

Durham E-Theses

*A re-appraisal of the doctrine of God deprived from
the new testament*

A. J. Blanksby

How to cite:

Blanksby, A. J. (1961) A re-appraisal of the doctrine of God deprived from the new testament.
Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8327/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

3
000

A

RE - APPRAISAL

OF

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

DERIVED FROM

THE

NEW TESTAMENT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

-oooJooo-

PART I. THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF GOD.

Chapters	Pages
I The Challenge of Modern Philosophy	1
II The Old Testament World-View	18
III Prophetic Modifications	49
IV Later Complicating Features	72
V The Final Old Testament Picture	109
VI Relevant Contemporary Elements	131

PART II. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF GOD.

VII Introductory	150
VIII Son of Man	175
IX The Pauline Christ	186
X The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews	198
XI The Development of the Technical Use of the Word	203
XII A Brief Introductory Statement of St. John's Christology	216
XIII The Johannine Conception of the Divinity of Christ	222
XIV The Humanity of Christ in the Fourth Gospel	242
XV Son of God and Son of Man	251
XVI The Glory of God	269
XVII Other Life Figures	282

PART III. CONCLUSIONS

XVIII The New Testament	296
XIX Historical Formulations	318
XX The Constitutional Sovereignty of God	346
Bibliography	385

PART ONE

THE CHALLENGE OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY

A modern biblical theologian can scarcely proceed without taking into account what modern philosophers have been saying concerning metaphysical statements, and the state of biblical scholarship. It will leave us in a position to give freshness to the review of biblical materials if we discuss the relevant aspects of modern philosophy first.

1.

Since the days of Kant theological statements have been steadily under attack. The attack reached its climax under the more trenchant early logical positivists, who refused to discuss metaphysical statements because

2.

they considered them meaningless. This was a reversal of the earlier primacy given to metaphysical propositions, as having their source

3.

in God, and on that account, being indisputable.

1. Cf. D.F. Pears, *The Nature of Metaphysics*, Macmillan, 1957 for an article by S.N. Hampshire on *Metaphysical Systems*, p.25, in which he discusses Kant's search for a metaphysical authority by which to underwrite morality. See also *The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking*, by D.M. Emmet, p.15
2. Cf. T.R. Miles, *Religion & the Scientific Outlook*, Geo. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1959, for the notion that "absolute" existence is "unintelligible". See also article by I.M. Crombie on "The Possibility of Theological Statements" in *Faith & Logic*, ed. Basil Mitchell, p.33. Also article Thos. McPherson on "Religion & Rationality", C.Q.R. Mar-June, 1960, p.201, in which he says that religion is said to be "irrational", "not expressible in assertions", "non-supportable by rational argument", "has an emotional basis", "does not really say anything", is "revealed".
3. See L. Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, Croal Lectures, Nisbet & Co. Ltd., p.135, "For our seniors the concepts of reason were the most certain realities and the objects of sense perception had very questionable status. For our juniors verification by the senses is the only guarantee of reality deserving of the name."

This original claim of the philosophers, which has been greatly
1. modified, drew its strength from the growth of the scientific
2. approach and method. The main contention is that metaphysical
statements have no terms of reference and there^{fore} cannot be verified.
The verification principle on which the Logical Positivists take
3. their stand has not escaped without criticism. It has been pointed
out that metaphysical ways of thinking have their legitimate place
4. up to a point. The resultant discussions have led to a re-examination
of metaphysical statements and their separation from "scientifically
verifiable" statements of fact. A new interest in language has
followed, which reviews and classifies types of words and sentences,
the meaning of the words, their grammatical arrangement, the logical
sequence of the sentences and the emotional accompaniments of certain
5. words.

1. See W.F. Zuurdeeg, *An Analytical Philosophy of Religion*, Geo.Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1959, pp.120ff. Also Thos, McPherson, C.Q.R. pp.210f, for a criticism of the Logical Positivist position. Also *Nature of Metaphysics* pp.124f.
2. Modern science no longer claims, nor can claim, to pronounce on the nature of reality. See Zuurdeeg, *ibid* pp.234f for a discussion on the "new" science. Also articles "Science & Metaphysics" in D.F. Pears, "The Nature of Metaphysics", and "Contemporary Scientific Mythology" by S. Toulmin in "Metaphysical Beliefs". See espe. p.80 Quotation from Butterfield.
3. D.M. Emmet, *ibid*.pp.58f, points out that scientific judgements are only better than Metaphysical because subjected to more thorough-going verification. Cf. also pp.94 and 190f concerning the verification techniques for gathering, checking and co-ordinating reports. G.F. Woods also in "Theological Explanation" pp.39, 57 & 110f sets out the satisfactory requirements for an explanation that goes beyond the usual frontiers of our knowledge.
4. See D.M. Emmet, *ibid*, pp.200ff, W. Zuurdeeg, *An Analytical Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 127 ff & 265, Thos. McPherson article C.Q.R. Mar.-June 1960 pp.210f, T.R. Miles *Religion & Scientific Outlook*, pp.18ff., pp.28ff.
5. T.R. Miles uses phrases such as "dud cheque", "cash value" & "definitional joker" concerning some sentences and words Cf. *ibid*, pp.20,27,36. See also "The Logical Status of Belief" in *Metaphysical Beliefs*, pp.171ff.

Metaphysical sentences are to be distinguished from verifiably accurate sentences in that they are said to be making claims that are unverifiable. They cannot be repeated and tested under the scientifically indisputable conditions demanded by the modern scientific method. Verifiable statements of fact are sometimes styled "indicative statements". The difficulty concerning metaphysical statements centres in the use of the words of 'indicative' speech as applied to transcendent subjects. There is said to be a kind of "fraudulence" about them. Such statements are being variously described as "convictional", "narrative", "parabohical", "analogical", "mythological", "theological", or the language of "faith" or "testimony", according to the scheme under which their examination has taken place. They are to be associated with

1. See D.M. Emmet, *ibid.*, p.94 for a description of conditions.
2. Cf. Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, pp.44ff. Cf. also pp.59 & 130 "is" language.
3. See p.6 below and footnotes.
4. See S.J.T. Dec. 1950, article by F. Ferré, "Is Language about God Fraudulent?", pp.337 - 360. See also Faith & Logic, pp.43 and 48.
5. Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, p.46 "Convictional language has the totality of reality in mind." See whole of Chapt. 1.
6. Zuurdeeg pp.54f. "The Possibility of Theol. Statements", I.M. Crombie (in Faith & Logic, ed. Basil Mitchell) p.79, cf. T.R.M. *ibid.*, pp.115f & 208.
8. See D.M. Emmet, *ibid.*, pp.119, 175, G.F. Wood, *ibid.* p.114
9. S. Toulmin article called "Contemporary Scientific Mythology" in "Metaphysical Beliefs", ed. A. MacIntyre etc. pp.15ff. Also D.M. Emmet, *ibid.*, quotes Cassirer on p.99 as saying, "myth-thinking is an alternative way of looking at the world." See Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, pp.173ff.
10. See I.M. Crombie title, *ibid.*, and G.F. Wood's book "Theological Explanation".
11. Cf. "analogia fidei" in J. McIntyre article p.14, S.J.T. above, and D.M. Emmet, *ibid.*, p.126. For contra see A. Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, p.83.
12. Cf. also terms "total assertion" (Emmet, p.154), "value judgements" (*ibid.*, pp.142 & 150.) W.A. Whitehouse also uses "church-thinking" in *The Christian Faith & the Scientific Attitude*, p.133. Other terms applied are "illustrative" and "interpretative".

what has come to be known as a "world view" or "weltanschauung" of the speaker. Man is said to organize his life around, or "establish his existence"^{1.} in relation to certain convictions about existence. This governs and directs his faith, and controls and gives "form" to conflicting lesser convictions of his life, and makes up his total view of life. By his world view man is able to thread his perilous way through the ever-increasing mass of phenomenal information and traditional reflection upon it, selecting what fits in with his world view, and neglecting or explaining away what does not. Only thus can he go on living. The driving force behind this "establishment" is said to be man's sheer inability and refusal to live with chaos and disorder, and his resultant^{2.} constant striving after order, unity and comprehensiveness. The best world views^{3.}, then, are those which explain the greatest number of the facts of existence, and reduce them to a commendable order and unity in a comprehensive whole. The significance of the facts left outside^{4.} the scheme of any world view is becoming increasingly recognized.

A world view is given "shape" in terms of a "model" or "key feature" which has an accepted authority within a well-recognized but limited discipline of the "indicative" world, and which seems to the holder to help.

1. Zuurdeeg's phrase, *ibid*, pp.85ff. He also uses the phrase "fanatical claim" as a supreme establishment of the ego. See pp.78 & 93.
2. The unifying strength depends on the power of the "Convictor", cf. Zuurdeeg pp.79f goes on to speak of "Absolute Convictor", and on p.112 of "convictional world view". For a discussion on "form" see D.M. Emmet: pp.61,67.
3. See D.F.Pears, *ibid*, pp.21ff. See W.A. Whitehouse, Riddell Memorial Lectures 1960, Oxford Press, Order, Goodness, Glory, pp.31f. re the struggle with chaos.
4. See Zuurdeeg, p189 re inadequacy of some world views. Also L. Hodgson's view of "unity", *ibid*.pp.89ff.

his understanding of existence itself. The modern philosopher is quite ready to admit the value of "models" in order to set out a hypothetical case, or give a "frame" of reference to a mathematical or scientific theory meant to explain a given number of proven examples of experience within the phenomenal world; but he challenges the transfer of a term having authorised use within an appropriate empirical discipline, to speculative exercises of reason where its use can have no empirical basis. This represents a "jump" from the natural to the metaphysical plane, or a break in categories. Such a transferred application might help to illustrate man's conceptions of the metaphysical world, but these statements about the metaphysical world do not have validity comparable with that of verifiable, indicative statements¹ within the phenomenal world.

1. See T.R. Miles, *ibid*, pp.41ff. re the legitimacy of moral assertions Attempts are often made to subtly conceal the break in category. (a) On the spatial plane "dimensions" are used to refer to something outside the terms of reference of the word "space". cf. D.M. Emmet, *ibid*, pp.109f. See also G.F. Wood, *ibid*, "dimensions only extend the range but not the character". (b) Within the time-history concept remote antiquity is taken as equivalent to "eternal". The word "eternal" is also suspect. See article (in D.F.Pears, *ibid*,) "Metaphysics and History", pp.83ff. (c) In the ethical field "ought" is often equated with "is". See D.F. Pears, pp.117ff. (d) Within scientific spheres the authority of "verifiable" hypotheses carefully worked out on inductive or deductive principles is transferred to the metaphysical plane. The status of scientific theory is discussed in a chapter on Science and Metaphysics in D.F. Pears, *ibid*, pp.61ff. Re induction and deduction see pp.39ff, also D.M. Emmet, *ibid*, pp.6ff & 17f. See also "We" in *Modern Philosophy, in Faith & Logic*, ed. Basil Mitchell, where "we" is tantamount to the evaluative element in genuine moral judgements. cf.p.196. (e) Some words have strong emotive associations and are linked with instincts and fears and survival, and are thought to be true in themselves. Cf. Zuurdeeg, p.57 re the use of "solemn and august over-arching concepts to silence deep-seated fears etc." see also p.248. (f) The dangers of using the words, sentences and logic of the "ordinary" world often slurs the fact that we are talking about the transcendent world.

The concession regarding the legitimate use of metaphysical statements withⁱⁿ the phenomenal world has the effect of narrowing down the area of challenge. It is only the final over-ambitious application of a "model" that is declared invalid.^{1.} It is at this point that the battle is to be joined, and it is to be discovered in its most challenge-^{2.} able form in the theological concept of "God".

There is also to be noted a graded evaluation of metaphysical "key features" or "models". Some have greater acceptance as models because, within their "this-worldly" application, they belong to what are considered the more verifiable disciplines. Mathematics and^{3.} scientific formulations are given a preference over historical, religious and political models in that the verification methods of mathematics and science have reached a higher form of precision. Accepted tests can be carried out under strict supervision. The results can be compared with other tests under similarly acceptable conditions, and there is therefore a greater guarantee of accuracy or truth to be established^{4.} from them. Moreover, some mathematical statements have an accepted self-authentic^{ing} proof within themselves.

1. See D.F. Pears, *ibid*, pp.138f, "The metaphysical assertion is not useless or inexplicable in that it is only the last and fatally over-ambitious application of a concept which, up to that point we properly employ." See also D.M. Emmet, pp. 200ff for an evaluation of metaphysical statements.
2. See T.R. Miles pp.145ff. re types of theistic language. Cf. J.M. Crombie, *ibid*, p.43, "the word "God" has no identifying force. He is not known to anyone. "i.e. no terms of reference.
3. See T.R. Miles *ibid*, pp.71f re "models". This is also usually accompanied by a preference for the inductive methods of science. See D.F. Pears, *ibid*, pp.10f and for the incompleteness of probability in the inductive method pp.39ff. Also see note 1 (d) on previous page.
4. That the formulations of science also stand within a framework of pre-supposition and is not wholly free from "convictional" elements is being increasingly recognized. See Zuurdeeg, *ibid*, p.52.

Disciplines such as history, on the other hand, depend to a larger extent on the subjective judgements and interpretative angle of their propounders. Recent philosophers have, however, pointed out the difference between the effectiveness of the models to be one of degree rather than of kind.^{1.} Different models are more effective for differing purposes. The question of the "frailty" of the historical model is most important for the biblical theologian in that biblical "revelation" of God is set in a "frame-work" of history. On the surface of things it seems to claim that certain historical events are so pregnant with meaning that they have significance in explaining the nature of reality.

Several areas of debate emerge: the status of the biblical metaphysical sentences, the significance of the "historical" model or key-feature in the biblical world-view and concept of reality, (viz, God,) and the meaning of the terms used.

The sentence-language question is resolving itself into a widespread recognition of the special nature of all metaphysical statements,^{2.} and this recognition has a big bearing on our attitude to the historical model as well. In the final analysis assertions concerning the ultimate constitution of the universe do not refer to something empirically observable. They are not scientific generalizations or mathematical formulae.

1. See Zuurdeeg, *ibid*, p.52. A Richardson's preface to "An introduction to the Theol. of N.T." p.10. Cf. G.F.Wood; *ibid*, p.31. "A series of changes began when it became generally accepted that all empirical methods worked with pre-suppositions of one kind and another: neither science nor history can proceed without implied or implicit views about the general character of the world."
2. See notes re "analogical" etc. nature of such statements p.3 above.

They are moral exhortations, and are often arrived at in the teeth of
2. empirical evidence. They are out of reach of proof or disproof because
they are dependent on a world-view which is "convictional", or they
are a matter of faith and commitment of the person. They are analogical
representations of a set of accumulated experiences of the transcendent
3. "other" set in a helpful, familiar frame-work. The tentative and
incomplete nature of such world-views is not always recognised when
they are given shape. Total commitment to some world-view seems
necessary all along the line in order that men may make sense of the
universe and their place within it. In the very nature of the case the
transcendent "other" is always proving greater than any analogical
representation of it. Meantime the relevant issue is that such
convictional world-views are out of the reach of empirical proof or
4. disproof. The philosopher must therefore content himself with limiting
his attack to an examination of the meaningfulness of the theologian's
5. language.

It follows that the claim that biblical truth is "revealed"
truth can be said to be a "convictional statement".

1. See T.R. Miles, *ibid.* p.41.
2. So Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, pp.291, 44f, 46.
3. See R. Bultmann, *Theol. of N.T.* vol.II Epilogue I Amer. edition. N.T. faith is not a choosing to understand oneself in one of several possible ways universally available to man, but man's response to God's word which encounters him in Jesus Christ. The difficulty of apprehending anything "other" than ourselves in its "raw" state is the basic problem of Idealism. See D.M. Emmet, *ibid.*, p.26, "Idealism begins from the fact that our primary awareness is already an ordering and interpretative activity." See also re "things" p.91. For a grappling with the problem of the "other" from the committal angle see Buber's "I - Thou" and "I - it" distinctions in his "Ich und Du". T.T. Clark, 1937; Trans. R. Gregor-Smith.
4. Cf. T.R. Miles, *ibid.*, p.29, "Despite the re-admission of moral assertions, it does not follow that sentences containing the word "God" can simply return into currency as though they had not been criticised."
5. See G.F. Woods, *ibid.*, p.32 re the philosopher's main function unless some comprehensive "empirically" founded world-view appears.

Here the philosopher and the theologian part company; on the one side, we have no empirical verification and therefore unbelief, on the other, there is faith and committal. This is the crux of the whole intriguing subject of revelation. It is here that it is finally to be accepted or rejected. Convictional claims are a matter of faith and out of the reach of philosophical attack. The philosopher, by his scientific approach, is dedicated to a detached, objective attitude to his subjects of research. He merely reckons to report what he sees, experiences and verifies, and argues inductively to generalisations from large numbers of verified examples. This scientific attitude has limitations when it comes to dealing with matters in which the essence of the case demands that the subject be himself involved. Commitment might even be claimed to be a necessary qualification for the understanding of matters of religion.

In a non-mathematical subject such as history, its significance can be hardly be said to be exhausted even if it could be said to be completely and scientifically reported. In the biblical record we have history set forth as revelation. It is one of the achievements of modern philosophy that we are no longer required to embark on long discussions on the nature of revelation as such, however informative such a venture might be. Nor does the case for revelation depend

1. See G.F.Woods, *ibid*, p.31 feels that belief in God might be the necessary pre-supposition of the theological explanation of the world in some such way as faith in the postulate of uniformity might be a necessary pre-supposition of scientific explanation.
2. Cf. Butterfield *Christianity and History*, p.107, A.Richardson, *Theol N.T.* p.13 quotes St. Augustine "Nisi credideritis, non intellegetis". Also S.A. Cooke. *The O.T., a Reinterpretation*, p.222, W.A.Whitehouse. *Order, Goodness, Glory* p.41. Cf. the Barthian position, see J.McIntyre, *S.J.T.* Mar.1959, pp.14f. It is the basis of Bultmann's "scandal of the incarnation", see *Theol. of N.T.* vol.1, section 46, Amer. ed.
3. Cf. G.F.Wood, p.103. Also D.F.Pears, *ibid*, pp.97f.

upon the unverifiable validity of history as an objective record or upon its frailty as a metaphysical model. The discussions have been cut short by the recognition of the convictional nature of the biblical revelation and the analogical view of biblical history along with all other moral assertions and analogical expressions of them. The revelation is to those who are committed, the history is not to be confused with "indicative" history. This is what the philosophers claim,^{1.} and biblical scholars have also come to recognise that the biblical testimony is sensitive to the "theological" nature of biblical history.^{2.} If we accept these conclusions, the discussions on "revelation" and "historical accuracy" can now be seen in their true perspective in the field of scholarship. The former belongs to the discussions on faith, the latter to those on analogy. As matters of faith and conviction are beyond proof or disproof, the main task of the biblical theologian at present seems to be to investigate the nature of analogy in general, and in particular history as analogy, and to relate his findings to the effectiveness or otherwise of the biblical, historical, analogical models.^{3.}

The recognition of the analogical nature of the biblical record implies something concerning the tentativeness and incompleteness of the expression of the revelation it contains. Analogical statements are not to be confused with exhaustive statements of indicative fact. They are not, in other words, univocal reporting - but neither are they equivocal reporting. They may say too much, and need the restrictive presence of other analogies, as well as say too little and require other analogical help.

1. See footnotes above pp.1 & 2.
2. Cf. C.H.Dodd. *Apost. Preaching*, pp.89f. *Bible Today*, p.31., H.H. Rowley. *Faith of Israel* in the introduction. C.R.North *O.T. and Mod. Stud.* pp.63ff. Cf. p.72 re "theologically edited" materials cf. M.Noth, *History and the Word in the O.T.* (*Rylands Bull.* ¹¹Mr. 1950. vol.32 No.2) and W.A.Whitehouse, *Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude*, p.36

Analogy is a widely used medium of communication especially in the communication of the unknown. It works from within the bounds of logic and utilizes word symbols arranged in accepted syntactical and grammatical orders. It is behind the recognized educational principle of teaching by moving from the known to the unknown. It can never in the nature of the case be the same as what it seeks to illuminate. There is always some part of the "new" knowledge not covered by the likeness. The unknown is always "greater" than the known with which it is compared.^{1.} So much is common usage and generally accepted. It is when analogical processes are being used to elucidate the nature of the supernatural world that they become important to theology and the subject of philosophical investigation. It is here that analogies partake of the "fraudulence" referred to earlier. They are being lifted out of their accepted applications within the phenomenal world and applied to the supernatural world, arguing from one world to another world, about which we can verify nothing. Analogies of this kind become convictional world-views which seek to say something about "absolute existence" by arguing from existence as we know it. By arguing from natural "being" they seek to say something about supernatural "being". Again, by the very nature of analogy it must first be said that it can never be an exact account. The transcendent "other" must always be "greater" than its this-worldly analogical representation. The difference between what is covered by

1. See D. M. Emmet, ibid. p.227 "the word does not copy the structure of the real".

any particular analogy and what is not is sometimes the most significant feature of analogical processes. It is the elucidation of what is dissimilar that stands behind the purpose of analogy. This is like that;^{1.} but it is also unlike it. Analogy may proceed by acceptance and denial. It means that analogies are not to be taken literally. These factors must be taken into account when we seek to understand the meaning of the analogical processes which have been applied to elucidate the transcendent "Other". We must always bear in mind that we are breaking the category.^{2.}

This means that analogical history must never be confused with "indicative" history. A distinction must be drawn between factual truth and analogical truth.^{3.} Therefore analogy can never be coterminous with reality. In particular in our theological thinking the limitations of our analogies must not be allowed to cloud the real nature of the "other". Our analogies are often "only pointers to a meaning they cannot contain".^{4.} It is at this point that the use of restricting or strengthening analogies placed in juxtaposition can help to correct the accuracy of the central analogy. The cumulative use of assisting and contrasting analogies can help to modify or clarify the representation of some difficult theological concept.^{5.} The conception of the "Other", especially

1. Although analogies gather strength from the character of their initial resemblances, it can hardly be said that their powers of predication encompass all the possibilities concealed within reality. Cf. W.A. Whitehouse, *Order, Goodness, Glory* pp.69f. also F.F.Wood, *ibid.*, pp.114f.
2. See J.S. Mill quoted by J. MacIntyre, *ibid.*, p.17 Analogy has only a pen-ultimate role in theological thought.
3. See Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, p.127. T.R.Miles, *ibid.*, pp.43ff. cf. p.145
4. D.M.Emmet, *ibid.*, p.104
5. D.M.EMMET, *ibid.*, p.105

in its traditionally personal form as "God", is notoriously difficult to the human mind. T.R. Miles considers that the "silence" concerning some of these issues can only be broken by "parable"^{1.} R.W. Hepburn sees paradox and near paradox as the staple of the account of God's nature.^{2.} The Suggestion is for the creation of some super-analogy by which to impose a comprehensive order or unity on otherwise disparate conceptual materials.

Certain classes are discerned among those analogies which are applied to ultimate existence.^{3.} Some move by an extension of features of the phenomenal world to the nth degree. They assume the difference between the natural and supernatural worlds to be one of degree. The frailty, imperfection and incompleteness of the phenomenal world becomes a starting point for a theoretical working out of perfect and complete forms which belong to the world beyond. The typically Greek world-view, and those influenced by it,^{4.} work on this principle.

A second class recognizes the distinction between the two worlds to be one rather of kind than degree, but discerns a certain amount of information from ^{the} "other" world to be present within the phenomenal world. Science, in the world of nature, and philosophy, in the sphere of abstract thought, have pushed back the frontiers of our knowledge. They have worked over the hints and directions pointed by observed

1. *ibid.* pp.145, 157, 160, 165.
2. Christianity and Paradox. Review by I.T. Ramsay in *J.T.S.* April 1959 pp.209ff.
3. See the chapter on Analogy in D. Emmet'. Also discussion by J. McIntyre in *S.J.T.* Mar. 1959, pp.1-20.
4. For this point see Zuurdeeg, *ibid.*, pp.202ff, who discusses the various modifications of the Greek Cosmic Conviction in science, phil. and religion.

designs and causes within human experience and nature, and have found some of them to be unexplained in terms of our known knowledge of the natural world, and the known capacities of natural forces and men. Piece by piece some kind of speculative analogical representation of the supernatural world has been built up.^{1.}

Another version of this class assumes that the "unexplainable" information is being initiated and fed into the natural world from the supernatural side. It further assumes prepared and receptive, not to say obedient, mediators on the natural, man-ward side, who first experience the approaches from the supernatural world, and then bear witness to them to their fellows, inviting them to share their experience.^{2.}

From the point of view of ^{the} modern philosopher this involves a doubly unverifiable situation. To the metaphysical pre-supposition, is added the unverifiable nature of the accuracy of the witnesses,^{3.} whose only guarantees are their own known characters, and the comparison of their witness with that of others over a prolonged period of time, and from widely dispersed areas. It is the same doubt which has been cast over the supposedly objective recording of history. The record is made within the frame-work of a "conviction" which governs the selection and rejection of events. We are left with a "convictional" experience and an

1. Cf. D.M. Emmet, *ibid*, p.101, speaks of "analogy drawn from man's sense of encompassing life and power... a sense of continuity of our own life and power beyond. "Cf. W.A. Whitehouse, *Order Goodness, Glory*, p.49 "No world could be more real than that which is crystallized out of the matrix of experience, and which survives the tests of ultimate reality, which are built into the formal structure of science".
2. Within the Christian "speculation" the Thomists and the extreme Liberals schools sought to establish themselves within an unified view of both "worlds", either rejecting the categorical break or minimizing it. The Reformers and Barthians have sought to work from the projected areas of "convictional" religion; the faith that prepares for the revelation, "justifies" the witness and moulds the analogy.
3. Cf. "Nothing is to be gained from minimizing the scandalous dependence of Christian belief upon the testimony of those disciples". See W.A. Whitehouse, *ibid*, p.21

"analogical" representation of it, by "doubtful" witnesses. The experience is beyond proof or disproof; the analogy, in the very nature of the case is only an approximation in its representation; the witnesses vary both in veracity and in capacity to understand and to interpret.

If this is the full truth it is little wonder the modern philosopher feels that it is waste of time working within a field so beset with doubtfulness, and that the gap is wide between theological belief and philosophical agnosticism. Fortunately there are signs that, on both sides, there are those who are ready to begin just at this point: to review again the grounds of recognised conviction; to look for a freedom within the very incompleteness and tentative character of analogical representation, and find "truth" within a "non-literal" interpretation of the given material.

Something ought to be said concerning the stress that is being placed on a particular type of analogy. It is remarkably fruitful because of its field of application is wide and varied, and its manner of application flexible, it works both by positive affirmation and by negation. Its scope ranges from natural to human history, and includes mental reflection and speculation. It has at its disposal all the fields of knowledge and activity of men and every aspect of nature. It seeks to invade the future by prediction based on a manipulation of the past, rearranging its sequences and patterns and expressing them in language stretched to breaking point, and in logic that is ana-logical.

This specially flexible nature of the personal analogy, and the analogy of personal relationship is in keeping with man's sense of his leading role within the natural world, and the complex and delicate nature of his personality. It means that what we find in man's make-up, much of it

1. Cf. a similar complaint re the concept of Natural Law. J. Ellul. The Theological foundation of Law, E.T. Marguerite Wieser. S.C.M. (Fr. Ed 1946) Introduction.

expressed symbolically, is analogical material. Man, as the highest achievement in the evolutionary process so far, in his most illuminating moments, should be able to provide the best available analogical materials by which to represent our best insights into ultimate being.^{1.} This fact should direct us to the use of records of human history, especially on its religious side, and to the action of individual personal biography, and the psychology of personality for analogical materials with which to represent our apprehension of the transcendent personal "Other".

Somewhere within the set of traditional analogies, that have been used and preserved throughout the centuries, either singly, or in combination, or within their cumulative representation, are to be found the analogical materials by the help of which the biblical theologian will continue to reconstruct his theistic conceptions. His task is to review and assess this traditional material, always bearing in mind what the philosopher is saying about the application of analogical processes to metaphysical subjects. He must not neglect what any of the analogies are saying; for from them he might find it possible to piece together what their many metaphysical references are reckoned to be, and re-frame them in some more complex and satisfying analogical pattern, which does greater justice to the predications the traditional analogies are trying to make, and finds a more ready acceptance in the modern mind. It is possible moreover that from the various human relationships which have achieved more adequate expression in modern times more adequate analogies may be discovered with which to reflect our theological apprehension of God.

1. The anthropomorphic tendencies in the biblical record strengthen this contention. Cf. E. Jacob. *Theol. of O.T.* pp.39, who traces a direct line from O.T. anthropomorphism to the Incarnation. See also T. H. Robinson, in *O.T. and Mod. Stud.* pp.361ff. espec. p.369 re O.T. emphasis on the personal and on personality.

Biblical scholarship has already undertaken a great deal of this assessment in many associate fields of research. In approaching the re appraisal of the Christian doctrine of God, we will be more likely to understand what the biblical record is trying to say, if we can unveil the "conviction" or "convictional world-view" under the pressure of which the biblical materials were selected and put together and modified. We shall avoid many pitfalls if we are more ready to recognise the "analogical" nature of the history recorded, and distinguish between it and the "indicative" history with which it is becoming increasingly possible to compare it.

This task will involve us in the re-examination of the technical terms which have been coined for use within the discipline of biblical theological thought, and those which have come to us out of the biblical record itself. It will involve the even more difficult task of elucidating the richer meanings of the religious symbolism which is a significant part of our religious and theological inheritance.

THE OLD TESTAMENT WORLD-VIEW

If the modern biblical theologian is satisfied that there is some substance in what philosophers are saying concerning metaphysical statements, he cannot proceed without taking cognisance of their claim concerning the non-indicative character of the biblical record. As the results of the researches in the various fields of biblical scholarship are being coordinated for theological purposes, there appears a growing recognition that some more-than-historical explanation seems necessary to account for both the selection of the particular biblical materials from the mass of historical data, and the final form in which they have come down to us. Neither the literal nor the liberal approach to the records alone seems adequate to an understanding of how they came into existence or what they are intended to convey. Both treated the records as indicative fact; neither understood the analogical nature of materials with which they were dealing. In taking their stand upon the exact literalness of the Bible, the literalists failed to appreciate the inexact nature of any analogical representation of reality. The liberals, on the other hand, sought to maintain the indicative nature of the records by minimizing and explaining away the miraculous and metaphysical references they contained, and in this way lessened the value of the record as revelation.

The more satisfying approaches to the biblical literature stem from the new emphasis being placed on the discovery of the guiding principles used by the biblical editors in giving the literature its final form. Our increasing knowledge of life and events contemporary with the biblical record demonstrates that the selection and omission of certain available materials, and the idealizing and over-stressing of others, were produced

under the stimulation of a recognisable set of religious beliefs.

These principles were being recognised in the production of the "documentary"

1. theories of the Pentateuch, but for the purpose of the O.T. biblical

theologian, the principles actuating the final editors, the LXX

translators and the canonizing councils are to be particularly noted.

On the historical level alone the result has been styled a "philosophy

2. of history". That is to say, the Bible historians recognised certain

universal historical principles which guided them in deciding what events

held significance beyond their own time, and helped them in the under-

standing of all history. This has come to be recognised as regular

historical procedure. What makes the biblical history different is that

3. it is called "prophecy", or "revelation", or "a theology of history". 4.

It is when it is claimed that the biblical record has been composed under

the influence of "theological considerations", that theologians are seen

to be recognising the analogical nature of the record, and that they are

moving within the framework of a "world-view".

There is being composed from the indicative facts of the history of Israel a recognizable pattern, which, irrespective of the truth of the facts themselves, gives meaning, not only to all other history, but to existence itself. This is being recognized in other fields of Old Testament research in the recognition of the fact that a distinctive brand begins to

1. See C.R.North, Pentateuchal Criticism, in O.T. & Mod.Stud. p.80. See also H. Hahn, The O.T. in Mod. Research, pp.1ff.

2. Cf. H. Hahn, *ibid*, pp.243ff. Also N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the O.T., pp.13f. Cf. S. A. Cooke, *ibid.*, p.213.

3. Cf. called the Former Prophets in the Hebrew canon.

4. H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p.20.

1.
appear on all Israel's borrowings from her larger contemporary setting.

The aim of the biblical theologian, then, must be to work against the background of agreement between scholars in the various Old Testament fields without becoming too involved in the detail of their work, so much of which is rendered of more or less antiquarian interest by the recognition of the analogical nature of the record. Under the discipline of the assured results of biblical scholarship, he must proceed to the examination of those distinctive features of the record which reveal the concepts of "Israel" and "Canaan" as distinct from the Israel of indicative history and the land of Palestine on a map, and of those features which reflect the activity and character of "Yahweh".

One of the assured results of Old Testament studies has been the recognition of the formative role of the events of the Exodus from Egypt in creating the "Israel" of Old Testament revelation. In these events the biblical narrators saw man and his world in the presence of the "holy" God in a way that seemed "typical" of man's eternal creaturely condition in the presence of his Creator. To them all creation and history rose up to confirm and illustrate this conviction, that the "holy" God was free to be whatever he wanted to be, and to pursue whatever purposes he wished to pursue and that it was of the utmost wisdom for man to recognise always his creaturely condition in gratitude. Moreover, the events set a premium for all time on "faithful reliability" and on "justice" and "compassion" because these appear as the disciplining and defining factors moving and

1. Cf. Snaith, *ibid*, pp. 11-13, and Hahn, *ibid*, p.72

2. See von Rad, *Moses*, pp. 64f, Rowley, *ibid*, p.16, also Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, p.56, H.W. Robinson, *Rel. Ideas of O.T.* p.51, and C.H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day*, pp.18 and 54.

constraining the activity of the arbitrary "holiness" of Yahweh present to redeem in the Exodus events.

The dramatic form in which the story is cast is an indication of the strength of conviction of the narrators that in these events the "holy" presence of Yahweh is seen to be active in redeeming Israel. They do not hesitate to name Yahweh at the head of the dramatis personae. True, He is invisible, represented by voice only. But this is an important technicality: a stage device calculated to create the dramatic illusion that He belongs to the arbitrary world of the "holy" and not to man's world of seeing. The invisibility does not carry with it inaudibility. These two factors belong to the peculiarly Israelitish representation of Yahweh, and of man in his presence. They stand for Yahweh's right to reveal himself as who he is, and the limitation of man's mediatorial rights to hearing and obeying.

More than all else these events gave significance to the reflection that gods and men are different. At all the significant points man's life is separated from the "holy" by a metaphysical gap. Qualitatively holiness is of a different category; ontologically it is of a different order of being. In it the time of man's world is confronted with the eternal, space with a cosmic dimension. The limitations of his life are in the presence of an arbitrary freedom.

The World of the "Holy":

In the story of the "call" of Moses, Yahweh is given immediate location within the world of the "holy". Whatever the word means to-day, or came to

mean in its later biblical presentation, its primary significance has to do with the dimension of deity as distinct from that which is not divine. It is that which cannot be explained in terms of, or reduced to, the limited dimensions of man's world. N. H. Snaith calls it "the most^{1.} intimately divine word of all", and J. Pedersen "the native element of^{2.} divine beings". R. Otto in his Idea of the Holy uses a complex of notions in order to try and reproduce his conception of what is holy. It has a non-rational element (by which he probably means a beyond-rational element). It is awe inspiring, producing a feeling of dependence. It has that air of mystery in the presence of the unknown and stimulates a trembling^{3.} fascination for itself. To all of these he gives the title of "numinous". E. Jacob stresses the idea of separation in the sense of being sacred, or^{4.} away from the humanly normal. In this he is supported by von Rad. It finds its most distinctively Israelitish expression in the feeling of danger and helplessness produced in man by the overwhelming weight of the presence of the glory of Yahweh. There is a qualitative and dimensional distinction between the world of the holy and man's world. Man is in the presence of something he cannot begin to understand, and which he is helpless to control. He is un-manned. His life is not of sufficient worth to feel stable or secure any more. The presence of the holy places the brand of uncertainty and creaturely dependence upon his whole existence. At the same time, however, as it strikes awe and helplessness into the human heart, the very all of which the holy consists

1. *ibid*, p.21. 2. *Israel*, vol. IV, p.498. 3. E. Jacob, *Theol. of the O.T.* pp.86ff. 4. *Moses*, p.53.

attracts man as the only answer to his own helpless dependent, creaturely worthlessness, if only he can come to terms with it. Holiness represents to him the very opposite type of existence to his own, the arbitrary right of the divine to be and do for always what he wills where he wills. If man takes up his rightful attitude of respect and dependence, it is just possible holiness may be potent for him.

In accordance with the action of the historical drama in which the biblical editors see Yahweh to be involved, it is natural that their conception of the holy should stress the irresistible and unpreventable power to perform, which is discernable wherever the presence of Yahweh is to be seen in the particular events of history. It is a presence which has the unpreventable power both to bestow and withdraw itself when and where and in whatever form it wills. That it is seen to be more than this is what allows the record to be considered a revelation. Take your shoes off, you are in the presence of the "holy", is but the starting point.¹ What constitutes the "holy" is about to be revealed in the redemption of Israel.

At the primary stage of the understanding of the "holy", holiness was not conceived of as being completely outside the world as men understood it. Supernatural agencies inhabited the earth, the sky and under the earth. Height and distance and majesty, and remote celestial habitation, and ethical purity, are not the earliest symbols of holiness. It is of the greatest import to the revelation that is about to take place, that holiness should be introduced in the purest, arbitrary, unconditioned

1. Ex. 3:5.

and undefined terms. Unpreventable power to perform is a basic element in the historical analogy. This is what the magical passages and the miracles of Egypt are intended to convey to the contemporary reader. Included within that power is both the ability and the right to bestow life, to withdraw it, and to renew it. Where holiness has a fixed and durable character it is concentrated in some divine being. This is the claim of the biblical portrayal in associating Yahweh with holiness, but it goes further in making Yahweh the source of all holiness. He is to be equated with the "holy". The holiness attributed to any place or thing or persons or race or activity is purely by association with Yahweh. This association sets it apart from the normal, and gives it the qualitative stamp of the miraculous unpreventable power of the "holy". It is the declaration of the Exodus events that Israel is chosen by Yahweh to be a holy nation. Her history is to reveal to all men the activity and character of the holy itself: that unconditioned "other", which, out of arbitrary choice, initiates and conditions creation and human existence; but remains itself freely "other" than it. Israel is brought into being by Holy Yahweh, and this is the only ground for her continued existence. It is this eschatological, holy quality of her existence that makes her history a revelation. To be a valid instrument of revelation demanded of her sole recognition of and obedience to whatever Yahweh reveals his holiness to be.

1. Ex. 28:35. 2. Ex. 20:8ff, cf 16:23; 38:30. 3. Lev. 21:1-9;
 Num. 16:3-5. 4. Lev. 10:10, 5. Ex. 19:6; 22:31;
 Lev. 11:44f; 20:7; 26; Num. 15:40f.

"Yahweh"

Although the name of Yahweh is linked with God earlier than the
 1. Exodus, no indication of the significance of the name is given in the
 earlier reference. Nor need we delay to enter into the scholarly
 discussions concerning the possible links of Yahweh with the god of the
 2. Kenites, however informative these investigations might be. Nor again
 is it relevant to follow out the reasons of the Old Testament narrators
 3. in linking Yahweh with the ancestral God Elohim. What is important for
 theology is, that the introduction of this name by the biblical editors
 at the outset of the Exodus story, is calculated to be the very first
 step in the self-revelation of the Holy. It was their studied purpose
 that no previous significance should attach to it. The revelation begins
 right here. In the borrowings from foreign sources the important feature
 is always what happens to the borrowings when they are trimmed and fitted
 into the "Israel" pattern created at the Exodus.

In biblical thought names always have an important significance as
 4. descriptive of the person. The name described both "label and package".
 A person without a name was not a person at all. The establishment and
 maintenance of a name was the only form of immortality open to the early
 5. Semitic peoples. A man's name was an extension of his personality.
 On this account the name of Yahweh cannot fail to have had significance
 for the revelation of his person. It involved his reputation before the
 6. world.

1. Gen.4:26. 2. H.W.Robinson The Rel. Ideas of the O.T. p.53.
 See H.H.Rowley, The Faith of Israel, pp.54f. 3. Exod. 3:6-16;6:2ff.
4. See S.A.Cooke, The O.T.: a Re-interpretation, pp.105f. Also
 von Rad, *ibid*, pp.19ff. 5. See A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of
 the Individual, pp.88f. 6. See Deut. 9:28.

The etymology of the Hebrew form of "Yahweh" is producing a literature of its own. From the many and interesting suggestions that have been presented there is a growing unanimity among scholars concerning its theological implications. Behind all other implications of the term is the assertion of the arbitrary freedom of Yahweh implied by his association with holiness. This relates in general terms to his "being" or "existence", if such a word is not too descriptive of man's strictly conditioned existence to apply to the unconditioned self-existence of anyone partaking of the nature and order of the "holy". In particular the "Yahweh" references have to do with the location of his existence outside the time-space dimensions of man's existence. In relation to time he is the I AM as contrasted to the transitory nature of creation and men. In relation to space, he inhabits it. There is no place to which he cannot be present, nor is there anything that can prevent his presence from being where it wishes. Perhaps the most important significance of the term "Yahweh" from the point of view of revelation is the suggestion that it should be translated "I will be that I will be". This could mean that up to now he has no name, or that he demands the right to describe himself, and that he will do this in the redemptive events he is about to initiate. It is not man's "right" to name him. Moreover he will be more than any individual revelation of his presence is likely to portray.

1. See E. Jacob, *ibid*, pp.49f., H.W. Robinson, *The Religious Ideas of the O.T.*, pp.52f., C.H.Dodd, *The Bible & the Greeks*, pp.4f., H.H.Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, pp.54f.
2. C.H.Dodd, *ibid*, p.4. 3. See the Aquila & Theodotion rendering: ἰσομαί ὅτι ἰσομαί, n.5, p.4, C.H.Dodd, *ibid*. See also margin R.V. ad. loc.

The revelation is to be safeguarded from any preconceptions of men and from the limitations of man's power to conceive.

Included within the "rights" of the holy is the right to reveal himself. Meantime his name will hinge on his ability to do what he says he will in rescuing a band of hapless slaves from Egypt, and making a nation of them in "Canaan".^{1.} H.W. Robinson feels that this close relation between Yahweh and Israel in the historical events of the Exodus was the nearest the Hebrew mind ever got to defining God. "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage". These events reflect the "rear view" of the glory and presence of the holy. No answer from within creation can sufficiently account for the achievement these historical events portray. Yahweh is declaring his presence, giving himself a name which describes his "being". The name "Yahweh", then, is an assertion of his utter holiness and at the same time notice of his intention to reveal himself in history in the Exodus events. The tension between the transcendence of Yahweh and his presence as revealed remains a feature of the entire Old Testament revelation. His name is a declaration of his holiness, and an announcement of his presence. Both these features characterize every expression of the initial revelation. They underwrite the conception of grace, they give meaning to the mediatorial position of the covenanted people, they find unconditional expression in the Decalogue.

1. Ibid, p.51. See also Rowley, *ibid*, p.56. See also p.55 "... not etymology but experience filled the term with meaning."

Grace:

The entire Exodus episode is characterized by sheer grace. She^{Israel} is the creation of the presence of holy Yahweh as the instrument of his self-revelation. Her very lack of well-defined political "shape" and the hopelessness of her situation, contribute to her suitability as a vehicle of revelation. She lacks the quality to think herself out of her slave mentality. Her tribal leadership is demoralized and hesitant. If she possessed both, the courage to perform would need at least to match the might of Egypt and the prospect of a prolonged desert journey and reconquest of Canaan. For good measure there is also Pharaoh's hardness of heart. The ability of the Hebrew tribes to save themselves is at a minimum. This is the whole revealing situation. The biblical narrators find here no possibility at all that man could ever be able to claim that he rescued himself by the strength of his own right arm, or cunning out-thinking of the Egyptian, or the sheer courage of his heart. The revelation of Yahweh would diminish in proportion to the ability of man to help himself. The Hebrews are sealed off from any hope of human redemption. Yahweh has prepared the situation, even to the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh. Lest the readers should imagine that Moses is wise after the event, the record is that Yahweh revealed his presence and set out his plans in some detail before hand. The redemptive plans are laid in terms of sheer miracle such as only one from the world of the holy could pretend to achieve.

The chief qualification of Israel as an organ of revelation, then,
 1.
 is the "poverty" of her existence in Egypt. Her resources as instruments of redemption reveal nothing to compete with the glory of Yahweh's holy presence in compassing her redemption. Yahweh is free to be what he will be, to reveal himself in whatever terms he chooses.

As all the "normal" means of rescue are precluded, the way is now open for an act of pure grace on the part of Yahweh. At the same time this activity can be as undistorted a revelation of the character of his holiness as an historical analogy can achieve. The very claims of the situation draw out what that character is, and what his name stands for. His
 2.
 promises to the ancestors of the Hebrews demand that he prove faithful, the poverty of Israel's resources melts him to pity and remembrance of his promises, the arrogance of the Egyptians and the religious pride of the Pharaoh call for a demonstration of the "rights" of the case. Here is a situation in history which reflects conditions which are the very opposite of the character of Yahweh's holiness. He intends to reveal his holy presence in a gracious act of redemption. He will choose Israel, who cannot possibly make any claim upon him, unless it be upon those very characteristics for which he would have his name known.

Yahweh's task is to build up, first in Moses, and then in the Hebrews in Egypt the faith that he is indeed who he says he is, and that he has the unpreventable power to bring about the redemption he has announced. To rescue the children of Israel despite the over-whelming appearances of impossibility would demonstrate unmistakably both his presence and holiness.

1. It is this association which gives the religious twist to the word "poor" in so many later Israelite references, and is the motivation of her sense of social justice.
2. Cf. Gen. 12:1f; 17:1f; 22:16f; 28:10ff.

To rescue them in remembrance of a long-standing promise, out of pity for their "poor" circumstances and in righteous indignation at the arrogant oppression of the haughty Pharaoh, son of Ra, would declare his "name" for gracious compassion (רַחֵם), faithfulness (אֱמֶן) and righteous salvation (יִשְׁלַח) for all time. In proving himself faithful Yahweh is shewing himself true and reliable in particular events to the label ancient events of universal history have put upon him.¹ In revealing himself as righteous he is declaring his own sovereign actions to be the ground and standard of all judgment. Israel could never more think of sovereign acts of judgment without thinking of Egyptian oppression and how their cry for help brought Yahweh's sovereign acts of redemption. Righteousness must mean henceforth, Yahweh taking action to set things right. The compassion of Yahweh's grace to Israel in Egypt is a declaration that Yahweh's sovereign righteousness is something more than justice. It has a bias towards the "poor" and those who are helpless to set their own affairs right.

If, then, the grace of Yahweh is underwritten by his holiness, it is motivated by reliability, by demanding sense of what is right and a special concern for the poor and helpless. These are all to be seen in a special way in the events that lead to the redemption of Israel from Egypt, and they reflect the character of Yahweh, but they are also characteristic of the activity of Yahweh since creation. However, the very special intensity of the revelation to Israel imposes upon her a total claim of responding gratitude, responsibility and faith which sets her apart as a "holy" people.

1. See H.H. Rowley, *ibid*, pp.66f.

In "Israel's" continued existence, despite the insufficiency of all "normal" reasons for doing so is to be reflected the presence of the holiness of Yahweh. It is this that constitutes "Israel" a "holy" nation. The moment her existence can be seen to depend upon "normal" means of existence it ceases to reflect the "holy". The mighty acts of Yahweh in redeeming her from Egypt were calculated to create in Israel a permanent faith in Yahweh, which would lead her to a blind obedience to his commands in all circumstances, whatever the odds against success might appear in terms of this-worldly calculation.

It was for this revelatory purpose that "Israel" as a closely-knit covenanted people, living by Yahweh's grace alone, was created, and could be described by Yahweh as "my son" or "my people" upon whose miraculous existence all the world could look and marvel to see the peculiar holiness of Yahweh displayed. It was this entire dependence on grace that so many of the patriarchal stories anticipate Noah's survival Abraham's faith Sarah's conception of Isaac, the choice of Jacob and Joseph were but pre-exodus examples of the operation of the holiness of God, claiming the allegiance of men when all the normal reasoning of men might have advised otherwise. It was upon this principle of grace that the illustrious examples of the book of Judges were chosen, as the writer of the New Testament letter to the Hebrews was not slow to perceive. On this account, if Israel is to be the organ of revelation of Yahweh, she must have the confidence to obey him implicitly. The Exodus events are meant to give her grounds for that confidence. Neither the forces of nature, nor the organisation of imperial Egypt, nor Egypt's gods must be allowed to compete with Yahweh or his Israel.

The Covenant People:

The Egyptians and other nations might have their gods, but in the case of Israel, it is Yahweh who possesses Israel. She is his creation. He has brought her into being for his purposes. Her national unity is not political but religious. She is held together by a covenant with Yahweh. Her laws are Yahweh's unconditional commands. To obey is to remain within the covenant, to disobey is to have no inheritance with "Israel". Canaan is a trust from Yahweh, the stage of dramatic revelation-events yet to be. Her leadership is first and foremost by prophetic mediation.

The solidarity of the people of Yahweh was ratified by covenant. This linked the Israelites with Yahweh as the objects of his grace. It marked them off from others and linked them together into a tightly-knit unity of obedience and dependence upon him. In the desert period, this compactness of the people and link with Yahweh was built up by his miraculous sustenance and protection under trying circumstances, when there was none but Yahweh to look to for help.

It was the covenant solidarity of Israel that gave Israelites their sense of "peculiarity" from others, and the false sense of privilege they sometimes exhibit. The strict maintenance of covenant relations was important to the accuracy of the revelation Yahweh was making through Israel. One renegade Israel could mar the representation of Yahweh's holy presence with them. On the other hand, one more-responsive member could lift the responsiveness of the entire group, and enhance the power of the holy presence of Yahweh.

1.

It is clear from the record that the Exodus covenant takes up in a particular way other more general covenants from patriarchal history and exhibits their spirit in a more concentrated form. The covenant with Noah, which relates to all mankind, and is of everlasting duration, is a typical universal example, but the covenant to Abraham and his immediate descendants is even more relevant. It makes more specific promises concerning Canaan and is linked to the exclusive practise of circumcision. These covenants give content to the *ברית* of Yahweh.

4.

The Sinaitic covenant is an exclusive and conditional agreement between Yahweh and his chosen people. It is recognised as an act of sheer grace and makes unconditional claims upon Israelites. They are to recognise Yahweh alone and to obey his commands for which they are to receive certain privileges. They are to be recognised before the world as Yahweh's people. They are to possess the land of Canaan, where Yahweh will sustain their national existence in mighty acts of sheer miracle that will witness to the nations the grace and holiness of Yahweh.

The unconditional demands of the covenant find expression in the

6.

7.

Decalogue. The keeping of the Sabbath is to be a sign of their willing acceptance of covenant direction. Later the institution of the priesthood is linked with the maintenance of correct covenant relations, and the ark and its contents becomes representational of the covenant presence of Yahweh and his demands.

9.

The importance of the individual within the solidarity of the covenant group, points to the special nature of the position of Moses, and a long line of later individual human figures.

1. Ex. 6:4f. 2. Gen.6:18;9:12-17. 3. Gen.17:4f.18 4. cf.Ex.34:10ff;15 5.Ex.34:10 cf.Ex.19:4ff Yahweh's people 6. Ex.34:28
7. Ex.31:13-16. 8. Num.25:12f. 9. Ex.25:16;21,cf.40:20

They owe their position not to themselves, but to the fact that they have experienced the holiness of Yahweh, and, willy nilly, they must witness to their total subjection to the commands and claims he makes upon them. It is the place of these figures within the corporate revelation that gives to the Old Testament the unique combination of historical^c and personal factors in a complex of personality and event at special moments in Israel's history. Such was the "weight" of Yahweh's presence that they had faith to believe in advance the promises of his redemption. It is through the responsiveness of the one man Moses that blessing comes to the many. Moses is the first "Israelite" in the special sense of the Exodus world-view. He carries the group forward into faith upon his individual shoulders. His absence in the initial stages of the adventure is the signal for a pathetic lapse to "un-Israelite" behaviour. Moreover, Moses is as if he were Yahweh to the people. He is "my servant" Moses, spokesman of Yahweh and his interpreter: acting with the authority of Yahweh. This representative mediatorial office was destined to play a decisive role within the Old Testament revelation. The conception works within the common Semitic psychological notion of "the one and the many", of which we shall have reason to hear much at a later stage of our investigations. Moses is ready not only to take up the call to obedience of Yahweh on behalf of Israel; but he is ready to plead the cause of the failing creaturely humanity of the group, and bear the judgment of Yahweh on their behalf. It was because the editors of the Pentateuchal literature

1. See Rowley, *ibid*, p.40, also von Rad, *ibid*, pp.10-12.
2. Num. 12:7f. See W.Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*, Chap.1. for the conception of 'Servant'. 3. Ex.33:8ff.
4. See A.R. Johnson's monogram, *The One & the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*, Cardiff, 1942.
5. Deut.1:37;4:20ff;9:18ff, *Espec.vv.25-29*.

felt that it was the conviction of Moses by the presence of the holiness of Yahweh that initiated the Israelitish world-view, that they were able to go on and claim Mosaic authorship for the Pentateuch. It was his mediatorial response to Yahweh on behalf of the people that enabled the Exodus events to take place. The "shape" of these events writ large gave an understandable shape to all history, and suggested the active presence of the "Holy" revealing the nature of his own unconditioned being in contrast to the conditioned being of man.

The Decalogue:

The important thing about the Decalogue as we have it presented in Exodus 20 is not that its contents bear similarity to other contemporary codes, or that its presentation indicates the tidiness of the end of a long evolutionary process; but its importance for theology is that the Decalogue of Exodus 20 reveals clearly the stamp of the peculiarly Israelitish world-view. It gives legal expression to the obedience-demands of the covenant with Yahweh. These laws are Yahweh's laws: they are unconditional demands upon anyone within the covenant. They reflect in the Law-giver the same irresistible total claims upon the obedience of men, they exhibit the same reliability, the same justice and mercy that are to be seen in the holy Presence presiding over the revealing events of Israel's redemption from Egypt.

First and foremost, then, the requirements of the Decalogue are revelation. They represent the crystallisation of the demands of prophetic

1. Notably that of the Laws of Hammurabi. See H.W. Robinson The Relig. Ideas of the O.T., p.19.

history to legal formulations. In other words, the prophetic historical and analogical "model" of the world-view is being temporarily exchanged for a legal. This change of model makes it possible to set out the position of man in the presence of the "holy" in more precise and durable terms. The preamble makes it clear, however, that the reality with which we are dealing is still the same. It is Yahweh who brought the Israelites up out of Egypt¹. This statement echoes the "I AM" of Exodus 3¹⁴, and, what follows, therefore, are in the nature of legal predicates descriptive of the strong legal claims one from the world of the holy is able by right to make upon mere men. These are unconditional laws simply because Yahweh has spoken them, and, in the nature of the case, ^{man} is in no position to vary their unconditional demands. He can only hope and find his salvation within them by obedience to their requirements.

The first section of the Decalogue rehearses the unassailable first position of Yahweh, simply because of who he is. Exodus events should have made it clear that other gods, if they exist, are simply ineffective when confronted with the power of Yahweh. Anyone who holds to another god just does not understand the facts of the case. Neither men, nor kings, nor nature, nor other gods could in fact prevent Yahweh from achieving his will. Israel, at any rate, has no further right to question Yahweh's first claim. Her existence has been established and maintained over a prolonged period by Yahweh only despite all that other nations or nature could do to prevent it. In her case at least Yahweh has every right to be "jealous", and to demonstrate his just rights and mercy respectively to the disobedient and obedient to the third and fourth generation. It is the direction of these unconditional commandments to a defined group that leaves a question

1. Ex.20:2.

mark hanging over the alleged speculative monotheism of the Mosaic era,
 and has brought into being the alternate descriptions of the scholars.^{1.}
 This direction to a defined group, and the fact that the existence of other
 gods is not explicitly denied, seems to indicate that something short of
 the full monotheism of the prophets is indicated.

The proposition of the "jealousy" of Yahweh is not to be explained away
 as an anthropomorphic relic from primitive ages. It is to be found in
 all the strands of the Old Testament tradition, and at all periods.^{2.}

It is anthropomorphic, to be sure, but any analogical representation by
 men of the world of the "holy" is bound to be, and the anthropomorphic
 expressions here are quite in keeping with the dramatic and personal
 presentation of Yahweh in the whole record of the Exodus events.

The "jealousy" of Yahweh, therefore, stands for the exclusive claim
 of Yahweh to the unremitting loyalty and obedience of Israel, if she is
 to remain the organ of his self-revelation. "Thou shalt have no other
 God before me", is justified both by who Yahweh is, and who men are, and by
 the revelatory position Israel occupies. The accuracy of the revelation
 corresponds with the degree to which the sovereign will of Yahweh rules
 the wills of the "stiff-necked" children of Israel. The first sin is,
 therefore, disloyalty, which is tantamount to rebellion. It is a usurpation
 of the rights of Yahweh to exercise authority and give direction and that
 by those who are in no position to do so. They are acting as though the

1. General discussion: H.H.Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, pp.71ff.
 S.A.Cooke, *ibid*, pp.92,94. Rowley, *The Rediscovery of the O.T.*,
 pp.108-130. For terms "Henotheism", "Monolatry", see Rowley,
Rediscovery, p.123, *Faith*, p.72, Cooke, *ibid*, pp.141f.
 For "Practical Monotheism" see Rowley, *Rediscovery*, p.129.
 Also note the terms "Incipient Monotheism" "Monarchical Monotheism"
 "Implicit Monotheism".
2. Cf. von Rad. *ibid*. pp.34f.

"revelation" of the redemption from Egypt had never happened: as though the helpless "poverty" of transitory men had never been brought into contrasting relation with the all-adequate resources of Yahweh's holiness. To make sense of his existence and history, man must begin by a recognition of who he is. This is not to be done by a comparison of himself with nature, over which he may have a semblance of authority, nor a comparison of himself with other men, over whom he might be king; but in the presence of the "holy" in the presence of which the fragile nature of his being is to be all too clearly seen. To organise himself within his world man must begin by being aware of the limitations of his existence when confronted with the being and sovereign will of his creator. It is interesting to note the reference to Creation in Exodus 20:11. In the Deuteronomic version (5:15), which is later than that of Exodus, there is no reference to Creation, the authority for the keeping of the Sabbath is based directly on the experience of Yahweh's irresistible might at the Exodus and not on the rest undertaken by God on the seventh day of Creation. The insertion of the word "Creation" in the Exodus version must be considered a gloss by Priestly editors with

1.

Genesis I of the Priestly Document in mind.

The Decalogue begins by confronting Israel in legal terms with the "Exodus" revelation of the One with whom she finally has to do. The "Israel" of Yahweh's creation cannot expect to go on stiff-necked in the yoke without imperiling her very existence as if Yahweh did not exist. The holiness of Yahweh as revealed in the Exodus events is such that it is not in the power of Israel to give him a name, or to make a settled this-worldly image of him. To do so is to usurp the prerogative of Yahweh, and to go beyond the warrant of her own this-worldly existence. To act thus is

1. On the relation of the Exodus Covenant to Creation see
E. Jacob, *ibid*, p.136.

his secret motives, and to the intentions of his envyings. If "Israel" is to be a witness to the world of her Exodus revelation, she must look to these things. The same reliability, justice and mercy she has experienced from Yahweh must be exhibited in her life.

The same principle that is the ruling factor in the Decalogue is to be found down through all the detail of the multifarious regulations that fan out from it. They take their source in the Yahweh that brought Israel up out of Egypt. The Decalogue is "typical" of the whole legal structure which underlines for all time man's unstable legal status in the presence of the holiness of Yahweh. This refers to man in general and Israel in particular. His only legal status comes from the grace of Yahweh, from his faithfulness, his justice and his mercy. Any legal salvation he has is on a par with Israel's historic redemption from Egypt. It has a gift status to be received in gratitude, that leads to obedience. In the conception of Yahweh as Judge, the character of Yahweh, and not the character of the Law, gives the conception its content. On that account man's final status is with Yahweh and not with the terms of the legal analogy which in its historic expression as $\rho 74$ and $\omega\upsilon\nu\eta$ is always modified by attendant conceptions of $\lambda\eta\gamma$ and $\gamma\theta\eta$.^{2.}

The final observation concerning the Decalogue, as representative of Yahweh's Law, is that it begins to exhibit that mediatorial quality that becomes so typical of it at a later stage of Israel's history. It gives precise this-worldly "shape" to the demands of the transcendent holy Yahweh. To deal with Yahweh's Law is to deal with Yahweh himself, for the Law is primarily a revelation of him. Moreover, to obey Yahweh's Law is to reveal him to the world.

Finally, then, if these Laws have any significance beyond their literal

1. Ex.20:7. 2. See E. Jacob, *ibid*, pp.94ff.

and local and strictly historical references, it is because they set mankind in the presence of the holiness of God continually, when man is in his historical setting or alone with his thoughts. By his very constitution he knows nothing about the world of the "holy" except what is revealed to him from thence, and, therefore, has no right whatever to give it a ^{his} ~~third~~-worldly name or shape. His existence is entirely a gift of grace which leaves him in a permanent creaturely, dependent position of gratitude and obedience. The presence of the "Holy" can shatter the entire stability of his existence unless he submits to it but obedience can ensure safety within the holy life of Yahweh.

The Liturgical Strand:

Another result of the intensive research in the Old Testament field has been the greater recognition being accorded to the existence and place of the cult in primitive times. Whereas the cult was once thought of as a later degenerate form of the earlier simple and pure prophetic religion, it is now recognised that the highly cultic forms of religion existing in Egypt, Mesopotamia and Canaan in times quite contemporary with the Exodus did not leave Israel uninfluenced. The result is that the priest, the cult and the liturgy are to be reckoned as parallel in development with the prophetic charismatic forms of religion. The priestly investiture and cultic injunction of the Book of Exodus are not to be reckoned entirely as the reading back into the record of the developments of later times. The important point for this thesis is that very early in the life of Israel, efforts were being made to foster the Israelite world-view by the aid of priestly activity and liturgical practice.

1.

The institution of the "Passover Legend" and its accompanying practises

1. Ex.13:1-22. See Pedersen, *ibid.* pp.384ff.

is an endeavour to recreate by dramatic repetition, at least annually, the atmosphere of sheer grace and miracle by which Israel was brought up out of Egypt by the hand of Yahweh. It was intended to remind Israel again of the glowing gratitude and obedience, with which she had been ready to follow Yahweh after such a demonstration of his irresistible capacity to direct the resources of the spirit world, of kings, of nature and men to fulfil his holy purposes. The repetition set Israel again within the wholesome presence of the Exodus revelation of the holiness of Yahweh, and of her own contrasting contemporary "poverty", and of her mission as witness to, and repository of, the holiness of Yahweh. It was a means of the renewal of her own holiness reflected in her existence of grace within the world. The Passover is to remind her that she came into being by act of the grace of Yahweh, and, as soon as her existence can be seen to depend on "normal" this-worldly means, the reason for her existence as a revelation of Yahweh ceases.

Provision is made within the covenant group for the maintenance and administration of the Law of Yahweh in its detailed application from day to day, by the appointment of "judges"; but, in order that the due "fear" of the "holiness" of Yahweh shall be inculcated, and provision made for pastoral guidance in "holy" things, special people must be designated and special places set apart and prescribed orders of approach to the "holy" must be appointed and instituted respectively. They are to be set apart as repositories and representatives of the peculiar holiness of Yahweh, and they themselves partake an imparted "holiness", as separated unto the Lord.

Every thing that militates against the solidarity of the holiness of the covenanted group is proscribed as "unclean" and is forbidden. The standard of ritual and liturgical "holiness" is set by the Exodus revelation. The

object of cultic formalities is to ensure that no person who is "unclean" by contact with sordid, "unexodic", "normal" living shall rush unprepared into the dangerous presence of the "holy". Fundamentally, the whole cultic procedure is to teach Israel that worship is the only appropriate attitude for men to adopt in the presence of Yahweh, the Holy. There is an ontological and qualitative gulf between them. However its complete arbitrariness is qualified by the self-revelation of his holiness by Yahweh at the Exodus. The purpose of the cult in Israel is to maintain, in the covenant life of the nation, that worshipful attitude to Yahweh, which will reveal to the world her understanding of his peculiar holiness. At the worship level, the cult is intended to maintain within Israel the appropriate attitude to Yahweh which will maintain her holiness, and so fulfil her revelatory purpose in the world. In this task it represents the cultic analogical model of the Israelitish world-view, in the same way as the Exodus events and the Decalogue respectively represent the historical and legal analogical models. In the same way as the historical revelation of the "holy" at the Exodus is modified by the accompanying concepts of קדוש , קדושה and קדושים and the Decalogue expression of it modified by the content of the individual laws, so in the cultic expression of the Israelitish world-view, the methods by which it is safe for man to enter the presence of the holy are set out. At the basis of them is the attitude of worship which is indicative of the appropriate attitude of man in the presence of God.

"God" in the Israelitish World-View:

The first conclusion of the Israelitish world-view about God is that he is "holy". He is "holy" in the sense that he is "holiness" itself. He has all the arbitrary rights of holiness to stand over against all things and to be

what he himself wills to be. In the presence of God, other gods and nature and men are revealed to belong to a completely different order than he. They can only be said to exist as the creation of his grace. From their strictly transitory existence within creation men have no right nor power to limit their description of him, in name or in form, to anything that is within creation itself, or that is within the mind of man to conceive. The prerogative of self-revelation is Yahweh's alone. If we use the word "existence" as descriptive of ourselves there is a sense in which it is inapplicable to God. Language, as a thing of this earth, falters, and we necessarily fall immediately into anthropomorphism. We must recognise the strictly analogical nature of our description of him.

Such is the "holiness" of God that in his presence all other existences are revealed for the creaturely, fleeting, dependent things they are, and he becomes revealed for what he is in contrast with them. Time and form and names and human life (existence) do not describe the "holiness" of God. Holiness is timeless, and there is nothing on earth that could give it adequate shape without misrepresenting it. If it is to be named, it must be called the Un-namable or That-Which-Alone-Has-the-Right-to-Name-Itself. Its life can only be understood as wanting nothing from human life and contributing everything to it. Holiness is otherness from this world in every significant sense. Such is the form of the holiness to which Israel must respond. If the holiness of Yahweh is more than this, it is because Yahweh has revealed himself in the dramatic action of human history, exerting his own holy prerogatives as a surcharge to historical time, giving a self-revealing distinctive and prophesied shape of his own to certain events of history, shewing how impossible it would be to give him

an adequate this-worldly name, and to deservy more ^{than} the "rear view" of the glory of his life within the normal terms of man's existence. The presence of God before his world is always a revelation. Its first effect is to demonstrate the utterly unconditioned nature of his being, and, at the same time, the strictly grace-conditioned nature of this world and the life of man.

The character of the holy, however, is further revealed in the nature of the recorded events. These events go beyond reflecting complete arbitrary holiness. They also exhibit a certain recognisable character in the way the events are reported and in their motivation. Over a whole generation there is a reliability which not only remains consistent within the events described but which lights up a similar consistency in events of other times. The promises of former times are shown to be fulfilled. God is faithful (πιστος). Moreover, the events demonstrate unmistakable evidence that they are wrought in just judgment on the proud and deep mercy for the oppressed. This is a new kind of holiness that is being revealed. The race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. The life of God is greater than the life of this world and men. Such are his prerogatives that men have no claim whatever upon him. Such are the resources of his holiness that he requires nothing of men he could remain totally "other", outside the world and history and is in a position to make an unquestioned total claim upon them. In point of fact, however, he reveals himself to be active within the world and history, and, wherever he is seen to be present, in the nature of the case, it is an act of sheer grace. But the acts of grace consistently occur when there is some gross injustice to be set right, and an appealing demand for compassion for the unfortunate. It is under such conditions that the

irresistible and peculiar nature of God's holiness is to be most clearly seen and most likely to occur. No one can ascribe these achievements to the "normal" processes of nature of the "normal" resources or the "normal" nature of men. They are undeniably acts of God, and the arbitrary holiness of the actions is consistently defined by the undeniable rights of the case and motivated by compassion.

God is not to be defined, therefore, in terms of power alone, nor is the response of man to be measured in fear alone. On the one hand, power is being used as an instrument of grace, characterised by reliability, justice and mercy, and, on the other hand, therefore, man's response is motivated by a gratitude that over-shadows his fear and sense of creaturely dependence.

On the historical model, therefore, man's most appropriate attitude is ^{to} stand aside, watch, and marvel, and respond in gratitude; on the legal model he must obey; but the cultic expression of his appropriate attitude under such circumstances is to worship.

A concluding statement of Mosaic monotheism must stress the fact that it is revealed, that it is practical and that it is personal, and that these features are also destined to characterise its future clarification.

It is revealed in the sense that it does not grow out of the natural processes of creation, nor grow up with the development of Israel. The whole value of the revelation depends on the degree of "abnormality" to be seen in the events. Something is going on where men and nature are in their most helpless state. Nature has not produced a God (Cf. Ex. 32:24.), nor has Israel increased his stature by the strength of her military exploits. The obduracy of nature and the helplessness of Israel are prerequisites

to the revelation. The very over-coming of the obduracy of nature and the helplessness of men are part and parcel of the revelation. Unless this revelation is recognised as a new creation, a new act of God himself in declaring himself to be "above" the known three-storied world of contemporary thinking, the events have happened in vain.

It is this that makes the monotheism "practical". For all practical purposes within the framework of the events under review, no other god counts. Therefore, for Israel no other god can possibly exist. This leads us to a further point. The revelation is to a defined group, and could therefore apply only within that group; but, in that there is always at the back of the record the proposition that this revelation is ultimately directed through Israel to all men, the editors of the Old Testament record no doubt intended the story to apply its monotheism universally. Israel is merely the mediator. Both she and the events of her history are "typical" for all people and all history.

Within the dramatic form of presentation the Exodus revelation, preference is shown for the historical and therefore for the personal. If the revelation is to have relevance to personal beings it would be less than adequate were it couched in impersonal terms or in terms of nature only. If we are ready to recognise the analogical nature of the record, the anthropomorphic aspects of it except in its cruder forms, will not trouble us unduly. The reality to which the anthropomorphic terms apply is always recognised to be greater and different in kind than the terms mentioned within the analogy. To this extent the discussions concerning

anthropomorphism, however informative for other purposes, are irrelevant to our central issues of discussion. The personal nature of the analogy indicates the inadequacy of any less than human presentation of the peculiar holiness of God. Accept the human, personal analogy and all the complex characteristics of human personality are available as instruments of analogical comparison. Moreover, humanity has some relative freedom from, and mastery over, nature. Man knows what it is to work both within nature and outside it. The choice, therefore, of the personal analogy is appropriate, both because it is the best available analogical model, and because of the appropriateness of its application to the personal creatures to whom the analogy is directed.

Within the Israelitish world-view, therefore, the terms of the historical and personal analogy exhibit the completely arbitrary and unconditioned nature of the transcendent "holiness" of God, but to be held in constant tension with it, is his gracious, personal and redeeming presence revealed in creation and human history, exercising a sovereignty over it that is characterised by reliability, justice and mercy.

PROPHETIC MODIFICATIONS

It is the frequent back and forward references to the redemption from Egypt in the other Old Testament books that help to mark off these events as determinative for what pertains to the Israelitish world-view¹. The anticipation in the earlier books, and the fulfilment in the later books, bear the stamp of the Exodus experience of grace. To the generation living a nomadic existence in the desert the grace of Yahweh confronted them at every turn, but the settled agricultural life lived amid Canaanite tribes that worshipped fertility gods, soon challenged the complete dependence upon the existence of grace. It did not seem at first incompatible with the primacy of Yahweh's claims upon Israel that she should also insure her survival by joining in the fertility rites of the Canaanite tribes.

It is a distinguishing mark of the prophets of Israel that they were responsive to a vision² of Yahweh which repeatedly underlined the characteristic features of the Exodus revelation. The substance of the prophetic world-view is, that history as they saw it, and as they and Israel were involved in it, only reproduced in a more emphatic way and in bolder outline, what the events at the Exodus had signified to their forefathers. The recurring pattern of events represented by the period of the Judges³ and at the foundation of the monarchy, could only be explained on the assumption that the Yahweh of the Exodus was involved in them. There was a correspondence between Israel's obedience to her utterly dependent covenant position of grace and her prosperity, and between her disobedience and her failure³, that could not be accounted for by "normal" calculation⁴. Moreover, the situations, as they are

1. Hos. 2:15; 11:1; etc. Amos 2:16; 3:1; etc. Jer. 2:6f; 7:25; etc. Micah 6:4; 7:15; Ez. 20:5f; 10; Is. 50:2; 51:10; etc. cf. Is. 63:11f.

2. cf. Is. 6; Jer. 1:4-10; Ez. 1; 3:14; Amos 1:1f; Hos. 4:1; 6:6;

3. Judg. 2:7; 3:4; 6:8-10; 13; 10: 11f.

. Jud. 2:13-19; 10:7;

4. Jud. 6:15f; 7:2; 13; 16:28ff.

recorded, are such that the elements of faithfulness or reliability, grace, justice and pity or compassion are undeniably present. The "form" of Yahweh as revealed at the Exodus is clearly to be seen.

The prophets, then, are in the Mosaic tradition; but they are working under new conditions and on a larger canvas. The increasing complexity of the life amid the Canaanite tribes lent an aura of attractive simplicity to the distant, nomadic, desert period to which some returned in protest¹. The writers of the prophetic literature probably idealised the desert period, but their main contribution to the larger situation was to portray the "Exodus" character of Yahweh in terms more commensurate with the new situation.

At first the canvas is limited to Canaan, which becomes the scene of Yahweh's characteristic presence² with Israel in terms of reliability³, justice⁴ and mercy⁵. Obedience to Yahweh, as represented in obedience to the first commandment of the Mosaic Law, and to the cultic⁶ ordinances⁷ are the basic demands upon the tribes during the period of the conquest of and settlement in Canaan. The Yahweh who brought them up out of Egypt proves himself to be equally in control of nature, of men and of the gods of the Canaanite tribes as he had been at the Exodus. The "Judges" are not made judges by any inherent virtue of their own, for it is the Spirit of the Lord which singles them out and endows them for their office⁸. Their victories are won under conditions which can be ascribed to Yahweh alone. Israel's "punishment" is a just reward for her disloyalty, and her re-instatement is evidence of the mercy of

1. Notably the Rechabites: 2 Kgs. 10:1-11; Jer. 35:1-10; Cf. Nazarites (Num. 6:2ff; Judg. 13:4f.) 2. Cf. Judg. 6:16; 3. Judg. 6:8-13; 10:11f. Cf. Judg. 2:1f; 4. Judg. 11:27; cf. 2:12; 14:20; 3:8; 5. Cf. Judg. 6:3; 10:16; 6. Judg. 2:12; 7. Judg. 6:26; 20:26ff; 21:4; 8. Judg. 3:10f; 6:34; 11:29; 14:6;

Yahweh when she cries to him. The presence of Yahweh is to be feared and the sight of him was expected to bring death¹.

Similar characteristics are attributable to Yahweh in the days of Samuel and the early monarchy. The prosperity and the adversity in Israel is clearly related to events that indicate that she has remembered or forgotten the Yahweh who brought her out of Egypt². The discomf^cture of Israel's enemies and their gods is accomplished by the presence of the ark³ of Yahweh and his holiness⁴. Leaders are rejected who do not maintain the standards of cult⁵ or justice⁶ associated with the known character of Yahweh. The narrators see Israel's existence as one entirely dependent upon the grace of Yahweh. The security within the solidarity of the covenant depends upon obedience to Yahweh's laws and statutes and is in jeopardy if she disobeys. Both in his judgement of disloyalty and in his re-instating mercy, Yahweh is revealing his reliability and grace in his treatment of Israel. The record is not history only but prophecy. The events of the Exodus have proclaimed in advance what Yahweh is, and Israel knows the end of her obedience or disobedience from the beginning. Nothing human or divine can prevent Yahweh from being what he is.

The institution and conduct of the monarchy is set in the same context. To begin with it is introduced under protest despite its military necessity⁷. It is a confession that Israel is seeking "normal" means of security and showing a lack of confidence in the Yahweh who brought ^{her} them from⁸ Egypt. Warnings are therefore given of the fallibility to be expected in the human rule. Israel must be prepared to accept the

1. Judg.6:22; 13:22; 2. 1 Sam.6:6; 8:8; Cf.4:7;21; 2 Sam.7:21-24;
 3. 1 Sam.4:4f;7f; 4. 1 Sam.6:20; 5. 1 Sam.2:12ff; 6. 1 Sam.8:3f;
 7. (1 Sam.8:4-9;20; 8. 1 Sam.8:7ff; cf.10:17f;
 (of. Anger Hos.13:10f;)

consequences of turning to human means of security. The very failure of human kingship will reinforce the utter faithfulness of Yahweh.

The organisation of the institution of kingship, nevertheless, does take on the stamp of Israel's peculiar position of grace. In the first instance the primary qualification of kingship in Israel is not so much political good sense, shrewd military wisdom, sensible alliances, but¹ obedience to the word of Yahweh given through priest or prophet, and an acknowledgement of the position of grace in which Israel and her king stood. The kingship has that charismatic quality of being called to the task of kingship of Yahweh's people. The king² is anointed by Yahweh's prophetic representative, and holds office during Yahweh's good pleasure. In Israel the monarch is but Yahweh's earthly representative. His authority is a derived authority, and there is also the consent of the people³ to be reckoned with, at least in the earlier period.

The Book of Deuteronomy has some instructive things to say concerning the kingship, which indicate the presence of un-Israelite features which endangered the practice of kingship when that book was written⁴. Deuteronomy represents a reversion to the past⁵ in which the king was thought of as *primus*⁶ *inter pares*, a military leadership without political and sacral functions. It amounts to a reduction of the kingship to yeoman size. He is not to have at his disposal horses (and, presumably, horsemen from Egypt) and money that would make him independent of "the people of the land," nor the other symbol of luxury associated with

1. 1 Sam. 12:13ff; cf. 15:13f; 2. Cf. link with Spirit. 1 Sam. 11:6; 14:7; 13; 16:9ff; 2 Sam. 1:14ff; 19:22ff; 23:1-7; 3. 1 Sam. 11:14f; 2 Sam. 5:3; 17; 4. Dt. 17:14-20; 5. Cf. von Rad, Studies in Deut. pp. 62ff; 6. Dt. 17:15;

other monarchs, a large harem. Israel is the יְהוּדָה ¹, and there is strong emphasis on free property-holding, full citizenship for every Israelite. These are the "people of the land," who play a leading part in the determination of the kingly² succession, and uphold the primitive Yahwism as opposed to syncretism and the cities³. Whatever else these events imply they represent a drastic curtailment of the absolute powers of the kingship at the instance of Jehoiada, the priest, and the people of the land. That a continual watch was being kept lest the kingship should develop along secular and arbitrary lines like other kingships, is indicated by the bitter opposition to Jezebel by the prophet Elijah, and the revulsion with which the long un-Israelitish reign of Manasseh is regarded by biblical writers and editors⁴. Under these restrictions the Israelitish kings often felt at a disadvantage by comparison with other kings, in that they possessed professional soldiers and were accountable to no-one else. The existence and security of the king in Israel, no less than Israel herself, must not be seen to be constituted in the established and tested rules of civilisation, but in Yahweh. This was the ideal of kingship with which Israel began her monarchical period. In actual practice of course it was often exercised in forms far below the ideal.

It is from this background, however, that the distinctive features of Israel's kingship come. They cannot be viewed without reference to the Exodus experience of the characteristic Lordship of Yahweh, his justice and special care for the "poor." As representative citizen the king gradually began to represent the nation in the cult, claiming renewal in holiness from Yahweh on behalf of the people.

1. 2 Kgs. 11:18; 2. 2 Kgs. 11 & 21:23f; in each case a minor is concerned and a revival of Yahwism. 3. Cf. 2 Kgs. 11:18; 4. 2 Kgs. 21, cf. Is. 10;

Although Israel borrowed the cultic ritual patterns of her neighbours, she gave them the peculiar "Exodus" twist in making use of them¹. The king takes his place, alongside the prophet and the priest, as another figure representative of the solidarity that is "Israel." He is the first and representative citizen of Yahweh's Israel, and to that extent, he is a concentrated form of Yahweh's self-revelation to the nations through Israel. All the intimate titles of relationship with Yahweh applicable to Israel become applicable to her anointed king, especially to David and his line². The time of David is always remembered with an air of nostalgia, not only as a time of expensiveness, but as a time when the kingship was still close to the people; when there was no large ruling class, and international relations were tribal in scale rather than menaced by rising, rival, world empires. But more than these things the king himself operated within the recognised sphere of grace and obedience³, recognising that his office, like Israel's existence, is always within the gift of Yahweh⁴. The king must know the rule of Yahweh within his own life before he can rule Israel on Yahweh's behalf. His rule within Israel and reputation outside her borders must be seen to depend on Yahweh alone⁵, and he must be careful not to discredit Yahweh⁶.

As soon as his kingship can be seen to depend on the normal securities of other kingships, he ceases to be a vehicle of Yahweh's self-revelation. Moreover, the King's own personal behaviour must be

1. S. H. Hooke, *Myth, Ritual & Kingship*, 1958. Espec. criticism by S. G. F. Brandon, pp. 261-291. See also *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, by A. R. Johnson, 1955, and Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 428ff.
 2. Cf. "servant" 2 Sam. 7:25;29; "Son" 2 Sam. 7:14; cf. Ps. 2:7f;
 3. 2 Sam. 5:19;24f; cf. 6:21; 4. 2 Sam. 5:12;7:8f;18ff;23; cf. 16:9ff;
 5. Not on numbers cf. 2 Sam. 24:10f; 6. 2 Sam. 12:14; cf. 24:24;

disciplined by the moral justice of Yahweh¹, and his administration must be informed continually by the justice and mercy of Yahweh².

Recent studies of the Psalms³ have stressed the central place occupied by the king in the temple cult at Jerusalem. A group of the Psalms have been styled "Enthronement Psalms," because they give the impression of belonging to some form of cultic ceremony of the enthronement of Yahweh, in which the king, as Yahweh's representative, played a key role⁴. Whether this thesis is finally sustained or not, the establishment of the kingship of Yahweh throughout the whole earth, through the instrumentality of his chosen people and their anointed king, finds repeated expression in the cultic life of Israel. The temple became the centre of holiness⁵, and the place where its renewal could be found. The king represents the most concentrated channel of renewal. By his individual obedience or disobedience to Yahweh's commands and cultic ordinances, he can raise or lower the holiness of all Israel, and in the same degree strengthen or lessen Israel's value as an organ of the revelation of the holiness of Yahweh. The king's administration of, or neglect of, Yahweh's justice could exalt or scandalise the name of Yahweh at home and abroad. Hence the nostalgia for the past days of Davidic glory, and hunger for the future days of some David-like king.

Meantime, except for occasional kings of promise, the office of king became less and less sustained by reliance upon the faithfulness

1. Cf. 2 Sam. 7:14f; 12:9; 2. Cf. Prov. 16:10ff; See also Is. 11:3ff; 16:5; Jer. 33:15; 3. See review in A. R. Johnson's "The Heb. Conception of Kingship, in Myth, Ritual & Kingship," pp. 204-235; Also Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 457f; and Johnson's "Sacral Kingship", pp. 50ff; 4. See espec. pp. "Myth, Ritual & Kingship", p 212, footnote; 5. Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 457f;

and grace of the Yahweh, who had brought Israel out of Egypt, and more and more by military strength, fortifications and alliances abroad¹, and upon arbitrary despotism at home². In the seclusion of the ruling cast³, kings lost their common touch, and with it lost the peculiar Israelitish character of their rule which was an expression of the rule of Yahweh's justice and mercy. Despite all the extravaganza of the cultic ceremonies, the kingship of Israel began to approximate to a revelation of the character of the kings of the earth and not of the King of Heaven. The remoteness of both the king and his central shrine from the people, and the concentration of both forms of authority into the hands of a centralised political and ecclesiastical nobility³, led to a growing inequality in Yahweh's Israel, and a false sense of security among the nobles, both lay and clerical. The king felt secure behind man-made fortifications and a human body-guard, and with the protective symbols of the presence of Yahweh housed securely within a city temple. It is little wonder that he could forget the character and quality of the Yahweh of Egypt and the Exodus. Who was to gainsay the king's word, or at least challenge his power. Secluded amid gay and flattering courtiers, how was he to hear of the growing injustices among the distant peasantry!

The cumulative result of this changed situation in Israel was that she felt less dependent on the grace of Yahweh, and began to take her

1. of. Jer. 2:18;37:6ff; Ez. 16:27ff;17:15; Is. 30:2f;31:1;36:6-22; Hos. 5:13;7:11; etc. 2. Ez. 45:8; Jer. 5:25-28; Mic. 3:1-3; Amos 4:1f;5:11; 3. e.g. Amos 7:13ff; etc.

covenant existence for granted, both in its scope and its permanence¹. Israel accepted all the benefits of the covenant without taking up its ethical responsibilities² or its claims for total loyalty. She lost sight of her revelatory "end," and acted as though she held proprietary rights upon Yahweh, and could channel his peculiar holiness for her private and very this-worldly purposes, misusing what is "holy" for merely human ends.

It is in this context that the prophetic activity in Israel is to be understood. The early non-writing prophets are presented as strict upholders of the primacy of Yahweh's claim on Israel's loyalty, and of the standards of justice and mercy of Yahweh's Law. They represent the voice of the Exodus tradition speaking with the authority of the tremendous redemption for Israel these events achieved. It is this appeal to the Exodus that represents the solid unifying force in the loosely confederated tribes in Canaan. The authority of the prophets is re-inforced by their obvious personal association with the "extra-ordinary," and their possession by the Spirit of Yahweh. These more-than-normal activities and skills, and the prophets' association with the miraculous, represent their close links with the world of the³ "holy." What distinguishes them from other mere dervish-type prophets, is that it is the holiness of Yahweh of the Exodus that they claim to represent. It is his Spirit that possesses them, his "word" that has come to them. The characteristic features of their activities, therefore, are a relentless opposition to the worship of other gods, and the safeguarding of the pristine standards of ethical equality of all Israelites, clerical or lay, king or commoner, before Yahweh. This second feature held special reference to the use of the growing arbitrary

1. Cf. Hos. 1:9; 8:2; Amos 5:18; 8:9f; Jer. 4:10; 5:10; Mic. 3:11f;
 2. Hos. 6:6; Amos 4:1; 5:11; Mic. 6:6-8; cf. 2:2; 7:2; & 6. etc.
 3. For recent prophetic studies see reviews, OT & Mod. Stud. H. H. Rowley, pp. 117ff; also Myth, Ritual & Kingship, S. H. Hooke pp. 236-60.

powers of the king to pervert the justice which he exercised on Yahweh's behalf¹. Such actions scandalised the name of Yahweh².

In the case of the "Canonical" prophets, emphasis is laid on the prophet's presumed compelling experience of the holiness of Yahweh often by the tradition of his "call." By comparison with this holiness all the recognised organs of divine representation in Israel are called into question and placed under judgement. It is inherent in the experience itself that the arbitrary freedom of the holiness of Yahweh cannot be questioned. To the presence of Yahweh the prophet has no reply but to submit, whether his approach comes in terms of "spirit," of "word," of "vision" or of dramatic act. If the prophet is called to a mission, he must offer his services³; if he is given a command, he must obey⁴; if he has had a vision, he must recount it to those whom it concerns⁵; if he receives a complaint from Yahweh about his people, the prophet must report⁶ it. He is the unique spokesman from the counsels of Yahweh⁷. All this sense of compulsion is of the essence of the experience of holiness; but the compulsion is not merely motivated by negative inability of men to refuse a command of Yahweh; it is a positive reaction of men in the presence of the holiness of Yahweh that he must give himself⁸; but the compelling nature of the contrast between what they have found Yahweh to be and what they see in the life of Yahweh's Israel, is an immediate motive for prophetic activity. Israel

1. Cf. 2 Sam. 11 & 12 (Nathan & David); 1 Kings 21 (Naboth's vineyard);
 2. Ps. 51:3f; 3. Is. 6:8; 4. Jer. 1:5f;17f; Ez. 2:8,3:1f; 5. Cf.
 Amos 7; Jer. 1:11f;13ff; 6. Hos. 4:1ff; cf. 11:1-4; 7. See Amos 2:13;
 and espec. Amos 3:7f; 8. Is. 6; Ez. 2:1f;

cannot "know"¹ the holy Yahweh of the Exodus and go on being what she is. For his own name's sake, because of who and what he is, Yahweh must re-assert his holy freedom, and break away from the limited representation of him to be seen in his people Israel. Israel must be confronted again with Yahweh's peculiar holiness in order that she may see how far short she has fallen in her revelatory "end." Her whole life and institutions are a creation of Yahweh². All the supporting features of Israel's existence and solidarity, which belongs to her special covenant relationship of grace, must be withdrawn, in order that she may learn that they belong to her only when her life is characterised by corporate loyalty to Yahweh, and obedience to his laws, and when her administration is informed by his special sense of justice and mercy. Her³ sacred city, her anointed kingship⁴, her inviolable temple⁵ and its cult, her possession⁶ of the Law, even her prophets, will avail her nothing; nor will the special marks of her nationhood⁷, unless her loyalty and obedience to Yahweh's ethical demands is forth-coming.

But the whole fabric of the nation is in fact completely unrepresentative of Yahweh's "Israel." Her king and the nobles are luxury-loving and irresponsible⁸. They oppress the "poor" and allow corruption to prevent the course of justice⁹. They look for protection to foreign alliances and city fortifications¹⁰. Her priests follow her kings¹¹ into

1. Hos. 4:6; 8:2; cf. 2:19; 6:6; Jer. 9:23f; 2. Hos. 8:14; cf. Jer. 2:27; 3:4; 19; Is. 63:16; 64:8; 3. Jer. 4:10f; 17:27; cf. 52:14; 4. Hos. 5:10; 7:7; 8:4f; 10:7 & 15; 13:9; 5. Jer. 7:4, 11, 14; 6. Hos. 8:12; Is. 8:20f; Jer. 8:8f; 7. Jer. 9:25f; 8. Amos. 3:9ff; 6:1-6; 8:10; 9. Hos. 12:7f; Amos 2:6f; 4:1; 5:11; Is. 14:32 etc. Jer. 5:25ff; 28; 7:4-6; 9:1-8; 10. Alliances: Hos. 5:13; 7:11; 8:9; 10:6; 12:1; 14:3; Is. 30:2; 7; 12; 31:1; 36:6-22 & 38; Jer. 2:8; 37; 6ff; Fortifications: cf. Hos. 8:14; 13:10; Jer. 5:10; 11. Jer. 2:8; Hos. 3:9;

idolatry and make a business out of their calling¹. Her elaborate liturgies are made a mockery by their lack of sincerity and their separation from the ethical demands of Yahweh². Even her prophets have been caught up in the general deterioration of the situation³. It is obvious that they have not experienced the complacency-shattering holiness of Yahweh or they would have denounced the disloyalty, corruption and oppression, and not declared "Peace," where there was no peace⁴. This kind of prophesying caused the Holy One of Israel to cease from being with Israel⁵.

As the prophets see it, the great need of the times is for Israel to be confronted with the holiness of Yahweh; but in this they are merely voicing the message of Yahweh himself. For his very name's sake, both within and outside Israel, the Holy One of Israel must assert his holiness. He must disengage himself from Israel as she is as present constituted, or be untrue to his character published abroad at the Exodus. It is the primary right of Yahweh's holiness that there is nothing automatic about his grace, unless it is safeguarded by the responding loyalty, obedience and "righteousness" of the recipients. The sole restraints upon the arbitrary withdrawal of his grace are the reliability, righteousness and mercy of Yahweh, and the nature of the response of the recipients. This recognition had been axiomatic in Israel at least since the Exodus.

There is, however, a certain heightening, broadening and deepening of the Exodus revelation of Yahweh's holiness to be seen in the prophets. In part, this grows out of the enlarging situation. Yahweh's authori-

1. Mic. 3:11; Jer. 5:31; 6:13; 2. Amos 5:21; Mic. 6:6f; Is. 1:11; 29:13; 3. Hos. 4:5; 9:8; Jer. 2:8; 5:13; 23:11; Ez. 13: 8 & 16; 13:23; 4. Mic. 3:5; Jer. 6:14; 14:13; 28:9; Ez. 13: 3 & 10; 5. Is. 30:10f;

tative control is seen to extend increasingly from Canaanite tribal activity of the days of the non-writing prophets, to surrounding smaller nations¹ and finally to world empires² during the time of the canonical prophets. Parallel to this extension is his widening and more complete control over all creation³, concluding in an explicit claim to be the creator of the world⁴. A similar movement can be seen concerning Yahweh's superiority over other gods. At first it is Canaanite Baalim over whom Yahweh exercises his control⁵, then it is the gods of the surrounding nations who are as nothing⁶, and, finally, it is idolatry in principle that is scorned. Men are engaged in actually making their own gods, as though there were no distinction in kind between this world and the world of the holy⁷. Yahweh is the true and living God in distinction from unreal lifeless human creations.

This widening of the scope of Yahweh's effective control to be Creator of all things and controller of all history, coupled with the reduction of idols to be mere creatures, makes explicit the monotheism implicit in the Exodus revelation. Nevertheless, it is still a practical monotheism rather than a theoretical and speculative monotheism on the Greek model.

The widening of the canvas of Yahweh's control was accompanied by a heightening of the conception of his majesty. To represent him as "above the world" (*Überweltlichkeit*) belongs to the imagery of the three storied universe, but it was responsible for introducing the idea of height as a symbol of the divine transcendence. It also stands in some relation to

1. Amos Chaps 1 & 2; 2. Cf. Is. 10:5; 13:1; 19:1; etc. 3. Amos 4:13; 7:8; Jer. 5:22; 10:10; 32:17; 51:15f; Is. 40:12; 4. Is. 40:26; 28; 41:20; 42:5; 45:5-18; 48:12ff; 51:13; 5. Hos. 2:8; 11:2; etc. 6. Is. 10:10f; 46:1; Jer. 1:16; 7. Jer. 2:11; 51:17f; Is. 2:8f; 30:22; 31:7; 41:18-20; 41:28; 42:17f; 44:9-20;

Yahweh's temporary disengagement of himself from the covenant with Israel, and her consequent sense of distant estrangement from him. But more than either of these, from the point of view of the doctrine of God, it symbolizes the extension of Yahweh's authority to the "Heavens," and his sovereignty over whatever influence the heavenly bodies might be supposed to exercise upon the earth. It re-emphasises the majesty, the glory, the up-liftedness of Yahweh above the whole earth, and his lordly occupation of the "sky."

Despite or because of the broadening and heightening of the sovereign power and authority of Yahweh in earth and sky, there is also to be seen in the revelation of the prophets a deepening of the ethical content of Yahweh's holiness. His faithfulness and reliability must be steadfastly maintained for his name's¹ sake. His sensitiveness to what is right, and to his word of promise to other generations, motivates his activity throughout the entire region of his sovereignty². His promises of blessing to the nations through the agency of Israel must not be impeded by Israel's failure. He must exercise his just sovereignty, even if it means the destruction of his own chosen people Israel. But, equally for his name's³ sake, he must not allow the oppressive brutality and unrighteousness of his chosen scourges to connect his name with the merciless. The righteous in Israel may wait in faith confidently for the day of Yahweh, when a reconstituted Israel will be redeemed by an equally certain act of pardoning grace motivated by Yahweh's holy mercy⁴. Because his name is what it is, he can accomplish whatever he

1. Cf. back references to Mosaic times. Is. 63:12; 14; 19; See Ez. 9:14; 20:44; 2. And note echo of Decalogue, Is. 42:8; 2 Cf. Jer. 44:26; Ez. 20:39; 38:23; 3. Cf. Jer. 10:2; & 16:50:33; Is. 63:19; Cf. 41:25; 4. See Hab. 2:4; Jer. 14:21; Is. 43:3-7; 48:9; 11; 55:6-13; Mic. 4:5; Ez. 36:22f; 39:7 & 25;

wishes¹; but, whether within or outside Israel, his sovereignty is informed by the same judgment on proud oppressors and by pity and by active, just redemption for the oppressed².

While it is noteworthy from Mosaic times that the "righteousness" of Yahweh always presages active participation in the form of judgment on oppressors and redemption for the oppressed, the ethical quality of the holiness of Yahweh in the writing-prophets is richer and more specific. It takes up and applies the ethical revelation of the Decalogue. It proclaims that the evil behaviour of Israelites towards their fellows is a blasphemy against the name of Yahweh before the nations. All sin is sin against Yahweh (Jer. 14:7;). On the other hand, to follow the reasonable requirements of Yahweh³, is not only to recognise and proclaim to the nations man's "humble" place when confronted by the arbitrary holiness of Yahweh, but also to exhibit to the proud world man's place of safety within the covenant laws of justice and mercy, which are characteristic of the entire sovereign activity of Yahweh himself. The prophets find it a part of Yahweh's justice and mercy that the good no longer shall perish with the bad. Any nucleus of good men around which a new Israel can be constituted, or the old Israel can be redeemed, however small, will give opportunity for the revelation of the mercy of Yahweh. The call of Yahweh goes out to all just men as individuals to turn to him and be saved⁴.

In the prophets the conception of evil itself is made increasingly personal and detailed. As well as the large national evils of disloyalty

1. This is inherent in the name "Yahweh," which is proclaimed afresh in the prophets. 2. Cf. Ez. 36:11;22f;38:23;39:7 & 25; Jer. 10:6;12:16; 32:18;44:26;50;34; Is. 42:8;45:5;48:2; 3. Mic. 6:6f;4:5; 4. Ez. 18: 2-32 (espec. v. 25); Jer. 31:29f;

and unrighteous oppression, for which whole nations must be held responsible through their kings, priests and prophets, there is a class of "sinners" to be differentiated from "just" men within any national group. Yahweh's new covenant is with the just¹ whatever nation they belong to.

Moreover, ethical evil is to be described in terms that go beyond formal, ritual and outward behaviour². Falsehood and deceit and commercial trickery have no place in the presence of the holiness of Yahweh. Yahweh himself is reliable and true³. Yahweh's ethical sovereignty is universal, it is exercised over men and⁴ individuals, and it is inward in its demands upon their behaviour.

The result of the application of this ethical sovereignty in Israel, is judgment and destruction of the solidarity of the old formal, national, covenantal relationship between Yahweh and his people, and the calling into existence of a new ethical solidarity around ethically responsive remnant groups and individuals committed to the prophetic revelation of the ethical holiness of Yahweh⁴. Over such an "Israel" Yahweh will reign, and will anoint kings characteristic of Davidic times⁵. She shall be in possession of the knowledge of Yahweh⁶; for her priests will teach her peoples the difference between the holy⁷ and profane, and Yahweh will write his laws on their hearts. The glow of gratitude will give reality to her cult, and Jerusalem will be a holy city⁸. So shall Israel fulfil her revelatory task, and Yahweh's "servant" shall see his "seed" and of the travail of his soul and be satisfied⁹; for nations

1. Cf. Jer. 31:31ff; Ez. 18: cf. Is. 56:1-8; 2. Jer. 31:33; Ez. 11:19; 18:31; 36:26f; 3. Jer. 5:27;7:18;9:4ff:13:25; Ex. 18:25 & 29.
4. Hos. 3:4f; For "Remnant" see Amos 9:8; Is. 1:9;4:2f;10:20ff;11:16; 37:31;46:3; Mic. 2:12;4:7;5:3 & 7:7:18; Jer. 15:10-15;42:5f;50:20; Ez. 6:8-10;11:13-21;14:22; 5. Hos. 13:10; Mic. 4:7; Is. 33:17; Jer. 10:10; etc. 6. Hos. 3:5; Jer. 22:4;23:5ff;30:9; Is. 9:6f;11:1ff;32:1f; etc. 7. Hos. 2:19f;6:3;6; Jer. 9:24;31:34; Ez. 22:26; 8. Jer. 31:40; Is. 4:3f;62:1-4; 9. Is. 53:11;

yet in darkness will see Yahweh's light¹ in Israel, and out of all nations shall men come to her sacred city and to worship her God², and all creation shall share in Yahweh's peace³.

The importance given to Israel, and all the delimitations of Israel, as witnesses⁴ of Yahweh in the prophetic literature, underlines an important aspect of Hebrew psychology. Israelitish leaders act as mediators of the revelation of Yahweh to Israel, and Israel herself acts as mediator to the rest of the nations. In the earlier days in their mediatorial relations with Yahweh, single leaders raised or debased the solidarity of Israel's total response to Yahweh by their individual efforts. The one became representative of the many in their corporate capacity. This was normal Hebrew thinking, just as, in the same way, a part or section of any object or person or group of things or persons, could be spoken of as if it were the whole⁵. It was sacrificial practice to accept the sacrifice of the first-born or first-fruits as a representative sacrifice for all of the flock, herd or crop of any particular year, and the blessing returned from the one to the many of the whole year's production⁶. Similarly any part of Israel or - speaking anthropomorphically - of Yahweh could be spoken of as the whole⁷ of his person.

Further complication arises when the one or the many, or the part or the whole, was used indiscriminately without notice within the same statement⁸.

1. See Is. 9:2ff;42:6;60:3;19f;62:1ff; cf. Hos. 6:5; 2. Is. 11:10ff;60:3 & 11;62:6f & 12; cf. Jer. 16:19; 3. Is. 11:6ff; 4. Cf. Is. 43:10ff; 44:8; 5. See A. R. Johnson's monogram, *The One & the Many*; see also, *The Vitality of the Individual etc.* by the same author; also H. W. Robinson, *The Heb. Conception Of Corporate Personality*, in *Werden und Wesen des. A.T.* pp55f; ed. Hempel, also E. Jacob, *ibid*, p. 237; 6. Cf. Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 313-316; 7. E.g. The holy arm of Yahweh (Is. 52:10;); 8. See W. H. Robinson (5) above;

This type of extension of personality, from Yahweh to his mediatorial representatives, and the fluidity of movement between Yahweh and his representative in prophetic statements, and the reference to some part of Israel as though it were the whole, has to be borne in mind in interpreting the theology of the prophets. This is especially so in reference to the conceptions behind such terms as the "Servant of Yahweh," the "anointed," the "elect," the "house of David," or the "throne of David," the "son of man", "Ephraim," "Jacob," the "son" and the "remnant"¹. At the prophetic stage of the Old Testament under review, these figures stand for "Israel" in some form or other; but the very close alignment of Yahweh with several of these mediatorial figures points in the direction of the supernatural representatives of God of a later period. In the devotional expression of the Psalms, and in the "Servant Songs" of Deutero-Isaiah, the borderline between divine and human figures is not always clear. If this is true, it means that final revelation of Yahweh does not rest with Israel, but with some mysterious supernatural personage, variously referred to under the nomenclature of former titles of Israel, or of her leaders in their several mediatorial capacities. This reduction of representation of Israel to individual figures is not the final form of the Old Testament presentation of "Israel" as agent of divine revelation. The figures are finally expanded into the conception of the "New Israel."

A further development which becomes increasingly significant is the important place of the "Word" of Yahweh, along side his Law. The "word" is spoken of as though it has a life of its own as an extension of the person of Yahweh². It is a more disciplined and directed representative of Yahweh than his Spirit. References are also being made to

1. Other figures are, the Branch, Root, Seed, etc. Espec. note the "I" of the Pss.

2. Cf. Is. 55; cf. Dt. 32:4; Jer. 10:10; (= living);

wisdom and truth in association with the word of Yahweh. This is not faith in the frail word of a single prophet. It is a word from the immediate counsels of "holy" Yahweh, and it is proffered as total security before Yahweh to those who stand now bereft of the ancient security of the traditional covenantal establishment. The basis of the new establishment is not the blood tie of nationhood, but the faith of individual hearers to the word of a single prophet, whose activity is presented as being representative of many¹. His word is guaranteed by its pronouncement of judgment. Any prophet who makes any other initial pronouncement simply does not represent man in the presence of Yahweh². This initial denunciation is accompanied by an appeal to "turn" to Yahweh and live³. The invitation is accompanied by the most tender reminders of former days of national loyalty, and expressions of Yahweh's grief at the present broken state of that former relationship⁴.

The word of Yahweh has special reference to the "poor" and "humble." It is into this condition that Israel will be plunged by the judgment of Yahweh. Robbed of all earthly security she will be a fitting object of Yahweh's mercy⁵, which will be a new undeserved gift of Yahweh's peculiar grace. In its Deuteronomic presentation the word is a generalised word of revelation⁶; a word of forgiveness to those who "turn" in gratitude, and it brings obedience to the law within easy reach⁷. Obedience is not a pre-condition, but a result of salvation. This word and its fulfilment gives unity to the Deuteronomic history of the Books of Kings. It

1. Is. 53:11; 2. Cf. Is. 6; cf. Dt. 8:5; 3. Jer. 3:7;12ff; Hos. 14:4ff; 4. Dt. 1:31;8:5;32:18; Jer. 31:9ff; Hos. 11:1; Is. 49:15; cf. Jer. 31:2ff; Hos. 11:8ff; 5. Is. 63:15ff;64:5ff; Pss. 51;90:13f;130; 6. Dt. 30:2-8; see von Rad, *ibid*, pp. 82-91 7. Dt. 30:11f;

is a word of mercy to Judah in fulfilment of promises to the house of David. Kings are judged by their basic orientation to Yahweh whose unpreventable word is being fulfilled in their historic activity. The promise remains open at the end of II Kings in that Jehoiachin is set free¹.

The reconstituted Israel will be called into being around some remnant group, or represented individual, or purified institution or city, which stands in the closest possible responsive relation to the revelation of Yahweh as it is seen in the prophets. The call goes out to all "faithful" and "just" individuals to join themselves to these representative groups and individuals and places. They become the symbols of Yahweh's new Israel, and executive agents of its realisation. At present they are a remnant sharing the revelation of Yahweh's faithful redeeming mercy, a "seed" or "root" or "branch" of the old stock struck again by his own gracious hand. Sometimes they are conceived of in cultic terms as a purged temple cult, precursor of a holy nation of priests unto Yahweh. They will exhibit the appropriate "son of Man" attitude of dependent, obedient worship in the presence of the "holy." They will be his "servants" as he is their "Lord", and bear patiently on behalf of many the suffering involved in the revelation of the word which is Yahweh's. The new Israel will take up the "sonship" so graciously bestowed at the Exodus, when she became the chosen recipient of Yahweh's fatherly care. She will joy in the privilege of being possessed as Yahweh's "lot" or "inheritance." She will rest in willing submission to a king "anointed" by the Spirit of Yahweh. In the prophets these

1. II Kings 25:27ff; this event is to the writer the sign of hope, and is calculated to quicken faith in the fulfilment of the promises of God.

conceptions begin to show the idealism and postponement which sets them apart from the historic events of the factual life of Israel. They begin to have a life of their own in another Age outside the time-space category of our world.

To conclude: the primary factor of the prophetic theology is the re-assertion of the holiness of Yahweh as first revealed at the Exodus. All the characteristic features of that revelation are to be seen, but their implications are more strikingly and finely drawn in their relation to the new situation. Yahweh's holiness is seen in a more majestic context. His unpreventable right to be "Yahweh" extends in range to cover the world-wide situation. He is the Creator of nature and men, the maker not only of Israel's history, but of all history, the first and the last, and in the heavens there is simply no one to compete with him. In theory he can make and destroy whatever he wishes. His might is infinite. He is Yahweh, the Holy One, let the earth and men and the heavens tremble before him. He is the sole God there is.

In actual practice, however, his activity does not show complete arbitrariness; it is governed by the ethical nature of his holiness, which is uniformly and always gracious, reliable, just and merciful. Wherever he sees oppression or injustice, inside or outside Israel, he is compelled to act. Wherever he sees the oppressed, he must show active compassion, for his name's sake: simply because he is ethically holy. This ethical holiness is of the very constitution of Yahweh's being. It stands revealed in both the judgment and mercy shown to

Israel. For men there is hence-forward no formal place of safety within the solidarity in mere racial, ritual or liturgical covenant. Any future covenant contracted with Yahweh, must stand in strict responsive relation to the revelation of the ethical holiness of Yahweh. Sincere groups or individual "just" men may wait confidently for this and live.

The finer points of the revelation are to be seen in the experiences of the approved representative leaders, who are the first to experience the ethical holiness of Yahweh, and who are expected to mediate it to others. They are the first and foundation members of the new covenant, and the new "Israel" fulfilling her revelatory end. Several of these representative figures have a traditional importance for Israel and are significant in their future theological import.

The patient, long-suffering waiting of the representative, righteous remnant "Israel," the Servant of Yahweh, amid the destruction of the wider Israel, is vicarious for an Israel yet to be raised up. The Servant is bearing innocently, before the scoffing world, the affliction of the revelation of the judgment of Yahweh's righteousness upon Israel; but he is bearing it that others might know the righteous judgment of Yahweh. His justification will come when he is also the object of the revelation of Yahweh's mercy. The suffering of the Servant is a revelation of what is involved when the one takes upon himself, on behalf of the many, the revealing of the holiness of Yahweh. Within the intimacy of the "master-servant" concept there are hints that the Master of the Servant is himself involved. There are depths to his ethical holiness yet to be revealed¹.

1. Is. 53:11cf; (My righteous servant")

Under the figure of the future "anointed" kingship, strict ethical limits are set to the rule he shall exercise. These stand in close relation to Yahweh's own kingly rule. The ethical judgment pronounced by Yahweh's prophets upon the kings of Israel, is intended to reveal the character of the kingship of Yahweh, which recognises no formal national subjection, but applies inwardly and universally, without respect to person or race, wherever there are individual hearts responsive to the ethical character of his sovereignty. It is stressed that his sovereignty is to be especially related to the gracious gift of pardoning mercy. It is this that lifts his sovereignty onto a new ethical level. It depends upon the authority of the obedience of loving responsive gratitude.

There is an indication of the willingness of Yahweh to reveal the extent of the ethical discipline of his own character, in the suggestion that an ultimate and characteristic relation of Israel with Yahweh is to be couched in the "father-son" relationship proffered at the Exodus.

The liturgical and cultic counterpart to these revealing insights is, that the devotional trust in the ethical holiness of Yahweh is to be underwritten by worshipful obeisance of the "sons of men" recognising their creaturely condition, and doing so only according to strict liturgical order, and supervised by a priesthood holy with the very ethical holiness of Yahweh, in a purified and consecrated temple on the sacred Mount Zion. This, too, is a revelation.

LATER COMPLICATING FEATURES

One of the theologically important tasks in which the post-exilic religious thinkers in Israel found themselves involved was the working out of the corollaries of the ethical monotheism of the later prophetic period. The prophetic insistence upon the liveness of Yahweh, Creator of all things, Ruler of universal history, Sovereign of earth and sky, and upon the ethical character of his holy majesty, had been the practical necessity of his projected saving acts of mercy. It was their conviction that nothing in the larger world, of which Israel now found herself a part, could withstand the will of Yahweh, and that no one could absolve himself from his moral scrutiny.

Because of her unfaithfulness the working out in history of Yahweh's admittedly righteous judgement had stripped Israel of her national covenant security, and left individuals exposed to a personal responsibility to the total and moral claim of Yahweh upon them. It was the judgement of the prophets that, in the presence of the peace-shattering holiness of Yahweh, man could find no basis of security, neither within the national covenant, nor as individuals, except by riding the storm of his just judgement and throwing themselves upon his sure mercy. Individuals were called to "turn" to Yahweh, trust his pardoning mercy, and in gratitude begin afresh to obey his laws and his sovereign will. The order of redemption events must ever be the sheer gift of gracious pardon followed by gratitude unto obedience. Israel's mistake had been that she had come to rely upon her covenant security as though it were her right, and unrelated to its gift status or her grateful obedience. She knew so

little about the holiness of Yahweh that she began to imagine that the normal securities within the creaturely world were valid in the world of the Creator.

Post-exilic events in Israel indicate how equally unready individuals were to accept the prophetic order of salvation events, the status of grace of men before Yahweh, and the inspiration of gratitude as the main-spring of their obedience. The persistent efforts of men were directed to reversing the order of the events of salvation: to acquire salvation by obedience to the law or cultic requirements, or by rational behaviour, or by the possession of this-worldly symbols of success.

The Deuteronomic historians, following on the prophets, had pointed the moral so persistently. The events of history proved that obedience to Yahweh's law spelt security and prosperity, and disobedience just as surely resulted in disaster. The obvious lesson was to obey and rest secure within the good graces of Yahweh, of which the outward symbols were long life and prosperity. It was the automatic working out of this principle that led to the view that those who lived to be old, and were surrounded by all the outward symbols of prosperity, were necessarily secure within the good pleasures of Yahweh. Conversely it seemed equally true that those individuals who were cut short in life, or struck down with illness, or robbed of their possessions were insecure within Yahweh's good graces. That this was an over simplified explanation of this-worldly events, we now know; but the theological fallacy from the Old Testament point of view was, that it carried the possibility of acquiring status within the divine world by the simple method of accumulating the evidences of this-worldly prosperity and good health, as though these things had equal currency within the presence

of the holiness of Yahweh. It was one of the purposes of the disastrous events of pre-Christian times to expose the theological fallacy within this view. The author of the Book of Job grapples with the problem from the point of view of one innocent of any significant disobedience, in fact of one careful to more than cover required cultic observances.¹ His answer is that in the presence of Yahweh it is sheer impertinance that such a question should arise.² Profit and loss accounts of this world are totally irrelevant to his relations with men. Yahweh can give and can take away, and both activities are occasions for praise.³ To a godly person, the fact that it is Yahweh who is giving and taking, should be reason enough. Man cannot build up status with Yahweh from "goods" within the created world, which belong to Yahweh in any case. He is acting as though goods ~~are~~^{were} original in themselves

Parallel with this attempt of man to acquire divine status, and within this same principle, is the attempt to make the many acts of obedience to the law the grounds of legal status with Yahweh. It is his belief that under such circumstances, the Law must assure his security in the presence of the total claim of the ethical holiness of Yahweh upon him. Such a claim fails to recognise both the limitations of the creaturely nature of man, seemingly biased towards disobedience, and the nature of evil outside man, in which he is willy nilly caught up. But more than both, it fails to recognise the extent of the utter totality of the ethical claim of Yahweh upon man. In the presence of the ethical holiness of Yahweh man is "undone." He can only hope for mercy. If he claims he can accumulate merit,

1. Job 1:5

2. Job 40:3-5

3. Job 1:20

his mathematics are limited to this world. He has no way of ever knowing if his sum is correct within the world of the holy. He must always suspect it is not, and, in the end discover his supposed status to be entirely irrelevant and in-effective, when it is called into question before the totality of the claim of Yahweh upon him.

Similarly, he who seeks to secure himself within the safety of his response to cultic demands, however numerous and elaborate his cultic acts may be, can never estimate cultically the satisfactory extent to which he must go. He must go on endlessly piling up cultic act upon cultic act, or throw himself on the mercy of Yahweh. The witness of the Old Testament is that man is incapable of maintaining even the gift status of Yahweh's pardoning mercy unless he is continually stimulated by the glowing gratitude awakened by the memory of the experience of pardon itself.

Both the legal and cultic attempts to find security in the presence of the holiness of Yahweh were able to continue in Israel, but only because of the domination of the later religious and national thought of Israel by a sense of renewed expectancy of a time when the old national covenant would find fulfilment. This was based theologically on the faithfulness of Yahweh to his promises to the patriarchs and David, that, through Israel, Yahweh would offer himself to the nations. This expectancy gave an "interim" air to present history, as though the whole world were awaiting a divine event which would make up for all the ^{deficiencies} ~~difficiencies~~ of nature and human history. The whole re-organisation of the state along theocratic lines, and the studied application to the fulfilment of legal and cultic requirements, were calculated to prepare for such an event. In this way the cultic practices and acts of obedience to the Law maintained the

illusion of relevance, and were continued and multiplied, as though the intervention of Yahweh would result from them, and not solely from the mercy of Yahweh himself.

The "Wisdom" Literature is another expression of the conviction that man, as a rational being, can acquire security in the presence of the holiness of Yahweh through wisdom. By the act of reasoning man should see that it is to his own advantage that he should be a moral being. The accumulation of wisdom and man's recognition of his place within creation, and the exercising of piety towards Yahweh must work out to man's permanent advantage. How vain this reasonable approach to life turned out to be is the plaint of the writer of Ecclesiastes. The neutrality of nature, the unavoidable purposelessness and repetitiveness of events, the common grave, the lack of discrimination between godly and ungodly apparent in the apportioning of material rewards of life, all rob the good life of its incentive, piety of its compensations and life itself of any sense of purpose. It is left to later editors and other wisdom writers to set true wisdom within the context of the "fear" of Yahweh.¹ This is in the nature of a confession, that, unless the wisdom takes its rise in the experience of Yahweh's holiness, it has no status or currency within the divine world. There is a differentiation of kind and not of degree between man's wisdom and the wisdom of God, which is solely and wholly in God's gift. That the development of this conception of "wisdom" holds other theological implications we shall note presently.

1. Job 28:28; Ps. 111:10. cf. Pro. 1:7; Eccl. 12:13

The uncertainty of the times was calculated to test to the fullest extent any such man-constructed system of security. The predictable neutrality towards men displayed in the unpredictable natural occurrences, the lawlessness of neighbouring states, the changing order of differing suzerain overlords, continually put man's security in jeopardy, and called into question the particular conception of divine government. The demonstrated ineffectiveness of man-made material, legal, cultic or rational systems of security to stave off disaster, was a necessary pre-supposition to the directing of man to the sole source of security within the revealed character of God. This disastrous experience of insecurity by the individual is parallel to what had been previously experienced by the nation. The extreme uncertainty of the times leading up to, and during, the Maccabean revolt seemed to single out for testing those who, by their serious application to one form or another of the current religious security devices, could have rightly considered themselves under the protection of Yahweh. The "just" found his legal security a fiction, the "saint" his cultic separation irrelevant, the prosperous his "goods" without currency and the "wise" his wisdom a mockery. They were thrown back on a fierce faith in Yahweh, whose activity, apocalyptic in nature, cosmic in dimension and foreshortened in time, they steadfastly proclaim.

In the conceptions of the divine activity involved in the "other-worldly" salvation towards which faithful Israelites are directed to look, the dominating conception is the utter transcendence of God. Yahweh must declare his freedom to individuals as well as to the covenanted nation. Indicative of his majestic unapproachability and inscrutability are his

remoteness in time and space, his unutterable name, only to be referred to in circumlocutions, or once a year by a specially prepared person in a specially sanctified place, the apocalyptic symbolism in which his presence is shrouded, and the supernatural multitudes with which heaven is peopled, among which the former this-worldly representative figures symbolic of "Israel" now have a definite, if not clearly defined place.

The prerogatives of Yahweh's "otherness" are continually safe-guarded by the emphasis on the indefinite and unknown time and place of his final redemption. It becomes associated with the end of time when something of the unfading quality of the eternal nature of Yahweh himself will characterize the life of his people. The incapacity of men to search out Yahweh for themselves is emphasized by the fact that his activity is to be conceived of as an unveiling over which men have no control, and at the point of man's greatest helplessness. Part of Yahweh's holy otherness is that he is hidden from men unless he chooses to reveal himself. Even the supernatural figures do nothing to bring in his rule or redemption. Dominion is "given" to the Son of Man. The Davidic messianic King does not earn his sovereignty at Yahweh's right hand. Yahweh will "divide" the Servant a portion with the great. Yahweh's Spirit is "poured out" upon all flesh. Salvation is not achieved from the world. It is a gift from heaven. Its sole guarantee is within the character of Yahweh.

The prophetic statements concerning Yahweh's universal creatorship and sovereignty, which follow from their monotheistic teaching, involve Yahweh's responsibility for the creation of evil as well as good. At first the implications of this teaching are not apparent, because the evil in which

Israelites are involved is included within the righteous judgement of Yahweh. It is when it persists beyond the point of punishment, and takes cruel unethical forms, or is applied to those who are, at least by human standards, just people, that it becomes a difficulty and an affront to the ethical holiness of Yahweh.

In pre-monotheistic religious thinking, the presence of evil created no difficulty. It was ascribed to the activity of some antagonistic god. Monotheistic thinking, on the other hand, must produce some satisfactory explanation. The problem is more pressing in the case of individual just people caught up in complex evil situations they have done little to produce, in which no distinction seems to be made between the good and the evil. The presupposition behind the two explanations that postulate a "fall" (i.e. the cosmic fallen angel of premundane times or the historic fallen man) is the recognition of, and insistence upon, the undiminished ethical holiness of Yahweh. The "fall" represents rebellion against the total claim implied in the belief in the holiness of Yahweh, the sole Creator and Ruler of the earth and sky.

It may have been under the influence of Persian dualism that, in post-exilic Judaism and inter-testamental times, there is the tendency to relieve Yahweh of the responsibility for evil by the ascription of evil to activity of Satan.¹ Although he is often referred to as the tempter or adversary,² he is also to be thought of as the personification of evil in all its forms: the prince of devils. The monotheism of Yahweh is thought to be maintained by Satan being allowed but a permissive rule.³ The introduction of the concept of an anti-god testifies to the impossibility with which Jewish

1. cf. 1 Chron. 21:1 Zech. 3:1f. 2. Job 1:6; 2:1. 3. Job 1 and 2.

religious thinkers viewed the thought that Yahweh could be held finally responsible for evil. Let men as nations (Israel) or as individuals, let angels be held responsible; but not the righteous government of Yahweh. They would prefer to wait and die in faith believing there would be an explanation.¹

It is the unbearable nature of the thought that Yahweh could be unjust or unmerciful that introduced the demand that "just" men should find their final justification in standing justified in the presence of God after death. However doubtful the earlier references to resurrection are, the fierce faith of the Maccabean religious leaders postulate the incentive of triumphant resurrection to martyrs in the religious struggle against Antiochus.²

The growing and insistent expectation that Yahweh will eventually set up his representative righteous government on earth, by the revealing of his Messiah, or the Son of Man, owes its strength to this faith that Yahweh must be true to his holy name. The prophets themselves had operated within the understanding of cosmic activity of Yahweh to re-instate his holy government upon earth. The word they bring from his counsels bears the holy unpreventable qualities of the one who has uttered it. It cannot be silenced until its end is accomplished.³ It has an indestructable life in itself. The final portrayal of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah assumes a closer representational association to Yahweh as his "servant" than as the symbol for corporate Israel. It partakes of Yahweh's holy quality, in that

1. Hab. 2:4.

2. See below p.105

3. cf. Is. 55:11.

the goal of the servant's suffering must be achieved. The monotonous reiteration and certainty of Ezekiel's prophecy concerning coming events, stems from his own appropriate associations as a "son of man" qualified solely by his awe-full experience of the transcendent holiness of Yahweh.¹ The promises to David will find unpreventable fulfilment, because David will be anointed and enthroned by Yahweh, and his rule will be informed by the transcendent qualities of Yahweh's own holiness.²

It is this irruptive quality of the transcendent holiness of Yahweh that is so closely associated with appearing of the mediatorial figures in pre-Christian times. In order to focus the attention again on the impossibility of the salvation of men arising from within the created world, or from the leadership of men, the figures must be represented as possessing a divine status from Yahweh, and as remaining, meanwhile, completely hidden within the transcendent, holy symbolic surroundings of Yahweh. They are, therefore, to be conceived of as supernatural figures, surrounded by all the apocalyptic regalia of Yahweh himself. Their appearance is from Yahweh, and is to be taken as a signal that the redemption of Yahweh is about to take place, and his kingdom set up. In keeping with the universal monotheistic principle, and probably hastened by contacts with Hellenism, is the tendency to seek a more universal type of expression for the revelation that has been vouchsafed to Israel. We have noted how the editors of the Deuteronomic literature began to use the "Torah" and the "Word" in a more general sense as representative of the general revelation of Yahweh to

1. Ez. 1.

2. Pss. 2 and 110.

Israel, rather than with particular reference to any particular law or word integral to it. The prophets as well had begun to use the terms "truth" and "wisdom" in association with the thought and purposes of Yahweh they were proclaiming.

Similar universalizing developments are to be traced in the use of the concepts of "grace", "mercy", "glory", "light" and "life."

In view of the importance to New Testament theology of both the supernatural figure, and the outworkings of the above-mentioned conceptions, it will be necessary to examine more closely the probably final Old Testament and inter-testamental theological implications. So far we have seen that, at different levels, or in different spheres, both groups of conceptions represent parallel expressions of the theological revelation to which the Old Testament religious leaders are under divine constraint to testify. They represent the analogical model figures and conceptions through which the Israelite world-view goes on expressing its reflections on "existence." Theologically these are the vehicles through which the revelation of Yahweh comes to expression.

(a) The Supernatural Figures:

There is a tendency which we have noted in later post-exilic, and in immediately pre-Christian times, for the this-worldly figures of the prophetic period to become elevated to the holy transcendent presence of Yahweh. Furthermore, although there are other similar and important terms used, both within the Old Testament and outside² it, to convey similar theological convictions, there seems to have been a concentration on the three that are

1. E.G. the "just," "poor," "elect" etc. 2. Cf. The wide use of the "just," "elect" etc. in the Qumran Scroll Literature.

charged with weighty import for New Testament theology, the "Son of Man," the Deutero-Isaianic "Servant" and the "Davidic Messianic King." These figures concentrate in themselves parallel, not to say converging, traditions of thought concerning vehicles of communication between Yahweh, the Sovereign Creator and Ruler of history, and his creation and men, and Israel in particular. They exhibit a common programme in the performance of their mediatorial and revelatory functions. For these reasons it will be convenient to discuss their developments together, indicating by comparison the theological importance of both the similarities and the differences between them.

There has been a great deal of investigation into the Hebrew linguistic antecedent references to the New Testament Greek phrase $\text{ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}$ and the general concensus of opinion is that the title is a rather slavish rendering of the original Aramaic ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܘܢ which would normally have been idiomatically translated ܕܥܠܡܝܢܐ .¹ Therefore, although the term could mean "one of the human species," it did, in fact, mean something more technical in the literature that developed around Israel's apocalyptic hopes. A. E. J. Rawlinson² points out that the New Testament phrase as it stands could only mean "the son of the man," which is unnatural, and its retention, therefore, is a standing testimony to the fidelity of the evangelists. T. W. Manson³ says that at least as early as Daniel, the words were taken up into the esoteric vocabulary of apocalyptic literature and used, not in their literal sense, but as a symbol of something else. By

1. See V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, p. 27. 2. *The N.T. Doct. of the Christ*, pp. 243f. 3. *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 212.

the time of the New Testament, it was conventional to use $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ for man in the ordinary sense and $\delta \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon$ when the sense was technical. W. C. Allen¹ describes the origin of the phrase as a semi-technical description of the supernatural Messiah in Enoch and ii Esdras. He is following Dalman's view that the Danielic phrase ܘܢܝܢܝܢ was not in common use in early Palestinian Aramaic when ܘܢܝܢ was used for "man" (and ܢܘܢܝܢ "men"). ܘܢܝܢܢ was a literary phrase formed by imitation of the rare and poetic ܩܝܢܢܢ and means "one of the human species." In later dialects it came to be used meaning "a human being." To say the ܘܢܝܢܢ the words would be rendered ܢܘܢܝܢܢ . This is the original behind the New Testament Greek phrase. The Greek is "an intentionally over-literal translation," because the idiomatic rendering $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ would have brought theological complications greater than the doubtfulness of the language difficulties of the fuller Greek phrase. Since the phrase had not yet been used as meaning "anyone," he concludes the New Testament usage to be technical. Against this view is the contention that the Greek phrase "The Son of Man" could not be rendered into Aramaic, because in that idiom it could only mean "man" collectively.² Neither Allen (p. lxxiii), however, nor Rawlinson (p. 244f) feel that this has been proven. Allen goes on to assert that the Danielic phrase ܘܢܝܢܢ means "a man," and that the later use of it in Enoch and ii Esdras and the New Testament is reminiscent of Daniel. The NT. expression is linguistically incorrect, but theologically less complicated than $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$. A Plummer³ sees in the

1. T.C.C. St. Matt. p. lxxiii. 2. See Rawlinson, *ibid*, p. 245.
3. I.C.C. St. Luke, pp. 156f.

use of the title in Enoch a clear indication that it was a technical term in the first century A.D., and recognised by the Jews as a title for the Messiah.

Concerning the biblical origin and development of the phrase "Son of Man," there are three general lines of investigation, and each seems to have contributed something to its possible theological significance.

In several Psalms¹ the phrase is used of man as representative, as creaturely and transitory, and as distinct from what is divine and permanent. He is like a breath;² a passing shadow. His insecurity is contrasted to the security of Yahweh, the Creator, the Just and the Compassionate.³ Despite his utter creaturely frailty, he has a higher destiny than the rest of creation. He will hold dominion over it; for he is made but little lower than divine.⁴ The final reference narrows the representative manhood to Israel, and places it in a context of present temporary suffering and abasement which will give place to exaltation and restoration under the faithful hand of Yahweh of Hosts.⁵ It is hardly possible to dissociate from these passages those Psalms which refer to the "righteous sufferer," who, out of ignominy and disaster, is raised up by the sheer grace of Yahweh.⁶ Many of the references also have the same fluidity, back and forth from the individual to the solidarity of corporate Israel and to Yahweh, already noted in the prophets.

1. Pss. 8:4; 80:16; 144:3; 146:3. 2. Ps. 144:3f. 3. Ps. 146:3ff.
4. Ps. 8:5 5. Ps. 80:16ff. 6. Pss. 22, 23, 31, 34, 41, 69, 118 etc.

The second field of reference for the phrase "Son of Man" is in Ezekiel, where the prophet is addressed as "Son of Man" some eighty times. The first indications are that the term here means "man" as distinct from the transcendent, holy Yahweh in whose presence he is so aware of his frailty and transitoriness. He is "man" assuming the only appropriate attitude left open to him in the presence of the holy, viz., submission and obedience. Nevertheless, the prophet is addressed as the representative of other men, and, therefore, revealing in himself the life of Yahweh bearing his living word to men, and calling men to seek their security in obedience to it. His submission and obedience and security is typical of what other men are invited to share. As well as feeling in himself the certainty of the national doom from Yahweh's righteous judgement, he makes articulate the nation's need for mercy, pardon and re-construction. This conception holds the germ idea of the mediatorial function lifted to cosmic dimension in the later supernatural figure who is the vice-regent of God.

However, the most important and significant reference to the "Son of Man" in the Old Testament is in Daniel chapter seven. All the features most characteristic of the apocalyptic figure are present. The Son of Man is a supernatural figure; but he is also an ideogram for "the saints of the Most High,"¹ who are called upon to suffer before they are ultimately given dominion and judgement by the "Ancient of Days." This corporate solidarity with the "saints" in Daniel is probably the key to the understanding of the apocalyptic references in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.² T. W. Manson

1. Dan. 7:13-27. 2. See Quotation from, the Book of Enoch, R. H. Charles, S.P.C.K., 1917, pp. 66f.

supports the view that these Enoch references need not be taken as personal. He draws attention the several other titles found in Enoch and IV Ezra, such as the "elect one," the "righteous one," the "anointed one," titles which even in the Old Testament are not always to be construed in the singular.¹ The promises to David in Isaiah² are to be transferred by inheritance to the nation. This makes it possible that the Son of Man can also be reckoned as the nation. It also gives an explanation to the problem in Enoch, where the Son of Man is on one occasion the historic character Enoch,³ and on another, is the supernatural figure.⁴ The reference in Enoch⁵ to Enoch and his followers forming an indissoluble society also finds illumination in this view.

The essential element in this conception of the Son of Man is the idea already familiar in the corporate "remnant" of Israel. It is basic to the "remnant" conception of Isaiah, the "servant" of Deutero-Isaiah, the "I" of the Psalms, and the "Son of Man" of Daniel. A common pattern of experience is associated with all these corporate figures. After abasement, and sometimes humiliation and defeat, they are raised up again by God. They demonstrate with what faith the foundation members of the new Israel may face the faithful judgement of Yahweh, and equally await his pardoning mercy and grace.

1. Cf. T. W. Manson, *ibid*, pp. 228f. See also C. W. Allen, *ibid*, p. lxxiv, re a possible earlier eschatological tradition behind these references, and concerning ideal man: "unfallen" man of God's original creative conception. Hab. 3:13; Pss. 39:49:52. Cf. 28:8; 84:10. 2. 55:3-5.
3. lxxi:14. 4. xlvi:6. 5. lxxi:16f.

W. Manson¹ finds sufficient evidence to support the theory that the three major parallel Israelite conceptions of the "Davidic messianic king," the "Isaianic servant" and the "Son of Man" of Daniel converge in pre-Christian times as the succeeding phases of a basic conception of Hebrew thought. He claims that the "Son of Man" conception is associated with the pre-existent heavenly Messiah in Enoch,² where he is invested with full personality and Davidic, messianic and "servant" functions. These have become correlated in the Midrash on Psalm two, verse seven. Their occurrence together is not confusion of thought, but synthesis "showing the remarkable inclusiveness of Jewish religious expectations."

These conceptions are all mediatorial. Each figure has a foot in either world; but they derive their authority from the divine world. Each has representative and corporate relations with man in his world. Each has a mission involving the future of the entire race, but more immediately the Jewish representatives of it.

The Davidic messianic kingship rests on a divine charter of promise, anointing and adoption; but the king figure is the representative of a covenanted and adopted people. Despite his present setbacks, he will be led to triumph over his national enemies, and be given the heathen for an inheritance.³

The "servant" is servant by identification with his divine Master. As the will of Yahweh was directed towards Israel as a nation, so the servant-

1. Jesus, the Messiah, p. 99. 2. 46:1ff; 48:2ff; 62:5ff; 69:26; 71:14; ii Esdras 13. 3. Cf. Pss. 2 and 110.

hood was worked out within the national life and representative of it. He suffers both representatively and vicariously. One day, therefore, he will be raised to be a light to the Gentiles.¹

The "Son of Man" pattern is worked out along similar lines. He gains his authority from the Ancient of Days, and, out of humiliation, he is raised to dominion and given the right of judgement.

H. H. Rowley,² however, doubts Manson's conclusion as far as it relates to the "servant" and the Davidic Messiah. All he will allow is that Manson's equation of predicates, only shows that it is not without reason the concepts were found together in the mind of Jesus. He finds no actual evidence of the conceptions being connected in pre-Christian times, and notes, in support of his view, the evident surprise of the disciples at Jesus' prediction of his suffering. Nevertheless, Rowley does allow that their being brought together does no violence to any of them; for they have connecting points and common roots. They are differing conceptions of the establishment of the divine rule on earth.

A common line of authority, function and mission informs these traditions, and, over a period, the pressure of the hard facts of history had shifted the plane of their anticipated activity from the earth to the heavens, and had varied the content of their "humiliation" from temporary material and national reverse and abasement to the ideal conception of remedial, vicarious suffering. The conception of mission moves between Jerusalem-centred military or religious domination and judgement, and the universal conceptions of service and light.

1. For a reconstruction of the order and significance of the Servant Songs see H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord*, pp. 49-57, also *The Missionary Message of the O.T.*, pp. 51ff. 2. *The Servant of the Lord*, pp. 87f and n. 3p. 61.

The final eschatological and apocalyptic forms in which all these traditions appear turn all eyes towards the heavens from whence alone final salvation and security come. The supernatural figures¹ of this apocalyptic literature are inhabitants of the divine world, they are closely linked with the life and being of God, and gain their authority from him.

(b) Torah, Word and Wisdom:

We have noted that it was part of the revelation of Yahweh that the mediatorial law-givers, prophets, priests and wisemen were bearers of a communication from Yahweh. Apart from the dramatic role they played in person, they were the bearers of a law, a word, a cultic formula, or wisdom from Yahweh himself. We have noted as well how these conceptions tend to move from the particular Israelitish form to ^{a more} universal application of Yahweh's communication. It is now also to be noted that, because the terms themselves become more general in meaning, they tend to overlap and finally to become interchangeable. The fundamental importance of the powerful word of Yahweh is basic to the Old Testament witness. The election of Israel is dependent upon the "call" of Moses and of his prophetic word to them. The prophets were bearers of a word to which they themselves had been obedient. The Deuteronomic historians were captivated by the assured fulfilment of the uttered word of Yahweh as they had seen it in their review of history.

1. Concerning the Jewish speculation the pre-existence of the Messiah in inter-testamental times, see the examination of the details in the Excursus in Strack u. Billerbeck, Bd. ii, pp. 334ff. Ideal pre-existence is worked out as implicit in Ps. 110 and is linked with Davidic expectations of Ez. 34:23 and 37:24 etc. It is worked out from the Greek dogma of the pre-existence of the soul in Alexandrian Judaism. In none of these is it a pre-existence of the ultimate kind different from other men.

The patriarchs are represented as being obedient to a word of promise. Creation is the result of the word of Yahweh. Edmond Jacob¹ associates the concepts of the word and the spirit of the Old Testament in their common derivation from a single concept of the breath (נָשָׁף) and its vocal projection (נָשַׁף : to push from behind). There is no inherent contradiction in creation by the word or by the spirit. Both proceed from Yahweh, and he gives them their content. They are associated together in Psalm 33:6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth." The important thing is that it is Yahweh's word. It is the extension of his very personality.² His sovereign position of "holiness" and his ethical character gives the word both content and character. He has but to speak and things happen: a world comes into being;³ men are raised to ^{such} a point of inspiration that their words become the words of Yahweh himself⁴ (as do their actions). The final point of its development is the independent existence with which the word comes to be endowed in prophetic writings.⁵ This stems primarily from the fact that it is Yahweh's word, and partakes of his holy transcendence, but also follows logically from the extraordinary results of its activity in terrestrial history. The word of Yahweh has that capacity of hanging over human history until its end is accomplished.⁶ The word is an objective dynamic force.⁷ It is greater than

1. The Theol. of the O.T. pp. 121ff. cf. p. 128. 2. See A. R. Johnson, the One and the Many, p. 21. Cf also E. Jacob, *ibid*, pp. 153ff. 3. Gen. 1, Ps. 33:6 and 9, Jer. 1:4f. 4. Jer. 1:4f; Ez. 1:3; Am. 1:3; 3:5-8.
5. Is. 55:10ff. cf. 9:7. 6. Cf. Jer. 26:27ff. 7. Jer. 3:16; Am. 3:8.

the prophet who bears it, and is always to be distinguished from him. As an objective reality it can be conceived of as falling on people and unloosing calamity and judgement; but it is also the word of pardon and promise and gracious re-instatement.¹ However, this tendency to hypostasize the word is not carried far enough to compromise essential monotheism.²

An important development in relation to the word of Yahweh, which has significance in its future relation to the Torah and Wisdom, is the permanence given to it beyond the immediate events to which it referred, when it became fixed in writing. Jeremiah was given instruction to write his prophecy down,³ and the Deuteronomic reformers and historians held at the centre of their movement a witnessing record of the fulfilment of the word of Yahweh.

The universalizing influence of Hellenism, and the dispersion of the Jewish peoples, led to the use of the more universal concept of wisdom to express the wider implications of the conceptions that had become cramped within the literalism and particularism of official Judaism.⁴ Wisdom ceases to be a mere attribute of Yahweh as contrasted with the accumulation of the sum of human wisdom. In the speculations of the wise in later Judaism it comes to possess independent functions and objective existence. In the Old Testament this development finds its clearest expression in the Books of Job and Proverbs; but in the inter-testamental apocraphal literature even

1. Is. 9:7; Jer. 5:14-20 cf. Chaps. 8, 23:29f. 2. Espec. the Excursus on "Memra" by Strack & Billerbeck. See Komm. zum N.T. Vol. 2 pp. 303-333.
3. Jer. 30:2; 36vv 2, 17, 24. Cf. Deut 30:11-14. 4. See also E. Jacob p. 133. Deut. is an attempt to identify the prophetic word with the legal word by presenting a book as the norm of authority.

more defined objective existence is ascribed to her.

In the Old Testament books wisdom is described as being brought forth before creation,¹ when she was daily the delight of God² in whose presence she existed.³ Wisdom was with God at the "beginning."⁴ By general association this is assumed to be at the point of creation.⁵ She is the agent of creation,⁶ and is associated with life for mankind. She is a tree of life to those who uphold her.

In the apocryphal literature further statements are made concerning wisdom's origin, person, works, intermediary role between God and the world. She is at the "beginning,"⁷ present at creation.⁸ She comes from God and abideth with God forever⁹ and is honoured by the hosts of heaven.¹⁰ Wisdom is described as "a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty,"¹¹ "the brightness of everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God,"¹² and "the mirror of his goodness." She is before light,¹³ is conversant with God,¹⁴ loved by the Lord of all things,¹⁵ privy to the mysteries¹⁶ of the knowledge of God and lover of his works, and "knoweth and understandeth all things."¹⁷

The works of wisdom are commensurate with the statements about her origin and person. She is agent of creation,¹⁸ master workman, overseer and

1. Prov. 8:23f. 2. Prov. 8:30. 3. Prov. 8:27. 4. Prov. 8:22; cf Job 28 and Gen. 1:1.
5. Cf. E. Jacob, *ibid*, p. 138. 6. Prov. 3:19; cf also Pss. 104:24; 136:5. For "life" see Prov. 8:35 and "tree" 3:18.
7. Eccl/us 24:9, cf. 1:4. 8. Wisd. 9:9; 9. Eccl/us 1:1. 10. Eccl/us 24:1-3.
11. Wisd. 7:25. 12. Wisd. 7:26. 13. Wisd. 7:29.
14. Wisd. 8:3. 15. Wisd. 8:3. 16. Wisd. 8:4. 17. Wisd. 9:11.
18. Wisd. 7:22 and 27.

can do everything. She bestows health and peace¹ from God, and skill and knowledge upon men. Wisdom renews all things,² exalts her children and give life.³ On the religious side, wisdom brings salvation to men,⁴ and is a treasure unto men that never faileth, which they that use become friends of God.⁵ Indeed "entering into holy souls" she "maketh them friends of God."² All these things are possible because she is present at creation.⁶

Wisdom is especially directed⁷ to minister to Israel, but only because her wider ministrations have not been received or responded to.⁸ There in her dwelling place in "Jacob" and her inheritance in Israel, she "served before him" in the tabernacle, and was established in Zion, and rested in Jerusalem and took rest in an honourable people.⁹ Thus wisdom is described as taking at least a temporary dwelling place in Israel.

Again, none of these statements compromise the essential monotheism of God; for the Lord Almighty is God alone, and beside him there is no other Saviour.¹⁰ Wisdom receiveth instructions from, and is privy to, the counsels of the Creator of all things,¹¹ and the Lord loveth¹² her.

The background to the speculations concerning the Torah comes in the first instance from the promulgation of the Law by Moses at Sinai.¹³ The term יָרָא comes from the hiphil of the root יָרָא meaning "to point out", to "show," "direct" or instruct.¹⁴ In relation to Jewish law it first carried the idea of instruction, but gradually came to include as its more

1. Eccl/us 1:18-20. 2. Wisd. 7:27. 3. Eccl/us 4:11f. 4. Wisd. 9:18.
5. Wisd. 7:14, cf. v.27. 6. Eccl/us 24:5f. 7. Eccl/us 24:8-12. 8. Eccl/
us 24:7. 9. Eccl/us 24:8-12. 10. 24:24. 11. Eccl/s 24:8; cf. 1 Enoch
42:2; Wisd. 8:4. 12. Wisd. 8:3. 13. Ex.20:1ff and 10-24; 34:11-18. Cf.
also Dt. 5:1-6. 14. See C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 30.

important feature the content of the instruction. The Decalogue and "the commandments, statutes, and judgements" of the early formative days in Israel came to be recognised as a body of reference laws. There were originally various types of laws each with their own particular original meanings and history, but later the distinctions were not always clearly marked. The three constituent elements in Jewish Law were positive commands and decrees, declarations of right and judgements and decisions.¹ The Law of Mosaic times was the visible basis of the invisible covenant, and gave content to it. To keep the Law was to remain within the covenant. As we have seen in post-exilic times the keeping of the Law became associated with the restoration of the covenant. The unity of all the types of law in Israel stems from their common source in Yahweh. As Yahweh was theoretically the King of Israel, all normal law distinctions between civil or secular law and ecclesiastical law do not apply in the same way. In the popular mind later elaborations of the Pentateuchal Law became included under the general term.

Originally the utterances of the prophets were of a different order. They were upholders of the covenant law, especially the spirit of it. Their back-references are very rarely specific.² They speak under the conviction that they are representing the Law; but their utterances have the additional power as coming direct from God himself. Their conception of the Law widens as they relate it to the larger needs of their times, and, more especially, in relation to their ethical conception of God as they knew him. The dis-

1. C. H. Dodd, *ibid*, pp. 27f.
24; 47:7; 50:1.

2. Cf. Hos. 8:1; Jer. 6:19; Ez. 20; Is. 42:

inction between their words and those of the Law, apparent in their own time, became lost to later Israelites, simply because both have their source in God. This more generalised use of the word אמת was in keeping with the more universal outlook of later Old Testament and inter-testamental times, and made more natural its syncretism with other universal terms.

Before we enter upon a discussion of the inter-changing of the terms used to express the various aspects of the Old Testament revelation, it will be necessary to touch upon the Hebrew conception of "truth" and associated universal ideas.

The Hebrew word אמת is used consistently to convey the idea of faithfulness, steadfastness, reliability in the sense of being true "to label." This is especially applicable to the character of God. It refers to his known reliability that creates faith in him.² As we have seen this was increasingly important to the individual caught up in the complexity of the disastrous later Old Testament period. The faithfulness of Yahweh in judgement and in mercy seemed all that remained to the "just." It was a natural step to consider the words which proclaimed Yahweh's faithfulness in the same light. The words of the Law, and especially in its broader sense as Torah, and the words of the prophets expounding it, came to be spoken of as the truth of God.³ W. F. Howard⁴ quotes a midrash on Psalm 25:10 which

1. See N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the O.T.* p. 181. 2. See C. H. Dodd, *The Interp. of the 4th Gospel*, pp. 171-179 draws attention to the moral sphere in which the concept operates and many meanings get lost in translation of GK ἀλήθεια operates in an intellectual sphere. 3. Cf. Mal. 2:6; Neh. 9:13; Pss. 119 and 142. 4. *Christianity According to St. John*, pp. 51 and 78ff.

says, "Truth by this the Torah is meant." In the Qumran documents there are indications that to the covenanters God's truth meant the Mosaic Law. In the Manual of Discipline they are admonished that "they must not turn aside from the ordinances of God's truth either to the right hand or to the¹left." They are "to adhere to the² truth of God," and be "witnesses of God's truth."³ In the Commentary on Habakkuk 2:3 it states, "This is addressed to men of truth, the men who carry out the Law, who do not relax from serving the truth even though the final moment be long drawn out. The Qumran covenanters consider themselves the "Sons⁴ of truth" and the "house of truth."⁵

Closely associated with the conception of truth is the conception of $\gamma\delta\pi$. Etymologically it means "strength" but linked with $\gamma\theta\alpha$ it holds the idea of "firmness."⁶ Derivately from these it means security and truth.⁷ It is in this sense that it becomes associated with the bond of the covenant. It is something every covenant member can appeal to. The prophets pushed it beyond the covenant by accompanying it with the words $\lambda\pi$ and $\lambda\pi\gamma$ i.e. pity and compassion.⁸ It is this element that gives its exercise the nature of abnormal generosity bordering on⁹ miracle. There is also an important deepening of the temporal element. God stands surety for the future.¹⁰ Although behind the covenant there was always the manifestation of God's free sovereignty, it is also always gratuitous in nature.¹¹

1. See T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, Secker & Warburg, Lond. 1957, p. 49. 2. *ibid*, p. 57. 3. *ibid*, p. 65. 4. *ibid*, p. See Manual IV:5-6; Hymns VI:29; VII:30; IX:35; X27; XI:11. 5. Manual V:6; VIII:9. 6. See E. Jacob, *ibid*, p. 107f; See Ps. 144:2. 7. Ps. 25:10; 40:11; 61:8; 138:2 etc. 8. cf Jer.3-12 Hos.2:21; Is.54:7f. 9. Pss. 4:4; 17:7; 32:22; 107:8,15,21,31. 10. Cf.Ps.80; Is.58:3. 11. Cf.Am3:2; Hos.11:1.

Israel had nothing to attract the grace of God.¹ The mercy of God was as reliable as his judgement, because the original covenant was a free gift.² Although she cannot claim her covenant right³ Israel can appeal confidently to God because of his קדושה ⁴ which lies within his own character. God has gratuitously linked himself with the lot of Israel, and her failure does not mean that he will fail as well. Quite the opposite, the steadfastness (אמונה) of his own character is involved. As he is steadfastly righteous, so he is steadfastly gracious.

It is at this point that a further associated concept must be introduced. The "glory" of God is at stake. The Hebrew word קדושה is basically associated with weightiness⁵ and success⁶ and sometimes beauty.⁷ J. Pedersen⁸ claims it is also determined by power and activity. This activity is historically⁹ shown through the miracles in Egypt,¹⁰ the giving of the Law at Sinai,¹¹ and in moments of his appearing to his chosen servants,¹² i.e. in Old Testament theophanies. But it has always to be born in mind that the theophanies were not just rapturous moments. They were moments of ethical heart-searching and complete subjection. It is this over-whelming weight of the ethical presence of the holiness of God. The קדושה of God is in fact his holiness.¹³ His very being is involved, and especially the "name" he has given himself in Israel. Israel could appeal to God and expect him to answer "for his name's sake." God created Israel and gave her his name.¹⁴

1. Ez. 16:1-31; Dt.10:14f; 96ff; 32:10f. 2. Jer.3:12; 31:31ff; Ez.5:1-14; Ps.145:17. 3. Dt.3:23; Ex.33:19; Ps.14:31; Job 8:5. 4. Pss.30:5-10; 89:34ff and 49:130 and 132 Cf II Sam 23:5. 5. Cf.Gen 31:1; Is.10:3; Hag. 2:7; Ps.49:17. 6. Gen.45:13; 1Kgs.3:13. 7. Is.35:3. 8. J. Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 614f. 9. See E. Hoskyns, *The 4th Gospel*, pp. 144f. 10. Num.14:22. 11. Ex.24:16f; Dt.5:24. 12. Ex.33:18-37; Ez.10:4, 18ff. 13. E. Jacob, *ibid*, p. 88. 14. Is.43:7; cf. Ez. 36:23. See also in *The Book of Hymns of the Qumran Sect*, Hymn XI:3-4. (Gaster, *ibid*, pp.175f) where "thy glory's sake" is used where "thy name's sake" would be normally expected.

She represented a specially selected and concentrated example of his power and activity in history.¹ God sanctifies himself when he lifts up the people of Israel before the nations.² Israel is his special point of manifestation which he must care for and constantly correct lest others be misled concerning his own nature.³ It is for this reason that God's choice of Israel can never be finally dissolved. His own honour and glory are involved.⁴ What will the nations think?⁵ It was for this reason that Hezekiah spread out the Assyrian letter before Yahweh in⁶ his temple. Yahweh's honour was involved. As we have seen this has special relevance to David's line.⁷ This is the connecting link with the representative figures of Israel, who stand in the same relationship with Yahweh as does the nation. The high hopes centred in the future of the house of David, the mission to the Gentiles of Deutero-Isaiah's Servant, the judgement and dominion to be given to the Son of Man (or the Saints), are revealing exhibitions of some aspect of the glory of Yahweh: means whereby the power and glory of Yahweh shall be seen by the nations and his "name" upheld. It is for this reason that it must be the corollary of the prophetic conception of the glory of God, that at the end of time it must fill the whole earth and be manifest to the nations.

In the Old Testament, then, the glory of God is his self-manifestation in history, to kings and prophets of the sum total qualities that make up

1. Num.14:22; Ps.145:11f. 2. Ez.20:41; 28:25; 38:14; 35:27. 3. Is.40:5; 59:19; 66:18ff; Pss. 96:3; 97:6; 102:16f. 4. Jer.33:9; Dt.32:27.
5. Num.14:11ff; Ps.79; Jer.14:7ff. 6. 2Kgs.19:14. 7. 2Sam.4:14; Ps.2:7; 18:50 = (2Sam2:22); 89:35ff; 132.

his essential¹ nature. It is to be found in the language of the worship of the people, and in the terminology of the future eschatological hopes of the nation. It is made known in faithfulness, which exhibits itself in two streams: acts of admonition, judgement and punishment, on the one hand, and in grace, mercy and ultimate redemption on the other.

In the devotional and poetic, religious literature of the Psalms the equation of Law and Word and Truth is completed. In some Psalms the "word" and "commands" are used interchangeably.² In Psalm 147:15 we read, "He sendeth forth his commands upon earth; his word runneth very swiftly." In Psalm 33 creative functions usually ascribed to the word are transferred to commands. Thus in verse ~~was~~^{six}, "by the word of the Lord were the heavens made" becomes in verse nine, "For he spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast." The Law is everlasting; it was "founded³ for ever;" it "endureth⁴ for ever." The Law has been from "the beginning;"⁵ it is "settled in heaven."⁶ It is to be linked with light,⁷ life⁸ and truth.⁹

In apocryphal writings the Torah existed before creation, "for at that time the lamp of the eternal law shone on all those who sat in darkness."¹⁰

The Torah lay on his knee when God sat upon his throne of glory and at his right hand.¹¹ It is associated with the giving of life and light to the world.¹²

1. See Pedersen, *ibid*, p.649 where he links נפש with greatness of soul. A. R. Johnson, *Vit. of Individ.* links Nephesh with ruach and blood as the essential nature of a person. Law is the "daughter" of God and hence divine.
2. Pss.33:6; 9; 119:17ff; 42ff; 71ff; 147:15; 148:5ff. 3. Ps.119:152.
4. Ps.119:160; cf.152. 5. Ps.119:160 i.e. at least before Creation. 6. Ps. 119:89. 7. Ps.119:108; 130. 8. Ps.119:116; 144:175ff. 9. Ps.119:142; 151; 160. 10. Bar.59:2. cf. IV Ez.14:20f. 11. See Strack, *u.Bill.* vol. 2 p. 243.
12. See IV Ez.14:21. Law is the "daughter" of God and hence divine.

The identification of Law and Word with Wisdom carries them a stage further in their universalization. The word of the Lord most High is a fountain of¹ Wisdom. Wisdom as the word came out of the mouth of the most High,² and is to be associated with the functions of creation. The Book of the Covenant of the most High God, which Moses commanded for an heritage unto the congregation of Jacob, is to be equated with the claims made for wisdom in Ecclesiasticus.³ "If thou desire wisdom, keep the commandments and the Lord will give her⁴ thee."

(c) Light and Life:

In the Old Testament God is associated with life, both in his own being, and as the life-giver. First in relation to his person; although the eternal nature of God is affirmed,⁵ but it is secondary to his life and presence. He is eternal because he is living and not vice-versa. In the Sinai self-revelation God is revealed as living on a level beyond the capacity and control of men. In the prophets it is his life that distinguishes him from other⁶ gods. His life and presence are involved in any final explanation of his name. E. Jacob⁷ thinks that the best commentary on Exodus 3:14 is [^]Isiah 41:4 (cf 48:12) and that "I am" as a revelation of God can only have as its corollary dependence and obedience. It is always related to the Exodus and directed to a defined group whose faith in Yahweh can be taken for granted. Believe in Yahweh of the Exodus and all things are possible. On this account the Old Testament takes belief in God for

1. Ecc/us 1:5. 2. Ecc/us 24:3, 23; cf Wisd. 9:1; Bar. 3:9; 4:4.
3. 24:1ff. 4. Ecc/us 1:26.. 5. Pss. 90:2; 102:27f; 139:16; Is.40:48; Hab.1:12. 6. Hab.1:2 cf. Is31:3; 49:6-20; Jer.12:16f; 16:14f; 23:7f; 1Sam 17:36.7. Ibid, pp. 50-54.

granted. An unbelieving Israelite, or a foreigner, cannot understand the Law.

C. H. Dodd¹ draws attention to two streams of tradition - one of which is somewhat speculative - which give meaning to the tetragrammaton. In the first tradition the Hebrew words אֲנִי אֲנִי are thought to stand for the unutterable name of God in later Judaism. This phrase is translated אֲנִי אֲנִי in the LXX (See Is.43:25) and taken by the translators to be parallel to

אֲנִי אֲנִי and to mean "I am" (Is.45:18), i.e. the Self-existent One. The second tradition seems to have derived from the same Hebrew words as the first, and differs only by the addition of one Hebrew letter thus, אֲנִי אֲנִי. There is evidence that in later Judaism this phrase was particularly associated by the priests with the Feast of the Tabernacles, and the meaning "I and He" indicated that the name of God can only become known when he is intimately united with his people in solidarity. The former of these traditions is an attempt to safeguard the "holy" existence, or being or life of God (If any of these terms are relevant.) The second is a witness to the presence or self-revelation of that "life" within the historical and natural frames of reference of our world. The ἐξ ὅθεν ὁ ἐξ ὅθεν type of life presents itself in all its holy adequacy as the Founder and Sustainer and Director and Final Expression of what we know here as "life." If Life is the standard of final judgement, God is the first one to be reckoned with, and will be the last.² He possesses life on the "holy" scale or model

1. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 93-96, 345, 349f, 377.

2. Is.41:4; 44:6 and 48:12.

utterly unconditioned in every way, endless in duration, or should we say outside duration. In relation to this-worldly life he is the Life-giver.¹ The land of life, the light of life, the fountains of life and the book of life are² his.

A. R. Johnson³ indicates three groups of names applied to God which indicate his close association with life: יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ ⁴ (R.V. the living God), $\text{יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַחַי}$ ⁵ (R.V. "the living God") and $\text{וַיְחַיֵּם אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ ⁶ (R.V. "and he liveth" Cf. ARJ "who is living"). It can be seen that the evident this-worldly life-activity of God, which is analogous to the life activity of men, partakes of the "holy" dimension and quality ~~which~~ which our this-worldly terms cannot define. His "life" is of a different category, to which our lives can only be conceptually related under such terms as "fountain" or "creator" or "giver." This means that, along with all else about us, our life itself is an act of grace. In ascribing creation to God, Old Testament thinkers were but following to the nth degree the holy, redemptive life-activity of God they saw in nature and in history. The life that God bestows on men can be thought of in terms of health,⁷ happiness,⁸ light⁹ and salvation.¹⁰ Many of the mediatorial conceptions of the Old Testament as we have seen are conceived of as means of renewal of life. In particular kingship and the priestly cult and the sacrificial system are linked with the renewal of life. From the earliest times the cult expressed in tangible form the communication

1. Gen.2:7; cf. Job 27:3. 2. Cf. Ex.32:32f; Ez.13:9; Is.34:16; Pss.40:7; 56:8; 69:28; 139:16; Dan.12:1. 3. The Vit. of the Individ. p. 105. 4. Jos.3:10 = JE.Pss.42:2; 84:2. 5. 2Kgs.19:4, 16; cf. Is.37:4-17. 6. Dt.5:23; 1Sam.17:26-36; Cf. Jer.10:10; 23:36; 2Sam.22:47; Ps.18:46; Dt.5:24. 7. Is.58:8. 8. Am. 5:18; Is.9:1; Ps.112:4; 97:11. 9. Ps.27:1. 10. Mic.7:8; Is.60:1; Ps.36:10; cf. Ps.27:1.

of life to the worshipper,¹ and involved the act of eating together with the invisible, though present, deity in commemoration of the² covenant. Within the sacrificial system the essential thing about the victim was not its death, but the offering of its life.³ In the later monarchy, and in post-exilic times, the temple became the centre of the renewal of life, because it was the place peculiar with God's presence. The kingship renewal functions, and those of the temple, represented a concentration of offices formerly exercised by many heads of families and tribes and in many sacred places.

Life is to be closely associated with the equated conceptions of word, torah and wisdom in later speculations,⁴ when these terms are to be considered middle terms between God and men. "If a man has gained for himself words of the law he has gained for himself life in the world to come."⁵ Even death is to be explained in terms of life in its weakest⁶ form. Life was early linked with the blessing of God in the form of abundance⁷ - including numerous offspring - prosperity,⁸ victory⁹ and peace.¹⁰ Although these are thought to be attainable to the righteous in this¹¹ life, they are for the most part only hopes.¹² The final religious conviction is that life must be sought in God himself.¹³ When men choose God it is the same as choosing life instead of death.¹⁴ Death is existence without God in Sheol.¹⁵

1. See S. A. Cooke, *ibid*, pp. 216f. 2. Pedersen, *ibid*, pp. 335, 338.
3. *ibid*, 313-16. 4. Pss.119:130; 36:9; Wisd.7:26; Prov.8:35; Wisd.8:13; 17; Eccl/us.17:11. 5. P. Aboth, 2:7, cf C. K. Barrett at John 5:39. 6. Strack & Billerbeck, *ibid*, pp. 353-61. 7. Gen.1:28; 9:1, etc. 2Sam.7:29, Dt.28:1-13. 8. Cf.(7) 9. Gen.27:29; Gen.49:8-12; Dt.28:7. 10. Peace is not just cessation from war, but positive well-being. See Is.54:13. 11. Ps.51; Jer. 31:31-3 Mic.6:6; Wisd.3:1; 5:15. 12. The tree of life myth indicates that life in its fullness belongs to God. 13. Esp.Pss.16,23,64; 1-4 and 73. Cf. Pss.49:19; 107:10,14; Amos.5:4. 14. Dt.30:19f. 15. Cf.Ps.88:3ff; Job 10: 21ff.

The life of God is characterised by spirit as the content of his life is associated with holiness. "Holiness never lost its true character as the force on which life depended and from which it is renewed."¹

The conception of the future life is also entirely linked with faith in a "holy" God, whose power, righteousness and mercy are working on a plane away from the earth. It is the eternal quality of the life of God that gives the eternal quality to the life he offers men. This grows out of the recognition that man's real end is fellowship with God. At first, length was the essential element in the concept of this earthly life.² Shortened days were considered a misfortune.³ The preacher's quarrel was not with life's goodness nor happiness, but its transitoriness.⁴

Resurrection, as distinct from life-giving fellowship which persists beyond the grave, is first introduced in Hosea 6:1-2, and in the allegory of Ezekiel 37. Here it is on national terms and founded upon the faithfulness of God. E. Jacob⁵ traces the development through the concept of David "revivus" (Ez.34:23) and the "servant" and his retributive reward (Is.53:11f). Concerning the "servant" he says, "The resurrection of the servant is in every way presented as an extraordinary phenomenon which could happen to an individual only in extraordinary circumstances."⁶ But in the Old Testament all God's extraordinary interventions, such as prophetic utterances, the priesthood, election in general, are called to pass in scope from the par-

1. Ibid, p. 295. 2. Pss.34:12; 91:16; Prov.4:10; 9:10ff; 10:27. 3. Pss.55:23; 89:47; Prov.10:27; Is.38:10. 4. See A. R. Johnson, The Wit of the Individ. pp. 94-97, The Qal of 'יָרַח, יָרַח means the ebb and flow of vitality due to the presence of absence of 'יָרַח as distinct from 'יָרַח from which it can be poured out. Cf Is.53:12; Ps.141 margin Job 30:16; Lam.2:12. For 'יָרַח see Dt.12:28; Is.10:18. 5. Ibid, p.312. 6. See p.312.

God's faithfulness. There is no immortality except in relationship with God's "life;" there is no resurrection apart from his active righteousness, which is redemption. They depend upon a practical relation, not upon a theory. The correlative in man is gratitude, trust or faith unto obedience.

In the Old Testament chaos and darkness are original, and it is part of the creative activity of God to push back the dark.¹ Light is linked with the manifestation of Yahweh's presence at Sinai,² and the glow of the shekina in the cloud above the ark and tabernacle denote his presence.³ It is associated with the torah⁴ and wisdom,⁵ with Israel's mission to the world⁶ and with her apocalyptic⁷ hopes.

The nearest the Old Testament comes to calling God light is in the phrase, "the Lord is my light and my salvation"⁸ but there is also the statement, "by thy light shall we see light."⁹ The references to darkness imply God's close associations with¹⁰ light. The place of death is where Yahweh's light does not penetrate.¹¹ The "Dies Irae" for the prophets dawns in darkness, because it represents a turning away from the "face" of God.¹² Although darkness results from God's judgement, his judgement is often associated with the penetration of his light.¹³ The light-darkness moral dualism is present. The light shines for the¹⁴ righteous, and dark-

1. Gen.1:3ff; Ps.74:16; Is.45:7; Job 36:30. 2. Ex.19:16; 18 and 21; 34:29; 40:34. 3. Ex.14:20; 16:10; 25:21f; Num.6:25-41; Neh.9:19; Job 18:6; Is.6; Joel 2:27; 4. Ps.119:105, 130; Prov.2:13; Job 18:18. 5. Wisd.7:21. 6. Is. 9:2; 10:17; 42:6; 49:6; 51:4; 60:3; 60:19f. 7. 4Ezra 14:20; 2Bar.48:50; Job 18:18; Zech 14:6. 8. Ps.27:1. 9. Ps.36:9. 10. Job 3:5; 10:21f; 24:17; Prov.20:20; Pss.49:19; 107:10-14. 11. Pss.49:15; 107; cf 88:3ff; Job 10:21f. 12. Amos 4:13; 5:20; Is.8:22; Jer.5:20; 13:16; Ez.32:8; Joel 2:2; Zeph.1:15. Cf Num.6:25, 41; Job 33:26. 13. Is.51:4; 59:9; Hos.6:5; Ps.37:6; Prov.13:9. 14. Job.22:28.

ness is the lot of the unrighteous.¹ But both light and darkness are subservient to God.² Within the special place of the kingship of Israel and its particular link with the house of David, there is a passage in which the king (viz. David) is called the light of Israel.³ Whether this significance attaches only to David or to all the anointed line is uncertain. If it does it forges a link with the Isaianic mission of Israel as a light unto the Gentiles.

The Old Testament light references, then are with the creative activity of God, with his presence with his people, with the Law (as wisdom and truth), with Israel's world mission (especially the servant). They carry with them ideas of the judgement of God, both in its admonitory and saving traditions, and have associations with the "age to come." The darkness-light dualism is always subject to the characteristic Jewish monotheism.

The darkness and light dualism has strongly influenced the Qumran Sects, and colours the doctrine of the two ways or spirits in the Manual of Discipline. Members are called the "sons of light;" but here again the doctrines are in strict subjection to the biblical doctrine of God, the Creator, who forms light, and creates darkness. Both spirits are creatures of the one God together with everything that exists.

1. Job 18:5f. 2. Ps.139:11f. cf. Dan. 2:22. 3. King David is prevented from going into battle lest his death should "quench the light of Israel." See A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 6f.

The Final O.T. Picture

In the O.T. we are confronted with the particular outworkings within a tightly-knit national group of mankind's universal experience of an order of existence other than its own. It is given a recognisable objective reality on the historical analogical model, which is set forth with increasing confidence and self-consciousness as the O.T. takes its final literary shape.

This order of existence is recorded for the greater part under the variations of the Hebrew root $\psi \tau \rho$; but is sometimes associated in its visible manifestations with the concept of $\eta \eta \eta$, and its affects in both nature and man are referred to under the concept of $\eta \eta \eta$.

Because the analogical model is historical the "holy" order is necessarily thought of as personal, and presented in the terms of the relationship between beings. The holy order of being in the O.T. is to be recognised in the key O.T. analogical situation under the name of $\eta \eta \eta$ ¹ . He is the Subject within the holy order about which certain predications are made, which give the holy Subject a recognisable, personal, objective shape or form.

The known philological associations of the name $\eta \eta \eta$ indicate an initial demand for freedom from any pre-conceived this-worldly conceptions of $\psi \tau \rho$. This amounts to a demand for a carte blanche in order that Israel can concentrate on the particular holiness to be revealed in historically observable activities of Yahweh.

Although the name Yahweh may indicate his presence within historical time, it is ⁱⁿno/

1. Kittel (Eng. Translation "Lord" in Bible Key Words, p.61) draws attention to "E's hesitancy in distinguishing the divine order by the normal this-worldly method of a name.

way to be confused with the transitoriness of this world's existence. It belongs to the eternal order, outside time, and is possessed with the unpreventable authority and power that is unconditioned by the created world or the ordering of human history. The difference between our order and the holy is one of kind not of degree.

Something of the extent of this holy dimension is indicated in the other Semitic divine titles that have survived, and, in one way and another, have been assimilated to Yahweh and his observable this-worldly activities. The holy order is unpreventably strong. This is ^{the} basic Semitic ~~SA~~ description of the divine order. It is self-sufficient and adequately present (~~7U-SA~~). It is majestically high and lifted up above man and creation (~~7Y SA~~). Its lordship (~~717A~~) is sovereign and immediate to men, and extends to the hosts (~~77A2Y~~) of heaven.

The oft-repeated predicates of the holy Subject give depth and ethical content to the holy dimension. These are first revealed in Yahweh's historical Covenant relationship with Israel. Whether in judgement or in redemption, faithfulness (~~777A~~) to his declared character is basic to his holy existence. The gracious pity (~~7077~~) to those whom he has chosen, and who have no claim whatever upon him, and the redemptive redressive action (~~776~~) he has taken on their behalf, are always to be relied upon. It is not based in the nature of creation or the reason of man; but in the ethical nature of the holy Subject, the moral character of his Spirit's activity and the pressing claim of his glory.

The correlative response of man, to the holy Subject, or to the activity of his Spirit, or the splendour of the manifestation of his glory, reflects a similar estimate of the holy order. In the presence of the holiness inherent in the name of יהוה "man is a prophetic "servant" (עַבְד) burdened with the ethical demand of a holy unpreventable word (דְבַר), which he must proclaim and, if necessary, to which proclaiming he must sacrifice himself. Possessed by his holy Spirit (רוּחַ) man is irresistibly an "anointed" vice-regent (מְשִׁיחַ), keeping and administering Yahweh's Law (תּוֹרָה), or his justice (צְדָקָה), or carrying out his redressive judgment or redemptive activity (פְּדוּת). The presence of the splendour and majesty of his visible manifestation (כְּבוֹד) reduces man to a recognition of his creaturely existence as אָדָם - בַּי: operating obediently and cautiously within the experience-tested limits of cult and sanctuary, knowing full well the great gulf fixed between the holy and profane. These representative figures operate under the absolute authority and ethical claim of Yahweh. It is his holy dominion they enter upon: his lordship; they experience and exercise: his glory they declare.

The self-consciousness with which this objective reality of the holy Subject is set forth begins within the Old Testament itself. The failure of the national covenant group to grasp permanently the significance of Yahweh's saving activity at the

1. The original this-worldly correlative to Yahweh was covenant Israel; but, through insensitiveness to her privileges, delimitations of Israel gradually assumed the role. Even these were considered so far removed from factual possibility that they were later thought of as still within the holy order of Yahweh and yet to be revealed.
2. References have already been made to the gulf which came to be recognised between wisdom of this world and holy wisdom.

Exodus is basic to the prophetic message, but it is also a measure of the extent to which the Exodus revelation of Yahweh had become an objective reality by the time of the prophets, and at least to the prophets. They were able to refer to the God "that brought the Israelites out of Egypt", as an acknowledged norm by which they were to understand the practical significance of Yahweh within the field of history. That the prophets broadened and deepened this field of objective reference is part of the accepted prophetic achievement. The evidence is, that, in the time of the prophets, there were at least individuals who held clear ideas of Yahweh as an objective reality to which they could make personal reference: someone whose activity could be seen in human history, but whose being or existence was completely other than this world or its events. This existence is to be understood in the prophetic concept of holiness, and is given content under the various prophetic predications of holiness. Because it is revealed in history it remains inescapably personal.

The objectivity of the Old Testament conception of deity, and the self-consciousness with which it is set forward, finds support from the documentary theories of the Old Testament literature. The whole basis of the documents is that, at various stages, and at various places in Israel, conceptions of the godhead existed under differing names, and under differing levels of ethical refinement, and, that at a later stage the dominance of a particular conception associated with the Exodus events emerged. One of the real advances of modern Old Testament theology has been the recognition of the importance of the theology of the later editors in shaping Old

Testament theology itself. It is evident that they came to their task with clear and objective theological fields of reference, which dictated their choice and use of their sources. Whatever reservations single documentary editors may have had concerning divine names, or refinements of ethical presentation, whatever religious emphases they made, the recognition of the holy order is stressed increasingly, the same predicates of the holy subject are ever present; the holy presence makes the same total and ethical claim upon men; man, confronted with the holy is in the same helpless state. In sum, the Exodus theme is repeated in each case. The Covenant story, the Law codes, the Cult, the prophetic Word, the racial legends and heroes back to creation itself, repeat the same distinctive theological pattern.

Moreover, the same presentation of a holy order is clearly to be seen in Apocryphal Literature. ^{1.} The Apocrypha is not apocryphal because it differs basically in its conception of the Deity. The holy One is ^{2.} an extremely common designation for God in both the Apocrypha and ^{3.} Pseudepigrapha. The God-titles maintain and develop those of the Old Testament proper. All might and power are his. ^{4.} He is all-seeing, ^{5.} all-wise and merciful, and author of all good things. He is the creator ^{6.} of all things by the word of his mouth. ^{7.} He is the Supreme God, the ^{8.} ^{9.} ^{10.} ^{11.} ^{12.} ^{13.} ^{14.} ^{15.} ^{16.} ^{17.} ^{18.} ^{19.} ^{20.} ^{21.} ^{22.} ^{23.} ^{24.} ^{25.} ^{26.} ^{27.} ^{28.} ^{29.} ^{30.} ^{31.} ^{32.} ^{33.} ^{34.} ^{35.} ^{36.} ^{37.} ^{38.} ^{39.} ^{40.} ^{41.} ^{42.} ^{43.} ^{44.} ^{45.} ^{46.} ^{47.} ^{48.} ^{49.} ^{50.} ^{51.} ^{52.} ^{53.} ^{54.} ^{55.} ^{56.} ^{57.} ^{58.} ^{59.} ^{60.} ^{61.} ^{62.} ^{63.} ^{64.} ^{65.} ^{66.} ^{67.} ^{68.} ^{69.} ^{70.} ^{71.} ^{72.} ^{73.} ^{74.} ^{75.} ^{76.} ^{77.} ^{78.} ^{79.} ^{80.} ^{81.} ^{82.} ^{83.} ^{84.} ^{85.} ^{86.} ^{87.} ^{88.} ^{89.} ^{90.} ^{91.} ^{92.} ^{93.} ^{94.} ^{95.} ^{96.} ^{97.} ^{98.} ^{99.} ^{100.} ^{101.} ^{102.} ^{103.} ^{104.} ^{105.} ^{106.} ^{107.} ^{108.} ^{109.} ^{110.} ^{111.} ^{112.} ^{113.} ^{114.} ^{115.} ^{116.} ^{117.} ^{118.} ^{119.} ^{120.} ^{121.} ^{122.} ^{123.} ^{124.} ^{125.} ^{126.} ^{127.} ^{128.} ^{129.} ^{130.} ^{131.} ^{132.} ^{133.} ^{134.} ^{135.} ^{136.} ^{137.} ^{138.} ^{139.} ^{140.} ^{141.} ^{142.} ^{143.} ^{144.} ^{145.} ^{146.} ^{147.} ^{148.} ^{149.} ^{150.} ^{151.} ^{152.} ^{153.} ^{154.} ^{155.} ^{156.} ^{157.} ^{158.} ^{159.} ^{160.} ^{161.} ^{162.} ^{163.} ^{164.} ^{165.} ^{166.} ^{167.} ^{168.} ^{169.} ^{170.} ^{171.} ^{172.} ^{173.} ^{174.} ^{175.} ^{176.} ^{177.} ^{178.} ^{179.} ^{180.} ^{181.} ^{182.} ^{183.} ^{184.} ^{185.} ^{186.} ^{187.} ^{188.} ^{189.} ^{190.} ^{191.} ^{192.} ^{193.} ^{194.} ^{195.} ^{196.} ^{197.} ^{198.} ^{199.} ^{200.} ^{201.} ^{202.} ^{203.} ^{204.} ^{205.} ^{206.} ^{207.} ^{208.} ^{209.} ^{210.} ^{211.} ^{212.} ^{213.} ^{214.} ^{215.} ^{216.} ^{217.} ^{218.} ^{219.} ^{220.} ^{221.} ^{222.} ^{223.} ^{224.} ^{225.} ^{226.} ^{227.} ^{228.} ^{229.} ^{230.} ^{231.} ^{232.} ^{233.} ^{234.} ^{235.} ^{236.} ^{237.} ^{238.} ^{239.} ^{240.} ^{241.} ^{242.} ^{243.} ^{244.} ^{245.} ^{246.} ^{247.} ^{248.} ^{249.} ^{250.} ^{251.} ^{252.} ^{253.} ^{254.} ^{255.} ^{256.} ^{257.} ^{258.} ^{259.} ^{260.} ^{261.} ^{262.} ^{263.} ^{264.} ^{265.} ^{266.} ^{267.} ^{268.} ^{269.} ^{270.} ^{271.} ^{272.} ^{273.} ^{274.} ^{275.} ^{276.} ^{277.} ^{278.} ^{279.} ^{280.} ^{281.} ^{282.} ^{283.} ^{284.} ^{285.} ^{286.} ^{287.} ^{288.} ^{289.} ^{290.} ^{291.} ^{292.} ^{293.} ^{294.} ^{295.} ^{296.} ^{297.} ^{298.} ^{299.} ^{300.} ^{301.} ^{302.} ^{303.} ^{304.} ^{305.} ^{306.} ^{307.} ^{308.} ^{309.} ^{310.} ^{311.} ^{312.} ^{313.} ^{314.} ^{315.} ^{316.} ^{317.} ^{318.} ^{319.} ^{320.} ^{321.} ^{322.} ^{323.} ^{324.} ^{325.} ^{326.} ^{327.} ^{328.} ^{329.} ^{330.} ^{331.} ^{332.} ^{333.} ^{334.} ^{335.} ^{336.} ^{337.} ^{338.} ^{339.} ^{340.} ^{341.} ^{342.} ^{343.} ^{344.} ^{345.} ^{346.} ^{347.} ^{348.} ^{349.} ^{350.} ^{351.} ^{352.} ^{353.} ^{354.} ^{355.} ^{356.} ^{357.} ^{358.} ^{359.} ^{360.} ^{361.} ^{362.} ^{363.} ^{364.} ^{365.} ^{366.} ^{367.} ^{368.} ^{369.} ^{370.} ^{371.} ^{372.} ^{373.} ^{374.} ^{375.} ^{376.} ^{377.} ^{378.} ^{379.} ^{380.} ^{381.} ^{382.} ^{383.} ^{384.} ^{385.} ^{386.} ^{387.} ^{388.} ^{389.} ^{390.} ^{391.} ^{392.} ^{393.} ^{394.} ^{395.} ^{396.} ^{397.} ^{398.} ^{399.} ^{400.} ^{401.} ^{402.} ^{403.} ^{404.} ^{405.} ^{406.} ^{407.} ^{408.} ^{409.} ^{410.} ^{411.} ^{412.} ^{413.} ^{414.} ^{415.} ^{416.} ^{417.} ^{418.} ^{419.} ^{420.} ^{421.} ^{422.} ^{423.} ^{424.} ^{425.} ^{426.} ^{427.} ^{428.} ^{429.} ^{430.} ^{431.} ^{432.} ^{433.} ^{434.} ^{435.} ^{436.} ^{437.} ^{438.} ^{439.} ^{440.} ^{441.} ^{442.} ^{443.} ^{444.} ^{445.} ^{446.} ^{447.} ^{448.} ^{449.} ^{450.} ^{451.} ^{452.} ^{453.} ^{454.} ^{455.} ^{456.} ^{457.} ^{458.} ^{459.} ^{460.} ^{461.} ^{462.} ^{463.} ^{464.} ^{465.} ^{466.} ^{467.} ^{468.} ^{469.} ^{470.} ^{471.} ^{472.} ^{473.} ^{474.} ^{475.} ^{476.} ^{477.} ^{478.} ^{479.} ^{480.} ^{481.} ^{482.} ^{483.} ^{484.} ^{485.} ^{486.} ^{487.} ^{488.} ^{489.} ^{490.} ^{491.} ^{492.} ^{493.} ^{494.} ^{495.} ^{496.} ^{497.} ^{498.} ^{499.} ^{500.} ^{501.} ^{502.} ^{503.} ^{504.} ^{505.} ^{506.} ^{507.} ^{508.} ^{509.} ^{510.} ^{511.} ^{512.} ^{513.} ^{514.} ^{515.} ^{516.} ^{517.} ^{518.} ^{519.} ^{520.} ^{521.} ^{522.} ^{523.} ^{524.} ^{525.} ^{526.} ^{527.} ^{528.} ^{529.} ^{530.} ^{531.} ^{532.} ^{533.} ^{534.} ^{535.} ^{536.} ^{537.} ^{538.} ^{539.} ^{540.} ^{541.} ^{542.} ^{543.} ^{544.} ^{545.} ^{546.} ^{547.} ^{548.} ^{549.} ^{550.} ^{551.} ^{552.} ^{553.} ^{554.} ^{555.} ^{556.} ^{557.} ^{558.} ^{559.} ^{560.} ^{561.} ^{562.} ^{563.} ^{564.} ^{565.} ^{566.} ^{567.} ^{568.} ^{569.} ^{570.} ^{571.} ^{572.} ^{573.} ^{574.} ^{575.} ^{576.} ^{577.} ^{578.} ^{579.} ^{580.} ^{581.} ^{582.} ^{583.} ^{584.} ^{585.} ^{586.} ^{587.} ^{588.} ^{589.} ^{590.} ^{591.} ^{592.} ^{593.} ^{594.} ^{595.} ^{596.} ^{597.} ^{598.} ^{599.} ^{600.} ^{601.} ^{602.} ^{603.} ^{604.} ^{605.} ^{606.} ^{607.} ^{608.} ^{609.} ^{610.} ^{611.} ^{612.} ^{613.} ^{614.} ^{615.} ^{616.} ^{617.} ^{618.} ^{619.} ^{620.} ^{621.} ^{622.} ^{623.} ^{624.} ^{625.} ^{626.} ^{627.} ^{628.} ^{629.} ^{630.} ^{631.} ^{632.} ^{633.} ^{634.} ^{635.} ^{636.} ^{637.} ^{638.} ^{639.} ^{640.} ^{641.} ^{642.} ^{643.} ^{644.} ^{645.} ^{646.} ^{647.} ^{648.} ^{649.} ^{650.} ^{651.} ^{652.} ^{653.} ^{654.} ^{655.} ^{656.} ^{657.} ^{658.} ^{659.} ^{660.} ^{661.} ^{662.} ^{663.} ^{664.} ^{665.} ^{666.} ^{667.} ^{668.} ^{669.} ^{670.} ^{671.} ^{672.} ^{673.} ^{674.} ^{675.} ^{676.} ^{677.} ^{678.} ^{679.} ^{680.} ^{681.} ^{682.} ^{683.} ^{684.} ^{685.} ^{686.} ^{687.} ^{688.} ^{689.} ^{690.} ^{691.} ^{692.} ^{693.} ^{694.} ^{695.} ^{696.} ^{697.} ^{698.} ^{699.} ^{700.} ^{701.} ^{702.} ^{703.} ^{704.} ^{705.} ^{706.} ^{707.} ^{708.} ^{709.} ^{710.} ^{711.} ^{712.} ^{713.} ^{714.} ^{715.} ^{716.} ^{717.} ^{718.} ^{719.} ^{720.} ^{721.} ^{722.} ^{723.} ^{724.} ^{725.} ^{726.} ^{727.} ^{728.} ^{729.} ^{730.} ^{731.} ^{732.} ^{733.} ^{734.} ^{735.} ^{736.} ^{737.} ^{738.} ^{739.} ^{740.} ^{741.} ^{742.} ^{743.} ^{744.} ^{745.} ^{746.} ^{747.} ^{748.} ^{749.} ^{750.} ^{751.} ^{752.} ^{753.} ^{754.} ^{755.} ^{756.} ^{757.} ^{758.} ^{759.} ^{760.} ^{761.} ^{762.} ^{763.} ^{764.} ^{765.} ^{766.} ^{767.} ^{768.} ^{769.} ^{770.} ^{771.} ^{772.} ^{773.} ^{774.} ^{775.} ^{776.} ^{777.} ^{778.} ^{779.} ^{780.} ^{781.} ^{782.} ^{783.} ^{784.} ^{785.} ^{786.} ^{787.} ^{788.} ^{789.} ^{790.} ^{791.} ^{792.} ^{793.} ^{794.} ^{795.} ^{796.} ^{797.} ^{798.} ^{799.} ^{800.} ^{801.} ^{802.} ^{803.} ^{804.} ^{805.} ^{806.} ^{807.} ^{808.} ^{809.} ^{810.} ^{811.} ^{812.} ^{813.} ^{814.} ^{815.} ^{816.} ^{817.} ^{818.} ^{819.} ^{820.} ^{821.} ^{822.} ^{823.} ^{824.} ^{825.} ^{826.} ^{827.} ^{828.} ^{829.} ^{830.} ^{831.} ^{832.} ^{833.} ^{834.} ^{835.} ^{836.} ^{837.} ^{838.} ^{839.} ^{840.} ^{841.} ^{842.} ^{843.} ^{844.} ^{845.} ^{846.} ^{847.} ^{848.} ^{849.} ^{850.} ^{851.} ^{852.} ^{853.} ^{854.} ^{855.} ^{856.} ^{857.} ^{858.} ^{859.} ^{860.} ^{861.} ^{862.} ^{863.} ^{864.} ^{865.} ^{866.} ^{867.} ^{868.} ^{869.} ^{870.} ^{871.} ^{872.} ^{873.} ^{874.} ^{875.} ^{876.} ^{877.} ^{878.} ^{879.} ^{880.} ^{881.} ^{882.} ^{883.} ^{884.} ^{885.} ^{886.} ^{887.} ^{888.} ^{889.} ^{890.} ^{891.} ^{892.} ^{893.} ^{894.} ^{895.} ^{896.} ^{897.} ^{898.} ^{899.} ^{900.} ^{901.} ^{902.} ^{903.} ^{904.} ^{905.} ^{906.} ^{907.} ^{908.} ^{909.} ^{910.} ^{911.} ^{912.} ^{913.} ^{914.} ^{915.} ^{916.} ^{917.} ^{918.} ^{919.} ^{920.} ^{921.} ^{922.} ^{923.} ^{924.} ^{925.} ^{926.} ^{927.} ^{928.} ^{929.} ^{930.} ^{931.} ^{932.} ^{933.} ^{934.} ^{935.} ^{936.} ^{937.} ^{938.} ^{939.} ^{940.} ^{941.} ^{942.} ^{943.} ^{944.} ^{945.} ^{946.} ^{947.} ^{948.} ^{949.} ^{950.} ^{951.} ^{952.} ^{953.} ^{954.} ^{955.} ^{956.} ^{957.} ^{958.} ^{959.} ^{960.} ^{961.} ^{962.} ^{963.} ^{964.} ^{965.} ^{966.} ^{967.} ^{968.} ^{969.} ^{970.} ^{971.} ^{972.} ^{973.} ^{974.} ^{975.} ^{976.} ^{977.} ^{978.} ^{979.} ^{980.} ^{981.} ^{982.} ^{983.} ^{984.} ^{985.} ^{986.} ^{987.} ^{988.} ^{989.} ^{990.} ^{991.} ^{992.} ^{993.} ^{994.} ^{995.} ^{996.} ^{997.} ^{998.} ^{999.} ^{1000.} ^{1001.} ^{1002.} ^{1003.} ^{1004.} ^{1005.} ^{1006.} ^{1007.} ^{1008.} ^{1009.} ^{1010.} ^{1011.} ^{1012.} ^{1013.} ^{1014.} ^{1015.} ^{1016.} ^{1017.} ^{1018.} ^{1019.} ^{1020.} ^{1021.} ^{1022.} ^{1023.} ^{1024.} ^{1025.} ^{1026.} ^{1027.} ^{1028.} ^{1029.} ^{1030.} ^{1031.} ^{1032.} ^{1033.} ^{1034.} ^{1035.} ^{1036.} ^{1037.} ^{1038.} ^{1039.} ^{1040.} ^{1041.} ^{1042.} ^{1043.} ^{1044.} ^{1045.} ^{1046.} ^{1047.} ^{1048.} ^{1049.} ^{1050.} ^{1051.} ^{1052.} ^{1053.} ^{1054.} ^{1055.} ^{1056.} ^{1057.} ^{1058.} ^{1059.} ^{1060.} ^{1061.} ^{1062.} ^{1063.} ^{1064.} ^{1065.} ^{1066.} ^{1067.} ^{1068.} ^{1069.} ^{1070.} ^{1071.} ^{1072.} ^{1073.} ^{1074.} ^{1075.} ^{1076.} ^{1077.} ^{1078.} ^{1079.} ^{1080.} ^{1081.} ^{1082.} ^{1083.} ^{1084.} ^{1085.} ^{1086.} ^{1087.} ^{1088.} ^{1089.} ^{1090.} ^{1091.} ^{1092.} ^{1093.} ^{1094.} ^{1095.} ^{1096.} ^{1097.} ^{1098.} ^{1099.} ^{1100.} ^{1101.} ^{1102.} ^{1103.} ^{1104.} ^{1105.} ^{1106.} ^{1107.} ^{1108.} ^{1109.} ^{1110.} ^{1111.} ^{1112.} ^{1113.} ^{1114.} ^{1115.} ^{1116.} ^{1117.} ^{1118.} ^{1119.} ^{1120.} ^{1121.} ^{1122.} ^{1123.} ^{1124.} ^{1125.} ^{1126.} ^{1127.} ^{1128.} ^{1129.} ^{1130.} ^{1131.} ^{1132.} ^{1133.} ^{1134.} ^{1135.} ^{1136.} ^{1137.} ^{1138.} ^{1139.} ^{1140.} ^{1141.} ^{1142.} ^{1143.} ^{1144.} ^{1145.} ^{1146.} ^{1147.} ^{1148.} ^{1149.} ^{1150.} ^{1151.} ^{1152.} ^{1153.} ^{1154.} ^{1155.} ^{1156.} ^{1157.} ^{1158.} ^{1159.} ^{1160.} ^{1161.} ^{1162.} ^{1163.} ^{1164.} ^{1165.} ^{1166.} ^{1167.} ^{1168.} ^{1169.} ^{1170.} ^{1171.} ^{1172.} ^{1173.} ^{1174.} ^{1175.} ^{1176.} ^{1177.} ^{1178.} ^{1179.} ^{1180.} ^{1181.} ^{1182.} ^{1183.} ^{1184.} ^{1185.} ^{1186.} ^{1187.} ^{1188.} ^{1189.} ^{1190.} ^{1191.} ^{1192.} ^{1193.} ^{1194.} ^{1195.} ^{1196.} ^{1197.} ^{1198.} ^{1199.} ^{1200.} ^{1201.} ^{1202.} ^{1203.} ^{1204.} ^{1205.} ^{1206.} ^{1207.} ^{1208.} ^{1209.} ^{1210.} ^{1211.} ^{1212.} ^{1213.} ^{1214.} ^{1215.} ^{1216.} ^{1217.} ^{1218.} ^{1219.} ^{1220.} ^{1221.} ^{1222.} ^{1223.} ^{1224.} ^{1225.} ^{1226.} ^{1227.} ^{1228.} ^{1229.} ^{1230.} ^{1231.} ^{1232.} ^{1233.} ^{1234.} ^{1235.} ^{1236.} ^{1237.} ^{1238.} ^{1239.} ^{1240.} ^{1241.} ^{1242.} ^{1243.} ^{1244.} ^{1245.} ^{1246.} ^{1247.} ^{1248.} ^{1249.} ^{1250.} ^{1251.} ^{1252.} ^{1253.} ^{1254.} ^{1255.} ^{1256.} ^{1257.} ^{1258.} ^{1259.} ^{1260.} ^{1261.} ^{1262.} ^{1263.} ^{1264.} ^{1265.} ^{1266.} ^{1267.} ^{1268.} ^{1269.} ^{1270.} ^{1271.} ^{1272.} ^{1273.} ^{1274.} ^{1275.} ^{1276.} ^{1277.} ^{1278.} ^{1279.} ^{1280.} ^{1281.} ^{1282.} ^{1283.} ^{1284.} ^{1285.} ^{1286.} ^{1287.} ^{1288.} ^{1289.} ^{1290.} ^{1291.} ^{1292.} ^{1293.} ^{1294.} ^{1295.} ^{1296.} ^{1297.} ^{1298.} ^{1299.} ^{1300.} ^{1301.} ^{1302.} ^{1303.} ^{1304.} ^{1305.} ^{1306.} ^{1307.} ^{1308.} ^{1309.} ^{1310.}

Despite the prohibitions of the use of the Yahweh name for the God of Israel, which take their rise in the second Commandment of the Decalogue,^{1.} the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha still maintain the *Κύριος* form for original *יהוה*. This is part of their representation of themselves in the form of Scripture. The Psalms of Solomon naturally retain the biblical modes of expression and Psalm forms.

The Jubilees use impartially the class name for God and the Yahweh designation, and scarcely use any other. The assumption of Moses, Vita Adae, the Apocalypse of Moses and Pseudo-Philo show a similar approach, and the Damascus text speaks almost throughout of "God". The older Books of Enoch regularly use both the class name and the name of "Lord", but also show a peculiar fondness for the liturgical fullness of double names, and produce an abundance of other divine predications. IV Ezra and Baruch use the "God" and "Lord" designations and are more discreet in confining themselves to such other designations as the Highest, the Creator, the Almighty, the Compassionate etc., all of which have precise reference in the peculiarly Israelitish revelation. The Slavonic Book of Enoch simply limits itself to "God" and "Lord" in significant places. It is not until we come to the Apocalypse of Abraham that we come to the admission of Gnostic secrecy, and the precedent is set for inventiveness that followed later. The Greek influence is seen in such titles as "Light". From the above survey it can be seen that the special Israelitish name for God, the class names and the periphrases are being used widely as equivalent terms even in strictly Jewish circles.

1. See Strack u. Billerbeck vol.2p.311., TWNT. Kittel p.93.

The same conscious striving for a pure conception of God is to be seen in the ^{LXX} translation of the Old Testament. Before setting out the evidence several general observations ought to be made. Firstly, there is the matter of exact equivalents. When we are dealing with experiences that are common to all mankind, we can assume that reasonably exact equivalents will occur in the languages involved. To expect exact equivalents in the Greek tongue for the Hebrew terminology expressive of the highly particular Hebrew religious faith, would be to presuppose that the Greeks were sharers of that distinctive religious experience. We know in fact that Greek religious development differs from the Hebrew in several basic presuppositions. In its most influential form it is shown to have reached its religious conclusions by the intellectual processes of logic, in which this-worldly qualities are carried to their absolute form or degree. Its discussions turn on the sameness of the essences which make up human nature and the divine. The distinction is but one of degree. The antitheses between this world's material order and the world of the gods: the light-darkness; spirit-matter; real-unreal, do not extend to the life of man. In its three chief conceptions of divine essence, πνεῦμα, φῶς and ἁλιθσία, the distinction from the same essences in man is one of degree. Man's religious life is involved in an endeavour to achieve the divine degree again. The Old Testament faith, on the other hand, concerns the relationship of orders of life that are different in kind. Its conclusions grow out of the

gracious self-revelation and redeeming activity, quite without obligation, on the part of the greater for the lesser order of life, which lower order is never at any time in a position to make a claim on the greater.

It should also be observed that the transference of the Old Testament thought into Greek, therefore, involved also a change of analogical key-feature. In the case of the Old Testament we are dealing with personal relationships on the historical analogical pattern; in the case of Greek thought with the processes of speculative logic. This transference is responsible for at least one important difficulty over equivalents.^{1.}

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that LXX translators deliberately set out to curtail the O.T. anthropomorphic representation of Yahweh, lest the Greek-speaking Jewish reader should assume that the Old Testament theology regarded the difference of order between men and the Deity to be a matter of indifference. By many quite arbitrary small alterations^{2.} the LXX translators indicate their strong support for the growing conception of the "otherness" of God, their disapproval of material ~~of material~~ representation^{3.} of God, of his close personal contact with man, of any display of human emotion in the being of God,^{4.} or of the responsibility of God^{5.} for evil. It can be seen that the protection of the "überweltlichkeit" conception of God, is a first principle of the LXX translation. It is to be seen in Greek equivalents used to translate the Hebrew terms which establish the divine or holy order, for the presentation of the personal holy Subject, and for the predications made about the holy Subject.

1. The representation of the יְהוָה root by ἀληθεία 2. Cf. Kittel W.B.b.iii, p.290 under Θεός . 3. Cf. Is.38:11 & Job 19:26f. 4. Gen.6:6f; Ex.32:12. 5. Job 42:7; 1Esd.6:14 (cf 5:12)

As we have seen the Hebrew holy order is concentrated in the conceptions indicated by the terms $\psi\tau\rho, \Pi\eta$ and $\eta\eta\eta$. Allowing for the change in analogical key-feature, we could have expected to find the basic concept of reality of the Greek $\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ group to have held a significant place in the translation of this concept. In point of fact, the $\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ concept is relegated to the representation of a predicate of the Hebrew holy Subject. Instead, the LXX represents almost without exception the decisive Hebrew concept of $\psi\tau\rho$ by the Greek $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ group of terms.^{1.}

Although this group of Greek terms is fundamentally linked with the early Greek $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, where its elemental idea is some unapproachable object of religious fear, and has connections with $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$: a notion which is used to convey the concept of cultic ritual cleanness, and is more appropriately applied to men than to gods, the $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ forms appear to be a biblical development, as clear evidence of extra-biblical usage is wanting.^{2.} They are parallel with the already recognisable Greek technical forms $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega, \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma, \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega, \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ but are free from the pagan associations of the original, and the ritual and human associations of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$. Greek ideas are at a minimum, and the Hebrew $\psi\tau\rho$ ideas can the more readily be stamped upon them by the O.T. contexts in which they are placed.^{3.}

Parallel to this choice of equivalent for $\psi\tau\rho$ is the representation the Hebrew $\eta\eta\eta$, not by $\phi\omega\varsigma$ which represents the Greek handling of the divine order under the category of light, but by $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$.

1. See Hatch & Redpath Concordance at $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, and cf Kittel TWNT b.i, p.95f. 2. Kittel, ibid, p.87. Cf. Moulton & Mill, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\zeta\omega$.
3. Note also the preference for $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ or $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron$ over the current $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ to translate the sanctuary of the temple. Kit. TWNT, p.95.

Literally δόξα means a seeming or appearance; but in classical Greek stood between knowledge and ignorance as opinion, and later came to mean reputation, especially good reputation, and thence to the idea of distinction or honour. There is something more appropriate about δόξα to represent 7127, which is so closely linked with the holy name or reputation Yahweh has made for himself by his majestic appearances in history, than the representation of it by the divine essence category word φῶς¹, which was so strongly associated with the spark of divine light that is by nature in every man.

Etymologically 717 and πνεῦμα are sufficiently near equivalents. Both are connected with the universal boundlessness and unaccountability of the wind, which is seen and known only by its effects. Both are early associated with the breath of life, which for the Greeks included thought, and are, therefore, to be associated with the divine. Greek Platonic thought extended the idea to represent the absolute forms of which this worldly forms are but paler copies. In the Hermetica πνεῦμα is hardly to be distinguished from λόγος in which all λόγοι are to be summed up, and came in Gnostic thought to indicate a substance, or image of the soul imprisoned in matter. But these latter are developments which at the time of the translation of the LXX were sufficiently undefined not to compromise the primary O.T. concept of 717 as a power to which man and nature are subject, but which is not to be identified with either. It distinguishes that unaccountable extra-ordinary and ab-normal activity in nature and in man that came to be associated

1. Cf. Ex. 16:7; 10; 24:16; 29:43; Num. 14:21f; Dt. 5:24; 1 Sam. 2:9; 4:21; Pss. 18:1; 21:5; 24:8; 29:2; 63:2; 79:6. Is. 6:3; 42:8; 66:19; Ez. 1:28 (LXX 2:1); 3:27; 8:4; Hab. 2:14; Zech. 2:3; Mal. 2:2.

with the presence of the holy. The Greek πνεῦμα is a sufficiently neutral definition of the divine order to remain wholly at the disposal of Hebrew ideas.

In choosing LXX equivalents for Hebrew divine titles no Greek god-names come into the reckoning. Nor are the terms chosen indicative of the absolute concepts of Greek logic, or of a single divine essence of which we are all particles, and to which we will all ultimately be re-united. They are clearly attempts to translate the Old Testament record of the relationship concepts of man's experience of a being of a much vaster order than his own. The Hebrew forms are translated by ἰσχυρός, the present helpfulness and self-sufficiency of יהוה is indicated by ἰκανός^{1.}, and high and lifted-up concept of יהוה by the Greek ὑψίστος. That Yahweh's lordship extends to the Heavens is indicated by the steady preference for δυνάμεις over ἐξουσίαι in rendering יהוה. In rendering the Hebrew divine class names יהוה and יהוה by θεός (and ὁ θεός), the article is reserved to distinguish the God of Israel. The much favoured impersonal Greek term τὸ θεῖον is almost wholly wanting.

Especially important attaches to the use of κύριος to translate יהוה.^{2.} The classical, adjectival use of κύριος means power of disposal or enacting, or valid as having the force of law. Of persons it stands for plenipotentiary power, entitlement or commission. The operative

1. The choice of this Greek word has helped in the understanding of the difficult derivation of the Hebrew term, and at the same time forwarded the transcendent theology of the translators of the LXX.
2. See TWNT. Kittel "Lord" (S.T.)

ideas are of power that is legal and plenipotentary. The use of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as a divine predicate originates in the orient, where gods are lords of reality and disposers of fate, and it corresponds to local native usage only, in which it is linked with the personal relationship of man to god, and takes the form of command on the part of the god, and petition on the part of man. Its correlative is $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and it therefore corresponds to the basic Semitic view in which the epithet "Lord" was added to the name of the god, with a personal suffix relating to the worshipper.

From these facts the first point to be noted is the time factor. The LXX usage of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is the first recorded application of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ to a god in Hellenistic times. No other instances occur before the first century B.C.^{1.} This factor alone makes it very unlikely that $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is meant to translate the Hebrew יְיָ , the vowels of which are most frequently to be found with the tetragrammaton in the Hebrew text. The Hebrew יְיָ form denotes the possessor of power over men, and, the especial religious form יְיָ , denotes sovereign and comprehensive power rather than local. It grows out of the personal and reverential attitude due to the sense of unrelieved nearness of the deity in which the deity is addressed as "my Lord"^(see 156). The linking of יְיָ with יְיָ in Ezekiel carries this experience a step further: filling יְיָ with the content of יְיָ . This represents a stage in the transition of stress from the divine name to the title in connection with יְיָ . However, the use of the vowels of other Hebrew divine titles with the tetragrammaton in the Massoretic text, indicates that vocalisation was not necessary to the understanding of יְיָ in any given situation. The read text was regarded as periphrastic for the unutterable name. Moreover, the use of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in Greek Syrian inscriptions/
1. See Kittel TWNT; Eng. Trans. "Lord" p.17

would need to be much more frequent to correspond to the very frequent use of יְיָ .

To conclude then: Κύριος is a title and not a name, and to this extent can compromise its Hebrew equivalent only by what its primary meaning brings to it. Its primary meaning concerns legitimate and plenipotentiary powers, but this has been modified in its religious usage within Hellenism in local areas in the orient, where these powers concern the personal relation between gods and men. They are indicated, on the one side, by the legitimate right to command and delegate, and on the other, the right to expect help. Moreover, the LXX usage of Κύριος is the first recorded in Hellenistic times. These factors indicate how little the use of Κύριος to translate the Hebrew יְיָ was likely to compromise the O.T. special revelation. To have chosen τύραννος would have discounted the ethical stress of the revelation. To have relied entirely upon δεδούτης would have emphasised the idea of possession at the expense of the legitimate powers of disposal, expressed in the sharp Semitic category distinctions and ideas of responsibility accepted on both sides. Κύριος preserves, by its notion of legitimacy, something of the covenant understanding of Israel.

The actual usage of Κύριος in the LXX is also instructive, Although used non-religiously, as a translation for various human relationships indicated by such Hebrew words as $\text{אֲדֹנָי, אֲבִי, אֲמִי, אֲחִי, אֲנִי}$ etc. it is never used of a foreign god, but confined to the one true God of Israel. Only by way of exception are other Hebrew terms for God

translated by ^{1.}κύριος. On the analogy with the LXX use of the article with θεός - which is much more regular than its use with κύριος - it can be assumed that with the article κύριος represents a title, and without the article it stands for a proper name. The use of κύριος to translate יהוה, therefore, as the first instance of a local, native usage, does not associate the LXX theologians deeply in Greek philosophical views of divinity. It is not to be explained on the assumption of a uniform Hebrew prototype (e.g. יהוה). It represents rather the יהוה of the basic Hebrew text. In its Hellenistic religious usage it is close to the Hebrew usage of יהוה, and it remains open to fuller influence from the distinctive LXX contexts into which it is introduced.

In translating the Hebrew predicates of Yahweh similar principles seem to be guiding the LXX translators, and it is at this point that the strong legal emphasis of Jewish post-exilic theology is to be noted. The יהוה character of Yahweh is sometimes rendered by πιστός i.e. that which is worthy of trust. More often, however, it is rendered by ἀλήθεια and the adjectives ἀληθής and ἀληθινός which are primarily used in Greek religious thought to convey the notion of the order of reality itself. Thus in the LXX, reality is thought of as a predicate of Yahweh. Its relation to the Hebrew יהוה, however, is confined to the point at which the Greek and Hebrew terms overlap, viz, reality corresponds with what is trustworthy or reliable, especially in relation to words, and Yahweh's word in particular. As we have noted this particular equivalent suffers especially in relation to the difference of key-feature of the Hebrew and Greek world-views. The

1. χφ (60) η' ζκ (23) σ' ηδκ (193) π' ηβγδ' ηδκ (3) η' ηγ' (6156)

Greek term is abstract and intellectual, the Hebrew personal and historical. Nevertheless, it is within the spirit of the O.T. theology that there is no other reality than Yahweh, and his word is to be trusted.

In the same way when the translators vary from *δικαίος εἶναι* in rendering $\rho 74$, and prefer *δικαιοῦσθαι*, they show an awareness that the Hebrew causative hiphal of the root $\rho 74$ means more than to judge with strict impartiality. They are seeking to translate the revelation in which Yahweh is shown rather as a redeemer, coming to the aid of the "poor", to vindicate him when he has no practical, legal or cultic merit of his own. It is at this point that the limitations of *δικαιοῦν* are also felt, as is demonstrated by the occasional use of *ἐλεημοσύνη* to render $\rho 74$ ¹.

It is when dealing with the Hebrew divine predicate $\gamma 0\pi$ that an apparently wide divergence occurs in the LXX rendering. It is rendered by *ὁσίος*, which indicates what is sanctioned by law, rites that are sacred, persons that are devout and a god that is holy: all in a ritual and legal sense. This is rather a reflection of the formal, ritual and legal approach to God, which is so apparent in late Judaism, than a rendering of the persistent, loyal affection within a bond of the O.T. $\gamma 0\pi$ experience of Yahweh. Nevertheless, the fact that $\gamma 0\pi$ is sometimes translated by *ἄεος*, which also renders $\pi 0\gamma$ (compassion) and $\gamma 1\pi$ (favour), and that in one or two instances *χάρις*² is used, indicates that the traditional "grace"

1. Cf. Ps. 24:5. 2. See Esther 2.

still breaks through. The indications are, therefore, that as far as these three significant Israelitish divine predicates are concerned, there is always in the background of the LXX translators minds an awareness of the holy Subject of which they but predicates. Behind the narrower legal and ritual implications of the chosen Greek equivalents, which are approximations of post-exilic Jewish theology rather than serious attempts at Hellenisation of the Hebrew terms, stands the sovereign figure of Yahweh whose holy name influences all it touches with its historic associations.

Two other LXX renderings must be noted; that of νόμος for מִצְוָה and λόγος for דְּבָרִים . Of the Hebrew side we have already spoken. The use of νόμος to represent indifferently both the broader and narrower conceptions of the Hebrew מִצְוָה necessarily led to much misrepresentation of the breadth of the original Hebrew conceptions; but it also indicates what conception of law dominated the Hellenistic Jewish communities. However, it must always be remembered that the source of Jewish law was in the Decalogue, the edicts, the statutes and judgements of Yahweh. Law took its character from him. It was a revelation of his holy being and ethical character. The LXX predications of the word νόμος would make that clear.

The importance of the LXX choice of λόγος to render the Hebrew דְּבָרִים must be noted here; but discussion reserved for
1.
a later section of the thesis.

We may sum up the discussions on the LXX translation by stating that the main outline of the O.T. theology is clearly and self-

1. See section on Philo p.140

consciously grasped ^{and} firmly portrayed. Any narrowing of the historic revelation is due to formal and legal emphases of post-exilic Judaism, rather than to any attempt to accommodate the Israelite faith to Hellenism. Strict action is taken to safeguard the holy category; care is taken in the choice of equivalents for divine titles. Where there are no exact equivalents those are chosen which are least likely to compromise the Hebrew revelation. Provincial and oriental Greek terms are given precedence over compromising philosophical terms, and weak, little-known Greek concepts are used and overshadowed and given new content, by the Hebrew contexts into which they are introduced. The Hebrew characteristic god-name is indicated by an adjectival descriptive title, and uncompromised by any Greek god-name. If the Greek renderings of the divine predicates leave something to be desired, the legal and formal emphases they show only make the legal and ethical demands of the divine Subject stricter than their primary Hebrew counter-part, and tend to overshadow the saving aspect of the divine activity. In reproducing the O.T. in the Greek tongue, the LXX translators were self-consciously aware of God as an objective reality, a description of whom could be transferred to those who understood another tongue than Hebrew. This they deliberately set out to do.

In the Rabbinical Literature the late biblical theological trends are pursued vigorously. This is to be seen in the treatment of the divine titles. The specially Israelitish Jahweh name is put in a class on its own. No doubt the strict interpretation of the Decalogue commandment is the immediate cause; but the transcendent holiness which attaches to ideas about God, provides the motivation behind its

stricter interpretation. The Tetragrammaton is early replaced by such titles as $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ and $\text{ג} \text{ד} \text{ו} \text{נ}$. But, because of their close identification with the person of God's own self, these substitute words gradually assume a holiness which makes them also unutterable, and they in turn are replaced by such words as $\square \text{ה} \text{ש}$ (in Scriptural citation) and $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ק} \text{ו}$ (in common speech). The survival of $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ in such phrases as $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ is only due to the fact that the rest of the phrase (i.e. $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$) makes the reference to the Deity less direct and mediate. The substitutes that are most frequently used seem to centre in a common significant idea. They refer in their different spheres to the historic manner in which the holy life of God has touched the life of this world. There is no doubt, of course, that $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ refers to the $\text{ש} \text{ה} \text{מ} \text{ק} \text{ו} \text{ל} \text{ה} \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ the $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ the place where God is designated, ^{1.} This is proof enough of the identification of the reference to the God of Israel. But if the investigations of Strack and Billerbeck are right, these two substitute names, and others besides, testify to a pre-occupation with the historic revelation of Yahweh to Israel. These terms are revealed to be references to a larger Scriptural group of words associated with the temple as the concentration of the place among the Israelites where Yahweh allowed his name to dwell. The Hebrew substitute titles $\square \text{ה} \text{ש}$, $\square \text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ק} \text{ו}$ and $\text{ג} \text{ד} \text{ו} \text{נ}$

1. Eng. Trans. T&NT under "Basileia" Bible Key Words pp.18 & 19
2. The terms go back as significant abbreviations 1. the off-repeated phrase in Dt. 12¹¹ 14²³ 16¹⁶ 11 262 (R.V) "the place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there". The key words of the phrase are "Lord", "place", "name", "dwell". These are just the ideas perpetuated by the periphrastic titles under discussion. See Strack v. Bill pp. 109-117 if also other title abbrev; from the phrase "when he spoke and the world was" $\text{ו} \text{נ} \text{ג} \text{ד} \text{ו} \text{נ} \text{ו} \text{ו}$ or $\text{ו} \text{נ} \text{ג} \text{ד} \text{ו} \text{נ} \text{ו}$ (speaker word or speech) (of S u B) also cf $\text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$, $\text{ה} \text{ש} \text{ה}$ Excursus Kom. z. N. T. etc. S. u. l. vol 2 pp. 303-333

\ all find their inspiration in the notion of Yahweh revealing his name and allowing it to dwell in Israel, and in this particular concentration of Israel. These terms are the key words of the notion, and are calculated to refer back to a particular well-known revelation of God, and not just to God in general.

A further important development to be seen in the Rabbis is the gradual drawing of the class names for God into the unutterable class in free speech, although they were still allowed in Scripture citation, in the liturgies and in religious texts. It is another stage in the conquest of the concept of the holiness of Yahweh that the general concept of deity is becoming expressed in terms of the Yahweh revelation.

The characteristic descriptive titles, however, are allowed complete freedom of usage in the Rabbis. They had never had a life of their own. They were not so much substitutes for the name of God as titles descriptive of aspects of his historical activity. Although the periphrases were used freely, they were most often attached to particular defining phrases, which broke down something of the immediacy of their holy reference. While they leave no doubt that they are describing someone of the holy order, they first focus attention on the ~~this~~-worldly term before lifting it into the divine category by the supporting phrase. Among this group the great frequency in the usage of these belonging to the varying aspects "lordship" concept should be noted.^{1.} This is some indication of the irresistible and unpreventable nature of the concept of deity which dominated Rabbinic thought. Similar "dominion" emphasis is to be observed in the more abstract group of titles

1. $\gamma\iota\tau\alpha$, $\gamma\iota\tau\tau$, $\gamma\iota\tau\sigma$, $\tau\alpha$ etc. etc.

הַיְיָ , הַיְיָ , הַיְיָ , הַיְיָ and הַיְיָ .

Although these titles are moving into the sphere of the Greek impersonal notions of deity, they are, nevertheless, conceptions that are firmly grounded in the historical developments of Israel's special revelation.^{1.}

It must also be noted that such terms as הַיְיָ (Compassionate or Merciful One) הַיְיָ (Gracious One), הַיְיָ (Long Suffering), הַיְיָ (Great in respect to pardon or favour)^{2.}

appear along with the titles indicative of power, and with similar binding powers of exorcism. So that behind the many extensions and multiplications of god-titles in Rabbinical literature, there stands the strongest association with the unutterable name, and the historic circumstances of its revelation to Israel. So much does this

"הַיְיָ" concept of deity dominate the Rabbinic thought that, the particular ethical holiness which attaches to it, is seen to be permeating the ancient class names of God and the descriptive titles, as well as the periphrases for the unutterable name itself. All god titles begin to be used as synonyms for הַיְיָ . The historical, personal revelation is never far away from whatever god-title is being used. The same difference of category is being made between the holy order and the order of this world, the same holy Subject is addressed and the same predicates are being made concerning him. The fault commonly attributed to the theology of late Judaism is... that it stresses over heavily the transcendence of the divine order, as though to clarify once and for all the utter completeness of the difference of category; to declare finally from historical experience, that there is no other position from which a theological beginning can be made. This

2. See S.u.B. ii, pp.306-8

3. Ibid, p.308.

separate order is still objectively recognised as the historic God of Israel, who fills with the content of his revelation every other concept of deity and all god-titles. It follows from the recognition of the difference of category, and this is supported from history, that salvation can come from the divine world only, and that the figures linked with that salvation must also represent the holy order, and it is part of their function to act as bridge between man's failure and his hopes.

Finally, late Judaism points to an objective reality that is not only to be thought of as other than Nature, but as ultimately other than Nature's most impressive and complicated expression: human personality. Nothing within this world, including human personality, can fully represent the holy Subject. Nevertheless, the ^{personal,} historical analogy as representative of the whole ^{in his entirety,} man is still to be preferred to that which is expressed in the strictly limited terms of intellectual logic. The Jewish theology is firm in its preference for ὁ Θεός and ὁ Κύριος over τὸ Θεῖον and τὸ Ὄν. If the deity is not personal according to the order of human personality, it at least is not impersonal. This is in agreement with the theology expressive of the final editing of the ^{1.} O.T. It is a declaration that, though all this-worldly analogies must finally prove inadequate to represent the holy Subject, the human analogy is least inadequate.

In the final theological achievement of Judaism we are confronted with a concept of deity that is abstracted out of the created world and human history, until it must be thought of as apart from them,

1. Cf. Gen.2:7("P")

but which has carried with it into objectivity concepts of sovereignty, ethics and personality, which belong to this world, but, which in their application to the activity of God in history, take on the dimension of the holy order to which they have been applied. To this extent their future currency in this world and in human affairs must forever remain (at least partly) limited to their holy revelatory task. The concepts and terms of this O.T. theology have become the foundation and the norm of all abstract thought about the requirements of deity ever since. The way in which this Hebrew concept of deity has finally triumphed a second time over the persuasive Greek ideas is one of the exciting discoveries of the revival of biblical theology in modern times. It was certainly the concept which is taken for granted as the accepted starting point of the New Testament revelation.

RELEVANT CONTEMPORARY ELEMENTS

(a) THE LOGOS

(i) Greek Conceptions

In the historic background to the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ conception the primary notions are of reason and speech: the inward thought and the outward expression of it. Behind the other religious uses of the concept stands the general field of Platonism, two features of which persisted into Hellenistic times, and influenced strongly its cosmological thinking. They were the Platonic dualism and the suggestion that Mind was the creator of all things. There is a world of ultimate reality distinguished from the visible objects of the phenomenal world, which are only shadows, representations or symbols of the real. This fundamental antithesis is expressed variously as between substance and shadow, reality and appearance, mind (or spirit) and matter, things above and things below, visible and invisible, eternal and transitory. The claim is that the things on earth have their source in the real world above. In the Phaedo, Plato portrays Socrates as saying, "I once heard someone reading from a book (as he said, by Anaxagoras, and asserting that it is Mind ($\text{N}\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\varsigma$) that produces order and is the cause of everything.....somehow it seemed right that Mind should be the cause of everything."

It is as a participant in possession of creative Mind that man is linked with the divine world and can hope for immortality. Concerning the world of reality Plato affirms, "That this permanent world is the only true object of knowledge. It can be apprehended by direct contemplation

1. See B. Jowett, The Dialogues of Plato, vol. iii, p. 634 2. Cf. Timaeus 27^{ff}; 51^{ff}. 3. Phaedo 101^a - 102^b 4. 97^c - 98^a Cf. Penguin Ed. E.V. Rieu pp. 129 and 134 See also Tim. 29^b & 31^b

of the mind freed as far as possible from the confusing interpretation of
 1. this world. "Man belongs to this world, he came from there. What we
 think of as knowledge is merely recollection of what we knew before birth."
 2. "When death comes to a man, the mortal part of him dies, but the immortal
 part retires at the approach of death, and escapes unharmed and indes-
 3. tractable."

Heraclitus (c.500 - 450 B.C.) was responsible for introducing
 the connection of $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ with cosmos. He conceived of ^{it as} the omnipresent
 wisdom by which all things are steered and the Stoics followed on from
 4. him.

The Stoics, however, did not hold a dualistic view of the world.
 There existed but one world, governed by a wholly immanent Word or Spirit,
 which pervaded all existence and all men. It was linked with the basic
 elements of nature such as air, fire and water, and in men with his direct-
 ing power or soul. They conceived of it as the reasonable order that
 ruled the world.
 5. They made $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ "the controlling philosophical idea by
 which the structure and unity of the universe was to be explained."
 6. There was a plurality of $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$ of which the highest representative of the
 deity was $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, who was the agent of creation. Each part
 of the universe was permeated by the one operative principle, the divine
 ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) Reason. By this generative Reason all things are begotten, and
 in every man the Reason is the directing power, the soul under the guid-
 ance of which he is able to live in harmony with the universe.

1.E.V.Rieu,ibid,p.144,107^c - 108^e. 2.ibid,p.99,74^e-76^a 3.Jowett,ibid,p.
 230,vol.iii,Tim.90. 4.E.C.Hoskyns, the Fourth Gospel,p.156, Cf.also
 Hastings Encyc. of Rel.& Eths. vol 8.pp.133ff. 5.Cf Macgregor,Moffatt
 Comm. on John p.xxxiv. 6.Hoskyns,ibid,pp.156f.

Λόγος ἐπιφαντικῶς was manifested in nature in a pantheistic way. A distinction was drawn between λόγος ἐνδιδθετός and λόγος προφορικῶς : between potential and manifested reason. This led to the idea of λόγος being emphasised as the speech of λόγος προφορικῶς and the thought of λόγος ἐνδιδθετός. Since Λόγος is present in all souls it makes it possible for them to find communion through this common element.

The broad field of Hellenistic religious thought was widely influenced by this Platonistic and Stoic stream of religious speculation. Viewed together they appeared to be in contradiction to one another. The Platonic dualism contrasted with Stoic ideas of unity and the reasonableness of the entire Stoic cosmic system. In practice the stimulating Platonic conceptions were woven into the loose overall unity of Stoic ideas. It is questionable whether dualism in Platonic thought was primary. Plato did postulate Mind as the creator of all things. There is only one world. "In order then that the world might be solitary like a perfect animal, the creator made not two world^s, or an infinite number of them; but there is and ever will be only one, only begotten and created of heaven¹". The dualism belongs to a stage lower than the primary conception of divine Mind.

On the other side, the Stoics were compelled to introduce a plurality of agencies at the secondary level of their thought. "Potential" Reason as distinct from "Manifested" Reason, differed little basically from the archetypal "pattern" and the "copy" of the Platonists. On the Platonic side the order runs, Mind, the archetypal form of the "good", the

1.Tim.31^b.

earthly "copy"; on the Stoic side, Seminal Reason, Potential Reason and Manifested Reason. The ramifications of these ideas were often held very confusedly in the popular mind as time went on.

(ii) Popular Greek Religious Thought:

As well as the speculative systems of the philosophers there existed at the beginning of the Christian era a confused mass of popular religious belief, syncretic in form and gnostic in type. The fundamental concept was the antagonism between spirit and matter. Human spirits were conceived of as sparks from the primal πῦρ which had become imprisoned within the material world. The aim of the gnostic teaching was to provide the initiated with the knowledge which would enable him to escape the bondage of the material world and gain immortality. The knowledge consisted of information about the divine nature of man, and about the structure of the supra-mundane world. "The Father of all consists of Light and Life, and from him man has sprung. If then being made of Light and Life, you learn that you are made of them, you will go back into Life and Light".^{1.}

Akin to the gnostic speculations are the "Mysteries", which in the practical field of religion, undertook to furnish the initiate with the esoteric knowledge with which to gain the blessed mysteries. The knowledge in this case consisted in equipment to ward off the attacks of demons and thwart the menace of Fate, and, after death, reach the abodes of "the blessed mysteries."^{2.} Coupled with the idea of knowledge was the

1. Cf. Corp. Herm. Lib. 1:21 (W. Scott)

2. See S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p.52.

sacramental participation in the life of the Deity in order to gain a foretaste of the direct knowledge and love to come: "a profound intuition of the Spirit of Love". The sacramental acts gave a dramatic presentation of the history of the cult deity in his or her struggles, sorrows and triumphs, and they were repeated subjectively by the initiate in the sacramental acts, together with prayers and liturgical formulæ.

(iii) The Hermetic Literature:

We are able to be more precise in the case of one particular type of contemporary Hellenistic popular religion. There has come down to us from Egypt a body of literature associated with the name of Hermes, and for that reason called Hermetic. Its associations with the general mass of popular religion can be gathered from the following descriptive passage concerning Hermes Trismegistus.

He was "a man like you and me - a man who lived in Egypt at the time of King Ammon - but he was a man who attained gnosis (that is to say, knowledge of God, but a kind of knowledge that involves union with God); and he was the first and greatest teacher of gnosis. He died, as other men die, and after death he became a god - just as you and I also, if we attain gnosis will become gods after death. But the dialogues which I and others like me write, and in which we make Hermes speak as a teacher, we represent him as talking to his pupils at the time when he was living on earth; and at the time he was a man!"

1. Re the name Trismegistus etc. see W.Scott, ibid, vol.1, pp.3ff.
2. See Scott's Introduction p.6.vol.1.

Besides possessing features of the speculative philosophy of the Platonic - Stoic school, the tractates have a fervour and religious intensity which probably belongs to their Egyptian setting. There is a background of gnostic dualism throughout, which leads to a disparagement of the material world and the human body. "But first of all you must tear off this garment which you wear - this cloak of darkness, this (prop) of evil, this bond of corruption, this living death, this conscious corpse, this tomb you carry about with you - this robber in the house, this enemy^{1.} who hates the things you seek after, and grudges you the things you desire..".

In another place we read. "There are two sorts of things, the corporeal and the incorporeal, that which is mortal is of one sort, and that which is divine is of the other sort. It is not possible to take^{2.} both."

The importance of knowledge to all the gnostic groups is axiomatic. Ignorance is the primary evil. "Its current sweeps along the soul which is penned up in the body and prevents it from coming into anchor^{3.} in the heavens of Salvation." On the other hand, "piety is the knowledge of God, and he who has come to know God is filled with all things good, his thoughts are divine, and not like those of the^{4.} many." But those who give themselves to the pursuit of knowledge are not always understood.... "they are thought mad, and are laughed at; they are hated and despised,^{5.} and, perhaps, they may even be put to death."

1.Cf.Lib.VII:2b. 2.IV:6b also XI:4a. 3.VII:1b. 4.IX:4a;IV:2 also XI (ii) 21b. "For it is the height of evil not to know God; but to be capable of knowing God or to wish or hope to know him, is the road that leads straight to the Good, and it is an easy road to travel." 5.IX:4b.

Despite the disparagement of the body and the material world, and the references to piety of the knowledge of God, the basic saving knowledge is that self knowledge by which a man knows himself to be divine. "....but to thee, O God Supreme, I give thanks that thou hast shed light
1.
on me: light whereby I see that which is divine."

The theology of the tractates is based on the speculative pantheism of Stoicism. "You must understand, then, that it is in this way that God contains within himself the kosmos, and himself, and all that is; it
2.
is as thoughts which God thinks, that all things are contained within him." Compare also this passage from the fifth Libellus. "Such is He who is too great to be named God. He is hidden, yet most manifest; He is apprehensible by thought alone, yet we can see him with our eyes. He is bodiless, and yet has many bodies, or rather, is embodied in all bodies. There is
3.
nothing that He is not; for all things that exist are even He...." "This is God's goodness, that he manifests himself through all things. Nothing is invisible, not even the incorporeal thing; mind is seen in its thinking
4.
and God in his working."

In keeping with the philosophical and speculative background, and with the preference for incorporeal abstractions, God, when he is conceived of apart from his indwelling in all things, is thought of as Mind (Νοῦς). "That Light is I, even Mind, the first God who was before the
5.
watery substance, which appeared out of darkness." "Mind is the very sub-
6.
stance of God; and what nature that substance is, God alone knows precisely".

1.The Latin Asclepius 32:0. Cf also Lib.1:21f;V11:1 2.X1(ii):20a. 3.V:10a;X11(i):1;cf.X1(i):4b,"and this whole body(Kosmos) in which all bodies are contained is filled with soul; soul is filled with mind, and mind is filled with God". cf.also X11(i):1. 4.Cf.X11(ii):22a. 5.Lib.1:21. 6.Cf.X11(i):1.

From the quotations already given it can be seen that God is to be associated with light and life. "It is God's very being to generate movement and life in all things." "Truth (Reality) has come to us, and on it has followed the Good, with Life and Light. No longer has there come upon us the torments of darkness".

The Deity is conceived of as passionless. "There is nothing that God lacks, so that he should desire to gain it, and should thereby become evil. There is nothing that God can lose, and in the loss of which he might be grieved.... no disobedient subject to raise anger in him; there is none wiser than God to make him jealous. And since his being admits of none of these passions, what remains save only the Good."

In relation with Mind, as a part of the creative sequence proceeding from him, is ^{4.} $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, Son of God, but in the sense that "for you too, the word is Son, and the mind is Father to the word."^{5.} Further elaboration of this idea can be seen in the statement, "Mind differs from thought to the extent that God differs from divine influence (inspiration). Divine influence is put forth by God, and thought is put forth by Mind, and is sister to speech ($\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$). Thought and speech are instruments of one another; speech cannot be understood without thought, and thought cannot be uttered without speech."^{6.}

1.Lib.1:2;1:21;X1(ii)17c;X11(i):1. 2.Lib.X111:9. 3.Lib.V1:1. 4.Cf. Lib.1:2, "that Light is I, even Mind, the first God.... The $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ which came forth from the light is the 'Son of God' ". 5.Lib.1:5a. 6.Lib. 1X:1c.

It is at the second stage of the creation sequence that the term λόγος occurs. Further definition is given to it in some of the later Fragments of the Hermetic Corpus. It is equivalent to "divine utterance", and in a general way it holds a corresponding position to the divine by which God is said to have created the world in Genesis. It also has an independent existence whereby it is able to achieve its purposes in separation from its fountain-head. It is said to be the "creative word of the Master of all. That word is next after Him, the Supreme Power, a Power ungenerated, boundless, that has stooped forth from Him, and the Word presides over and governs the things that have been made through him." And.... "the nature of His intellectual Word is generative." "The word of the Maker, my Son, is everlasting, self-moved, without increase or diminution, immutable, incorruptible..... he is ever like himself and equal to himself....after the Supreme God he stands alone." These statements, however, are often confused by others. For example we read, "And deem not that God resigns ought of power to another, for who is as God is?". Sometimes other figures are used which ignore the word altogether. "If God then is the source of all things, the Aeon is the power of God; and the work of the Aeon is the Kosmos; which never came into being; but is ever coming into being by the action of the Aeon."

We are left with two conclusions: the writers are influenced by the Old Testament creation story, and add nothing significant to it, and the word is not always even second to God. What ultimately becomes of

1.Cf. the closeness to the Genesis sequence. See C.H.Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp.100f. Also W.Scott's *Intro.to Herm Vol.1.i.* 2.Frag.33. 3.Lib.1:31;IV:1; Excerpt XI:15. 4.Frags.27 & 35. 5.Frag.28. 6.Frag. 29. 7.Frag.30. 8.Lib.XI(i)5;Cf.XI(ii)11. 9.XI(i)3;XI:(i)6b.

more importance is that the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ has no saving functions. The only Libellus which touches on the doctrine of rebirth through the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is considered to be of late origin and influenced by Christian conceptions.^{1.} The notion of the creative word and its relation to the Supreme Being as it appears in the Hermetic Corpus seems to be controlled by the Old Testament conceptions by which it is seen to be influenced.^{2.}

(iv) Philo - A Hebrew and Greek Synthesis

In the person and writings of Philo of Alexandria (c.20 BC-AD 50), we have a Jew of the Dispersion more than usually open to the influence of Greek thought and culture. Although he retained his loyalty to the absolute authority of the Old Testament revelation, his writings reveal a mind steeped in Platonic and Stoic thought and ideas. Hebrew ideas had developed from the practical relationship of a people elected of God, and of whom unquestioning obedience and unshared love was demanded in return for the privilege of election. Recognition of the difference in category between God and man is the common demand of all levels of the Old Testament theology. Moreover, it is of the essence of Old Testament monotheism that God is the only one of his kind.

Greek philosophy by processes of logic had arrived at the stage when an abstract Absolute Principle could at least be a matter of discussion. To the Platonists it would be expressed as the sum of all

1. See Scott, *ibid*, Vol. 1, *Introd.* Also C.H. Dodd, *ibid*, p. 209. cf. Lib. XLIII: 1 & 2.
2. C.H. Dodd, *ibid*, pp. 242 & 245.

"Good". To the Stoics it would be described as the "Immanent Reason" ($\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\nu}\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$) pervading all things. Many and varied conceptions fill in the details. Within both systems cosmological schemes were worked out. By the time of Philo, as we have seen, a mixture of both systems claimed popular support. The basic Platonic dualism still held good. The ideal universe was called $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma \nu\omicron\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ because it existed only in the mind, and for some at least Mind was of the essence of deity. In the Stoic cosmogony the determinative conception, the rational immanent principle, could be called God, or belong to God, and was responsible for the universe. It could be described as $\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\nu}\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, and this is Philo's starting point. The LXX translation of the "Word" of Yahweh as $\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ Κυρίου}$, favoured an ambiguity between Greek and Hebrew thought. In the Hebrew the "Word" of Yahweh was no ordinary word. It was creative and directive, and spoke to men through the Torah and the prophets, and was an extension of all the unpreventable power and ethical demand of Yahweh, whose word it was. In the Greek the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ primarily meant thought or reason and the expression of it; but, as we have seen, in Stoic thought and popular religion $\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ played a significant, if ill-defined, part in Greek cosmological ideas. It is Philo who sought to synthesise the Greek Immanent Reason with the creative and self-revealing "Word" of Hebrew thought.

Philo's identification of the Greek and Hebrew conceptions

1. See previous sections above. 2. See C.K. Barrett, *The N.T. Background Selected Documents*, p.183f. 3. Cf. Jer.12:8; Hos.1:1. Mic.1:1; Zeph.1:1; Zech.4:8 etc.

endows the Hebrew "Word" of the Lord (Wisdom/Torah) with a separate existence. He is at least figuratively a second God. He is called the "Eldest Son", the "Firstborn", the "Incorporeal One who differs not one whit from the divine image."^{1.} This is considerably different from the "reverential peri-phrases" of the Old Testament and kindred literatures. To Philo the λόγος is the semi-personified representative of the Archetypal world, and the connecting link between the transcendent invisible Deity and the visible material world.

In theory Philo is a monotheist. The supreme place in his cosmogony is the personal one God of the Hebrew Scriptures. In practice, however, Philo has portrayed the Hebrew God stripped of all personal qualities and every vestige of anthropomorphism.^{2.} He becomes the speculative Absolute of Greek philosophy; pure being: the first Cause: sometimes an impersonal neuter.^{3.} This is far removed from the Hebrew Yahweh,^{4.} active in history and "speaking" to men. The speculative aspect overshadows the moral conception of God. Nonetheless, God is the God (ὁ Θεός). The article is reserved for Him. That which is "improperly so called" is merely god (^{5.}θεός).

God is conceived of in the Greek terms of light, for which he would find O.T. warrant in Psalm 27:1. "And he is not only light, but the archetype of every other light, nay, prior to and high above every archetype holding the position of the model of the model."^{6.} God is uncreated. "He receives nothing from anyone, for, besides that he has no

1. Cf. Conf. Ling. 63 (Loeb. Vol. 4. p. 45). 2. Sometimes by methods of Alexandrian allegory (see examples in C. K. Barrett, Selected Documents.) 3. De Fug. 197f (Loeb. Vol. 5. pp. 117ff). 4. Cf. 3rd of the LXX Ex. 3:14. 5. De Somm. 1:229-34 (Loeb. v. 5, pp. 419ff.) 6. De Somm. 1:75 (Loeb. v. 5, pp. 335ff), cf. quod Deus 58 (L. 3. 39)

needs, all things are his possessions." God was the creator of the world that is seen only by the mind (^{2.}κόσμος νοητός). This is conceived of as the model for the empirical world. There is only one model (i.e. κόσμος νοητός), which is archetype for the visible world. This "model" or "ideal" world is λόγος which created the visible world. For "even so the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than Divine Reason (θεῖον

λόγον)^{3.} Within these impersonal limits Philo does think it is possible for us to love God. "Now Moses defines living in accordance with God as consisting in loving him, for as he says 'thy life is to love him that is'

(Dt.30:19f.) "^{4.} Again, "God asks nothing of thee that is heavy or complicated or difficult, but only something quite simple and easy. And this is just to love him as benefactor or to fear him at least as ruler and lord."^{5.} "Not to love God is to live irrationally (ἄλογως)^{6.}"

Knowledge of God is "the consummation of happiness."^{7.} "But when he has arrived at full knowledge, he will run with more vigorous effort, and his pace will be as great as that of him who before led the way; for so they will both become attendants on the ALL-leading God...."^{8.}

"those who live in the knowledge of the One are rightly called 'Sons of God', as Moses also acknowledges."^{9.}

A feature of the Philonic cosmogony is the archetypal world, the κόσμος νοητός.^{10.} It was made by God or conceived in his mind. In reality

1. Cf. Quod. Deus. 57-8 (Loeb. v. 3. p. 39) 2. See De Opif. 16-19 (Loeb. v. 1. p. 17) Note Philo is apt to confuse γένεσις with παρῆναι. Cf. De Ebr. 30 (Loeb. v. 3. pp. 333f). 3. De Opif. 16-19 (Loeb. v. 1. p. 17.) 4. De Post. 69 (Loeb. v. 2. p. 305) 5. De Spec. Leg. 1:299f (L. v. 7. p. 273) 6. Cf. n. 4 above. 7. De Spec. 1. 345 (L. 7: 302f) 8. De Myr Abr. 175 (L. 4: 233ff) 9. De Conf. 145 (L. 4: 89ff) 10. De Opif. 16-19 (L. v. 1. p. 21.)

it is the λόγος of God in the act of creating the empirical world.

"Should a man want to use the words (λογος νοητός) in a simple and direct way, he would say, that the world only discerned by the intellect is nothing else than the θεοῦ λόγος in the act of creating the world.¹" This λόγος (which is λογος νοητός) belongs to the world of "models", "patterns", "archetypes" and "ideas". It stands between absolute God and the empirical world in all spheres and under all figures. Its middle position in one of those spheres can be seen from the following: "for 'sound' is the function of the uttered word or reason, whose Father is mind, when it has grasped the Good.²" Under another figure it is seen that God is the model of the model (archetypal - λογος) of light: "for the model or pattern was the 'word' which contained all his fulness - light in fact."³ Λόγος is therefore the middle term in creation. "He employs a minister of his gifts, the Reason, wherewith also he made the world."⁴ Λόγος receives divine wisdom and is the fountain of human wisdom. God as wisdom is able to see his own self. He is the absolute wisdom of which the λογος is the image.⁵"

Within this κόσμος νοητός or λόγος world of archetypes etc., λογος is also the "model" for empirical man. "There are two types of man; the one a heavenly man, the other an earthly. The heavenly man, being made after the image of God is altogether without part or lot in corruptible and terrestrial substance; but the earthly one was compacted out of matter scattered here and there, which Moses calls 'clay'. For this reason he

1. De Opif. 24 (L.v.1.p.21) 2. De Cher. 7 (1.v.2.p.13). 3. De Somn. 1:75 (L.v.5.pp.335ff). 4. Quod Deus 57-3 (1.v.3.p.39) Cf. Quod Deus 31; God is the Father of time's father. 5. De Myr. Abr. 40 (L.v.4.p.155) Cf. Leg. All. 1: 5 (L.v.1.p.189) and Quod Deus 143 (L.v.3.pp.81ff).

says that the heavenly man was not moulded; but was stamped with the image of God; while the earthly is a moulded work of the Artificer; but not his offspring. We must account the man made out of the earth to be mind mingled with, but not yet blended with, body. But this earth-like mind is in reality also corruptible, were not God to breathe into it a power of real life; when he does so, it does not any more under go moulding, but becomes a soul, not an inefficient and imperfectly formed soul, but one endowed with mind and actually alive; for he says 'man became a living soul'¹. This heavenly man is further defined: "Behold a man whose name is rising, strangest of titles, surely, if you suppose that a being composed of soul and body is here described. But if you suppose it is the Incorporeal One, who differs not a whit from the divine image, you will agree that the name 'rising' assigned to him is quite truly descriptive of him. For that man is the eldest son, whom the Father of all raised up, and elsewhere calls him his firstborn, and, indeed, the Son thus begotten followed the ways of his Father and shaped the different kinds, looking to the archetypal patterns which the Father supplied."² The unique position of the λόγος, therefore, is that it is the model class of which only one specimen exists. "Witness his express acknowledgement in the sequel, when setting on record the creation of man, that he was moulded after the image of God. Now if the part is an image of an image, it is manifest that the whole is so too, and if the whole creation, this entire world

1.Leg.All.1:05(1.v.1.p.139). 2.De Conf.Ling.03(1.v.4.p.45).

perceived by the senses (seeing that it is greater than any human image) is a copy of the divine image, it is manifest that the archetypal seal also, which we aver to be the world described by the mind, would be the very word of God.^{1.} "The λόγος is the 'true' or 'real' Man (πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρώπου)^{2.} who is absolutely pure Mind, One, even the only God..." The λόγος then, is the "idea" of man. "But if there be any as yet unfit to be called Son of God, let him press to take his place under God's Firstborn,^{3.} the Word, who is the elder among the angels, their ruler as it were."^{4.}

If it is true that the κόσμος νουτός is the λόγος in the act of creating the empirical world, it follows that the heavenly Man is the λόγος of God in the act of creating empirical man. Empirical man, however, has a link with the divine in that he is "in respect to his intelligence akin to the divine λόγος, being an impress or fragment or effulgence of the blessed nature;^{4.} but in respect to his body akin to the whole world."

The earthly man is as yet incompletely mingled with νους. When God breathes into him the power of real life (ἀληθινῆς ζωῆς), he will become actually alive.^{5.} Man has within him from his creation something of the "true" man which is his link with the κόσμος νουτός, the world of λόγος, which is divine. "But it is the lot of man, as we see, to occupy the place of highest excellence among living creatures, because his stock is akin to God, sprung from the same source in virtue of his participations in reason (λόγος), which gives him immortality, mortal though he seems to be."^{6.}

1. De Opif. 25. (L. v. 1. p. 21); 2. De Fug. 71 (L. v. 5. p. 49), Leg. All. 1: 31-2.
3. De Conf. Ling. 140 (L. v. 4. p. 89). 4. De Opif. 140 (L. v. 1. p. 115). 5. Leg. All. 1: 31-2 (L. v. 1. p. 107). 6. 1. De Spec. 4: 14 (L. v. 8. p. 17)

This archetypal Man, which is λόγος and from the κόσμος νουτικός, has common features with the Ἄνθρωπος of the Hermetica, and, along with it, represents the background of Greek speculation against which the New Testament must be viewed.

Other Philonic figures are associated with the mediatorial functions of the λόγος. The Shepherd is taken up from Psalm 23. "The Lord leads his hallowed flock (which in this case appear to be the basic elements, plants and animals, and the heavenly bodies, as well as men,) in accordance with right and law, setting over it his 'true' Word and First-born Son who shall take upon him its government like some viceroy of a great king." The λόγος controls and directs human life as its ruler and steersman. "He is the Reason who holds together and administers all". God employs "as minister of his gifts, the λόγος wherewith he also made the world". He is the παράκλητος who is the Son of the Father to whom men must consecrate themselves and who must plead their cause as their ἀρχιερέως. The λόγος is the leader of men along the way to God, "for as long as he falls short of perfection, he has the Divine Word as his leader; since there is an oracle which says, 'Lo, I send my messenger before thy face, to guard thy way that he may bring thee on into the land, etc". It is the λόγος who is the sole interpreter of God. "We may be content if we are able to swear by his name, which means (as we have seen) the interpreting word. For this must be God for us the imperfect folk, but, as for

1. De Agri. 81 (L.v. 3. p. 135), cf. De Mut. 114: -116 (L.v. 5. pp. 201f). 2. De Cher. 30 (L.v. 2. p. 31) 3. De Vit. Mos. 2: 134 (L.v. 6. p. 515). 4. Quod Deus 57 (L.v. 3. p. 39) 5. De Vit. Mos. 2: 138f (L.v. 6. pp. 513ff) 6. De Migr. Abr. 174 (L.v. 4. p. 233) 7. Quod. Deus 138 (L.v. 3: 81), De Mut. 18 (L.v. 5. p. 153).

the wise and perfect, the primal Being is their God." ^{1.}

The λόγος of Philo then is an impersonal force operating from the eternal world as creator, sustainer and mediator to the phenomenal world and men. Its creative functions had already been assigned to the Torah (on its Wisdom side) in the speculations of Rabbinical Judaism; but Philo fails to represent adequately the break in category between the divine and phenomenal worlds so insisted upon by Old Testament theology. For Philo the λόγος is πρωτόγονος, as κόσμος νυκτός he is the elder Son whom God kept by him. He is θεός and second God, and is to be associated with life and light and reality. As the sole revealer of God and παρήμεκλιτος of men, the λόγος holds a unique mediatorial position between the divine and human worlds.

To conclude: Philo's conception of the divine world involves the following terms. There is ὁ θεός by which he designates the God of Israel. In this regard he distinguishes between ὁ θεός and ὁ κύριος. By ὁ θεός he refers to the God of creation and his kindness and goodness, and by ὁ κύριος to his lordly powers. ^{2.} As we have seen by θεός he designates the "second God" or ^{3.} λόγος; but he also uses philosophical abstract expressions such as τὸ θεῖον, which indicate just how far he has moved from the Hebrew personal conception of the divine being.

It is interesting to note that Josephus uses ὁ θεός and θεός without distinction, but prefers the former. He also uses periphrases such

1. Cf. Leg. All. 3:207 (L.v.4.p.43). 2. Leg. All. 3:73. 3. De Somn. 1:299f; Leg. All. 3:207f; Vgl. Eus. Prae. Ev. 7:XI11:1.

as εἰ οὐρανοί and the metaphysical τὸ θεῖον ; but the δ κύριος title is almost entirely wanting, because it represents the unutterable name.

It would therefore appear that by the time of Philo and Josephus for Jews at home and abroad to use the divine class names, either in their personal or abstract forms, was to refer to the God of Israel. To use is to make the reference more particular, in the case of Philo it is to refer to demonstrated lordship of God proven in history. In Josephus it represents the forbidden name of Israel's experience for which all other god-names are less dangerous synonyms. The use of the metaphysical abstract τὸ θεῖον and abstract periphrases owes as much to the late Jewish transcendent conceptions of divinity as to the Greek philosophical abstractness. Behind the LXX choice and Philonic use of λόγος on the Hebrew side stands the Jewish Rabbinical speculations with the conceptions of Torah, Word and Wisdom as nearly personified intermediaries between the transcendent Deity and creation, and in his communications with men. On the Greek side in the time of Judaism the λόγος is associated with the world of archetypes: products of the thought and utterance of God: unique models and patterns from which the entire phenomenal world is made, and agent of its creation. The λόγος is the θεῖος of the imperfect world unable to aspire to unmediated relationship with ultimate divinity. In both Jewish and Greek worlds λόγος represents the thought of the mind of the divine world expressing itself. In both cases it results in creation and becomes a means of communication between the divine world and men. But on the Hebrew side in the LXX λόγος Κυρίου is only significant as the "holy" word of Yahweh, unpreventable and ethical, speaking to men of another order. On the Greek side, deity, λόγος and men are degrees of the same order. Naturally Philo never succeeds in harmonizing these two conceptions.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF GOD

Introductory:

There is never any discussion about the existence of God in the New Testament Literature. This is no doubt due to the close relation between the New Testament revelation and the Old Testament, in which the practical presentation of the mighty acts of God in history leaves little room for speculation. Indeed, the relationship between the two Testaments is so close at the initial stages of Christianity that it must be assumed that references to the Deity are references to the God of the Old Testament. Other gods and idolatry only come into the reckoning when the Church took up its missionary task within the Gentile world. Meantime, it is the "God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus....", or, it is "our God", "the God of Israel" who is to be associated with the mighty works of Jesus. Carried over from Mark into both Matthew and Luke is the citation by Jesus of Exodus 3:6 in support of his belief in the resurrection of the dead. Paul's discussions in his Epistle to the Romans, and the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews would be meaningless without the Old Testament theology upon which they lean so heavily.

The events of the earthly life of Jesus did not take place in a vacuum. However original his contribution to our knowledge of God, connections with his native theological environment are a necessary starting point for an understanding of what he had to contribute.

4:10;
 1. Cf. Acts/5:30;10:36;36;13:7;22:14 etc. 2. Acts 14:11ff;17:23ff;19:24; 2:30ff;1Thess.1:9;1Cor.8:4;10:21;12:2;2Cor.6:16. 3. Acts 3:13. 4. Acts 2:39. 5. Luke 1:16;66. 6.12:26. 7.22:32. 8.20:37.

This background, however, must not be allowed to destroy or overtake the powerful new elements for which his life and death and resurrection were responsible, and, which indeed brought into being the Christian Church and its literature.

In assessing the theology of this literature, the tremendous achievements of New Testament scholarship, and biblical scholarship generally in all its fields, must be taken into account. But having said this, it is equally important to recognise at the beginning the analogical nature of the record. It would be possible to take cognisance of all these matters and to fail to realise that, in the New Testament, we are dealing with a world-view, and we are, therefore, not dealing with a simple objective record of events, and/or lives of personages. It is being claimed that these events and lives have significance for all the events and lives of history, and that they say something significant about Existence, Life itself. The symbols and terminology must stand for something more than their normal associations literally indicate. It is this overtone of which we must be constantly aware. Not only does the record contain parables, it is one huge parable itself.

There is a sense in which the New Testament world-view is on the same model as that of the Old Testament, but there is also a sense in which it is different. It stands in relation to the Old Testament world-view in the same sense as history in general does to the individual. The analogy is concentrated in the history of an individual man, and, to that extent, is more truly an analogy of being than is the Old Testament. It is therefore important that we should first define the theological area in which the New Testament theologians are seen to be

worship, because their first claims indicate that they are conscious that they are writing about the life-events of no ordinary man in any case. His life seemed to be associated from its beginning with highly significant events, figures and expectations of the religious history of the Jewish people, which are the basic elements in the Israelitish world-view. Less immediately, when the centres of Christianity moved out into the Gentile world, the later New Testament writers were compelled to take into account the world-view of the Greek culture into which they had moved, and which was constructed from the speculative logic of thought. The most determinative difference between the two world-views, however, is not so much the difference of key-feature, but the difference of status or category of the two worlds they bring into analogical relationship. The difference between man's world and the divine world in the case of the Greeks is a matter of degree, while in the case of the Israelitish view it is a matter of kind. Between the world of man and the holy there is a great gulf fixed. Only action from the holy side can bridge the gulf, an action upon which man has no right to call, or the holy world any obligation to give.

On the Greek view, the spark of divinity with which man is by nature endowed ensures his final return to his full divine status. All he needs is the helpfulness of knowledge about his divine origin, and of the "topography" of the supramundane world to find his own way back to the divine world.

In both views intermediary divine figures are met with. At the primary stage of the New Testament explanation of the Christian

1. It must be recognised that this is a conviction that belongs to the post-resurrection period.

events, the existing objectively recognisable category descriptions of the world of the holy or divine remain undisturbed. After the inadequacy of any human description of Jesus becomes apparent, it is with these intermediary figures that our attention is being engaged. For reasons already made clear, the earlier part of the New Testament limits its usage to figures from the Jewish Palestinian background.

In the Hebrew developments the holiness which belongs exclusively to God is extended by gift to those who react appropriately to his holy presence and rightful claims upon them. It is fundamental to the Old Testament as revelation, or world-view, that the holiness which is God, is to be seen reflected analogically in those who take up the appropriate correlative attitude to what the presence of the holiness of Yahweh proves itself to be. At first the gift of holiness was offered to the whole people of Israel in its covenant solidarity, and what Yahweh was could be seen in the miracle existence of the days of the "nomadic ideal". The return for swift and appropriate recognition and obedience to the claims of the holy Presence, was a holy life unconditioned by the recognised limitations of human existence, which reflected the holy unconditioned life of the holy God himself.

As we have seen, the Hebrew race as a whole were not able to maintain the quality of the relationship, and holiness became linked with groups and places within the race, and finally attaches to representative and corporate figures, the more important of which survive to New Testament times. In later Judaism, holiness became permanently associated with these figures, who themselves were associated with the national expectations of divine redeeming activity, expressive of the "faithfulness" of Yahweh.

If the "lordship" of Yahweh is to be revealed, the necessary accompaniment is the appearance of the correlative "servant"; if the "Spirit" of Yahweh is to come, then the "Messiah" of his anointing must simultaneously appear. Similarly, according to another figure, the "son of man" is the natural correlative to the manifestation of the "glory" of God. These figures, along with the "Word" (and/or Torah and Wisdom), stand on the fringe of personification, and are so closely linked in late Jewish thought with the expected redemption from the holy world, that they are given a place within it. Their appearance from thence will be a sign and token that the salvation of God is come.

Whatever the final estimation of the New Testament about Jesus, it is in this area of religious thought that the first Christians found at least a temporary estimate of his wider significance. They are concerned with making clear the warrant of Jesus to speak for God. It is to their evidence we must now turn.

(1) The Early Kerygma

That something of the outline of the early Christian "preaching" is available to us is due to the patience and acumen of New Testament scholarship over a number of years. Its main features seem to have emerged into a clear pattern by the time the Acts came to be written. That the pattern was not original to that writer is shown by his general accord with other elementary Christological statements which appear in remnant form here and there in the New Testament record.

The early speeches in the Acts show that the first Christians found the significance of Jesus in his fulfilment of Messianic prophecy. "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that followed after, as many as have spoken have likewise foretold these days", says St Peter. The events surrounding Jesus' life and person happened "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." He was a man "approved of God among you by miracles and signs". These latter are the bona fides of his authority.

The fulfilment involved the descent from David, an account of his ministry, his death and resurrection and the Lordship and future glory of Jesus. The Messianic Age, which began concurrently with his life, is now demonstrated by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church

1.c.A.D. 64 for a possible Aramaic original: See A.H. McNeile, Intro to Study of N.T. 2nd Ed (Ed. C.S. Williams) p. 101f. Cf. final form most likely in the nineties, C.H. Dodd, Apost. Preaching, p. 17. 2. See Mk. 1:14ff, Rom. 1:1-4; 1 Cor. 15:3ff. 3. Petrine: -1:10-22; 2:14-40; 3:12-20; 4:9-12; 10:34-43; 11:5-15. Pauline: 13:10-41; 14:15ff; 17:22-31; 20:18-35; 22:1-21; 24:10-21; 26:2-23. 4. 3:34; cf. 1 Pet. 1:3; 10. 5. 2:22. 6. 2:30f (Cf Ps. 132:11). 7. 2:22. 8. 2:23; 3:13ff; 4:10; 23:3-50 (Ps. 110:1); 3:13; 4:11 (Ps. 110:22f). 9. 2:24-30. 10. 2:10.

1.
 as a sign of his presence in power and glory, and will shortly be fully
 2.
 consummated by his return. On the basis of this fulfilment, an appeal
 3.
 for repentance is made, and an offer of forgiveness is given.

Although there are questions concerning the sources of the
 later speeches in the Acts, because they do not contain the usual Pauline
 emphases on the "cross" and "judgement", the general trustworthiness of
 5.
 St Luke as a historian, and the reliable use he makes of his sources,
 encourages scholars to make use of them for theological purposes.

6.
 B.Reicke finds indications of this same elemental teaching
 in the instructions given by Jesus when sending the Twelve on their
 7.
 mission to the villages. Its object was conversion, and, at that stage,
 it consisted in the admonition of current wickedness, and an invitation
 to follow Jesus, with the emphasis on the latter. The thesis of the
 Kerygma of Jesus is that he is the Elect One of God, the Suffering Servant
 and the risen Lord. The proofs are as follow: The Jews were eye-witnesses
 of his miracles and mercy, his humiliation and execution, which proves
 that he was the Servant. (i.e. they saw, but did not understand.Cf.Is.6:10.)
 The Scriptures foretold his resurrection as well as the events of his life.
 The Apostles bore witness to his resurrection, which is the proof of his
 Lordship. His present power and miracles, and the gift of the Holy
 Spirit proves his continuing activity in the Church. The conclusion is

1.Acts 2:33(Joel 2:28-32) cf.2:17-21 & 5:32. 2.3:21;10:42. 3.2:38f;
 (Joel 2:32;Is.57:19);3:19;25f;4:12;5:31;10:43(Jer.31:34;Mic.7:18).
 4.A.H.McNeile,ibid,p.104. 5.C.H.Dodd,Apost. Preaching.pp.17ff. 6.Root
 of the Vine,p.139. 7.Mk.3:14ff.

that both Jew and Gentile must repent and be baptised.

It is with these recurring features in the early preaching, in varying forms, and under differing symbols, that the New Testament writers as a whole are dealing. The later more literary speeches in the Acts indicate similar estimates of the person of Jesus. He is distinctly Messiah, although interpretative elements are entering in to modify the current Jewish national concept of the title.

(2) The Early Titles:

Supporting the Kerygma estimate of the person of Jesus in the Acts are some of the titles that the Synoptic writers faithfully record as they recount the events of his ministry. These titles clearly belong to an earlier period of Christian interpretation, although the fact that they are meant to imply more than they actually say, cannot be entirely discounted.

To some of his hearers Jesus is placed among the prophets. To others he is "the holy One of God", or "Teacher", or "Rabbi", or even "Lord", all of which set Jesus in some special category of association with divine authority. But at this period the title "Lord" hardly carried with it the full significance of its later post-resurrection usage, when the confession of the Lordship of Christ became the feature of Christian belief, essential for admission to baptism, the Lord's Supper and the Church. Its growing significance can be dated

1. See Acts. 17:2-3; 26:22ff; 24:46ff. also C.H. Dodd, *ibid*, pp 16ff.
 2. Mk. 6:14ff; 8:27f; Lk. 7:10; 11:49 (Cf. Mk. 3:4 & Jn. 4:44.) 3. Mk. 1:24; Lk. 4:34 (Cf. Dan. 4:13); Acts 3:14. 4. Mk. 10:17-30; Mt. 19:10-29; Lk. 18:18ff.
 5. Mk. 10:51. 6. Mk. 7:28. 7. 1 Cor. 10:21. 8. Acts 10:36; Rom. 10:9; 11 Cor. 4:5.
 9. 1 Cor. 6:11; 12:13.

1.
 from the resurrection when the preaching associated the exalted Jesus
 2. with the Lord at God's right hand, and extended his Lordship to creation. 3.
 However, it should be noted that St Paul's wide use and extended range
 of this title does not indicate in any way a consciousness of introducing
 something unknown to his readers.

Although Jesus hesitates to use the title himself, the first
 judgement of the early Church indicates him as Messiah. He came in
 fulfilment of ^{the} Messianic Age, and entered into a Lordship over men and
 creation by his triumphant resurrection. The resurrection is presented
 as an act of God which stamps Jesus as God's anointed. It is the signs
 and wonders of his ministry and power and Lordship of his post-
 resurrection activity which links him with the supernatural quality of the
 Age of Messianic fulfilment. It is the Lordship of Psalms 6,16,72,89
 and 110 being lived out in the ministry of Jesus, and in his resurrection
 existence. Salvation is not yet linked with the cross; but of the
 unique mediatorial position of Jesus in man's salvation there is already
 no doubt. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none
 other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."
 4.

(3) The Synoptic Estimate of Jesus

The Synoptic estimate of the person of Jesus is not to be
 dissociated from that already seen in the early preaching and expressed

1.Rom.1:1-4; Acts 2:36. 2.Acts 2:32-36. 3.Acts 4:24; 4.Acts 4:12.

in the early titles; but is to be thought of as interpretive of it.

In associating Jesus with the announcement of the arrival of the

1.

Kingdom of God, the Synoptic writers were arguing back from their

estimate of his person, and the quality of the supernatural events

surrounding his life, rather than forward from Jewish expectations to

him. He was such and such a person, he did such and such a thing,

2.

therefore is the Kingdom of God come among you. "If I with the finger

of God cast out devils, no doubt the Kingdom of God is come upon you,"

3.

argues Jesus. Later ^{in the records} Jesus is so completely identified with the Kingdom,

that "preaching the Kingdom" and "preaching Christ" are interchangeable

4.

5.

terms. By the time of Paul "preaching Christ" alone survives. It is

always to the supernatural activity that attention is directed. To the

Baptist's question, "Art thou he that should come?", the answer is

6.

given in terms of Messianic activity. In the announcement of his

commission at Nazareth Jesus sets out his programme in terms of the

7.

supernatural times linked with Messianic expectations. The continual

aura of signs and wonders surrounding Jesus are meant to indicate that

God is reigning in his world through Jesus. It is upon his authority

as God's regent upon earth that Jesus acts. Under this warrant there

8.

is no distinction between healing a palsied man and forgiving sins.

9.

And "who can forgive sins save God only?" He is Lord of God's Sabbath,

1.Mk.1:15;Lk.11:20. 2.The meanest estimate is that God has given such power unto men.Cf.Mt.9:8,see also 8:27;12:41;Mk.4:41;Lk.10:9;23ff (Mt.13:16f.).

3.Lk.11:20(Mt.12:28) 4.Acts 8:12;19:8,Cf.5:42;17:3.

5.1Cor.1:23;11Cor.4:5;Phil.1:15f. 6.Lk.7:22f. 7.Lk.4:17-20. 8.Mk.2:1-12.

9. See 8 above.

1. when divine compassion is involved. His authoritative "I say unto you"
 2. takes precedence over the Mosaic Law. The claims that Jesus makes upon
 men are total claims. A confession of him before men will be recognised
 3. in heaven. To receive Jesus is to receive him that sent him. He must
 4. continue to have absolute authority with any who seek to be his disciples,
 5. a claim which must have appeared to every Jew as parallel with the
 demands of the first commandment. Through personal lordship over the
 lives of his disciples, the kingly reign of God could be said to have
 been set up in their hearts.

This exercising of the total claim and holy authority is reflected in the Synoptic titles ascribed to Jesus. Although some of them are closely linked with the vice-regency of God through his Messiah, and have the supernatural implications attached to that figure, they often fall short of full divinity. Moreover, they are not all of equal importance in estimating the final significance of the person of Jesus. They do, however, demonstrate how Jesus continually proved greater than the evaluation being put upon him by his contemporaries.

When the expression of opinion is quoted as coming from the
 crowd, Davidic Messianic titles dominate, especially when linked with
 6. occasions of high national fervour. The evangelists have woven this
 7. popular recognition into their stories by quoting the titles used in an
 ejaculatory way on such occasions. They witness not only to the high

1.Mk.2:28;Mt.12:8. 2.Mt.5:20;33;38;43;Mk.13:31. 3.Mk.8:38. 4.Mk.9:37.
 5.Mk.3:34. 6.Cf.Mt.9:27;12:23;15:22;20:30;Lk.18:38. 7.Mk.11:9ff;
 Mt.21:9;Lk.19:38.

estimate of the crowds, but to the estimate of the person of Jesus held by the evangelists themselves, and they show just how strong was the association of Jesus with Messianism at this period. Similar use is made of the witness of representatives of the demonic world. The demons recognise they are confronted by someone of extra-ordinarily high consecration to God, if not a supernatural agent from God who belongs to the holy category.

Matthew adds to this popular and demonic recognition of Jesus his own calculated genealogical statement, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David the son of Abraham." With this statement Luke whole-heartedly agrees.

When we come to deal specifically with the "Messiah" title in the Synoptic writers we are faced with several significant features. The first is that Jesus himself does not use the title; but it does not follow from this that he did not think of himself as Messiah. At an early stage in his ministry Jesus is represented as urging, often quite unsuccessfully, a restraint upon those who seek to reveal his Messianic identity. There is no doubt an element of preparation in this stated restraint on the part of the evangelists, who must have been aware that a re-interpretation of the Messianic role was to follow. However, after the revealing incident of the transfiguration, and following Peter's "confession", a Messianic role is accepted by Jesus; but only in so far as his immediate disciples are concerned. It is to be

1.Mk.1:24;5:7;Lk.4:34;8:28. 2.Mt.1:1. 3.Lk.1:31;2:4;11. 4.Mk.5:43;7:36;8:4;Lk.5:14;8:56. 5.Mk.9:9;Mt.17:9;Lk.9:36.

kept as a secret from the general public. At a later stage Jesus shows
 1.
 no reticence in accepting the Messianic imputation of Caiaphus.

This early reticence of Jesus towards the Messianic title could be understood as the natural caution of one living in an occupied country. The possibility of political conflict with Caesar was ever
 2.
 present. That Jesus was aware of the politically dangerous task to
 3.
 which he was inviting his disciples is quite explicit. Later events demonstrate that Jesus was fully prepared to take the full consequences of such calculated political risks. Meantime his great concern seems to have been to ensure that his particular understanding of the Messianic role should be rescued from identification with the popular Jewish national and political conceptions of it. We know that from Peter's confession onwards Jesus set about unfolding to the inner group of disciples the suffering role implicit in his understanding of his Messiahship; but this must be left to our discussion of the title with which Jesus chose most often to designate himself.

The whole Synoptic presentation of Jesus moves to a rejection of the current national Messianic expectations. The record of the
 4.
 "temptation" of Jesus means nothing if it does not imply a rejection of current conceptions which would involve Jesus in a repetition of the presumptuous sin of ancient Israel. St Mark records an incident in which Jesus specifically disassociates himself with Davidic Messianic
 5.
 Kingship. Moreover, the manifesto for his mission announced at Nazareth

1.Mk.14:61f. 2.Mk.12:14-17;cf.Mt.22:15-22. 3.Mk.8:34-8;Mt.16:24ff.
 4.W.Temple,Readings in the 4th Gospel,p.XXIV, Temptations are rejection of "Banquet"(Is.25:6),Kingship (Is.9:6f)and angelic intervention(Dan.Enoch).
 5.Mk.12:35ff.

is far from being a programme of national aggrandisement, and the universal application, inward emphasis and ethical and spiritual content of the teaching on the Sermon on the Mount are far removed from national considerations.

That the first Christian community expressed its estimate of the person of Jesus in Messianic terms we have seen from the Kerygma. In the period covered by the Synoptic Gospels these conceptions are still being employed; but it is becoming increasingly clear how inadequate the purely national conceptions of the Messianic title are, ^{1.} to convey the fuller understanding of the person of Jesus into which at least some of the Christians were entering.

By the time of St Paul, and certainly later on, when the centres of Christianity ceased to be in Palestine, the title "Christ" lost its peculiarly Messianic references, and appears along side the name of Jesus in the nature of another proper name.

Meanwhile the title "Son of God" was being applied to Jesus with at first equally varying significance. There are occasions when the usage is meant to convey nothing more than that the particular person referred to was a "good" man. ^{2.} This seems to have been what is meant by the reference of the centurion at the crucifixion, when he said, "Truly this was the Son of God."

1. Similar limitations appertain to other titles with Messianic imputation.
2. Cf. Lk. "righteous man". See 23:47. also Mk. 15:39 & Mt. 27:54. However we have learnt from the literature of the Scrolls how full of overtones many of these terms were for Jewish Sects.

Seeing that the conception of divine sonship has very wide associations in both Jewish and Hellenistic worlds, some clarification is necessary at this point.

In the Old Testament the style "son of God" is used of angels,^{1.} of Israel,^{2.} of kings,^{3.} and of "righteous" or "true" Israel.^{4.} From these references a line of development can be shown which is demonstrative of Israel's high conception of her special mission in the world. The application of the style "son of God" to angels at least bears testimony to a time when it was believed, that, around God in heaven, were beings who stood in that close relationship to him by nature. Its only value for our purpose is that it stands in stark contrast with the remaining Old Testament references which apply to men, who are never represented as standing in a natural sonship relation with God. These references show on what level the Old Testament conception of the divine sonship of men was conceived.

The references to Israel have to do with her special relationship as elect of God, the proofs of which are the miracles in Egypt and at the Exodus and in the desert. This relationship is a corporate sonship based solely on election love, and has added implications associated with the firstborn;^{5.} may be with the firstborn of the flock (or first barley sheaf), which has to be sacrificed (or redeemed) in order that the blessing

1. Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7. 2. Ex. 4:22; Hos. 11:1. 3. 11 Sam. 7:14; Pss. 2:7; 89:26f (cf 72:17); Zech. 9:10. 4. Ps. of Sol. 13:8; 17:30; 18:4; Sir. 4:10. 5. Ex. 4:22, cf. Jer. 31:9.

may go back to the on-coming sons (and/or flocks or sheaves).^{1.}

Although the introduction of kingship in Israel may have been influenced by the kind of kingship existing in Egypt and Canaan,^{2.} Israel created "her own brand of kingship". When divine sonship was applied to him personally. The king stood in close relation to both the nation and to Yahweh. He was Yahweh's "anointed" with all the associations of endowment of the Spirit. He was vice-regent of Yahweh; but he was never divine. In other countries the king may be a god; in Israel God was King,^{3.} to whom the earthly king was responsible, especially for the "poor" and those who had no helper. He was a corporate representative figure for Israel, who, on the nation's behalf, took over many of the cultic functions formerly undertaken by individuals and within^{4.} families.

In applying divine sonship to the king, then, it was tantamount to the earlier national sonship by election. The particular relationship of the king with God only served to symbolize the relationship of the people as a whole. The Kingly sonship was especially associated with David and his house with whom the covenant was renewed.^{5.} "It is based on and gets its stability from the everlasting covenant with David, and depends upon the faithfulness of God and not on the righteousness of any particular Davidic king."^{6.} Kingly divine sonship, then, is created

1. See J. Pedersen, *Israel* vol. iii-iv, pp. 301f. 2. *ibid*, p. 437. 3. *Pss.* 29:10; 103:19. 4. E. Jacob, *The Theol. O. T.*, pp. 234-38. Cf. p. 249. 5. *Ps.* 132:10f. Also Jacob, pp. 331f. 6. A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, p. 25.

by the Father and is, therefore, dependent. The Father has a sovereignty vainly sought in human relations. After the political failure of both the king and the nations both traditions lived on in the apocalyptic hopes of the nation, and carried with them their sonship implications, which, as we have seen, is based on adoption. The apocalyptic figures are but mediums of God's rule among the nations. "The Davidic Messiah, as "son" of the national deity is to possess only a limited monarchy, and in that, in the last resort, he will be responsible to Yahweh for the right administration of his office."

In the Greek view there never could be any real difficulty over the conception of the divine sonship of kings or private individuals. The final distinction between gods and men was but a matter of degree. The fact that some men possessed a greater degree of divinity whilst on earth created no insuperable theological problem. There are occasions when it does represent a reduction of the idea of God and an extravagant estimate of man. In the political tradition it was common for rulers to be accepted as descended from the national god, or to assume divine honours, whether out of political sagacity or from sheer egotism, is not always clear in each case. Well-known Greek mythological heroes have gradually become invested with divinity and included in the divine pantheon for services rendered.

1. Cf. Is. 63:10; 64:6 and Jacob, *ibid*, pp. 202f. 2. See Pedersen, *ibid*, p. 405, and W. Manson, *Jesus, the Messiah*, p. 103. 3. A. R. Johnson, *ibid*, p. 26. 4. C. H. Dodd, *Interp. of 4th Gospel*, pp. 250ff. 5. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, p. 54, Jacob, *ibid*, pp. 128 & 193f, A. R. Johnson, *ibid*, n. p. 4., R. Bultmann, *Theol. of N.T. (Amer. Ed.) vol. 1. Para. 12. Section 3.*

Although popular Greek conceptions may be important at a later stage in the development of the New Testament conception of the title "Son of God", at this "synoptic" stage, we are mainly concerned with the Jewish tradition. The title has strong Messianic links in such cases as the cries of the demoniacs, Peter's outcry after the incident of walking on the water, his confession (Matthean version), or in the reported conversation between the angel and Mary in St Luke. These are possibly relics of an earlier period in primitive Christian belief. In them we are being confronted not so much with divinity, as with someone who stands in the Old Testament category of special relationship with God by endowment of the Spirit.

It is when we come to deal with the title as it reflects the inner consciousness of Jesus that we meet its most significant use in the Synoptic record. The evidence is that at his Baptism and Transfiguration experiences, Jesus regarded himself as standing in a unique filial relationship with his Father, God, and that this experience was confirmed by a voice from heaven. That these experiences were open to adoptionist interpretation was apparently felt by St John; but there are other Synoptic passages which indicate that it was not to be so understood. The parable of the Wicked Husbandman makes a clear distinction between the servants and the son. The Temptations proceed on the assumption that

1. Mk. 3:11; 5:7; Matt. 8:29; Lk. 4:41. 2. Mt. 14:33. 3. Lk. 10:17. 4. Lk. 1:35. 5. Mk. 1:11; (& para.) Mk. 9:7 (& para.) 6. Cf. Mt. 12:18, which could support adoptionist ideas. 7. Lk. 12:1-9.

Jesus is convinced of his divine Sonship, and represent an unsuccessful attempt on the part of Satan to undermine his filial consciousness.

However, there are statements in both Matthew and Luke which admit of no equivocation. Jesus is reported as saying, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."^{1.} These words are so striking that their genuineness is in question. They have been described as "a bolt from the Johannine blue."^{2.} They make up the only piece of explicit autokerygma in the Synoptic record.^{3.} They testify to a unique, unshared Sonship with the Father, and to a position as sole revealer of the Father to men.^{4.} If this passage is genuine, it would be possible to regard it as "having the germ from which was ultimately developed the whole Johannine theology of our Lord as 'the Son'."^{6.}

In discussing the Fatherhood of God in the life of Jesus,^{7.} T. W. Manson, in *The Teaching of Jesus*, says, "the experience of God as Father dominates the whole ministry from the Baptism to the Crucifixion." He finds it the basis for his authoritative "I say unto you" which compared unfavourably with the second-hand elucidation of the Scriptures by the scribes. The Old Testament prophet in his inaugural vision was

1.Mt.11:27;Lk.10:22. 2.A.M.Hunter, *the Works and Words of Jesus*,p.84.
3.A.Fridrichsen, in *The Root of the Vine*,p.137. 4.A.Plummer,ICC,*St.Luke*, p.282. He finds in it the whole Christology of the 4th Gospel, "even the doctrine of pre-existence seems to be implicitly contained in it."
6.A.E.J.Rawlinson, *The N.T.Doc. of the Christ*,p.262. 7.p.102.

delegated a message. Jesus was assured of a status: "Thou art my Son." The message of the prophet was relative to a given situation, the filial relation is independent of time and place and circumstance. The descent of the Spirit also is represented as permanent. Jesus does not repeat words given to him, the spiritual source of all inspiration takes possession of him. The Spirit of the Father is in him. His authority is based on absolute trust and confidence and unquestioning obedience.

1.
Vincent Taylor, discusses the genuineness of these passages with the Marcan passage, "Of that day or that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father". He feels that this latter passage is genuine because of its denial of knowledge to Jesus. It bears witness to Jesus' use of the title Son as distinct from angels and men and in distinctive relation to the Father.

It should be noted that in both Matthean and Lucan texts this "Johannine" verse is followed by other elements in the same Johannine spirit. The authoritative "I" is seen in "I will give you
2. 3.
rest". In Luke the disciples are shown to be in a privileged intimate position as possessors of this piece of special information. Support
4.
for its genuineness is found by Bishop Gore in the fact that it comes from "Q"; but Rawlinson does not find this absolute proof. He finds it wholly intelligible as an expression of Christian belief about Christ,

1. The Names of Jesus, p. 64f. 2. Mt. 11:29. 3. Lk. 10:23f. 4. Quoted from Belief in Christ, p. 56 by Rawlinson, *ibid*, p. 262.

but as a saying uttered by Jesus it is "less easy, though perhaps, not impossible to explain."

1.

A. M. Hunter claims it has as high a documentary claim to genuineness as any in the Gospels, and draws attention to Paul's phrase in reference to Christ as "the Son of his love"². The occurrence of this verse in both Matthew and Luke, even if it goes back to a single source, proves that this saying reaches back to an early stage of the Gospel tradition, and, by the use of the aorist of the verb (παρῆβόθη) it is difficult to escape the conviction, that the evangelist was prepared to set forth the full rigours of the claim in implying, that the handing over of authority to the Son by the Father was a pre-temporal act. This of course implies in turn the pre-existence of the Son.

Support for the genuineness of the saying is found in what must have been its original rhythmic form in "Q", which has been carried over into Matthew 11:25-30. It consisted of three strophes of which only two appear in St. Luke. Patristic evidence of certain phrase omissions is considered of doubtful value, in that the quotations are possibly from memory. The four-lined strophe structure, moreover, is against textual reconstruction. Each line seems necessary to the next, which makes acceptance of the whole seem a necessity. If it is

1. *ibid*, p. 84. 2. Col. 1:13. 3. Cf. W. C. Allen, *ICC Comm.* p. 123.
4. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, pp. 60-62.

unauthentic as a saying this statement, thought of as an early Christological hymn, could possibly pre-date Philippians 2:5-11. It implies the existence of a community who worshipped Jesus as Son of God.

In dealing with the question of its Hellenistic and Johannine quality Dr. T. W. Manson's dictum must be taken into consideration, viz, that it is not a canon of Synoptic criticism that anything Johannine in the Synoptic Gospels is necessarily unauthentic. He feels that this saying must be understood against the entire Synoptic presentation of the person of Jesus, from which this claim, if not genuine, is fair inference from the facts. It may be interpretative or exaggerated; but it is based on something that is given and real. To begin with, if it is a matter of the nature and character of the Father with which we are concerned, then the difference between the Matthean and Lucan versions is irrelevant. The two primary sources, "Q" and Mark, agree that Fatherhood teaching was given only to the disciples, and after the confession of Peter. The parables implying Fatherhood fit into this pattern. The more emphatic Fatherhood teaching undertaken by St. Matthew, St. John and the Johannine Epistles is present as a given feature in other New Testament books and in the Synoptic Gospels. The Fatherhood of God was not always presented by Jesus in terms of argument. God, the Father, was presented as the supreme reality of his own life. The filial re-

1. See The Teaching of Jesus, pp.109ff.

relationship to the Father, to which there is a parallel nowhere else, is
 1. the secret of his work and ministry. It is important to note also that
 "knowledge of God" is not something appertaining to Hellenistic religion^{alone}.
 2. It has a strong tradition within Old Testament theology, and, of course,
 3. is found in St. Paul. The ultimate implications of metaphysical dis-
 tinctions within the Godhead are not necessarily raised within the say-
 ing itself. Its immediate implication is of "a unique, intuitive, and
 4. personal apprehension of God." Examination of the relevant Synoptic
 texts, and their probable original positions in their respective source
 documents, reveals that Jesus is not reliably shown to have taught the
 belief in God's universal Fatherhood of all men. It required discip-
 5. ~~ship~~ ^{with the Son to bring human sonship into vital relationship}
 with the Father. If this saying were allowed to stand where it
 probably stood in the original sources, it would present a natural
 "Jubelruf" after the confession of St. Peter. It expresses a spontan-
 eous joy on the part of Jesus, that the first and primary premise of his
 revelation has found acceptance among his disciples. His revelatory
 warrant is being put in order. From this premise all that follows
 obtains its authority, an authority which must surpass all existing
 authorities. It must go beyond the secondary and derivative authority
 of the Torah. Thus it is that Jesus proceeds from a pre-existing
 6. filial consciousness to a Messianic consciousness and not vice versa.

1. V. Taylor, Jesus & His Sac., p. 30. 2. Rawlinson, *ibid*, p. 203. Cf. Jer. 31: 34; Hos. 4: 1; 6: 6; Am. 3: 2; Dt. 34: 10. 3. Gal. 4: 9; 1 Cor. 13: 12. 4. V. Taylor, *Names*, p. 66. 5. See T. W. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 94f. 6. See W. Manson, *The Messiah*, p. 110.

His relationship with the Father includes the sharing of his concern for men, and led to the profound sense of engagement to bring them to the Father. The first step in the coming revelation is a recognition of the depth and intimacy of the Son with the Father, which includes knowledge of all that the Father has to bestow. This intimacy has special reference to the ability of Jesus to make real the Father to men. He is able to do it not by mere speech, or argument, but simply by being the Son.

Another line of support for the genuineness of this saying is found in the background of the term ἀγαπητός, which is found in all the records of the heavenly testimony at the Baptism of Jesus. It has been shown that in some ancient usages ἀγαπητός can mean "only", and would thus be equivalent to the Johannine ^{1.} μονογενής. It could even be considered not as attached to "Son" in these contexts, but as an independent ^{2.} title equivalent to the "Messiah". It should also be pointed out that this exclusive claim is not entirely unknown in the early preaching in ^{3.} the Acts, at least in its interpretative section.

From the foregoing survey it can be seen that a very strong case can be made out for the genuineness of this vital saying of Jesus. Its accepted place in the other-wise un-Johannine source-document "Q", the supporting strength of other Synoptic teaching in general, and from the probable "only" for "beloved" in the records of the Baptism, and,

1. Cf. A. Plummer, *ibid*, p. 100, T. H. Robinson, *The Gospel of St Matthew*, (Moffatt) ad loc. Rawlinson, *ibid*, p. 79. R. Bultmann, *Theol. N. T. Amer. Ed.* vol. 2, pp. 33f.
2. W. C. Allen, *ibid*, p. 29. 3. Act 4:12.

finally, in the particular aptness of the natural spontaneity of the likely original setting of the saying. The very existence of the Gospel at all seems to demand very high warrant indeed, unless it is to be considered nothing more than a reform movement within Judaism.

With W. Manson, we are at least bound to agree that the distinctive element in the Christian Gospel must be allowed to have begun with ^{1.} Christ. The agreement that this saying is fair inference from other given facts carries us a long way towards accepting it as genuine. At least the saying testifies to an early recognition of Jesus by a primitive Christian community as "Son of God" in the absolute sense. Over and above the undeniable evidence of the final miracle of the resurrection, the memory of the early Christian community of the life of Jesus was that its freedom and expansiveness, its decisiveness and authority and its utter availability and sacrifice, were due to a unique ^{2.} trust in God as Father; so unique in fact that prior knowledge of the Father seemed the only explanation. The relationship so clearly demonstrated by his resurrection, had they only had eyes to see, had been ^{3.} evidenced at every vital and demanding point of his life, and in the authority of his teaching, and the providential happenings surrounding his birth. It was entirely in keeping with this sequence that Jesus should have made such a claim of unique pre-mundane fellowship with the Father.

1. Ibid, p. 110. 2. Mt. 6:25-34. 3. At his Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, on the mountainside, in Gethsemane and upon the Cross, the supreme point at issue is the maintenance of his unclouded fellowship with the Father.

The Son of Man

At the Synoptic stage in our study of this title our field of antecedent reference is essentially the Hebrew background to which we have already made extensive reference. ^{1.} It must have appeared to the Synoptic writers as of the utmost significance in the understanding and interpretation of this important self-designation of Jesus. If the conclusions we have reached concerning the etymology of the actual Greek phrase are correct, we can assume that it was possible on philological grounds for the use of the phrase to go back to Jesus himself. "It is now generally held that merely linguistic objections to our Lord's use of "barnasha" as a self-designation are no longer insuperable." ^{2.} The view of Lutzmann and Wellhausen that the title could only have arisen in a Greek-speaking Christian community who knew the LXX of Daniel 7:13, has not wholly convinced scholars generally.

There has never been any doubt that the early evangelists believed this title to have been Jesus' deliberately chosen self-designation, and that when they used the title in reference to Jesus, they used it in some more than ordinary sense. It may have been theologically confusing; but it was less confusing than to have used the idiomatic form of the expression *ἄνθρωπος*. It continued to point to a Hebrew tradition in which right theological deductions were to be made concerning Jesus. The Palestinian record of the Synoptic Gospels

1. See Chapter above on Later Complicating Features, section (a) The Supernatural Figures. 2. See Rawlingson, *ibid*, pp. 246f, W.C. Allen, *ibid*, p. lxxiv.

was still too closely linked to Jewish monotheism to enter explicitly and fully into the implications of the equality with God to which the sayings of Jesus were pointing. The title Son of Man allowed Jesus a special supernatural origin, divine representative functions that had always been assigned to God's Messiah, maintained his place within the life of humanity, and, at the same time, left that air of mystery about his person that had still to be fully explained.¹ It held all the essential elements with which to express a significant new revelation. The title was a recognised, if less known, Messianic title, with all its attendant supernatural functions. It was not as closely committed to Jewish nationalism as others were, and on that account was more open to re-interpretation. It was the achievement of Jesus to fill it with his own re-interpretation in such a way as to gain controlling domination of the old terminology in which it was couched.

There is general agreement that the Synoptic Son of Man sayings of Jesus fall into three broad categories, viz:

- 2.
- (a) as a periphrasis for "I"
- (b) in anticipation of the sufferings of Jesus.
- (c) as conforming with the late Jewish Apocalyptic view of a Parousia.

2. See Rawlinson, *ibid*, p.247, nn.4 & 5, & p.243, n.1. Cf. also T.W.Manson, *ibid*, p.213. (a) Mk.3:20(Lk.9:58); Mt.11:19(Lk.7:34); Mt.12:32(Lk.12:10); Mt.12:40(Lk.11:30); Mt.13:37; 13:11(omitted by $\lambda\theta\iota\theta$); Lk.9:56(omit. by $\pi^s\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota$); Lk.17:22; 19:10; 22:48. Maybe Mk.2:10; 2:28 and parallels where some consider the title means "man" and a mistranslation of original barnasha. Rawlinson rejects (*ibid*, pp.247f) but Manson accepts this explanation (*ibid*, p.214).

Within these divisions there are certain sayings which are treated with
 1. reserve, some on textual grounds, and others as possible editorial
 2. additions, and some where the meaning is possibly only "Man" in the
 3. normal sense of that term.
 4.

The source support for these general classifications has
 shown that all four main sources uphold the Apocalyptic group of sayings
 and mainly Marcan support for the Passion group. Two other features
 are shown which have special significance. Except for those references
 for which there are other explanations, the Son of Man sayings occur
 after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi and are addressed to
 the disciples.
 5.
 6.

1. The two major divisions are:-

(a) the Passion Group: Mk. 8: 31 (Lk. 9: 22); 9: 9 (Mt. 17: 9); 9: 31 (& parallels);
 10: 33 (para.); 10: 45 (Mt. 20: 28); 14: 21 (para.) 14: 14 (Mt. 26: 49); Mt. 26: 2; Lk. 24: 7.
 (b) the Apocalyptic Group: - Mk. 8: 38 (para.); 13: 25 (para.); 14: 62 (para.)
 Mt. 19: 28 (Lk. 22: 30); 24: 27 (Lk. 17: 24); 24: 37 (Lk. 17: 26); 24: 44 (Lk. 12: 40);
 10: 33; 13: 41; 25: 31; Lk. 17: 30; 18: 8; 21: 36. With these classifications of
 Rawlinson should be considered the classification of T.W. Manson, *ibid*, pp.
 215-26.

2. Cf. Mt. 18: 11 which is omitted by such important MSS as BL²⁰ &c. and
 Luke 9: 55 omitted by p45 ABCLW 28 &c.

3. Cf. Mt. 16: 13; 28; 26: 2 and maybe Mt. 24: 39, because these references are
 not supported either in Matthew's known primary sources or included in
 other Gospels which have used the same sources.

4. Two passages in Mark (2: 10; 2: 28) are concerned; but there is no complete
 unanimity about this meaning; See n.1 above. Rawlinson feels that they
 could mean "the Messiah".

5. See tables set out in *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 225f. Lucan support for
 the Passion sayings is found in Luke 22: 48 & 69, and possibly in 24: 7.
 The absence of support for the passion group in "Q" is because this source
 does not appear to have included Passion narrative. Source "M" which
 has special interest in Jewish fulfilment seems to have been too occupied
 with the apocalyptic eschatological angle to have included the Passion
 for any greater reason than as a "route" to glory.

6. i.e. as editorial additions etc. See nn. 2, 3 & 4 above.

The indications are, therefore, that these sayings are intended to carry the burden of the revelatory mission of Jesus. They include the basic assumption that the essential characteristics of the Son of Man of Daniel and the Servant of Isaiah had been fused in the mind of Jesus. The Apocalyptic references carry the Danielic associations of the Reign of God, and the Passion sayings are linked to the Servant conceptions. These latter are not unrelated to the general pattern behind the Righteous Sufferer of the Psalms.

Diametrically opposite evaluations have been made of these two groups. There are those who consider the Passion sayings the work of the primitive Church, wise after the event. They consider the only authentic sayings to be those which place Jesus within the known apocalyptic expectations of Israel. The rest are editorial. On the other hand, those who find in the apocalyptic sayings "the mistaken products of early Christian belief", claim that Jesus' use of the title is from Ezekiel's ben Adam and that Jesus thought of himself as a prophet whose mission to his people would involve him in suffering and death. All the facts of the case seem to indicate that all three categories should find a place within any satisfactory interpretation of the title. To fulfil the supernatural role of the Son of Man of Daniel, via the Servant "route", Jesus must become a man in the Ezekiel sense.

1. Those who see no Messianic significance in the title consider it a synonym for "I" throughout, and refer it to the teaching on Jesus' humanity as the universal representative of mankind, the "man" of divine intention. This view appears too Greek for the Synoptic period.
2. & 3. See Rawlinson, *ibid*, p. 250.

Nonetheless, his authority as the Son of Man comes from his divine origin within the supernatural world. It has an absolute reference^{1.}

for men. Otherwise it could mean no more to the total divine human situation than the authority of any other man who had gone before.

Moreover, the supernatural authority can be exercised on earth, where it appears as the sign of the powers of the Kingdom of God.^{2.}

The sayings which portray the "humiliation" of the Son of Man on earth are foundational to the special revelation Jesus has come to bring. It is not enough that as a man he "comes eating and drinking" like other men, he has "nowhere to lay his head", he comes "to serve and not to be served" and "to give his life a ransom for many", to "suffer many things", to be "betrayed, to suffer, to be killed and to rise again".^{3.}^{4.}^{5.}^{6.}^{7.}

These events are not at the dictation of circumstance. They are announced beforehand as a secret to the inner group of disciples, who, through their spokesman, had voiced their recognition of him as Messiah.^{8.} These events represent the method whereby the coming victory is to be achieved, and the Kingship of God is to be established. That these ideas did not accord with the current Messianic notions we know, both from the prominence given to the Davidic Messianic ideas of the crowds amongst whom Jesus moved, and from the fact that Peter took him and began to rebuke Jesus when he unfolded his ideas to the disciples.^{9.}

1.Mk.8:36;Lk.6:22;12:2;21:36. 2.Mk.2:10 & 28.Cf, however, some think these titles mean "man". 3.Mt.11:19(Lk.7:34). 4.Mt.8:20(Lk.9:58). 5.Mk.10:45. 6.Mk.9:12. 7.Mk.10:33;14:41 -"into the hands of sinners." (Cf.Is.53:12) 8.Mk.8:27-31(Mt.16:13-16;Lk.9:18-20.). 9.Mk.8:32.

The element of suffering in these sayings is not just a necessary evil, it is central to the revelation. It is the deliberate introduction of the vicarious remedial suffering of the Isaianic Servant as the method of victory. It is of course doubtful if the disciples realised this at the time, but the evangelists have faithfully recorded possibly more than they understood.

The other significant element in the Son of Man revelation is that contained in the apocalyptic conceptions of "dominion" and "judgement".¹ Although these are to be understood according to the traditional pattern, they undergo re-interpretation within the Gospel records. W.Manson has pointed out that the two principles governing Old Testament apocalyptic have caused its form to be varied within the Old Testament revelation.² The intensity of the clash between the observed facts of history and faith in a righteous God, controlled the amount of apocalyptic necessary to bridge the gulf between them. The content of the hope is determined by the nature of the God believed in. A new revelation of God in Israel's history has resulted in the framing of a new and corresponding hope.³ If this pattern is correct the new revelation involved in the humiliation of the Son of Man is the operative principle controlling the content of the Parousia group of Son of Man sayings. The new principle is that the final consummation is not a compensation for the sufferings in the present, but the result of them.⁴

1.Cf.Dan.13:7f & see 7:27. 2.Ibid,p.247ff. 3.Cf.Lev.11:44 & 45; Amos 7:7;Is.6;Jer.1:11;Ez.1:26ff;Hos.1:6 & 9. 4.See T.W.Manson, ibid, p.259 on this point.

The vicarious nature of the sufferings alters the whole situation, and along with this alteration, the conception of the victory, judgement and dominion alters as well.

Before an evaluation of the Apocalyptic references can be made certain judgements have to be made concerning the materials available. The "Little Apocalypse" in Mark 13 has tended to dominate popular Christian thought concerning the Parousia. Comparisons with other New Testament Parousia statements, however, do not encourage scholars to place full confidence in this passage as it stands. While there may be some genuine sayings of Jesus within it, the passage shows evidence of having existed as a whole before its inclusion in St. Mark, and, by the way the sayings are put together "a new total effect is created which might be quite different from anything Jesus intended to say." ^{1.} Moreover, this total effect does not accord with the teaching about the Parousia in ^{2.} the other Gospel sources and in the Epistles of St. Paul. ^{3.}

In the "Q" source the coming of the Son of Man will be characterised by a sudden appearing while people are eating and drinking and following their normal daily lives. This is also the view of St. Paul. Furthermore, the final saying in St. Mark 13 also agrees with this ^{4.} statement. From other Synoptic sources we gather the coming of the Son of Man will be decisive for the individual. His lot will be decided by his attitude to the Son of Man prior to his Parousia and by the loyalty

1. See T.W. Manson, *ibid*, pp. 261f. 2. Cf "Q" (Lk. 21: 34-36.) 3. 1 Thess. 5: 1-10. 4. Mk. 13: 33-37.

1.
he has displayed in trial while he is waiting.

2.
The Parousia itself will include the unexpected coming of the
3.
Son of Man on the clouds as in Daniel with the possible gathering of the
4. 5. 6.
Elect and the last Judgement. The call is therefore for moral stead-
fastness in order to be worthy in the day of the Son of Man.

The conclusion to be drawn from these statements is that the
7.
coming of the Son of Man will contain a notable element of surprise, and
will be a displacement of the kingdoms of this world rather than an
emergence from them. It will be an act of the Sovereignty of God. It
will be constituted in judgement based on the attitude of the individual
8.
to Jesus. Among the disciples the judgement will primarily involve
loyalty to the new teaching of Jesus, especially concerning suffering
and bearing the cross. The general judgement will involve the attitude
of mankind to Jesus and to his representatives on the basis that, "in-
as-much as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it
9.
unto me." The principle of wider universal judgement to those who have
not known Jesus or his disciples, is based on the attitude of such people
to the representatives of the Sovereignty of God, who are present in their
10.
particular age. It should be noted that the idea of judgement now re-
places the military metaphor for the final consummation of the ages.

1.Mk.8:38.Lk.12:8f. 2.Lk.12:39f;Mt.24:43f. 3.Dan.7:13 & 27. 4.Cf.
Lk.17:34f.Mt.24:40f. 5.Mt.25:31-46. 6.Lk.21:34-36 and maybe Mk.13:33-37;
Lk.12:35-46;Mt.24:43-51 also the talents. 7.This is supported by three
sources: Mk.13:32-37; "Q" (Lk.12:39f;17:23-30);"L"(Lk.21:34-36). 8.Mk.8:38
etc.. 9.Mt.25:40 Cf v.45. 10.Mt.12:41f;Lk.11:31f.

Moreover, the Judgement is not nationally biased in favour of the Jews.

The final "enemy" is not now thought of in terms of Gentile races and
 1. world empires opposed to Israel, but is in terms of the kingdom of Satan
 as opposed to the Kingdom of God. The coming of the Son of Man marks
 the dividing of the age. The victory of the Son of Man over Satan is
 2. the spearhead of the Reign of God. His obedience unto death constitutes
 him the first-fruits of a great brotherhood of victory yet to be.

A significant feature of the Synoptic Son of Man references
 is the use made of corporate ideas that take their rise in Daniel's use
 of the title as an ideogram for the "Saints of the Most High", and which
 3. have a place in the Enoch references as well. In the Passion group of
 sayings it becomes clear that the sufferings of Jesus are examples of
 4. what is to be expected from his followers as well. They must literally
 be involved in the Cross. The Parousia Son of Man references strengthen
 this conclusion. In St Matthew 25:31-46, there are three figures in-
 volved in the last judgement scene, viz, the Son of Man, the King and the
 Father. It is clear that the Father is God; but the King can hardly be
 the Son of Man in view of what follows. We must conclude that the King
 is Christ. The indications then are that "those on the right hand", for
 whom the Kingdom has been prepared from the foundation of the world, are
 to be recognised as the "Saints of the most High" of Daniel, who are
 synonymous with the Son of Man. But in Matthew's record they are also

1. Cf. Enoch 46:4-6; 52:4-9; 90:19; 91:12; 1V Ezr. 13; Ps. 2; Is. 11:4; Pss. of Sol. 17:23-27; Bar. 39:7; 40:2; 70:8; 72:2-6. 2. Mk. 14:62; Lk. 22:69. 3. See O.T. Section above. 4. Mk. 8:34ff; 10:38f, Cf. Col. 1:24; 1Cor. 1:5; Phil. 3:10; Rom. 8:17; Gal. 6:17.

the followers of Jesus. The King (Jesus) is the first of the "Saints" who are those who have accepted him. He is their spok^eman at the Judgment. It follows that the attitude of the world to the disciples is tantamount to its attitude to the Son of Man himself. Possible support for this corporate view is also to be found in the manuscript evidence for Mark 8:38. The *λόγους* of the text has been omitted in some manuscripts. The Marcan usage of *ἐμῶν* (= "mine" and not "my" Cf Lk. 10:40) would support the resulting shorter version, which would then run, "whoever shall be ashamed of me and mine etc". This "mine" would be his followers.

That the disciples are to take part in the Judgement at the last through the Son of Man is indicated by the reference to them sitting on twelve thrones and judging the tribes of Israel.

It is in this vision of the Saints entering embryonically into the Kingdom in himself, that inspires Jesus' utterance at his trial. Especially in the Lucan version, which runs, "hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God.

We conclude then that the Son of Man title as used in the Synoptic records was considered by the evangelists to have been the chosen self-designation of Jesus during his ministry. It was in their source as such, and, to them at least, it held the authority of a Messianic title.

1.Mt.25:40-45. 2.See additional notes T.W.Manson, *ibid*, pp.333.
3.Mt.19:28. 4.Lk.22:69.

It was the vehicle of Jesus for his special revelation given privately to his disciples after the confession of Peter. The burden of the message was that, before the Kingdom of God could come, he must suffer and die vicariously. The Kingdom could only come as a result of this kind of suffering, and Jesus invited his disciples to drink the same cup of suffering with himself. They will be judged finally according to their loyalty to this vision of suffering. The world would, on the other hand, be judged on its attitude to the suffering Son of Man, and on its attitude to any others, who, because they share his cup of suffering, become representatives of God's Sovereignty along with him. In this sense the Son of Man title is a corporate one, and the suffering role of the Son of Man represents the kind of dominion God himself exercises. Jesus is the first member of the "Saints of the most High" for which the title Son of Man is an ideogram in the Book of Daniel. Jesus and his disciples, as the Son of Man, will come again at the consummation of the age, when he and they will sit in judgement upon mankind, who will be judged according to their attitude to the Son of Man, as represented by the particular "Saints" who belong to their own day and generation.

THE PAULINE CHRIST

In his estimate of the person of Christ St Paul shows no consciousness of a break with the primitive tradition of the Church. There are several explicit statements which indicate he does possess a body of tradition that has come down to him and to which he makes reference. The proposition that his Christianity, and incidentally his estimate of Christ, is completely new breaks down at this point. The fact that the detailed narrative of the life of Jesus finds no place in the Pauline literature can be explained on the basis that such information was taken for granted. His "Epistles" did not claim to be "Gospels"; but advice, admonition and exposition directed for the greater part to specific communities and particular problems.

When the teaching of Christ became directed to Gentile communities unfamiliar with the Jewish historical background, it was natural that some of the Jewish Messianic references and titles would fall into disuse, and, that new shades of meaning would be applied to those that remained in use from the new general context of the Hellenistic world. Some of the familiar Synoptic titles find restricted use, but they occur in the "received" tradition to which St Paul makes reference. The expression "Son of David" appears in the formula in Romans. It is a part of the tradition, but does not play any significant part in the argument of that letter. He is more concerned with the racial personage of Adam.

1. See Rom. 1:1-3; 1 Cor. 2:2; 11:23-26; 15:1-4; Cf also Rom. 3:31-34.

2. See Rawlinson, *ibid*, pp. 90-92 on this point. 3. 1:3. 4. See Rom. 5:12-21.

Included in his received tradition is the fact that Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power.....by the resurrection of the dead according to the spirit of holiness." We know the resurrection to be the main-spring of Apostolic preaching, but the use of the Aramaic ^{1.} "Abba" of Synoptic usage also indicates close associations with early tradition. This means that Paul was using the term Son of God, not in the Hellenistic sense of a human who has achieved divine status, but in the Jewish-Christian sense of Jesus' unique sonship of God, which he had received in the tradition. In Pauline theology the Son of God "who loved ^{2.} me and gave himself for me", needed to be more than man become divine. The validity of his self-offering required absolute reference to make it authentic. Brought up in the Rabbinical tradition, he finds the final demonstration of the power of God to be the resurrection of his Son, which ^{3.} at the same time justifies the trust of the Son and gives him his authority.

The whole argument of Galatians is that it was God's Son, who ^{4.} was "made of a woman, made under the Law etc", and is expressing the very love of God himself. This God was the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus ^{5.} Christ." He was "in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Christ ^{6.} was the "Son of his love", a phrase which as we have seen probably goes back to the word "beloved", which sometimes carries the meaning "only".

1. Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6; Cf. Mk. 14:36. 2. Gal. 2:20. 3. Rom. 1:1-3; Cf. 1 Cor. 15:31.
 4. Gal. 4:4f. 5. Rom. 15:6; 2 Cor. 1:3; 11:31. 6. Col. 1:13 Cf. T. K. Abbott, ICC
 Comm. p. 11, re Ephes. 1:6, "accepted in the beloved", i.e. in Christ. Also p. 20c,
 re Col. 1:13 = The Son who is the object of his love, and corresponds with
 Ephes. 1:6. "Love is not merely bestowed upon him, but makes him his own"

This points to St. Paul's appreciation of the unique filial self-consciousness of Jesus. The sonship title forms a counter part on the doctrinal level to the title "Lord" on the reverential and devotional level. The early Church confessed and worshipped Jesus as Lord; but described him as Son of God. The sonship is not only unshared by others, but it consists in a mutual sharing with the Father of his love for men, and a sharing of the resultant redeeming activity. It corresponds to the traditional, Jewish belief that Salvation is of God, and is present whenever he visits his people.

The use of the term "Christ" by St. Paul has been restricted almost to its use as a proper name. The combination "Lord Jesus Christ" and "Our Lord Jesus Christ" for the most part take their christological significance from the title "Lord", especially as far as the Hellenistic Church is concerned, where "Christ" (or 'Messiah') had no clear background reference. The new importance of the title "Lord" as descriptive of the significance of the person of Christ is due to the fact that it was understood in both Jewish and Greek worlds. However, we have already seen how thought concerning the significance of this title worked out from entirely different directions in the Hebrew and Greek religious conceptions in the Hellenistic period. Hellenism with its background of Emperor worship, and its Lords of syncretic cults, and religious teachers addressed

1. Cf. Act 10:36. 2. 2Cor. 5:19. 3. See doubtful titular uses:- Rom. 9:5; 1Cor. 10:4; 15:27; 2Cor. 4:4; 5:10. Cf. Messianic uses:- 1Cor. 1:23; 2Cor. 1:5; Ephes. 5:25; Col. 1:24.

as "Lord", could admit of men climbing into divinity. This cut right across the Hebrew religious concept of the "holy". The title had therefore become restricted to God or his appointees. We have seen how the LXX translators chose *Κύριος* to represent the holy name of יהוה of the Hebrew text. There is no doubt that in the later New Testament literature the title always carried absolute overtones, which were not present in the term used in the life time of Jesus, when it was probably meant to convey the respect of a pupil due to his teacher. Its use in the absolute sense seems to have been a post-resurrection development. It was linked with the Lord at God's right hand in the Kerygma, and the tremendous increase in its use in Pauline letters strengthens this conviction. The Pauline usage shows a limited application to the historic Jesus, but a wide application to the exalted Christ, as the "coming One", as the Judge, as the ruler of the living and the dead, as the Lord of all men, as the one Lord, the dispenser of grace and favour and as the final Lord.

From this evidence, which can be supported from the Pastoral Epistles, it can be seen what importance St. Paul attaches to the title. It is to be noted also that it is in his received tradition and is therefore not a novelty of his own. In fact its frequent use in the apocalyptic section of what is thought to be his earliest extant letter pushes the

1. See E. Jacob, *The Theol. of O.T.*, p. 59. 2. 137 times in the Epp. apart from combinations. 3. 1 Cor. 7:10; 12; 25; 9:14. 4. 2 Cor. 10:8; 13:10. 5. 1 Thess. 4:16; 2 Cor. 5:5. 6. 1 Thess. 4:6; 1 Cor. 4:48. 7. Rom. 14:9. 8. Rom. 10:12. 9. Eph. 4:5. 10. Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:3. 11. Phil. 2:11. 12. Rom. 1:3.

accepted usage of the lordship title back very close to the most primitive Church itself. This conclusion is strengthened by the strong connection with the cultus.

The established forms of the confession, the baptism into the Name, and the use in the Eucharist and the surviving hymns, prayers and invocations indicate the continuity with the primitive Church usage. This contention is strengthened further by the survival of the Aramaic "maran atha", Our Lord Come, in the Letter to the Corinthians. All these factors imply that St. Paul was taking over an already well established reverential attitude towards Christ. It is not necessary, therefore, to suppose that the worshipping of Jesus as Lord was the creation of the Hellenistic Christian communities. St. Paul's Christological usage would indicate that by his resurrection and exaltation Jesus was, in fact, Lord. Moreover, Paul had been confronted by the risen Lord in the way. Jesus is the Lord of individual Christians, who are his $\delta\delta\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$. He is Lord of the Christian communities in the sense that he is "our Lord". He is Lord of "principalities" and "powers" in that he has struck a decisive blow against the worst that they can do. He is the Lord of the renewal of creation and men.

1. 1Thess. 4:6; 15:52. 2. Rom. 10:9, Cf. 1Cor. 12:13 also 2Cor. 4:5. 3. 1Cor. 6:11. 4. 1Cor. 10:21; 11:20. 5. 1Cor. 1:20; Ephes. 5:20. 6. 1Cor. 16:22, cf. Acts 10:36. 7. Gal. 1:10. 8. Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22; 4:15; 5:23; 1Cor. 12:12, cf. Rom. 7:4; 12:8. Christ is Head of the Church which is his body, although part of it, he exercises Lordship over all of it. 9. Cf. Rom. 15:6; 2Cor. 1:3; 11:31 etc. 10. Rom. 8:38f. 11. Rom. 8:11.

St. Paul's extension of the primitive post-resurrection title $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ to its widest implications was partly due, no doubt, to the manifestation of Christ to him "in glory", and in that sense it introduces pre-existence implications which had not previously been worked out. This would be supported by the use of $\acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ for God in the Septuagint. From his own experience Paul must have realised that he was dealing with someone with the authority of God himself. With the support of history, primitive Christian tradition and personal experience, he was in a strong position to answer the pressing need for authority within the Hellenistic Christian communities, and, at the same time, to make some attempt at theological explanation of the person of Christ in terms with which they were not unfamiliar.

Paul's Christological concepts grow out of this high estimate of the Lordship of Christ in relation to his redemptive work for mankind. It is from this redemptive work that he argues back to Christ's pre-existent
1.
life with God.

In two passages in the Epistles, Paul draws the parallel between Adam and Christ, which he works out in two directions. If it were possible through the act of Adam for sin and death to come to all mankind, it was equally possible for all men to receive justification
2.
through the action of Christ. Moreover, if death could come to all men through Adam's action, life could equally come to all men through the re-
3.
demptive activity of Christ.

1. See Phil. 2. 2. Rom. 5:12-21. Rabbinical speculation had given free rein to the conception of "unfallen" Adam as the progenitor of the race. It had idealised and aggrandized his being and life, and likened him with what man was intended to be in the mind of God before creation. Cf. C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St John*, p. 156. 3. 1 Cor. 15:20-49, cf. 2 Cor. 13:4. Also see Rawlinson, *ibid.*, pp. 130-3, where he argues that the parallel is not meant to throw light on Paul's concept of Christ, but on the resurrection life and its accomplishment.

Behind these parallels are Old Testament conceptions of racial solidarity and representative functions, and the sacrificial tradition of the firstborn and firstfruits referred to above. Adam was the first representative of sinning mankind, and carries us over with him into sin and its consequences in death. Christ is a new creation and his representation of us carries us over with him into goodness and Life. By his offering of himself the sacrificial blessing flows back into all who are of his race. By his resurrection he carries us over into life along with him.

It is in this conceptual field Paul's thought is working when he speaks of Christ as the firstborn of creation, the firstborn of many brethren, the firstborn from the dead, and the firstfruits of resurrection. This is his answer to the fundamental questions of the human spirit. What is creation and human existence all about? Whence, what and whither? To these questions he makes answer in Romans 8:18ff. in terms of sonship with God through Christ's redeeming activity. It answers the question about that day when we fear we will cease to be. Christ is the firstfruits of resurrection from the dead. It answers the questions about ultimate human brotherhood. Christ is the first universal "brother". We Christians are involved "in Christ". We must put off "the old man", Adam, and all his ways, and put on the "new man", Christ. Any man who

1.Col.1:15. 2.Rom.8:29. 3.Col.1:18. 4.1Cor.15:23. 5.1Cor.15:22;2Cor. 5:17;cf.Eph.1:3;6("Beloved"= Christ):20;Gal.6:15 etc. The far-reaching application of this principle of indwelling "in Christ" is obvious from the many references. It is not a mystical union so much as an ecclesiastical formula, by which followers of Christ are made members of his "Body", the Church. They are baptized into Christ(Rom.6:3;Gal.3:27)and, in baptism, they are buried and rise with him(Rom.6:4;Col.2:12f). 6.Col.3:9 7.Col. 3:10f.

is "in Christ" is a "new creation". But Christ is also "in us" as well. He is our hope of "glory". This sums up to this final picture: we are "in Christ", God is in Christ, and Christ belongs to God. This is very near mutual indwelling. It also involves us in his sufferings, which is sharing his "glory". We suffer and die with him, we rise with him, we reign with him.

It is not surprising that we should find St. Paul using the term ὁ ἀνθρώπου in relation to some of these conceptions. Although Paul makes typically Hebraic modifications of this conception of the "heavenly Man" by its identification with the created divine "image", there are some Greek background references to be taken into account, especially as St. Paul is dealing with Hellenistic Christian communities. From Plato onward the "Archetypal Man" of Platonic Ideas is always in the background of religious and philosophical speculations about the relations between the human and divine worlds. We have seen how Philo made use of these conceptions in order to introduce a synthesis of Hebrew and Greek conceptions. The Archetypal Man was the heavenly model from which the earthly copy was made. The Hermetic Literature introduces the conception of "primal man". However, St. Paul's references to Adam and the Old Testament figures seem to indicate that he is moving rather in the sphere of the Danielic Son of Man. To him the Christians are "Saints", which in turn echoes the Daniel "Saints of the most High", and these ideas were

1. 2Cor. 5:17; Col. 3:10. 2. Eph. 3:17. 3. 1Cor. 3:23; 2Cor. 5:19. 4. Rom. 8:17; 2Cor. 1:5; Phil. 3:10; Gal. 6:17; Col. 1:24. 5. Rom. 8:14; 2Cor. 4:10; 13:4; 6. Cf. Rom. 5:17; 1Cor. 4:8; 2Tim. 2:12. 7. 1Cor. 15. 8. 2Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15.

developed further in Apocalyptic literature.^{1.}

All this amounts to the fact that $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ is to be related rather to $\delta \acute{\upsilon}\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ of the Gospels and involves concepts in which Christ is the head of a new humanity, which includes both Greek and Jew.^{2.} These ideas are parallel to the Synoptic ideas in which Jesus is seen as the Son of Man and first member of the "Saints", who are involved, along with him, in suffering, death and exaltation and the dominion of God's Judgement.^{3.} The difference between Paul and the Gospel presentation is that, in the Gospels, the idea is still in prospect.^{4.} Some of the events of the life and death and resurrection of the Son of Man have not yet taken place. In St. Paul these events have taken place,^{5.} and the "Saints" are seen to be suffering and entering into Christ's glory around him.

Paul's Christological conceptions of the Heavenly Man are elaborated in connection with the idea of the "form" or "image" of God.^{6.} The first man, who was the "image of God", fell while grasping after divinity;^{7.} but Christ, who is the last man, who had the form of God, revealed himself in the form of a "servant" and became obedient unto death.^{7.} This term "form" is to be linked with the conception of "glory" expressed in terms of suffering and service, and is connected with the same category

1. See Enoch 46:4-6; 52:4-9; 90:19; 91:12; 1VEzr. 13; etc. 2. Cf Lake & Jackson, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 1, p. 380, "Paul was too good a Grecian scholar to translate Bar-nasha by so impossible a phrase as $\delta \acute{\upsilon}\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ and rendered it idiomatically $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$. 3. 1Cor. 15:45-9. 4. Eph. 2:13-18. 5. Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:12. 6. Gen. 1:26; 2:7; cf. 1Cor. 11:7. 7. Phil. 2:7f; cf. Gen. 3:5f.

conception of light as the "image" figure. The form that Christ
 1.
 possessed before he laid it aside was the image or glory of God.

It is to be noted that in these references the figures used
 of Christ are still subordinate to God. The "servant" will be exalted
 2. 3.
 etc. "to the glory of God the Father." The "image", although a perfect
 copy (an express image), still stands in a derivative relation with the
 original. The glory is still "of the Father".

In conquering death the Heavenly Man subjects all things unto
 4.
 himself; but only that "God may be all in all". It is God who has
 5.
 given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Nonetheless, that
 6.
 Christ has had a life with the Father from which he has come is clear.
 He has come out of the form or glory of God. The suggested Danielic
 and Enochian background claims that the Heavenly Man was "chosen and
 hidden before the creation of the world and forever more". The Son of
 Man "came to the Ancient of Days" (presumably in a pre-existent divine
 7.
 world).

In describing Christ's relationship to creation itself, Paul
 describes creation as waiting deliverance from corruption along with man.
 The presence of the "Spirit" in Christians is indicative of the larger
 8.
 all-inclusive redemption of the entire creation yet to be. Christ has
 9.
 the re-ordering of it.

1.Cf.2Cor.4:6;Col.1:15. 2.Phil.2:8-11. 3.Col.1:15. 4.1Cor.15:28.
 5.1Cor.15:57. 6.Phil.2:6ff. 7.Enoch.48:3f;Dan.5:17. 8.Rom.8:14-25.
 9.2Cor.5:17.

What St. Paul has to say about Christ's creative functions follows those already ascribed to Wisdom in the Old Testament and associated literature. Christ existed before all things, being the firstborn of creation, the agent in the original creation of every conceivable thing, creation itself consists in him. He is destined to have entire pre-eminence, and all things are to be finally gathered up in him. Again, all these creative assignments are held in subordination to the Father. He holds them "because it pleased the Father." Paul's conception of Christ as the "wisdom" of God accords fully with Old Testament conceptions of the activity of God in history. It is entirely a matter of grace (love: 1Cor.13.), and never to be confused with the pomposity of human knowledge and boasting. God's wisdom is the cross, and the seemingly foolish things that confound the mighty; the power of God unconditioned by human contriving. In Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Within the context the *πλήρωμα* could well refer to the fulness of grace which is in Christ; but it was a known technical term of Greek religious thought. Paul may have had in mind the particular brand of heresy at Colossae in which other heavenly beings were being allowed to share the divine "fulness" with Christ. Paul asserts that the entire fulness of God belongs to Christ.

1. See Prov. 8:22; Wisd. 7:23 etc. 2. Col. 1:17. 3. Col. 1:15. 4. Col. 1:16. 5. Col. 1:17. 6. Col. 1:18. 7. Eph. 1:10. 8. Col. 1:19. 9. 1Cor. 1:17-24; 30. Cf. 2Cor. 8:1. 10. Col. 2:9. 11. See also the possible connection with the angelic beings of Enoch 82:10ff and Jubilees 2. Also Ps. 104:4 and Rev. 7:1; 14:18; 16:5; 19:17 and comment by T.K. Abbott, *ibid*, pp. 247f, and A. Richardson, *Word Book of the Bible*, p. 58.

To conclude; In Paul's Christological references we are to infer that Christ was pre-existent with God before creation, that he was sole agent and mediator of creation and its sustainer. He is the image or form and entire fulness of God, in whom all things consist, are renewed and are to be summed up. Christ still stands in a derivative relation with the Father, but as close as a "Beloved" or "only" Son. In fact what has been called Paul's mysticism, centred in the phrase "in Christ", seems to point the way to a final inclusive mystical union between the Father and the Son and the believer. Within that union, as far as the believer is concerned, there is no distinction between the Father and the Son and the Spirit. In dealing with Christ we are dealing with God.

As a practising missionary, most of Paul's statements are made in relation to practical and local situations, and have to be detached from these practical contexts. Had he set out to make a fully reasoned statement, he might have worked over his final corollaries more clearly. As it was it was left to others to hammer out the implications in a more definitive way. Nevertheless, Paul's practical conclusions are probably the better for being worked out in close range with the living primitive tradition, and under such practical religious circumstances. He is never
 1.
 in any doubt about the authority of his Gospel in connection with its origin or its effectiveness. He is convinced, moreover, that whatever new revelation of God his message contained, it is centred in the cross of Christ, and authenticated in the resurrection, and effective in the Spirit, which is demonstrated in "love".

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the supremacy of the Christian revelation and dispensation over that of the Old Testament is the main purpose of the writer, we are confronted with certain claims concerning Christ which are couched in terms which point towards the Johannine presentation of the Gospel. The Epistle is quoted by Clement of Rome and is thought to be dated before the end of the first century A.D. Because of the strongly Alexandrine method of philosophical exegesis, it has been linked with Egyptian Christianity. Its Bible quotations are from the LXX, and, in view of the likeness of the situation addressed to that described in the Apocalypse (Chapter 2), and the presence of Timothy, Ephesus has been suggested as its destination. This, however, is mainly conjectural.

The general Platonic conception of "Ideas" must be born in mind as a background to the Epistle. It consists in a contrasting of the ideal and perfect revelation in Christ against the imperfect and incomplete revelation offered by men and lesser heavenly personalities. The Christology is worked out on the basis of mediatorial status, in which the superiority of the status of Christ is demonstrated. This superiority of Christ's status appertains to both his divine and human planes of life.

1.5:11 - 6:20; 10:19-31; 32-39. 2.13:23.
See T.H. Robinson, The Ep. to the Heb. Moffatt Comm. pp. xvff.

The writer's theory of revelation is based on the Greek theory of "possession", in which the human element is minimized by the presence of the divine. God spoke in the prophets and in a Son. The distinction between the mediation of Christ and others is that he is a Son of God, and knows by nature what others have to be informed about.

The status of Christ, then, is established immediately. He is the "heir of the universe" and agent in its creation. He reflects the glory of God, and is the express image of his person. He sustains the world by "the word of his power", and, by virtue of his priestly offices for us, has been given an exaltation higher than angels. He is to be linked with the "son" of Psalm 2:7, and with the sonship implied in Chronicles, and is to be described as the "first-begotten". These Old Testament references keep the sonship within the bounds of Jewish monotheism, and link it with the renewed covenant with the house of David. This latter reference is probably made in a Messianic context, and is to be interpreted along the spiritualizing lines of Alexandrian religious practice.

The "Son" is worshipped by angels, and his throne is forever and ever. He is "anointed above his fellows". He is the "Lord", who at the "beginning" has laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of his hands. All things may pass away, but Christ will remain.

1. See T.H. Robinson, *ibid*, p.2. 2.1:1-3. 3.1:5. 4.1Chron.22:10.
5.1:6. 6.1:7f. 7.1:9f. 8.1:10-12.

All this amounts to a very advanced Christology. It gives Christ a pre-existent life with God at the "beginning", creative functions and unique sonship and an everlasting quality of life. It is this intimate and divine status with God that gives the superiority to all his mediatorial functions described in the body of the Epistle. It is also responsible for the completeness and perfection of his revelation over that of others.

His sonship gives Christ superiority not only in the prophetic office, but also in his priestly functions. The beginnings of the Aaronic priesthood are known facts of history. Its priests depend for their status in each particular case on the call of God. Its administration depends on the functioning of a law that is temporary. Its priests need replacing, and its sacrifices repeating. Christ, on the other hand, has a permanent call of God in the form of his eternal sonship. He is consecrated priest forever, after the power of an "indissoluble" life. His sacrifice needs no repeating. His priesthood, moreover, gathers status from his obedient suffering and the perfection of his manhood. His mediatorial status is guaranteed by a perfection which extends from his perfect sonship with God, on the divine side, to his perfect manhood on the human side.

1.5:4. 2.8:4-13, cf. Platonic "shadow of heavenly things", also 10:1, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things...." 3.7:11;27; 4.5:5;7:28b. 5. So Moffatt, cf. A.V. "endless life", cf. 4:14. 6.7:27. 7.2:10;5:8f; cf. 12:2b. 8.4:15.

When the writer of the Epistle turns to the idea of sacrifice itself, he finds the sacrifice of Christ also superior to those of the ancient Israelites, because of the very eternal nature of his life as an offering. It is not to be compared with meals, drinks etc, which have no permanent existence or efficacy. Both covenant and Day of Atonement sacrifices are temporary, because the temples in which they are offered "are made with hands", the priests are imperfect and the sacrifices need to be repeated. Christ has opened a new and living way into the holy of holies (Heaven), by his perfect and priestly offering of himself as the one "true" and eternal sacrifice, that has made all repetition unnecessary. This offering of himself constitutes Christ the author and captain and finisher of our faith.

In addition to, and within the foregoing Christological figures, there is a limited reference to Jesus as "Lord", and a reference to the "word of God", which could be interpreted in a technical sense, point towards such a sense. To the writer to the Hebrews, then Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and today, and forever. He is the pre-existent, eternal, and firstborn Son of God, the image of his Father, and his agent in creation, who, in the sufferings of the incarnate Jesus, offered himself the one, true and perfect sacrifice. For this reason

1.9:12;10:12;14. 2.9:9ff. 3.9:1;7:24, cf again the Platonic reference: Temples as figures of the "true". 4.10:19f. 5.9:24. 6.10:10. 7.12:2. 8.2:10. 9.12:2. 10. See T.H.Robinson on this point, *ibid*, pp.43-40. 11.13:8.

God has exalted him to his position as Lord, from whence he performs a perfect priestly and mediatorial office between God and mankind. The effectiveness of this office is based on both his divine status and his human sympathy.

Two comments remain: first, the position of the Son is still considered in subordination to the Father, and second, the humanity of Jesus is, therefore, also still very real in its conception. In fact the heavenly priest is instructed by his earthly human experience. However, as in both spheres his perfection is recognised, this does not detract from the validity of his priestly functions or from his perfection of sacrifice. The authority of Jesus to speak for God is guaranteed by his pre-existent, divine sonship, and his sinless, obedient manhood. This is a further step on the way to the full projection of the significance of the life of the human Jesus into the life of God. In our account of God we have also to take into account the revelation of the activity of the human Jesus.

THE DEVELOPMENT OFTHE TECHNICAL USE OF THE "WORD"

Before turning to the seemingly novel description of Jesus in St. John's Gospel as the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, it will prove helpful to examine the New Testament usages of $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$ outside the Johannine Prologue, firstly, because the evidence points to a development of ^atechnical use of these terms, and, secondly, because it will help to introduce some of the New Testament conceptions taken up and developed by John in his highly Christological Gospel.

From the Acts it can be seen that at a very early period in the primitive Church some kind of technical sense attaches to the use of $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$; but the degree of technicality is uneven and hard to fix. In one case $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ refers to what purports to be a quotation of the actual words of Jesus, which are being used authoritatively for practical instruction. ^{1.} In another case the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ stands without a defining genitive, and, from the context, it is clear that it is to be associated with "the word which ye (the hearers) know, How that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were ^{3.} oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." This verse shows the wide significance of the term. It had a coverage which extended over the main events of the ministry of Jesus. This same content appears again in other places and forms.

1.20:35. 2.10:36. 3.10:38.

1.
Other expressions include "the word of this salvation" which
is related to the Old Testament fulfilment conceptions. It is "the word
2.
of his grace" which builds up and sanctifies. It is the "word of the
3.
Gospel", and often "the word of God".

From the contexts in several places, and the iuxta-position of
associate phrases, certain distinctions and equivalents can be worked out.
The Twelve are said to have asked to be relieved of certain Church duties,
4.
that they might not have "to leave the word of God and serve tables."
Serving tables and prayer are at least distinguishable from "the ministry
5.
of the word." Elsewhere this activity is spoke of as "preaching the
6. 7. 8.
Gospel", "preaching the word of God", "preaching the word", and as speak-
9. 10.
ing "the word of the Lord" or "the word of God". From the receiving end,
11.
men can "hear the word of the Gospel". The Gentiles, moreover, "by my
12.
(Peter's) mouth heard the word of the Gospel," or "they gladly received
the word of Peter". The use of the words "hear" and "mouth" in these
contexts indicate that the word is to be taken as something spoken.

In two places closely related citations imply that preaching
13.
"the word" is the same as "preaching Christ". It is Jesus that fills in
the content of the preaching, and the preaching describes Jesus. It is
14.
also equivalent to speaking in his name.

What is equally important is the powerful effects of preaching
15. 16. 17. 18.
the word. There are remission of sins, grace, and peace, salvation,

1.13:26. 2.20:32. 3.15:7. 4.6:2. 5.6:4. 6.16:10;11:19. 7.13:5.
8.8:4. 9.16:32;13:46. 10.4:10. 11.13.7;44. 12.15:7. 13.8:4,cf.
8:5;11:19;11:20. 14.cf.4:18;3:16;4:7;14 etc. 15.2:38. 16.20:32.
17.10:36. 18.13:36.

1. concord; but there is also healing and exorcism and signs and wonders,
 2. 3. 4.
 5. 6.
 raisings from the dead and miraculous escapes from imprisonment, so
 7.
 mightily grew the word of God and prevailed. These are the "words" of
 8. 9.
 of this life which is "everlasting" and "eternal", and results from the
 9.
 acceptance of "his word". God's powerful word speaks this eschatolog-
 10.
 ical life into being by his Spirit in and around all who accept him, with-
 out respect of persons. There is a revealing statement in Acts 18 where
 11.
 Paul has been pressed in the Spirit and testified to the Jews that "Jesus
 is Christ". This possibly signifies that the burden of the word, and the
 content of the preaching, was that Jesus was the Christ. As the preaching
 in the Acts is strongly influenced by the resurrection and the exaltation
 of Jesus to God's right hand. The "word", therefore, is "Christ is Lord".

In the Synoptic Gospels the range of associations of the Word
 are extensive. In the introduction to his Gospel St. Luke refers to his
 authorities as "those which from the beginning were eye witnesses, and
 12.
 ministers of the word". This could hardly be the words Jesus taught;
 but rather the word about Jesus as the Messiah in the same sense as St.
 13.
 Mark speaks of "the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God." It is Jesus
 who gives both terms their content and significance.

From the outset of his ministry the grace of his words and the
 14.
 authority of them was a matter of great astonishment. His word was

1.2:44f;11:29f. 2.5:15;9:34. 3.5:16;8:7ff. 4.2:43;5:12. 5.9:36-43.
 6.12:1-19;5:17-28. 7.19:20. 8.5:20. 9.13:46;48. 10.10:34. 11.18:
 5, cf.10:36, "He is Lord of all." 12. See Hoskyns, *ibid*, p.160, who comments
 that both "Gospel" & "word" are drawn into the orbit of the person of Christ,
 but "word" is still neuter. Cf. Plummer, *ibid*, pp.3f. rejects link with per-
 sonal "Word" of John. 13.1:1;2:36;4:12. 14. Lk.4:22. Mk.10:24.

1.
 "with power". The governing principle of Jesus' life was that man should not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God. The Jewish leaders, on the other hand, were making the word of God of none effect through their traditions. Here, as in the rejoinder of Jesus on another occasion (Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.), the reference was no doubt to the Law in its wider sense as the Torah. There is something of the corporate nature of the new family of God behind the words, "my brethren are they that hear the word of God and do it." It was the experience of the disciples sent on their preaching mission to find devils subject to them in Jesus' name, and the divine authority of Christ is to be associated with their preaching and its results. In any persecuting court of law, the Father will actually speak in them.

The words of Jesus, however, are clearly to be linked with the word of God. "the people pressed on him to hear the word of God." They were moved to ask, "What word is this?" Jesus is reported to have claimed permanence for his words.

Apart from the actual utterance of his words, it is the effect of the words of Jesus that comes in for comment. They inspire confidence and trust: "nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net." The words of Jesus have healing power and at a distance. He casts out devils with a

1.Lk.4:32. 2.Mt.4:5;Lk.4:4, cf Mt.6:25:34. 3.Mk.7:13. 4.Lk.11:28.
 5.Lk.8:21. 6.Lk.10:17. 7.Mt.10:14;Lk.9:5. 8.Mt.10:20. 9.Lk.5:1,
 cf.Mk.2:2. 10.Lk.4:32;36. 11.Mk.13:31.Lk.21:33. 12.Lk.5:5. 13.Lk.
 7:7;Mt.8:8.

word, and this rouses astonishment: "we never say it after this fashion",
 1.
 2.
 "It was never so seen in Israel".

What is of the utmost significance is Jesus' claim of the absolute authority of his words for the final judgement. "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words..... of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy
 3.
 angels." This passage is linked closely with the special revelation given to the disciples after the confession of Peter which involved recognition of Jesus as the Christ. They include predictions of the cross as a part of the Messianic role, and must therefore have a special place in what is finally meant by the "word" of Jesus. These are the specifically Jesuan words to which absolute loyalty is demanded.

The post-resurrection judgement of Jesus was that he was "mighty
 4.
 in word and deed." After the ascension it is reported that "they (the disciples) went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them,
 5.
 and confirming the word with signs following."

The Sermon on the Mount emphasizes the word of Jesus in the sense of teaching. But this teaching was invested with authority (Lit. $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\grave{\xi}\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$
 6.
 $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\chi\omega\nu$; as one having the "right"). His words have that absolute quality of judgement in them. If obeyed they make the house of life stable as if
 7.
 built on rock. He opposed the admittedly divine Law with authoritative

1.Mt.8:16;Mk.2:12. 2.Mt.9:33. 3.Mk.8:38;Lk.9:26. 4.Lk.24:19. 5.Mk.
 16:20. 6.Mt.7:29. 7.Mt.7:24.

1. "I say unto you". His words are either the works of God or they are nothing. They enclose a new revelation that goes beyond the legal to the inward and ethical intention, and operate in the sphere of faith, where there is no guarantee, but utter trust in God. They speak of a life that is a miracle like the life of ancient covenant Israel, dependent upon nothing more than trust in the "word of the Lord". To accept this word and then to grasp after mammon is a contradiction. "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away", is not meant to be a fanciful claim.

4. The parables are linked with speaking the "word". Whatever other meanings may be attached to the parable of the Sower, in the minds of the Synoptic evangelists, it is linked with the reception of the words of Jesus. There is, moreover, a special meaning attached to them for the disciples, which is hidden from others. It is linked with the possibility of persecution, and anticipates the special teaching about suffering given later, and the absolute loyalty demands which are connected with such teaching. The implications are that it is the word of the cross that will finally divide mankind.

8. The phrase "the word of the Kingdom" also brings into the orbit of this discussion all the "Kingdom" teaching.

1.Mt.5:vv.22:28:32:34:39:44. 2.Mt.6:25-34. 3.Mt.24:35. 4.Mk.4:33, cf Mt.13. 5.Mt.13:19 6.Mk.4:11,cf.Mt 13:11ff;Lk.8:10. 7.Mk.4:17; Mt.13:22f;Lk.8:13. 8.Mt.13:19 note Lk.11:20.

Behind all the Synoptic references to the "word" stands the assumption of authority based on Jesus' claim to stand in a unique relationship with the Father. It is to be associated with the "Gospel" and the "Kingdom", and consists in the experience of the eschatological powers of the sovereignty of God seen in the life of his Son, Jesus Christ. It is evidenced in the authority of his teaching, the power of his words, his healing ministry, but it is especially to be linked with the acceptance or rejection of the new revelation of the part to be played by suffering in the bringing in of the Kingdom. This amounts to the acceptance of Jesus in the role of the "servant". The situation has not yet reached the stage where the preaching of the "word" by a third person is equivalent to preaching Christ, but all the materials are present in the Gospel record.

For the most part, St. Paul uses the "word" as equivalent for the "Gospel". Because of his bonds, the brethren at Philippi "speak the word
1. more boldly." Other parallel phrases are used, viz, "the word of God",
2. "the word of Christ",
3. "the word of life" and "the word of the truth of the
4. Gospel".
5. Paul links his usage with the confessional formula "Jesus (is)
6. Lord;" for "faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God".
7. The baptismal formula is also probably referred to in the difficult words,
8. "That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church) with the washing of
the word".

1. Phil. 1:14, cf. 1 Thess. 1:6; 2:13; 1 Cor. 14:36. 2. 2 Cor. 2:17; 4:3. 3. Col. 3:16.
4. Phil. 2:16. 5. Col. 1:5, see T. K. Abbott, the principle notion is that the truth of the Gospel belongs to the "word". 6. Rom. 10; 8f, cf. 1 Cor. 16:23, Jesus is Lord. 7. Rom. 10:17. 8. Ephes. 5:26, cf. Abbott, *ibid*, pp. 168f.

The sense of the "word" as the whole saving Gospel is to be
 1.
 thought of as "the word of life", and is to be linked with the "servant"
 example of Christ, that Christians may be lights in the world. It is for
 2.
 this Gospel of the mystery of Christ that Paul wishes "a door for the word".
 3.
 The word moreover is to "dwell in you richly in all wisdom", and this must
 be taken along with the parallel statements, "that Christ may dwell in your
 4. hearts by faith", and "Christ in you the hope of glory". Here the "word"
 5.
 is seen to be the equivalent of Christ, and to "preach the word", or "the
 6.
 Gospel of God", or "the Gospel of Christ" is to pre-suppose that Christ
 7. and the "word" are one and the same thing. "For we are not, as many,
 which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the
 9.
 sight of God, speak we of Christ." All these references make it clear
 that preaching the "word" and preaching Christ are equivalent. The word
 10. is of Christ crucified and risen and Lord. The accompaniments of the
 11. 12.
 word are newness of life, which find their permanent manifestation in
 13.
 faith and hope and in mutual love of the brethren. The word he preaches
 14. is a "new Creation" in Christ and a "word of reconciliation". 15.

The "word" references in the Epistle to the Hebrews are illuminating. The "son" to whom we are immediately introduced upholds all things
 16.
 by "the word of his power". It was by his creative word that God framed

1.Phil.2:16. 2.Col.4:3. 3.Col.3:16. 4.Ephes.3:16. 5.Col.1:24.
 6.Rom.10:8. 7.Rom.15:16;2Cor.11:7(cf.2Cor.2:17;4:3=word of God.)
 8.Rom.15:19,cf "Christ's Gospel" 2Cor.2:12. 9.2Cor.2:16. 10.1Cor.2:2.
 11.1Cor.15:14,cf.1Cor.15:1-4. 12.1Cor.16:22. 13.1Cor.13:13. 14.2Cor.
 5:17. 15.2Cor.5:19. 16.1:8.

1. the world. Readers are admonished to remember those who have spoken unto them "the word of God", and to follow their faith, which is defined as "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today and forever." It is this Jesus, who is the eternal Christ, who was the subject of their word, and not the variegated doctrines of others. Despite the apparent harshness of the context the verse concerning those who have "tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come", and have returned to their former life, is also instructive. This is to crucify Christ afresh, and to deliberately choose darkness after having seen the light.

5. The description of the "word of God" as a living thing, alive, active and more cutting than a two-edged sword, and with discriminating powers and penetrating sight, is linked with many of the Old Testament conceptions we have already reviewed. It moves in the world of personification, acting apart from God, but almost identified with him (v.13) and endowed with functions of discrimination and judgement.

7. Two contrasting pictures are drawn by the author, setting forth the superiority of the word spoken by Jesus. In the first, the contrast is with the word of angels: "if the word spoken by angels was steadfast... how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that

1.11:3. 2.13:7f. 3.13:9. 4.6:1-6. 5.4:12. 6. See T.H. Robinson, *ibid*, pp.43-47, where he sets out the possibilities (a) an expression of thought, (b) the O.T. Scriptures as a standard of action, (c) the Christian Gospel, (d) the technical Logos of Greek Phil. He supports the idea of a less developed Logos doctrine than Philo, a semi-divine emanation or personified element of Deity like Jewish Wisdom & Torah. 7.2:2ff.

heard. God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost...^{1.} Here we have the word of salvation spoken by the Lord, accompanied by eschatological living, and by the presence of the Spirit. There must be added to this the quotation of the humiliation and exaltation of the son of man in Psalm 8, and the special significance of suffering as a constitutive element in the events of salvation.^{2.}

The second parallel contrasts the "word" with the terrifying voice of the words associated with the Sinai revelation and its fear-provoking injunctions, "which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more."^{3.} The writer goes on, "If we escape not him that spake from the earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."^{4.} Within the voice that speaks to Christians is included Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the hosts of angels, the general assembly of the Church of the firstborn, God the Judge of all, the spirits of just men made perfect, and finally, Jesus the mediator of the new covenant and the blood of the sprinkling, that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel. This word is to judge between things that are shakable and those not able to be shaken. We receive a Kingdom that cannot be moved, because it is linked with all the many things previously mentioned as inherent in the voice of the word which speaks from heaven, because it is mediated through Jesus.

1.2:2ff. 2.2:7-10. 3.12:18-28. 4.12:25.

To the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, then, the content of "the word" extends widely enough to include all the fulfilment and eschatological accompaniments of the primitive traditional salvation events of the life of Jesus, including the cross, and, in addition, the voice of the heavenly exalted Jesus, whose sacrifice is associated with his mediatorial functions there. To accept or reject any or all of this "word" amounts to the acceptance or rejection of salvation. The "word" is beginning to assume an objective life of its own; but always its content is to be filled out with reference to Jesus in one or other aspects of his pre-existent or earthly life.

In the first chapter of the First Letter of Peter, there is a striking passage in which Christ is referred to as the lamb fore-ordained to be sacrificed before the foundation of the world, to obedience to the truth, unfeigned love of the brethren, and love for one another, and being born again, not with corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. This is one of the passages which shows how deeply embedded the phrase "the word of God" is in the primitive Christian vocabulary, and how steadily it was used to describe the work of Christ. The underlined words and phrases point their own development towards the later identification of Christ and the word.

1. 1Pet. 1:20ff. 2. See E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 149ff, and Hoskyns, *ibid*, detached note pp. 152-64. 3. John 1:1; 1John 1:1; Rev. 19:13.

In the Apocalypse the "word" references in the main follow what we have seen elsewhere in the New Testament. By "the word" is meant those salvation events to which the writer witnesses, and for which he is on the island of Patmos, but it is, nevertheless, to be distinguished from the testimony of Jesus. Though it is parallel with it. The people of Sardis are commended for keeping "the word of Christ", and this is the same as the "word of my patience", which is patience under the same kind of suffering as Christ endured, and for which the Philadelphians are commended. It is also the same as not denying Christ's name. The opening of the fifth seal reveals under the altar, "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held". Both these phrases are objective and mean the word given by God and the testimony to it by Jesus. However, in 20:4 the phrases are in reverse order: "I saw the souls of them that have been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God..." The suffering is then linked with the testimony of Jesus rather than the word of God. There does therefore seem to be a clouding of the distinction between the two conceptions. Although in 19:13 we meet the statement: "And his name shall be called The Word of God," the context does not go much further than allow it as

1.1:2. 2.1:9. 3.3:8. 4.3:10. 5.3:8. 6.6:9. See C. Anderson Scott, The Century Bible, p.181, re a Rabbinical tradition that the souls of the just are buried below the throne of glory, and that whoever is buried beneath the altar it is equivalent to being buried beneath the throne of glory. 7.C.A.Scott, ibid, pp.181f. These two phrases, or variants of them, are associated at 1:2;1:9;6:9;20:4.

a technical use of the term. However, it must be noted that it is applied to a personal supernatural figure, representing, even if in a less than Christian way, the divine government of the world.

There is a brief but apt reference to the "word" in the Epistle of James which also points forward to final developments. The "Father of lights.....of his own will begat he us with the word of his truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures". This makes the word of truth the instrument of begetting.

It is, however, when we come to the Johannine literature that we meet with the explicit identification of Jesus with the "word". We have noticed its technical application in the Revelation, but elaboration of the identification is to be found in John's First Epistle, and in the main body of the Gospel of John, and most strikingly in the prologue to the Gospel. Nonetheless the developments we have traced throughout the rest of the New Testament amount to a substantial link between Jesus and the "word" which approximate surprisingly to the final Johannine statement.

A BRIEF INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF JOHN'S CHRISTOLOGY

The Christological teaching of St. John is to be understood against the same distinction between the divine world and the world of men as the Synoptic record and St. Paul's Epistles, but it is couched in different terms. The "Kingdom of God" and "This world" of the Synoptics, and "the Age to come" and "this age" of St. Paul, are more often expressed in St. John by $\tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ and $\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$. The trafficking between the two worlds follows perpendicular courses.¹

The characteristic of "things above" are that they are real and permanent; those "below" are unreal and transitory.

John does not wholly abandon the Messianic language or titles² used in the other Gospels, and the testimony of the Baptist plays an important part.³ In fact the whole purpose of the Gospel has Messianic intent.⁴ Jesus accepts the Messianic⁵ role which is confessed from the start.⁶ Superimposed on this traditional Messianic background, however, is a framework of vast supernatural activity on the cosmic plane, which is interpreted in new terms and concepts significant in both Jewish and Hellenistic worlds.

The Gospel begins with a statement about the divine identity of Jesus, strikingly set out under the concept of the divine $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, who is the unique $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\acute{\nu}\eta\varsigma$ Son of God, who mediates sonship to believers because of his own unbroken communion with the Father. John's thesis is that Jesus is not

1. Cf. 1:51; 3:3; 13:27; 8:23; 17:24; 18:37 etc. The choice of these perpendicular terms makes it less likely that the two worlds will be confused in the minds of the readers. John emphasises the fact that it is the irruption of another type of life into the world of which he speaks. 2. John explains the Hebrew word, cf. 1:41; 4:25. 3. 1:20-27; 3:24-36. 4. 20:31. 5. Cf. 4:9. 6. 1:41, cf. 6:49.

a man who has achieved divinity, or been adopted into it, but one who was already divine who has been sent down from heaven.¹ He has this divine authority for what he does.

John's first task is to substantiate this divine claim. Witnesses are brought forward whose testimony is intended to establish the divine authority of Jesus. The Baptist denies his own Messiahship and declares Jesus Messiah.² He is only the promised fore-runner of One on whom he saw the Spirit descend. The water of John's baptism is to be superceded by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as the work of Jesus will be to baptise with the Holy Ghost. This conjunction of the Holy Ghost and baptism is part of the declaration of the "holy" and "spirit" origin of Jesus. The Baptist's testimony is followed by that of the disciple who has "found the Messiah",³ and by that of Nathaniel, whose conclusion is, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel."⁴

These claims are supported by the miracles. In the Synoptic record the miracles were the "signs" that the Kingdom of God had arrived; that God was present. Only if God were present could such things happen. John takes up and develops this⁵ idea, but the "signs" are more specifically and particularly directed. They are signs that the eternal world has infiltrated into the present ephemeral⁶ order, to the discomfort of its princes,⁷ and the dis-establishment of its institutions, and the renovation of its thinking.⁸ The signs are a revelation of the particular "glory" of God which Jesus has

1. 3:16. 2. 1:19ff; 32ff, cf. 3:27; 5:33; 10:41. 3. 1:41. 4. 1:49.
5. Cf. 3:2. 6. 1:10f. 7. 12:31; 2:6ff; 3:10. 8. 16:13.

come to reveal,¹ and, in this sense, are witnesses to the divine authority of the Revealer. The signs support this status not only by the unique nature of the actual happenings, but in the changes they portend and the revelation they give of the reality which belongs to God.² The miracles and incidents reported by John are but stepping-stones to the statements about Jesus which they precede.³ Every allusion made and every controversy^{introduced into} is recalled and recorded for Christological reasons, and made the pretext and context of some further definition of the divine identity of Jesus.

For the main part the presentation is in the framework of the Jewish convictions concerning activity of God in human history, and many Jewish conceptions are used to support the divine nature of Jesus. This claim is pursued on many levels and with increasing certainty and daring. On its easiest levels it may merely amount to the statement that God is with⁴ Jesus, or that he is⁵ from God, or is sent by God,⁶ or even by a sense of mystery about his⁷ identity, or that he is a prophet.⁸ These claims do not invade the monotheistic principle or establish divinity. Messianic categories are introduced both by others and from Jesus' own self-consciousness.⁹ It is this self-consciousness that is of paramount importance to St. John's record. On it rests the conviction of Jesus' special filial relationship with the Father,¹⁰ and his sense of unique commission to undertake the salvation of the¹¹ world. Jesus is conscious of a divine destiny to be fulfilled, and

1. 1:14; 2:11; 13:31ff; 17:1ff; 22. 2. Cf. 13:24; 15:9; 15. 3. E.g. The Feeding of the 5000 leads to the discourse on the Bread of Life etc. 4. 3:2. 5. 16:30. 6. 3:34; 4:34; 5:37; 12:49; 17:3. 7. 10:21; 6:69; 7:12; 26; 31; 41; 9:30. 8. 7:40. 9. 1:49, cf. 6:69. 10. Cf. 8:35. 11. 3:16ff; 5:37; 16:28; 17:5ff, cf. 10:18; 18:11.

testifies to its fuller accomplishment every time his message seems to have obtained a foothold in human understanding,¹ or whenever he escapes human designs to bring about his destruction,² or when fulfilment itself is being realised there³ then. It is this filial consciousness that is the basis of his authority.⁴ It is not based on learning⁵ or family considerations.

The Messianic claims of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel are centred in the Son of Man concept. Around his conception of the functions of the Son of Man all the novel features of Jesus' Messiahship move. In particular this is to be seen in the unveiling of the connection of suffering with the concept of glory. This title is closely associated with Jesus' sense of mission⁶ and with his own self-consciousness of who he⁷ is. At this Johannine stage also there is to be linked with Synoptic and Jewish Old Testament Son of Man ideas overtones of Greek ideas of primal Man, which also contain implications of divine origin.⁸

However, it is in the "sonship" concept that the approximation to, and assumption of divinity becomes most manifest.⁹ The personal claim of Jesus to sonship with God is clearly stated.

The central and controlling ideas in the concept of sonship are full communion with the Father and a sense of dependence and commission.¹⁰ The two conceptions are parallel in many places within the Gospel, but only in so far as there are two persons concerned. In what they do the Father and

1. 2:4; 4:23; 35; 5:25; 12:23. 2. Cf. 8:20. 3. 13:1; 16:32; 17:1; 18:37; 19:30. 4. 7:46, cf. 2:13ff; 9:16; 10:18; 9:33; 10:21. 5. 7:15. 6. 3:13; 6:53; 12:23 (cf. 12:38); 13:31. 7. 6:62; cf. 5:27; 8:28. 8. 19:5. 9. 9:35ff; 10:36ff. 17:1, cf. 19:7 and 20:31. 10. 5:19ff.

and the Son¹ are one. The final implication of this one-ness is not always shirked. It forms the basis of the charges levelled at Jesus by the opposition,² and stands at the heart of the ultimate devotion of at least one of the disciples.³

As in the primary Christian tradition the real significance of the title "Lord" is reflected from the resurrection,⁴ although it is sometimes used within the Gospel.⁵

The double field of reference is one of the features of John's Gospel which distinguishes it from the other Gospels. Some conceptions appear to have strong Jewish associations. The phrase ἐγὼ εἰμὶ , for example, and the conception of glory, especially in association with the phrase "lifted up," have vital connections with the historical revelation of the presence of God in Old Testament times. The "shepherd," "light" and "water" figures have antecedant Jewish associations. On the other hand, whenever these terms are prefaced by the adjectives "true" or "good" they are given additional interpretative value from Greek speculative thought and religious experience. Within these combined statements, the two world of thought are seen to meet. The "I am" statements of St. John can be thought of as linking the Jewish tetragrammaton implications of ἐγὼ εἰμὶ as subject with Jewish or Hellenistic predicates, and further defined by Platonic adjectives.⁶ The Christian figurative⁷ conceptions are given divine implications in the idiom of two thought worlds.

1. 10:30; 14:7-10; 17:22. 2. 10:33; cf. 19:7 and 5:18. 3. 20:28. 4. 20:20; 28; 21:12; 15ff. 5. 13:14; 25. 6. 15:1; 8:12; 9:5; etc. 7. Vine, Bread etc.

In whatever high terms the divine claims are made, they only enhance still further the implications of St. John's second major claim, that this high personage "has become flesh and dwelt among us," and in the historical Jesus. It is in this "flesh" that men have met with and seen the evidence they report. The danger in John's record is, that despite his insistence upon the reality of the flesh of Jesus, the writer of, and the reader of the striking claim to divinity in the Prologue, should in a measure be disqualified from understanding the humanity of Jesus. With these convictions in his mind he can hardly speak of his humanity as though he had never heard of Jesus' divinity, and this is the first piece of information he is given. This means that what constitutes the real humanity of Jesus falls into the background as the realisation of his divinity is advanced. The reports of the Sons's dependence on the Father prove to be concessions to the Jewish monotheistic principle.

Nevertheless, the reality of the humanity of Jesus is not finally allowed to come into question. The humanity of Jesus is always intended to be real. Indeed, it is the "scandal" of the Gospel, and basis of its call to faith,¹ that "Joseph's² son" should be also pointed out as the Son of God. Our next task, therefore, must be to examine in more detail how John portrays both the divinity and the humanity of Christ.

1. 20:31. 2. 6:42, cf 7:5.

THE JOHANNINE CONCEPTION OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

It is in the Prologue to the Gospel of John that the claim of the divinity of Christ is to be seen in its most definite and striking form. Our examination of the Prologue will involve^u in several issues, viz., the meaning of the term λόγος, an exegesis of the claims made concerning the λόγος, and the examination of some textual problems. It may also involve the problem of the integration of the Prologue with the rest of the Gospel. The unity of the Gospel has some bearing upon its Christology in that it is only in the Prologue that the term λόγος is used absolutely, and this has led some to conclude that it is a later addition.

That there is harmony between the claims of the Prologue and those of the bulk of the Gospel will become increasingly clear as we proceed.

The Prologue of John is possibly the most concentrated Christological passage in the New Testament. Its main business is to inform the reader who it is that is being described in the following narrative. It is not man become God, but God become man. If the reader can believe this piece of information, he is about to have the glory of God revealed to him. If he cannot, the story will be filled with things unbelievably hard to understand¹. This means that for John the "scandal" is the incarnation of the Son of God, the story of whose human history he is about to tell, but he must first dispel any doubt concerning the divine status of Jesus.

John seeks to confront the Christian believer once and for all with supreme issue of his faith by drawing out the implications of his confession of Jesus Christ as "Lord." By his opening statement under the

1. Cf. 6:60ff.

symbolism of the divine λόγος, John proceeds to make the status of Jesus clear. We are dealing with one who existed before time as we know it ever existed. So much is to be gathered from the traditional phrase "in the beginning," the primary reference of which is in Genesis 1:1, where it is associated with the point of creation, beyond which it is impossible for man to go¹. The use of the imperfect tense of the verb (ἦν) clarifies the issue. When the moment of creation arrived, the divine λόγος was already in existence. This amounts to an absolute existence before time, and statements within the body of the Gospel leave no doubt that this is what St. John meant².

The next statement is a defining statement concerning the place of the λόγος within the Godhead by whose "word" creation is said to have taken place³. The meaning again is to be understood from the continuous past tense of the verb, and the use of the preposition πρὸς with a following accusative. Two ideas are to be conveyed; continuous nearness and movement towards. This amounts to an existing (ἦν), active relationship towards (πρὸς) the Godhead, a matter taken up within the Gospel⁴. The mode of life of the divine λόγος within the Godhead is one of active, personal partaking. He is distinct from God but not independent of him.

1. Cf. other references: Prov. 8:22; Ecclus. 24:9; Mt 19:4-8; Col. 1:15-18; Rev. 3:14; Cf. also E. Jacob, *ibid*, p.138, & C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 109f; 2. 1:15; 8:58; 17:5; etc.
3. Gen. 1:3; 6; 9; etc. 4. 17:5;

The third point of clarification is that the λόγος was God (θεός)¹. Too much cannot be drawn from the fact that the noun has no article. At best it could reduce the predication to saying that the λόγος was divine in essence, without excluding the possibility that there might be other divine beings as well as himself. The next phrase is no mere repetition, but a further clarification of the time factor which defines the sphere of the existence of the λόγος. He did not "come to be" even at "the beginning." He was already present on a continuing basis in active relationship with God before creation². The "ἄν" is in strict contrast to what is next to be mentioned; for creation is something that is ζῆγενετο.

Lest there should be any doubt concerning the sole agency of the λόγος in creation, John uses both positive and negative statements to deny the possibility. This is anticipated in other New Testament documents³. In John's statement, however, there is a textual problem because the earliest manuscripts and heretical quotations show the punctuation mark before the ὁ γένονεν, and thus link it to the following statement to read, "that which came into being in him was life...." If the phrase is linked to the preceding statement, it merely acts as a descriptive addition to the excluding phrase "not one thing," and would read, "not one thing which came into being." On the other hand the older reading does have a bearing on John's Christology, in that it leaves the λόγος (and consequently Jesus) to be the creator of the Holy Spirit, or of an emanation called ζῶν.

1. As we have seen in the LXX ὁ θεός is reserved for the God of Israel.
2. Cf. Prov. 8:30; 3. I Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:2; Cf. Col. 2:15;

However, this reading, despite its ancient and strong manuscript support, contradicts what has already been said concerning the λόγος, viz, that he already existed before creation, and did not need to come into being. It would have needed to say, that which was in him already was life, rather than, that which came into being in him was life.

Ὁ γενόμενος would only have been the appropriate word after v. 14, where the λόγος became flesh. But then the functions under description in the subsequent verses would apply not to his pre-existent life, but to his incarnate life, which would be to anticipate and make an anticlimax of v. 14. It seems best, then, taken with the preceding statement¹.

From here John goes on to associate the λόγος with the bestowal of life in its broader sense². He it is who makes alive. Within the Gospel proper, this is one of the major demonstrations of the glory of God, of which the raising of Lazarus is an illustration, and the resurrection of Jesus is the final demonstration. In the case of mankind, the life that is peculiarly theirs, outside mere animal activity, takes the form of light or illumination. The λόγος is the kind of life

1. In the discussion of this point see:-

Bp. Wescott's Gospel According to St. John, vol. 1, pp. 59ff, where he follows the earlier Mss. Hoskyns, *ibid*, v.1, pp. 137f, agrees on the grounds that it was only abandoned in A.D.350 in defence of orthodoxy. Macgregor, *Moffatt Comm.* p, 5, feels the sense is the same either way. C. K. Barrett, *ibid*, p. 130, comes out decidedly in favour of the later reading, in that, despite Mss evidence and pressure of orthodoxy, John often used a repetitive negative to support a positive statement, and, because of other supporting passages (e.g. 5:26;6:39;63;), and it is also quite Johannine to say, "in him was life."

2. Cf. Acts 17:28;

that is man's illumination. This claim is underlined and elaborated in the body of the Gospel¹, and the indications are that it is not only metaphysical in its implications, but moral and ethical, and makes for judgment. Those who see Jesus and receive him are in possession of the kind of discriminating knowledge that is absolute. John's claim is that back beyond creation the light² that was *λόγος* was already shining. At no time has darkness ever dimmed its shining. This looks like the *λόγος* model-class light of Philo. Further Greek conceptions are introduced in the adjective *ἀληθινός* in the next phrase, which sets the light in the Platonic Archetypal class associated with completeness and perfection as distinct from the incomplete and imperfect. It is the real and authentic light, which corresponds with reality. It is permanent as distinct from other lights that glow and are gone, as for example that of the Baptist³. The *λόγος* was the light at which other lights were lit.

A textual problem centres in the participle *ἔρχόμενον*. It may be taken as a neuter with antecedent *τὸ φῶς*, in which case it refers to the incarnation of Jesus. If it is taken with *ἀνθρώπων*, as a masculine accusative, it would refer to all people who come into the world, and read, "which lighteneth every man coming into the world." These two readings illustrate concisely the opposing conceptions of man in the Jewish and Hellenistic worlds. The latter builds on the assumption that

1. 8:12;9:5;11:10;12:36;46; 2. Recall Philo's *λόγος* class.
3. Cf. 5:35; Note the wide use of this adjective; 4:23;6:32;15:1;
17:3;

mankind by nature partakes of the essence of light, the former works under the constraint that Light is the prerogative of the holy world, and only shared by mankind as an act of grace.

The general concensus of opinion favours the former reading as required by the next verse. Other passages in the Gospel parallel this statement. Jesus often speaks of himself in this way¹. If this is so², the verb φωτίζουν would most likely be taken in relation to the succeeding verse where there is a strong hint of judgment, a subject so closely linked with the "light" figure in the Gospel proper³. The verb should then be rendered "shed light upon" every man, with the idea of judging him⁴. The verb also has associations with the Stoic ideas of inward illumination and instruction dear to the Greek mind⁵.

The general internal references within the Gospel favour the idea of an anticipation of the notion of the function of light being to throw men into κρίσις . This would imply the absolute judgment of light, which is not only to be associated with the earthly life of Jesus, but with the eternal λόγος . The note of judgment is strengthened by the strong contrast between those who do not, and those who do receive him. It is noteworthy that those who receive him are described as "those who believed on his name." While this may mean simply no more than to

1. 9:39;16:28; cf. 6:14;11:27; 2. However see parallel phrase when it simply means all "comers" i.e. all men. Westcott, *ibid*, v.1 ad loc. Also Midrash Rab. Lev. 31:6; quoted by Macgregor, *ibid*, ad. loc. "Thou givest light to those who are above and to those who are below, and to all comers into the world."

3. 3:19;6:14;12:46f; cf. also 9:37 in its context.

4. Cf. the Synoptic apocalyptic Son of Man also has functions of judgment. Cf. also Heb. 6:4;10:32; Eph. 1:18;

believe on Jesus himself, there remains the possibility of a reference to the traditional Christian confession embedded throughout the New Testament concerning the confession of Christ as "Lord." Contrasted with this, however, is the peculiarly Johannine confession which emphasises the coming of Jesus "in the flesh."¹ This is the scandal that has to be accepted.

There is involved in the manuscript evidence for v. 13 a further possible Christological suggestion. The Verona Codex of the Old Latin version displays the singular "who was born" in place of the accepted plural "who were born." The acceptance of the singular, despite its manuscript minority, has been held to refer to the Virgin Birth, or, at least, to the generation of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ² by God.

The evidence seems conclusive against the singular, but it is nevertheless thought that some allusion to the birth of Jesus may have been intended by John, whose Gospel is noteworthy for so many side and double references. The full context of the Prologue seems, on the other hand, to be well outside the range of the birth of Jesus. It is more concerned with the divine $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ before time began. It was not his incarnation that

1. Cf. 1 John 4:2f; & 5:12f; along with John 6:48-54; 20:30f; the names set before the readers are "the Christ" & "the Son of God." Cf. 1 John 5:12; "Whoso hath the Son hath life." In the context of the Prologue the name could be the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.

2. See Hoskyns, *ibid*, v. 1. Detached Note, pp. 164ff. Re the Virgin Birth; see C. K. Barrett, *ibid*, p. 137f, and also note that in the West, the text would be more likely to have changed from the plural to the singular to support the Virgin Birth than vice versa.

made him a "Son."¹ His earthly human birth is more in the nature of the mechanics fulfilling what has already been decided on the heavenly plane.²

Assuming that the plural is the correct reading, we return to the earlier part of the verse which speaks of the right (ἔξουσιάν) to make children of God of all who believe on his name and receive him. This "right" is to be equated with eternal life,³ which follows naturally from the statement already made concerning the λόγος, "in him was life."⁴ This is further described as being solely a work of new creation, and outside man's achieving. It cannot be achieved by biological descent, ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, or by race ἐξ αἱμάτων, or human will or purpose ἐκ θελήματος ἀνθρώπου. It is a work of God's generation from above,⁵ and is initiated by believing in the λόγος of God, who speaks into being this new creation.

The climax of this high Christological statement is that the divine λόγος, intimate of God before creation, sole mediator in the creation of every conceivable thing, the eternal light that illumines all other lights, life itself and the bestower of life, and now engaged in the effective ordering of a new creation in men, is to be identified with the historical personage of Jesus.

In a few concise phrases John unfolds the whole divine drama. The choice of his words and phrases make precise what the body of the Gospel

1. See vv. 14b & 18 & cf. 17:3; 2. Cf. 3:16f; 3. See 3:16;
4. 1:4; cf. 5:20f; 5. Cf. the Nicodemus episode in Chap. 3 and 6:65;

declares in full, and at the same time excludes other prevailing mis-beliefs. In one short verse John states the tremendous fact itself ("And the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ became flesh"...), links it with all the fore-going claims, describes the life of Jesus ("tabernacled amongst us"), witnesses to human observation of it ("and we beheld his glory") and adds to the previously revealed character of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ("full of grace and truth"). The underlined words are an indication of just how packed this sentence is. Its swift action brushes aside as of only microscopic interest, the manner of entry of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ into this world of time and space.¹ It insists that it was into real and "beholdable" flesh that he "came." " Ἐγένετο " is the word used for the normal coming into this world. This much is conveyed by the contrast with the preceding description of the eternal life of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.² The paradox of the divine life becoming human is put in its extreme form, challenging faith to the utmost. The "blasphemy"³ of the claim and the difficulty for faith⁴ is elaborated within the Gospel proper. The Prologue verse represents the new and important place of the incarnation in Johannine thought.

The word flesh carries its Hebrew Old Testament meaning,⁵ where it means "man" and not "body" only: not any particular man, but man in his

1. St. John leaves unanswered the implications involved in a divine person becoming human. St. Paul had made one suggestion (Phil. 2:6-8). John asks our faith to bridge the gap; but it is a faith inspired by what God has freely put before us in the person of his Son.

2. For anticipations of John's statement see Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7; Heb. 4:41; cf. Gal. 4:4; 1 Tim. 3:16; 1 Jn. 4:2;

3. 5:18; 10:33; 4. 6:42-71; cf. 14:10f; & the man born blind (Chap. 9), also W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, Addit. Note "D", p. 204f; 5. Cf. Is. 40:6;

weakness, dependence and mortality. This is conveyed by the use of the word ἐγένετο, which is the same verb used to describe the coming of the Baptist.¹ It contrasts with the continuing existence implied in the pre-mundane life of the λόγος, conveyed by the use of the imperfect tense ἦν. Now, however, the λόγος is to become flesh he must enter into our existence in the same manner as other men, viz, ἐγένετο.² Although the manner of his coming was human, John conveys overtones of his divine origin in the descriptive words he uses and the echoes they awaken.

The Greek word σκηνῶν (to pitch a tent or tabernacle or to dwell) contains the same consonants as the Hebrew שָׁו (to inhabit or abide in).³ The noun derived from שָׁו became in Rabbinic times a periphrasis for the divine name or presence. It was associated with the "glory" of God's presence which accompanied Israel in her desert wanderings.⁴ Yahweh was on pilgrimage with his people. However, as שָׁו was not so much the glory as the presence of God, and, as שָׁו was not uniformly rendered in the LXX by (κατα)σκηνῶν, John may have been merely saying, he took up his residence among us.⁵ In the phrase ἐν ἡμῖν there is the suggestion that John may be anticipating his final theme, the mutual indwelling of Christ; but, as the words stand, and unassociated with later events, they must simply mean among us.

1. 1:6; 2. John does not mention the Bethlehem connections, as far as he is concerned Jesus came from Nazareth (1:45) and Galilee (4:44;7:9). He would know Mk's statement that Jesus was David's "Lord" (12:35ff) and in 9:29f he seems to hint at the traditional expectation of the Messiah from concealment (1V Ezra 7:28;13:32; Bar. 13:32)
3. Ex. 25:8;29:46; 4. Ex. 24:16;40:33; 5. cf. Sir. 24:8; Enoch 42:2; where Wisdom is portrayed as taking residence in Israel.

It is at this point that John leaves the divine $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and his pre-existent life and takes up his story on the human side of the veil that separates the human from the divine. We are now confronted with the earthly form of one who is to be pointed out as the Son of God, but the divine glory breaks through in every incident recorded in the Gospel. The incidents are chosen and recorded which are calculated¹ to excite a faith that permits his glory to be seen.

It is not with the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ conception but the Father-Son relationship that John proceeds into the main body of the Gospel. The Father dwells above, the Son below, but living on in that eternal relationship² which was characteristic of the pre-mundane life of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. This unique relationship is introduced here within the Prologue. The Son is seen to be reflecting that eternal glory he had with God as only a unique Son could do. The $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ is definitive rather than comparative. The words "only Begotten" describe a relationship that can only belong to one person,³ an unshared relationship, and the words form a link with the narrative to come.⁴ They place the Son in personal, though never independent, existence within the Godhead.⁵ The "glory" we behold comes from this uniquely close relationship,⁶ and the content⁷ of the relationship is described as "grace and truth."

1. $\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ 20:30f; 2. 5:20;23;6:39;8:12-20;14:9; 3. We have seen how $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is sometimes translated "only" in the LXX. See Wescott, *ibid.*, v.1. p.23. Thus in Mk. 1:11 (para.) 9:3; "beloved" may mean "only." Cf. Philo, *De Conf.* 146. 4. Cf. 1:18;3:16;18; 1 Jn. 4:9; See also the Father is the source of all the Son does, 3:35;
5. In the same manner as $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in v.1b. 6. 14:9;
7. The discussion of antecedents of $\pi\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (indeclinable) is only of grammatical interest; but see C. K. Barrett, *ibid.* p. 139 and Macgregor, *ibid.* p.19;

Behind these words stand strong Hebrew antecedents that were descriptive of the divine character in the Old Testament. They reflect the Hebrew phrase אמת וחסד ¹ associated with the faithfulness and mercy of God in respect to his covenant with Israel.² We have seen how in his relationship with Israel the "undeserved favour" (חסד) of Yahweh shines forth in close association with his utter reliability (אמת) of character. "Truth" in St. John retains this Hebraic character in many of its usages,³ but in others it stands for the Greek idea of reality.⁴ These two conceptions represent a summary of the revelation John is about to describe in the person of Jesus. In the body of the Gospel "grace" emerges as "love"⁵ and "truth" as the words⁶ of Jesus. He is the love of God, and he is the reality of God.⁷ Love and reality came in with him,⁸ because they belong to him and are a part of his fullness. Note the contrast with the Law "given" through Moses, which is therefore partial and incomplete.

The word πλήρωμα is used by St. Paul⁹ when it appears to be linked with the technicalities of the contemporary religious background of his readers. Here, although the word probably refers back to πλήρης (v. 14) from which all Christians receive the abundance of grace,¹⁰ there is also the probability that John is taking his stand with St. Paul in claiming all πλήρωμα for Christ. This is the import of the whole Prologue.

1. Ex. 34:6 (cf. 33:17 δοξα in context). 2. Pss. 25:10; 57:10; 108:4; (cf. "glory" v. 5) 3. 5:33; 8:40; 44ff; 16:7; 4. 1:17; 8:32; 16:13; 17:17; 19:18; 37f; 5. 3:16; 6. 8:45ff; 17:17; 18:37f; 7. 14:6; cf. v. 9; 8. 1:16; cf. the juxta-position of Jesus (historical person) & Christ (the representative of God). 9. Col. 1:19; 2:9; Eph. 1:23; 3:19; 4:13; The phrase seems to imply one grace exchanged for another.

The final declaration of the Prologue is that the Son is the sole revealer of God. No one else is in a position to make any real revelation about the Father, because no one has seen him.¹ There is only one person in a position to do this, the one who is in the closest possible relation to the Father, who is "in his bosom."² There is a textual variation concerning this verse. The available readings are (a) "only begotten," (b) "only begotten God," (c) "only begotten Son." The best attested reading is "only begotten God," and it is generally favoured on other grounds as well. It includes the two great predicates made of the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in the Prologue, i.e. $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (1:1;) and $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ (1:14;). Moreover, it is the most difficult reading from which the other readings are most likely to have begun.³ However, the statement would only be of Christological importance if the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ had not already been styled $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (1:1;). The sense remains the same as the uniqueness of revealer is the only point in question. He is the only one of his kind. The choice of the verb $\xi\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\iota$ to describe the function of revealing helps to build up the conception.⁴ The "Exegetes" is the interpreter of the "Mysteries," who initiates the worshipper into the spiritual exercises through which he is able to see God and be re-born and become divine.

1. The Old Testament tradition was that it was dangerous to see God, cf. Dt. 4:12; Ps. 97:2; Is. 6:5; & Ex. 3:6; It was a matter of amazement that Israel had looked on God and lived. 2. The term "bosom" was symbol of mutual confidence, cf. Dt. 13:6; Num. 11:12; John 13:23; (not because of the ascension but the eternal status of the Son, cf. 17:5;) 3. See Wescott, *ibid*, v. 1, p. 28. However cf. Hoskyns, *ibid*, v. 1, pp. 151f, and Barrett, *ibid*, p. 141, favour $\psi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ because it is demanded by the following clause, and in line with Johannine usage, 3:16;18; 1 Jn. 4:9; 4. See Macgregor, *ibid*, pp. 21f, & Angus, *ibid* pp. 96f;

John's contention is that there is only one who is able to fulfil such a function, the only begotten Son of the Father. Because he bears the divine nature, and also our flesh. Because he is both Jesus and Christ, he is able to set up permanent¹ communications between earth and heaven. John's terms of reference are always what he has found the historical Jesus to be. Any other references are purely illustrative, that all the Greek "fullness" as well as Jewish fulfilment might be shown to consist in him. His starting point is always the historical Jesus, and the saving functions he is assigned among men. Writing to people who could be familiar with the type of religion exhibited in the Hermetica, or a range of ideas indicated by the writings of Philo, or conceptions such as are reflected in the Rabbinical Torah-Wisdom speculations, John is insistent that the starting point is the incarnate Jesus. "The λόγος doctrine has the person of Jesus stamped upon it."² The whole purpose of the Gospel is that the character of the incarnate Jesus should reflect back into the divine life of the Father what has been revealed on earth in the life of the Son. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

And thus it is in the main part of the Gospel. Jesus is portrayed as the "spokesman" of God. He has come out of the world of God to which he belongs with a word for men. This picture is built up from the following Gospel statements. "Ye are from beneath, I am from

1. John 1:51; 2. Macgregor, *ibid*, p. XXXV

above, ye are of this world, I am not of this world."¹ "He that has sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him."² "As my Father has taught me; I speak these things. My doctrine is not mine; but his that sent me."³ "Yet my record is true; for I know whence I came and whither I go."⁴ "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."⁵ Only those who believe in him have the words of God abiding in them. Jesus is the word of God whose words (and works) are truth,⁶ and Jesus himself is truth.⁷ The words of Jesus are spirit and life,⁸ which is what the Father is.⁹ Jesus has given the Father's words to the disciples¹⁰ and they have kept it.¹¹

To believe on Jesus is to believe on him that sent him,¹² and thus to see Jesus is to see him that sent him.¹³ He has come a light unto the world,¹⁴ therefore to reject him is to reject him that sent him, and to stand under judgment.¹⁵ The words of Jesus are absolute, because they are the Father's everlasting commandments¹⁶ to him, and these are truth. They are free of all human determination.

If his disciples abide in his words then are they his disciples indeed¹⁷, and this is equivalent to abiding in Jesus or his words abiding in them.¹⁸ If they do so abide they will ask what they will and it shall be done unto them. The final indwelling is to keep his words

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. | 8:23; | 2. | 8:26; | 3. | 7:16f; cf. 12:50b; | 4. | 8:12; | | |
| 5. | 14:10; | 6. | 17:7; | 7. | 14:6; 9:14; 9. | 4:24; | 10. | 17:8; | |
| 11. | 17:6; | 12. | 8:44; | 13. | 8:45; | 14. | 8:46; | 15. | 8:47f; |
| 16. | 12:50; cf. 8:47; 14:24; | 17. | 8:31; | 18. | 15:7; | | | | |

(commandments) and abide in his love, as he keeps his Father's commandments and abides in his love;¹ for love is his new word.² If a man loves me and keeps my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode³ with him.

The words of Jesus have eternal life-giving qualities. "Thou hast the words of eternal life," is the Johannine confession of Peter.⁴ To believe in the words of Jesus is to have eternal life. "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment; but is passed from death unto life."⁵ "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death."⁶

This is the life-communicating word that speaks from God to men: from the world "above" to the world "below." Its sole mediating agency is the word that is in Jesus. He has that word of life within himself. To eat his flesh is to live.⁷ But this is the same as to believe on his word.⁸

It can be seen that the cumulative effect of what is stated in the body of the Gospel of John amounts to the same sum as the concentrated statement of the Prologue. That Jesus is the "word of God" is to be equally substantiated in the Gospel, and with the parallel statements that he is the life-giving "Bread" or "Water" or the "light" of the world. In the rest of the New Testament the "word of God" may be equivalent to "the Gospel," in the early preaching its emphasis may be on the resurrection and exaltation, in the Synoptics it may be more

1. 15:10; 2. 13:34; 3. 14:23; 4. 6:68; 5. 5:24;
6. 8:51; 7. 6:51;58; 8. 6:63;

particularly associated with the cross, as it is in St. Paul; it may be accompanied in all of them with supernatural qualities of life, but for St. John, it is the eternal, pre-existent, creative, life-giving word of incarnation. It is the word, which is the reality of God, sharing his loving eternal purpose of remedial, suffering love in and through the words and life of the historic Jesus. Whoever believes in this word has eternal life.

The complete identification of the λόγος with Jesus is also the starting point of the First Epistle of John. The readers are invited into fellowship with those who are already in fellowship with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ.¹ "And whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected"² The λογος is associated with life³ and light⁴ and love⁵ and truth,⁶ and is the word of life "which was with the Father."⁷ This "word," however, is to be identified with the historic Jesus, whose humanity was real and substantial.⁸ It is belief in this historic Jesus as the Son that gives life.⁹

Before going on to investigate the Johannine conception of the humanity of Christ, it might be advantageous to sum up what we have seen concerning his concept of Jesus as the "Word of God" in relation to background implications concerning its meaning.

It is apparent that some of John's thought is weighted with the Hellenistic form of Platonic dualism, especially in his ideas of what is $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ or $\lambda\acute{\lambda}\acute{\eta}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$. But it must be noted that John does not accept

1. 1:3; 2. 2:5; 3. 1:1 & 2; 4. Cf. 1:5ff; 5. 4:7-21;
6. 1:8;2:8;5:20; 7. 1:2; cf. 5:11; 8. 1:1; 9. 2:22f;3:
23;4:2;15;5:1;5:12f;

or build on the basic Greek concept of the natural immortality of man, and nowhere in the Greek conceptions of the λόγος is there ever any suggestion that the λόγος becomes incarnate. This is John's insistent starting point. Familiarity with Greek conceptions may have given him an entry into the religious understanding of those equally familiar with such conceptions; but for John the content of the λόγος is the historic life of Jesus described within his Gospel.

There are indications that in presenting Jesus as the λόγος, John was aware of Old Testament and associated ideas, viz, the speculations which followed on the equating of the creative word of God with the word of the Law and the prophetic word, and the Torah-Wisdom-Truth speculations of the Apocryphal and Rabbinic literature. In the rest of the New Testament there is great variation in what is understood by the term Law.¹ The New Testament term νόμος only partially covers the Old Testament $\text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ר} \text{ו} \text{ת}$. When the divine teaching of the Torah takes the form of commandments regulating conduct, and when the principle of life of the Greek concept is due to legislative enactments, they approximate. Matthew, Luke, the Acts and Hebrews generally use it in this sense. St. James uses it in the wider Greek sense, and St. Paul in the Greek Stoic sense of an inner principle of life.²

1. This is probably due to the indiscriminate use of νόμος by the LXX translators to represent Law in many Old Testament forms. See C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 32f, for a useful summary.

2. Rom. 7:23;

In the Fourth Gospel "there is no passage where the word is not used in a sense not directly derivable from the LXX use of νόμος = הַחֹק."¹ This means that the background to Johannine usage is to be found in the LXX very general approximation. The law governs the administration of justice in Jewish and Roman communities alike.² It does not condemn unheard,³ and prescribes two witnesses.⁴ It is the code of religious ordinances traceable to Moses.⁵ Elsewhere it stands for the Jewish religion as a whole.⁶

St. John finds in Jesus infinitely more than the Law could bring. This is especially to be associated with "grace"⁷ and "truth." It is very doubtful if the speculations about Law (Wisdom) was ever more than semi-personal. Even then allowance has to be made for poetic licence. It was one of the devices to bridge the gulf between the holy and profane when the utter transcendence of God was so strongly felt in post-exilic times. Within John's reference to the inferiority of the revelation of Moses⁸ and the Law, there was probably intended the "Law" in its sense as inclusive of the prophetic word and wisdom. There is a defined inferiority of the last of the prophets, John the Baptist.⁹ The prophetic mantle is not big enough for Jesus. The Spirit "abides"¹⁰ in him. Its communication is never-ceasing.¹¹ "The words which I speak unto you they are spirit and life."¹² The word of Jesus supercedes the prophetic word.

1. C. H. Dodd, *ibid*, p.38; 2. Cf. 18:31;19:7; 3. 7:51;
4. 8:17; 5. 7:19;23; 6. 1:17;7:49; 7. 1:17;
8. 1:17f; 9. Cf. Mt. 11:11; 10. 4:19;25f;29;42. See also
1:20f; Cf. 1:32 and especially 3:34; 11. 1:51; 12. 6:63;

The pre-existent life of the λόγος is anticipated partly by the Torah and wholly in respect to Torah and Wisdom. From these Old Testament and Rabbinical speculations therefore are many of the materials for a construction of the λόγος doctrine as it is presented in the Fourth Gospel. As these same materials are available to St. John as well as to Philo, it is hardly necessary to look to Philo's writings for a background for John's λόγος doctrine.¹

There is, however, the same recurring distinction between all the possible sources of the Johannine doctrine and St. John's own presentation (and this includes the Old Testament and Rabbinical sources as well as the Greek); none of these source possibilities ever gives a hint that the λόγος or $\overline{\text{דבר}}$ (Word/Wisdom) will ever become incarnate. This is John's starting point. While the Gospel pre-supposes the God who spoke creatively "at the beginning,"² who gave the Law by Moses,³ who testified to Jesus through the prophets⁴ and the Scriptures,⁵ all these features are superseded by the word of the "beloved Son" who is Jesus. There is a new creation, a new word of love, a new word of life, even Jesus Christ full of grace and truth.⁶

Within the New Testament the functions of Jewish traditional Torah-Wisdom-Word were being freely applied to Jesus, the κύριος, by St. Paul and in the Epistles to the Hebrews and of St. Peter and elsewhere. The repeated substitution of the term "word" for "Gospel" also reflects this belief. It remained but for St. John to gather up and state boldly what was already the implicit belief of the New Testament Church.

1. Cf. Hoskyns, *ibid*, p.158; 2. 1:1; 3. 1:17; 4. 12:38ff;
5. 5:39-47; 6. Redeeming love and reality;

THE HUMANITY OF JESUS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

One of the striking differences between St. John and the other Gospels is the portrait they give of the human life of Jesus. In the Synoptic records, alongside the supernatural accompaniments of his life, and within the framework of the proclaimed divinity, the humanity of Jesus is to be seen in a form much closer to our own. Jesus is moved with compassion, stirred to anger, surprised at human dullness, unaware of the future. He makes real choices and faces real temptation. He lives a similar life of trust and dependence on God as other men do. He reacts naturally and spontaneously to human life situations. In St. John, on the other hand, Jesus seems moved more by theological considerations than by human feelings. The twin pillars of his Gospel are the divinity of the pre-existent $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and his incarnation in the historic personage of Jesus. John is at pains to keep these in proper relation. To be an effective mediator Jesus must have clear status in both worlds. But for St. John the mediator has come down from the world above and his supreme qualification must rest there. His status in the higher world is his "natural" status, it is his human status that he assumes. All his human qualifications would be of no more avail than those of any other human. His divine status is primary in time, in precedence and in mediatorial value.

The truth is that Jesus' humanity was so real that we were in serious danger of missing who he really was. The whole strength of the

1. Mk. 6:34; Mt. 9:22 (cf. v. 36). 2. Mk. 7:11f. 3. Mt. 16:3. 4. Mt. 24:36; Mk. 13:32. 5. Mk. 1:12f (& pars). 6. Mt. 6:25-34. 7. Jn. 1:1f. 8. Jn. 1:11; 3:16. 9. See R.H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p. 85, cf. 1:45, 6:42; 7:27f; 8:40; 10:33; 19:5.

situation rests upon the fact that it was the Son of God whose flesh we saw. For this reason John's procedure is to establish the divine identification first, and then proceed to the incarnation. The result is that everything reported in the Gospel is read with the prior knowledge of the divine identity of the principle personage. It is this that gives absoluteness to his words and actions, and makes his judgement final for men. The cost at which this presentation is achieved is the measure of the humanity with which John portrays the historic Jesus.

The second principle which influences John's human portrayal of Jesus is his universal outlook. All Jewish national aspects are reduced to a minimum in order that the universal humanity of Jesus might appear.

This double principled approach governs the choice of John's Gospel materials and their presentation. There are some notable omissions from the Synoptic tradition. In common with St. Mark there are no birth stories. References are made in John's record by others about Jesus' native regions, his family connections and his associations with Galilee, and apparent lack of connections with David's town. Jesus, on the other hand, always insists on his divine origin, on his having been sent by the Father, about whom he claims unique knowledge, and with whom he claims to maintain intimate communion.

1.1:45f. 2.6:42;7:27. 3.7:42, cf. St. Mk. 12:25ff. 7:41. 4.6:62;8:58, cf. 8:23;8:14;14:10, also 5:43;3:17 etc. 5.3:13;6:46;10:15;14:7. 6.10:30;14:20;15:10 etc.

If these things are true certain corollaries follow. In the first place, as a divine person, Jesus obviously knows everything. He needs no instruction or information from men or about them. If he knows heaven, how can anything on earth be hidden from him? John enters into the full result of this premise. The whole course of the human enterprise of Jesus is bathed in divine knowledge. He knows where he has come from and where he is going to, and is privy to the divine counsels. He knows the end from the beginning. He will recognise "his hour" and awaits its coming. Details of the lives of others do not escape him in his pre-knowledge. He knew Nathaniel before he came to him, and can rehearse the life of a seemingly unknown Samaritan woman. He knows who will betray him and that Peter will deny him. He is not surprised by what the crowds are thinking. He knows at a distance that Lazarus is dead.

The second corollary is that Jesus never loses control of events. He makes the events and directs their courses. They do not involve a real moral choice on earth. No man taketh his life from him. He has power to lay it down, and power to take it up again. He is not arrested, he gives himself up to death. No one can pluck his sheep out of his hands. At his trial he takes the initiative and becomes the judge. His conversation with Pilate is directed at his universal and

1.8:14;16:28;17:5, cf 6:62. The background comes from 1V Ezr. 7:28;13:32, cf also Jn.1:31 & Mt.24:26. See Strack & Billerbeck, v.ii, pp.334ff. 2.3:16;12:50 etc., cf 1:29. 3.17:24. 4.2:4;12:27, cf.17:1;18:11b. 5.1:48. 6.4:17f. 7.6:68;13:38. 8.5:42. 9.11:14. 10.12:27. 11.6:51;10:11;17f;15:13. 12.18:3-8; 13.10:29. 14.18:19.

1. non-Jewish understanding. Pilate cannot escape within his national
 2. background, his authority is delegated. In the crucifixion story Jesus
 3. bears his own cross. From the cross itself he offers comfort and gives
 4. direction. He does not die, but, having accomplished his God-given task
 5. he "lays his head" and gives up the ghost. All these things stem natur-
 6. ally from his divine status, because he has life within himself.
 7.

That the life of Jesus is meant by John to be fully human is
 8. specifically stated. He is portrayed "wearied with his journey" and
 9. weeps at Lazarus' tomb, and offers prayer. His prayer is not so much a
 10. prayer, however, as a Christological statement of his own self-conscious
 11. and unbroken communion with the Father.

This emphasis on the primary divine qualification results in a picture of Jesus as a figure secure in its prescience of eternal plans and the issues of human events. He is a spectator of human lives, never involved in their fleshly weakness, their ignorance, or confronted with their moral choices. The spontaneous compassion is subordinate to divine authority. For this reason Jesus can never appear as another human king, rivalling Caesar, and put to death by Caesar's men, or a Jewish religious innovator, destroyed by bigotry. He is the eternal Son of the eternal God, taking upon himself man's flesh, and laying down his life for his friends, in order that he, who is qualified to represent the unbreakable communion of the Father and the Son in the divine world, might establish a link of love with men, that lifts them into the orbit of the divine love and life.

1.18:33-37. 2.19:11. 3.19:17. 4.19:25ff. 5.19:25ff. 6.19:30.
 7.5:26;6:57;8:12b. 8.Cf. $\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha$ as for Baptist. Something has been made by some of the lack of the article at 5:27; "a son of man". See Hebrews 1:1 & espec.4:15. 9.4:4. 10.11:34. 11.Chap.17.

This statement of the Jonannine conception of the humanity of Jesus revises the Synoptic picture at several points. There is the question of the Virgin Birth. As we have seen some have followed an attractive piece of manuscript evidence which could support a connection;^{1.} but the textual evidence does not support the claim. The best that the evidence will support is that the manner of the rebirth of the believer could possibly allude to the traditional pattern of the birth of Jesus from a Virgin, i.e. "not of bloods, nor the will of the flesh, nor the will of man,^{2.} but of God." However, John's whole statement is that Jesus was the divine Son before his birth, and that by a voluntary act which belongs to the very nature of the intimate communion of the Father and the Son in an extra-mundane life. This act belongs to that spirit which is of the very essence of divinity^{3.} itself. John incorporates the Christological substance of the Synoptic birth stories into the theology of his record, without risking the half-legendary history that is involved in^{4.} them, by asserting both the uniqueness of Jesus and the fact that he was God's Son.

John is no more content to leave the beginning of Jesus' earthly life where St Mark does at the baptism by John the Baptist, which is at-^{5.} tested in all the records including the Acts. But Mark's statement leaves the divinity of Jesus open to adoptionist interpretation. He could have

1. See previous discussion on this point in section on the Prologue, p. 228f. above. 2. Cf. also 3:3-14. 3. 4:24. 4. See C.K. Barrett, The Gospel Accd. to St. John, p. 43. 5. 13:24ff.

1.
 been a human made divine by the endowment of the spirit at his baptism.
 It is noteworthy that in John's record, in which much is said about the
 2.
 Baptist, there is no mention of the baptism of Jesus. The Spirit, more-
 3.
 over, is said to have remained on Jesus. This is because John's theology
 demanded that Jesus must be divine when he came into the world. The
 4.
 Baptist is not a god-maker, but a witness to a divinity that was already
 there. No doubt this is what Mark intended to say, but his record was
 open to another construction.

Similarly, John omits the Synoptic "temptations" as of no
 theological assistance. The theological import of them is transferred to
 the larger cosmic canvas. John is as sure as Mark that Jesus triumphs
 over the powers of evil. It is one of the matters about which he has
 5.
 prescience. But the battle with Satan is not of limited duration, nor
 entirely to be associated with the exorcism of his subordinates so prom-
 inently associated with the earlier Christian tradition. The "Prince of
 this world" has a much wider sovereignty, and is to be linked with all
 that is inimical to life itself.

Besides omitting what appear as historical facts in the Synoptic
 Gospels, John takes up and develops some of their features. The seemingly
 momentary human experiences within the "transfiguration" and "Gethsemene"
 are stripped of their this-worldly accompaniments and presented in the con-
 cept of the eternal Son. The light of glory that is always in danger of
 being misinterpreted as the experience of "heightened" humanity, appears

1.Mk.1:10. 2.1:32-4. 3.1:32. 4.3:31. 5.Cf.8:44f;12:31;14:30;16:11.

in St. John as the revelation of the continuing glory that is of the

1. essence of divinity. The human moral conflict presented in the Synoptic

2. agony in the garden, gives away in the Johannine record to the ecstasy of unremitting communion and sharing of purpose between the divine Son on

3. earth and the divine Father in heaven, which find their expression on

4. earth in the obedience of the Son.

The incidents chosen and described by John in great detail are not so much history as revelation: signs and portents of the purposes of God. In this sense they are artistic creations in which features may be omitted or added, or emphasized or re-arranged in order that the central revealing purpose may be achieved. In this process the humanity of Jesus is one of the first casualties. Je^s' relationship with his human

5. family become secondary. The death of a dear friend and the sorrow of his relations, hardly matter so much as the demonstration of the glory of

6. God in the raising of the dead. The compassionate affection for all men so much a feature of the Synoptic record, become distant in the eternal love of God that is hardly demonstrated in particular cases, unless the theological purposes of the Gospel are forwarded thereby. Comfort and care within this world are secondary compared with a place in the eternal world.

The Parousia of the early tradition is re-interpreted by St. John as being too closely linked to this world in general, and Jewish history in particular. It had no application to eternal life for all mankind;

1.1:14. 2.Mk.14:32-42 (& paras) 3.12:27-30;18:11. 4.12:49f;14:20f;
15:9f. 5.2:4. 6.11:b, cf. v.15.

but rather a Kingdom for a particular group. As time passed it became more open to misunderstanding. Within this belief also was the promise of the return of a somewhat human figure motivated by sectional human interests, and the perpetuation of a this worldly life. It is into "eternal" life that the incarnate $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is to introduce men. It is the divine life he is to mediate to all who believe. It is the life of the Spirit, which is the life of God. The Spirit belongs to the world of reality. It abides continually on Jesus and is to be found in his words. By the same Spirit men are born into the divine family. Jesus will send the Spirit to his disciples to comfort them. It will inform and sustain them continually. In the post-resurrection scene, Jesus breathes the Spirit upon the assembled group of disciples, giving them absolute regal authority to forgive sin and share the family circle of the Father.

This divine life of the Spirit requires the stimulation of no particular vision of an appearing Lord to maintain it. In fact, those who do not see and yet believe are especially blessed. Here is the contradiction involved in the incarnation, that one who should need to dwell in human flesh to reveal the divine life to men, should finally have to withdraw from the flesh, lest it deceive men concerning its own transitory nature. The stability of the flesh of Jesus was no more permanent than that of men. It is the life of the Spirit that abides.

1.4:24. For a suggestive discussion of the Paraclete passages see W.F. Howard, *ibid*, pp.74-80. 2.4:23;14:17. 3.1:33;51. 4.6:63. 5.1:13. 6.14:17f. 7.14:26. 8.20:22. 9.20:17;28. 10.20:29.

The humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is as real as a doctrine of the voluntary incarnation of the Son of God will allow it to be. It is to be considered as a "sign" of the unreal and transitory life of men into which the eternal life of reality has chosen for a time to enter in the person of Jesus, in order to mediate to those who live within it, the permanence and reality of the life of God. The Johannine portrait of the humanity of Jesus has, therefore, been reconstruced to the theological purposes of the Gospel, which is to safeguard first and foremost the unique position of the person of Jesus, by which alone his mediatorial role can be made effective, and eternal life made available to men. The humanity of Jesus, nevertheless, contains in it the symbol of the cross, by which alone men could see in human terms the everlasting love of the Son of God for men, which is also the "glory" of God, the Father.

SON OF GOD AND SON OF MAN

(a) Son of God:

As we have seen both forms of divine sonship, the corporate and the individual, spoken about in the Jewish traditions are derived, and depend upon the election of God. Nevertheless, it is to those Old Testament passages which speak of sonship with God that the early Christians first turned to explain their experience of Jesus as the Son of God, but the pre-Johannine New Testament statements show a development which make it natural to advance to a further more decisive statement.

The Petrine kerygma, influenced strongly by the resurrection, sees the exaltation of Jesus to his place of dominion as Son of God as a proof of his special Messianic relationship with God. St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews begin from this tradition, and the term "Son" becomes descriptive of Christ's place of origin, and makes valid the salvation he brings. He is God's Son, and, therefore, his actions are valid for God. His revelation has unique warrant. The Synoptic writers base their estimate of the person of Jesus, and the validity of his authority, upon the self-consciousness of Jesus, that he stood in unique filial relationship with God.

It is the stated purpose of St. John's record to awaken belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. It is not surprising then to find a frequent use of the title or its variants, and there must be added

1. See V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, pp.56f. "Son of God" five times (1:34;49;11:27;19:7;20:32). It is included in 3 sayings (5:25;10:36;11:4). "The only begotten Son" 3 times (1:14;3:16;18) "The Son" 16 times 3:vv.17,35,36(2);5:vv.19, 20,21,22,23(2), 26;6:40;8:36;14:13;17:1(2).)9:35 should probably read, Son of Man(See J.H.Bernard,ICC St. John, p.338.

to these the many times in which sonship is implied by Jesus' use of the term "Father" for God in a special way. The term "Father" is^{1.} correlative to Jesus' self designation of himself as "the Son". The records show a development in the use of the term "Father" by Jesus. It is clear that when he spoke in this way of God he was expressing more than the general universal relationship of humanity to God as Father-Creator. The evidence ranges through the whole Christian tradition. It is used in Mark(14:36), where it is obvious that Jesus is speaking under the tension of a special understanding of the purposes in which the Son and the Father are at one. We have already dealt with the important "Q" statement when the absolute uniqueness and unanimity of the Father and the Son are claimed.^{1.} In the special "M" material at Matthew 15:13 there is reference to special knowledge of the work of the Father among men. Jesus attributes St. Peter's confession to a revelation from the Father.^{3.} In 18,vv.10,14,19 and 35 Jesus claims to speak for the Father, and similar claims are made in Matthew 25:34 and 26:53. In the "L" tradition Jesus is recorded as saying^{3.} "I must be about my Father's business". He claims the same right to appoint kingdoms^{4.} as his Father possesses. In the passion narrative Jesus confidently

1. Many times whole contexts imply similar relationship.
2. Matt.16:17
3. 2:49
4. 22:29

1.
relinquishes his spirit into his Father's hands. In Luke's anticipation of the giving of the Spirit it is to be noted that the Spirit is the promise of the Father, who is spoken of in this special way in the Acts.

2.
This glance at the received-tradition references reveals all the Johannine features in incipient unexplained form; the absolutely unique unanimity of life and purpose (Mk.14:36;Mt.11:27;Lk.10:22,cf 2:49), the right to do the same work and exercise the same authority as the Father (Mt.15:13;18:10;14;19;35;25:34;26:53;Lk.22:28), the role of Intercessor and the relationship with the Spirit (Lk.23:34;24:49) and the "servant" re-interpretation of the Messianic role (Lk.22:29).

3.
John's opening use of the term Son of God serves to identify the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ - and all that is claimed for the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ with the Son who is alone in a position to reveal the Father to men, because he alone has seen him. He is the $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\varsigma$.
4.
Upon this identification the whole Gospel rests. All succeeding statements are interpretative of the person of Jesus and aimed at establishing his divine status. He is possessed of the Spirit of God.
5.
This accords both with Messianic expectation and the witness of the primitive Church, including the conclusion of Nathaniel.
6.
7.
8.

1. 23:34.
2. Lk.23:34;49,cf.Acts 2:33.
3. 1:34.
4. Used 4 times (1:14;18;3:16;18) Mention has already been made to anticipations of this conception in the Synoptics in the term "beloved"="only" & in St.Paul, "son of his love". But cf. Howard, *ibid*, pp.69f.
5. 1:33f.
6. Joel 2:28f;Is.44:3.
7. Acts 2:16; Lk.4:18,cf.Rom.5:5;Lk.3:22;4:1;Mk.1:10;12;3:16;4:1.
8. 1:49 Although the following phrase "King of Israel" possibly makes the title here no more than a Messianic reference.

The primitive Church's belief that the Son, because of his unique position, is an object of faith and has saving and judging functions, is accepted by John in the reported conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus. Believers have life; non-believers do not see life. The motive controlling the coming of the Son is stated to be the love of the Father. It is conveyed in personal terms: on the Father's side in confidence from love (3:35): on the Son's side in obedience from love (cf. 18:11).

In the second witness by John the Baptist the proof of the Son's heavenly origin, the validity of his saving functions and the unlimited nature of his authority, are related to the love of the Father for the Son, and the unbounded measure of God's Spirit that is in him. These give him the right to control all things, and to give and to withhold life.

In the incident of the Sabbath-healing of the man with a prolonged infirmity, Jesus justifies his action in words which claim in a life situation all that the Prologue asserts concerning the relationship of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ with God, and anticipates the categorical statement of complete identity made later in the Gospel. Jesus claims to be doing only what he knows the Father to be doing in whose complete confidence he is. With the Father he shares the power to raise the dead,

1.3:17f. Judgement in Johannine terms is the final response of man to the "crisis" which disposes of human destiny. 2.Cf. 1Jn.5:12, cf.2:23, 4:15. 3. 3:16, cf. pre-Johannine tradition, Rom.5:8 & 1Jn.4:2;19 & Jn.10:30;17:20-26. 4. 3:35. 5. 3:34. cf.1:51. 6, 5:19-26. F.W.Howard, *ibid*, pp.70f, says that Jesus' claim to be equal with God was equivalent to the Rabbinic idea of making himself independent of God, i.e. a rebel. Hence Jesus' answer was to establish obedience and absolute unity with God. 7. 10:36; 14:13.

1. i.e. to give life. Judgement is given to him by the Father. To
2. honour the Son therefore is to honour the Father, because they, having
life in themselves, have equal rights in the administration of life
3. (salvation) or death (condemnation). To all these things the likeness
of the works which the Son does to those of the Father bears effective
witness that the Father has sent the Son to speak in and through him.

Under the figure of the Bread of life, Jesus declares himself to
4. be the Son, who is the Bread of Life which came down from heaven.
Because the Son abides forever the freedom from sin that he gives is
5. true freedom. The charges of blasphemy made by his enemies bear neg-
ative witness to the positive claims Jesus makes concerning his relation-
6. ship with the Father. They exhibit a recognition on the part of the
Jewish authorities that Jesus' claims held more than Messianic import.
7. It was the practical demonstration of the life he had in himself at the
raising of Lazarus that caused the authorities to take radical action.
He is the resurrection and the life, because he is "the Christ, the Son
8. of God, which should come unto the world." The glory he exhibits as
9. the Son is the glory of the Father. If you have seen one you have seen
the other. It is a glory shared in pre-existent unity between the
10. Father and the Son. Because of who he is, the Son has the power to
mediate life to believers by incorporating them within the unity of
the Father and the Son.

1.14:22. 2.14:24. 3.14:26. 4.6:40 and context. 5.8:35ff, cf. "Son" &
"Son of Man" seem interchangeable here. So in the whole Gospel. See
C.K.Barrett, pp.58ff, re the relation with the Synoptic titles. 6.10:35f;
19:7. 7.11:4. 8.11:27f. 9.14:13. 10.17:5;24.

From these references, explicit and implied, it can be seen that for St. John Jesus is Son of God in the fullest meaning of the title. He is not a human being adopted or anointed with divinity, or to whom divinity is ascribed by men for services rendered, nor has he achieved it himself as an historic personage. He brought it with him. He is in possession of unlimited measure of the Spirit of God, who is himself Spirit. He has the essence of divine life within himself and can mediate it to others in his own right. The destinies of men are in his hands, as though they were dealing with God's very self.

What is equally important for John is that the Son is now present in human form, to love and be loved, to give himself in time, as the Father gives himself eternally. Therefore he is of surpassing significance to men. To receive him is life, and not to receive him is not to live.

John's claim for Jesus as the Son of God is practical rather than speculative identity with God. On the one side his sonship may involve a speculative metaphysical relationship with the Father, with whom he inhabits eternity; but it is through the moral quality of obedience that men come to see the Father in Jesus the Son. The Son reproduces only what he sees the Father doing. To see the Son at "work" is to see the Father. This means that the Son, as identified with the Father, is obedient to the essential Spirit which is the nature of both. Phrases like being "sent by the Father" etc. are to be read as indicative of the

1. cf. 5:19-31 & Jn. 5:12. 2. 5:14; 14:12. 3. In its widest references.

taken the words "Son of God" at their face value, because the power of the resurrection had proven it to be a fact. In this he had been anticipated by the Petrine Kerygma.¹ The Synoptics linked the title with Jesus' own unique filial consciousness, which is the climax of the entire Synoptic portrayal.

St. John takes up this very point at the opening of his Gospel. Confession of faith in Jesus as the Son of God is a pre-supposition to the understanding of the Gospel at all. He approaches the life of Jesus through the doctrine of the *λόγος* from the divine side. He finds the title "Son" most satisfying to carry over into the bulk of his work what he wishes to say concerning the "being" of Jesus in his relation with God.² It becomes the vehicle for expressing the co-eternal and co-equal nature of Jesus with God, and the deep personal relationship of love and purposive mission shared by both of them. The fact of the sonship of Jesus gives an ontological meaning to his mediatorship. He is not only mediator as redeemer, but also because of his divine nature. The spiritual insight of St. John has been ratified by time in that the title "Son of God" has found an abiding place in the Christological terminology of the Church. It abides because of the truth in fact of what the words actually say. The Church of New Testament times found all that they had come to associate with divine being true about Jesus and ratified in the resurrection.

1. Cf. Rom. 1:1-3. 2. In the Names of Jesus, Vincent Taylor lists 70 titles used in the N.T. alone, in its attempt to assess and report the significance of Jesus.

(b) Son of Man:

There are twelve clear references to the Son of Man in the
1.
fourth Gospel and one probable reference. They fall into two
categories. Six of them deal with the earthly manifestation and
exaltation of the Son of Man, and the remainder are connected with
the special Johannine interpretation of the passion.

(1) The Earthly Manifestation of the Son of Man.

John introduces the statement "Hereafter ye shall see heaven
open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of
Man" The first thing to be said about this usage is that it is one
2.
of an enumeration of titles, with which John, at the outset of his
Gospel links his work with the "received" tradition. The Son of
God stresses Jesus' relationship to the Father, the "king of Israel"
title relates him to the chosen people of Israel and its Messianic
tradition, but the "Son of Man" links Jesus to mankind in general.
While locating Jesus upon earth, these titles point back to super-
3.
natural origins of the Synoptic records.

The choice of this title in this text directs attention to the
glace of revelation in the visible person of the historical Jesus,
in whom the eternal $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is incarnate. It involves the "scandal"
4.
of the incarnation, and veils the Johannine "secret" (revealed to
those who believe, but hidden from unbelievers), that the flesh of
this earthly figure hides the Son of God. He is linked with

1.1:51;3:13;14;5:27;6:27;15;62;8:28;12:23;34a;34b;13:31. Cf.9:35, See
Bernard, *ibid*, p.338, Hoskyns, *ibid*, p.414. V. Taylor, *Names of Jesus* p.30.
2.1:41;45;49. 3.Cf. Mk.8:31; Mt.16:13f. 4.Cf. R. Bultmann, *The Theo-
logy of the N.T. (Amer. ed.)* V.2, par.50. Johannine faith is the overcoming
of the offence raised by a man who claims, without being able to make
it credible to the world, that God is encountering the world in him.

universal mankind in bearing their flesh, but is linked with God in sonship, and is thus able to form a bridge of communication between them. In this sense this verse is descriptive of the entire ministry of Jesus. It is illustrated by an allusion to Scripture as to fact, but is distinguished from it in relation to its continuity. At the head of Jacob's ladder stood the Lord renewing his promises. John's main point is the continuity of communication being now set up between earth and heaven. How much more is being conveyed depends whether the angels in the Genesis story are descending on Jacob or the ladder. In the former case Jesus is being substituted for a person, in the latter for a ladder. In both cases he is becoming a permanent means of communication between earth and heaven.

In the story of the blind man, if the Son of Man title is preferred, it will be seen that the title takes its place in a gradation of references to Jesus. He is referred to consecutively as "a man called Jesus" (9:11), a "prophet" (9:17), "of God" (9:33), "Son of Man" (9:35) and "Lord" (9:36). This title stands between references to men, and to the divine Lord, who is to be worshipped. As "Son of Man" Jesus is the point of illumination for the "blind". To see him as the "Son of Man" is to worship him as Lord.

1. See C.K. Barrett, *ibid*, p.156. If any point attaches to these findings of N.T. scholarship, John's substitution of "Son of Man" for a possible "Jacob" of the ancient text, may be his way of introducing the corporate conceptions of the title. Jacob, often the rep. of ancient Israel, and now Christ, the representative of the new Israel.

(2) The Exalted Origin of the Son of Man.

In his discourse with Nicodemus it is revealed that the source of Jesus' authority is that he came down (ὁ καταβῆς) from heaven, as in the Prologue the λόγος is described as being with God and then becoming flesh. This is further guaranteed by the fact that he is now "in heaven", a statement made editorially by John from the stand-point of the post-resurrection, and with the totality of the Gospel in view. Having come from God he is able to speak in a unique way about "heavenly things".^{2.}

In this Nicodemus story Jesus' authority is vested in the fact of his *κατάβας*. In the reference at 5:27, in addition to the reiteration of the Son having life in himself, a further feature of the authority of the Son of Man is introduced. He is invested with "judgement" by the Father "because he is a son of man". Great point has been made of the lack of the article here; but, if the operative idea comes from Daniel, which seems likely, there is no article in the LXX version of Daniel 7:13. Moreover, the uniqueness of the personification concerned is clear enough without having the article to define it. That someone more than a man is being referred to is fairly clear when it is remembered that judgement is linked with the Son-of-Man references in both Daniel and Enoch.^{3.}

1. A phrase missing from some Alex. mss, perhaps accidentally. See Hoskyns, *ibid*, pp. 235ff, also note the frequent use of Ps. 110:1 in the prim. tradition. 2. Cf. Jn. 1:18; 7:29; 8:29, cf. Mt. 11:27. 3. Enoch 48-73.

This may be sufficient explanation for John's whole reference, but knowing his frequent use of ambiguity, it is not unnatural to suppose that here John is emphasizing the humanity of the Son of Man as a basis for his judgement.

This view would not be difficult to support both in John and in other parts of the New Testament, where much is made of Jesus' human obedience to his God-given assignment in the flesh as a basis for his exaltation and judgement. The second point follows from this. The experience of Jesus as a man gives him the necessary understanding to be judge of men. The final judgement is not to be thought of in terms of the supernatural mythical world under the jurisdiction of a mysterious transcendent figure; but here and now, in the attitude of men to the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, whose very presence judges the world. In this manner John retains the eschatological tradition, but links it to the statement that the Son of Man, who is the $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, has become flesh. In fact John makes this statement the basis of judgement. The "scandal" of the cross has become the "scandal" of the incarnation. This accords with the specifically Johannine thesis. It is at the point of acceptance of the humanity of the Son of Man in Jesus, that judgement takes place. The corporate judgement of the Son of Man (equals the "Saints") may also fill up the background of this statement.

1. Cf. John 5:23;30;37;43;6:38f;8:25, cf. Phil.2:6-9; Heb.2:16ff; Acts 17:31. 2.8:15f;9:35. 3.1:12;3:18;6:29;51;65. Cf. behind the sacramental reference 6:53 stands the basic fact of the acceptance of the "flesh and blood" of the Son of Man.

(3) The Son of Man and the Passion of Jesus.

We have seen how in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus chose this less known Messianic title to bear the burden of the re-interpretation he put upon the role of Messiah which he intended to play. St. John makes even greater point for the re-interpretation by the strong link he gives the title with the passion of Jesus. He begins by associating the title with the ambiguous phrase "being lifted up". This phrase takes up the Prologue conception of glory, and introduces into the conception of the Son of Man the Isaianic ideas of the "Servant". By substituting the pronoun "I" for the title Son of Man, John links the person of Jesus with the reconstructed Messianic-Servant role.

The movement in this development is skilfully made by John. He first links the "lifting up" of the Son of Man with the "lifting up" of the serpent by Moses in the wilderness. At first sight this "lifting up" appears to follow the traditional Old Testament lines in which a final exaltation succeeds a certain experience of humbling of the people of God. It is God's vindication of his people or his "servant". This idea can be paralleled within the New Testament. At this stage no further explanation is given except perhaps by the hint in the use of the word "stake".

The references in Chapter 6 seem to contain all the especially Johannine features. In particular 6:53 can hardly be expounded
1. 3:14. 2. Acts 2:33; 5:31; Phil. 2; Lk. 14:11 (cf. 10:35; 18:14)
1 Pet. 5:6; Jas. 4:10.

without reference to central Christological doctrines of the Gospel. The acceptance of the "flesh and blood" of the historic Jesus as being the material, visible and unique earthly manifestation of the heavenly Son of Man, is insisted upon as the first step in salvation. The contrast between the limited benefits derived from eating the historic manna, and the life-giving results from eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Jesus introduces in a sacramental context the Servant notion that Jesus' flesh and blood were given "for the life of the world". For the first time it is clearly stated that the death of Jesus involves the redemptive work he came to do. His heavenly origin and mission from the Father give his sacrifice added significance. Those who eat his flesh and drink his blood partake of his spirit which is life, and a mutual indwelling is set up which brings the life of God to the believer. But this is to be understood in terms of ascension and incorporation along with him. These statements of Jesus bring on the dilemma which puts the world in judgement. The acceptance of a suffering Messiah proves beyond some of his followers, but his disciples confess their belief. All succeeding references to the Son of Man develop this "Servant" conception, and uncover the developing dilemma and judgement of the world.

1.6:27&62. Cf. also the Hebrew phrase "flesh & blood" equals man i.e. a man's life. (Mt.16:17;Gal.1:16;Eph.6:12;Heb.2:14) 2.6:51 See C.H.Dodd According to the Scriptures, pp.81&92 claims that practically every verse in Is.52:13-53:12 is to be found in quotation in the N.T., and in all sections of the primitive tradition. 3.Only those who know the secret have seen the anticipation in 1:29. 4.6:62 etc. 5.6:54ff. 6.Cf.4:24 God is Spirit. 7.6:62. 8.6:60;66;68.

In the context of the claim of Jesus to be the Light of the World,^{1.} the Son of Man title again makes its appearance. It is a discussion about the identification and origin of Jesus, which is concluded by a prophecy of Jesus that he will be recognised "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man." This lifting up of the Son of Man will reveal his divine origin, that he is the "I Am". The ambiguity of the phrase "lifted up" now becomes pressing. It involves the dilemma of the dying Messiah.^{3.} Despite the temporary eclipse of the Old Testament Son of Man, his final triumph was never in doubt. The Apostle John considers the use of ὑψῶν quite appropriate to the revelation that is taking place before men in the passion events of the life of Jesus. It is probably intentionally enigmatical. If taken in the sense of John 3:12-15 it could mean the ^{ascend-} ~~divers~~ of Christ from τὰ ἄνω to τὰ κάτω, but this is precluded by the second person plural form. The only way in which "ye" (the Jews) could have taken responsibility for Christ's ascension would have been by their responsibility for his death, and therefore for his ascension. Rather is it the "scandal" of the incarnation in its most pressing form: the belief that the historic Jesus upon a cross is Son of Man.

1. See also 8:24. 2. All the Old Testament ⁷⁷⁷ revelation must now be considered relevant back-reference. It is always to be related to the revelation at the Exodus, from which time, within the defined Israelitish group, belief in Yahweh was the first and sufficient guarantee of his word. 3. 12:34.

Jesus is to be recognised by the final sign of his exaltation to be the I AM. The implication is that the name of God, which is the symbol and nature of his being and character, is the unity of the Father and the Son, which finds its finest expression on the
1.
cross.

The importance John places upon the universality of the Gospel
2.
is seen when certain Greeks are brought to him. Here in embryo is the completed task of Christ. His "hour" has come. Any ambiguity regarding the role of suffering he must accomplish must now be swept away. Only if a corn of wheat falls into the ground and dies can it
3.
bring forth fruit. This same suffering must be the mark of disciple-
4.
ship. This is the glory with which he will glorify the name of the Father. Jesus receives verification of this role by a voice from heaven, which is variously understood by the by-standers. For Jesus it is the hour of victory over the "prince of this world", and the hour of the world's judgement. It is at this moment that he is prepared to fully identify himself with the Son of Man; "And I, if I be lifted
5.
up from the earth will draw all men unto me." That the meaning of being "lifted up" was now fully understood is shown by the comments of those who stood by, and by the editorial comment. To prefer any
6.
other light than this is to prefer darkness.

1. See C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 93-95, 345, 349f & 377, concerning the streams of Old Testament tradition behind this phrase, and the equations that are to be worked out from them.

2. 12:20. 3. 12:24, 4. 12:25, cf. Mt. 10:39; Lk. 14:26. 5. 12:32.
6. Cf. 12:36-50.

This new role of remedial, suffering love is not something to be patiently born in order to win through to glory, but is the glory of the Father who has sent him. It is in the intimate circle of his disciples at the Last Supper that Jesus sees, in his betrayal by Judas, the on-rushing events which are to reveal the surpassing "glory" of the Son of Man, which is the glory of God himself. The love motive behind the sacrifice of himself is laid upon the disciples as a new commandment.

The full range of Son of Man references is now before us. They are first expressed by reference to usages on several levels in the Old Testament, but centre in man as he recognizes his creatureliness in the presence of the holiness which is God. From thence the title is caught up into Apocalyptic speculations of late Judaism, and concentrated in a supernatural figure, who is linked with certain forms of Messianic expectation.

In Hellenistic circles the conception involved the idea of the Heavenly Man, archetype of the earthly man. In the Synoptic records Son of Man was the self-designation of Jesus into which he concentrated his specifically new teaching about his mission to his disciples.

It is with all these things in mind that any review of St. John's references must be undertaken. John shows an astonishing awareness of the historical references. The Son of Man that is both a human figure and a divine figure is important to St. John. It is in the Old Testament, a son of man in Ezekiel and the Psalms and a Son of Man 1. 3:16; 12:25f.

in Daniel, who is also linked in solidarity with the Saints of new Israel. It is the acceptance of this double identity that is important. Those who abide in him as son of man, and accept his double identity, will abide in him as Son of Man, who also abides^{1.} in the Father in heaven. By their belief and incorporation in the Son of Man believers will not come into judgement.^{2.} They will be included in redemption, and excluded from judgement, by their acceptance of Jesus as the Son of Man.^{3.} In this doctrine John has been anticipated to some extent by St. Paul's conceptions of Christians finding their eternal existence "in Christ", especially in his references to the "first" Adam and the "heavenly man". In taking up the Synoptic teaching of Jesus about the suffering of the Son of Man, John makes it clear that he is not talking about dominion after suffering patiently born, but dominion wrought by suffering, or rather suffering which is dominion, God's dominion and glory.

The term Son of Man is therefore not dominated by its history, but given new content by the life and death of Jesus. Dominion and glory are reinterpreted as humility and service. Jesus draws men into commitment that amounts to total subjection, not by overmastering power, but by self-sacrificing love, as a shepherd his sheep, or a man his friends. He rules by love. The solidarity of his sonship with God, and his community with men, lifts mankind into his own divine life of love, which is also the life of God.

1.15:9f. 2.3:17f, cf. 1Jn. 4:15;5:5;12. 3.6:53ff.

THE "GLORY" OF GOD

It is hardly possible to consider many of the concepts of St. John's Gospel in isolation. They bear in on one another, and, by their combinations, mutually modify and define one another's meanings. They are sometimes deliberately brought into relation for the express purpose of re-interpreting the currently accepted meaning of some term. This is so concerning the re-interpretation of the concept of "glory" in so far as Jesus may be said to reveal the glory of God. On its metaphysical side, glory involves the concepts of light and life, and, on its ethical side, grace and truth. Subsidiary involvements include the relation of light to the idea of judgement, and the emergence of grace as love, and the fact that the life and grace of God have expressed themselves in the provision of a way of salvation for men. This "way" concept has to do primarily with the functions rather than the person of Jesus Christ.

(a) Background to Glory.

In his Prologue John claims that no man has seen God at any time, but that the "only begotten Son" has revealed his glory to men. We have seen how the word $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ became important because it was the Greek word chosen by the LXX translators to render the Hebrew $\כבוד$ (aramaic $\ܕܘܒܪܐ$). In its Greek etymology $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ could mean reputation and carries the idea of distinction and honour, and therefore held a particular appropriateness in translating the Hebrew $כבוד$.

While many of the Old Testament associations of the glory of God were on its metaphysical side, and represent an attempt to see the actual

presence of the divine majesty, its later associations were more of an ethical and spiritual character concerned in the revelation of the reputation or character of God.

Although Yahweh is lifted high above the earth, he is not an abstraction. He has a personal life and a "human" form in that his bearing is described anthropomorphically. His glory is closely linked with his name or reputation among men. When the concept of glory is applied to God it has a double reference. It applies to the existence of the glory of God itself, but it also involves the feeling it engenders within the worshipper by the presence of that glory. These two features, the being, character or reputation of what God is, and his involvement with men, seem to be basic to an understanding of the Old Testament conception of glory. Yahweh and his sanctuary are Israel's glory, and, conversely, Israel is Yahweh's glory before the nations. He has created them and called them by his name. Along with his power and glory in creation and nature Israel represents a specially selected and concentrated example of his power and activity in history. When Yahweh lifts up his people before the nations he sanctifies himself. Israel learned to trust in Yahweh because his name was involved in her success or failure. It follows that the figures representative of Israel stand in the same relation to Yahweh's

1.Ex.31:17. 2.Cf.Gen.1:26f.Ez.1:26ff. 3.Is.63:1-6;Dt.33:26;Hab.3:8,cf Gen.11:7. 4.See E.Jacob,ibid,p.32. 5.Cf Jacob,ibid,pp.79f, J.Pedersen, ibid,pp.614ff. 6.Is.43:7;Ez.36:23. 7.Pss.19:2;134:31;138:5;Ez.39:21. 8.Ez.20:41;28:25;38:14;35:27. 9.Num.14:11ff.Ps.79;Jer.14:7-9 etc.

glory or reputation before the world. It is for this reason that the Israelites can speak with such confidence about the ultimate exaltation of the Messiah, Son of Man or Servant etc. On the other hand, we have seen how the presence of the glory of God underlines man's sense of creatureliness and transitoriness, and makes total claims upon him which he cannot ignore, but to which he must respond. The glory of God therefore stands for the sum total of the qualities that make up the essential nature of God, possessed in his holy right and revealed voluntarily to men. When it becomes revealed, it creates in men a feeling and sense of majesty and splendour, that leaves no doubt in their minds of the difference of category between the human and divine orders of existence. In the presence of the glory of God man cannot but obey.

Associated with the manifestation of glory are the concepts of life, light as the essence of deity, faithfulness as judgement and mercy, and redemption. Within the later development of these Hebrew conceptions, and within their use within the Greek terms of the Hellenistic language, several equations must be born in mind.

1. See Is. 6. 2. Πηχ (Faithfulness) = ἀλήθεια (reality), Judgement is expressed in terms of the demands of righteousness, and mercy in terms of grace and love, and salvation is connected with the notion of the "Way".

(b) Life.

The terms "life" and "eternal life" had become technical in later Judaism, when they referred to the coming age which stands outside the time series as distinct from this age, and carries also the qualitative distinction implied in the word eternal. This contrast between the two ages is always in the background of the New Testament. In the Synoptic record it stands behind the concept of the Kingdom of God; that kingdom which gets its distinctiveness from the fact that it is God's. He alone can effect its coming, and it is as permanent and unpreventable in its coming as God himself is thought to be.

The claim of the Synoptic writers was that the presence of Jesus is equivalent to the coming of the Kingdom of God. The powers of the "Age to come" were upon him. This means that eternal life was in him and available to men. He brings life to men by laying down his own life, on the principle that to give life away is to find it. In the Acts, Jesus is described as the "Prince of Life", and for St. Paul Christ is the bringer of life. To say "for me to live is Christ" is another way of saying "Christ is life to me".

It is John's main purpose to represent Jesus as the life-bringer, and his first aim is to prove that Jesus has this life within himself by right of his divine nature. In his first reference to "eternal life" there stands the parallel phrase Kingdom of God. Although they may not

1. On this Jesus bases his authority. He is possessed with the powers of the Kingdom. Cf. Lk. 11:20 (Mt. 12:28). 2. Mk. 10:30. 3. Mt. 19:16; 25:46; Mk. 10:17 etc. 4. Mk. 10:25. 5. Lk. 8:35. 6. 3:15 cf maybe "Author" or "Pioneer". 7. Rom. 7:17f; 6:4; 8:2; 8:10; Gal. 2:20 etc. 8. Phil. 1:20.

be exact equations their essential content is the same. The Kingdom is given by God, because of his mercy and grace. Outside the Kingdom men perish. Both the Kingdom and Eternal Life find their present reality in Jesus, but will find a larger consummation later. Present salvation, either as membership of the Kingdom, or as participation in Eternal Life, is a pen-ultimate stage.

In John his miracles are "signs" of the presence of this different order of life within him. They display the glory which is the life
1.
of God and therefore, unrestricted in its reference. Jesus knows where
2.
his life comes from and whither it tends. There is a very real sense in which the entire Gospel of St. John is about "life" in this divine eternal category. All other conceptions are but figures by which he claims sole possession of it for Jesus. He then goes on to demonstrate how Jesus can mediate this "life" to men.

(i) Life as Light.

We have seen how light was one of the categories under which the Greeks conceived of deity, and how, in the Old Testament, a restricted reference to the association of God with light is to be found, which later developed into a light-darkness dualism, possibly in the Persian period. The New Testament enters into this inheritance more particularly on its Old Testament side. The light-darkness dualism is a common descriptive
3.
figure for the life of the two moral kingdoms of good and evil. Satan's
4.
powers are powers of darkness. The machinations of evil powers are works

1. John 3:2f, cf vv. 15 & 16 and 2:11. 2. 5:20; 7:29; 8:14; 23:36.
3. Lk. 22:53. 4. Col. 1:13.

1. of darkness, and perdition is conceived of as outer darkness, i.e. out
2. from the presence of God.

Paul thinks of believers and non-believers as belonging
3. to the respective worlds of light and darkness. Satan can only pose as
4. an angel of light. On the other side Christians are called out of dark-
5. ness into Christ's "marvellous light". The disciples are described by
6. Jesus as the lights of the world, and children of light, and Christians
7. as "saints in light". St. Paul's description of the coming of Christ is
8. as "the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of
9. God....." On another occasion he says, "For God who commanded the light
10. to shine out of darkness, hath shined in your hearts, to give the light of
11. knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Paul expressly
denies the effectiveness of the light of the law.

In the context of the judgement of the Queen of the South and
12. the men of Nineveh, Jesus associates himself with light and moral discrim-
ination as reported in the Gospel of Luke. Behind the experience of the
transfiguration of Jesus, described in the Synoptic Gospels, there are
associations which must have influenced the New Testament writers towards
13. the acceptance of light as a symbol of the divine life. It is also
probable that the record of the darkness which enveloped the earth at the

1. Rom. 13:12; Eph. 5:11; 1 Cor. 15:50; 2 Pet. 2:4; 17. 2. Mt. 8:12; 22:12; 25:30. 3. 2 Cor.
4:14. 4. 1 Cor. 11:14. 5. 1 Pet. 2:9. 6. Mt. 5:14; 16:6; 22. 7. Lk. 16:8; Eph.
5:8; 1 Thess. 5:5. 8. Col. 1:12. 9. 2 Cor. 4:4 (put in a negative way)
10. 2 Cor. 4:6, cf. Eph. 5:8-14 and St. Paul's conversion experiences (Acts 9:3;
22:9-11) 11. Rom. 2:17-24. 12. Mt. 13:44
13. cf. Mk. 9:2-8 "white like snow"; Luke: "white and glistening", Mt. "white
as light" cf. 1 Tim. 6:16.

time of the crucifixion is meant to indicate the temporary eclipse of
 1.
 the light of the world. This may be one of the very points taken up by
 2.
 St. John when he describes the light as never having been mastered.

In his detailed examination of the New Testament background to
 3.
 the conception of Christians as "Sons of Light", E.G. Selwyn concludes
 that the same moral abstentions are called for as those associated with
 the Day of the Lord in the Old Testament. The same approaching eschato-
 logical crisis is posed as the motive behind the figure. He feels that
 the light-darkness theme of 1 Peter has intervened to make the eschato-
 logical motive less direct, and to give it a new experience of a new
 meaning. The fear of imminent Judgment is replaced by
 4.
 spiritual order here and now already begun. In the light of his investi-
 gations Selwyn assigns the light theme to the first baptismal formula, and
 regards it as marking an important stage in the realisation of the Lord's
 eschatology. That Jesus belongs to the world of light not only marks the
 transfiguration experience, but also the fact that the angels at the re-
 4.
 surrection are bathed in light, St. Paul's meeting with the risen Lord is
 in terms of light, and the predictions of the Parousia include the same
 5.
 figure.

These light corollaries seem to have been taken up more fully
 in the traditions that have come down to us from the Ephesian stream of

1. Lk. 23:44. 2. 1:5. 3. The Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 375-82. 4. Mt. 28:3;
 Lk. 24:4, cf. Lk. 16:5, Acts 12:7 and Eph. 5:14. 5. Lk. 17:24.

New Testament literature. In the Apocalypse there is interchangeable reference concerning the responsibility of God and "the Lamb" for the lighting of the New Jerusalem, and the first Epistle of John describes God categorically as Light.

From this investigation of pre-Johannine light references, it would appear that early Christians took up Old Testament fulfilment conceptions, which carried over to them the figure of light as associated with God's Messiah. Jesus himself, and they, were influenced by the current background light-darkness moral dualism as expressive of the Kingdoms of God and of Satan respectively. The New Testament writers conceived of Christ as coming from the world of light, to bring light to men, and, by his resurrection and ascension, returning to that same world of light. Meantime, Jesus has recruited his disciples to the side of light, and imposed upon them the mission of carrying that light to the rest of the world. If Selwyn is right, the bringing to the fore of this light tradition began the refining of the early eschatology of the Christian faith, especially in respect to the concept of judgement.

John enters into the full implications of these statements. God's world is the world of light. It is descriptive of his essential life. Jesus the incarnation of the divine $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is the only one possessed of light by nature. The Baptist could only bear witness to the light.

1. Rev. 21:23, cf. 22:5. 2. 1 John 1:5-7; 2:9f also Eph. 1:12; 5:14.
3. Jn. 1:4f. 4. 1:6.

1.
 Jesus is engaged in the great pushing back of the "Dark". Nothing can stop this work that he, the light, is doing. He ^{as light,} simply goes on shining. He is the true light, and is coming into the world to give that light to 2. men. Upon their reception of the light their ultimate destiny is decided. The final sin is to have seen the light and preferred the Dark. This choice of light is to be described as recognising the truth and doing it. 3. 4. The truth so revealed is the truth of God which enables believing men to 6. escape death and judgement, and to become the sons of God. This truth is embodied in Jesus' words, and in himself. 7. In Old Testament times the light of truth was associated with the Torah. John's claim is that the 8. only illumination adequate to the salvation of men is Jesus. He dwells with the Father in light and therefore partakes of true light himself. This links John's conceptions with Greek conceptions of reality; but John parts company with the Greeks in his contention that Jesus only has the true light. Man has no light in himself. Men must be born of God. Moreover the Greek conceptions are stronger on their metaphysical side than on the moral side. It is in the Old Testament that the three basic New Testament elements are found. Light is the life activity of God, it is connected with his saving mission for men, and it has a strong moral emphasis.

On its mission plane, under the conception of the Servant, the

1.1:5. 2.1:9;cf.8:12;9:5. 3.3:19f;8:20f, cf.1:14. 4.3:21. 5.8:20f; 20f;12:49. 6.8:51,cf.8:30. 7.12:35;40. 8.1:14;18;3:13.

Old Testament conception of sacrificial, remedial suffering is also to be associated with the light which lightens the Gentiles. This conception holds two important Johannine features, its universal scope, and its association with Isaiah's concept of suffering. It is in connection with his figure of light that St. John undertakes his final elucidation of glory as the suffering of Jesus upon the cross. Knowledge of this fact is the real illumination of the life of God for men. Under this light the world is judged. The ultimate judgement upon men is shown in their attitude to the light God has sent into the world. This judgement is a self-judgement.

(ii) Light and Judgement.

The idea of Judgement in the history of Israel was not quite parallel with modern forensic terms; nor is it to be wholly conceived of in terms of doom. The ~~6000~~of God is a divine act of grace in keeping with the revealed character of God. There is always a strong connection between the moral discipline of Yahweh and his love for his people. His wrath is an expression of his love. The use of forensic terms in relation to God means that, if he were arraigned before a court of law, he would be utterly blameless. His acts would stand the utmost scrutiny.

Justice in the Old Testament means God's justice, and can never be separated from him. All precedents were decided by divine lot, or by

1. 12:23-50. 2. Cf. J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Penguin classics, 1950, p. 126. 3. See H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, p. 04f.

prescribed oracular forms, and were associated with the word of God.

There is no necessity in Hebrew justice. God is his own necessity, and justice is what he wills for such is his character. Israel could appeal to God as guardian of justice. The righteousness of the Old Testament does not impose itself "with the immutability inherent in ideas; but in a living person". The Judge more than declares men innocent or guilty, he establishes them in the right way. When performed by Yahweh, judgements always conform to the rule; they are right, and attain their end, which is the establishment of his Kingship. As a representative of God, the king was responsible to God for the well-being of his people, and his judgements were expected to take on the quality of divine justice.

The corresponding Greek word for ~~שׁוּ~~ was κρίνειν, which means to discriminate. It is in this sense that St. John uses the word when he seeks to safeguard his presentation from the solely negative aspects of judgement. This probably comes from the Ephesians suggestion, especially in view of John's statement of the self-condemnation of those who prefer the darkness to the light. The light and life of Jesus' words are not accepted, and this carries an anticipatory judgement, which is seen in its most glaring form in the passion and the cross. The indication is that the great paradoxical problem of the origin of evil within a monotheistic belief, must be answered in some such method, i.e. must depend on the

1. Lam. 1:11-20; 20:13ff. 2. Cf. E. Jacob, *ibid*, pp. 95f. 3. C. H. Dodd, *the Interp. of the 4th Gospel*, p. 210, does not find this sense in the Hebrew; but cf. Snaith, *ibid*, p. 74 (Zech. 7:9). 4. Cf. 3:17; 8:15; 12:47. 5. 5:8-14. 6. 12:40-50. 7. 12:31.

moral choice of men in the presence of things that are moral in themselves. Poetically, this finds expression in the light-darkness conceptions. It is one of the contributions of the eighth century prophets, that the nature of the holiness of God is associated with righteousness, and that the bias of righteousness favours the "poor". It goes beyond justice. This kind of "righteousness" is the ^{1.} ~~1)~~ ¹⁾ ~~1)~~ of God, in which there are two streams, judgement and mercy.

^{2.} Bishop Westcott sees judgement in St. John as an authentic and final declaration of the state of man in relation to God. The contradictory element in the Johannine statement is more apparent than real. Judgement ^{3.} ^{4.} is first said to be self-judgement, and then said to rest with the Son. In the first place there is no need for Jesus to pronounce judgement.

Men have seen the light, and have chosen darkness. They are without ^{5.} excuse. Their judgement is immediate. On the other hand, judgement is with the Son in so far as men have seen him, the Light of the World, in ^{6.} the flesh, and have not believed. To have believed would have freed them ^{7.} of judgement. They have seen the light, and persisted in the darkness. But God's mercy is shown in that they may still believe and see and escape self-judgement.

This Johannine conception of self-judgement further refines the

1. See N.H. Snaith, *ibid.*, pp. 51f. 2. *ibid.*, p. cviiif. 3. 3:17; 19; 12:47f. 4. 5:22; 27; 9:39; 8:27; 8:15; 5:30. 5. 5:22. 6. 5:27. 7. 5:24, cf. 8:18; 8:46.

Synoptic Parousia judgement scenes. By the use of the light figure, it lifts the idea of Judgement out of the particular national setting, and expresses it in more universal terms. It makes an anticipatory judgement here and now that is valid for all time, because the judgement of the Light of the World, which is the Light of God himself, becomes God's sovereign act of Judgement, which is "right" or "true".

1.

In discussing the office of the Paraclete to convict, C.K.Barrett says ἐλάττω here means "to expose", or "bring to the light of day": in the presence of God's holy act of judgement. It means that in Christ men are judged as they were in the Old Testament, where judgement annihilates,
2.
but also lifts up. But the judgement is sharpened by the character of God revealed in Jesus Christ. Men are judged by the love which sent Christ down, and by the glory of the cross.

1. *ibid*, p.70. 2. Cf. Is.6.

OTHER LIFE FIGURES(a) Living Water.

What gives the water its special significance in St. John's record is that it is a well of "living" water springing up into "ever-
 1. lasting life". When we read, "I am the bread of Life" as a correlative of "he that cometh after me shall never hunger", we can presume also an implied "I am the Water of Life" as correlative of "he that believeth on
 2. me shall never thirst". It is probably implicit in the phrase "living
 3. water" in its close relation to "everlasting life". This is another life figure containing all the features of the "life" theme. Jesus is the unique source of the living water. It has everlasting qualities. To drink is equivalent to believing on Jesus.

Inclosed as it is between baptism references and a discussion on
 4. the "Spirit" nature of the Godhead,
 5. the possibility is that it would be understood as a reference to the water of baptism, and the accompanying gift of the Spirit. This gives the figure additional breadth, and it receives support from the statement elsewhere, "he that believeth in me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of water". The editorial comment is "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that
 6. believe on him were to receive...." In the context also of 6:35 there is a likely reference to Christ's reception of the anointing of the Spirit in
 7. the phrase "For him the Father, even God, hath sealed". Birth from above

1.6:35. 2.6:35. 3.Jn.4:10, of 14. 4.4:1 5.4:20-26. 6.7:37ff.
 7.6:27.

is also under the dual operation of water and the Spirit. If all these
 above inferences are correct, Jesus is actually saying, I am the living
 Spirit, which is the essence of the life of God, and the only one through
 whom that Spirit can be mediated to men. The words of Jesus are also
 said to be both spirit and life. To believe in Jesus is to become poss-
 essed of "Spirit". It will be a life within the constant supply of the
 Spirit.

(b) The Bread of Life.

It is from the detailed working out of this figure of the Bread
 of Life, that the detail of the pattern for some of the other parallel
 figures can be filled in.

In the preamble to the discourse, the miracles of the Feeding of
 the Five Thousand and the Walking on the Sea are recorded. These are
 evidences of the powers of "the Age to Come", and they set off the dis-
 cussion about the origin of Jesus. In the midst of the tossing waves is
 found the reassuring phrase, "it is I", behind which stands all the wealth
 of antecedent reference attaching to the $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ of Old Testament times.
 There follows the link with the "sealing" of Jesus by the Spirit at Baptism,
 which give him unique right to speak for God, and the contrast between the
 earthly meat which perishes and the heavenly bread which is "true" bread,
 and which gives everlasting life. The contrast with the manna-eating
 forefathers who died is meant to heighten the offer of everlasting life.

1.3:5. 2.4:24, cf. 14:23. 3.0:03. 4.12:23b. 5.6:15. 6.0:27.
 7.v.40. 8.vv.33,40,47,50.

But the bread is also his flesh, which he will give for the life of the world. To eat his flesh and drink his blood is to gain his life. It will set up an indwelling. The listeners, who might be repulsed by this literal eating of his flesh, are reminded that there is the symbolism of the word and spirit, which is life, behind the symbolic act of eating the flesh of Christ. The flesh is the word, and to believe his word is equivalent to eating Christ's flesh. The final feature is the suggestion, that it is the readiness to give his life for the life of the world, that gives the bread the "real" and "true" quality. The final equivalents of the symbolism are: the bread from heaven = the "true" bread = the $\alpha\rho\omega\tilde{\nu}$ ($\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$) = the bread of Life = the "living" bread = the bread of sacrifice = the flesh and blood of Jesus = the life of Jesus = the words of Jesus = Spirit = Life. To eat the bread, therefore, is to believe in Jesus.

(c) The Word which is Life.

There are several features from the Word references which are parallel with those from the Bread discourse. The $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ comes from God (Heaven), and has life. At creation he gave life which for men is in the form of light. The word is linked with the flesh of Jesus. We may assume then that the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is the "living" Word or the Word of Life. It speaks life into being, because it comes from the divine world: from the life of God. It is the living word of revelation which brings eternal life to the believer.

1.vv.54 & 57. 2.1:14 This links John's sacramental teaching with the humanity of Jesus. 3.v.40. 4.v.50.

(d) The Resurrection and the Life.

In the story of the raising of Lazarus, Jesus moves on from the
 1. accepted Jewish belief in resurrection on the last day to a statement in
 the I AM category. Taken along with other relevant claims of Jesus this
 phrase could well read "I am the resurrecting life" or alternatively "the
 2. living resurrection". It is a frequent Johannine claim, that Jesus has
 life in himself, and it is stated that he will raise himself up from the
 3. dead, and will also raise up those who believe on him. The raising of
 Lazarus is the undeniable present example of his resurrecting power. He
 has that quality in his own life which resists death, in fact it "stands
 up" from it. And "because I live ye shall live also", is Jesus' promise
 4. to his disciples. This resurrection, however, does not do away with the
 5. final eschatological resurrection. It is only an anticipation of it.
 Martha recognises that the claim of Jesus to be the resurrection is
 soundly based, because of his actual eschatological living as the Messiah
 6. and Son of God. If he is the Messiah, resurrection is implicit in his
 person. Again, this belief is not shown to be based on the indestruct-
 able nature of the human spirit, but on the life of the living God as re-
 presented by his only Son. It is a belief that he can and will raise
 from the dead those who believe. In the case of Lazarus it was a matter
 of raising dead bodies, but ultimately it is connected with death-resisting

1. See section on the development of the Hebrew conceptions of resurrection in the Old Testament section of this thesis, p. 105 above. 2. This alteration of phrasing has been shown to be possible in connection with "I am the way, the truth and the life." i.e. I am the true and living way. See C.K. Barrett, *ibid*, p. 382. 3. 2:19; 5:29; 6:39; 11:25; 10:17. 4. 14:19. 5. Cf. 5:24 & 5:28.

life, which he will bestow on all believers, though they be in their
 1. graves. His life not only resists death, but actively invades the
 2. territory of death. He is the resurrecting Life.

(e) Life from the Vine.

Within the symbol of the vine John includes the "I am" and "true"
 implications, which indicate the Jewish and Greek ideas of participation
 in the divine order. According to the Johannine figure, to believe in
 Jesus is like a branch that indwells in the stock of the vine, and in this
 3. way draws its life from the connection. There is no other way known to
 husbandary in which this can be done. The symbolism is immediate. To
 abide in the vine (Jesus) is to abide in the divine world (of the Father),
 with all its life-giving resources. It is from this world that the "true"
 4. vine comes. The life of this mutual indwelling is to be seen in the kind
 5. of love that lays down its life for its friends. This kind of life will
 6. flow into all believers. The "true" vine in Greek thought would be
 equivalent to the "Vine of Life" in Hebrew idiom. It is the eternal
 7. quality that is seen supremely in "laying down" life for others.

(f) The "Good" Shepherd.

The same implications are to be read into the shepherd symbol,
 where the adjective "good" places the shepherd in the Platonic archetypal
 class. It is the speculative Greek equivalent to the Hebrew divine
 status. This status is demonstrated in the contrast with the ordinary

1.11:25f. 2. See V. Taylor, Names, p. 140 re the parallel use of Expiation as
 a name. 3. 15:4. 4. vv. 7-9 cf 14:19. 5. 15:13. 6. 15:18-20 cf 23.
 7. See C.H. Dood, The Interpret. of the 4th. Gospel p. 173 re the vine figure.

1. shepherds who serve their own interests and save their own lives. The
 2. "Good Shepherd" gives his life voluntarily for the sheep. The voice
 3. (word) of the Shepherd will be heard and his own sheep will hear and res-
 4. pond, and will follow him into the abundant life, which he will give to
 5. them. It is this self-giving that links him in love with God the Father. 6.
 "True" shepherding love belongs to the life of the Father, which Jesus,
 7. the Good Shepherd, shares with him. To follow the Shepherd is to believe,
 8. not to follow is not to believe.

(g) Birth into Life.

The conception of birth from above, which is insisted on in the
 conversation with Nicodemus, again introduces a life through divine be-
 9. getting by the Spirit. According to the Prologue men become sons of God
 10. by being born of God. If we accept the reading favoured by the scholars
 11. at 1:18, viz, "only begotten God", we can assume Jesus is the only one
 12. possessed of the divine nature, which is Spirit. The Spirit is his per-
 13. manent possession. He is also the only one who has come down from above,
 and therefore the only one who is able to tell of this birth into this com-
 14. pletely different category of life. Those who believe on the only begot-
 ten have everlasting life. He is the life-giving Spirit. If we can take
 the Son of Man in the sense of "I" (3:13), we can infer from the context
 that Jesus was calling himself the equivalent of the "Birth of God"; the

1.10:12. Cf the full range of O.T. Shepherd symbolism espec. Ez.34, see vv.
 11ff "I even I will etc." 2.10:11. 3.10:18. 4.10:10, cf v.28. 6.10:
 15;17:30. 7.10:18b. 8.10:26f. 9.Cf.5:3. 10.1:13. 11. See discuss-
 ion on Prologue. 12.4:24. 13.1:33;51. 14.3:6.

divine birth form above which gives life. Again, this figure, like the others, is an equivalent for believing in Jesus, and for accepting his words, which are life. Not to receive his words is darkness and death.

(h) The Way of Life.

In this saying, taken out of its context, there is what looks like a comprehensive claim for the authority of Jesus, but the paramount topic in the immediate conversation is the way to the Father's house, which is linked with whatever conceptions are to be finally included in the terms "truth" and "life". It has been suggested that this phrase should be interpreted according to the Hebrew idiom, wherein the following substantives are treated as adjectives descriptive of the first noun.¹ It would then read, "I am the true and living Way". This is a possible interpretation, but as truth and life are major Johannine conceptions in their own right, it is doubtful if they should be treated here as descriptive adjectives only. Behind the surface pre-occupation with the "Way", there is also the proposition that the way leads to truth and life.² Vincent Taylor sees a progressive meaning in the composite name. Jesus is the way through whom as the truth we receive the knowledge of God, and in whom as life we have, here and now, eternal life. To be merely the true and living way would hardly be adequate to the rest of the Gospel.³

1. See C.K. Barrett, *ibid*, p. 382. 2. Names, p. 145, cf Jn. 17:3 & 12:44-50.
3. Barrett, pp. 303f, links the idea of the "Way" to a wide range of antecedent references in the O.T. & N.T. in support of the idea that the Way is the controlling notion in this phrase.

(i) Jesus as the Way.

In the Old Testament Israel rested within the Covenant. The way to God within the totality of what was Israel was defined by this special relationship, and all the expressions of it. The life of Yahweh was mediated to those who kept the requirements of the covenant law.

1. The way to God is by keeping the Law in its broader sense, which could be renewed when necessary ^{and} in prescribed ways. The way of the Lord stands over against the way of evil and disobedience. But the way of the Lord is an everlasting way.

2. Within the New Testament in the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospel of Jesus is spoken about as the "way". Paul's commission to Damascus involved those who were "of the way". He is also at a later date teaching "the way of Salvation". Others are reported of as speaking evil of the "way", and also "there arose no small stir about the Way". A certain Jew named Apollus was "instructed in the way of the Lord" imperfectly, and Aquilla and Priscilla "expounded the way of God more perfectly". Paul is also found explaining his Christian worship as "after the way which they (the Jews) call heresy."

3. In his letter to the Corinthians Paul talks of a "more excellent way" of love. The writer to the Hebrews talks about a "new and living way". The most expressive preparation for St John's statement is possibly to be found in the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians 2:16. "for

1. See a most instructive link between the possible derivation of the word Torah and the idea of the way. E. Jacob, *ibid*, pp. 271. 2. Cf Ps. 77:13. 3. Ps. 1:6b; 119:29f; 139:24; 146:9b, cf earlier reference to the Two Ways of the Qumran Sects. 4. Ps. 139:24. Hab. 3:6. 5. 9:2. 6. 16:17. 7. 19:9. 8. 19:23. 9. 18:24; 26. 10. 1Cor. 12:31ff. 11. 10:19ff.

through him (Jesus) we both (Jew and Gentiles) have access by one Spirit unto the Father".

Within the Synoptic tradition, on the broad level of common morality, two opposing ways are set before the people in the teaching of Jesus. There is the contrasting dualism of a broad and narrow way, treasures on earth and in heaven, darkness and light, and the dividing of the sheep from the goats. These are all made very personal by the statement of Jesus about our inability to serve two masters, and the difference between those who save their lives and those who lose them, links the choice with following Jesus to suffering and death. This way is so unexpectedly different that the first shall be last, and the last, first. Even the Pharisees conceded, for their own ends, that Jesus taught the "way of God in truth". It became obvious to his opponents that Jesus claimed an authority to supercede the way of the Law.

Here then within the New Testament, we have the growth of a technical use of the term "the Way" in relation to the teaching and life and death of Jesus, which was based on his claim to a special relationship with God.

To John then who held the highest possible estimate of the person of Jesus, it was quite logical to speak of Jesus as "the Way". It was descriptive of Jesus in terms of the actual reconciling function he undertook.

1.Mt.7:13. 2.Mt.6:19f. 3.Mt.6:22. 4.Mt.25:24-28. 5.Mt.6:24. 6.Mk. 8:35ff. The way of Jesus cannot be disassociated from Mk.10:42-45. cf also Phil.25-11. 7.Mk.10:31. 8.Mt.22:16. 9.Mt.11:27ff. cf Lk. 10:22.

Jesus called himself the "door" of the sheep, and indicated that he was
 2. 3.
 the way of grace and truth which superceded the Mosaic requirements.

The first step on the way to God is to believe that the incarnate Jesus
 is the sole way to God; that his word is the word of God, that his deeds
 are God's deeds, and that the "truth" and the "life" are in his ways.

(j) Truth and Grace as Life.

Just as in the metaphysical sense, the deity can be considered
 as life and light, so in the ethical sense the content of deity can be
 described as grace and truth.

In the Acts Jesus is represented as evidence of the grace of God.
 4.
 It is the Gospel of the grace of God, and its effects can be described as
 5.
 6. 7. 8.
 grace. The Gospel is the word of his grace, which reaches the Gentiles.
 In the New Testament outside John, the conception of grace is linked with
 9.
 the Hebraic idea of the undeserved love of God in Jesus Christ. It is
 10.
 contrasted with salvation by "works" of the Law, and is fundamental to
 11.
 Pauline theology, where the Old Testament concept is directed from nat-
 12.
 ional security channels to moral forgiveness and victory. Believers
 13.
 take a common stand within the grace of Jesus or under his grace. Grace
 14. 15.
 is the Gospel itself. It is associated with gifts of Christian character.
 16.
 Paul's own apostleship is a gift of grace. In St. Peter's First Epistle

1.10:1. 2.& 3.1:17,cf.5:39. 4.& 5. 20:24. 6.4:33;11:23. 7.14:5;
 20:32. 8.15:11. 9.Rom.5:8;Eph.2:7. 10.Eph.2:8. 11.1Cor.15:10,
 cf.Rom.4:16;5:17;11:6. 12.Rom.6:1. 13.Rom.5:2;6:14. 14.2Cor.6:19.
 15.Rom.12:3;6;15:15. 16. Gal.1:15.

Christians are described as heirs of "this grace of life"^{1.} Because the Gospel is considered a new dispensation of the grace of God, which is freedom from the Law, grace takes its place in greetings and benedictions.^{2.} In St Luke it is recorded that Jesus grew in grace and stature.

It is John's forthright statement, that grace and truth are elementary to the "life" and "glory" of God,^{3.} and that grace and truth came into this world with Jesus,^{4.} who alone held that life and glory in common with God, because he was the only begotten Son.

John's references concerning the truth as it appears in Jesus, move in two thought worlds. From the Hellenistic point of view it centres in the use of the adjective $\lambda\alpha\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.^{5.} When applied to Johannine conceptions it immediately introduces the Greek ideas of reality. Some of the same associations attach to some of the usages of the noun $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$.^{6.} This strengthens the universal aspect of truth, and makes it understandable outside Jewish circles, where religious truth had been more strictly limited to the Law of God. It is to this truth of the Law that John deliberately opposed the truth of Jesus.^{7.}

John's message is that the word of God was in Jesus. This word is truth: the truth that sets men free, such words are life.^{8.}

By linking the idea of truth with grace, John has put it in the Old Testament setting of the steadfastness and the reliability of God,

1.3:7. 2.2:40. 3.1:14. 4.1:17. 5.1:9;17:3 cf.8:16. 6.4:23f, cf. 17:17;18:38. 7.1:17, cf.5:45 The function of the Law is limited to accusation. 8.17:7, cf.8:31f, 6:63; 68.

which, as we have seen, has special reference to his word of promise, in which God's name and glory were involved. The unique glory revealed by the only begotten Son alone is that God's reliability, in the Hebrew sense, and his reality, in the Greek sense, are revealed in self-giving love of Jesus on the cross. Only the Son is able to know this truth.

1.

It can be seen in him. Those who recognise it will have seen the "true" God, and will know eternal life. If we return to John's claim for Jesus (14:6), we might now re-construct it in another way. Jesus is the "living truth", which is the "way" to God.

2.

Behind John's conception of grace is the love which initiated

3.

the whole incarnation programme. To believe in Jesus is to find God faithful in its widest Old Testament sense, which was never complete without mercy, and which depended from first to last on the free grace of God. This grace was fundamental to the grace of the Torah, but "true grace" (to switch the Hebraism), grace in its fullness, "grace for grace", is in Jesus. It is unique to him because he alone, as the only begotten, has been privy all along to the redeeming purpose of God. This grace is most clearly evident in the "lifting up" of the Son of Man. It demands a response which will prove to be the final judgement of all who are confronted with it. By acceptance or rejection they judge themselves. To accept Jesus is to live. To reject him is not to live.

1.1:14. 2.4:24, cf 17:3. 3.3:16.

(k, Conclusión)

In all these Life Figures, St. John is fulfilling his purpose in declaring the historic Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, and that in his name believers might have life. Basically all the Gospel features are here. The "Christ" represents someone "anointed" from the divine world. In Greek terms this is conveyed by the concept of reality in the adjective *ἀληθινός*. Jesus is the Son of God in a factual sense as only he can be, which gives him unique revealing functions. He is the way to the "true" (Greek) or "eternal" Life (Hebrew), which is to be seen in his flesh, and especially in his cross.

The common factor which links all these figures is that they are all to be paralleled with "believing", which is the work of God. It involves the acceptance of the flesh of the historic Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, whose life is Spirit, as only God's is. The most extreme challenge to belief is when the flesh is lifted up on the cross. On the revelation side Jesus and his cross must be accepted as the very Word of God, expressive of the love and glory of God himself. This is to drink the Water of Life, to eat Jesus' flesh, which is the Bread of Life given for the world. In the light category, it is to see in the "lifting up" of Jesus the glory of God. The predicate of the Good Shepherd is that he should lay down his life for the sheep. This is the glory which Jesus shared with the Father before the world was. In the vine symbol disciples are invited to share this life of love, the mark of which is that a man lay

down his life for his friends.

The resurrection of Jesus is the dynamic proof of the presence of this everlasting quality of the life in Jesus. It is the life to which physical death is irrelevant; the life of the Age to Come. Even more importantly, it is a demonstration, that the life that is "eternal" and "Spirit", is moved by the same love and self-giving glory as this present life had been for the historic Jesus. It did not cease at the grave. The self-giving was not a phase, through which Jesus was caused to live for a time, and then return to some other kind of more splendid glory. The glory that was in the flesh and cross of Jesus was the eternal pre-existent glory, shared between the Father and Son in mutual indwelling, and the same glory will be the glory of the exaltation. Meantime, it is the glory of his resurrection existence. The same Spirit and peace is available to believers present at resurrection scenes, and to those who have not seen Jesus' resurrection and yet have believed. This glory is the abiding quality which distinguishes the divine life of the Father and the Son. It is available to believers here and now, but its uninhibited manifestation awaits them beyond the grave.

We are left, then, with the resurrection as the crowning "sign" of the divine authority of Jesus, to declare in his own flesh and blood and cross the eternal glory of the Godhead.

PART THREECONCLUSIONS(1) NEW TESTAMENT

From our investigations into the New Testament we are now in a position to conclude that its chief concerns are the establishment of the authority of Jesus to speak for God, the content of what he had to say and the safeguarding of the way in which it is to be understood. Its work was begun in an atmosphere of Jewish monotheism, in which the holy category of the Old Testament was only modified by the belief in the existence of supernatural Messianic figures, and by a certain hypostasizing of characteristic attributes or operations of God expressed in personal terms.

From the fragments of the earliest Christian preaching that have come down to us in the Acts and St. Paul, it has become clear that Jesus was placed at least in the Messianic category and invested with Messianic authority. The eschatological quality of his life and work was substantiated by his resurrection from the dead. This tremendous demonstration of power seems for a time to have overshadowed all else as the solid basis of the authority of Jesus to speak for the divine world. It served to declare that God was with him. He was a man approved of God, or anointed by God. He died by the foreknowledge of God, and God raised him up, and exalted him to his own right hand, where he will execute Lordship and Judgement. He is the Holy One, the Just and the Prince of Life.

Although the Christology of these claims does not necessarily infringe monotheism, it does ascribe to Jesus such anointing of the Spirit

that even death could not hold him. It permits him an exalted life with God in the divine world, where these events were pre-planned by God himself. It declares that Jesus is one who has come and spoken authoritatively and decisively from God.

The Synoptic records and their sources also move within the sphere of Jewish fulfilment conceptions, and use freely their many titles, but they move on - after Peter's confession - to claim for Jesus such intimacy with God that it can only be expressed in terms of unique and unshared sonship. This gives the words of Jesus divine authority for men, and makes his claim upon them total. Despite the high Christology of the Synoptic record, the portrayal of the humanity of Jesus is so real that, among his contemporaries, only his most intimate followers, and the recipients of his miraculous helpfulness, suspect the presence of any greater personage than a Messianic pretender. The teaching of Jesus about himself, especially his future suffering, under the lesser known Messianic title Son of Man, ensured the limitation of his reception to his more immediate disciples. What the records have to say still remains predominantly applicable to Israelites, and there is to be felt a strong eschatological current moving through the Christian community in which the events take place. This latter spirit seems to have grown out of the fact that too literal an interpretation was put upon the Jewish apocalyptic colouring of the words of Jesus himself, when he spoke of the coming of the Son of Man at the end of time.

Some of the early theological uncertainty was due then, not so

much to the intentions of the evangelists, but to the confusing associations of the terms in which their conceptions were expressed. They are grappling with new truth, and have as yet only old terms and symbols in which to express it. That Matthew and Luke had seized upon a profound truth about the divine origin of Jesus is certain. Whether the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was adequate to express the fact is another matter. In many places the conceptions inherent in the Gospel are still being presented in terms dominated by the Jewish scene in which the events were enacted in history.

Towards the end of his Gospel the Fourth Evangelist makes clear his aim in writing. His purpose is to give men grounds for faith by proving Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. To stand as revealing mediator between two worlds Jesus must have clear titles in both worlds. Moreover, for his divine title to stand clear in the eyes of Jewish believers, with their categorical distinction between the human and holy worlds, Jesus must have enjoyed a pre-existent divine life before he entered history. Pre-existent life is also demanded to safeguard Hellenistic believers from conceiving of Jesus' divinity as something achieved as a reward for his human endeavours after the Greek heroic pattern. John's aim was, therefore, to prove that prior to his earthly existence Jesus was in fact God's Christ of Jewish hope, and the factual Son of God of Hellenistic thought.

The Synoptic Gospels present a highly developed Christology. With their main contentions John is entirely in agreement. Jesus of Nazareth stands in unique relation to God. He has brought a new

revelation of decisive significance for men. He has been raised up and exalted again to God's right hand, from whence he will one day come again and sort out his followers and establish his Kingdom. It is clear that John accepts what is implicit in this Christology. It is at least the second premise of his thesis, that the Son of God takes his place in history. There must never be any doubt about the "flesh" of Jesus, either about its reality, or that in the flesh and blood of Jesus dwells the Son of God. The primary premise, however, is the establishment of the identity of the One who dwells in our human flesh as Jesus. There must be an incarnation from the divine world in order that the revelation he brings can be invested with significant authority for mankind. For John accepts the exceedingly modern-sounding dictum, "no man has seen God at any time", and "no man hath ascended up into heaven". The essential first requirement is for one to have come down from heaven. Therefore, although the humanity of Jesus must be real, he must never appear to have been only a man, or to have begun as a man. The Synoptic record, by the striking reality of its presentation of the human Jesus, had left some doubts at this point.

The Matthean and Lucan narratives had intended to cover this point with their genealogies and Virgin Birth stories. The Marcan baptism record had been intended also to safeguard the divine connections of Jesus. What they intended was clear, but what they said was open to misunderstanding affecting the authority of Jesus to speak for the divine world.

The humanity of Jesus must be real, but the particular humanity of a particular race and family must not be allowed to diminish his divine status at any point. Jesus was not by birth half god half man through the parentage of the Holy Ghost and a virgin mother. Nor was he adopted by God at his baptism because God was well pleased with him. Nor had Jesus grown in divine filial self-consciousness, because of the quality of his day-to-day obedience. Finally, the divinity of Jesus was not the representative divinity, in the manner of ancient Israel and the Old Testament representative figures and the Torah. These were mediators without full status; partial in their status, and partial in their effectiveness. They merely represented the divine life; they did not possess it in themselves by right.

The Synoptic presentation was also open to misunderstanding in that the humanity of Jesus remained too particular. It lacked complete universality. That it was intended to be universal is clear, especially where St. Paul's influence is seen in St. Luke's record, concerning Jesus' link with the racial figure of Adam. St. John claims for Jesus effective mediation to the entire human race. The balance must be kept between the verisimilitude of particular history and local events and family connections, and the common humanity which distinguishes all men.

Difficulty also attaches to the unevenness of the presentation of the divinity of Jesus in the Synoptic record. If it is of the nature of divinity to be all-seeing, all-knowing, all-powerful etc., it must be continually so at all times. If the divine world has a manifestation to

make, a dominion to establish, a judgement to give in and through Jesus, it does not finally vary in these matters. The glory of God is one, not many. Any fresh appearing, any summing up of all things will not vary the divine nature from what is revealed in the incarnation, the life and death and resurrection of the Jesus of history. The earthly life of Jesus was not merely something to be endured temporarily while on a mission of absence from the divine world. This was an expression of the glory of Jesus' pre-existent life with the Father before the world was. The divinity seen in Jesus therefore does not go and come. The incarnation itself, the historical life of Jesus, his dying for his friends, his resurrection are indicative of the nature of the divine life of the Godhead, as it has always been, and as it always will be. This is the "glory" which is of the very essence of the divine or holy order.

The Christological statements of Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had shown a consciousness of some of the difficulties involved, and had prepared for the Johannine Christological restatement. Pauline Christianity moves to the borders of Jewish Messianism. It retains some of the Messianic titles, but they operate more as proper names, or lose their messianically technical significance, and become factual in meaning. The Christological statement is increasingly dominated by universal and spiritual conceptions, rather than national and material considerations.

For Paul the earthly world is characterized as $\zeta\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}$ and the divine world as $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$. While Jesus is "of the seed of David", and "born of a woman", and "became a man", he was previously "in the form of God". His Lordship is the Lordship that speaks from heaven, as the factual Son of God, and as demonstrated in power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead. In the maturer thinking of St. Paul, his earlier Parousia teaching falls into the background, and is replaced by the present dominion of the Spirit of Christ, which is the firstfruits of things to come. The Spirit of Christ does not operate within the national framework. It approaches men as men, not as nationals, and operates in the sphere of ethics to re-create men, and to call them into a new society. It is no longer limited to the occasional and abnormal possession of special individuals as in Old Testament times, but is available to all men and on a permanent basis.

Such Lordship is not only applicable universally to all mankind indifferently, but also to the entire created world. As the Son of God with power, and the Man from Heaven, Jesus is the firstborn of creation, the firstborn from the dead and the firstborn of a great new brotherhood. It is the purpose of God to sum up all things in him. The Lordship of Christ, and his dominion and judgement, are things of the Spirit. They are achieved through the spiritual victory of the love of God in Christ upon the cross, while men were yet sinners, and prior to any response on the

part of man. It is therefore a love from which nothing can separate us. It operates in the height and in the depths, in the past and in the future, and conquers all things, and abides permanently. This love is God's love. Christ stands for God in this matter. There is no accident about it. It has been eternally planned and includes all the creation processes in its subsidiary designs and purposes. Christ came from the world of God, where he had the form of God, and the image of the glory of God, and its entire bodily fullness. God is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ", by which is implied that to look upon Christ's sonship is to see God's Fatherhood. Christ is his "own" Son, or the "Son of his love".

This is very high Christology indeed. It speaks of the incarnation of God's Son, who, as the expression of God's love, quite gratuitously came to die for sinful men, and is returned to the life of God from whence he came. He was the Heavenly Man who stood on earth bearing our manhood, but especially because of his "servantly" sacrificing of himself on the cross, he is to be regarded as fully plenipotentiary for God, and to have received the name that is above all names. The implication of this Old Testament reference is that that name carried all the associations of the tetragrammaton. Dominion is his. He is the firstborn of God's new race. To be included "in him", is to die on his cross and to share his resurrection and divine life. The task of the new "body" of Christ is to undertake his sufferings.

In the presentation of his Christological ideas Paul was greatly influenced by the more universal aspects of the later Jewish thinking, especially those speculations linked with the hypostasizing of the concept of Wisdom. Nevertheless, many of his terms have an ambivalence about them which give them a currency in the Hellenistic world. This is especially so in relation to the term Son of God. In Jewish Messianic thinking it does not necessarily infringe essential monotheism. It is probably on account of his strong Rabbinic training that Paul never finally comes to claiming for Christ full equality with God. Christ is always portrayed in some dependent relation to God, but the closeness of that relation, and his clear conceptions about the functions of the Spirit of Christ (and/or of God), make some early clarification essential. Meanwhile St. Paul had rendered the very great service to Christology in reversing at least implicitly, the early confessional formula from "Jesus is the Son of God" to "the Son of God is Jesus", and thus claiming that the love of Christ upon the cross should not be regarded as a passing episode in the earthly life of Jesus, but as an expression of the eternal love of the Godhead, which involved the whole conception of the incarnation of the eternal Son of God.

The writer to the Hebrews, at the same time as he expresses a similarly high Christology, carries further the transference from the use of the personal (and therefore historical) key feature of the analogical presentation of the Christian world-view, to the use of the metaphysical key feature. He applies Greek archetypal ideas to historic Jewish conceptions,

and presents Jesus as the Heavenly Archetype that conveys perfectly what fumbling historic symbols had sought to do over the centuries. God has spoken through his first-begotten Son, who, as pre-existent and eternal, shared in his creative purposes. By his perfect obedience in his human life, even upon the cross, Christ became the perfect "captain" and "pioneer" of our salvation. His perfection is secure in both worlds. As archetypal priest and sacrifice, he has that eternal quality about all that he is and achieves. His mediatorial functions take their effectiveness from his "indissoluble" life. He pioneers the way into the holy of holies. The prophetic word of God is made complete by his speaking in a son. What the son has to say is in terms of self-sacrifice, and it is beginning to be expressed by this writer in more definitely Greek metaphysical terms.

The truth expressed concerning Christ in the New Testament Epistles is to some extent impaired in that they do not pretend to be Gospels, and they are, therefore, incomplete in their coverage. However, they have the advantage of being written to meet the real theological needs of live Christian groups. The passage of time, and the transference of the Christian faith to Gentile environments, led to occasional demands for the clarification of the loosely-conceived theology of the Kerygma and the Confessional Statements. The demand was not only for reliable traditions, but reliable interpretation. St. Paul and his fellow missionaries sought to answer the most pressing problems as they arose, but the time factor

and the enlarging understanding of St. Paul and others must always be taken into account in working out the cumulative Christology. Some kind of chronological order must be given to the writings. Even this cannot finally offset the fragmentary nature of the presentation, and the possibility that no one Church possessed all the Epistles, or those containing his more mature Christological statements.

Ephesus, as a second headquarters of Pauline missionary enterprise, and later headquarters of Christianity in Asia Minor, became a clearing-house of advancing Christian belief and practice. The Christian literature that is associated with this centre is imbued at varying levels with a more universal spirit and enlarging conceptions of the unity of divine planning and government. It is here that the final New Testament Christological statement appears to have been framed. We must assume that the writer of the Fourth Gospel reflected upon the salvation events away from the particularity of their original Jewish setting, and with the growing oral and written traditions of the Church before him. His Gospel implies that there was a need for a clarifying re-statement of the Gospel which took into account all the developments into which the Spirit was leading the Church. The sporadic nature of the tradition left it open to serious misunderstanding, and it must have seemed particularly necessary that the restatement in universal terms, which was taking place in a fragmentary way and here and there, needed gathering up into a comprehensive presentation.

Statements which seemed quite valid in their authority in the Palestinian setting, where the solid monotheism acted as a framework for theological thinking, needed guarded restatement in a pagan setting, where terms meant something quite different. The supreme theological problem was the demand for a clear and unequivocal statement concerning the person and being of Jesus Christ in relation to the Godhead. Such a task called for a selection of those elements of the faith which had more universal application. Detailed history was less important than the living spirit of the faith that would meet the demand of a world-wide Christian community. However, there is no real need to suspect seriously the historicity of St. John's record. New names occur, and new stories appear, but none of the preceding records claim to be exhaustive in their coverage. That Jesus lived what might be called an "eschatological" life, and that he took his disciples apart for long periods of instruction, is undoubted. John's task was to maintain the balance between historical realism, and a presentation that would do justice to the demands of a universal faith. His dominating principle is his high estimate of the person of Jesus. He saw the significance of the entire Gospel to depend upon who it was who came and offered the love of God to men. Of all the New Testament writers he speaks most strongly in the tradition that the "Son of God is Jesus", and he is pre-eminently aware of the advantages and dangers in translating the expression of the Gospel from the Hebrew to the Greek terminology and conceptions.

The first reading of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel does give an impression of breaking new theological ground, but a great deal of what is said represents what was already implied in the most progressive thinking of other Church leaders. It is the cumulative effect of the Christological materials gathered in the Prologue which creates the impressive impact of newness. It is both succinct and decisive. To affect the divine-human situation in its totality, the divine identity must be clearly established. Only thus could the incarnation be valid. Furthermore, the divinity of Jesus must not only attach to his pre-mundane life and to his post-resurrection life, but must persist throughout his earthly life as well. Paul's "Kenotic" theory had left some doubt at this point. It needed re-statement in conjunction with some of Paul's other maturer thinking. The divinity of Jesus was not a reduced divinity during his earthly life. It is his known divine status that gives significance and authority to his words and acts, and gives validity to his mediation between the two worlds. Any descriptive figure used of Jesus during his life-time that does not establish this status has only reminiscence value in John's Gospel. It is employed for the secondary purpose of linking the story to the earlier records, and falls into proper perspective behind the Prologue statement of full divinity. Such figures do not correspond to the full facts of the case. In John's record they are often reported as the opinion of others, who are not in possession of the full facts, or of

those deceived by the reality of the human manifestation of God's only-begotten Son.

The ambivalence of terms and phrases to be observed in Pauline writings, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is widely apparent in St. John. But John is ever at pains to dispel any misunderstanding. There is never any doubt about the divine status of Jesus. Doubtfully divine terms and conceptions are always qualified by defining adjectives or predicates, or adjacent contextual conceptions which clarify their meanings.

As we have seen "Life", "Light", "Spirit" and "Truth" convey absolute conceptions in both contemporary Jewish thought and in popular Hellenistic faiths. In Hebrew thought "Life" had come to be descriptive of the "eternal" Life of "the Age to Come": the age outside the time series, and under divine government. For the Greeks "Life" was of the essence of divinity. In the Old Testament light was constantly associated with the historical manifestations of God, with the pushing back of chaotic "dark" at creation, with the giving of the Law at Sinai, with the fire of the first sacrifice, with the "Shekina" of God present with his people, with the illumination by the Spirit, and is widely linked with the spread of the knowledge of God to the Gentiles in the Deutero-Isaianic concept of the mission of Israel. From the illustrative figures of Plato's theory of reality to the metaphysical conceptions of abstract deity of the popular religions and the illumination of the Mysteries, light and enlightenment are both constitutive elements and functions within the godhead in

Greek thought. Knowledge of God is enlightenment. The divinity within men is a spark from the full light that is God. On the metaphysical side the twin concepts of light and life together describe the essence of divine being. They are associated in the Old Testament, in Philo and in the Hermetica.

In later Judaism the entire revelation of the Old Testament is spoken of as the Torah; but especially in the Greek period the more universal concepts of wisdom and truth become interchangeable with it. These conceptions were lifted into the supernatural sphere and thought of as having some underfined independent and quasi-personal existence with God before time was. By them creative processes were begun and maintained, and would be fulfilled. They gain their status and reliability from God, the expression of whose life they are.

For the Greeks truth was always spoken of along side the reality of what was "Good". It represented the real and permanent world as contrasted with the transitory and shadowy existence of men. It described the *λόγος γεντός* class of Philo, the "only" model class: first-begotten of a series: the divine mental progenitor of the earthly "copies", which mediate the life of ultimate heaven to earth.

The conception of "Spirit" as of the divine essence was accepted throughout the Old Testament. Anything of an extraordinary nature in creation, or in the life of man, was ascribed to the more-than-normal

presence of the Spirit of God. It brooded over creation itself, it spoke in the word of the prophets, it anointed men for kingship, it would be poured out on men at the end of time in such measure as to usher in the rule of God. For the Greeks the concept of spirit merged into the notion of mind. The unseen world of eternal thought and perfection, the archetypal existence in the world beyond was of the free and good world of the spirit, into which men would escape from the tiresome and frustratingly evil world of matter.

"God is Spirit", John reports Jesus as saying to the Samaritan woman, and immediately, at the very moment, men are free. There are no more particular locations of worship at which he only is to be found. This is "true" worship, which bridges time and nationalities. Because God is "Spirit" he is "true" and "I that speak unto you am he". Jesus is the "I AM", the living One who speaks enlightening words.

In such manner does John speak simultaneously the languages of two spiritual worlds. If there is ever any doubt concerning the divinity of Jesus in any one of the terms, he doubles his guarantees. Jesus has this life, and light, and spirit, and truth in himself. He is of the divine essence. He is the light of the world. If there is any doubtfulness in the divine implications of the term "light" used alone, Jesus is the "true" light, and, as such, can not only give light to blind eyes, but

discrimination of the disciplining word, that amounts to the kind of judgement that perfection permanently passes on imperfection: light on darkness: men who accept Christ on those who reject him.

John follows the same pattern in all his "Life" figures.

Jesus as Life can produce sustenance for Life. The Bread and Water of Life are at his command. He is the Life-Bread of which the bread of the miracle was but the "sign". He is the bread of "heaven" and the "living" water. If the divine remains hidden beneath the symbol still, he is the "true" bread. If both miracle and claim have not made the divine status clear, the explanatory word has but to be believed. It is "spirit", it is "eternal", it is "life".

Similarly in the Shepherd figure, the implication of the defining adjective "Good" would not escape Greek readers. It immediately **lifted** the shepherd into the Platonic archetypal category. The Jewish readers would already have linked him with the Old Testament Shepherd of Israel of the Psalms and Ezekiel.

To any who became lost in the this-worldly metaphor of the vine the evangelist directs the adjective "true", which lifts the whole concept for the Greek reader onto the religious level. The "true" vine is of the divine class, of which there is only one example, the one that abides in the Father. To abide in that vine is also to abide in the Father.

In view of the claims of Jesus it should not surprise to be confronted with the resurrection of the dead. Jesus has Life in himself,

and this includes power to take it up and to lay it down and to resurrect it. He is the "true" and "living" resurrection, just as he is "truth" itself. Wherever he appears the very reality of his life demands an answer. This is the kingship of truth to which he belongs. All other kingships are derivative.

Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of Man, at first in the third person, but later as equivalent to "I". Here again there are divine associations in two religious worlds. The Son of Man of Daniel and Enoch convey supernatural status and coming judgement and dominion in which the Saints of the most High will participate. The *Ἀνδρῶπιος* of the Greek popular religion stood somewhere between ultimate God and men, the archetypal man of Philo's "only" model class. John's insistence upon this term was calculated to direct attention constantly from the one who appeared as a man, but was in reality the Son of Man, Primal or Archetypal Man. To "eat the flesh" of the son of man was to accept the fact that, in this historical person called Jesus, there was indeed the Son of Man come to establish divine rule, and incorporate men into the Kingdom of God's Saints. To put it in Greek parlance, the divine first Archetypal Man was present in Jesus.

The promise of the Comforter, who is the "spirit of Truth", was to convert the present conviction, guidance and instruction, being given personally by the presence of the "man" Jesus, into an eternal reality, not based on his physical presence, or his physical coming again, but by their incorporation into the world of the Spirit, which is the world of

God, and of Life and Light and Truth from which he comes. "Blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed". This experience is like being born from above where the particular becomes lost in the universal, the temporary in the eternal, the physical in the spiritual, the human in the divine. The use of these terms has the effect of exchanging the historical and personal analogical model of the Old Testament and Synoptic Gospels, for the more universal metaphysical analogical model of Greek thought. What it loses in the immediacy of particular history and personal event, it gains in universal applicability. But it should be noted that it is John's whole purpose to show that the Life and Truth and Light and Spirit, that is thought of metaphysically as of the essence of divinity, has become historical and personal in Jesus. It is at this point that he has something new to say to the Greeks, which is as valid in their world of thought as the Messianic and kindred Jewish concepts were in theirs.

Here is a new definition of the divine life, whether it is conceived of as holiness or glory or Torah or Life, Light, Truth, or Spirit. As far as the world is concerned, these terms are but the predicates of which Jesus is the subject. He is the only one qualified to speak authoritatively of that world. He has a new word of content to add to Life and Light and Truth and Torah and the rest, as descriptive of the characteristic essence of what is divine.

The inner essence of the life of the Son with the Father, the moving-spirit motive of their inter-dependent communion and purposes, is not Law, which can only accuse and condemn. It is not knowledge, which can only inform, or life, which may only exist as activity. It is grace that gives divinity its ultimate content. Grace is the love which quite gratuitously is sent, and obeys and comes down from the world "above" to give itself for the life of the world. Grace is that which causes a shepherd to give his life for the sheep, or a man his life for a friend. It lives by giving its life away. Only by dying can it ensure its own life. The historical Jesus possessed this grace in its fullness. It is the glory of the only begotten Son of God. It is God's own glory with which he will glorify himself in Jesus on the cross. This is the peculiarly Christian contribution to human speculation about God and of the revelation given to men. It is seen nowhere else so effectively as in the life of Jesus, and there most clearly in the actually historic cross.

Throughout the New Testament records there had always been special authority claimed for the words of Jesus. They contained self-authenticating truth within them. They were placed along side the words of God on equal terms. After his resurrection and exaltation, Jesus' own actual words, and words about him, became equally important in the early preaching. Jesus, and all the conversations and events connected with him, constitute the Gospel. To believe this word of God's revelation is to hear the very word of God himself to men. This word is no ordinary

word. It is "true": it is "spirit": it is divine ($\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\varsigma$). It is the word of historical revelation the word of creation, the word that became fixed and accusing in the Law, the word of prophetic judgement and redemption, which is more than all else a word of grace. This word is absolute. It is not to be disregarded. This is why John continually demands that to believe this word is equivalent to reacting correctly to any other figurative presentation of Jesus. It classifies men eternally before God. It is God's "only" Son speaking. To put it in Greek terms, it is the of God with which men are dealing in Jesus: the immanent divine reason ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) to which, all divine communication has relation. Believe and act upon this word and you will be born of the spirit, you will know reality, you will have escaped judgement, you will have Life and by-pass resurrection, you will have found the way to God. He that has seen Jesus and his cross, has seen the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. To believe this is to become a sharer in it, to be caught up into the self-giving communion which is the life of God. This position is present in its application, permanent in its validity, and is sustained and informed by the ever-living Spirit of God. It awaits but the response of those who believe its testimony, who have seen in Jesus the Christ, the Son of God, and even more blessedly, those who have not seen, yet believe.

This Johannine gathering up of the Christian belief in Jesus as the incarnation of pre-existent only Son of God, and his presentation of the Christian's permanent possession of a life in Spirit created, at a

later date, the urgent demand for clarification of the resulting Christian conception of the Godhead as such. It is in comparison with the facts of this New Testament testimony, however, that any such conception is finally to be judged.

Similarly, in any Christian presentation of the position of man before God, whether it be expressed in terms of divine judgement, kingship, Lordship, dominion or sovereignty of any kind, must be dominated, not by the accusing righteousness which is of the Law, or the arbitrariness which is often associated with ultimate sovereignty, but by the completely gratuitous grace of God most effectively revealed in the incarnation of the Son of God, and his death upon the cross for men while yet sinners. This is the most characteristic and defining content of divinity itself, from which nothing in this world or the next can separate us; for God is Love ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$) . The terms of reference for that love are to be seen in Jesus and his cross, and nowhere else; for he alone has the right to speak for God.

(2) Historical Formulations.

It is one of the preliminary premises of this thesis that the early Church moved within the thought world of Jewish monotheism in its first attempt at Christological statement. It was not until it began to associate Jesus with a doctrine of the incarnation of the pre-existent Son of God that it began to infringe essential "monarchia". The implications of this doctrine were beginning to be worked out within the New Testament itself. Several important problems emerged. The first was a necessity for a reconstruction of the doctrine of the Godhead which took into account the assertions that were being made concerning the divinity of Jesus. This was made all the more pressing by the increasingly divine role being ascribed to the Holy Spirit as a permanent regenerating influence within the Christian communities ^{as} of a continuation of the work begun by Jesus himself. The second problem was the relation in which the pre-existent divine Son stood to the historical Jesus; a problem that became more urgent as the divine status of Jesus within the Godhead became more decisively stated.

The problem in both cases was how to maintain unity without sacrificing distinction; to conceive of the unity of the Godhead, and at the same time explain the incarnation and the presence of the Spirit. The theology of the Church was under pressure from several directions. The freedom of theological expression characteristic of the charismatic Church exposed it to the inroads of all kinds of heresies. The ambivalence of some of the New Testament terms was confusing. In the Gentile world there was great danger of Christ being merely added to the Greek pantheon.

Within the New Testament the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ Doctrine could be regarded as an attempt to claim full divinity for Jesus without infringing the Jewish monotheistic principle. Philo had equated the divine Word (Wisdom-Torah) concept of Jewish speculation with the Greek $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ conception, in which he had described the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ as $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ as distinguished from \acute{o} $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ of Jewish monotheism. The point does not seem to have been lost on the writer of the Fourth Gospel.^{1.} The insistence also by the same writer on the acceptance of the "flesh"^{2.} of the Son of Man does indicate at least an awareness of the very real problem of his person. The Synoptic writers, who were more closely linked with the actual historical events of the life of Jesus, were more successful in maintaining the reality of the humanity of Jesus, but their messianic presentation of Christ's heavenly warrant did not endanger monotheism to the same extent.

In the Old Testament religion the potentially trinitarian situation did not really develop sufficiently to compete seriously with the monotheistic faith. The conception of the Holy Spirit, despite its associations with "holiness" and abnormality in men and nature, settled in a description of the "holy" category^{3.}, and in a special relation with the creative and prophetic word of God, and became the characteristic of the future Age.^{4.} The supernatural figures were eschatological developments of the extreme delimitation of the conception of covenant Israel,

1. John 1:1. 2. John 6:48-71. A conclusion with which John is in agreement, cf John 4:24. 3. Is.31:3.

4. The figure of the Spirit is taken from these fulfilment associations (Acts 2) and heightened by its possession by Jesus, and by its special functions within the early Church.

and were never really thought of as divine in themselves. In the New Testament Kerygma the trinitarian implications were not fully apparent because of the way in which the Christological facts were presented within the framework of Jewish Messianic expectations. It was always possible to think of Christ's divine Sonship as parallel to the adopted sonship of Israel. Moreover, in the fervour of the charismatic situation the finerpoints of doctrine did not immediately arise. In the historic grappling with the implications of the Christian faith, however, the New Testament¹ in general, and the Kerygma in a special way, seem to have had a determining influence, and must continue to be the basis of any reconstruction. Each time theologians have returned to re-examine the Kerygma, and its Soteriological situation, fresh helpfulness seems to have been forth-coming. "Theology may, and indeed must, go beyond the Kerygma in interpreting it, but it must not contradict it".² Whatever implications there are present within the documents concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ, alongside them there is nothing which puts the humanity of Jesus in question. It is this that constitutes our problem. How to conceive of the divinity of Christ within the Godhead, and at the same time safeguard his humanity.

In reviewing the historic answers to these problems, it would be

1. Vincent Taylor in his book, *The Names of Jesus*, draws attention to the seventy odd titles with which Jesus is credited in the N.T.. The question of the Canon hardly arises, as all the relevant theology is present within those books which have been accepted within the Canon from a very early date. 2. See R.S. Franks, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, Stud. in Theol. Duckwork, p. 196.

possible to discuss many extensive systematic presentations of the Christian theological materials, as they have been assessed by noted theologians throughout the centuries, and to discuss fully the findings of great Church Councils and their credal statements. However, it is our purpose, both for the sake of brevity and clarity, to present the doctrinal evidence of the Christian view of deity as it presents itself in the gradual piecing together of terms, which do greater and greater justice to what the New Testament documents imply concerning the nature of the deity, and concerning the nature of the person of Christ, and the relationship between them.

One of the features of the history of the Christian doctrine of God is the early and widespread recognition of the analogical nature of the language the theologian is by nature forced to employ.¹ It was one of the bases on which the Fathers felt they could maintain their freedom of interpretation inherited from the New Testament.² The everlasting need seemed to be for terms that could adequately uphold the unity of the Godhead in view of the Christian revelation of the Incarnation; terms that would safeguard monotheism; that would avoid tritheism, on the one hand, and inferiorism and modalism on the other, and resolve the paradox of the incarnation.

Because of its New Testament associations, the earliest and most natural term used to associate the divine Son within

1. Theologians must always acknowledge the truth of the Johannine phrase, *Θεὸς οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε* .

2. Whether there is N.T. recognition of the use of analogy (Rom. 12:6, cf 1 Cor. 2:11.) depends upon exegesis. We are inclined to think a case could be made out for it.

the Godhead was the term λόγος . To Ignatius Christ was the λόγος in which God breaks silence.¹ This was linked with a doctrine of salvation in terms of immortality. The λόγος conception established Christ's co-eternity with God and did not press too closely the notion of full equality. The difficulty of relating the divine λόγος with the historic Jesus was resolved for the Apologists by equating Christ with that Universal Reason, which bridges the gap between the world and a God who can only be conceived of in negative terms. To Irenaeus the Son and the λόγος were inter-changeable terms, but the λόγος is to be distinguished from the man Jesus whose sufferings the λόγος did not share. By the use of the λόγος term these theologians secured eternity for the Son, as a Scripturally warranted divine relationship with the Father, without pressing full equality in other respects, and they left the Son's relationship with Jesus indistinct. Irenaeus was content to say, "He was made what we are, that he might make us completely what he is".²

One of the early uses made of new terms is to be seen in the adoption of the Greek word πρόσωπον by the Fathers. There was a complaint³ that Sabellius spoke of the Godhead under three different manifestations (πρόσωπα). This term secured the unity of the Godhead, but left the distinctions within it in doubt. The term originally meant a face, then a mask and so a dramatic character.

1. Magni.6:2. 2. V.Praef. 3. By Callistus, Bishop of Rome See Franks, *ibid.* p.79, but cf. *Prestige, God in Patristic Thought*, pp. 158ff. links this to be O.T. "Face" of God conceptions, and speaks of it being used by Hippolytus. See H. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Faith*, n. p.46 and p.54.

To Tertullian belongs the credit of introducing an altogether stricter application of terms. He had a clear view of the problems, and applied the term "substantia" to the unity within the Godhead and "persona" ^{1.} to the distinctions, i.e. One substantia, three personæ. The former term was used in the same sense as referring to a particular metal. Persona and substantia were applied in reverse order to the elucidation of the relationship of the divine and human in Christ: one persona, two substantiæ ^{2.}

In the Eastern Church through the instrumentality of Origen use was made of the terminology of Neoplatonism ^{3.} to describe the unity and diversity of the Godhead. Though not an exact equivalent, the Greek word ὑπόστασις was used in a similar way to the Latin "persona". It meant properly substratum, but came to mean subsistence, and finally concrete existence. As an alternative the word οὐσία was introduced. ^{4.} Its primary connotation is the general idea of shared essence, and the particular idea of the essence of an individual. To describe the two aspects of Christ's person the idea of two natures (φύσεις) was used. Origen's Christological and theological statements recognise the analogical nature of human language as inapplicable to what is beyond time. All he is willing to say regarding the divine nature of Christ and its corporeal ὑπόστασις or οὐσία is that it is the Wisdom of God substantially existing. The incarnation of the Son

1. Not to be confused with its modern usage. It is not quite equivalent to προσωπών. It was applied successively to a mask, a character in a play, a part played in the world and a human who plays such a part. It does not mean "personality" of Mod. Psychol.

2. Adv. Prax. XXXI. See H. Bettenson, *ibid.* p. 44. 3. In the Neoplatonic System the primary ὑπόστασις were, the One, Nous and World Soul. 4. ὑπόστασις is not used in the same sense as the O.T. quasi personification of divine attributes. Both ὑπόστασις and οὐσία are ambiguous. See H. Bettenson, *ibid.* p. 46 n.

of God does not represent a putting forth of a part of the divine $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha$, but, on the analogy of the breath or affluence from a human body, represents the whole divine $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha$, as "eternal" generation. This qualification "eternal" belongs to the category beyond time. It is not merely everlasting. It is through this term "eternal" that Origen reconciles the distinction between the $\acute{\omicron}\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ($\omicron\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron-\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) which is God, and the $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ who is Christ. They co-exist "eternally" in this categorical sense. An even more marked inferiorism appertains to his conception of the Spirit. However, the three are of the same substance ($\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha$).

It is around this term that the controversies associated with the name of Arius raged. The Arian statement concerning the Son was, "there was (a time) when he was not".¹ The real contradiction between the acceptance of the three co-eternal $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and the inferiorism of the Son and the Spirit was exposed in the developments that led up to the Council of Nicea (A.D.325). The inferiorism was an attempt to safeguard the humanity of Christ. But the creatureliness of the Son placed in doubt his authority to represent fully the divine Father. The acceptance of the principle of $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha$ distinguished the Son as unlike all things made. Any $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in man was of grace. Athanasius admits the difficulty of the Father-Son analogy and reasserts the Scriptural terms Word and Wisdom.

1. $\acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\alpha\kappa\ \acute{\eta}\nu$. Arius carefully avoided the use of a phrase which introduced the idea of time. See H. Bettenson, *ibid.* p.57.

The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are ὁμοουσία none of whom are creatures.^{1.}

The post-Nicene position can be seen in the three terms that are traditionally applied to the parties concerned. There were the Arians proper, whose key word was ἕνεκα, indicating that the λόγος was unlike the Father in οὐσία. Then there were the Homoousians (ὁμοουσία), a few eastern and most of the western leaders. Finally there were the Homoioussians (ὁμοιούσια : of like substance). These were the great majority of the eastern leaders, who were more afraid of modalism than inferiorism. The crux of the difference between the Arians and the two latter groups was the equivalence of the terms ὑπόστασις and οὐσία in the Nicene statement. The Arians feared Tritheism, the others modalism.

Athanasius was influenced in his doctrine of the Incarnation by his Soteriology. He conceived of it in terms of physical deification. He applied the term ἀφθαρσία as descriptive of this immortality. "He was made man that we might be made God".^{2.} If he were not fully God he could not make others so.^{3.}

1. The line of development to Nicea could be shown thus: Paul of Samasata: sought to return to Kerygma statements. Methodius (Bp.Olympus 311) controvened Rule of Faith at 3 points: re the eternity of all spirits, pre-existent "fall", incarceration in human bodies which were spiritualized by resurrection. Peter (of Alex.311) taught the eternity of three ὑπόστασις, but inferiorism of Son and Spirit, each a creature. Dionysius (of Rome) accepted eternal generation, denied creation of the Son, and stood for the unity of Word & Spirit with the God of the universe, hence monarchia.
2. De Darn.54. See H. Bettertonson, *ibid.* pp.47f. 3. "He could not deify being himself subject to deification". D.Synod.51.

The λόγος and the Son are equivalent and complementary terms.

The λόγος represents the indivisibility of the Father and the Son, who in turn makes clear the hypostatic existence of the λόγος. In the general agreement at the Council of Alexandria (A.D.362) that all anti-Arians "meant" the same thing by their statements, there is a further acknowledgement of the analogical nature of their terms.

Post-Nicene technical advance is seen in the work of the "three Cappadocians"¹, whose general interpretation of the Nicene statement was accepted at Constantinople (A.D.381). For them the divine transcendence is clear, ὁ ὢν (He who is). For the rest it was the distinctions with which they applied the terms ὑπόστασις and οὐσία which gave clarity to their expositions of the Godhead. They applied οὐσία to the divine unity and ὑπόστασις to the distinctions within the unity. The distinctions, moreover, were described as of relationship (ἐξέσις) only, and they were to be distinguished as Unbegotten (ἀγέννητον), Begotten (γεννητόν) and Proceeding (ἐκπορεύμα). While one in their οὐσία, the three persons of the Godhead are to be distinguished in their properties² (ἰδιότησιν). The relationships within the Godhead are to be delineated as "modes of existence" (πρόσπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως)³, concerning which a further conception is added in the use of the term permeation or co-herence (περιχώρησις). Again there is a warning concerning the falling short of creaturely analogies when applied to the super-

1. Basil, Bp. of Caesarea, c.330-379, Gregory of Nazianzus, c.330-390, Gregory of Nyssa, c.335-394. 2. Based on the Aristotelean distinction between the universal (κοινόν) and the particular (ἴδιον), see Franks, *ibid*, p.155. 3. See Prestige, *ibid*, pp.242ff.

essential deity.^{1.}

These discussions seemed to have brought some temporary agreement^{2.} concerning the relationships within the Godhead. The division between East and West over the "filioque" clause within the credal statement of the double procession of the Spirit from the Father "and the Son" was still to be settled. But in this there were more than theological issues at stake.^{3.} However, the clarification of Christ's position within the Godhead only served to focus attention on the need for a re-statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation concerning the relationship between the divine λόγος and the historical Jesus. The important issue was the maintenance of the humanity of Christ now that his divine status was clear. The controversies that culminated in the Chalcedon Council (A.D.451) represent attempts at working out a unifying formula. Some held that the divine λόγος took the place of the human νόυς in Jesus.^{4.} Others that Jesus was a human person that worked in unity with the divine λόγος.^{5.} Others, again, claimed that Jesus had one ἑνωσις in two φύσεις, the human nature having no ἑνωσις of its own^{6.}, or that the human nature was absorbed into the divine nature of the λόγος to make one divine-human nature.^{7.} According to the Tome of Leo,^{8.} the two natures remained distinct and unconfused, each acting according to its own,

1. Cf. Franks, *ibid.* p.120, Prestige, *ibid.* p.247. 2. See H. Bettenson, *ibid.*, pp.62f. 3. *Ibid.*, pp.36 & espec. pp.133f. 4. Apollinarius, Bp. Laodicea, c.310-390. 5. Nestorius, Bp. Constantinople, (428-31). 6. Cyril of Alex. d.444 A.D. 7. Eutyches. c.450. 8. 449 A.D.

properties existing in reciprocity. At Chalcedon the two natures were described as concurring in one person (*πρόσωπον*) and one *ὑπόστασις* , "without confusion, without change, without division, without separation". This was confirmed in the East at Constantinople in 681 A.D., along with the formula of two wills and two energies.¹ John of Damascus² sought to resolve the disunity within the person of Christ by combining the idea of *ἐνυπόστασις* with that of permeation (*περιχώρησις*). However, the proposition was discredited by the qualifications concerning the permeation. The human will had no real choice, but was subservient to the divine omniscience, and the divine nature had no share in the human sufferings of Jesus. This undermined something of the essential richness of the conception of incarnation, and excluded the cross from the Christian revelation of the Godhead.

It is not unnatural that some advances grow from the dissatisfaction concerning the inadequate presentation of a Godhead divided at the point of its Soteriological activity. From within the overwhelming sense of the grace of God, Augustine points to the Scriptural divine "simplicity".³ As distinct from the Greek Fathers⁴ he prefers to describe the Godhead as one substantia in three personae in absolute equality. His key term is relation (relativum of *σχέσις*).

1. See H. Bettenson, *ibid.* pp.128f. 2. C.750 A.D.
 3. De Trin.XV:5 & 8 cf VII:4. See also Prestige, *ibid.*
 pp.237 & 240. 4. *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις*

The three personae are only to be distinguished in their relations, which again differs from the Eastern theology, where the Father was held to be the original source of the Godhead, and the Father and the Son the origin of the Holy Spirit. Again the analogical use of terms is referred to, especially in relation to the nature of the Trinity and the being of Christ, as persona.^{1.} The λόγος and the man in Christ are one.^{2.}

During the Middle Ages the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation were worked over more thoroughly on the basis of both authority and reason.^{3.} This resulted in a new appreciation of the humanity of Christ, especially from the Soteriological side. "As himself a man" Christ made satisfaction for human sins.^{4.} His Godhead gave infinite value to his work. He merited for men the grace by which they in turn can merit salvation.^{5.} The salvation events in Christ represent a revelation of the eternal love of God, kindling a responsive love in man towards God.^{6.}

The analogical nature of theological language again receives recognition when Richard of St. Victor defines the term "persona" as "an uncommunicable existence of the divine nature".^{7.} Similarly Thomas Aquinas indicates that as all names used of God are used in a higher sense, so the terms "persona" and ὑπόστασις are to be understood in this way.^{8.} Names are limited by their subject matter. He sets out the words to be avoided in theological

1. De Trin. XV:27;49. 2. Serm. CLXXIV:2. 3. The definition of a person in Boethius' trans. of Aristotle seems to have given a reason a new importance. "An individual substance of a rational nature". Cf. Franks, *ibid*, p. 132. 4. Anselm, cf. H. Bettenson, *ibid*, pp. 192ff. re Cur Deus Homo. 5. Aquinas' Summa Theologica. 6. Abailard (1070-1142). 7. See Franks, *ibid*, p. 135. 8. S. Th. qu. 29.

statement because of their own intrinsic limitations and historical associations.^{1.}

The Doctrine of the Trinity is not proven by reason. It is a revelation.^{2.} Reason is only helpful as explanation. Hence Aquinas' doctrine of the double procession is set in the framework of the reasonable assumption of the equality of all divine attributes. The divine Intellect (divine $\nu\acute{o}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$) produces an Image of itself, consubstantial and co-equal. This is his explanation of the divine begetting of the Son. The divine Will (also divine $\nu\acute{o}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$) directed towards that Image results in the living impulse of love and is properly called Spirit. Aquinas follows the Greek Fathers and Augustine in his preference for psychological analogies.

Concerning the Incarnation Aquinas expounds the notion of $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as the divine and human natures of Christ united in the divine $\delta\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.^{3.} In Christ the divine Son of God is Subject and his humanity predicate.

In the Lutheran expression of the spirit of the Reformation, all rational interpretative theology is secondary to the doctrine of Justification by Faith,^{4.} and to liberation from ecclesiastical authority. Contemporary with this Reforming spirit was the spirit of the Renaissance which liberated reason from the control of authority. The result theologically was a new emphasis on the primacy of Scripture

1. Summ. Theol. P. 1. Qu. 31. Art. 1.

2. Ibid, Qu. 32. Art. 1.

3. Ibid, lll, Qu. 2. Art. 3.

4. Luther held that God was to be sought in the humanity of Christ, not in any speculative theory of God's essence. See Franks, *ibid*, p. 139. cf. Melancthon. "To know Christ is to know his benefits, not as the Schoolmen teach, to know his natures and modes of incarnation".

as the source of all doctrine and creed, and a new appreciation of the personal experience of the Holy Spirit by the individual Christian.¹ With this freedom all the old controversies broke out again.² The Lutherans taught that every aspect of Christ's divinity was shared in every aspect of his human life. This led to some form of "Kenotic" or "Kryptic" explanation of Christ's person. With this stress on distinction in their doctrine of the Incarnation, the Reformers were led to a mild modalism in their trinitarian doctrine.

On its extreme rational side, the new freedom was expressed theologically in Deism and the Unitarian movement. Socinus returned to the fluid Kerygma Trinitarian position, and sought to explain away the pre-existence statements of the Pauline and Johannine Christology. Some Unitarians, however, did ~~not~~ accept an ideal pre-existence for Christ.

Some of Socinus' attack was based on his confusion of the historic terminology. He argued from the equivalence of the terms ὑΠΟΤΑΞΙΣ and οὐσία, which, as we know, only prevailed at the beginning of Greek theology.³ He neglects their later qualifications and applications. The divine unity was his primary emphasis.

The Arminians were ready to accept the Scriptural Trinitarian statement, but claimed the freedom of theological interpretation

1. See G.P. Fisher, History of Christian Doct. p.299. Cf Calvin was only prepared to accept the individual experience of the Holy Spirit, if its dictates agreed with Scripture. 2. Cf the catch phrases over "communicatio idiomatum": Lutheran "finitum capax infiniti", the Reformed "finitum non capax infiniti". Franks, *ibid*, p.140. 3. Racovian Catechism Qu.21-23. See also Fisher, *ibid*, pp.322ff, and Franks, *ibid*, p.143.

they perceived in the ante-Nicene Fathers. Their Trinitarian doctrine is based on "inferiorism".

The extreme results of this intellectual freedom are to be seen in the application of the principles of literary and historical criticism to the Scriptures and to the ecclesiastical dogmas by the scholars of the Aufklärung, in which the assessment of Christ was reduced to that of a teacher like one of themselves. From the conflicts that marked the new freedom, there has emerged an understanding of the idea of self-consciousness within the general concept of personality, and with it a new appreciation of the term "person" as applied to the Trinity, and also of the nature of the person of Christ.

To some extent this is due to the maintenance within the pietistic movements of the stress on personal experience of God and of Christ through the Holy Spirit. Often in defiance of reason, which, through its representative philosophers¹, had left nothing remaining basic to the structure of thought, but matters of fact and mathematical procedures. It is for this reason that the examination of Kant of the relationship between reason and experience is significant.

Kant distinguishes between the categories of understanding through which the raw material of experience is received, and the ideas of reason which seek to go beyond it in order to complete it. Trinitarian belief he discarded as belonging to the second

1. Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz and Wolff on the continent, and Locke, Berkley and Hume in England.

category, and therefore of no practical significance. It was upon this dichotomy of thought that others sought to impose a unity. Hegel sought to achieve this with his basis for thought in thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Within this scheme he found a place for religion in the form of imagery (Vorstellung) of which concept (Begriff) is the perfect philosophical form. Schleiermacher takes up this Kantian primacy of experience over reason, and the Hegelian place for religious experience, to which he give not only an independent value, but makes of it a means of unifying the dualism between experience and thought.

In line with the Kantian rejection of the works of reason as a going beyond the facts of experience, Schleiermacher goes back beyond the historical rationalisings of religious experience to the experiential roots of theology, and attains a fresh simplicity of understanding of theological truth. He begins with the Scriptural record of the Church's experience of Christ. Here he finds a spirit of absolute dependence (which he equates with God-consciousness) to be of the essence of religion. He is concerned with the total impression of the person of Christ in communicating to others the God-consciousness, which he himself possesses in a more dominant form than they. His doctrines of the Incarnation and Salvation are both explained in this concept of the experience of God-consciousness. He finds that the Trinity is not an immediate utterance concerning Christian experience, but rather a combination of several such utterances,

so as to express their coherence in the whole of Christianity. In recognising the analogical nature of such utterances he is more ready to receive the Trinity as a revelation than to penetrate into the eternal being of God. His conception of the Spirit is that it is the common Spirit of the Society formed by the communication of the God-consciousness of Christ, which regenerates those it indwells.

Ritschl finds his unifying principle in the idea of the Lordship of God through the Kingdom of God, in which the supremacy of the Spirit over matter is finally assured. Jesus represents the victory of the Spirit and the universal over the national and material. He is the incarnation of the perfect Spirit of religion: knowing God as Father and being known as Son. In his filial love, and in his own love for men, he reveals God's love. The immanence of God in Christ is seen in his patience, which is his Lordship over nature and man within the Kingdom. Forgiveness is an extension of that love. Spirit is related to the Christian community, as the ground of its knowledge of God and of its moral and religious life. It is the knowledge that God has of himself in his own self-end. Ritschl recognises how impossible it is for us to maintain God's standpoint of eternity. Therefore he explains that, although the pre-existence of Christ is for us in time as it is for God in eternity, he acknowledges that the concept is only understood by God.

This emphasis on the humanity of Christ came under attack from the scholars¹ who re-discovered the basically eschatological nature of the Scriptural presentation of Christ. Again it was the re-examination of the Scriptural account that brought redress and balance into theology. The most important contemporary theologian working within the compass of this re-emphasis of the eschatological view of the Scriptural revelation is Karl Barth.² He takes his theological stance within the framework of Kierkegaard's philosophy of the revelation of God as otherwise unknown, transcendent and absolutely different. God's transcendence is his freedom as sovereign Lord (Herr) and Absolute Will, and is therefore personal, as יהוה in the Old Testament, and Κύριος in the New. His freedom is shown in assuming the form of revelation without at least abandoning his mystery, or power to reveal himself otherwise. He preserves his sovereignty even in the historical Jesus, who is only known to the individual as the revelation of him creates the faith to believe. This faith is therefore something in the nature of a pre-supposition to the revelation³ which is our only source of the knowledge of God. The Incarnation is a matter of faith: a paradox: a leap beyond the evidence, which is immediate to contemporaries, and traditional to non-contemporaries. It supercedes both religious feeling and value judgements, as the only point at which the revelation of the transcendent God touches man. This Word of

1. J. Weiss and Albert Schweitzer in particular. 2. For a critical judgement on Barth's position see below pp. 351ff.

3. Dogmatic theology therefore is an exegesis of the revelation of the Word of God, as preached in the Church today, as testified in the Prophets & Apostles of Scripture and in the experience of the believer created by faith. Cf Dog. Grund. Pars 2, 3, 4.

God in Jesus Christ is the content of Dogmatic Theology. In it God is revealed as Lord. When this revelation is expanded we have the doctrine of the Trinity, which in itself can be expanded into a compendium of the Christian Faith.

Trinitarian belief grows from the simple fact that God is known as he reveals himself. As God he is Revealer, as Son he is the Fact or Act of Revelation, as Holy Spirit he is the State of Revelation.¹ These are the three "moments" of revelation. There is but one God, and three modes of being (*πρῆποι ὑπαρξίως* or Seinsweisen). Barth avoids the term "person" because of the ancient and medieval usages lack the modern mark of personality, which is consciousness. There are not three "consciousnesses" in the Godhead. There is one consciousness and three moments. These are not phases which do not touch the divine essence, but necessary distinctions within it, and eternal as God is. The divine monarchia is absolute. God is one in all his operations in the world. The Trinitarian belief is not speculation, but is required by Scripture. It is an attempt to look at the divine revelation "sub specie aeternitatis". In his teaching about the incarnation of the Word, Barth holds that individuality belongs to his human nature without which there would be no incarnation, but is that of the God-man. The relationship is an ἐν ὑπόστασις. The Word is subject and humanity predicate.

1. Cf. also Subject, Form, Contingency.

That the extreme emphasis on the "infinitely qualitatively different" nature and Godness of God and his egoistic, abstract, solitary, self-sufficiency was a necessary reactionary statement Barth now freely proposes.^{1.} In the freedom of God's sovereignty and Lordship he includes as essential his freedom to love^{2.} and to subordinate and humble himself, to adjust himself to something else, and to adjust this something else to himself, about which more will be said later. These elements are revealed in Jesus, but they are present within the trinitarian life of the Godhead as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The revelation of them in the humanity of Jesus does give man some point at which to receive the revelation, which was the chief point of criticism of the earlier presentation.^{3.}

In England modern theological thought has tended to seek light on the fundamental unity of the Godhead in the concept of divine "personality"^{4.} in which there is the idea, not only of mere unity, but an implication of subject-object and mutual relations. The name "Son" can only be used of the divine λόγος analogically. There has been a serious attempt to interpret the Trinity along social lines^{5.} from the point of view of an empirical philosophy, rather than from propositions. The doctrine of the Trinity arises when we project the life of Jesus (of self-giving love to the Father through the Spirit) into eternity, thinking away the accidents.

1. See the Humanity of God, in God, Grace, and Gospel, S.J.Th. Occasional Papers No.8. Eng. ed. 1959. p.32.

2. See espec. ibid,

p.40. 3. See Franks, ibid, p.183.

4. R.C. Moberley Essay on

the Incarnation in Lux Mundi.

5. Croall Lectures 1943, by

L. Hodgson.

He recognises the analogical language of Nicea. The ὁμοῦς is equivalent to Phil.2. It amounts to a change in analogical model from "the impossible piece of history" to "timeless" metaphysical truth. In an endeavour to reconcile the social view of the Trinity with the fundamental divine unity, psychological analogies are helpful, especially the idea of the unity of personality in thinking, feeling and willing. Hodgson begins from the view that we know in our experience the Trinity, and that we only strain after the unity in thought. This view is opposite to that of the Fathers as represented by John of Damascus, and Augustine, and also to the Kantian assessment.¹ It also leaves us with an unsatisfactory emergent conception of the Godhead.

What observations can be made from this survey of the historic attempts at precise formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Godhead? Perhaps it will put any conclusions we may reach in perspective if we note first of all, what others² during the Christian centuries have noted before us: that the Christian Church was functioning quite effectively on its Soteriological side while the doctrinal formulations were very fluid indeed. This surely implies that God is not necessarily confined, nor delayed by our formulations. Another comment is probably pertinent. The bitterness engendered by the demand for preciseness has often done little credit to the revelation it was meant to convey. Some very wrong notions were put forward by sincere men. The problem was how to

1. When he relegated the Trinity to the second category of thought structure, see above p.332.

2. Augustine, Luther and Wesley.

hold a charismatic freedom of analogy within the Christian group and a preciseness of expression of doctrine before the world. The more precise the terms became, the less the freedom for future formulation. On the other hand, the problem became more clearly grasped as the answers of theologians became more and more precise. The task was the building up of a terminology to answer a new theological situation that had arisen from the New Testament events. Terms were needed to express the essential monarchia of the godhead, and then to make allowance for the distinctions within it demanded by the Christian revelation of Jesus as the incarnation of the Son of God, and for the activity of the Spirit. Terms were slowly collected and restricted in their application to recognised usages. The difficulties were greatly increased by the different languages of the participating theologians.¹ They were applied to the Godhead in unity or distinction, and to the relationship of the distinctions to the unity and severally among the distinctions. The parallel problem of how to conceive of the relationship of the divine Son of God to the historic human Jesus called for similar terminological experimentation.

In all this experimenting the evidence shows that, sometimes the New Testament generally, and sometimes the Kerygma in a special way, acted as the principal norm to which constant reference was made. It is interesting to note that several recorded

1. Greek and Latin at first but later German and English for the most part.

reversions to the Scriptural norm have, in fact resulted in a fresh grasp of the essential problems, and in turn stimulated the endeavours of theologians to find more satisfying answers to them, which took into account any new terminological expressions available at the time in contemporary thought. The advance that is to be seen in the complexity of human thought and expression all along the line suggests the constant need for revision of terms. Many of them change in their usages in society, and care must be taken not to read back later meanings into earlier usages.

One of the most suggestive factors to be seen within the historical survey, is the constant recognition by many of the most original contributors of the analogical nature of the terminology they were applying to the elucidation of the nature of the Deity, and to the person of Christ. In this they have maintained for themselves some sort of private freedom of expression for their theological and Christological conceptions, often in the midst of the most cramping demands of orthodoxy. It is this freedom that he permitted them to reach out and adopt the more complex and satisfying analogies as they have become available. The most notable advances have been made by the application of the conceptions and terminology associated with the new conceptions of personality.

The final result has been the development of a series of terms which successively have sought to express more sensitively the basic conception of the unity of the Godhead. This has

temporarily come to be expressed in the terms of the analogy of human personality. As it is at present understood, the essential mark of personality is felt to be the possession of "self-consciousness". This term is being applied analogically as descriptive of the essential unity of the divine life. A second series of terms has sought to convey what was historically called the "distinctions" within the Godhead to be seen in the Christian revelation. "Modes of life" has been one of the more apt descriptions of these distinctions. Within the framework of the analogy of personality these are being very satisfyingly referred to as "moments" of the essential divine "self-consciousness". The third series of terms are expressive of the thorough coherence or permeation of thought and will and love in which the "moments" find the oneness which is "self-consciousness" and monarchia. We are left with a new analogical trinitarian formulation: Self-consciousness, Moment, Coherence, which does not seem to contradict the documentary New Testament formulations, yet goes most helpfully beyond them in interpretation.

Similar series of terms have been built up and applied to the exposition of the nature of the Person of Christ. Here the difficulty from the beginning has been that a life in two categories is being suggested within the being of a single historic personage. The final New Testament proposition is that the term $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is analogical of the pre-existent being of Jesus, and the term "Son" of his earthly relation to Fatherhood within the Godhead. This has been

the position that the theologians of the Church have striven to uphold. Their difficulties seem to have arisen from their desire to do away with the notion of analogy and speak "logically" of something which is "ana-logical". This resulted in the protracted discussion between those who held that Christ was possessed of two natures, and those who held he had but one. Advance seems to have come through those who have sought to express the life of Jesus as a "total impression", which is analogical of the "self-consciousness" which is God's. His life represents dominant "God-consciousness". To put together two of the conceptions we have been speaking of: the "total impression" of Jesus' life is an analogically representative "moment" of the "self-consciousness" which is God. To seek to resolve the analogical totality of the life of Jesus is to do away with the whole concept of incarnation. It is to assume that the progress across the "ontological gap" from the divine world into the human, can be described throughout as history. We can only take up of record on the earth-ward side of the metaphysical gap. If what we see in the history of the life of Jesus reveals what we have come to associate analogically with the divine presence within history, we must accept what he says, and is, and does, as analogical of the divine, along with former accepted revelations, which have to be qualified accordingly. We must put down along side the transcendent, just and merciful sovereign lordship of our accepted conceptions of Deity, the fullness of the lordship of his patient

"servanthood", and the giving of his life "for many", which is the "servant" correlative of the "Lord" who is God.

If we accept the view that the personal analogy is something in the nature of an end of the analogical series so far presented, it is to a richer understanding of human personality and personal relations that we must turn for further elucidation of the fullness which is divine personality, and which the analogical statements of the New Testament, and the "Trinitarian" formulations of historical theology have sought to safeguard.

Summary of Development of Incarnation Doctrinal Terms

Λόγος N.T. = The Son on pre-existent side.
Fathers: Eternal therefore co-equal.

Tertullian:-

persona & **substantias** One person two substances.

Origen:-

ὑπόστασις = substratum, subsistence then concrete existence
οὐσία (alternate word) (the Wisdom of God substantially existing)
φύσις Two natures.

Eternal generation. of the Son.

Chalcedon:-

Two natures concurring in one: One persona: one **ὑπόστασις**

Augustine:-

Λόγος and Man are one.

John of Damascus:-

ἑνυπόστασις & **περιχώρησις**, applied to the person of Christ.

Aquinas:-

Two **φύσεις** united in the **ὑπόστασις** of the **Λόγος**

Schleiermacher:-

The God-consciousness of the man Jesus.

Ritschl:-

Knowledge of God in filial relation.

Barth:-

Individuality belongs to the incarnation.

ἑνυπόστασις: The Word as Subject: the humanity as Predicate.

Summary of terms in relation to

Conceptions of the Spirit.

Synoptics & Kerygma : Spirit of God.

Pauline: Spirit of Christ, of God, in the Churches.

Johannine: God = Spirit: the Words of Jesus = Spirit: Paraclete.

Cappodocians: Proceeding (from the Father of filioque)

Aquinas: Love (Intellect, Image, Love) = Spirit.

Schleiermacher: Spirit common to society indwelt by the God-consciousness of Jesus.

Ritschl: Spirit common to those indwelt by the filial love of Christ.

Barth: the State of Revelation: Contingency.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

At the outset of our discussions we were confronted with the finality with which the Positivist philosophers rejected the validity of metaphysical statements. We were also made aware of the pressures under which they were unable to sustain the full rigour of their thesis. The outcome of the battle has left some wholesome conclusions that demand the attention of biblical theologians. Among them is the firm reminder of the priority of experience over conceptual thinking as providing the "raw material" of human knowledge. This is followed by the acceptance of the analogical nature of all forms of communication, even when it consists of communications between the members of like species, and the subjects are the common experiences of many. There can never be any real guarantee that any two minds are receiving or describing exactly the same thing.

Our attempts at communicating our experiences of the transcendent world are fraught with the additional difficulty, that no man has ever visited it and returned to report at first hand, and no man has ever seen God. The Positivists and biblical theologians would be in agreement on this point.¹

The acceptance of the analogical nature of statements about the supernatural world and about God, has provided theologians with a new starting point in that it is of the nature of analogical statements that they are neither univocal nor equi-vocal. They are not

1. For biblical support see Jer.23:18; Is.40:13f; John 1:18; (Cf L.John 4:12); 5:37; 6:46; 8:19. But cf also Amos 3:7 and Jer.23:18 for the idea that prophets were admitted into the counsels of God.

exhaustive statements of indicative fact.

The question concerning whether it is possible to build up a reliable concept of reality from our experience of nature and mankind in this world, or whether we are entirely dependent upon some specific revelation from the supernatural world, is still the subject of debate. It does sometimes appear that both parties in the discussion are drawing on the same data, but looking at ^{them} it differently, and are using different terms to describe what they are doing. The biblical theologian, however, is bound by definition to give priority to biblical data. Moreover, it is an important point of attack upon the Positivist position, that theologians need not only the most reliable data upon which to work, and all the most up-to-date relevant critical acumen and equipment, but that they need a sense of involvement as well. This rules out any strictly impersonal and objective approach to the biblical data, and calls for a readiness to believe as an important qualification in those who seek to assess the reliability of the biblical record and understand what it is trying to communicate.

The results of our researches in the biblical records indicate that the general Semitic categorical concept of the "Holy" has been significantly modified by the historical revelation the records contain. The authority of the Godhead is consistently exhibited under one or other of the analogical forms of the concept of sovereignty or lordship. In the Old Testament the arbitrary nature of this sovereignty is qualified by the characteristic features

of the Yahweh revelation. Within the New Testament exclusive claim is made that the nature of the divine $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$ is to be seen in its fullness in Jesus Christ, who is $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. Any future conception of deity must take into account this revelation. Whatever is revealed to us concerning the nature of God in the humanity of Jesus, must be read back by us into the Godhead from whence it originally came. Since no man has seen God at any time, only a recognition of the $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ of Jesus can give him any theological significance for mankind. Jesus is Spirit category, as God himself is. As God is $\bar{\eta}\eta\eta$, Jesus is $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. The sovereign Lordship of God is to be understood in terms of the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

The New Testament had not arrived at any final formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Godhead. There is to be seen a fluid trinitarian movement of thought in all streams of its tradition. The Spirit which is God and which is Jesus Christ, exercises the same Lordship. The determinative New Testament factor, however, is the Lordship which is characteristic of Jesus Christ. It exhibits a new conception of Lordship which is also claimed to represent the Spirit which is God. The charismatic enthusiasm of the early Church was so stimulated by the presence and unanimity of this Spirit, which was Christ's Spirit, and the Spirit of God, that the need for precise formulation seemed unnecessary; but it is the relationship between the Lordship which is Christ and which is Spirit, and the Lordship which is God, and which is also Spirit, with which the Fathers wrestled for centuries. In view of the revelation in Jesus Christ, how was the Lordship of the Godhead now to be conceived, and in what unambiguous

terms was the divine *ὁὐσία* to be expressed?

The history of theological thought has shown a pendulum swing from an emphasis on the divine unity to an emphasis on the distinctions within the unity. In these historical shifts of emphasis, the New Testament statements have acted as a norm. The main problem in these periodic formulations was the inadequacy of terminology. So many of the terms used to stress the unity of diversity within the Godhead, have lacked comprehensiveness, and have done an injustice to one or the other conception. It was for this reason that the New Testament fluid trinitarian formulation was so important. Any formulation of the divine unity which did not take into account Jesus, who was equally Spirit with God could not be accepted as final. On the other hand, any trinitarian formulation which did not represent the basic unity of will and love exhibited within the New Testament salvation events, could be no more acceptable. The insistence of the New Testament was that the divine *ὁὐσία*, which has exhibited itself in creation and history in terms of personal sovereignty and lordship, has been significantly qualified by the equally divine lordship of Christ, which is from the first represented as an outpouring of the Spirit of God. The Fathers, on account of the rigidity of their terminology, were unable to express this diverse activity without either doing an injustice to the diversity of action or to the divine unity behind it. In more recent times stress is again moving towards the conception of the divine unity. Because of the newer conceptions of human personality, and especially personal relationships, it does seem that this stress on divine unity may be accepted without

doing so much injustice to the distinctions within the Godhead.

The requirements of the New Testament seem to be that we must still think of God as God. His Sovereignty is still to be recognised as of the order of the "holy". The Christian revelation does not mean that the "metaphysical gap" has ceased to exist. All that has been exhibited concerning the Lordship of God in creation and in the heavens abides. He is Spirit; He is eternal in category; He is Life itself. Nor does the Christian revelation mean that the revelation of the peculiar Sovereignty of God in the Torah and covenant does not exist any longer. In claiming that Jesus Christ is also Spirit, and an expression of God's Spirit; that he is Lord, as only God is Lord, the New Testament was expressing its belief that in Christ we are dealing with the Lawgiver himself, who has every right to make full any partial revelation in the Torah. The "Torah" is a limited analogical expression, and not to be equated with full divinity. God who is Spirit is Lord with the Lordship that is Christ, who is also Spirit. The third New Testament feature is that the Spirit, which is also Lord abides and exercises the Lordship of Christ in the Church. This is also the very Lordship of God.

As biblical theologians it is this Lordship with which we are confronted, and no other. It meets us first in history under the name of קדוש , holy, eternal, unpreventable, unconditioned, and self-existent; but exhibiting the character of its Lordship as אלהים , יהוה and יהו . It is this same Lordship that encounters us in person in Christ, as a man, and a servant, and upon a cross, and in resurrecting might. This is the fullness of its grace, of its

redeeming activity, and of its constancy. It is this same Lordship that is met with within the sphere of its sovereignty in the Christian Church, a Holy convicting, informing Spirit, but pregnant with the "breath" of Christ and his peace.

It can be seen, therefore, that the Lordship ascribed to Christ in the earliest Christian confessions is not just any Lordship. The New Testament claim is first that Jesus is the *κύριος* that is *יהוה*, who is *יהו*. But equally and characteristically it is the *κύριος* which is Jesus Christ, who is also *ἐπιθέματα*. This is not simply divine Lordship or Sovereignty, it is constitutional sovereignty.

It is at this point that any serious theologian becomes aware of the significance of the work of Karl Barth. Barth's primary insistence is that we should continue to recognise that, in the Lordship of Christ, we are still confronted with the Lordship of God, and not of man, not even of the Man, Jesus. It was just here that Liberalism failed. The first lesson of biblical theology at any point in the records, is that we are dealing with the Lordship of God who is of another order of being.

It is for this reason that Barth approaches theology from the transcendent side. Unless we are clear of this point of the continuing Godness of God, we will never be clear at all. We must first be aware of the "unknowability", the "hiddenness", the utter "freedom", which is God. The difficulty of approaching theological statement from the transcendent side is that one is exposed to the danger

of giving priority to the conceptual image of Deity over the biblical historical revelation of it. It tends to a philosophical Idealism. This cannot have been the intention of Barth, who takes his stand so firmly within the conviction that we only know God within the self-revelation of his Word. It was a point which became blurred in his protest against the humanism of the Liberal theological position. He has since recognised this, as he was bound to do.^{1.} It must not, therefore, be made an excuse for neglecting the importance of his demand that the $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ of Jesus Christ must first and foremost be recognised as of the category of God's $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$. Of ourselves we cannot know God as he really is in himself.^{2.} God is known by God and only by God.^{3.} His "hiddenness" is not mere incomprehensibility,^{4.} nor is it the inapprehensibility of absoluteness arrived at by human reason.^{5.} It denotes the impotence of our categorical order of being.

Similarly, when we speak of the "freedom" of God, it is conditioned solely by its own self-sufficiency. Our life is never to be confused with his, or compared or contrasted with it as commensurate.^{6.} Nor is anything else which he is not. With the idea of "freedom" we simply affirm what we would be affirming if we were to characterise God as Lord.^{7.} This concept of freedom is the prerogative of divine sovereignty which distinguishes it from all other sovereignties. It is more than the

1. Cf. The Humanity of God, S.J.T. Occasional Papers. No. 8, p. 39. (E.T.J.S. McNab), "It is therefore no general godliness, to be conceptually reached etc". 2. See Church Dogmatics, Vol. ii, part 1, (E.T., T & T. Clark, Edin. 1957) p. 261. 3. Ibid, p. 204.
4. Ibid, p. 186. 5. Ibid. p. 194. 6. Ibid, p. 310.
7. Ibid, p. 301.

the absence of limits, restrictions and conditions. It is to be positively grounded in one's own being; to be determined and moved by oneself.^{1.} God is ontologically independent as no one else is.^{2.} He does not need even his own being to be what he is.^{3.} His life is lived in the abundance of many individual distinct perfections, each perfect in itself, and in combination with others.^{4.} The operative stress of these statements is upon the utter self-sufficiency of the divine order within itself, and the complete unnecessariness and inability of our order of life contributing anything to the divine order, or being anything but totally dependent upon it.

This almost conceptual self-sufficiency of the divine category, so emphatically stated in the Barthian doctrine of God, overflows into his conception of his second major premise, the grace of God. It is at this point where Barth's emphatic protest against Liberalism brings him again close to conceptual idealism. But this is rather in his presentation than in intention. The biblical presentation of the grace of God is that it is in his grace that his Lordship is to be seen. It is this that Barth is anxious to preserve. The grace of God can be seen in its fullest possible dimension against the self-sufficiency and freedom of his order of being; even his grace is self-sufficient. There was no necessity within God's own self to give us knowledge of himself. He is quite complete within his hiddenness, and free within the sovereignty of his

1. Ibid, p.302.

2. Ibid, p.310.

3. Ibid, p.306.

4. Ibid, p.332.

own being. We are totally dependent upon God's readiness to reveal himself;^{1.} otherwise he is inaccessible to us. However, God is knowable because of his grace. "We cannot be too definite when we go on to say, that we are thinking of the grace of God when we say God is knowable".^{2.} Grace is the majesty, the freedom, the undeservedness, the unexpectedness, the newness, the arbitrariness, in which the relationship to God, and therefore the possibility of knowing him, is opened up to man by God himself.^{3.} It is a circular course, because God is known by God and only by God. Even as an action undertaken and performed by man, knowledge of God is objectively and subjectively both instituted by God himself and led to its end by him.^{4.} He is only known in the act of his self-revelation.^{5.} By the grace of God we shall truly know God with our views and concepts, and truly speak of God with our words. But we shall not be able to boast about it, as if it is our success, and we have performed and done it.^{6.} It is we who have known and spoken, but it will always be God, and God alone, who will have credit for the veracity of our thinking and speaking. He who steps down to the level of us all, both believers and unbelievers, is the real God alone, in his grace and mercy. And it is only by the fact that he knows this, that the believing man is distinguished from the unbeliever.^{7.}

Grace is the distinctive mode of God's being, in so far as

1. Ibid, p.126.

2. Ibid, p.69.

3. Ibid.p.74. Cf.p.204.

4. Ibid.p.204.

5. Ibid p.274.

6. Ibid.p.213.

7.Ibid,p.95.

it seeks and creates fellowship by its own free inclination and favour, unconditioned by merit or claim in the beloved, but also unhindered by any unworthiness or opposition in the latter - able on the contrary to overcome all unworthiness or opposition.^{1.} Grace is a turning, not in equality, but condescension, and is the essence of the divine.^{2.}

Even together with this concept of grace we must maintain the concept of holiness. As holy, God is still Lord, and his grace distinguishes and maintains his own will against every other will.^{3.} He condemns, excludes and annihilates all contradiction and resistance to it. His grace does not mean surrendering himself to the one to whom he is gracious.^{4.} He neither compromises with this resistance, nor ignores it, still less calls it good. The one to whom God is gracious comes to experience God's opposition to him.^{5.} Grace in Jesus Christ stands in victorious opposition to the resistance set up by the creature to God.^{6.}

Again, all this must ideally be seen to be so; but Barth is in danger of presenting it as a presupposition to the revelation of God's grace as we actually have it in history. Again, it is not his intention that it should be so. It is a part of his insistence that God is free and able to be gracious within himself without any obligation towards us, but such is the divine dimension of his grace, that in fact, God does condescend to be gracious to us. Barth makes this clear when he says, "That divine ability, which works out and is represented in his existence in that superordination and subordination, is manifestly also God's ability to humble

1. Ibid, p. 353. 2. Ibid, p. 354. 3. Ibid, p. 359. 4. Ibid, p. 361.
5. Ibid, pp. 361f. 6. Ibid, p. 371.

himself, to adjust himself to something else, and to adjust this something else to himself".^{1.} Or again, "For it is God's freedom to love, and therefore his ability to be not only in the heights but also in the depths, not only great but also small, not only in and for himself, but also to be with another who is different from himself, to give himself for this other.....".^{2.} "..... this is the mystery in which we actually meet him in the existence of Jesus Christ".^{3.}

However, this too is grace. It has nothing to do with any optimistic estimate of man.

Constantly throughout Barth's presentation of the "Perfections" of God, his ideal conceptual view of them is subjected to the correction of the actual and corresponding biblically revealed facts of the case. God is for us fully revealed and fully concealed in his self-disclosure at one and the same time. By the grace of revelation our human views and concepts are invited and exalted to share in the truth of God, and therefore in a marvellous way made instruments of a real knowledge of God, that is, in his being for us as he is in himself.^{4.} His perfections are not other than one another, or in opposition or contrast, but the same. Just as his holiness and his grace are to be taken together, and to be defined by acts of revelation, in the same manner must his perfections, in which the holiness and grace are expounded in greater detail. The love and mercy of God is to be distinguished by the revealed fact that no worthiness on the part of the recipient is involved.^{5.} Nor is there any necessity or compulsion or incompleteness within the Godhead. His mercy stems from his own life, and is not to be taken

1. The Humanity of God, p.40.

2. Ibid, p.40.

3. Ibid, p.43.

4. Church Dogmatics, vol.ii, part 1.p.341.

5. Ibid, p.275.

alongside his righteousness, but as the same thing.^{1.} God's revelation of himself as Law distinguishes him from all unrighteousness. But he cannot implement the Law more strongly than by the grace by which he pardons the sinner.^{2.} The condemnation of God is the depth and power and might of his mercy. This is not to divest God of judgement, punishment or reward. In the cross God's punishing mercy really broke out, smiting and piercing human sin, and man the sinner.^{3.}

Similarly the patience of God is grace, not because God did not have great cause to be otherwise, but because he chose to be patient when impatience might have been expected of him. In this respect it is an intensification of his mercy, and is to be linked with the peculiar nature of the wisdom of God. Knowing all, he still chooses to be patient.^{4.} He is wise in that all relates back to him as its source. In his patience he confirms his own wisdom. It is for this reason that the unity of God is the sum of his perfections. It is to be understood first in terms of his uniqueness. He is the only one of his kind. But then it is to be understood in the undivided nature of all that he is or does.^{5.} This unity is also not to be thought of as the result of human conception, but is the result of historical encounter.

Omnipresence is a determination of the freedom of God. It is the sovereignty in which, as the one he is, existing and

1. Ibid. p. 381. 2. Ibid, p. 383. 3. Ibid, p. 391. Cf. Rom. 14:10;
2 Cor. 3:9; 5:10; Phil. 2:12f; 1 Pet. 1:17. 4. Ibid. p. 422.
5. Ibid. p. 445.

acting in a way that corresponds to his essence. He is present to everything else, to everything that is not himself, but distinct from himself.^{1.} This includes his Lordship. God cannot be present without being Lord. The spatiality of God is distinct from all other spatiality of every other being. It is identical with his being.^{2.} He possesses his space and creates it. There is no place where he is less present than others. This too is grace. God is present to this world, not because he must~~be~~, but because he graciously chooses to be.^{3.} Creation and all that follows from it stems from this grace. Creation is not made of necessity, but in the freedom of God's love. He did not need anything outside himself.

It is important from the point of view of creation that the omnipresence of God should be linked with his constancy. He who is omnipresent remains the one he is. This does not conflict with his freedom, but expresses it. If we speak of God as immutable, the Subject must determine the predicate, and the Subject must be understood by his self-revelation, and not an arbitrarily chosen Subject by an arbitrarily chosen predicate.^{4.} This means that God will never turn and contradict himself, not even in virtue of his freedom, or for the sake of his love.^{5.} He is immutably free, even to maintain contact with a sinful world.^{6.} The meaning and secret of creation and the preservation of the world is revealed in the history of Salvation, that is in Jesus Christ. He is

1. Ibid,p.461.

2.Ibid.p.470.

3.Ibid,p.476.

4. Ibid.p.493.

5. Ibid.p.495.

6.Ibid.pp.502f.

immutably this God.^{1.} He is able and willing and ready to be one with creation in Jesus Christ. That he did in fact do this is the constancy of his grace.^{2.} It is the constancy of his free decision which he is exercising in being revealed in Jesus Christ.^{3.}

When we are thinking of the Omnipotence of God, we are thinking of the positive character of his freedom; that^r which stands as Lord over all reality, which God has created.^{4.} He is its source and its preservation. He is sovereign over creation's death, which has no place in him. Again, it is characteristic of the divine category of power, that it is not power in general in itself, which is neutral, or even evil, but it is power as revealed and conditioned by God's own deity. It is always to be associated with right.^{5.} It is to be distinguished from omni-causality, in that God is not omnipotent in a general way, but in saving activity. His omnipotence extends to all his perfections. He has power to be himself, and over all others, who without him would be powerless. He is distinct and free from all other objects. Within the limits of being imposed by God himself, he knows everything.^{6.} There is no being who is not subject to his will, or outside or beyond him.^{7.} His knowledge takes the form of "praescientia", which is a category definition, and therefore more than temporal.^{8.} God's omnipotence is bound up with his willing and knowing, and his willing and knowing with his omnipotence.^{9.} These conclusions are not conceptually derived.

1. Ibid, p. 512.

2. Ibid, p. 515.

3. Ibid, p. 518.

4. Ibid, p. 522.

5. Ibid, p. 528.

6. Ibid, p. 553.

7. Ibid, p. 555.

8. Ibid, p. 558.

9. Ibid, p. 597.

They depend upon the fact that God has a personal place in history distinct from other places, a concrete temporal centre, from which God knows and wills, and from which he exercises power in all ages. He has revealed himself as Lord of everything that takes place from the Old Testament beginning in Exodus, to the end of the consummation of his Church in the New Testament.^{1.}

In the same way the eternity of God can be conceived conceptually, but it follows logically from the biblical revelation. It is and has simultaneity. It is not the mere negation of time, or its extension backwards and forwards everlastingly. It contains the "duration" which is lacking in time, in which God is the free Lord of time. Put in the concrete biblical form, God precedes time's beginning, accompanies its duration and exists after its end.^{2.} God is proclaimed as the living God.

The glory of God is not merely the sum of his perfections.^{3.} It is his right to make himself known for the one he is in relation to all else. It belongs to the glory of God not only to be "gloria", but to be "glorificatio.". Although glory expresses the divine as appertaining to the category of light and power, Barth stresses the concept of beauty as most characteristic of the revealed glory of God. As light he enlightens, as power he convinces, but as beauty he persuades.^{4.} The Son is the locus of the Trinity in which the beauty of God is to be seen in supreme degree.^{5.} What the creature does in its "new creatureliness", which in Jesus Christ has become gratitude to God, is to glorify God.^{6.}

1. Ibid, pp. 604f.

2. Ibid, p. 619.

3. Ibid, p. 652.

4. Ibid, pp. 653 & 667.

5. Ibid, p. 661.

6. Ibid, p. 669.

We have seen how Barth moves on from his original transcendent approach to theological statement which belongs to his very necessary protest against humanism. He acknowledges that the term "diastasis" was his most frequently used term as descriptive of the divine-human relation, and that he seldom used the complementary term "analogy".^{1.} He speaks of his almost non-human configuration of God which resulted from his more conceptual approach to theology,^{2.} and which he is prepared to describe as a divine monologue.^{3.} He goes on to speak of the divine-human encounter with equal conviction as the dialogue between man and God, which involves God's grace and man's gratitude.^{4.} He is prepared to concede that the biblical evidence reveals a necessity within the divine *ouçia* of God to seek a sphere for his sovereign Lordship within the correlative "servanthood" of man, with whom he seeks to conclude a covenant of fellowship. This grace which seeks out man is not general godliness to be conceptually reached; but the concrete Godness - actual and recognisable in the condescension - that is peculiar to the existence of Jesus Christ, and that comes from that sequence.^{5.}

This is of course important for Barth's final dogmatic statement, but it does not so much contradict his former statement, as go on from it. He makes his beginning from the this-worldly biblical revelation, and projects his theological findings into objectivity as his concept of divine Lordship. It is constituted first in the historical *1777* revelation of Exodus, with its

1. The Humanity of God, *ibid*, p.36.

2. *Ibid*, p.38.

3. *Ibid*, p.46.

4. *Ibid*, p.48.

5. *Ibid*, p.39.

Law-Covenant, and grounded in the revealed character of the transcendent Godhead as $\gamma\delta\pi$, $\rho\tau\gamma$, and $\lambda\eta\kappa$.

This is also determinative for all the holy "perfections" of God.

Then as its final, personal and human expression, it is grounded in the person of Jesus Christ, especially in his dying in love for many on the cross. This also is the Holy grace that is most characteristic of the $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$ which constitutes the $\omicron\upsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of $\acute{\omicron}\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{o}\varsigma$, which is also $\pi\rho\upsilon\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha$. It is to God in Christ that man's final thought must turn for theological adjustment.

It would be hard to contribute to this presentation of the biblical doctrine of God, except in one important regard. That "Lordship" understood as "transcendence" and qualified as "grace", represents the character of the biblical revelation of God we must agree, especially as set out so painstakingly in Barth's Church Dogmatics and his subsequent variations from this statement, but the presentation seems more than all else to demand a more living analogical concept, in which to sum up the results of these tremendous labours. If our concept of God should be described as transcendent Lordship qualified by grace, we must look for a living analogy which will hold together the two operative ideas "in solution". The very fact that Lordship and sovereignty throughout the earth is at this moment under qualification is not without relation to the very revelation of God we have been discussing. This qualification in broad and general terms represents the seeking of an approximation to an ideal that has grown out of the biblical revelation of the perfection of the Lordship of our Father "which is in heaven". If it is possible to use a this-worldly analogy at all of the transcendent Lordship of God, and

qualified in terms of the biblical revelation of the character of God ^{always} (assuming that "Lord" is the right term to use) it would be most natural that the full and final description of the "qualified" Lordship of God should be looked for within the political key-feature to which the term "Lord" itself belongs. As Barth's Summary Statement now stands "transcendence" represents his emphatic insistence on the categorical distinction between the divine Lordship and this-worldly lordships. This means for us in this context that any comment of ours upon the divine Lordship can never be more than analogical. We will be talking about Lordship in absolute terms, and the frailty of our human language must be kept constantly in mind.

The term "Lord" of course has the full weight of the Old Testament *יהוה* and the New Testament *Κυριος* behind it. It means that God has chosen to address us in political terms, as best representing in this-worldly terms, the relationship in which he stands to creation and mankind. In relation to man and his world, God can never be anything else than Sovereign Lord.

That the activity of God in Creation and history is grace throughout, follows from our acceptance of "transcendent Lordship" as descriptive of the relationship of God to all else that is not himself. Creation is grace, history is grace, and in a special way "salvation history" is a particular focussing of grace in general. It is all condescension. But what we have in the biblical record is not just general grace, or arbitrary grace, but a particular grace that is grounded in the revealed character of the Lordship of God.

It is grace that is redressively right in its activity, and it is constant; so constant that it can be written into the legal charter of a covenant, and guaranteed by the repeated support of historical acts of divine constancy. It is as constant as the entry of God himself into history. in the person of Jesus Christ. It is constant unto death. The grace of God in covenant and in Christ, represents a constitutive qualification of the character of the sovereign Lordship of God. It is not something that is occasional or arbitrary. It is the manner of the Lordship itself. It cannot be anything else than faithful to its covenant and unto death. It bears the measure of man's failure within itself to maintain its constancy. Such is the biblical revelation of the Lordship with which God is Lord. This is not arbitrary Lordship; or even transcendent Lordship only. It is Lordship operating within a revealed charter in which "servants" may put their entire trust, and to which they may respond in gratitude. The Old Testament charter is the Law-Covenant, the New Testament charter is the person of Jesus Christ.

It is at this point that an extension of the political analogy of Lordship or Sovereignty seems to be required in order to convey the constancy of the grace with which the biblical revelation qualifies the transcendent sovereignty of God. The remarkable thing is that it does seem to be at hand.

In our attempts to modify the political concept of arbitrary sovereignty so that the authority of the ruler (and/or state) may be held in some kind of defined relation to the freedom of the subject, there has developed the practice of drawing up written or

unwritten charters, in which the rights of all parties are clearly set out and understood from all sides. Such charters are usually referred to as constitutions, and the authorities that work under them as "constitutional". This is a live political concept which is constantly being applied as a qualifying definition to the sovereignty of a state or ruler. If then we are to refer to the Sovereignty or Lordship of God as under permanent qualification from within his own character, in the biblical revelation it would seem equally legitimate to describe that sovereignty as constitutional. It would seem right to say that what we have revealed to us in the covenant relation between God and man in the Old Testament, and in the personal relation in Jesus Christ in the New Testament, is the Constitutional Sovereignty of God. It remains now to test this conception out against the various biblical analogical presentations of divine Lordship.

If the results of our investigations are correct the formative biblical analogy of the divine-human relationship is the "Yahweh-My People" analogy of the Exodus revelation. This representation is political in key and remarkably comprehensive; in fact most of the other biblical analogies take their rise in some association with the primary conception of Yahweh and his people. It must first be noted that it is a political analogy. On its divine side it can be set out briefly in the following manner.

The "Holy" ($\psi \tau \rho$) is revealed as Yahweh ($\eta \gamma \eta \nu$), who is pitiful and gracious ($\gamma \delta \pi$), ready to take redressive action ($\rho \tau \zeta$) and faithful ($\pi \nu \chi$). His $\gamma \delta \pi$ moved him to choose hapless Israel and his $\rho \tau \zeta$ led to his redressive judgement of arrogant Egypt

and redemption of Israel, with whom his אֱלֹהִים is expressed in the making of a covenant (אֲבָרְכֶם), which in turn is more precisely set out and given content in the Commandments of the Decalogue ($\text{אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל}$), which in turn make a total claim on the obedience of his people.

The operative ideas behind the name אֱלֹהִים are the establishment of his "eternal" category, the revelation of his presence within the time-space order and his close association with his people.

All these terms are man's terms from man's world, and they describe a human estimate of an historical experience, but what these terms represent in their this-worldly connotations is analogous to the life and activity of Yahweh in the holy category. In view of the contrast between the unconditional faithfulness of Yahweh and the constantly recurring unfaithfulness of Israel, it is to be inferred that the Exodus revelation does not represent any change in the nature of the holy, but represents its eternal character.

This distinctive character of Yahweh is the determinative feature of prophetic theology in its wider application to the larger world scene and to individuals. It is still determinative in the "überweltlichkeit" emphasis of late Judaism, when the historical features of the Exodus revelation were given a conceptual objectivity separate from the world. The apocalyptic eschatological expectations of Israel are grounded in the faithful mercy and redressive action of Yahweh. The intensity of the legalism of Judaism is aimed at a restoration of the covenant relation of Israel as the people of Yahweh. In so far as the representative figures are delimitations of historic Israel, they too move within the comprehensiveness of the "Yahweh - My people" analogy. The

maintenance or reconstitution of the people of Yahweh is their final goal. The single supernatural figures are finally related to the "many", who are the Saints of the most High, or the Elect, or Members of the Messianic Kingdom.

There is a reference in the New Testament in which the miraculous activity of Jesus evokes the comment that God has visited his people.¹ The First Epistle of Peter² makes more universal use of the background of this conception of the people of God, by gathering up all the affectionate terms in which Yahweh speaks of his people and applying them to the Gentile Christian Church. The emphatic communal teaching of St. Paul concerning the Church, also makes this analogy an important one in the final assessment of New Testament theology. God is to be known as the Spirit of Christ, the holy correlative of the this-worldly oneness of the Christian Communities.

It is within this "Yahweh-My people" frame of reference that the term *κύριος* is to be understood. We have seen how this term was chosen with particular care by the LXX translators to represent the original *יהוה* of the Hebrew Scriptures, because it indicated a defined exercising of lordship over a servant, which contrasted with other more arbitrary forms of lordship to be seen in contemporary rulers. It was reckoned to be more appropriate to the convenantal lordship of Yahweh with his people.

When the title was applied to Christ in the early Christian confessions which are embedded in the New Testament literature, it is intended to give his authority absolute reference. In the earlier references Christ is linked with the Lord at God's right hand

1. Luke 7:16.

2. 1 Pet. 2:9f.

in the Psalms, but St. Paul associates the title with the "name" above all names presumably the name of יהוה יהוה¹.

Just as in the Old Testament the predicates of the divine יהוה are יהוה, רב and אלה of the historical revelation, so in the New Testament the title κύριος is given the content of Christ as the personal historical revelation. The name is associated with his laying aside of divine prerogatives as they are normally understood, and with the assuming of the servant role, and choosing death. In John it is the "lifting up" of Jesus on the cross which is the glory shared with the Father in his pre-existent life.²

It is to this New Testament conception of Lordship we must turn. Here Lordship has acquired a new depth. It is a grace (יהוה cf. Χάρις) that approaches sinners; it takes redressive action by taking upon itself the human sinful condition (רב), and it is faithful (אלה) unto death. The Lordship is universal in its range, individual in its application, it is spiritual in its content and eternal in its duration. It is exercised in the height and the depths, and against the powers of darkness that have men in thrall. The total claim it makes upon men is offered through love, which inspires a responding love in the heart of men. In applying this κύριος title to Jesus, the New Testament direction is that the particular Lordship exercised by Christ was to be read back into the character of the Godhead. God is the Father to such a Son, and the Spirit is the Spirit of such a one. These are Christ's guarantees of God's free grace to man, and of man's free gratitude to God.³

1. Phil. 2:5-11.

2. John 17:5.

3. Barth, *ibid.* p. 38.

The divine Lordship title in the New Testament, growing as it does out of the Old Testament covenant setting, can be clearly seen to have a constitutional character, which is deepened and enriched in the revelation of Jesus Christ.

One of the features of the biblical analogies is that they are seldom presented in an uncomplicated and single manner. They are often mutually dependent upon one another. The terms of one grow out of, and are used in connection with another. This has been so from the beginning. The Father-Son analogy grows out of, and is used within the Exodus concept of the covenant people of Yahweh, where it introduces an additional personal note of intimacy within the larger national analogy.^{1.} The concept of the "son" is first of all an ideogram for "Israel".

Two important features have been noted in the Old Testament usages.^{2.} The first is that it represents the gracious "adoption" of Israel by Yahweh" as his covenant people. The second is that the application of the title to the Davidic Messianic king in the Psalms contains the term "begotten". Both these features hover in the background of New Testament interpretation of the person of Christ, and are to be found in the theology of the Fathers.

Concerning the Old Testament position, several comments can be made.^{3.} In the Psalms there is always the possibility of

1. These are supplemented repeatedly by other analogies as "Shepherd-Sheep", "Husband-Wife" etc. 2. See above pp.163ff.
3. Cf. Ex.4:22f; Jer.31:9; Hos.11:1.(Cf.Mt.2:15); Ps.2:7.

poetic embellishment of the Davidic Messianic role to be considered, in which the religious possibilities are strained to the limit commensurate with monotheism in order to encourage faith. Investigations¹ into the beliefs of later Judaism concerning the pre-existence of the Messiah have indicated that, within the Messianic speculations, there was no pre-existence in the categorical sense. The supernatural figure of the Davidic Messiah as "son" is representative of the "sonship" of Israel. At its inception at the Exodus, it was adopted sonship and contingent on obedience. Any stability accruing to the "sonship" rested in the faithfulness of the "Fatherhood" of Yahweh, and upon his grace. Israel had no claim upon sonship with Yahweh by natural right, but by grace, sealed in the law and covenant. The stability of the whole relation depended upon the continuing faithfulness of Yahweh, not upon any divine prerogatives of legitimate sonship, or the goodness of any particular Davidic king. The "begotten" statement in the Psalms is clarified within its own context. It is preceded by the phrase "this day", and followed by the statement "I will give thee etc".

In the later Old Testament and in inter-testamental Judaism, the term "Father" was often qualified by the term "Heavenly" or the clause "which art in Heaven". These additions were not gratuitous. To begin with, they were intended to prevent any presumptuous claim to a "natural" sonship analogous to human sonship. However, they also served to draw attention to the

1. Excursus on John 1:1 in Strack u. Billerbeck ad. loc.

character and stability of the Fatherhood which was grounded in the known character of Yahweh, to which Israel could appeal.^{1.} It was based on the Exodus covenant and law, and to that extent, it establishes a covenantal "right" of sonship to which Israel could point.^{2.}

The Old Testament Father-Son concept, then, is grounded in and gets its stability from the "Yahweh-my people" analogy, of the Exodus of which it is a specialized variant. It carries all the implications of that analogy for theological comment. It is an adoption that represents the grace ($\gamma\ \nu\ \nu\ \nu$) of Yahweh. It is underwritten by the covenantal and torah guarantees, and represents the "Fatherly" qualifications of the "Lordship" exercised by Yahweh, which are constitutive of his eternal character.

The New Testament conception of man's sonship with God begins strictly within the Old Testament background. It should be noted that the people addressed are Jews. In association with God's Fatherhood there is frequent use of the categorical phrases "Which art in Heaven" and "Heavenly"^{3.} and there is a specific request from Jesus that the term "Father" should be restricted to God.^{4.} The opening phrase of the Lord's Prayer contains the "categorical" "which art in Heaven" with the intent, that the worshipper should adopt the appropriate attitude in the presence of a Father who is of the order of the holy. This is also the object of the restricted usage requested by Jesus. He is the Father whose activities belong to the order which shows man's

1.Ps.68:5, note "widows" are involved. 2.Ps.89:49f.

3.Mt.6:9 (Lk.11:2-4);6:48 (Lk.11:11), cf.7:11. 4.Mt.23:9.

needs before they are spoken,^{1.} he sustains nature,^{2.} he distributes impartially to good and evil^{3.} alike, he sees in secret and rewards openly.^{4.} It is to this "heavenly" Fatherhood men are to look for the perfection of their sonship.^{5.}

This sonship of men with God is put in its right New Testament perspective in the contrast with the claim of Jesus to a unique Sonship with God, as a basis for his absolute authority. In our examination of this claim^{6.} we saw that its authenticity is substantially supported by New Testament scholars. It is to be found in the Synoptic Gospels and Pauline literature, and is taken up in its most decisive form in John. The complete oneness of Jesus, the Son, with the Father, is central to the Fourth Gospel. To believe this claim about Jesus is to open to men the right (ἱξουσίᾳ) to become sons of God.

It is in this Father-Son relation that the true nature of the Godhead is to be seen. Its most characteristic glory is to be seen in the oneness with which the enterprise of redemption is conceived in love and expressed in the incarnation and the cross. This is a revelation of "sonship" before it is a revelation of the Father. The ancient Israelite notion of sonship grew out of the patriarchal society in which the complete obedience of the son figured the life of his father. Here in the New Testament is presented a sonship in which Father and Son are in full confidence, sharing mutually a common Spirit, God is not just

1.Mt.6:32. 2.Mt.6:26. 3.Mt.5:45. 4.Mt.6:18; cf.6:4; 6.
5. Mt.5:48. 6. See above pp.168ff.

any Father, or any "Heavenly" Father. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he that hath the Son hath that Father also. The content of the God's fatherhood, the Spirit of which he consists is the sonship of Christ. The sovereignty of this Father of the "Heavenly" order is the depth of the self-giving love to be seen in the Son. It takes up its abode with, and rules in the hearts of those who so willingly embrace the Son that they share his self-giving Spirit, which is the present experience of the Life of the Age to Come. The sonship of Jesus is constitutive of the Fatherhood of God.

The Kingship-subject analogy is a specific sovereignty analogy, and a variant of the Lordship analogy. The human kingship entered the life of Israel haltingly and under strong protest from the prophets. It is always representative of the Kingship of Yahweh, and takes its character from him. We have seen how it was early exercised within the constraints of accountability, first to the people, then to the prophets, and always to Yahweh. It was an office of grace held while it represented the peculiar כֹּהֵן מֶלֶךְ of Yahweh. As representative of the people the king later concentrated in himself the cultic forces which renewed the holiness of the people. When the kingship was finally eclipsed, the concept remained in association with the expectation of an ideal Davidic king, who would be anointed with the Spirit of Yahweh. In the context the primal idea survived in the conception of the expectation of the Kingdom of God.¹

1. Or of heaven, "heaven" being sometimes used as a periphrasis for the unutterable name.

It is in the use of these phrases that we are introduced to the conception of the Kingship of God in the New Testament.^{1.} Jesus began his ministry with the announcement of the Kingdom's arrival. Much of his early teaching concerns its nature and the character of its citizenry. The kingdom is not like this-worldly kingdom.^{2.} Paul's statement is that it is not meat and drink,^{3.} but righteousness and peace. In the teaching of Jesus it must be man's primary goal,^{4.} anyone looking back is not fit for it. Its claim is total. Unless it comes with the attraction of the pearl of great price, we have not seen it.^{5.} It does not come by observation.^{6.} It is the gift^{7.} of God. It is characterized not by a formal Lord, Lord, but by the casting out of demons,^{8.} and feeding the hungry and visiting the sick^{9.} and prisoners. Those who listen to the word of Jesus are its children.^{10.} It grows up from small beginnings in a world from which temporarily it may be indistinguishable. It is inward, spiritual and ethical. In short it is tantamount to putting yourself under the discipleship of Jesus. The Kingdom is contemporaneous with Jesus. It is the Kingdom of God's "dear Son",^{11.} and it has to do with the "patience" of Jesus.^{12.}

The Kingdom of God and Jesus are synonymous terms. He gives content to its rule. In the Johannine literature this analogy is transposed into the concept of "eternal life".^{13.} There was a danger that its religious significance would be misleading and politically dangerous in the wider Graeco-Roman world. As a final analogy of the Godhead, kingship is open to domination by limiting

1. Cf. Mk. 1:14f; 39; Mt. 4:23; Lk. 4:15; 8; 10.

3. Rom 14:17. 4. Mt. 6:33. 5. Mt. 13:45.

8. Mt. 12:28; Lk. 20:11. 9. Mt. 25:31ff.

12. Rev. 1:9.

13. John 3:3; 5; cf. 15.

2. The point of the temptations.

6. Lk. 17:20. 7. Lk. 12:32.

10. Mt. 13:38. 11. Col. 1:13.

historical examples, but it is clear from the analogy that the kingship of God is constituted, not in Caesar's Imperial Lordship, but in the dying Lordship of Christ.

An important variation of the Fatherhood analogy is that in which the term "Father" is used in the sense of originator, and finally as Creator. The "Creator-creature" concept of the divine-human relation is an extension of the Lordship concept of the Exodus. It is one of the important corollaries of the practical monotheism of the Israelite world-view.

The effective lordship over nature and history demonstrated in biblical events is given a general and primary form "in the beginning". This became a technical phrase meaning at the point of creation. Correlative to the Creator is the dependent creatureliness of man and his world. This "Creator-creature" analogy is expressive of the categorical distinction between this world and the supernatural world in its frankest form, the ultimate unconditioned lordship of God and the utter dependence of man. However, in its biblical context, the term Creator is not so much the Subject, but the Predicate of the term $\bar{\eta} \eta \bar{\eta}$, and all its historically revealed characteristics. The boldest assertions of the Creatorship of Yahweh in the prophets are linked with the idea of redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, and with anticipations of the redeeming faithfulness of Yahweh in the Maccabean times.

The concept of Yahweh as Creator immediately places the world of nature and human history within a framework of the control of Yahweh. This seems to have been the basis of an earlier covenant in Patriarchal times,¹ and Jesus himself is represented as commenting on

1. Gen.9:12ff.

the reliability and impartiality of natural phenomena as expressing the wide range of gracious provision of his Father.¹ The concept of Creatorship holds as inherent within itself certain suggestions of constraint upon the arbitrary freedom of the Creator. It implies some measure of satisfaction in the results of creative activity, and agreement, temporarily at least, to enjoy the results of such activity. A further invasion of the Creator's liberty to make and unmake is to be envisaged, if some part of that creation consists of a being also endowed with a measure of freedom. This is all contingent of course on presupposing some permanence for the creature is implied in the very concept of creating.

If, however, we are concerned with the biblical concept of Yahweh as Creator, the most significant invasion of the absolute freedom of the Creator is within the revealed character of Yahweh himself. It is on this account that the biblical Creation accounts can always imply that Creation itself is "good". It is expressive of the character of Yahweh. Behind the biblical conception stands not an impersonal creating force, but a revealed personal Figure, Yahweh, who brought the Israelites up out of Egypt.

In the presence of the Creator the first man is בן אדם , and each other one of the race is אדם אחד . This conception has close links with the "son of man" of the Psalms and Ezekiel. He is man as a creature, lord of all other creatures maybe, but still a creature. To recognise this is to take up the only appropriate dependent attitude before the Creator. It is to express this wholesome recognition that cultic formulae and ritual practices were designed.

1. Matt.5:45.

This analogy also stands behind the "Son of Man" supernatural figure to whom dominion will be given by the Ancient of Days in Daniel and Enoch. The figure is an analogy, and ideogram for the "Saints of the most High", who are Israel.

We have seen how Jesus took up and re-interpreted this concept in terms of suffering and the cross, filling it with the content of his own life as Man, as the perfect correlative of the Creator who is his Father. St. Paul moves within the sphere of this idea with his concept of Christ as the second Adam, reflecting the image of the Creator. At the back of the Johannine presentation of the Hebrew "Son of Man" ideogram there is the supplementary suggestion of the Ἄνθρωπος of Philonic Logos model class, and of the Hermetica. St. John makes the acceptance of the creaturely flesh of the "Son of Man" a test of the believer's Christian faith. Jesus as the Son of Man is to be accepted as the earthly correlative of the heavenly λόγος who is Θεός. What Jesus is seen to be in terms of creaturely man, λόγος is to be understood in terms of Creator.

In the biblical record then God is not portrayed as just Creator in a general way. He is אֱלֹהִים, a Creator who makes and faithfully keeps constitutional covenants with his creatures. He is the Father Creator to the Sonship of Christ, who is λόγος and Θεός, and constitutive of the divine life at the point of creation, at the beginning. Behind these concepts there stands all the speculative wealth of the quasi-personification of Torah-Wisdom, who exercise creative functions, and the creative word of Yahweh, giving definition to Spirit, and order to Chaos, and all as representative of the divine life of God.

Undergirding all these analogous conceptions in their earliest implicit forms within the comprehensive Exodus revelation, stands the notion of Law as giving precise formulation to the "Yahweh-my people" covenant relation. In order to obtain a clear and unequivocal expression of the covenant, it became necessary to change from the historical to a legal key-feature. But this changeover is not a dissociation from Yahweh. The law makes a total claim upon man because it is the law of Yahweh, who has settled his authoritative warrant once and for all, in bringing the Israelites out of Egypt. The contract is not between equals, in fact it is between those who are unequal in category. Yahweh therefore has the right to claim and Israel has the grateful obligation to respond.

The Commandments exhibit the character of Yahweh. They represent his יְהוָה , קָדוֹשׁ , and his יְהוָה . In the total Exodus situation to obey the Law is to remain in the covenant; to disobey is to take oneself out of the covenant. What is even more important, to disobey is to infringe the authority of Yahweh. It is rebellion to transgress the Law. They are Yahweh's Commandments.

The Law itself is one and indivisible. Man is accountable to Yahweh, not for part, but for the whole of his life. The insistence upon the personal link with Yahweh lifts the idea of the Law out of its purely forensic setting, and gives it a political context. We are not confronted so much with Yahweh as Judge, but with Yahweh as Lawgiver. The Law represents the unavoidable commands of a Sovereign Lord, but since they are the Laws of Yahweh, they define the areas of his divine sovereignty and of human obligation. They are man's charter exhibiting in precise and recognisable terms the qualifying boundaries Yahweh's revealed character by covenant agreement

places upon his divine sovereignty. This Law remains the terms of reference of the biblical presentation of the divine-human situation whatever other change is made in biblical analogy. The prophetic word is a contemporary commentary on, or application of what has already been revealed. It is charged with the same total authority as the historic Decalogue commandments of Yahweh, and eventually becomes identifiable with them. The breaking of Yahweh's Law forms the basis of the judgement upon Israel, pronounced by the prophets. Salvation consists in being put on the right side of the Law. The cult is a means of getting on the right side of the Law, and of remaining there. It must not become an end in itself.

It is this legal formulation of areas of authority and obligation that makes community living possible. It safeguards our separateness as individuals within a community, so that even in the closest relationships personal identity is maintained. It rescues human relationships from drifting into the complete domination of the weak by the strong, and our religious relationships from developing into pantheistic mysticism.

Nevertheless, the legal formulations are secondary to the relationship itself, and must never be allowed to be lifted out of the context of the relationship. When this happens it is the Law that is being maintained at the expense of the relationship. This is what happened in the legalising period of late Judaism. The maintenance of the Law took precedence over the will and/or needs of both parties to the covenantal relationship. The Law is not meant to be a curb on the peculiar Lordship of Yahweh, but an expression of what is essential to it. The Law is not the God of Israel, but a poor

legal analogical expression of the authority of his character. This legal metaphor must not be allowed to rob Yahweh of his divine sovereign Lordship. The final expressions of the analogy must not be Judge-lawbreaker. It is Yahweh who gives commands and who is behind the Law.

It is this incomplete nature of the Law's representation of his Father as Law-giver to which Jesus addresses himself. The Law's requirements upon man are not necessarily God's maximum requirements. It must not be allowed to stand merely as a negative instrument of justice accusing the law-breaker. It must become a positive instrument for man's salvation; not outward and formal, impersonal and destroying, but inward and living, and making alive.

In the New Testament references in which Jesus speaks of the Law, he often uses it as representing the whole of Scripture.¹ His statement in Matthew 5:17-19 make his attitude clear, and it must also be viewed within the whole context of the Sermon on the Mount, where he is represented as a second Moses speaking with authority, and introducing the *πλήρωμα* of the Law. His statements do not contradict the Mosaic Law in principle. He is concerned rather with its ineffectiveness. The last word must not be left with the condemnation of the Law, but with the grace and mercy of God, which has not been exhausted in its legal representation. The "Golden Rule" does not take away anything from the Law. It rather offers a short cut to the keeping of it, and has the added advantage of brevity.

1. See Luke 24:44; John 1:45; 12:34; 15:25. Cf. Jesus does on occasions refer to the Decalogue. Cf. Mk. 10:17-22.

There are occasions when Jesus appeals to the Law to support his freedom to do good on the Sabbath,^{1.} and he admits that to keep the Law will give eternal^{2.} life. In point of fact, however, men do not keep the Law, in which case the Law can only condemn. It can set out man's position precisely, but it cannot remedy it. The final representation of God therefore cannot be left with righteousness which is of the law, but with the $\gamma\theta\pi$ and $\rho\tau\epsilon$ of God, and with his faithfulness.

The whole Pauline argument in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians is based upon the over-riding grace of God. Paul admits the Law is good^{3.} and spiritual. He delights in it.^{4.} It fulfils the necessary task of setting out man's position before God for Jew and Gentile alike.^{5.} If there were no law there would be no sin.^{6.} If man could keep the Law it would still offer him salvation.^{7.} But we do not keep it, and it can only condemn us. It is just at this point when man is standing helpless under condemnation of the Law, that God does in fact help him, in that Christ died for us men "while we were yet sinners".^{8.} It is at this point that Paul introduces the Jewish "one and the many" concept in his contrast between the First Adam and Christ, the former carrying everyone into sin and death in his first act of breaking the Law, the latter carrying us along with him into life.^{9.}

In Galatians Paul represents the Law as being the schoolmaster,^{10.} necessary to our immaturity, but when we are adult we should have gone

1. Matt. 12:5; John 7:23. 2. Lke. 10:25ff. 3. Rom. 7:12f.
 4. Rom. 7:22, cf. Phil. 3:5;9. 5. Rom. 2:11-37. 6. Rom. 3:20;4:15;
 7:7f, cf 1 Cor. 15:56. 7. Rom. 8:13; Gal. 3:21. 8. Rom. 5:6ff.
 9. Rom. 5:12-18. 10. Gal. 3:23f.

beyond the Law. Our source of goodness should be a spontaneous expression of our gratitude and returning love for Christ. All these statements must be born in mind in interpreting the statement in Romans,¹ that Christ is the end (τέλος νόμου) of the Law. This does not mean doing away with the Law, but recognising it for what it is. It cannot bring about δικαιοσύνη. It can only prescribe our condition before God. Only God's grace can rescue from its condemnation. This grace is to be seen at its most effective level in the death of Christ for us.

The legal image of God as Judge must be set in the context of the saving intentions of the Lawmaker. His grace is not only shown in the mercy extended to thousands who keep the Law, but in his faithfulness and grace which comes to fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The final word is with Him who gave the Law. His intentions were to set things right (ρ 74). It is we who constantly thwart his intentions. But he is faithful and his mercy is plenteous.

Jesus is represented as the fountainhead of authority. When the Law-giver is present what need is there of the Law itself? It is for this reason that a purely forensic portrayal of reality is inadequate. It does not in fact represent the full biblical revelation. It has the advantage of clarity and preciseness, its presentation of man's position before God may be admirable, but in the biblical record it is secondary to the sovereign Lordship which it represents analogically. Throughout the ages it has stood solidly in the background, a wholesome reminder of, and giving precise, recognisable content to our accountability to the One with

1. Rom. 10:4, cf. Mt. 5:17 & Gal. 3:24.

whom we finally have to do, but it is not to be equated without remainder with the actuality of the divine-human situation. It must be supplemented by the actual spirit and experience of the relationships it represents. In its immobility it does not even say all about man. It assumes that man can keep the Law once he has been apprised of it. In order to set right the life of man, which also is more complex than the Law's representation of it, the situation requires the personal attention of the Law-giver, who is more resourceful than the Law's representation of him. The Divine-human situation requires the sovereign grace of God in terms of the complexity of man's own personal existence. This means a shift to a more resourceful analogical key-feature. If the Law in Old Testament times gave to man a precise temporary charter, constitutive of the Godhead in its relationship with men, we must now in these Christian times, assume Christ to have taken the place of the Law as a more adequate representation of the Godhead in its relationship with men, and in terms of human personality. The sovereignty that the Godhead exercises, the kingship, the Fatherly oversight, the creative rights that belong properly to Godhead, must all be kept in strict relation to the historical events which make up the life of Jesus Christ. He represents in the fullest possible terms of human personality the constitution of the divine sovereignty in relation to mankind. The Lordship of the particular humanity of Jesus is to be construed analogically as fully representative of the sovereignty of the Godhead in the divine category. It is for this reason that the claim can legitimately be made that the Sovereignty of God exhibited in the biblical records is not just any sovereignty, but

it is constitutional sovereignty, and the Lordship of Jesus Christ exercised in "servanthood", and from the cross is its constitution.

- ABBOTT. T.K. The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. I.C.C. Series. Clark, Edinburgh, 1922.
- ALLEGRO. J.M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Penguin, 1958.
- ALLEN. W.C. St. Matthew. I.C.C. Series. 1907.
- ANDERSON. G.W. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. Duckworth: Studies in Theology. 1959.
- ANGUS. S. The Mystery-Religions and Christianity. Murray, London, 1925.
- ANGUS. Samuel. The Environment of Early Christianity. Duckworth, London, 1914.
- BAILLIE. D.M. God Was in Christ. Faber, 1948.
- BARCLAY. W. A New Testament Wordbook. S.C.M. 1955.
- BARRETT. C.K. The Gospel According to St. John. S.P.C.K. 1955.
- BARRETT. C.K. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. S.P.C.K. 1956.
- The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. S.P.C.K., London, 1958.
- BARTH, Karl. Church Dogmatics, Vol. 11, Parts 1 & 2. The Doctrine of God. E.T. - Rev. T.H.L. Parker, etc. T. & T. Clark, 1957.
- Dogmatics in Outline. E.T. - G.T. Thompson. S.C.M. Press, 1955 ed.
- God, Grace and Gospels. E.T. - James S. McNab. Scottish Journal of Theology: Occasional Papers No. 8. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1959.
- BERKOUWER. G.G. The Triumphant^{ly} Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth. The Paternoster Press, London, 1956.
- BETTENSON. Henry. Documents of the Christian Church. Oxford University Press, London, 1959.
- BIGG. C. The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. I.C.C. Series. Clark, Edinburgh 1922.
- BOX. G.H. The Apocalypse of Ezra. S.P.C.K., London 1917.

- BRILL. E.J. The Sacral Kingship. Leiden 1955.
- BRUCE. A.B. The Training of the Twelve.
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1911.
- BRUCE F.F. Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls.
Paternoster, London 1956.
- Eschatology. The London Quarterly & Holborn Review.
April, 1958.
- BRUNNER. Emil. The Mediator. E.T. - O.Uyon.
Lutterworth Press, 1956.
- BUBER, Martin. I and Thou. E.T. - R.Gregor-Smith.
T. & T. Clark, 1937.
- BULTMANN, Rudolf. The Theology of the New Testament. 2 vol.
London S.C.M. 1952.
- BURROWS, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls.
Viking Press, New York, 1955.
- BUTTERFIELD. H. Christianity and History. Bell, London, 1954.
- CAIRNS. David. The Image of God. S.C.M. 1953.
- CARR. Arthur. The Epistle of St.James. Cambridge New Testament.
C.U.P. 1905.
- CAVE. S. Christianity and some living religions of the East.
Duckworth, 1944.
- CHARLES. R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. 2 vols.
Oxford, 1913.
- The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.
S.P.C.K. 1917.
- The Book of Jubilees. S.P.C.K. 1917.
- The Apocalypse of Baruch. S.P.C.K. 1917.
- The Book of Enoch. S.P.C.K. London, 1917.
- COCHRANE, C.N. Christianity and Classical Culture.
Oxford University Press, 1957.
- COLSON. F.H. &
 WHITAKER. G.H. Philo. 9 vols. Heinemann, London 1934.
- COOKE. S.A. The Old Testament - A Re-interpretation. 1936.
- CRANFIELD. C.E.B. The First Epistle of Peter. S.C.M.Press Ltd.,
London, 1954.

- CROSS. F.L. Studies in the Fourth Gospel.
Mowbray, London, 1957.
- CULMANN. O. The Early Church. E.T. - S.Goldman. 1956.
- DAVIES. D.W. Paul & Rabbinic Judaism.
- DODD. C.H. The Bible Today. Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- The Apostolic Preaching and its Development.
Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1936. New Ed.1944.
- The Meaning of Paul for Today. London, 1937.
- The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.
Cambridge, 1955.
- According to the Scriptures. Nisbet, 1952.
- The Bible and the Greeks. Hodder & Stoughton, 1954.
- EICHRODT. W. Man in the Old Testament. Translation by
K & R. Gregor Smith. Studies in Biblical
Theology Series. S.C.M. 1951.
- EMMET. D.M. The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking.
McMillan, 1946.
- ELLUL, Jacques. The Theological Foundation of Law.
E.T. - M.Wieser. S.C.M. Ltd., London.
(Published in Paris 1946. Published in London 1961)
- EVANS. Owen E. Demythologizing. Article in "The London Journal
& Holborn Review". April 1958.
- FARRER. Austin. The Communication of the Gospel in New Testament Times.
S.P.C.K. London, 1961.
- FINDLAY. B.G. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians.
Cambridge Greek Testament, 1925.
- FINDLAY. J.Alexr. The Fourth Gospel. Epworth, 1956.
- FISHER. G.P. History of Christian Doctrine.
T & T.Clark, Edinburgh, 1908.
- FLEW. R.Newton. Jesus and His Church. Epworth Press, London, 1938.
- FOESTER. W, &
G.QUELL. Lord. (Bible Keywords 8) T.W.N.T.(Kittel)
E.T. - H.P.Kingdom, 1933.
Published - A & C.Black, London, 1938.
- FRANKS, Robert S. The Doctrine of the Trinity.
Duckworth: Studies in Theology, 1953.

- FRIDRICHSEN. A. The Root of the Vine. London, 1953.
- GASTER. Theodor H. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.
Secker & Warburg, London 1957.
- GLASSON. T.Francis Greek Influence in Jewish Theology.
S.P.C.K., London 1961.
- GREENSLADE. S.L. Schism in the early Church. S.C.M. London, 1953.
- HAHN. H.H. The Old Testament in Modern Research.
Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1954.
- HANSON. A.T. The Wrath of the Lamb. S.P.C.K. London 1957.
- HEPBURN. Ronald W. Christianity and Paradox. C.A.Watts, 1958.
- HIGGINS. A.J.B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. S.C.M.1952.
- HODGSON. Leonard. The Doctrine of the Trinity. (Croal Lectures 1942-43)
Nisbet & Co.Ltd., London.
- HOSKYNs. E. The Fourth Gospel. Ed.F.N.Davey. Faber, 1940.
- HOWARD. W.F. Christianity According to St.John.
Duckworth:Studies in Theology, 1943.
- HUMPHREYS. A.E. The Epistles to Timothy & Titus. Cambridge 1925.
- HUNTER. A.M. Interpreting Paul's Gospel. S.C.M.

The Work and Words of Jesus. S.C.M. 1950.
- JACOB. Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. E.T. - A.W.Heathcote
and P.Allcock. Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.
- JAMES. M.R. The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford, 1955.
- JOHNSON. A.R. Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel.
University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1955.

The Vitality of the Individual. etc.
- The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception
of God. Univ.of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1942.
- JOSEPHUS. Flavius The Antiquities of the Jews. E.T. - W.Whiston.
Ward, London.
- JOWETT. B. The Dialogues of Socrates. 3 vols. Timaeus.
- KENNEDY. H.A.A. The Theology of the Epistles.
Duckworth: Studies in Theology, London, 1952.
- KIRKPATRICK. A.F. The Book of Psalms. 2 vols. Cambridge Bibles for
Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1900-1912.

- KITTEL. Gerhard. T.W.N.T. pp.65-120. Article on *θεός*
T.W.N.T. Article on *ἀγίος*
- LEWIS. Edwin. A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation.
Epworth Press, 1948.
- LIGHTFOOT. R.H. St.John's Gospel. Ed.C.F.Evans. Oxford 1956.
- MACGREGOR. G.H.C. The Gospel of John. Moffatt Commentary Series.
Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- MACKINTOSH. H.R. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ.
Clark, Edinburgh, 1913.
- McNEILE. A.H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.
Second Edition, ed. C.S.C.Williams. Oxford, 1953.
- MANSON. T.W. The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus, in
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol.34. No.2.
March 1952. Also The Lord's Prayer, Vol.38, No.1.
Sept.1955.
The Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge, 1955.
- MANSON. W. The Messiah. Hodder & Stoughton, London 1943.
- MARCUS. R. Philo. Supplements 1 & 11. Heinemann, 1953.
- MILES. J.R. Religion and the Scientific Outlook.
George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1959.
- MITTON. C.L. The Johannine Literature. Article in The London
Journal & Holborn Review. April 1958.
- MOFFATT. James. Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.
T & T.Clark, Edinburgh, 1912.
The Theology of the Gospels. Duckworth, 1948.
- MORRISON, Clinton D. The Powers that be. Studies in Biblical
Theology Press. S.C.M., 1960.
- MOULE. C.F.D. Form Criticism and Philological Studies. Article in
The London Quarterly & Holborn Review. April 1958.
- MOULE. H.C.G. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Philippians.
Cambridge Bible for Schools & Colleges.
Cambridge, 1924.
- NOEL. Conrad. The Life of Jesus. J.M.Dent & Sons Ltd., London, 1937.
- NORTH. C.R. The Thought of the Old Testament. Epworth, 1948.
- NOTH. Martin D. History and the Word of God in the Old Testament.
Bulletin of John Ryland's Library. Vol.32. No.2.

- OESTERLEY. W.O.E. The Wisdom of Solomon. S.P.C.K. 1918.
- OTTO. Rudolf. The Idea of the Holy. E.T. - J.W.Harvey. Humphrey Milford, O.U.P. 1925.
- PARRY. R.St.John The First Epistle of Paul, the Apostle, to the Corinthians. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge Univ.Press. 1937.
- PEAKE. A.S. A Commentary on the Bible. London 1920.
- PEARS. D.F. The Nature of Metaphysics. Macmillan, 1957.
- PEDERSEN. Johs Israel - Its Life and Culture. Humphrey Milford Oxford Univ.Press, 1940.
- PFEIFFER. Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. A & C.Black, London, 1953.
- PLATO. The Last Days of Socrates. Penguin Classics. Ed.E.V.Rieu. Translation by Hugh Tredinnick.
The Republic. Everymans Library Edition. Dent, London, 1935.
- PLUMMER. A. St.Luke. I.C.C. Clark, Edinburgh 1942.
The Epistles of St.John. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge Univ.Press. 1938.
- PRESTIGE. G.L. God, in Patristic Thought. Heinemann Ltd. London 1936.
- RAD von, Gerhard. Moses. Lutterworth Press, London 1960.
Studies in Deuteronomy. Studies in Biblical Theology Series. E.T. - David Stalker. 1953.
- RAWLINSON. A.E.J. The New Testament Doctrine of The Christ. Longmans, 1926.
- REID. J.K.S. Biblical Theology. Article in The London Quarterly & Holborn Review. April 1958.
- RICHARDSON. Alan Christian Apologetics. S.C.M. 1950.
Also, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. S.C.M. 1958.
A Theological Word Book of the Bible. S.C.M. 1951.
- ROBINSON. H.Wheeler The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality. in Hempel's Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments. Berlin, 1936.
- ROBINSON. H.Wheeler The Cross in the Old Testament. S.C.M. 1956.
The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. Duckworth, 1913.

- ROBINSON. J.A.T. The Body. Studies in Biblical Theology Series. S.C.M. 1952.
- ROBINSON. T.H. Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. 1950.
- The Epistle to the Hebrews. The Moffat N.T. Commentary Series. 1933.
- The Gospel of Matthew. Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
- ROWLEY. H.H. The Rediscovery of the Old Testament. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1945.
- The Faith of Israel. S.C.M. 1956.
- The Old Testament and Modern Studies. Oxford & Clarendon, 1952.
- The Biblical Doctrine of Election. Lutterworth, London, 1950.
- The Missionary Message of the Old Testament. Carey Press, London, 1944.
- The Servant of the Lord. Lutterworth, London, 1950.
- The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study, in Bulletins of the John Ryland's Library, Vol.36. No.1. Sept.1953. Also, Sanballatt and the Samaritan Temple, Vol.38. No.1. Sept. 1955. Also, Nehemiah's Mission and its background. Vol.37. No.2. March 1955.
- SCHMIDT. Karl L. Basileia. T.W.N.T. (Kittel) E.T. - H.P.Kingdon. etc. A & C.Black, London, 1957.
- SCHWEIZER, Eduard Spirit of God. T.W.N.T. (Kittel) E.T. - H.E.Harvey. etc. A & C.Black, London, 1960.
- SCHWEITZER. Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Black, London, 1948.
- SCOTT. C.Anderson. Revelation. Century Bible, London.
- SCOTT. W. Hermetica. The Ancient Greek & Latin Writings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus. 8 vols. Oxford 1924-36.
- SELWYN. E.G. The First Epistle of St.Peter. Macmillan, London, 1955.
- SEPTUAGINT. Version of the Old Testament. Bagster & Sons, London.
- SNAITH. N.H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. Epworth, 1944.

- SOUTER. Alexander Novum Testamentum Graece. Oxford, 1953.
- SPARKS. H.F.D. The Old Testament in the Christian Church. S.C.M. 1944.
- STAUFFER. E. New Testament Theology. E.T. - J.Marsh. S.C.M. 1955.
- Christ and the Caesars. E.T. - K & R.Gregor-Smith.
S.C.M. England, 1955.
- STRACK und Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. (aus Talmud und
BILLERBECK. Midrasch) 8 vols. C.H.Beck. München, 1922-56.
Esp.Excursus on John 1:1 (pre-existence of the Messiah)
Band 2. pp.334-352.
Also, Excursus on Memra Jahves. Band 2. pp.302-333.
- TAYLOR. Vincent. The Life and Ministry of Jesus.
Abindon, New York, 1955.
- The Names of Jesus. Macmillan, London, 1954.
- Jesus and His Sacrifice. Macmillan, London, 1937.
- The Gospels. Epworth, 1938.
- TEMPLE. William. Readings in St.John's Gospel. Macmillan, London 1940.
- TILLICH. Paul. Systematic Theology. Vol.1. Nisbet, London 1953.
See also Review, volume 11. Journal of Theological
Studies, April 1959. pp.103ff.
- TURNER. H.E.W. Jesus, Master and Lord. A.R.Mowbray & Co., London 1953.
- WATERHOUSE. John W. Zoroastrianism. Epworth, 1934.
- WESTCOTT. B.F. The Gospel According to St.John. 2 vols.
John Murray, 1908.
- WHITEHOUSE. W.A. The Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude.
Oliver, Boyd, Eden. 1952.
- Order, Goodness, Glory. (University of Durham,
Riddell Memorial Lectures) Oxford Univ.Press, 1960.
- WOODS. G.F. Theological Explanation. James Nisbet & Co.Ltd., 1958.
- WRIGHT. C.J. The Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel.
Hodder & Stoughton, 1933.
- ZIMMERLI, W. and The Servant of God. Studies in Biblical Theology
JEREMIAS. J. No.20. S.C.M.Press, 1957.
- ZUURDEEG. William F. An Analytical Philosophy of Religion.
George Allan & Unwin Ltd., 1959.

VARIOUS ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

- BOOBYER G.H. Review of "Die Verklarung Jesu" by Heinrich Baltensweiler, J.T.S., April 1960, pp.133f.
- DAVIDSON R. Article, "Some Aspects of the O.T. Contribution to the Pattern of Christian Ethics", S.J.T., Dec., 1959, pp.373ff.
- DOBBIE R. Article, "Deuteronomy and the Prophetic Attitude to Sacrifice." S.J.T., Mar. 1959.
- DOW J. Review of "Miracles and Revelation", by J.S.Lawton, in Exp. Times, Feb., 1960, pp.133f.
- DUBS H.H. Review of "Prophecy and Hebrew Religion in Ancient China and Israel", by H.H.Rowley, J.T.S., April, 1959, pp.103ff.
- EBLING G. Article, "The Meaning of Biblical Theology", J.T.S., 1955, p.224f.
- FERRE N. Article "Is Language About God Fraudulent ?" S.J.T., Dec. 1950, pp.337-360.
- GRAY J. Review of "Myth, Ritual, Kingship" by S.H.Hooke, pp.551ff. J.T.S., Oct. 1959.
- HICK J.H. Review of "Christ and the Christian", by Nils Ferre, Bib. Journal, Dec., 1959, pp.414ff.
- HOOKE S.H. Review of "Patterns in Comparative Religion", by Mircea Eliade, J.T.S., April, 1959, pp.217f.
- JOHNSON A.R. Article "Hebrew Kingship", J.T.S., Oct. 1959, pp.354ff.
- KNIGHT C.A.E. Review of "An Outline of O.T.Theology", by Th.C.Vriezen, S.J.T., Dec., 1959, pp.423f.
- MCINTYRE J. Article on "Analogy", S.J.T., Mar., 1959, pp.1-20.
- MCPHERSON T. Article on "Religion and Rationality", Ch.Q.R., June, 1960, pp.200ff.
- O'NEIL J.C. Article on "The Six Amen Sayings in St.Luke", J.T.S., April, 1959.

- RAMSAY I.T. Review of "Christianity and Paradox", R.W. Hepburn,
J.T.S., April, 1959, pp.209ff.
Review of "A Theological Explanation", by G.F.Woods,
Hib. Journal LVIII, Oct. 1959, pp.85f.
- ROBINSON J. Article "The Prophetic Teaching on Righteousness and
our Preaching", Ch.Q.R., Jan., 1960.
- ROWLEY H.H. Review of "A Christian Theology of the O.T.", by S.A.F.
Knight, Exp. Times Dec., 1959.
Article "Ritual and Hebrew Prophecy", J.T.S., Oct. 1959,
pp.354ff.
- SAGGS H.W.F. Article "The Date of 11 Isaiah", J.T.S., April 1959, pp.84ff.
- SCHOFIELD J.N. Review of "The Book of the Law" by G.T.Manby, J.T.S. April,
1959 pp.107f.
- WOODS G.F. Review of "For Faith and Freedom" by L.Hodgson, J.T.S.,
April, 1959, pp.205f.

Abbreviations:

I.C.C. International Critical Commentary
E.T. English Translation
S.J.T. Scottish Journal of Theology
Ed. Editor
J.T.S. Journal of Theological Studies
Ch.Q.R. Church Quarterly Review