, thieves, wrongdoers, or mischief-makers (ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος). This latter word is not found elsewhere so its meaning has been the subject of some speculation. Selwyn² suggests that the word might mean "revolutionary," or "meddler in other peoples' affairs to the point of being an informer." Thirdly, he says it will be of help if they can see God's purpose in their trials. The persecution

-
1. This verse shows that Christian leaders were aware of the danger of martyrdom becoming something a Christian fell into carelessly, or even sought. See W.H.C. Frend, Op. cit., 150, for the aggressive side to martyrdom.
 2. op. cit., 100.

is the beginning of judgment, and if it is severe for believers, how much more terrible it will be later on for unbelievers. What a privilege to be among the first judged, and to have your faith tested by such a trial! Fourthly, he addresses the elders directly because of his concern for the unity and order of the community during the persecution (5:15). The right administration of the flock is extremely important in such a time. Finally, he tells them it is a time to be watchful for signs of the working of their spiritual adversary, the devil (5:6-11). Earlier they had been told to be submissive, even to the occasionally unjust human authorities. Their spiritual adversary must be resisted however. This symbol of the angelic powers which are behind events like the persecution had not been, until the end of the letter, in evidence. The great danger which the devil represented at this time was apostasy. Therefore resisting him meant standing fast in the faith, something, one need hardly add, that had to be accomplished in the here and now.

H. THE PASTORALS

Questions of authorship and date for these epistles have proved difficult to establish.¹ This study has concluded that an early second century date, somewhere between 100 and 130 A.D., and non-Pauline authorship are to be assumed. The suggestion has been quite widely accepted that fragments of genuine Pauline letters may be included in these writings, but that the writings themselves reflect a much later period than that of Paul's ministry.² In terms of what the Pastorals tell us about the credal formulations, the discipline, the doctrine and the hierarchical structure of the Christian community, the second century is definitely indicated. What the writings tell us about the heresies that were being combatted and the persecutions that were being endured, suggests the same period.

The heresy in the forefront of the author's thinking was a type of Jewish-Gnosticism in all probability,³ although some scholars make a strong case for the Marcionite heresy being the particular foe.⁴ The writings make frequent mention of persecutions, in such a way as to indicate that at the time of composition

-
1. See appendix on dating.
 2. C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, 10 ff.; P.N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles; New Testament Studies, 2 (1956), 250-61.
 3. Barrett, op. cit., 12-16.
 4. John Knox, Marcion and the New Testament, 73-76; F.D. Gealy, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus", Interpreter's Bible, 11:358 ff.

general persecution, and that probably for the crime of being a Christian (II Tim. 2:9), had been going on for some time. Yet there is no indication that Christians were being hunted out. A fairly normal and tranquil (I Tim. 2:2) life can at least be contemplated. Nor is there any sign of any sudden calamities or fiery trials in the background of these writings.

The author's eschatological ideas are not set out in any detail, but they are nonetheless interesting as far as our subject is concerned. He looks forward to the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ as a future event which will bring full and complete salvation to mankind. But he says, "That appearance God will bring to pass in his own good time" (ITim. 6:15). Obviously, history is for him a period of indeterminate length, and for that reason he can be expected to take it more seriously than some of the earlier New Testament writers,¹ who thought the time was very short. He will see the Christian community and the world as co-existent, with the future kingdom in no way exerting unbearable pressure on the forms of this world. For this author, the future salvation was potentially universal in its availability to men (I Tim. 2:9; 1:15), but in these "last days" only a few embraced the gospel, while the majority plunged deeper and deeper into wickedness and error (e.g. II Tim. 3:1 ff). In his thinking salvation can be the present

1. Cf. I Cor. 15:51 f; I Thess. 4:15 ff; Mark 13:30.

possession of believers (Titus 3:5; I Tim. 4:16), but there is a strong future cast to his doctrine too (Titus 3:7). Thus it can be said that the Pastorals do maintain the eschatological tension of the earlier writings, but probably to a lesser degree (Titus 2:12-13). The difficulty of the Christian attempt to live by new standards within the same old world is understood in these writings,¹ but they also try to make the task easier by making it more possible for the Christian to isolate himself within his own community, and by trying to stabilize the relationship between the church and the world.

Community Organization

The times called for a greater attention to the organization of the Christian community. This was necessary because of the events that had taken place. There had been an outbreak of heretical teaching with the consequent disruptions and arguments. There were the persecutions that left isolated Christians open to the temptation of apostasy, and for which no common community teaching or practice had been worked out. It was necessary also, one gathers, for psychological reasons. The more the break with Judaism became final, and the longer the delay of the parousia, the greater would

1. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, 2:185, refers to this as "The qualitative and not merely chronological sense of the Christian's betweenness."

be the need of Christians for a sense of being a people, and for a polity of their own.

The Pastorals reflect the kind of activity that gave a greater cohesiveness to the Christian community in the second century. First, there are extensive references to the hierarchical leadership which was developing at the time. The work and status of Timothy and Titus themselves are discussed (I Tim. 4:6; 1:12; Titus 1:5), giving the impression that a great deal of thought was being given to the question of how the leaders could more effectively order and discipline the life of their charges. Secondly, we hear of a major teaching effort that had the purpose of maintaining orthodox opinions throughout the flock (Titus 1:9). Lastly, there are references to a developing doctrine that the church is the inheritor of the ideal theocracy ideas of Judaism (Titus 3:1-7).

The author of the Pastorals often seems too middle-of-the-road and unexciting as he goes about the task of strengthening the organization. Critics would do well to reflect, however, on how much the transmissive gifts were needed at this time. Our author was no creative, prophetic spirit, but without his and similar efforts, Christianity as a historical, ethical, and prophetic movement might have disappeared. If he seems to emphasize overmuch such pedestrian virtues as sobriety, seriousness, temperance, and honesty, we should ask whether

these were not the virtues most needed by a community struggling to find a unifying and permanent identity.¹

At any rate, under the influence of people like the author, Christianity became a kind of enclave. There was a belief that the church was a special people, whose members were joined to God and to one another through the redemptive work of Christ, a remnant redeemed from the perishing world, hoping to be removed from it one day, and therefore superior to it and not particularly dependent upon it.² On the other hand there was no feeling that the church was living on the brink of catastrophe, and so there was a tendency to try to establish the church in the world, and to enjoin the virtues - civic, practical and rational - which were appropriate to such a purpose.

A good illustration of the foregoing tendencies is found in I Tim. 6:2 where the subject is the behaviour of slaves. "Those who have believing masters must not be disrespectful on the ground that they are brethren; rather they must serve all the better since those who benefit by their service are believers and beloved." Within the Christian community, it is assumed that a relationship of love exists between the two men which makes them brothers. However, the author does not envisage a situation in which this fact could be allowed to upset the hierarchical ordering of the world's society.³ It is assumed that love can

1. B.S. Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, 197 ff.

2. F.D. Gealy, op. cit., 11:541.

3. C. Spicq, Ste. Paul: Les Epitres Pastorales, 183.

and should be a part of the life of the enclave, but in the author's view it would be damaging to the church's position if the new standards were allowed to upset society and so draw the attention of outsiders to Christians as meddling busybodies (I Tim. 3:7; 6:1; Titus 2:5; 3:8,15). It is in this context that we must see the author's teaching about the state.

Civic Duties

To illustrate the attitude to civil authority of the Pastorals we will examine three passages. The first is Titus 3:1-2.

Remind them to be submissive (ὑποτάσσεσθαι) to rulers and authorities, to be obedient (πειθαρχεῖν), to be ready for any honest work, to speak evil of no one, to avoid quarreling, to be gentle, and to show perfect courtesy toward all men.

When the author comes, in his section on Christian obedience, to deal with the attitude to civil authority, he knows that Christians already have their instructions. So to Titus he says, "Remind them." It is interesting that two words are used to explain the attitude to the government. ὑποτάσσεσθαι is used elsewhere in the Pastorals and usually means to recognize the authority of those whose calling is different from your own. The use of πειθαρχεῖν is a little stronger, and probably does imply that the author approved of what the state was asking of its citizens at this time. It would be difficult to imagine him using

this word if he knew that the state was requiring worship of the emperor from the Christians to whom he wrote. The word has the sense of rendering obedience to duly constituted authority.¹ "To be ready for any honest work," moves beyond a mere passive grudging obedience, however, to the position that Christians should co-operate actively with the government in its work for the common good. The word "honest" is the only qualification in the whole section. The virtues in the list in verse two, if practiced, would mean that Christians backed down in disputes with heathen members of society rather than cause offense. One cannot imagine a policy more anxious to make friends with society.

The second is I Tim. 3:7;

Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, or he may fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

This passage is in line with others in the New Testament which show the concern of the church that the behaviour of Christians should be such as to command the respect of outsiders. The persecutions had arisen in large part out of the inflamed feelings of a populace who believed Christians to be evil men. In other cases, e.g. in Titus 3:8, it is as much as admitted that Christians had on occasion given cause for a bad opinion to be held of them. Here, where he is thinking of the appointment of bishops, the author stresses that they above all men in the church had to be careful of their good reputation.

1. Barrett, op. cit., 139.

Thirdly, there are the important words at the beginning of the section on the ordering of Christian life, I Tim. 2:1-4.

First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectful in every way. This is good, and it is acceptable in the sight of God our saviour, who desires all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.

This passage is just as affirmative of the place of the state power as is Titus 3:1 ff. or Rom. 13:1 ff. It pluralizes and therefore generalizes the approval given to rulers. As in the other passages it is assumed that government is a good gift of God's providence. Christians should therefore pray for it, so that what God intends by it may be achieved. But there are two other reasons, in the author's view, for approval, as he reveals in what follows. First, if prayers are made, Christians will be relieved of suspicions of disloyalty, and may then be permitted to lead a quiet and peaceable life. The traditions tell us that even when before a magistrate Christians offered to show their loyalty by praying for the Emperor, as a substitute for performing the required cultic act.¹ Secondly, they prayed that the ruler might become a Christian. We saw earlier that the major difficulty of an enclave Christianity was its inability to release its ethical and prophetic element into the world.

1. de Ste. Croix, op. cit., 199.

One of the positive ways it sought to remedy this deficiency was by prayer. Prayers reached beyond the enclave to all men, and as it is God's desire that all be saved, there is a real possibility that the ruler will be drawn within the community to receive his salvation too. "Knowledge of the truth" is a technical term in the Pastorals. Having it is the equivalent of being saved or becoming a Christian. The liturgical clauses of verses five and six have the effect of grounding the request to pray for kings in the rule of faith which all Christians accepted at baptism.¹

Persecution

A word needs to be said about the persecutions as they are reflected in the Pastorals. They had apparently become so general that the writer could say, "All who desire to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted" (II Tim. 3:12). We are not given much indication of the severity of the persecutions however, or even whether it is abuse from the populace or official action that is meant. Perhaps it is better to think of the term as all-inclusive. At any rate, suffering of one kind or another is thought to be the normal accompaniment of preaching (II Tim. 1:8),² and the very meaning of the word 'witness' has by this time the connotation of suffering and death. This is a dismal fact from one point of view, but it is no

1. Gealy, *op. cit.*, 11:399.

2. Cf. I Clement 5:4.

mean achievement that suffering has come to have a positive meaning and value in the teaching of the church (II Tim. 2:9-10).

So it is that in II Tim. 2:4, the author gives the leaders of the church the admonition to take their share of suffering as good soldiers. When the hour of their "good fight of faith" comes, they are to remember "Christ Jesus who in his testimony (μαρτυρήσας) before Pontius Pilate made the good confession" (I Tim. 6:12-13). Their "good confession" at baptism (vs. 12) is related here to Christ's "good confession" before Pontius Pilate, which had to do with his actions and his attitude more than his words. He did not flinch or falter even in the presence of Rome's power. He was gentle and peaceable even when they took his life. Above all, they are to remember Paul, who languished in prison, and wore fetters like a criminal (II Tim. 2:8-9). We can see here the beginnings of a doctrine of martyrdom, which could lead to the unhealthy attitude of seeking out martyrdom, especially when the benefits of martyrdom to the individual are stressed (II Tim. 1:10; 4:18).

At this state of the development the sections on the duty of an obedient Christian warrior are still only good, stringent, practical advice. And they constitute one useful approach to the problem of how ethical insights were to be communicated to the world. The courtroom was

one place where the members of the Christian enclave and the world were going to meet for some time to come. Any Christian who came to his trial, aiming to demonstrate the "righteousness, godliness, faith, love, steadfastness, gentleness" of which the writer of these letters speaks, would be bound to communicate something of the radical judgement of the gospel.

I. OTHER WRITINGS

Some New Testament writings, namely James, Matthew, the Johannine epistles, Jude and II Peter have not been seen as being of prime importance for the tracing of the development of attitudes to the state in primitive Christianity. Some have been referred to in footnotes. On examination they did not appear to have much direct evidence for our subject. Where they are relevant they merely confirm or underline the findings which have been reported in other works. A brief summary will be attempted here, however, in order to indicate the main lines of thought in this area.

James, taken here as written about 60 A.D.¹ to Jews of the diaspora, including Christian Jews,² gives us a valuable indication of what a close relationship existed between Christians and the Jewish nation at Jerusalem before the war of 66-70 A.D. In this period the pillars at Jerusalem, James, Peter and John, were conducting a mission to the circumcision, as Paul reports in Galatians 2:9. The internal evidence of this letter supports the view that the epistle of James was written as part of this ministry. The fact that a Christian apostle could write directly to Jewish synagogues with some hope of getting a hearing speaks clearly of a closeness to, and a concern for, the nation

1. See appendix on dating.

2. A.T. Cadoux, The Thought of St. James, 25 ff.

Israel which is only matched in the New Testament in the thought of Jesus. In James, as in the teaching of Jesus, the nation as a whole is addressed (1:1,16,19), judged (4:1-10), and reminded of its high responsibility as the receiver of the promises of God (4:17). Again, just as Jesus stressed the prophetic call to righteousness more than some other elements in the Jewish religious heritage, so James lays his principal emphasis on the ethical. In the epistle there are, for instance, several examples of one of the main principles of Jesus' teaching, that what we are trying to be to our fellows limits or allows what God is to us. "Give and it shall be given unto you" (Luke 6:38), emphasizes that our outgoing to our fellow men and God's incoming to us are a unity. James, in his teaching that faith without works is dead (2:14-26), stresses the same vital unity. Also, there is in James a clear indication that he shared Jesus' idea that the nation had been called to live by a higher righteousness than the Mosaic law. At some points he speaks quite simply of the old law (2:9-11; 4:11 f.). But he more often qualifies the noun, thereby showing that he believes that there are now higher demands to be met. He speaks of the "royal" law of loving the neighbour (2:8), the "law of liberty" (2:12), and the "perfect" law (1:25).

There are two passages in James which could be construed as having reference to persecutions. In 1:2

there is the rather uncertain reference to "various trials," and in 4:1-4, "wars and fightings" are mentioned. In the last reference it is clear, however, that those addressed are not passive recipients of persecution, but passionately involved as initiators in the struggles. The situation is precisely that of the Jewish community just prior to the Jewish war. And again, James' attitude to Jewish nationalism is similar to that of Jesus. In 4:2 there is the phrase "you kill and you covet" (ἐηλοῦτε). Rendall¹ thinks this may refer to the Zealots. Whether he is right or not the whole context of the phrase suggests the kind of bloody insurrection for which the Zealots stood, and James sternly repudiates the attitude. Positively, he praises those who are peacemakers. "The harvest of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace" (3:18).

Matthew, composed in the latter part of the first century,² gives further data on the differentiation from Judaism and corroborates what we know about the persecutions at this time. Like Mark he accounted for the growing rift between Christians and Jews by saying that Jewish rejection of Jesus was part of the divine plan (22:6-7). But he develops the idea further by having Jesus predict that the kingdom of God will be

-
1. G. H. Rendall, The Epistle of St. James and Judaic Christianity, 56 ff.
 2. See appendix on dating.

taken away from the Jews and given to a nation producing the fruits of it (21:42 f). Like Luke he emphasizes the mission to the Gentiles (24:14).¹ Yet along with these two emphases there is a strain in Matthew that has not finally abandoned the hope that Israel will repent.² He hasn't anything new to tell us about the persecutions but his reworking of Mark 13 (24:9 ff.) shows that persecution was an experience of the church of his day, and perhaps that it was becoming more general.

The Johannine letters, written about 100 or 110 A.D., reflect the same attitude as the Johannine gospel; namely a view that the whole world is in the power of the evil one. Yet even with the positive identification of the world with the devil, there is no call to a frontal attack upon the world. Rather there is a lofty scorn of the society of the empire viewed from the heights of the fellowship of love and peace³ (1 John 2:17).

However, other-worldly though these epistles are, they speak of a defection from the apostolic community (I John 2:26) to an even more spiritualized faith (I John 4:1-3), and they counteract the false doctrine in two ways. First, by emphasizing the concrete, historical figure of Jesus (I John 2:22). The point at issue was

-
1. B.N. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, 187.
 2. G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, chapter 6.
 3. Gwatkin, op. cit., 17.

the flesh of Jesus. The writer of these letters stressed the incarnation and preserved a Christian concern for the world. Secondly, by talking about the peace which the true community of the children of God possesses. It is as if the writer believed that through the peaceful atmosphere of his letter he could prevent any further defections. The epistles have been called the least militant books of the New Testament.¹ Even when the writer urges his readers to exhibit the true attitude of Christ to the point of laying down their lives for the brethren (I John 13:16), he does so in language of great calm.

Several commentators have remarked on the fact that these epistles give no hint of any impending or recent persecutions.² The untroubled tone of the writing may, however, be misleading. For one thing this writer believes that the world is indeed perilous, but more because of its seductions than because of its hostility. Also, the first epistle does talk of the need for boldness before the judgment seat (4:17). If the last judgment is meant where would be the need for boldness? We do know that persecution was probably on the increase at this time, and more Christians were finding themselves before Pliny and the other governors. Boldness would

-
1. T.M Parker, Christianity and the State in the Light of History, 20.
 2. e.g. Westcott, Commentary, xxxiii ff.

certainly be necessary if they were not to deny their affiliation.¹

II Peter was probably written about 150 A.D. and Jude, because of its incorporation therein, was somewhat earlier. Both writings reflect an attitude to society similar to that of the Pastoral epistles. The main concern is in the building up of the internal life of the church (Jude, 4). Disciplines must be rigidly maintained so that unruly elements do not gain a place in their midst. Great stress is laid on sound morality (Jude 20-23), but even more on sound doctrine, which is the basis of the holy life. II Peter protests against the rejection of the doctrine of the parousia, more because this was a part of the orthodox belief (II Peter 3:3-7), than because he believed the end to be near. Destructive heresies that unsettle the community are the major problem in these writings. The Pastorals reflect a church intent on the development of its own polity, for whom insubordination was perhaps the most serious sin. The same attitude is found in Jude. He speaks of Korah's rebellion (Jude 11), a reference to the leader of a group of malcontents who became arrogant and challenged the leadership of Moses and Aaron (Numbers 16:1-34).² The author severely reproves any such tendencies in his church.

In these writings we also see once again a church

1. Carpenter, op. cit., 470.

2. Cf. Titus 1:9-11; III John 9-10.

struggling with the problem of the delayed parousia.

II Peter is clearly reflecting contemporary ideas when he has Peter predict that scoffers will come in the last days saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? For ever since the fathers fell asleep, all things have continued as they were from the beginning of creation" (II Peter 3:3 f). He vigorously attacks such opinions saying that the delay is caused by the Lord's forbearance, who wants everyone to reach repentance. The delay should therefore not make them easy prey for skeptics, but should fill them with an evangelical zeal.

CHAPTER VIISUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In assessing the evidence of the various books of the New Testament it has not been possible to find a continuous thread of development, or a key which would make all the various attitudes to the state fall into a pattern. It was thought best to deal with the writings in some approximation of the order in which they were written so that if there were trends in Christian attitudes which were explainable as responses to the political developments of the time, these would stand out more clearly. But attitudes were apparently not formed in such a simple way. Different writers, with a variety of teachings and experiences in their backgrounds, account for the attitudes we find quite as much as do the changing fortunes of Christianity in the Empire.

We can, however, with some profit, trace Christian attitudes in relation to some broad themes which seemed to have a consistently great importance for believers throughout the New Testament period. With some of the themes there does indeed seem to be development in a certain direction; with others, no pattern emerges, or else attitudes have a stable consistency from period to period. We will try to summarize

the conclusions of this study under the headings of the themes which seem most illuminating for attitude to the state.

The themes we have selected are obviously related to each other at many points, perhaps in the fashion of a contrapuntal piece of music. But running through the whole development we find a concern to express the ethics of the kingdom in some fashion. If Christianity did have a distinctive effect and influence on society it was primarily because of its attempt to make the ethic of generous love relevant and practical for human beings organized in community. There is very little indication of a distinctive Christian contribution to social theory, yet we can with assurance point to benefits which have flowed into society because the people whose story the New Testament is were willing to struggle with the difficult task of finding ways of applying the teachings of Jesus in a variety of particular situations.

The Theme of Order

The existence of man in society is possible only when chaos is overcome by unity and order. Yet the goal of order is continually threatened for a variety of reasons. Beginning with the Old Testament background to the coming of Jesus, there was a continuous and observable struggle to achieve a cohesive and orderly corporate life in Israel. Sometimes the factors

which threatened disruption were external in origin, the cultural onslaughts, the invasions by stronger powers, the consequent exiles being among the most serious. But also there were from time to time strong voices from within the nation which attacked the smooth working of society in the name of justice. Amos was one of these. In some periods, according to Amos and the other prophets, order was bought at too high a cost in righteousness. At these times the cohesive factors, which have an indispensable function in the state, were seen in prophetic eyes as evil. The kings, whose authority provided necessary vertical forces of cohesion, were denounced as wicked. The cultus too, which was a horizontal force holding society within a workable pattern and sanctioning it, was similarly attacked. It is useless to try to take sides in this kind of struggle because at one period of history the function of fighting chaos may be all important as it was when the kingship formed in Israel to combat the Philistines, while at another a stagnant society needs to be troubled into movement by a purer ideal.

When Jesus began his ministry there had been a crisis in the Jewish nation for a long time. External forces were threatening its cohesion. Some, like the Sadducean priesthood, were willing to pay a very high price in terms of forgetting the promises of God and the responsibilities of election in order to keep some semblance of a state in existence. Some, like the Pharisees, retreated to moralistic and pietistic positions which tried to force God to act by a perfect obedience to the Law's commands. Perhaps, they reasoned, God

will reward our efforts by sending his Messiah to rule us directly and give us dominion over the nations. Some wanted to throw off alien political power by rebellion so that Israel could work out a separate development. Jesus' answer to the crisis was in the prophetic tradition. It was to challenge the preconceptions of political morality which lay behind each of the options. The Jewish authorities asked their citizens for a measurable obedience to the commands which accompanied Israel's constitution. In Jesus' ministry, every human security was swept away, and men were brought face to face with God's infinite and immediate claim to be the ruler of the nations. Christ asked men to consider themselves as citizens of a kingdom whose ethic was higher than that of any earthly kingdom to which they might belong. In fulfilling by faith their duty to the higher righteousness of loving service they would be better citizens of the kingdoms which were passing away. Only by the challenge of such living could the present systems based on duty and force be transformed or superceded. Jesus was no anarchist, and he urged his followers to carry out the perfunctory duties of citizenship, but he was willing to be disruptive in order to get the nation to accept a new role for itself, one more in keeping with the justice and love of God.

The glimpses we get of the early Christian communities demonstrate the difficulty of putting the higher ethic into practice. At the time of Stephen's appointment the community at Jerusalem was attempting a noble social experiment which was inspired by the ideal of love, but they ended up having to give

their whole attention to consequent problems of administration. Paul continually brought his apostolic authority to bear upon the problems of order of his various churches. He greatly appreciated the need for order and looked upon it as a natural gift. Yet he did recognize the new conditions which were called for by the kingdom ethic and instructed his charges to shun civil law courts in favour of settling their internal disputes in an atmosphere of love and forgiveness. Clement was particularly hard on the anarchy of the Corinthians, and tended to see orderliness as a desirable end in itself. He praised the Roman army for its organization. He also laid more stress than earlier writers on the internal organization of the church. The writer of John's gospel believed that his most important immediate task was the strengthening of the brotherhood, and the quieting of disruptive voices. In the Pastorals the emphasis is almost completely on church order, and on subordination to a God-given system of political order in the world outside the church. At this time there does not seem to have been as much ethical tension as there should be if Christians are going to minister to the state and challenge its activities in the name of the perfect society.

Early Christian attitudes to the state which were the most appreciative of its functions were held by those whose role in the church was more administrative than prophetic. Whether it was Caesar who was instrumental in bringing order, or one of his governors, or the system of law itself, many thankfully received it as a gift from God, who in the beginning had

pushed the waters of chaos back, and had given names to the unruly profusion of living things. The problem of politics is the problem of order and justice. How can the anarchy of conflicting human interests be coerced into some kind of order without losing the vision of the kingdom of love and peace? The New Testament gives no definitive answers, but it shows that throughout the period Christians were aware of the problem and were struggling to work out valid approaches which kept both vital needs in view.

The Theme of Eschatology

This theme is important for our study because, depending on the type of eschatology that was stressed in a particular book of the New Testament, there was either a tendency to take history seriously as the normal realm of the Christian's activity, or to adopt a non-dynamic view of history with its resultant lack of responsibility for the state. In the Old Testament period, the failure of the ideal theocracy to be realized in any sufficient sense caused some Jews to panic into apocalyptic. The apocalyptic approach was to acknowledge the existence of antitheistic powers and of a divine programme of events which had to run its determined course. When the course had been completed, then the rule of God's Messiah in the perfect kingdom could begin. The goal of Israel was guaranteed, but in an other-worldly, beyond history setting. This world view undoubtedly enabled the Jews to go on believing in their nation and finding their identity there. But it led to political attitudes which were passive, negative, or irresponsible.

Jesus' teachings contained an eschatology which generated a high degree of tension. He announced that the transcendent kingdom was already set in the heart of the present time. It is important to notice, however, that his eschatology was organically related to the historical process. The ideal of love which he preached, was preached to a nation in an historical setting. The kingdom of God was future, and it was described in terms raised ^{so} close to perfection as to seem impossible of attainment, but Jesus believed that with God it was possible. It was a possibility in historical terms because its heights of pure love were organically related to the experience of love in all human life. And he demonstrated the possibility of it in his own life, loving, and bearing the consequent suffering, to the end. It was the action of forces on the historical plane that recognized the threat of Jesus' disruptive teachings and did away with him. His death was not an event which occurred only in the eschatological world beyond history.

After Jesus' death, the fact that there was an unrealized aspect to the kingdom left the church feeling that it lived in a short interim between the coming of Jesus and his coming again. This undoubtedly caused a lack of interest in the early church in politics on the grand scale. It was all coming to an end very soon. So why worry about changing or improving the social order? We can see these tendencies in the ministry of Paul, for instance. But it is also true that the parousia hope was responsible in large measure for maintaining the ethical rigour of the early church, so even this

belief functioned positively in an historical setting. Eventually, when the hope waned, the church was forced to come to terms with the relativities of life in the world.

The Apocalypse was an example of a Christian use of late Jewish apocalyptic styles of thought. The language was certainly suitable for expressing negative thoughts against the Roman Empire, which, on the historical plane, was frustrating the Christian community. But for Christians it was also a glimpse beyond history to the place where Christ was already reigning. As such it didn't ^{not} elicit any feelings of positive responsibility from the Christian toward the state. It did strengthen his confidence so that he could remain loyal to his own community. On the whole, however, apocalyptic eschatology led the Christian away from a dynamic view of history.

For many New Testament writers the prolonging of the interim led to the development of theologies which tried to maintain the eschatological tension while emphasizing to a greater extent the here and now. Mark showed great skill in handling apocalyptic material. For many apocalyptists the interim period was simply a time when events of prognostic significance took place. For Mark it is the important time in which God's plan of salvation for the Gentiles is being worked out. Luke also boldly re-interpreted the primitive eschatology. He saw the redemptive history proceeding by continuous sections. At the mid point stood the time of Jesus. Directly after was the time of the church in which Christ rules through the Spirit. The Spirit was no longer, for Luke, the

eschatological gift. It was a present, helpful substitute for the final salvation which enabled the Christian to engage in the important historical task of the mission to the Gentiles. John's gospel and the epistle to the Hebrews both tended to solve the problem of the delayed parousia by finding ways of transcending history or escaping to a timeless thought world. But even John, through the device of mixing the tenses of his verbs, managed to keep a certain eschatological tension.

Toward the end of the New Testament period, eschatological ideas reveal another change of emphasis. The author of the Pastorals believed that history stretched out ahead for an indeterminate, but quite lengthy, period of time. The future kingdom, in his thought, did not press in upon the present with the urgency that it did for earlier writers. Jude believes the parousia doctrine because it is part of the orthodox tradition but it does not function in his church in the way that it had in earlier times. Just as too much disparity between actuality and the ideal caused apocalyptic, with its escape from history, to bloom, so when Christians accommodated themselves to what they thought were the permanent forms of historical organization, they tended to lose the strenuous ethical attitudes which went hand in hand with an eschatological world view.

The Theme of Universalism

A most useful theme for tracing New Testament attitudes to the state is universalism. Each person's basic political

philosophy arises out of his attitude to the particular entity to which he is most securely attached. Thus even though the prevailing political power at the beginning of the Christian era belonged to Rome, the average citizen of Israel thought of himself as belonging to the Jewish nation, and thought of Rome, when he thought of it at all, as alien and remote.

However, beginning in the Old Testament period, there was an increasing dissatisfaction in some quarters with such a limited cosmos. The exilic prophets showed that they were developing a consciousness of belonging to an entity which encompassed more than the immediate community of their allegiance. When a nation has achieved internal harmony and integration and has the imaginative capacity to look beyond its borders, a universal outlook becomes a possibility. In some cases it develops a selfish slant and is dubbed imperialism, but it can also be an expanding of the borders of the mind so that hopes and visions cherished at the parochial level are seen as a possibility for the whole community of mankind. There can be little doubt that the universalism of Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah was of this kind; Jesus also saw the Gentiles as potential members of the kingdom, though Israel continued to have an important instrumentality in his thought for the reaching of universal community.

Where this attitude predominated, as for instance in Luke-Acts, there was a very positive attitude to other states. Foreigners were not classed automatically as enemies. But the possibility of seeing them as brothers did not mean a passive

acceptance of the forms and standards of their governments. These could be strongly challenged with a view to their renovation.

In some cases the universal outlook may have made Christians conscious of being in competition with Rome, whose imperial policy was also informed by a universal outlook. Thus the author of the Apocalypse poured scorn upon the imperial trappings of the emperor, and the cult whose purpose was to bring unity to the whole inhabited world.

The apostolic community demonstrated its universal outlook primarily in its evangelistic thrust. Mark introduced the thought of the Gentile mission into the midst of his apocalyptic passage. The whole purpose of Luke's writings was to show how suitable the Christian faith was to being the religion of the world. These leaders believed that the first job of the church was to grow. And perhaps apostolic Christianity made its greatest social and political contribution where it was most intent on its missionary purpose, for here the new ethic definitely came into contact with the world. There were times, particularly near the end of the New Testament period, when they found the boldness of Luke's view too much, and they drew back into an enclave mentality, saving men out of the world into the church. Yet even in these situations the vision was not completely lost. John's gospel did make much of the image of the sheep fold which spoke of the safety and security of the small, contained community. But he also developed a theology which had the "other sheep" very much in view. The Pastorals reflect a community for which salvation was a potentially universal

achievement but which was rather too resigned to a situation in which relatively few embraced the gospel while the majority plunged deeper into wickedness and error. Yet through the channel of prayer, even this community reached out to see the possibility of the emperor becoming a Christian.

The evangelism which was such an important feature of the New Testament attitude, did imply a dissatisfaction with the philosophy which lay behind the states to which those evangelized belonged. It implied that it knew of a better way of achieving unified and cohesive communities than the Jewish method of rigid legalism or the efficient coercion of the Roman state; namely, the method of love. The root of all destructive political philosophies is the placing of one's own nation or culture at the centre of existence. The insight of the New Testament was that the absolute community, the heavenly kingdom of love and peace, was at the centre of existence judging all others, and drawing all others to its standards. It is true that the Christian ideas were visionary, and in a sense other-worldly, but then by what other means can the world's standards be changed?

The Theme of National Identity

As long as the Jewish nation existed, there was a certain assurance that there would be a positive Christian attitude to the state. Christians who had been brought up as Jews continued to find their identity in relation to Israel. Even Gentile Christians in adopting the religious heritage of Judaism

came to feel a sense of belonging and the consequent responsibility of a citizen. The political attitudes were often critical of the Jewish theocracy, but they showed a vital concern for the health of the society centred on Jerusalem. Where Rome was concerned the attitude was often indifference, because, with the notable exception of Paul and Luke, the early Christians did not feel that they were responsible members of the Roman Empire.

As the Jewish nation, torn by strife, gradually disintegrated and then, finally, seemed to have disappeared, there were severe crises for the Christians. These were mainly resolved by the decision of the churches to build up their own polity, to become, in short, a new Israel. This was never thought of, however, as a thoroughly political activity. It had the limited purpose of restoring to Christians a needed identity, and it was other-worldly in that it looked to an invisible king and waited for the future kingdom to be granted. James gives us some idea of how close the relationship between Christianity and Judaism had been originally, for he wrote as a Christian directly to Hebrew synagogues and expected to be listened to. Hebrews reflects a community of Jewish Christians whose members were having extreme difficulty in adjusting to the idea of being stateless sojourners. John's gospel shows how negative Christian thinking could be after the divorce had occurred. In the author's view there was no true Jewish nation left in existence. One senses in his writing that going hand in hand with this belief was a loss of positive concern for society. I Peter is one of the later writings which reflect

the attempt to re-establish a secure identity for Christians. Yours, he tells them, is the privilege of belonging to the new Israel, of being a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. This attempt to build up the Christian community as a kind of "third race" was no doubt necessary from one point of view, but it ran the danger of developing an enclave mentality which was informed by reverence for the principle of order rather than by the attraction of the ideal of love.

The Theme of Persecution

This study has tried to show what the persecutions were like. First, a suspicious and resentful populace began to make life difficult for Christians by exerting various social pressures and by campaigns of slander. This led on at least one occasion to a mass slaughter of believers. Nero chose the sect as a suitable scapegoat, and large numbers were burned or crucified. After this, persecution could have been for the name, but was probably carried out on a sporadic basis according to the local governor's estimate of the threat to order which Christians posed. During Domitian's reign there is evidence that some Christians were victims because of the emperor's jealousy and because he was not secure in his authority. In 112 A.D., according to good evidence, persecution was on the increase, but there was no policy of hunting out Christians, and many were able to live a relatively peaceful life.

The Christian response to persecution was remarkably consistent throughout the period. Some New Testament writers do not indicate the expected attitude in detail, because they assume it to be well known. There are enough places where the

response to persecution was articulated that we can make some general statements. First, in every period the example of Jesus' meek attitude before Pilate seemed to exert a strong influence. Christians were to have the same gentleness, kindness, and lack of guile when they faced the governor. Secondly, the New Testament writers constantly repeated their exhortation to give no cause for offense to Roman society. They were to maintain good conduct, and soon Rome would realize that they were not evil men. Thirdly, there was an attempt to show the Roman state that the church posed no threat to imperial rule. Though the state was part of that which was passing away, the early Christians were convinced that it was their duty to perform the basic duties of a good citizen. In fact, toward the end of the period when persecutions were on the increase, Christian affirmations about a positive duty to the state became even more positive than they had been at the time of Paul.

The Dominant Theme of Suffering Love

In dealing with attitude to the state under various themes, there has been one constant reference point, and that is the ethic of Jesus. Christians coped with the problems of their developing situation - persecutions and all - in a variety of ways: by adopting apocalyptic world views; by transcending history; by retreating to the safety of the fold. But in every situation they felt constrained to live according to the love ethic. They often found difficulty in combining this approach with an other-worldliness which took them away from the society of men but they did struggle with the problem and

found some ingenious and courageous approaches. It was here that the greatest contribution was made to political and social thinking, although it must be repeated that Christian contributions to social theory were meagre. The Christian ethic made no sense at all in an other-than-social setting.

The letter of James represents a stage when the ethical principles were rather simply, and perhaps naively, set forth. The greater part of the writing was given to exhortations to kindness, humility and charity, and to the praising of those who have a peaceful spirit and who obey the royal law of love for the neighbour. John's gospel contains a more developed theology, but one in which the spirit has the function of guiding Christians into those actions which Christ would approve. When Christians walk in the Spirit, John believed, love, joy and peace are manifest in the world. The author of the Pastorals, whose horizons were limited in so many ways, yet assumed that love could and should be a part of the life of the Christian community.

The early Christians were under no illusions about the difficulty of practicing love. In fact they often linked "suffering" and "love" in their thinking. Jesus had not sought suffering for its own sake, but he had accepted what was necessary in the course of his ministry of love. And this was the way it was for most Christians in the apostolic age. The writer of I Peter found Christ's suffering a strong motive power for believers who thought the way of love difficult. At some points in the New Testament an attempt was made to make martyrdom an attractive thing in itself. The Apocalypse urged Christians to

seek it as a positive goal. This was surely a perversion of Jesus' thought. This attitude looked for future rewards and expected nothing but a rebuff from the state in the present.

Jesus had been a loving, suffering servant within the life of his own nation. He had given a positive challenge to the state by preaching the powerful, transforming ethic of the transcendent kingdom. The Christian church would be at its best in any age in which it saw its responsibility to be preserving, salty presence within history. It would be at its best when its members, by their faithful following of the way of loving service, place a judging, transforming tension upon the ethic of measurable duty by which the states of the present world live.

A short time after the close of the New Testament period, an unknown writer composed an "Epistle to Diognetus" which contained a synthesis of many of the major themes of New Testament thought, and which managed also to preserve a positive and helpful attitude to the state:

Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind in country or speech or customs ... Though they live in Greek and barbarian cities, as each man's lot is cast, and follow the local customs in dress and food and the rest of their living, their own way of life which they display is wonderful and admittedly strange They take part in everything like citizens, and endure everything like aliens. Every foreign country is their native land, and every native land a foreign country They obey the established laws, and in their own lives they surpass the laws. They love all men and are persecuted by all men. They are unknown, and they are condemned; they are put to death, and they are alive By the Jews they are warred upon as aliens, and by the Greeks they are persecuted, and those who hate them cannot give a reason for their hostility. To put it briefly,

what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world r.... The soul is shut up in the body, but itself holds the body together; and Christians are kept in the world as in a prison, but themselves hold the world together.

APPENDIX

THE DATING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

It was felt that sections on the dating of the New Testament writings, if contained in the body of this study, would be intrusive. Yet, there is so much disagreement concerning the dates of writing that it seemed necessary to indicate how the chronology adopted here was arrived at. In most cases it was not thought necessary to be precise. Indeed, there are very few places where we know within a few years when a particular writing was composed. There are, however, two legitimate aims as far as this study is concerned. First, the study will be served if we can examine the evidence of New Testament times in the approximate order in which it was written. This approach makes it much easier to note any historical trends which there may be in the area of attitude to the state. Secondly, it will be helpful if we can with some assurance place a particular writing with relation to the historical landmarks of the era. It makes some difference, for instance, whether the thirteenth chapter of Mark was written before or after the Neronian persecution, before or after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The appendix also proceeds on the assumption that when a date is chosen on which there is quite broad agreement, it does not need as much justification as one that disagrees with the one approved by the majority of scholars.

CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

| DATE | HISTORICAL EVENTS | LITERATURE |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 50 A.D. | Paul's Arrival at Corinth (Acts 18) | 1 and 11 Thessalonians (50-51) 1 Corinthians (54-55) Galatians (54-55) 11 Corinthians, (55) Romans (56) |
| 58-59A.D. | Paul Imprisoned at Rome (Acts 28:16) | Colossians, Philemon, Philippians (58-61) |
| 62 A.D. | James Martyred | James (60) Hebrews (60-63) |
| 64 A.D. | Neronian Persecution | |
| 70 A.D. | Fall of Jerusalem | Mark (71) |
| 81 A.D.) | } Reign of Domitian | Matthew (90) Apocalypse (93-96) Luke-Acts (95) I Clement (95-96) |
| 96 A.D.) | | |
| | | |
| | | Johannine Gospel and Letters (90-120) |
| 112 A.D. | Pliny Writes to Trajan | I Peter (112) The Pastorals (100-130) Jude (130) II Peter (150) |

The vast majority of scholars would agree that the authentic letters of Paul were written between 50 - 61 A.D. The dates given for the various epistles depend upon the particular chronological scheme of Paul's life which one adopts. Since it is not of vital concern for this study there will be no attempt to justify the order that is assumed here. Ephesians is left out of consideration altogether.

James is maintained by some to be pseudonymous, symbolic in address, written to churches that are in the main Gentile, but at a time when the Gentile question had ceased to be a vital one. These scholars are forced to assume a very late date for the letter. They seem most unconvincing in their suggestions regarding an occasion for the letter. If we take the letter at face value, however, and assume that it was written by James, the leader at Jerusalem, to Jews generally, including Christian Jews, then we must assume an early date, before 62 A.D. The historical context provided by this date is a very suitable one for such a letter. It is altogether the kind of epistle that one would send if one were trying to spread the Gospel among the Jews of the diaspora, and this was precisely the task that James had undertaken at the Jerusalem meeting.¹

Hewbrews contains one line that seems to give concrete evidence of the time of writing. "You have not yet resisted to the death in the conflict with sin" (12:4). If the letter was written to Rome, as most scholars believe, then a date

1 Acts 15: 13-29; A. T. Cadoux, op. cit., 26.

prior to 64 A.D. is indicated. The reference to persecution (10:32 ff.) would then, and quite appropriately, refer to the troubles of 49 A.D. under Claudius. However, the Roman destination cannot be firmly established and there is a possibility that the reference to blood is figurative, so we really must conclude that the date is uncertain. It does seem that it was written before 96 A.D. as Clement quotes from it, and the references to the temple are such as one would expect if the temple worship were still going on. There is also the quotation (3:7 ff.) which emphasizes a forty year period of probation in the wilderness. The reference would be more apt if the fortieth year from the events of 30 A.D. were approaching. All in all, although with some hesitation, we have chosen a date of 60-63 A.D.¹

Mark, according to a quite general consensus of scholarly opinion, was composed sometime during the period 60 - 75 A.D. Many commentators try to be more precise than this because the years referred to contain the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D. Beasley - Murray has set forward, in convincing style, the reasons for a pre-70 A. D. date.² But the present writer found Brandon's counter-arguments even more persuasive³, and so a date of C. 71 A.D. has been chosen. It seems clear that the emphasis on persecution would not be so great if the book were written before the Neronian persecution.

1 See especially, W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 162, and F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews, XLii ff.

2 G. R. Beasley-Murray, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen.

3 S.G.F. Brandon, "The Date of the Markan Gospel," New Testament Studies, 7 (1960-61), 126 ff.

But the persecutions alone do not explain all of the special Markan material. The triumphal procession of Vespasian through the streets of Rome following the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., does seem to account in satisfactory fashion for the references in Mark 13 to the desecration of the temple.

Matthew shows that he is thoroughly familiar with Mark's gospel, so that a date sometime after 71 A.D. is to be assumed. Indications in 22:7 add weight to this assumption. All other internal evidence leads us to a considerably later date. The author went out of his way to show that God had punished Israel for her blindness. The great commission (28:19 f.) reflects the world wide vision of a growing, universal church. The author describes baptism with the use of the trinitarian formula. All of these things suggest a late first century date, perhaps about 90 A.D.

The Apocalypse is generally dated in the closing years of Domitian's reign, that is 93 - 96 A.D. The traditional reasoning is that emperor worship was the particular source of the author's wrath, and that Domitian had promoted the official cult in his later days more zealously than any of his immediate predecessors. This reason is supported by a number of smaller pieces of evidence. Thus, 17:11 appears to be an attempt to bring up to date an earlier prophecy written in the time of Vespasian or Titus. A date at the end of the first century seems to be in keeping with the life of the seven churches which is reflected in chapters 2 and 3. Again, 6:6

could quite easily be a reference to the agricultural legislation which Domitian is known to have had passed in 92 A. D. In addition to all this the tradition from Irenaeus' time is unanimous in saying that the Apocalypse was written at the end of Domitian's reign.¹

The author of Luke - Acts uses Mark as a major source for his gospel. Various passages suggest that the destruction of Jerusalem had already occurred. Thus Luke - Acts must have been composed after 70 A.D. If, as some commentators maintain, Luke was familiar with Josephus' Antiquities, then the work is past 93 A.D. Since the collected letters of Paul were known to most Christians who wrote in the second century, and since this author betrays no familiarity with them, we might safely assume that Luke - Acts could not have been written much past 100 A.D. Though it is impossible to be precise, a date of C. 95 A.D. fits in well with the probabilities.²

1 Clement is dated with almost universal assent, in the later years of Domitian's reign, or about 95-96 A.D. The main support for this dating is in the references which the letter contains to persecutions. There is an historical progression in his descriptions that corresponds to the movement from pre-Neronian times to the slaughter under Nero (6:1), and which concludes with a reference to the struggles of his own day.

1 Barclay Newman, "The Fallacy of the Domitian Hypothesis," New Testament Studies, 10 (1963-64), 133 ff.

2 C.K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, 62.

These latter difficulties are of the kind we could expect under the jurisdiction of a man of Domitian's temperament.

John's gospel demonstrates that the author was acquainted with the gospel according to Mark,¹ and since there is wide agreement that Mark was written at some time close to 70 A.D. John could not have been written earlier than 80 A.D. At least ten years, and more probably about 20 years, would be required for Mark to reach the place where John was written. By checking the use of John in the literature of the second century we can establish a terminus ante quem of about 120 A.D.² It seems impossible, and perhaps for our purposes it is unnecessary, to be more precise.

The Johannine epistles are closely related in their thought to the gospel. So in the absence of any strong indication to the contrary, we have assumed a date close to that of the gospel and possibly slightly later.

With 1 Peter the most fruitful approach is to try to relate the historical situation presupposed by the epistle to known conditions within the Roman Empire during the general period. This together with the evidence for the literary relationship of 1 Peter with other writings of the first and second centuries should help us narrow the possibilities considerably.

1 C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, 108.

2 C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, 424.

1 Peter shows a dependence on the Pauline letters and particularly on Romans and Ephesians. Even if the latter were not a second generation writing, which seems most unlikely, we could not assume a date earlier than about 68 A.D. The author of 1 Peter seemed also to be familiar with Hebrews and James, both of which we have dated in the earlier part of the same decade. Polycarp of Smyrna, writing about 135 A.D. shows that he is acquainted with the letter, so the other limit is some time prior to that date. Within this rather long period the historical situation that most closely fits the evidence concerning persecution which is contained in 4:12-16 is that which is reflected in Pliny's letter to Trajan of about 112 A.D. Neither the reign of Vespasian nor Domitian provides evidence of persecutions like those described in 1 Peter. Trajan's reign does, and in the very section of the empire to which this epistle is addressed. A date of about 112 A.D. seems quite believable for this writing.¹

What the Pastorals tell us about credal formulations, discipline, doctrine and hierarchical structure of the church, all suggest a second century date. But it is very difficult to narrow the limits to a few years. An important group of scholars suggest a date around 110 A.D. Some argue for a date of 160 or later. P.N. Harrison² has come up with a good argument which

1 F. N. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, 9 ff.

2 P. N. Harrison, Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians, 30 f.

stated that the Epistle of Polycarp, which was written around 135 A.D., was dependent upon the Pastorals. If we accept this theory the limits are narrowed to the first third of the second century. For our purposes, this is probably close enough. The letters do show a development when compared with the Pauline letters and the Gospel of Mark, to take two examples. They can safely be taken as evidence for the attitudes of the late New Testament period. ¹

II Peter was probably written about 150 A.D. Paul's epistles are spoken of as if they are known to Christians generally. Also, they have come to be regarded as scripture of equal weight with the Old Testament. For this to have happened would require a mid-second century date. The epistle was known to Origen, so that it must have been written sometime in the second century.

Jude, because it is so slavishly reproduced by II Peter, must have been written a decade or so earlier. The Gnostics who are attacked in this letter display the characteristics of early second century Gnosticism. ² Thus we will not be far wrong in our conjectures if we assign a date of C. 130 A.D. for Jude and C. 150 A.D. for II Peter.

1 C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, 10 ff.

2 M.S. Enslin, The Literature of the Christian Movement, 335 f.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chapters 1 and 2

- Bevan, E.R., The House of Seleucus. 2 vols. London: Edward Arnold, 1902.
- _____ Jerusalem under the High Priests. London: Edward Arnold, 1904.
- _____ A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. London: Methuen & Co., 1927.
- Black, Matthew, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature", Expository Times, LX, (1948).
- Bousset, W., Die Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903.
- Box, G.H., The Ezra Apocalypse. London: Isaac Pitman, 1912.
- _____ Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. ed. R.H. Charles. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- _____ Judaism in the Greek Period. Oxford: Clarendon, 1932.
- Buber, Martin, Moses. Oxford: East and West Library, 1946.
- Burkitt, F.C., Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. (The Schweich Lectures.) London: Oxford University Press, 1914.
- Buttenweizer, "Apocalyptic Literature" in The Jewish Encyclopedia.
- Charles, R.H., A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. London: A. & C. Black, 1913 (2nd ed.)
- _____ Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- _____ Studies in the Apocalypse. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913.
- Cook, S.A., The Old Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.
- Engell, Ivan, "The Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in 'Deutero-Isaiah.'" Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 31, No. 1 (January, 1948).

- Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. London: Kegan Paul, 1947.
- Frankfort, Henri, Kingship and the Gods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Frost, S.B., Old Testament Apocalyptic. London: The Epworth Press, 1952.
- Ginzberg, Louis, "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue towards the Apocalyptic - Eschatological Writings." The Journal of Biblical Literature. XLI, (1922), 115.
- Hollman, G., The Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus. Translated by E.W. Lummis. London: Philip Green, 1909.
- Hooke, S.H., "The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic." The Labyrinth. London: S.P.C.K., 1935.
- Lagrange, M.J., Le Judaïsme avant Jésus Christ. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1931.
- Levison, N., The Jewish Background of Christianity. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1932.
- Lods, Adolphe, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism: Translated by S.H. Hooke. London: Kegan Paul, 1937.
- MacLeod, Wm.C., The Origin and History of Politics, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1931.
- Moehlman, C.H., The Christian - Jewish Tragedy. Rochester: Leo Hart, 1933.
- Moore, G.F., Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Niebuhr, R., The Structure of Nations and Empires.
- North, C.R., "Pentateuchal Criticism." The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Judaism and Christianity. London: Gollancz, 1948.
- Porter, F.C., The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers. London: James Clarke, 1905.
- von Rad, Gerhard, Old Testament Theology, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Rankin, O.S., The Origin of the Festival of Hanukkah. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930.
- Riggs, J.S., A History of the Jewish People. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1900.

Rowley, H.H., The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London:
Lutterworth Press, 1944.

The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London:
Lutterworth Press, 1950.

(ed.) The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1951.

Schürer, Emil, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche
1901.

A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ.
Translated by John MacPherson, Sophie Taylor, Peter Christie
5 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885-1890.

Smith, W. Robertson, The Religion of the Semites. 3rd ed. London:
A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1927.

Snaith, Norman H., The Jews from Cyrus to Herod. Wallington:
Religious Education Press, 1949.

"The Historical Books," The Old Testament and Modern Study.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Tarn, W.W., Hellenistic Civilisation. 3rd ed. revised by the
author and G.T. Griffith. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1952.

Welch, A.C., Post-Exilic Judaism. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood
& Sons, 1935.

Chapter 3

- Berry, J.B., "The Temptations of Jesus." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, New College Library, University of Edinburgh.
- Bindley, T.H., Religious Thought in Palestine in the Time of Christ. London: Methuen & Co., 1931.
- Bishop, E.F.F., Jesus of Palestine. London: Clarke, 1955.
- Black, Matthew, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature." The Expository Times. LX, No.1, 11-15, (October, 1948.)
- Bultmann, R., Jesus, Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1929.
- Cadoux, A.T., Jesus and Civil Government. London: Swarthmore Press, 1938.
- Cadoux, C.J., The Historic Mission of Jesus. London: Lutterworth Press, 1941.
- _____ The Life of Jesus. West Drayton: Penguin, 1948.
- _____ "The Politics of Jesus." Congregational Quarterly. XIV, No.1, (Jan., 1936,) 58-67.
- Coates, John R., The Christ of Revolution. London: Swarthmore Press, 1920.
- Dalman, Gustav, The Words of Jesus. Translated by D.M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Dickey, Samuel, The Constructive Revolution of Jesus. London: Swarthmore Press, 1923.
- Dodd, C.H., Gospel and Law, New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Dougall, Lily, and Emmett, C.W., The Lord of Thought. London: S.P.C.K., 1922.
- _____, The Parables of the Kingdom. London: Fontana, rev. ed., 1961.
- Ellul, Jacques, The Presence of the Kingdom. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: S.C.M. Press, 1951.
- Holtzmann, O., The Life of Christ. Translated by J.T. Bealvy and M.A. Canney. London: A. & C. Black, 1904.
- Jeremias, Joachim, The Parables of Jesus. New York: Scribner's, rev. ed., 1963.

- _____, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, London: S.C.M. Press 1958.
- Kingdon, "Had the Crucifixion a Political Significance?" The Hibbert Journal. (1936-7) XXXV, 556.
- Klausner, J., Jesus of Nazareth, London: 1955.
- Liberty, Stephen, The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry. London: Milford, 1916.
- Lindsay, A.D., The Moral Teaching of Jesus. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937.
- Loewe, Herbert, "Render Unto Caesar". Religious and Political Loyalty in Palestine. Cambridge: University Press, 1940.
- Manson, T.W., "Is it possible to Write a Life of Christ?" The Expository Times, LIII, 248.
- _____, "The Life of Jesus: A study of the Available Materials." Bulletin of the John Ryland Library. Manchester: Manchester University Press, Vol. 28 No.2 p.9.
- Manson, William, Christ's View of the Kingdom. London: James Clarke & Co., 1918.
- _____, Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1943.
- Otto, Rudolph, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1938.
- Renan, Ernest, Vie de Jésus. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1906.
- Riesenfeld, Harald, Jésus Transfiguré. Kobenhavn: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1947.
- Robertson, A., Regnum Dei. London: Methuen and Co., 1901.
- Rosadi, Giovanni, The Trial of Jesus. Translation of the third Italian edition. London: Hutchinson, 1905.
- Rowley, H.H., An Outline of the Teaching of Jesus. London: Lutterworth Press, 1945.
- Schweitzer, Albert, The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1926.
- Scott, E.F., "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Mind of Jesus." The Journal of Biblical Literature. XLI, (1922) 137.
- Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Taylor, Vincent, "Is it Possible to Write a Life of Christ?"
Expository Times, LIII, 60.

_____, Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan, 1952.

White, T.G., "Render unto Caesar," Hibbert Journal.
XLIV, (Oct. 1945-July 1946) 263.

Windisch, Hans, Der Messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum.
Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1909.

Chapter 4

- Barnes, A.S., Christianity at Rome in the Apostolic Age. London: Methuen & Co. 1938.
- Bigg, Charles, The Church's Task under the Roman Empire. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Buss, Septimus, Roman Law and History in the New Testament. London: Rivingtons, 1901.
- Chapot, Victor, The Roman World. Translated by E.A. Parker, London: Kegan Paul, 1928.
- Clapperton, J.A., Through Roman Spectacles. London: Kelley, 1902.
- Dill, S., Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. London: Macmillan, 1911.
- Frend, W.H.C. "The Persecutions: Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 9 (1958).
- Gavin, Frank, Seven Centuries of the Problem of Church and State. Princeton: University Press, 1938.
- Glover, T.R., The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. London: Macmillan, 1923.
- Grant, Robert M., The Sword and the Cross, New York: MacMillan, 1955.
- Gwatkin, H.M., Early Church History to A.D. 313. Vol. 1. London: MacMillan, 1927.
- Selection from Early Christian Writers. London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Hallock, Frank H., "Church and State in Tertullian." The Church Quarterly Review, Vol. CXIX, No. 237, 61.
- Hardy, E.G., Christianity and the Roman Government. London: Longmans, Green, 1894.
- Hirsch, E.G., Christianity and the Roman Government. London: Longmans, Green, 1894.
- Hort, F.J.A., Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillan, 1894.
- Jones, A.H.M., Studies in Roman Government and Law.
- Juster, Jean, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Paul Guethner, 1914.
- Kidd, B.J., A History of the Church to A.D. 461. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

- Lanciani, R., Pagan and Christian Rome. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- Last, Hugh, "The Study of the Persecutions," Journal of Roman Studies, 27 (1937)
- Merrill, E.T., Essays in Early Christian History. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Milburn, R.L.P., "The Persecution of Domitian," Church Quarterly Review, 139-287 (1945)
- Moffatt, James, "The Church and the Civil Power." The International Review of Missions. Vol. XVIII, (1934), 263.
- Neil S., "Civilisation." Biblical Authority for Today. ed. A. Richardson and W. Schweitzer.
- Niven, W.D., The Conflicts of the Early Church London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- Norton, F.O., The Rise of Christianity. Chicago: University Press, 1924.
- Parker, T.M., Christianity and the State in the Light of History. London: A. & C. Black, 1955.
- Ramsay, W.M., The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170. 5th ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1893.
- Rayner, A.J., "Christian Society in the Roman Empire." Greece and Rome. Vol. XI, No. 33 (May, 1942) 113.
- Sherwin-White, A.N., Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Sherwin-White, A.N., "The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again", Journal of Theological Studies, 3(1952).
- de Ste. Croix, G.E.M., "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" Past and Present, 26(1963).
- _____ "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted? An Amendment: A Rejoinder," 27(1964).
- Westbury-Jones, J., Roman and Christian Imperialism. London: Macmillan, 1939.
- Westcott, B.F., "The Two Empires; the Church and the World." The Epistles of St. John. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1892.
- Workman, H.B. Persecution in the Early Church London: Kelley, 1906.

Chapter 5

- Alexander, A.B.D., The Ethics of St. Paul. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1910.
- Badcock, F.J., The Pauline Epistles. London: S.P.C.K., 1937.
- Barth, Karl, The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Humphrey Milford, 1933.
- Beare, F.H., St. Paul and His Letters, London: Adam and Chas. Black, 1962.
- Bryden, Walter W., The Spirit of Jesus in St. Paul. London: James Clarke and Co., 1925.
- von Campenhausen, Han, "Zur Auslegung von Röm. 13." Bertholet Festschrift, 97. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950.
- Carrington, P., The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge: University Press, 1940.
- Cullmann, O., Christ and Time. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. London: S.C.M. Press, 1951.
- _____ "L'Essence de la foi chrétienne d'après les premières confessions." Révue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses. XXII, (1942), 30-42.
- Dewick, E.C., Primitive Christian Eschatology. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Dibelius, M., A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1936.
- _____ Paul. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1953.
- _____ Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Gottingen: 1909.
- _____ Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, London: 1956.
- von Dobschutz, E., The Apostolic Age. Translated by F.L. Pogson. London: Philip Green, 1909.
- Dodd, C.H., According to the Scriptures, London: 1952.
- _____ The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London: Fontana, 1959
- Evans, Ernest, To the Romans. London: A.R. Mowbray. 1948.
- Lietzmann, Petrus und Paulus in Rom. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1915.
- MacGregor, G.H.C., "Principalities and Powers," New Testament Studies, 1 (1954).

- Morrison, Clinton D., The Powers that Be. London: S.C.M. Press, 1960.
- Pierce, C.A., Conscience in the New Testament, London: 1955.
- Reicke, B., "The Law and this World according to Paul", Journal of Biblical Literature, 71 (1950).
- Rigaux, B., Les Epîtres aux Thessaloniens, Paris: 1956.
- Sanday, W., and Headlam, A.C., The Epistle to the Romans. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Schoeps, H.J., Paul, The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish History, London: 1961.
- Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: A. & C. Black, 1931.
- Stacey, W.D., The Pauline View of Man. London: 1956.
- Stewart, J.S., A Man in Christ. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935
- "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology", Scottish Journal of Theology, 4(1951).
- Whiteley, D.E.H., The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Chapter 6.

- Bacon, B.W., Studies in Matthew, New York: Henry Holt, 1930.
- Barnard, L.W., "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian,"
New Testament Studies, 19(1963-64).
- Barrett, C.K., The Gospel According to St. John. London: S.P.C.K.
1955.
- _____, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, London:
Epworth Press, 1961.
- _____, The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Beare, F.W., The First Epistle of St. Peter. Oxford:
Basil Blackwell, 1947.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., Jesus and the Future, London:
MacMillan, 1954.
- _____, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, London: MacMillan, 1957.
- Brandon, S.G.F., "The Date of the Markan Gospel,"
New Testament Studies, 7(1960-61).
- Bruce, F.F., "'To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes',"
New Testament Studies, 9(1962-63).
- Cadoux, A.T., The Thought of St. James, London: James Clarke, 1944.
- Carpenter, B.H., The Johannine Writings. London: Constable
and Co., 1927.
- Carrington, Philip, The Meaning of Revelation. London:
S.P.C.K., 1931.
- Causse, Antonin, "De la Jerusalem terrestre a la Jerusalem celeste."
Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.
XXVII, 12-36, 1947.
- Clarke, W.K.L., The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.
London: S.P.C.K., 1937.
- Conzelmann, Hans, The Theology of St. Luke, New York:
Harper and Row, 1960.
- Cranfield, C.E.B., The First Epistle of Peter. London:
S.C.M. Press, 1950.
- Dodd, C.H., Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel,
Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Easton, B.S., The Pastoral Epistles, London: 1948.
- Grant, F.C., The Gospels, London: 1959.

- Geldenhuis, Norval, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1950.
- Harrison, P.N., The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, London: 1921.
- Henshaw, New Testament Literature, London: Geo. Allen & Unwin, 1952.
- Heussi, Karl, War Petrus wirklich romischer Martyrer? Leipzig: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1937.
- Hoskyns, E., The Fourth Gospel. London: Faber & Faber, 1947.
- Hoskyns, E., and Daveys, N., The Riddle of the New Testament, 3rd ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1947.
- Jackson, F.J.F., and Lake, K., (editors). The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vol. London: Macmillan, 1920-33.
- Kiddle, Martin, The Revelation of St. John. (Moffatt New Testament Commentary Series.) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1940.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Oxford: 1950.
- Knox, John, "Pliny and I Peter", Journal of Biblical Literature, (1952).
- Lake, Kirsopp, Landmarks of Early Christianity. London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Lightfoot, J.B., S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols., London: 1900.
- Lock, W., The Pastoral Epistles. (I.C.C.) London: A. & C. Black, 1926.
- Loisy, A., Les Evangiles Synoptique. 2 vols., Macon: Protat Freres, 1907-8.
- Manson, W., The Gospel of Luke. (Moffatt Commentary.) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- _____, The Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951.
- Milburn, R.L.P., "The Persecution of Domitian," Church Quarterly Review, 139(1945).
- Moffatt, Jas., An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. London: A. & C. Black, 1926.
- Newman, Barclay, "The Fallacy of the Domitian Hypothesis," New Testament Studies, 10(1963-64).
- O'Neill, J.C., The Theology of Acts. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Peake, A.S., The Revelation of St. John. London: Holborn, 1929.
- Purdy, A.C., "The Epistle to the Hebrews," Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 11.

- Ramsay, Wm., The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904.
- Robinson, T.H., The Gospel of Matthew. (Moffatt Commentary.) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- Schweizer, Edward, "Mark's Theology," New Testament Studies, 10(1963-64).
- Scott, E.F., The Beginning of the Church. New York: Scribner's 1914.
- _____ The Epistle to the Hebrews. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.
- Selwyn, E.G., The First Epistle to the Hebrews. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.
- Streeter, B.H., The Primitive Church. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- _____ The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan. 1927.
- Swete, H.B., The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan. 1898.
- _____ The Apocalypse of St. John. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1907.
- Taylor, V., The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Weinel, H., Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Tubingen: J.B.C. Mohr, 1911.
- Westcott, B.F., The Epistle to the Hebrews. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1906.
- Wickham, The Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Methuen & Co., 1910.
- Williams, C.S.C., "The Date of Luke-Acts," Expository Times, 64(1953).

General Works

- Angus, S., The Environment of Early Christianity. London: Duckworth, 1914.
- Barth, K., Church and State. Translated by G.R. Howe. London: S.C.M. Press, 1939.
- _____, Community, State, and Church, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1960.
- Black, Hugh, Christ or Caesar. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Brunner, E., Justice and the Social Order. Translated by Mary Hottiger. London: Lutterworth Press, 1945.
- Cadoux, C.J., The Early Church and the World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1925.
- Carlyle, A.J., The Christian Church and Liberty. London: Jas. Clarke and Co., 1924.
- Cochrane, C.N., Christianity and Classical Cultures. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Cullmann, Oscar, The State in the New Testament, London: S.C.M. Press, 1957.
- Dibelius, M., From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- Duhm, Bernard, The Ever-Coming Kingdom of God. Translated by Archibald Duff. London: A. & C. Black, 1911.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., The Dead Sea Scrolls. Translated by E.M. Rowley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Van Dusen, H.P., and others, Church and State in the Modern World. New York: Harper & Bros., 1937.
- Gardner, E. Clinton, Biblical Faith and Social Ethics, New York: Harper, 1960.
- Gluckman, Max, Politics, Law, and Ritual in Tribal Society, Chicago: Aldine, 1965.
- von Harnack, Adolph, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. 2 vols. Translated by James Moffatt. 2nd ed. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- Hudson, E.C. and Reckitt, M.B., The Church and the World. Vol. 1. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938.
- Hughes, Philip, E., "The Biblical Doctrine of the State." The Churchman, Vol. LXV, 3, (July-Sept. 1951.)

- Knox, John, The Ethic of Jesus in the Teaching of the Church, New York: Abingdon, 1961.
- Kraemer, Hendrik, The Bible and Social Ethics, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Lebreton J., and Zeiller, J., The History of the Primitive Church. Translated by E.C. Messenger. Vols. 1 and II. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1942.
- Lecler, Joseph, The Two Sovereignities. Translated by Hugh Montgomery London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1952.
- Lindsay, A.D., The Essentials of Democracy. 2nd ed. London: Humphrey Milford, 1935.
- _____, Our Duty to God and to the State. London: Lutterworth Press, 1940.
- Loisy, A., The Birth of the Christian Religion. Translated by L.P. Jacks. London: Geo. Allen and Unwin, 1948.
- Richardson, Alan, and W. Schweitzer, (ed.). Biblical Authority for Today. London: S.C.M. Press, 1951.
- Schlatter, Adolf, The Church in the New Testament Period, London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Schweitzer, W., Die Herrschaft Christi und der Staat im Neuen Testament. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1948.
- Scott, E.F., The Varieties of New Testament Religion, New York: Scribner's, 1943.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert, Christ and the Caesars. Translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith, London: S.C.M. Press, 1955.
- _____, New Testament Theology, London: S.C.M. Press, 1955.
- Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. Translated by Olive Wyon from the German edition, 1911. 2 vols. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931.
- Turner, C.H., Studies in Early Church History. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Watson, Philip S., The State as a Servant of God. London: S.P.C.K., 1946.
- Weinel, H., Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- von Weizsacker, Carl, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. Vol. 1, Translated by James Millar from 2nd ed. London: Williams & Norgate, 1894.