

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1969

A critique of Albert Schweitzer's eschatology.

James W. Johanson
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Johanson, James W., "A critique of Albert Schweitzer's eschatology." (1969). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6565.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6565>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

A CRITIQUE OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER'S ESCHATOLOGY

by

JAMES W. JOHANSON

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Theology in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of
Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

WINDSOR, ONTARIO

1969

UMI Number: EC52748

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC52748

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABD2779

Approved by:

Edward J. Howley

D'Arcy L. Egan, Esq.

E. O'Malley

270130

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	vi
PART I ELEMENTS OF SCHWEITZER'S ESCHATOLOGY.....	1
CHAPTER I. THE KINGDOM OF GOD.....	1
(i) Its Jewish Background.....	1
(ii) Schweitzer's Treatment of Gospel Sources.....	7
(iii) Jesus' Views on the Kingdom.....	9
(iv) The Ethic of Jesus.....	12
(v) The Kingdom in Paul.....	15
2. ATONEMENT.....	21
3. THE RESURRECTION.....	28
4. BAPTISM AND EUCHARIST.....	32
PART II CRITIQUE OF SCHWEITZER'S ESCHATOLOGY.....	37
5. THE KINGDOM OF GOD.....	37
(i) Eschatology: Realized or Expectant.....	37
(ii) Enoch and Daniel.....	42
(iii) Jesus' Knowledge of the "Parousia".....	45
(iv) The Gospel of Matthew and Form Criticism.....	46
(v) Interim Ethics.....	49
(vi) The Lord's Prayer.....	53
(vii) The Gospel of John.....	55
6. ATONEMENT.....	58
7. THE RESURRECTION.....	64
8. BAPTISM AND EUCHARIST.....	69
CONCLUSION.....	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	84
VITA AUCTORIS.....	89

ABSTRACT

We are living in an age of great theological flux. That this is healthy few of us will deny. Not only have many of our traditional Biblical and ecclesial concepts had to go by the wayside, but Christians have been forced by events to look more deeply into their traditions. In a very large measure, this has had the effect of creating an atmosphere for ecumenical study and dialogue. Both the "preacher" and the average layman today are better informed than formerly.

There is a danger, however, that theological diversity can create a degree of confusion. Albert Schweitzer's Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity is a good case in point. Written for the layman by a great humanitarian and by a learned expositor, its treatment of the Gospels leaves Jesus a rather obscure first century apocalypticist. Published first in 1968, there is no doubt this book will have a widespread influence. Yet unknown to the man who may read it, this fascinating book is academically at variance with contemporary scholarship at a number of crucial points. Indeed, it is at variance enough to make Schweitzer's very portrait of Jesus unsound.

The purpose of this paper will be realized if (1) we can demonstrate the necessity of care and moderation in New Testament studies, and (2) if it can be seen that Biblical criticism rather than being destructive, makes a lot of sense out of the Gospel narratives. We should not be

"tossed about by every wind of doctrine"; but like the New Testament Bereans, (Acts 17:10-12) we ought, when we have read and heard, to search out for ourselves whether what we have read and heard is true. Personally, having taken such a possibly dangerous path, I have found the study of Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity a road to renewal and faith.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the hours of help and encouragement given by Rev. Edward Crowley, C.Ss.R. during the writing of this thesis. My thanks go also to Miss Lee Latter, my typist, and to Dr. Thomas Echlin, M.D., for providing the duplicating and binding. I must also express my thanks to Rev. D'Arcy L. Egan, C.Ss.R., Librarian at Holy Redeemer College, for his helpful service.

INTRODUCTION

The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity is the last book, and final theological testament, of Albert Schweitzer. After his death in 1965, his daughter discovered in Lambaréné, carefully wrapped in a white linen bag, the manuscript of this work, which was lying practically ready for the printer.

Whereas The Quest of the Historical Jesus was written when Schweitzer was a young man, this book provides an insight into the theological development of Schweitzer extending into his extreme old age. Here we are face to face with an old man dwelling in the loneliness of the primeval forest. Whereas his previous works were developed along the lines of technical theology, this one is purely expository. It is a work of scholarship, yet one which calls the reader to reflection, and even into the presence of the One who motivated the author through fifty years of missionary activity.

This paper will attempt both a presentation and an analysis of the book. In the analysis we shall, to some degree, be handicapped by the fact that The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity was first published in 1968, and no other analysis, to our knowledge, has as yet been undertaken. However, as we shall see, Schweitzer's exposition of the Gospels is at variance at many points with that of modern critical scholars, and therefore it will be in that context that the analysis in this paper will be undertaken.

PART I - ELEMENTS OF SCHWEITZER'S ESCHATOLOGY

CHAPTER 1. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

(f) Its Jewish Background

To Albert Schweitzer, Christianity is, in essence, a religion of belief in the coming of the Kingdom of God. In Christianity and the Religions of the World he pointed out the fundamental difference between the redemption-idea of Hellenistic cults and that of Christianity: "the one knows nothing of the conception of the Kingdom of God...the other is dominated by that conception".¹ This belief begins with John the Baptist (Matthew 3:2), and Jesus continues this teaching and preaching after the Baptist's imprisonment (Matthew 4:12, 17).

The Christian view of the Kingdom has its roots in the Jewish. Schweitzer traces its origins to the "Day of Yahweh", where God visited His judgement on the enemies of the chosen people. These enemies, in the "Day of Yahweh" concept, would be subjected to Israel forever. "A reign of peace was expected, in which the mastery of the world would fall to

¹ Albert Schweitzer, Christianity and the Religions of the World (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939), p. 8. See also G. Eldon Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom (London: S.P.C.K., 1966), p. 160. Other authors agree with Schweitzer. The Kingdom of God was present in the proclamation of Jesus itself. We find it in the words "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον), "to preach" (κηρύσσειν), and "to preach the gospel" (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι). Jesus' message about the Kingdom was more than prophecy or promise. It was gospel - the proclamation of good news.

the people of Israel".² At the time when the unified Israel no longer exists, this picture of the Day of Yahweh is challenged by Amos. To Amos, because Yahweh is an ethical God, judgement must fall upon the chosen people too. Sacrifices do not make Yahweh favourable, but rather men are judged by their deeds. Men may not pervert justice or deal unmercifully with the poor. The Day of Yahweh is not a day of victory, but a day of sifting. Only ethical thought and action admit one to a place in the coming Kingdom. Amos, then, is the first to portray God's "ethical personality".³

According to Schweitzer Amos had a profound influence on the prophets who came after him: Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Zephaniah and Jeremiah. These prophets expect God to punish the chosen people, and believe that the

² Albert Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity (New York: The Seabury Press, 1968), p. 3. See also Gerhard Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Volume II (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), p. 119ff and 293f. Von Rad is in agreement with Schweitzer. The Day of Yahweh concept is that of a Holy War and the preservation of Zion. The survivors of that war will make pilgrimage to Zion to worship Yahweh. Jerusalem will be exalted on the mountain, and out of her will flow living waters. See also Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult", in Alexander Altmann, ed., Biblical Motifs (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 22, 30. Cross in this essay sees "Yahweh the Warrior" in Psalm 24 and the reign of Yahweh in the twelfth century Song of Miriam (Exodus 15:16 - 18). The Day of Yahweh became the festival of enactment of his ritual conquest, and led in apocalyptic to the manifestation of the kingdom of God and the creation of new heavens and a new earth.

³ This statement can be challenged. For an excellent treatment of the Decalogue see Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960), pp. 52 - 59. The JE material of Exodus 20:1 - 17 is a tradition which with high probability can be traced back to Moses. The Ten Commandments reflect a covenant bond between Yahweh and His people emphasizing what Yahweh had done for Israel through His mighty acts of deliverance. Israel's pledge of obedience was based on gratitude for the goodness of Yahweh, and a realization that she was dependent upon grace and promise. Thus there is an ethical element in the Mosaic understanding of God.

nation will be saved through a remnant which will not be destroyed. However, Isaiah has a new concept, which is carried on in Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, that a wonderful transformation of nature will take place in the age of the Kingdom of God. In other words, the Kingdom is commencing to become "something wholly supernatural".⁴ Schweitzer makes the point that Jesus was familiar with the thought of Deutero-Isaiah.⁵

Schweitzer's treatment of the Jewish prophets is both sweeping and really quite exciting to read. We need not treat all of it here. To get the background for his treatment of Jesus' disappointed eschatological expectation, however, we should note that the return to Jerusalem took place in 538 B.C., but the intervention of God, as foretold by Deutero-Isaiah, never materialized. Haggai and Zechariah continued to hope for a miraculous divine intervention, but "once again all these hopes were doomed to disappointment. Nothing more is heard of Zerubbabel".⁶ Thus with Malachi there is no trace of the exuberant hopefulness of Deutero-Isaiah, Haggai and Zechariah. Malachi has the Day of Yahweh concept of Isaiah, Amos and Hosea, together with the new idea that God will send back Elijah. (Malachi 4:5).

4 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 19.

5 See Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Ind., 1958), pp. 34-35; and Lucetta Mowry, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), p. 12. From Qumran Cave IV have come to light twelve manuscripts of Isaiah. This would be an indication of its first century popularity.

6 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 20.

The Messianic Kingdom of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and even Deutero-Isaiah, is spiritual and ethical. God's spirit works on men. The previous transformation of nature is a minor issue. Both with Malachi, Joel, the writer of Isaiah 24 - 27 and the writer of Zechariah 9 - 14, the Kingdom is, by its nature, supernatural, and is not initiated by the working of God's Spirit in men, but "appears as a ready-made divine creation."⁷ And Malachi, Joel and the author of Isaiah 24 - 27 make no mention of the descendant of David (who had dominated the thought of Isaiah); Deutero-Zechariah mentions the place of honour accorded to the house of David, but says nothing about a future king of David's line.

This is the background to the Book of Daniel, with which the age of Late Judaism begins.⁸ Daniel draws out the consequences, as Schweitzer puts it, of the supernatural character of the expected Kingdom.⁹ Like the prophets of the later post-Exilic period, he disregards the Messianic king; indeed he puts in his place "the Son of Man", a being (howbeit, a human figure) sent down from heaven by God to rule the kingdom. Daniel certainly has been influenced by the old prophetic concept of Messiah, but a king of the House of David cannot rule those who rise from the dead.¹⁰ The post-exilic prophets gave up the Davidic-Messiah concept because the House of David had passed out of existence, and the Messiah

7 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 25.

8 Ibid., p. 41.

9 Ibid., p. 25.

10 Ibid., p. 31.

concept did not fit that of the completely supernatural Kingdom.¹¹

Schweitzer feels that Jesus' attitude to Kingdom and Messiah is that of Late Judaism.¹² He feels that Jesus' concept of Son of Man is closest to the Book of Enoch.¹³ Schweitzer therefore in The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity deals extensively with the works which

11 See G. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, pp. 284-5, and B. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, p. 439. Schweitzer's position here is not tenable. The royal psalms were read in the post-exilic age with great Messianic interest. In addition Zechariah, who first began to preach when the Temple was being rebuilt, held out the prospect of a Messianic office. Haggai saw Messianic possibilities in Zerubbabel.

Perhaps Schweitzer has erred at this point because he does not recognize that "annointed one", or as we have it in Zechariah, "branch", are terms in the post-exilic period used for the messianic king. Anderson points this out, and agrees that the term "Messiah" took on the special meaning of 'the' annointed one only in later Judaism. However, the Messianic concept is there. It refers to Zerubbabel, the David Messiah, Yahweh's Annointed One, in Haggai 2:20-23.

12 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 90. See Sigmund Mowinckel, He that Cometh (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 449-450. Mowinckel disagrees strongly. "The Son of Man, who as originally conceived, is the pre-existent, heavenly one, endued with the spirit...will be humiliated, and will suffer and die. The thought was unheard of, both among the adherents of the national Messianic ideal, and still more among those who gave allegiance to the idea of the Son of Man. The Jewish Messianic concept is thereby transformed, and lifted up to a wholly other plane. In fact, the Jewish Messiah, as originally conceived, and as most of Jesus' contemporaries thought of him, was pushed aside and replaced by a new redeemer and mediator of salvation, 'the Man', who comes from God to suffer and die as God's Servant, in order to save men from the power of sin, Satan, and death. For Jesus, the Jewish Messianic idea was the temptation of Satan, which He had to reject".

13 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 92. But see also J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 33-34. Milik feels that on the basis of studies of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Similitudes cannot be considered to be pre-Christian. The Son of Man in a Messianic sense appears in the Similitudes section of the Book of Enoch, Chs. 37-71. Cave IV at Qumran has yielded fragments of several Enoch Mss., but the Similitudes section is not represented. Fr. Milik would consider (footnote continued on next page)

provide our knowledge of the eschatological expectation of late Judaism: Enoch, Baruch, Ezra, Psalms of Solomon. These four have in common that they do not expect the Kingdom to follow some particular historical event (as with Daniel). Yet they are not in agreement either. Enoch, like Daniel, has a supernatural Son of Man appointed by God to rule the Kingdom. The Psalms of Solomon look for a Kingdom with a Davidic-Messiah. In Daniel God conducts the Last Judgement; in Enoch it is delegated to the Son of Man.¹⁴ Enoch, taking his cue from Deutero-Isaiah, sees God creating a new heaven and a new earth. God does not implant His Spirit in man's heart, but rather man partakes of God's wisdom, thought of as a heavenly being. In Baruch the Messianic Kingdom is transformed into the everlasting Kingdom of God.¹⁵ Baruch thus assumes that those who participate in the Messianic Kingdom will be transformed into angel-like beings; those who rise from the dead will attain the same state and be added to their number. Ezra makes the Messiah die. Baruch and Ezra, being first century A.D., deal with problems which occupied St. Paul. Indeed, as Schweitzer points out, these problems (like human beings passing through death and resurrection before becoming angelic beings), "were in his mind when he was still a scribe living among scribes".¹⁶ Schweitzer would trace the two-kingdom

this section to be a Christian interpolation (1st-2nd cents. A.D.) and perhaps the composition of Jewish Christians. There is the possibility however that the absence of the Similitudes from Qumran is accidental. The Similitudes could be pre-Christian, with Christian editing. For a study of Enoch see Raymond E. Brown, et al., eds., The Jerome Biblical Commentary Vol. 2 (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 536-8 (Hereafter this book will be referred to as JBC).

14 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 47.

15 Ibid., p. 63.

16 Ibid., p. 66.

expectation of I Corinthians 15:23-28 to Baruch and Ezra, for example.¹⁷ Here there is a Messianic Kingdom in which Jesus reigns, followed by the everlasting Kingdom of God.

(ii) Schweitzer's Treatment of Gospel Sources

Before treating Kingdom and Son of Man concepts in the thought of Jesus, we should look at Schweitzer's approach to the Four Gospels. In The Quest of the Historical Jesus, Schweitzer had rejected Mark as being adequate, by itself, for a presentation of the Life of Jesus.¹⁸ In his "last testament", The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, this approach is much more fully developed. Matthew and Mark he places on the same level, as "the two oldest Gospels".¹⁹ Matthew has an advantage over Mark by having, in addition to the source they have in common, another source (which includes stories and speeches belonging to the earliest tradition). We owe it to Matthew, for example, for our possession of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, and the commission of the disciples (Matthew 10). "The question which of the two Gospels give us the account closest to the original cannot be answered".²⁰ Neither has come in its original form to us, because for example, each has interpolated within it an Apocalypse of the early Christian period (Mark 13: 1 - 37; Matthew 24:1 - 51). Schweitzer rejects the primacy of

¹⁷ Baruch and Ezra are Pharisaic books.

¹⁸ Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910), p. 358.

¹⁹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 71.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 68.

Mark.²¹ He holds that the agreement of Jesus' expectation of the Kingdom with late Jewish eschatology is more noticeable in Matthew. So historical research must consider not only which account could be the older, but which is the fuller. Matthew's account of the Sermon delivered at the sending out of the disciples, is a "firmly constructed whole", whereas Mark has but a few sentences. In Mark the meaning of the mission (which is central to Schweitzer's thesis on the ministry of Christ), is not at all clear. Further, Schweitzer feels Mark and Matthew give a reliable report of the speeches of Jesus. Here Schweitzer makes no mention of a "Q" source, but only that their sources derive from men "who were present during the ministry of Jesus".²²

They do not attribute to him any views different from those of the late Jewish expectation of the Kingdom and the Messiah. This shows that their account is basically historical.²³

Luke appeared after the first two Gospels, and presupposes the existence of earlier written Gospels (Luke 1: 1 - 4). It is worth noting that Schweitzer makes 115 references to Matthew, 52 to Mark, 8 to Luke, only 3 to John. John presupposes a Hellenistic Christian milieu, and most likely appeared at the beginning of the second century. It makes Jesus preach a message different from the other three, and in effect, had

21 Ibid., p. 70. But see also Howard Clark Kee and Franklin W. Young, Understanding the New Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), p. 70. The majority of Biblical Scholars agree that Mark was the first of the Synoptic Gospels, and that the other two used Mark as their base with the addition of supplementary material. For the latest bibliography, cf. JBC, vol. 2, p. 1.

22 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 71.

23 Ibid., p. 71.

difficulty in gaining admittance to the New Testament Canon at all. Schweitzer also sees a resemblance between the Johannine Prologue and Enoch 41:1f., where Wisdom, when she did not find the dwelling place she desired among men, returned to heaven.²⁴ We will certainly have to look closely, later in this paper, at Schweitzer's suspicions concerning the Gospel of John.

(iii) Jesus' Views on the Kingdom

Jesus' view of the Kingdom is that of Late Judaism.²⁵ In his Christianity and the Religions of the World Schweitzer pointed out that Jesus never taught that the Kingdom comes through a development of human society, but as something coming when God transforms this imperfect world into a perfect one.²⁶ Here in the last of his books The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, he shows how, when "the decision becomes necessary to regard Matthew and Mark as the only real historical sources",²⁷ the view that Jesus preached a spiritualized kingdom became untenable.

The key to Schweitzer's thought on the Kingdom is Matthew 10:23b. Let us go back again to The Quest of the Historical Jesus. He points out that the insight of Johannes Weiss demolished the view that Jesus founded a Kingdom.²⁸ Jesus waits for the Kingdom. When in Matthew 10:23 he sends his disciples out on their mission, he tells them that he does

24 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 50.

25 See footnote twelve.

26 A. Schweitzer, Christianity and the Religions of the World, p. 16-17.

27 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 89.

28 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 356.

not expect to see them again in the present age.²⁹ The Parousia of the Son of Man will take place before they complete their hasty journey through the cities of Israel to announce it. The words "mean this and nothing else"; and the point Schweitzer makes is that this prediction was not fulfilled. Schweitzer in The Quest of the Historical Jesus feels that the Christian Church has never really faced squarely the delay of the Parousia:

The whole history of Christianity down to the present day, that is to say, the real inner history of it, is based on the delay of the Parousia, the non-occurrence of the Parousia, the abandonment of eschatology, the progress and completion of the "de-eschatologising" of religion which has been connected therewith.³⁰

The non-fulfillment of Matthew 10:23 is the first postponement of the Parousia, and it is this postponement which gives to the work of Jesus a new direction, otherwise inexplicable.

The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity is an expansion of Schweitzer's earlier work. The Son of Man-Messiah, in the thought of Jesus, is a supernatural being. He appears on the clouds of heaven, and is surrounded by his angels, when the time for the Kingdom has come. This is the promise of Matthew 10:23.³¹ In his view of the Son of Man, Jesus is close to Daniel and Enoch, but closer to Enoch. With Enoch, as we have seen, Jesus holds the view that it is the Son of Man, rather than God (as in the later post-exilic prophets and in Daniel), who will be the

29 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 357.

30 Ibid., p. 358.

31 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 91.

Judge. With Enoch he holds that this Judgement extends over the fallen angels, that little and great will enter the Kingdom, and that "the rich must be regarded as lost from the very beginning".³² The Kingdom follows the Resurrection, and the earth acquires a supernatural perfection.

Thus the Messianic consciousness of Jesus does not consist in a belief that He is Messiah while He is still a man, but that He is the one who will be revealed as Messiah when the Kingdom comes. At that time He will receive a supernatural form of existence, as will all those who share in the Kingdom.³³ Problems which Late Judaism could not solve with regard to Kingdom and Messiah, Jesus solves. He assumes that "a man born as a descendant of David in the last generation of mankind will be revealed as the Messiah in His supernatural existence at the coming of the Kingdom."³⁴ He is that descendant, a conviction which He keeps as a secret. His disciples need only believe in the nearness of the Kingdom, and prepare for it; soon enough they will learn that their Master is Messiah.

Late Judaism had a problem regarding the relationship of the Son of Man to the Messiah. The Psalms of Solomon and the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, use the term Messiah; Daniel and Enoch speak of the Son of Man. It is a mistake, says Schweitzer, to assume that both terms were equivalent in meaning. The first combination of these terms is found in Jesus! Most remarkable is the way Jesus could use the Son of Man designation

³² A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 92.

³³ Ibid., p. 103.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 103.

for the supernatural being coming on the clouds, and to describe his earthly existence. When Jesus uses the term to describe Himself, He does not mean that He is an incarnation of a pre-existent being, but "that He is the man of David's line who will be the Son of Man in the Kingdom of God".³⁵ Jesus' view of Messiahship presupposes a previous human existence of the Son of Man, not a heavenly pre-existence. A normal son of man (in Aramaic the term means simply "man"), selected by God, will become a heavenly being when the Kingdom comes. The idea of a heavenly being dwelling in a man, Schweitzer feels, arose when Christians held that Jesus was Messiah during His earthly ministry. So there is in Jesus a kind of double use of the term Son of Man. But the idea that the expected Son of Man will have a human before a heavenly form never occurs to Jesus' hearers.

(iv) The Ethic of Jesus

In his book Christianity and the Religions of the World, Schweitzer shows how the Graeco-Oriental religions long after the spiritual, whereas in Jesus' teaching men must be gripped by God's will of love, and carry out that will in this world, in things both great and small.³⁶ Showing God's love and ethical activity³⁷ are preparatory stages to the perfect world, the Kingdom of God.

In The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, Schweitzer develops

³⁵ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 106.

³⁶ A. Schweitzer, Christianity and the Religions of the World, p. 14.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 17.

the thought that Jesus taught love of one's enemy; and adds that late Jewish ethics had already risen to this level.³⁸ He cites Proverbs 24:17 and 25:21f. The reason the idea was not more widespread in the ethics of late Judaism is that it had no place in the Law. Jesus teaches "an unlimited will to love" - this is God's will, not the keeping of commandments and prohibitions. Now Schweitzer disagrees with those scholars who are convinced that Jesus rejected the expectation of the Kingdom of God current in first century Judaism as though it were too materialistic. These scholars felt that He taught a spiritual doctrine both on Kingdom and ethics.³⁹ Schweitzer feels such a view was tenable so long as the four Gospels were regarded as equally authentic sources of Jesus' preaching and ministry. John, he admits, has such a "spiritual teaching". But John's spiritual teaching relates not to Jesus' inward ethic, but to the *λόγος*.⁴⁰ So, working on Matthew as His authentic source, and from the position that Jesus' view of the Kingdom is that of Late Judaism, the Doctor from Lambaréné suggests that the ethics of Jesus are not the ethics of the Kingdom, but ethics appropriate to preparations for its coming. The supernatural Kingdom is beyond ethics. Perfect, angel-like inhabitants of that Kingdom cannot sin. While Jesus brings to completion the ethics of Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, He does not accept their view

38 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 85-6.

39 Ibid., p. 89.

40 Since Schweitzer wrote this, scholars have demonstrated the Jewish background of the *λόγος* and of the Gospel of John itself. This topic is dealt with later in this thesis.

of the Kingdom, "towards which their ethics were oriented",⁴¹ He could have taken their view of better conditions of living for men, and have given it new life. Instead He accepts the late Jewish view of a supernatural Kingdom, and directs His ethics to one end: to prepare those who belong to the last generation of mankind for entry into that Kingdom. His ethics are therefore interim ethics. Why does Jesus take this view of the Kingdom? Because the spiritual-ethical Kingdom gives no solution to the problem of God, man and the world. It is only available to the last generation of men, who experience it. The righteous dead get nothing. All their striving to please God was in vain. So Jesus posits the resurrection. The Kingdom must be supernatural, and super-ethical.

The result according to Schweitzer is that in the ethics of Jesus there is a depreciation of the existing, transient and imperfect world.⁴² The time allotted to the present world is very short. Detachment from all that belongs to it is essential. He blesses the children because, as the children of the final human generation, they will enter the Kingdom as they are. They will never know anxiety, because the Kingdom will have come before they have grown up (Mark 10:13-16). The Kingdom is so close that there is no longer justification for earning a living, (e.g., Matthew 6:19-21; 31-33). His ethics are not concerned with the problem as to whether non-resistance to evil will threaten relatively well-ordered social conditions. Despite his view that the ethics of

41 Ibid., p. 93.

42 Ibid., p. 96.

Jesus were geared to a preparation for an imminent Kingdom which did not come, Schweitzer can still say with a rich sense of Christian piety:

Nevertheless it is of immense importance in the spiritual history of mankind that Jesus made men think only of what they knew in their hearts was the way to become what they were meant to be.⁴³

(v) The Kingdom in Paul

According to Schweitzer the Apostles and the primitive Christians, because of Jesus' death and their faith in His resurrection, expected the Kingdom to come immediately, and they too were disappointed.⁴⁴ They were reconciled by the thought that there would be an interval, and they continued to wait. Paul solves the problem by showing that from the death and resurrection onward, there is a process of transformation in the world, from a temporal state to a supernatural one. Schweitzer sees no Greek influence on Paul. The Baptism of Romans 6:3-6 is based on eschatological ideas. The Greek idea of rebirth is not found in Paul at all.⁴⁵ The higher and new nature of man is based on an already experienced resurrection. His mysticism of death-resurrection is rooted in an eschatological hope for the Kingdom. Because of the death and resurrection of Jesus, that Kingdom has already come. Outwardly, the kingdom means the overcoming, through Christ, of angelic beings. Late Jewish thought saw these beings as responsible for a deplorable state of

⁴³ Ibid., p. 99.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 154.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 157. The idea of rebirth is found in the allegory on Hagar, Galatians 4:21-31. A distinction is drawn by St. Paul between those who are born "in slavery" according to the flesh (vs. 23), and those who are "born free" according to the Spirit (vs. 29).

nature, and that their rule would be destroyed by the Messiah.⁴⁶ They had no power over the resurrected Christ, yet they will admit no defeat. The Resurrection of Jesus begins the Messianic Kingdom, and "believers of the final generation who have already died, will enter it through the resurrection".⁴⁷

Where Jesus teaches a sudden transformation of men into angelic beings, Paul sees it as a process that takes time.

He is therefore able to see the time that intervenes between the resurrection of Jesus and his return as that of the invisible development of the Kingdom which has been in existence ever since his resurrection.⁴⁸

Ethic in Paul is not directed toward entrance into the Kingdom. Whereas Jesus' ethic was directed toward achieving a higher righteousness, supplementing the Law, and gaining entrance to a Kingdom which is imminent, Paul's ethic cannot be obtained by achieving a higher righteousness. It is granted by God, through grace, on the basis of faith in the death of Christ. For Paul it is proof that we are already in the Kingdom.⁴⁹

46 See D.S. Russell, The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 249ff. Schweitzer is quite correct. Angelology comes into its more developed form in Late Judaism. Fallen angels are the origin of evil. Evil angels have taken control not only of man's nature, but also of the world in which he lives.

St. Paul takes up the theme in I Corinthians 2:8 and in Romans 8:38. He speaks of evil angels, the angelic rulers who, according to ancient thought, were the real causes of historic events. These angels and principalities were defeated on the Cross. Paul may have shared ideas similar to those in the Ascension of Isaiah 10-11.

47 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 161.

48 Ibid., p. 162.

49 Ibid., p. 167.

Schweitzer says that Paul presupposes the view that by inheriting Adam's sin, man cannot achieve the good commanded by the Law; this view Schweitzer traces to the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra.

Paul realizes that evil lives alongside good. In his ethic, believers must prove they belong to the world of the good. So in his doctrine of the Spirit, Paul turns from the narrow teaching of late Judaism and primitive Christianity (which was derived from Joel), to the deep, broad doctrine of the prophets.⁵⁰ To them, the essence of the Kingdom lay in the truth that God has given man an ethical spirit which enables him to act according to God's will. Again, it is provisional; at the Return of Jesus, the Kingdom will become supernatural.

The months and years which Paul envisaged for this however, have become centuries. His saying (Romans 14:17) about the present concealed

⁵⁰ See G. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology Vol. II, pp. 56-7 and B.W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, p. 446. Isaiah 11:2 speaks of the spirit resting upon the "stump of Jesse". The spirit bestows the ethical qualities of understanding, counsel, knowledge and fear of the Lord. Perhaps it is something like this that Schweitzer has in mind when he speaks of the "broad doctrine of the prophets". However, while Joel portrays the pouring out of the Spirit and accords the gift of prophecy to a broad spectrum of men, the operation of the spirit in the office of prophecy is not peculiar to any particular prophet. We should therefore be careful not to make too artificial a distinction between Joel and the mainstream of prophecy. The work of the spirit in the call of a man to be a nabi' can be traced back to the ninth century. It is imperative to the proper function of the prophetic office, particularly among the prophets of the North.

That having been said, there is a real sense in which one could be correct in making some distinction between Joel and the other prophets. Joel's prophecy is akin to pre-exilic preaching on the Day of Yahweh, and its descriptions of cosmic upheavals are like those found in post-exilic apocalyptic literature. Joel therefore has a particularistic flavour to his doctrine of the spirit.

Kingdom being righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, will be true for all time. In Schweitzer's own words,

Without knowing it, he has presented it to Christianity, as it was beginning to enter on its appointed pilgrimage through the ages, as its password for the journey.⁵¹

Paul does not think then in terms of work being an inopportune concern with worldly matters. Work is important, idleness is a spiritual danger (I Thess. 4:11f). How far, says Schweitzer, has Paul moved from Jesus? He does this under the pressure of the fact that the world was not coming to an end (a view to which Christianity was later obliged to assent). His teaching on respect for the magistrate fits this picture, and is derived from Late Judaism. Respect for order and property comes to be at home in Christianity through Paul.⁵²

Paul combines the view that Jesus' death brings forgiveness of sins with the one which is also found in Jesus (as we shall see later) that it brings about the Kingdom. Paul shares with the primitive Christians the view that the death of Christ is an event bringing about forgiveness

⁵¹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 169.

⁵² Ibid., p. 170. We could counter Schweitzer with Jesus' admonition that we are to render Caesar his due Mark 12:13-17. However Schweitzer considers that saying of Jesus to be an example of irony. Jesus slips out of a trap set by those who ask Him whether or not to pay taxes to Caesar. The real meaning of the saying, says Schweitzer, is not understood by his hearers. The real meaning is related to the expectation that "very soon there will be only God and no Caesar as ruler". No one can prove that Jesus had or had not the end of the world in mind in this saying. The crux of the problem once again is to ascertain the correctness or incorrectness of Schweitzer's view of Jesus Himself.

of sins. However, in addition, Paul says the Christian has died and risen with Christ, that he belongs already to the Kingdom, and that, as a member of the Kingdom, the Christian must have received forgiveness of sins. Living in a resurrection state, the believer is no longer subject to sin.⁵³

The believer is also free from the Law. The Law is invalidated through Christ's death. According to Schweitzer the suggestion that the Law may no longer be valid never occurred to primitive believers, because they still were expectant of the Kingdom. Because Paul believes the Kingdom is present due to Jesus' death and resurrection, he had to assert the Law was invalid, and that it was not obligatory for Gentiles. Paul believed the Law was not given by God, but by angels,⁵⁴ (Gal. 3:19f). To make Gentiles subject to the Law is to put them under the rule of angels, at a time when angels are about to become impotent, being made so by Christ who is locked with them in battle. Thus they would lose their calling to belong to the Kingdom.

Schweitzer does not see justification by faith alone as the centre of Paul's teaching, but rather the mystical view of dying and rising with Christ is at the centre. This doctrine, as we have seen, "explains

⁵³ However, see Romans, chapters six and seven. Schweitzer makes no reference to Romans, chapter seven in the entire book, and bases his thesis on Romans 6:4-7; 6:11. But two classic verses in chapter seven are at variance with Schweitzer. St. Paul himself says "I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate" (7:15), and "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members (7:23). Cf. also Galatians 5:16-25; Phil. 3:12-16. See also footnote 99.

⁵⁴ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 173.

everything that constitutes participation in the Kingdom which is beginning to come into existence".⁵⁵ Yet Paul is not different from Saint James. Redemption cannot be attained by works; but to stay redeemed and not to produce works is inconceivable.

Schweitzer obviously loves Paul. What comfort there is in Romans 8:1, mediated to broken hearts over the centuries! The Kingdom will come by Christ ruling in our hearts, and through us, in the whole world.

In the thought of Paul the supernatural Kingdom is beginning to become the ethical and with this to change from the Kingdom to be expected into something which has to be realized. It is for us to take the road which this prospect opens up.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 176.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 183.

CHAPTER 2. ATONEMENT

Jesus sought to keep His Messiahship a secret; however, Schweitzer says, Peter becomes aware of it and through him it is communicated to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi.⁵⁷ No one else knew this secret, even in the days at Jerusalem. Suddenly the High Priest knows. "How", asks Schweitzer? Through Judas. The main question for historical investigation is not why Judas betrayed his Master, but what he betrayed.⁵⁸ This position Schweitzer took in The Quest of the Historical Jesus.⁵⁹ In the book before us he expands upon it. The betrayal could not have been concerned with the most convenient location for the arrest. It would have been easy to find out about his nightly visits to Bethany.

When the disciples learn of the Master's Messiahship, He announces to them that He will die, and rise again. Schweitzer considered such

57 Ibid., p. 111. See also Howard Clark Kee and Franklin W. Young, Understanding the New Testament, p. 147. Schweitzer is at variance with other New Testament scholars at this point too. There are scholars who say that in the Gospel record, Jesus neither refers to Himself as the Messiah, nor does He discuss His mission in specific terms of Messiahship. They would point out that according to Mark, when Peter called Him Messiah, Jesus neither assented nor dissented. He told the disciples to drop the conversation.

58 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 111.

59 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 394.

predictions as "dogmatic...historical",⁶⁰ because they can only be explained through eschatological conceptions.

How do we explain Jesus' resolve to die, and the meaning of His self-sacrifice? Schweitzer rejects the age-old thought that "increasing opposition made His work for the Kingdom of God impossible".⁶¹ It cannot be found in what Schweitzer considers to be the two oldest Gospels. The crowd which shouted "crucify" was not the one which shouted "hosanna", but a group collected at dawn by His accusers.⁶²

Why does Jesus stop preaching in order to be alone with His disciples? The key, again, is Matthew 10:23. What Jesus had expected did not occur. The new thought of His passion will centre now, around Jesus' role in the final tribulation. This position Schweitzer held before He went to Africa,⁶³ and once again his "last testament" will clarify and expand that position. The persecution promised the disciples in Matthew 10:16-18 was the pre-Messianic tribulation. The origin of this concept is found in late Jewish eschatology and it is this, says Schweitzer, to which Jesus alludes in the persecution sayings of

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 385. See also Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 39-102. Raymond E. Brown deals exhaustively with the problem of Jesus' knowledge. He argues that Jesus spoke about vindication by God, not literal resurrection; that in such matters as the afterlife He had nothing to say other than that which would have been known from Late Judaism. Where Jesus speaks with authority is on the subject of the Kingdom of God.

⁶¹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 112.

⁶² How Schweitzer would establish this I do not know.

⁶³ A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, P. 389.

the Sermon on the Mount⁶⁴ (Matthew 5:10-12),

Jesus expected to live through the pre-Messianic tribulation. But where Ezekiel taught that the righteous would not taste death, Jesus assumes that those who are called to the Kingdom will meet their death in that tribulation, after which the Son of Man will appear. Jesus spoke of closest kinfolk becoming enemies, brother delivering brother, and the father his child, to death (cf. Enoch 100:1f).

Before telling the disciples at Caesarea Philippi that He would suffer and die at Jerusalem, He had already then, called upon them as believers, to suffer with Him. Jesus had also held that God may will to spare the faithful this need to prove themselves. He had taught them, says the doctor from Lambaréné, to beg for this in the last two petitions of the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:13).⁶⁵ Because the tribulation was delayed (re Matthew 10) Jesus concluded that God "was willing to spare believers from it if He fulfilled it in His own person".⁶⁶ He would accomplish this through death, thus ending the rule of evil which would have marked the end of the tribulation. The "many" for whom He dies, are the righteous of the last generation of mankind, "those predestined for the Kingdom", as he put it in The Quest of the Historical Jesus.⁶⁷ Jesus dies for them only, not for all men;⁶⁸ no thought had been

64 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 115.

65 Ibid., p. 119.

66 Ibid., p. 119.

67 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 388.

68 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 120.

given to the righteous dead of the past having to go through the tribulation. They gained entrance to the Kingdom through the resurrection. Schweitzer feels that Paul would not have known that Jesus went to His death to bring about the Kingdom "by fulfilling the pre-Messianic tribulation in His own person".⁶⁹ Jesus Himself, in preparing for His death, has no thought of future generations, because He holds that the end of time has come.

Jesus does not die as the Messiah then, but as the future Messiah. The Suffering Servant (whom Schweitzer feels in Deutero-Isaiah is the nation),⁷⁰ Jesus feels to be Himself.⁷¹ His death will bring about the Kingdom.⁷² This is the fundamental meaning of the death of Christ, as he saw it. Believers benefit by entering the Kingdom, and by being spared the pre-Messianic tribulation.

The last two petitions of the Lord's Prayer find fulfillment in Jesus' death. It is not a model prayer.⁷³ The bread is the bread of

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 157.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

⁷¹ A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 388. But see Morna Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), p. 132. Morna Hooker feels that Jesus did not consider Himself to be the Servant, but exclusively the Son of Man. Mark 9:32 for example, she links with Daniel 7. She says there is no evidence in this verse for the oft-repeated view that Jesus refers to the Servant Songs. Rather He thinks of the Son of Man.

⁷² A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 123.

⁷³ See Raymond E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer" New Testament Essays (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 275ff. Brown feels that the Pater Noster does not refer to the daily circumstances of the believer. It is not in this sense a model prayer. Jesus is saying to His disciples, "this is how you should pray". At the same time it is eschatological in that it refers to the "final times."

the Messianic banquet.⁷⁴ It is a prayer exercising pressure for the coming of the Kingdom.⁷⁵ The forgiveness of that prayer is forgiveness which comes from God alone. (Jesus' forerunner on the teaching of forgiveness is ben Sira; see Sirach 28:1 - 4).

The death of Christ then is not an atonement for sins. No load of guilt, in late Jewish eschatology, delays the coming of the Kingdom (IV Ezra 4:38 - 42). The Suffering Servant passage Jesus applies to Himself as an act of service and the payment of a ransom. Forgiveness of sins comes about by God's compassion, not through a sacrificial death. His death simply meets the conditions needed for the coming Kingdom.

Schweitzer reminds us that in The Quest of the Historical Jesus he had held that in the pre-Messianic tribulation, a load of world-guilt delayed the Kingdom, and that Jesus, taking into consideration the Servant passages, looked upon His sacrifice as an atonement. Further study of Jewish eschatology had caused Schweitzer to drop that view.⁷⁶

74 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 124.

75 See Raymond E. Brown, New Testament Essays, p. 283. Jesus spoke often of His return and of its suddenness. The return of Christ occupied the imagination of the early Christian communities, (see I and II Thess., I Peter). According to Raymond Brown, on the lips of that early community, Jesus' prayer "was an expression of their yearning for His return and for the ultimate fulfillment of the things He had promised". This interpretation would be akin to that of Schweitzer except that Schweitzer feels that rather than being a prayer of the post-resurrection community, it is in its present form a prayer of the early disciples. Here then we are faced again with Matthaean authorship and form criticism.

76 See John L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah, The Anchor Bible, Vol. 20 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. XLIX, and a book review of Leopold Sabourin, Les noms et les titres de Jesus in The Heythrop Journal (April, 1965), p. 215. McKenzie is of the opinion that Jesus was identified as the Servant by the primitive church, and that such identification would go back to Jesus Himself. This does not in his mind make the Servant poems a prediction of Jesus in a literal sense. It

270130

This is the way he had put it in The Quest of the Historical Jesus:

As He who was to rule over the members of the Kingdom in the future age, He was appointed to serve them in the present, to give His life for them, the many (Mark 10:45; 14:24), and to make in His own blood the atonement which they would have had to render in the tribulation.⁷⁷

The atonement-death teaching arose in primitive Christianity.

Since the early believers had no clear saying of Jesus about the meaning of His death, they concluded from Isaiah 53 that He had secured forgiveness of sins enabling them to enter the Kingdom.⁷⁸ So, according to Schweitzer, in Christianity two doctrines of forgiveness existed side by side, that which is found in the Lord's Prayer, and that based on atonement. The consequence is that the simple formula of the Lord's Prayer loses its significance. The demand that we prepare ourselves for forgiveness by forgiving others, ceases to dominate the entire concept of forgiveness. Thus, "the ethical element in the religion of Jesus has not been completely taken over into that of Christians".⁷⁹

is a New Testament interpretation. Morna Hooker on the other hand, feels that Jesus did not identify Himself with Deutero-Isaiah's Servant nor did He explain the purpose of His death by using phrases and words from the Servant Songs. It is probably as inconclusive to argue that Jesus thought of Himself as the Suffering Servant as it is to argue that He thought of Himself as the High Priest of the order of Melchizedek.

77 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 387.

78 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 136.

79 JBC p. 324. The ethical element in the teaching of Jesus is certainly carried over into St. Paul. The worship which must be paid by Christians to God is manifested concretely in a life in society based on charity and humility. See Romans 1:9-2:29; 12:1-15:3. In the particular passage of Romans, 12:1-13:14, the very unity of the Christian community demands that individual Christians strive by every possible means to overcome evil with good.

It takes, for centuries, a back seat behind dogmatic statements on forgiveness.

CHAPTER 3. THE RESURRECTION

At midday of the same day - it was the 14th Nisan, on the evening of which the Paschal lamb was eaten - Jesus cried aloud and expired. He had chosen to remain fully conscious to the last.⁸⁰

That early ending to a chapter in a classic book had left the theological world to some extent guessing as to what Schweitzer believed on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. In his last book, much, much more is said!

We have noted that Schweitzer saw resurrection as a prelude to participation in the Kingdom of God. In this he felt that Jewish eschatology had been influenced by Zarathustra.⁸¹ Hell by the way is probably derived from Zoroaster.⁸²

80 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 395.

81 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 37. See also D.S. Russell, The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 19, 385f. It is debatable among modern scholars to what extent the Jews were influenced by Persian religion. However there is little doubt that the Persians had much influence in such matters as "the two ages", the determinism of historical events, angelology and demonology, the final judgement and in eschatological ideas generally. Russell feels however, that it is unlikely that resurrection belief among the Jews can be traced to Persian influence, since the doctrines held by the two peoples are very different from each other.

82 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 38. See also W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1957), p. 361, and D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 386. There is a danger in overestimating Iranian influence on Judaism and Christianity. W.F. Albright feels that among features where Persian influence may be detected would be "developing belief in the last judgement and in rewards and punishments after death". Certainly much of the imagery of Hell would be Persian.

Primitive Christians did not believe Jesus was Messiah during His ministry on earth. He became Messiah in the supernatural state of His resurrection.⁸³ The view that He was Messiah on earth belongs to a later generation. The earliest Christians are convinced of His resurrection, established in their thinking through visions. Schweitzer makes the point that earliest tradition knows of no appearances "from which the material reality of His bodily presence could be inferred".⁸⁴ Such stories are later traditions, found in Luke and in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Luke 24:36-43; John 20:26-29). The visionary nature of the appearances is borne out by Paul (I Corinthians 15:5-8).

83 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 131. See also Jurgen Moltmann, Theology of Hope (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1967), p. 202. The titles of Christ which are understood in an eschatological sense are used to anticipate His future. Moltmann believes in the Resurrection of Jesus, and therefore can be expected to see things in a somewhat different light. These titles are not hard and fast ones which define who He was, but are open and flexible and announce in terms of promise what He will be. The titles which are dynamic and important are those which stir men and women to mission, to their work in the world, and to their hope in the future of Christ.

84 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 131, and J. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, p. 178; 141-2; 165. Moltmann rejects the visionary theory of the Resurrection and says that it removes the necessity for a decision with regard to its reality and meaning. Whereas Schweitzer sees the Resurrection experiences in the light of Jesus' apparently misguided apocalyptic promises, Moltmann can say that it was Yahweh, the God of Abraham, Exodus and promise, who raised Jesus from the dead. Through the Resurrection of Jesus this God of promise to Israel becomes the God of all men. The Cross and Resurrection is understandable only in the context of the conflict between law and promise, and through these events Christ becomes the salvation of all men, Jews and Gentiles. Moltmann also says that Christianity stands or falls with the reality of the raising by God of Jesus from the dead.

How did the primitive Christians come to have this ecstatic experience? The clue Schweitzer finds in the promise Jesus made that He would rise again. Schweitzer rejects the idea that such a promise placed in the mouth of Jesus comes in consequence of resurrection-faith. Rather, belief in His resurrection arose in consequence of the promise. So, the disciples remain in Jerusalem in the expectation of going to Galilee with their risen Master, who has appeared to Peter.⁸⁵ Jesus Himself thought that He would proceed to Galilee at the head of the disciples after He had risen (Matthew 26:32). Schweitzer raised the question in The Quest of the Historical Jesus,⁸⁶ but did not draw out the consequences for resurrection faith. Paul's authority is the resurrected Jesus, not "Jesus after the flesh".⁸⁷ The earthly life of Jesus belongs to the past, and has become meaningless (II Corinthians 5:16).⁸⁸

85 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 134.

86 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 334.

87 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 165.

88 See George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), pp. 336-7. To estimate persons after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα) means to judge them from a human point of view, i.e., to judge them by external standards, without taking into account their real worth in God's sight. With regard to Christ this means to think of His lowly life and His shameful crucifixion as though they were proof He was disowned by God and therefore ought to be rejected by men. Paul once thought of Jesus after this manner. Now that he is a Christian, and no longer persecuting the Church, Paul cannot think that way about his Lord. Jesus to Paul was sent by God to save men. As the risen Lord He rightfully claims Paul's allegiance. Schweitzer has grossly misunderstood Paul's understanding of Christology in this verse. The RSV reads, "From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view; even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer" (II Corinthians 5:16).

Schweitzer's "belief" in the resurrection of Jesus can be summarized in the following paragraph:

To understand the visionary experience of Peter we must take into consideration the fact that the women who had come to the tomb in which he had been laid early in the morning on the third day, in order to embalm the body, found the tomb empty. When and by whom he had been removed from it will never be established.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 132, and J. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, p. 184-5, and George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Bible Vol. VII, p. 911. Even if we refute belief in the Resurrection of Jesus, it would be impossible to say that anyone removed the body. That is going beyond our evidence. F.C. Grant for example, rejects the theory that the evidence for the Resurrection goes back to the "wrought-up imaginations of a group of hysterical women", but he does not emphasize the empty tomb story. He says that the earliest evidence is that found in I Corinthians 15: 3-8. The empty tomb story (Mark 16:1-8) is a later development, like the evidence for a "palpable, material body of the risen Lord", John 20:17, 20, 27; 21:13. The earliest conception of the risen Jesus was as the glorified, exalted Messiah, who appeared repeatedly to His disciples and friends. Compared with this earliest tradition, the empty tomb story is late. While it may be one important feature in the Resurrection story as a whole, it is plausible to say that it cannot be used to discredit the reality of the resurrection of Jesus.

Moltmann emphasizes the nature of faith in accepting the Resurrection. The message of Easter must speak to us neither as myth nor as history, but as something which concerns our very existence. For a complete bibliography, cf. JBC, Vol. 2, p. 791.

CHAPTER 4. BAPTISM AND EUCHARIST

In this chapter we will simply present Schweitzer's views on Baptism and Eucharist. We will examine these views in Chapter Eight.

In The Quest of the Historical Jesus, Schweitzer described both Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as "eschatological sacraments".⁹⁰ The history of dogma begins with a "fall" from early, pure theology, into "sacramental magic". Baptism, with no command from Jesus, and without Jesus ever baptizing anyone, was taken over into Christianity, and given special reference to receiving the Spirit.⁹¹

In Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, everything making up primitive Christian faith is tied together with baptism. It is done in the name of Jesus, and brings into fellowship those who accept His Messiahship and wait the imminent Kingdom.⁹²

Jesus not only never baptized, but He never gave the commission to baptize. The tradition found in Matthew 28:16-20 is a later one. It arose because it seemed preposterous that baptism would arise with no instruction from Jesus. Here Schweitzer departs from his thesis that the Matthaean sayings of Jesus are authentic. He never makes use of

90 A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 378.

91 Ibid., p. 379.

92 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 139.

Form Criticism, but there is something akin to that here. The Trinitarian formula found in Matthew for baptism came into use only at the end of the first century.⁹³ In the primitive Church it was in the name of Jesus.⁹⁴ So "for Jesus Therefore, there cannot be any question of baptism".⁹⁵ Belonging to Him guarantees Salvation. He never even considers that following His death a sacramental practice like that of John the Baptist would be necessary for forgiveness of sins. He does not really reckon with the possibility of new believers. The end of time has come. Through the "sheer logic of events", John's Baptism with water is taken into Christianity, "and Christianized".⁹⁶ Time passed,

93 For a more precise discussion cf. David M. Stanley, The Apostolic Church in the New Testament (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1965), p. 190. The Trinitarian formula became an essential part of the baptismal rite by the time the Greek Matthew was written in the last decades of the first century. Because of this the Evangelist places the saying of Matthew 28:19 in the mouth of the risen Christ. In the early days when adults were the main additions to the community, the religious significance of baptism was underlined by the candidate's profession of faith in the lordship of Christ. With the inauguration of infant baptism a profession of faith had to be made by someone else, no doubt the minister. So custom changed. Even the Trinitarian formula had to be made explicit where it had been previously implicit. Such a development would have taken place before the writing of the Greek Matthew.

94 Ibid., p. 189-190. Schweitzer is correct. Primitive baptism was carried out in Jesus' Name, but the invocation of His name was made by the candidate, not the minister. Such an invocation at baptism was a declaration that the candidate was willing to follow Jesus. It was an act of faith in His death, and entrance to His Church. This baptismal invocation would also have included all that is meant by *κύριος*. The early hymn found in Philippians 2:9-11 attests to this. "Jesus Lord" was a popular and the earliest, creed, and expressed faith in the divinity of Christ.

95 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 140.

96 Ibid., p. 142.

days became weeks, and weeks months, and months years. Faith had to face the fact that the baptized would not experience the Kingdom. They would have to pass their existence after baptism still as corporeal men, with the related inclination to sin. The possibility of sins committed after baptism was a problem wrestled with by Christians for centuries, with no final solution ever being found. Paul does not face this problem, because he too expects the Kingdom, and therefore the end of sin itself.⁹⁷ The reason he does not is that he expects the Kingdom quite soon and leaves the decision to Christ who is coming to hold the Last Judgement. Paul holds the primitive Christian teaching that believers "are saints in virtue of their baptism".⁹⁸ However, the forgiveness of sins made possible through the Atonement, and granted at baptism, only applies to sins committed before baptism.⁹⁹ The doctrine of original sin Schweitzer traces to Late Judaism and its interpretation of the story of Adam.¹⁰⁰ The doctrine was unknown to Jesus. It does not

97 Ibid., p. 180.

98 Ibid., p. 178.

99 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 179. But see also footnote 53, and compare it here with Paul's doctrine of baptism. Schweitzer feels that when Christian baptism arose, it would be possible to say that believers were in a sinless condition because the Kingdom was imminent. Writing two decades later Paul feels that they could remain sinless if they tried hard enough. He admits that they may relapse into sin, but he cannot come up with a solution. All he can do is urge upon believers the consequences of sin.

100 See also Herbert Haag, Is Original Sin in Scripture? (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), p. 106ff. Haag too says that the idea that the descendants of Adam are automatically sinners because of Adam and the moment they enter the world, is foreign to Scripture. He says that Psalm 51:7, "Behold I was born in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me", means that all who are born into the world become sinners, without fail. The "inheritance" of Adam means that men are born into a sinful world and in such a world become sinners. Certainly this is an

belong to Christian faith.

To turn now to the Eucharist, in Jesus' last meal He promises the disciples that they will soon be united with Him in the Messianic banquet (Matthew 26:26-29). The accounts contained in Matthew and Mark say nothing of its repetition.¹⁰¹ The significance of the bread and wine is not found in the comparison with flesh and blood, but rather in the earlier words of thanksgiving. In this context only, Schweitzer would say that the Supper is repeatable.¹⁰² Schweitzer refers to the Didache where the thanksgiving prayer refers to the passing away of the world, and the coming of the Kingdom. This is what is being said in the Aramaic invocation Maranatha [ܡܪܢܐ]. Thus he concludes,

That this cry which concludes the celebrations is in Aramaic, while the prayers are handed down in Greek, shows that it originated in the earliest period, when the prayers were spoken in Aramaic.¹⁰³

The thanksgiving meal in expectancy of the Kingdom is the only worship service in the primitive period. Preaching is unknown. Daily following the resurrection, the disciples and first believers (120) from Galilee, celebrated the meal, "in order that the hope aroused by that saying might come to fulfillment".¹⁰⁴ Such celebrations took place not in the evening,

interpretation of original sin which is compatible with twentieth century thinking about man and God.

¹⁰¹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 143.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 146.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 148.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 148. Acts 2:46 implies that the breaking of bread was a daily practice of the primitive Christians.

but in the morning.¹⁰⁵ It was in the morning that Jesus' return was expected, a belief arising from the view that it was in the morning the resurrection had occurred. Therefore, there was no celebration of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Church.¹⁰⁶ The thanksgiving meal in expectancy of the Kingdom was an enthusiastic one, and it is probable that it was here, on the morning of Pentecost, that speaking in tongues originated.

Once the imminent return of Jesus ceased to dominate Christian teaching, the meal became non-eschatological. It became, rather than a real meal, a celebration "in which consecrated elements are shared".¹⁰⁷

This has been the story of the manuscript found in a napkin, in a hut deep in the primeval forest. Deeply spiritual, yet academically radical, it calls forth our best in trying to fit it into the Life of the Master.

105 See C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (Welwyn Herts: James Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1961), pp. 136-9. Schweitzer feels that the morning thanksgiving meal grew out of the evening meals. Jesus' return was expected at this meal. However there is no way of proving that the meal took place in the morning. The story of the ten virgins in Matthew 25 has a liturgical touch indicating that the Second Coming was expected at midnight. While the parable has its place in the life of Jesus, it was used by the Church to enforce its appeal to men to get ready for the approaching Second Advent.

106 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 150.

107 Ibid., p. 153.

PART II - CRITIQUE OF SCHWEITZER'S ESCHATOLOGY

CHAPTER 5. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

(i) Eschatology: Realized or Expectant?

The sayings and parables of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels demonstrate that the idea of the Kingdom was central in Jesus' teaching. The passage dealing with the mission of the disciples reveal that their message concerned the Kingdom.¹⁰⁸ Obviously the subject is of equal importance to a contemporary understanding of the Gospel.

The thesis that the proclamation of Jesus must be considered within the framework of Judaism is sound. Whether or not Jesus' thinking is closer to Enoch than Daniel is, of course, another question, one to which we shall turn shortly. But scholars as divergent as Rudolf Bultmann¹⁰⁹ and Raymond Brown would concur in saying that Jesus (as

108 For a comprehensive study of the Kingdom see George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3 (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 19-20. On the question of the present or future coming of the Kingdom ("realized" or "final" eschatology), cf. Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), The Anchor Bible, Vol. 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), pp. CXVI-CXXI; Brown thinks that in many ways John is the best NT example of realized eschatology. God has revealed himself in Jesus so that the Fourth Gospel can declare "we have seen his glory" (Jn 1:14) and again "the light has come into the world" (3:19). In the Synoptics "eternal life" is received in a future age, but in John it is a present possibility (compare Mark 10:30 with John 5:24).

109 Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1964), p. 71f, 86f.

Brown puts it), draws upon "the imperfect religious concepts of His time", in such areas as demonology, the afterlife and apocalyptic, "without indication of superior knowledge and without substantially correcting the concepts."¹¹⁰

Since we have alluded to Bultmann, we ought to briefly note his attitude to eschatology. Schweitzer and Bultmann lived in completely different theological worlds. Bultmann could say that Schweitzer carried the theory of Johannes Weiss to extremes. Jesus' conception of the Kingdom, to be sure, is eschatological. Nobody doubts that today. But Bultmann's objection to Schweitzer is his position that not only the preaching and self-consciousness of Jesus were dominated by an eschatological expectation, but also His day-to-day conduct of life.¹¹¹ This amounts to an "all-pervading eschatological dogma".

Bultmann himself considers both the "Kingdom of God" and the concept of an eschatological drama to be mythological.¹¹² The rule of Satan over the world and "Salvation history" itself are both mythological. The New Testament proclaims in the language of myth that the last time has now come.¹¹³ Obviously Bultmann is the subject of another study.

Commenting on The Quest of the Historical Jesus, D.M. Baillie notes that even Schweitzer saw the effect of his interpretation, which was to create a picture of Jesus so grotesquely eschatological as to make Him

¹¹⁰ Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 59.

¹¹¹ Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 13.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 14.

¹¹³ Hans Werner Bartsch, ed., Kerygma and Myth, A Theological Debate (London: S.P.C.K., 1960), p. 2.

a "complete stranger to our time",¹¹⁴ remote, mysterious, even unintelligible, bringing to an impasse the entire work of making the historic Jesus real to modern Christianity.

Bishop Stephen Neill objects to Schweitzer's very use of the word "eschatology".¹¹⁵ Traditionally the term applied to death, resurrection, judgement, and eternal life. For the intervention of God in the affairs of the world, the proper term is "apocalyptic".¹¹⁶ But alas, moans the scholarly Bishop, the damage is now done. "Eschatological" is a term used today in a half dozen ways, "often without definition, and the confusions are endless".¹¹⁷

Of greatest concern, however, is Schweitzer's thesis that Our Lord

114 D.M. Baillie, God was in Christ (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1958), p. 24. See also John Bligh, "C.H. Dodd on John and the Synoptics", The Heythrop Journal (July 1964), p. 293. There is a sense in which Jesus is a "complete stranger to our time". Bligh suggests the possibility that the Galilean section of the resurrection narratives were retrojected by the editor of John, into the public ministry of Jesus. In this sense the eschatology of John could be considered as realized. This makes Jesus a "stranger to our time", but not in the sense that He was a first-century, misguided apocalypticist, as Schweitzer has it.

115 See The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 26. Eschatology is defined by Schweitzer as "the sum of the ideas which in different periods belong to Jewish and Christian expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God".

116 Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 195.

117 Ibid., p. 196. cf. also along the same lines Jurgen Moltmann, Theology of Hope, p. 17. Moltmann rejects the idea that there can be a "doctrine" or collection of theses of last things. Christian eschatology does not speak of the future; it speaks of Jesus Christ and His future. In this sense Moltmann distinguishes what he recognizes as the spirit of eschatology from the spirit of utopia.

expected the end of the world in the near future. A.M. Hunter says that Schweitzer "turned a nelson eye (sic) to those many well-attested sayings which proclaim the Kingdom to be present in Jesus and His mission".¹¹⁸ There are many other scholars who take issue with Schweitzer here and find realized rather than futurist eschatology. This is the conviction that the judgement of the world is continuous, and that "the end" is involved in each moment of history.¹¹⁹ While the Synoptics appear to emphasize a parousia eschatology, such scholars would remind us that in the Synoptic tradition there is an interpretation of Jesus' eschatology which, in many ways, was a realized eschatology. The historical and the eschatological are parallel rather than successive, yet the end is never absent from the process. Jesus therefore does not speak in a sense of erroneous expectation. Further, the concept of realized

118 A.M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958), p. 13.

119 G.P. Gilmour, The Memoirs Called Gospels, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited, 1959), p. 148. See also Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960), p. 28; C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. vii-ix, 21ff; and Rudolf Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 197. Conzelmann feels that what is beginning in the ministry is a period free from the rule of Satan; it is not the last times which come with Jesus but an interval between the period of Law and the period of the Spirit or Church. Dodd's realized eschatology was originally an answer to the problem raised by Schweitzer. The Kingdom of God was present in the ministry of Jesus and was released in effective conflict with evil. The eschatological Kingdom was preached as a present fact. The Kingdom, in Jesus' terminology, is not to be interpreted by apocalyptic speculation. Apocalyptic referred fancifully to the future, whereas Jesus spoke of a Kingdom that was already experienced. Schnackenburg says that Jesus spoke both of a coming Kingdom and a Kingdom already here: "we must not say that he speaks about the nearness of God's reign less definitely than about its presence because he was not so clearly aware of the future as of present reality".

eschatology will force us to look at the Gospel of John for a balanced view of Jesus' ministry (as we shall do shortly in this paper). John contends that "eternal life" already exists; it is not something that begins after death.¹²⁰

Just for the record, however, we must note that Schweitzer is not alone in his thinking. Alan Richardson takes a hard look at the verse ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ (Mark 1:15; Matthew 10:7; Luke 10:9), which C.H. Dodd translates "the kingdom of God has come".¹²¹ Richardson insists that it should be translated "the kingdom of God is at hand".¹²² As Richardson, who is much more "conservative" than Schweitzer, puts it,

Jesus is represented in the Gospels as teaching that the days of his own ministry were the days of the preaching of the reign of God (Luke 16:16), and that the reign of God thus proclaimed would shortly come 'with power'...within the lifetime of those who had actually listened to his preaching.¹²³

120 G.P. Gilmour, The Memoirs Called Gospels, p. 148. See also Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), The Anchor Bible p. 505. Eternal life for John is the very life of God in the believer; it is different from natural life in that death cannot destroy it. Eternal life and divine sonship are gifts of God possessed by the Christian as a present reality.

121 Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, (London, SCM Press Ltd., 1958), p. 85-6. The reference Richardson makes is found in C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 29-30. Dodd makes this translation "with an eye on the presumed Aramaic original".

122 Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 85. See also Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1959), p. 167. Taylor feels that while "has come" may be a possible translation, it is more likely that ἤγγικεν should be translated "is at hand", or "has drawn near"; cf. Romans 13:12, James 5:8, I Peter 4:7. He feels further that the difference is slight, and that Jesus believed that the Kingdom was present in His ministry.

123 Ibid., p. 85.

As we conclude this section we could point to the tension between realized and future eschatology in the Synoptics, and we are able to see the need for further examination of the Gospel of John. We will examine critically Schweitzer's treatment of John in the final section of this chapter.

(if) Enoch and Daniel

It should be emphasized again that no critique, so far as we know, has as yet been done on The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity. It would be helpful to be able to draw upon such a critique, for the book is a tremendous expansion of Schweitzer's exposition of Scripture. What we can do is take certain basic "dogmas" in his thesis, and see how they fare in the light of the best in Biblical scholarship.

Schweitzer claims that Jesus' Son of Man concept is closest to the Book of Enoch. Enoch's Son of Man, as we have seen, conducts the Last Judgement, whereas in Daniel it is the work of God. This schema of course, best fits Schweitzer's over-all thesis.

It is true that "Kingdom of God" and "Son of Man" are phrases taken from both Daniel and from non-canonical Jewish literature. However, our question is simply this: how did Jesus think of these concepts? And I think we have to say that a great many Biblical scholars would not agree with Schweitzer that "Son of Man" in the thought of Jesus is the "Son of Man" of Enoch.

Let us first look at a specific "Son of Man" saying. Mark 14:62 reads, "And Jesus said, I am; and you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven". Schweitzer does not refer to this verse, and it is unfortunate that he does not.

This saying does not predict a second advent at all, as is commonly supposed. A.M. Hunter draws to our attention the fact that the words are from Daniel 7:13 and the phrase from Psalm 110:1.¹²⁴ The verse prophesies not a descent, but an ascent. The destination of the Son of Man in Daniel is the immediate presence of God. Thus instead of predicting a Second Advent, we have here Jesus giving an impassioned assertion that although His cause appears to be ruined, "He will yet be vindicated by God and exalted to heaven".¹²⁵

Hunter has done some fine work on the "Son of Man" sayings. The Son of Man concept in the Gospels, he points out, is either from Daniel 7:13 or from that part of Enoch known as "The Similitudes" (Enoch xxxvii - lxxi). Hunter however, makes three very pertinent conclusions: (1) the pre-Christian date of the Similitudes is not certain, (2) no one has yet proved that Jesus knew them, and (3) Jesus certainly knew Daniel.¹²⁶ We may therefore assume, as do most scholars, that the title is from Daniel 7:13f.

Let us consider one more author. Vincent Taylor has drawn our attention to the aspects of Enoch's "Son of Man" which do not appear in Jesus' teaching. He says that comparing the sayings of Jesus with the

124 A. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 108.

125 Ibid., p. 109.

126 Ibid., p. 85. See also Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, p. 34, and John Bligh, a review of Les noms et les titres de Jesus, by Leopold Sabourin, The Heythrop Journal (April, 1965), p. 214ff. Cave IV of Qumran has amply demonstrated the popularity of the Daniel literature. Further, we must come to terms with the thesis of Morna Hooker, that Jesus never identified Himself with the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah nor did He explain His death with phrases from the Servant Songs. Rather, says Miss Hooker, we must ask whether there is not something in Daniel which associates the Son of Man with suffering and would therefore explain the words of Jesus.

Apocalyptic sayings, we become conscious of an enormous difference. Jesus does not say of the Son of Man, as in Enoch, that "the word of his mouth slays all sinners" (lxii.2), or that "all evil shall pass away before his face", (lxix.29). Jesus does not use language like that of the Ezra-Apocalypse where, in the Man from the Sea vision, a "flaming breath" goes out of his lips to reduce his adversaries to "dust of ashes and smell of smoke". Taylor therefore posits that the bareness of the genuine sayings suggests that Jesus spoke of a parousia, but did not ascribe to it the place it held in contemporary apocalyptic. His thought is nearer to Daniel 7:14. It concerns the final restoration of all things, and "includes all that is meant by the Resurrection".¹²⁷ Further, as Hunter points out, "Son of Man" in Daniel is a kind of "society person";¹²⁸ that is to say, Jesus regarded Himself as the representative or head of the people of God. His task as the bearer of the rule of God was to create this "people of God", and for Jesus the Twelve was its nucleus.¹²⁹ "Son of Man was not a familiar messianic title; it was non-political. In actual fact (it was)...apparently less nationalistic than the Jewish."¹³⁰ Because it was a mysterious title, Jesus could use it, even during His ministry and before Peter's confession, without the disciples finally concluding that He was the Messiah. Certainly this is a different interpretation from that of Schweitzer,

127 Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1951), p. 31.

128 See T.W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), p. 74. "Corporate personality" is the more common term.

129 A. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 86.

130 Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 83-4.

where he pictures Jesus as keeping His Messiahship a deep dark secret. Vincent Taylor can say that "Jesus certainly described Himself as the Son of Man, and the Messianic consciousness it expresses is the Foundation of His estimate of His Person and Work."¹³¹ These then, are scholarly points we would have to lay alongside the study worked out by Schweitzer, in order to give our own understanding of Jesus adequate perspective.

(iii) Jesus' Knowledge of the "Parousia"

Schweitzer's treatment of the Kingdom and the imminent coming of the "Son of Man" on clouds of heaven is oversimplified. Raymond Brown has established that there is really some confusion existing in the whole New Testament understanding of "parousia". This would be caused, first, by early Christians reinterpreting the statements of Jesus in the light of traditional eschatological expectations. Secondly, the field is confused because Jesus' own position was not clear. "Such confusion could scarcely have arisen if Jesus both knew about the indefinite delay of the Parousia and expressed himself clearly on the subject."¹³²

¹³¹ Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 30. For an excellent treatment of this subject, see also Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark.

¹³² See Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 77, Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 203, and Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, p. 95-136. The New Testament Epistles give separate evidence to demonstrate the confusion that existed about the Parousia in the first century. This confusion Brown traces to Jesus' own limited understanding of the subject. Perrin on the other hand posits that all elements in the tradition about the future which give a definite form to the expectation of the future in Jesus' teaching, cannot pass the test of authenticity. The Apocalyptic of Mark 13 is derived from early Christian apocalyptic. The "parousia" says Perrin, is a Matthaean development of the Son of Man tradition, which in turn is a development of the early Christian interpretation of passion and resurrection. All Perrin traces to Jesus is a general

Brown feels further that when Jesus spoke of life after death, or the signs of the end of the age, He merely repeated the descriptions which would be current in His time. It is when He spoke of the rule of God over men that he spoke with "startling originality".¹³³ A critical Biblical evaluation therefore, of Jesus' knowledge in these matters, takes nothing at all from His authority in the area which He made His own: the area of the Kingdom of God.¹³⁴

(iv) The Gospel of Matthew and Form Criticism

Since beginning this thesis, a very short review of The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity has been made available in the Expository Times. The question, which we have considered obvious from the start, is raised with regard to Schweitzer's "total trust in Matthew". Schweitzer accepts sayings "which other scholars would regard as least trustworthy".¹³⁵ This, plus his total rejection of Luke (which would be a subject worthy of a vast treatment in its own right), puts The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, from a scholarly point of view, in a bad light, to say the least.

Gerard S. Sloyan has pointed out that Matthew was once given priority

expectation of vindication and judgement. This is general and tells us nothing about the form of vindication. Luke gets around the problem by omitting any suggestion of a fixed time for the end; the idea of a coming Kingdom is replaced by a timeless conception of the Kingdom.

133 R. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 97.

134 Ibid., p. 101.

135 See article "Talking Points from Books" Expository Times, LXXX, No. 3, (December 1968), p. 66.

among the Gospels because early in the second century, Christians believed a gospel of Matthew had been written first in Hebrew.¹³⁶ This work never actually survived, so that Mark now has priority. The author-editor of the Greek Gospel of Matthew used Mark extensively in his work.

Schweitzer does not deal with Form Criticism, and yet it is Form Criticism which is so necessary to our understanding of the Gospel of Matthew. For example we can establish that the apocalyptic expectation of Mark 13 is from early Christian apocalyptic; the "parousia"-expectation is a Matthaean development from the apocalyptic "Son of Man" tradition; the latter tradition has in turn developed from an early interpretation of the resurrection and early Christian apologetic of the Passion of our Lord.¹³⁷ "Son of Man" sayings in this context, would be products of the early Church, since the conception they embody arose in Christian circles "on the basis of an interpretation of the resurrection".¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Gerard S. Sloyan, The Gospel of Mark, New Testament Reading Guide, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 3; Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 1-3, and Beda Rigaux, The Testimony of St. Mark (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1966), pp. 38-40. Mark can be explained without assuming the existence of an Aramaic Matthew. The Papias tradition traces Mark to the preaching of Peter, and most scholars today give it priority among the Gospels. The Aramaic Matthew cannot be given any real form; what originally existed would be some written work on the passion and Resurrection, the ministry in Galilee, something on John the Baptist, the baptism and temptation. But it was not a systematized gospel. What was written was still in ferment. The Aramaic Matthew, whatever it was, could have emerged from this formless, fermenting material. But we cannot distinguish its contours.

¹³⁷ Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, p. 203.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 201. But in regard to the authenticity of these Son of Man sayings cf. Robert Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels", New Testament Studies 15 (October 1968), pp. 45-74. The result of research into the genuineness of the Son of Man sayings has been widespread disagreement.

Such an understanding of the Gospel of Matthew as a whole, would help us to interpret Matthew 10:23b. Several authors can be brought to bear on the verse, but it would be best to state the thesis of their approach before working through their technique. Let us begin with Raymond Brown:

Jesus warns them that they will meet persecution, but assures them: "When they persecute you in one town flee to the next; for truly, I assure you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel before the Son of Man comes". Combining the Matthean and Marcan versions, A. Schweitzer put forward his famous theory that Jesus expected the Parousia before the Twelve had finished their Galilean mission. When they returned without this having happened, disappointment brought Jesus to realize that his death would be necessary to bring about God's intervention. Today few would follow Schweitzer in this interpretation. The Matthean and Marcan scenes cannot be combined. The setting of Mt. 10 (e.g., references to persecution by synagogues, governors, and kings in vv. 17-18) is that of the later Church; and in its present form at least, 10:23 must be understood in that atmosphere and not as a reference to an expectation within the ministry of Jesus. The Palestinian church is assuring itself that, despite persecution, it will not have exhausted all possibilities of preservation before the Son of Man comes.¹³⁹

Charles H. Giblin has devoted a detailed study to this text. What the text deals with, says Giblin, is not a single historical event, but a theological understanding of the Church's mission, "expressed in terms of the mystery of Christ".¹⁴⁰ Norman Perrin too, allows no claim to authenticity to Matthew 10:23: "It is directed to the early days of the Church's mission to the Jews when the imminent expectation was at its height".¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ R. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 71.

¹⁴⁰ Charles H. Giblin, "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b", Theological Studies, XXIX, No. 4, (December 1968), p. 641.

¹⁴¹ N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, p. 202.

With the conviction that "few evangelical passages" have caused as much controversy as Matthew 10:23b, Feuillet is another of the great twentieth century Catholic scholars who has tackled Schweitzer's key verse. He shows how some scholars have placed Matthew 10:17-22 in Mark 13:8-13; and that John A.T. Robinson would therefore substitute Mark 13:10 for Matt. 10:23.¹⁴² That verse reads, "and the gospel must first be preached to all nations". However, this does not satisfy Father Feuillet, for Matthew already has the equivalent of Mark 13:10. Matthew 10:19-20 is the equivalent of Luke 12:11-12, both of which parallel Mark 13:9. Father Feuillet would remove the variables and place Matthew 10:23 after verse 20. The origin for Matthew 10:23 then would be not the discourse of a mission, but rather a discourse of consolation. Luke 12:11-12 and Matthew 10:23 are built on exactly the same pattern. The two passages formulate therefore, an eschatological comfort for a time when there was persecution: (1) the Spirit comes to the rescue of the persecuted, and (2) it is the Son of Man who comes to the rescue.¹⁴³ In both cases the persecution is caused by the Jews and the horizon is limited to Palestine.

What we may conclude then is that Schweitzer stood still and form criticism has advanced.

(v) Interim Ethics

Hunter says that both Weiss and Schweitzer, by using "consistent eschatology" as the master-key to the understanding of the Life of Jesus,

¹⁴² Andre Feuillet, "Les Origines et la Signification de Mt. 10,23b", The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII, No. 2, (April 1961), p. 183.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 185.

inevitably made that key fit many locks it was never meant to fit.¹⁴⁴ Therefore, when the ethical teaching of Jesus proved to be a great difficulty, it was dismissed as "an ethic of the interval," that is to say, a code of emergency rule valid only until by catastrophe God shall end this world and bring in a new one. In one sense Hunter is unfair to Schweitzer by treating his "interim-ethic" in that manner. In The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity interim ethics are a vital part of Jesus' plan for his followers. However, Hunter sees no "parousia" in Jesus' words on prayer and forgiveness, and while he admits the ethics of Jesus are eschatological ethics, the eschatology itself is "realized eschatology."¹⁴⁵ In other words, the main thought in the moral

144 A.M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 12: "It was Johannes Weiss who pioneered the way which Schweitzer's Quest made known to English readers. Weiss and Schweitzer both urged that the master-key to the understanding of the Life of Jesus was 'consistent eschatology'. The crucial terms in the Gospel (they said) are the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, and both are to be interpreted eschatologically. Inevitably, Schweitzer made his new key fit many locks it was never meant to fit..."

145 Ibid., "What then is the relation of the ethical teaching of Jesus to this preaching of His about the Kingdom of God?"

"Albert Schweitzer, it will be remembered, called the moral teaching of Jesus 'an ethic of the interval'--a code of emergency regulations valid only for the short interval between the preaching of the Gospel and some impending Parousia which would end the world-order. The ethical teaching of Jesus is not an interim ethic in Schweitzer's sense. To import a reference to the Parousia into Jesus' words about prayer, or forgiveness, or humility, or truthfulness, or trust in God is to read into the Gospel record what is simply not there. Jesus did not say, 'Love your enemies, because the end of the world is at hand.' He bade men love their enemies that, by so doing, they might become sons of their heavenly Father (Mt. v. 44.=Lk. vi. 35, Q). Yet the ethics of Jesus are eschatological ethics in the sense that they grow out of Jesus' eschatology. But the eschatology is 'realized eschatology,' and the major premiss of Jesus' moral teaching is, 'The Reign of God has come upon you.' In other words, the ethic of the Sermon on the Mount is the moral ideal of the Kingdom of God. It is the new way of life for those who live in the new age which has come with the coming of the Kingdom and the King."

teaching of Jesus is "the Reign of God has come upon you". The ethic of the Sermon on the Mount is the moral ideal of the Kingdom: a new way of life for those who live in the new age which has already arrived with the arrival of the King and the Kingdom. Thus our understanding of the interim ethics will be settled largely by our understanding of the Kingdom. It would certainly seem strange that Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom proved wrong, and that His "temporary" ethics proved to be of lasting value.

We must, however, face the fact that Schweitzer's Interimsethik is out of balance with a true picture of the relationship between Apocalyptic and Orthodox Judaism in Jesus. Schweitzer has completely divorced Apocalyptic thought from the Rabbis.¹⁴⁶ The life of Jesus therefore, is controlled by a dogmatic and consistent eschatology so that Jesus is simply the culmination of Jewish Apocalypticism.

This problem is adequately dealt with by W.D. Davies in Christian Origins and Judaism. He maintains that to follow Schweitzer is to "sever Jesus from the main stream of Judaism and connect Him with a sectarian Apocalyptic tradition within it."¹⁴⁷ Davies maintains that Jesus was not the product of an apocalyptic tradition completely separate from Pharisaic Judaism. Rather, both elements can be found in Jesus.

Jesus in fact was called Rabbi. He knew not only classical Hebrew but He knew the Hebrew of the schools and used it in His discussions

¹⁴⁶ A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, pp. 365ff.

¹⁴⁷ W.D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 20.

with His opponents. He is not simply a "Galilean Apocalyptist", but is linked further to the Orthodox Judaism of Jerusalem through the Synagogue, which "everywhere gave to Judaism a marked unity."¹⁴⁸ Through the Synagogue and the schools there was a constant flow of ideas between the Jews of Galilee and the rest of Palesine.

Davies further points out that the attitude of Apocalyptic writers towards the Torah was not an approach different from that taken by the Rabbis.¹⁴⁹ For instance, I Enoch 99:2 reads: "Woe to them that pervert the words of righteousness, and transgress the eternal law." II Baruch gives a central position to the Torah, and the Assumption of Moses is the product of a Pharisee who delights in the Law. We can, therefore, conclude that there is no cleavage between Orthodox Judaism and Apocalypticism and that both must be taken into account in a balanced "life of Christ." We can go so far as to say that there was a "community of eschatological doctrine between the Pharisees and the Apocalyptists",¹⁵⁰ and that it is a mistake to make a "distinction between fanatic Apocalypticism and sober orthodoxy."¹⁵¹ Apocalypticism was not in the main concerned with ethics; and the teaching of Jesus was "not merely of crisis significance."¹⁵² There is plenty of ground upon which to conclude then that there is a body of teaching in the ministry of

148 Ibid., p. 21.

149 Ibid., p. 22.

150 Ibid., p. 23.

151 Ibid., p. 23.

152 Ibid., p. 20.

Jesus which is not tied to apocalyptic. Jesus' ethics may very well be part of that body of teaching.

Yet we can conclude that even if Jesus did expect the end of the world in His time, His is not an Interimsethik nor did the early Church so understand His teaching. The early Church retained Jesus' ethic "when the hope of an immediate end of the existing order had waned."¹⁵³

The synoptics do not make an appeal to the end of the world as the basis for ethical conduct such as is found in St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:26.

(vi) The Lord's Prayer

Once we have established that Saint Matthew's Gospel reflects the teaching of the Primitive Church, many of the issues raised by Schweitzer fall into place, including the question of the Our Father. Once again Raymond Brown has much that is helpful. First of all, it is true that the Lord's Prayer does not refer to daily living, but rather to the last days.¹⁵⁴ It is eschatological. However, what we are witnessing in Matthew is the meaning that the Lord's Prayer had for the early Church, after the Resurrection of Jesus. It is difficult even to ascertain what shades of meaning the prayer had when Jesus first spoke it before His death, or how the disciples understood it. It became a prayer of the Christian community. On their lips, says Brown, the prayer given them by Jesus "was an expression of their yearning for His return and for the

¹⁵³ George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 2 (New York: Abingdon Press), p. 169.

¹⁵⁴ See R. Brown, New Testament Essays, p. 275ff.

ultimate fulfillment of the things He had promised."¹⁵⁵ That it is a community prayer is further established by the first person plural which appears throughout the prayer.

Joachim Jeremias agrees that the Lord's Prayer is eschatological in nature. He points out that the petitions "Hallowed by thy name, thy kingdom come" parallel each other in content, and recall the "Qaddish," an Aramaic prayer which concluded the service in the synagogue.¹⁵⁶ It is also a prayer with which Jesus doubtless would have been familiar from childhood. By comparing these petitions of the Lord's Prayer with the Qaddish we are able to see that they make a plea for the revealing of the eschatological kingdom of God, and that they contain the same content as the Maranatha prayer of the early Church.¹⁵⁷

Although a comparison can be made with the Qaddish, there is, says Jeremias, a great difference. In the Qaddish the congregation knows only the darkness of the present age, and pleads for its consummation. But in the Lord's Prayer the congregation knows that the point of turning has come since God has already begun this work of salvation.¹⁵⁸ It is now a more full and richer revelation which is being sought for.

Ernst Lohmeyer agrees with the eschatological nature of the Lord's Prayer. He speaks of the "eschatological act by which God hallows his name before and in and over all the world."¹⁵⁹ Schweitzer deals

¹⁵⁵ Joachim Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 21.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 22f.

¹⁵⁹ Ernst Lohmeyer, Our Father (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 80.

specifically, however, with the last two petitions of the Lord's Prayer
 μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς ῥύσιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ
 πειρασμός . Schweitzer is writing about the testing which believers
 have to undergo in the pre-Messianic tribulation.¹⁶⁰ The specific word
 which we ought to consider, and the etymology about which Lohmeyer writes,
 is the Greek word *πειρασμός*. It contains a concept of a leading into
 temptation which is neither repeatable nor by nature permanent. It is
 a single event.¹⁶¹ There is in the Gospels and in the Lord's prayer the
 moment or day of temptation.¹⁶² And Matthew's picture of the Lord's
 Prayer is that it is a traditional exercise of piety, to be "determined
 by the eschatological opposition of hiddenness and openness....to be done
 in secret because God will reward them openly."¹⁶³ By way of summary,
 however, we have to note a similarity and a difference between Schweitzer
 and Lohmeyer. Lohmeyer takes the *πειρασμός* to be an eschatological
 temptation in the form of a final encounter between God and demonic
 forces.¹⁶⁴ For Schweitzer it is that, but to use his specific language,
 it is the testing of the pre-Messianic tribulation.¹⁶⁵

(vii) The Gospel of John

Schweitzer makes no use of the Gospel of John. Now there is always

160 A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 130.

161 E. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 195.

162 Ibid., p. 198.

163 Ibid., p. 20.

164 Ibid., p. 206.

165 A. Schweitzer, p. 119.

a danger in overworking one author, but once again I want to bring Raymond E. Brown into the "debate". There are other scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic, who would be helpful in such fields as eschatology, or the Gospel of John. However, Brown is not really excelled in his field, and what he says, he says well. With regard to the sacramental nature of the Gospel of John, in his New Testament Essays he admits that Schweitzer began a trend in so regarding it, and that following him Oscar Cullman went through the Gospel in detail, further establishing the case.¹⁶⁶ The idea that the Old Testament was fulfilled in the New created the possibility for typology. Thus it would be natural for John to present Jesus' words and actions as "prophetic types of the Church's sacraments". Their significance would be recognized by the early readers of that Gospel. All this Father Brown admits.

However, with our knowledge of Qumran, many of the "radical theories" on the origin of the Gospel have gone by the board. It is better viewed now in a Palestinian setting.¹⁶⁷ In addition, archaeology has confirmed the existence of many Johannine localities, such as the pool of Bethesda, or Bethany near Jerusalem.

The abstract language which had at one time ruled out Palestinian origin, now helps to confirm it. The dualism of the book, the abstract language, the vocabulary, the theological outlook, is also found at Qumran, before and during Christ's time. Jesus can thus be pictured against a real Palestinian background; obstacles to belief in the

¹⁶⁶ Raymond E. Brown, S.S., "The Johannine Sacramentary," New Testament Essays, (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 81.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 188.

historicity of John no longer exist.¹⁶⁸

Brown points out, however, that none of the Gospels are histories or biographies in the modern sense. The Synoptics reflect early teaching and preaching (which in turn, of course, stemmed from eye-witnesses). The Gospel material was organized theologically, not chronologically.

The final writer of John knew at least part of this Synoptic tradition,¹⁶⁹ although he is not dependent on that tradition. Further,

168 Ibid., p. 190. See also C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), pp. 117-118. Barrett feels that while John did not intend to write a scientific history, neither did he create narrative material for the purpose of allegory. There is a sense in which John gives a real affirmation of history, "combining discourse material with narrative." Barrett compares historian with apocalypticist and gnostic. "Both apocalypticism and gnosticism may be regarded as a flight from history. The apocalypticist escapes from the past and present into a golden age of the future; the gnostic escapes from the past and present into a world of mysticism and fantasy. Over against these John asserted the primacy of history. It was of supreme importance to him that there was a Jesus of Nazareth who lived and died in Palestine, even though to give an accurate outline of the outstanding events in the career of this person was no part of his purpose. He sought to draw out, using in part the form and style of narrative...the true meaning of the life and death of one whom he believed to be the Son of God, a being from beyond history. It is for this interpretation of the focal point of all history, not for accurate historical data, that we must look at John. Yet at every point history underlies what John wrote."

169 R. Brown, "The Problem of Historicity in John," New Testament Essays, p. 194. See also C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 423. Dodd concludes that there exists behind the Fourth Gospel a tradition which is independent of the other Gospels. John, to Dodd, is not a mosaic of the synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts.

See also JBC, Vol. II, p. 420. John's highly spiritual purpose was to centre his Gospel in Jerusalem among the doctors of Judaism rather than in the countryside of Galilee. That this aspect of his teaching was historical, however, even the synoptic tradition itself witnesses, especially in the "Johannine" passage of Mt. 11:25-27 par., which "contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel" and "causes perplexity to those who deny the solidarity between the Johannine heaven and the synoptic earth."

A further point of interest is that in John, Jesus makes several trips to Jerusalem, engaging in controversy with the Jewish leaders. This is more plausible than that He should have made one trip to the holy city, "and crowded into a single week's time all His dealings there

while the Gospel of John, in its final form, would not be written by the disciple John, Father Brown believes he is the source of that tradition. The import of all this is that this Gospel is worthy of a place in a study of the life and teaching of Jesus. And the point which is relevant to our study of The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, is that "for John the kingdom of God is present in Jesus."¹⁷⁰

II. ATONEMENT

According to Schweitzer, Jesus felt that his death would bring about the Kingdom¹⁷¹ and spare believers from going through the pre-Messianic tribulation. The idea of an atoning death occurs only in primitive Christianity, not in the mind of Jesus. No clear saying on Jesus' death, attributable to Him, could be found, so they concluded on the basis of Isaiah 53 that He had secured forgiveness of sins, which would enable them to enter the Kingdom.¹⁷² Thus the simple formula of

(Mt. 23:37 par. suggests that the Johannine picture is the more factual when it quotes the Lord as "often" having had the desire to gather Jerusalem unto Himself)."

¹⁷⁰ R. Brown, op. cit., p. 192.

See also R. Brown, The Gospel According to John, I-XII Anchor Bible, p. cxvii. Brown feels that in many ways John is the best New Testament example of realized eschatology. God has revealed Himself in Jesus, so that the fourth Gospel can declare, "we have seen his glory," (1:14), and again, "the light has come into the world" (3:19). In the Synoptics "eternal life" is received in a future age; but in John it is a present possibility (cf. Mark 10:30 with John 5:24).

¹⁷¹ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 123.

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 136.

the Lord's Prayer, with its emphasis on the personal responsibility of forgiving others, loses its significance.

Schweitzer has thus laid down a challenge to orthodox Christianity, and to our traditional understanding of the Gospels—and the gospel. Two thoughts then, emerge. There is no atoning value to the death of Christ. And Jesus made a valid decision: He concluded that God would spare His disciples the tribulation if He fulfilled it in His own Person.¹⁷³ His death would do this, and thus end the rule of evil which would have marked the end of the tribulation.

Some would be content to eliminate talk about salvation as 'mythological'. Bultmann speaks of the end of time, and atonement for sins, in this manner,¹⁷⁴ and proceeds to strip away the "myth" to get at "Kerygma". But Bultmann's process does not solve the problem with which Schweitzer faces us. The question before us is this: how did Jesus conceive of His death?

The question of the pre-Messianic tribulation must be solved within the context of such matters as (1) our understanding of Kingdom and (2) form criticism of the Gospel of Matthew. All this we have faced before. If Jesus did not think in terms of an imminent supernatural kingdom,¹⁷⁵ then in effect He is not assuming an imminent tribulation either.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 119.

¹⁷⁴ H. Bartsch, Kerygma and Myth, p. 2.

¹⁷⁵ It is possible to conjecture that John 14:3 is a reference to an imminent parousia; and that Mark 14:62 is a similar reference. On the other hand we might say that Jesus spoke of His victory as a Jew and in so doing applied to this victory the imagery of Daniel and the return of the Son of Man; but that the Resurrection took place instead and the parousia lay a distance in the future. Raymond E. Brown feels that all we can do in this field is conjecture. See Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, pp. 71-72.

This is not the context in which He would think of His death.

How did He conceive of it? Schweitzer has ruled out any conception of atonement in the mind of Jesus.¹⁷⁶ But other New Testament scholars do not agree. Neville Clark, for example, feels that in Judaism the idea of vicarious atonement accomplished through death was never based on Isaiah fifty-three. Even the evidence that Jesus assumed the role of Deutero-Isaiah's Suffering Servant is inconclusive.¹⁷⁷ Yet Jesus saw His death as being possessed of vicarious significance.¹⁷⁸ The idea, says Clark, that the suffering and death of the righteous might atone for the sins of others was a belief quite widespread in the Judaism of Jesus' time: (ref. II Macc. 7:37f; IV Macc. 1:11; 6:28f. 17:20ff.). Such a conviction came to its full fruition in the agony of the Maccabean revolt. Indeed it was in that period, with all its torment, that the assurance of resurrection imposed itself.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ See The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 127.

¹⁷⁷ This is the thesis of Morna Hooker, in Jesus and the Servant (London, 1959). Cf. the review of this dissertation by John Bligh in The Heythrop Journal 6 (1965), pp. 214-216. Miss Hooker argues that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah and did not explain the purpose of His death in words and phrases derived from the Servant Songs.

At the end of her book, Miss Hooker raises the interesting question: "Is there nothing in Daniel itself which associates the Son of Man with suffering and could thus explain these words of Jesus?" Cf. M. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark, p. 190, where Miss Hooker's thoughts would be close to those of Schweitzer.

¹⁷⁸ Neville Clark, Interpreting the Resurrection, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), p. 42.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 42.

In the chapter on the importance of being reconciled to our brethren, Jesus speaks of offering a gift at the altar (Matt. 5:23f.). In Mark 1:44, he advises a leper whom He has healed, to go to his priest and make the Mosaic sacrifice. Vincent Taylor makes the observation that these would be very strange words on the lips of someone who had rejected the sacrificial system.¹⁸⁰ Jesus actually makes an invitation to offer a sacrifice. While Jesus was aware of the limitations of the sacrificial system, He recognized its place in Jewish religious life. He was no iconoclast.

Schweitzer has said that Jesus' view of the Kingdom was that of an age later than that of Jeremiah, where it had been conceived of as spiritual and ethical. Taylor points out that Jeremiah also rejected sacrifice. Jeremiah felt man could himself fulfill the demands of a holy God. He has no appreciation for the symbolism contained in sacrifice, or for its value for frail erring man. Nor is Jeremiah able to get beneath pagan excesses in sacrifice to those principles "which find a sublimated expression in the figure of the Servant of Yahweh."¹⁸¹ However, and here Taylor drives home his point,

the well-known anti-sacrificial Old Testament sayings ...are so markedly wanting in the quotations of Jesus; and it is worth noting that, while He quotes the words of Isaiah freely, His use of Jeremiah is sparing.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 70.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 63.

¹⁸² Ibid., p. 70.

Taylor concludes that Jesus thought of His own death in terms of sacrifice.¹⁸³ What is being said here is that sacrifice in the mind of Jesus must be seen against the background of the sacrificial system, with its "value for erring man", rather than simply against the background of messianic tribulation.

By the method of Form Criticism we are able to identify, with a good deal of accuracy, which statements in the Gospels would go back to Jesus, and which are put into His mouth by the post-resurrection Church. Such a study we have found necessary to our understanding of the Gospels of Matthew in relation to 10:23b. Now we can use the same tools of Biblical study, in our approach to Jesus' understanding of His death. Joachim Jeremias for example, sees Mark 9:31 as being a pre-Hellenistic saying. Re-translated into Aramaic it reads, "God will surrender the man (bar naša) in the hands of men (b^ene naša)."¹⁸⁴ After taking us through a number of such texts, Jeremias concludes that anyone familiar with the

extraordinary importance which the idea of the stoning power of suffering and death had attained in Late Judaism will have to admit that it is completely inconceivable that Jesus would have expected to suffer and die without having reflected on the meaning of these events.¹⁸⁵

We will try to illustrate this further with an examination of the Gethsemane narrative. Jesus speaks of the 'cup', and in His prayer to the Father requests that if it be possible, the 'cup' may pass from Him.

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁸⁴ Joachim Jeremias, The Central Message of the New Testament, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 42-43.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 45.

(Matt. 26:39). To understand what Jesus is talking about, once again we must go to the Old Testament. Of twenty metaphorical uses of the word 'cup' in the Old Testament, in seventeen of those cases it is a metaphor for a divinely-appointed suffering, indeed even divine punishment. A good example would be Isaiah 51:17,22. It is the punishment of God on human sin. Therefore, A.M. Hunter would conclude that Jesus' understanding of His 'cup' would exclude the actual physical pain of death. "We should be nearer the truth if we called it 'the cup of God's wrath against human sin'".¹⁸⁶

Further, Jesus saw His passion as a 'baptism', (Luke 11:50, Mark 10:38). This baptism is a reference to His death, and is a metaphor for suffering. He spoke of His passion as a road to be travelled, (Mark xiv. 21). "The Son of Man goeth, as it is written of Him", could be paraphrased "the Son of Man travels the road mapped out for him in scripture". "What is that road?" asks Hunter? It is the path of humiliation and death, mapped out five centuries before for the Servant of the Lord.¹⁸⁷

Schweitzer has it that Jesus planned His death, in relation to His understanding of the pre-Messianic tribulation. However, other scholars do not see it even in the sense of a 'plan' on the part of Jesus. Jeremias feels that it was the events of His ministry which forced Him to reckon with the inevitability of His death.¹⁸⁸ D.M. Baillie points out that the Gospels were written at a period when the Christian community looked back at the Cross, and saw it as ordained by the purpose

¹⁸⁶ A. Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 96-7. See also John L. McKenzie, S.J., *Second Isaiah, the Anchor Bible*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968, pp. 123-4, 126-7.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

¹⁸⁸ J. Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, p. 41.

of God. However, when Jesus looked forward to the likelihood of the Cross, and accepted it by faith, it appeared to Him as a tremendous tragedy.¹⁸⁹ Up to the last night Jesus prayed and hoped that it might not come. We would think, says Baillie, it artificial to picture Jesus setting out from the beginning of His ministry, with the clear consciousness that He had entered the world for the express purpose of dying a violent death for human salvation. So "it would be equally artificial to think of Him as forming the intention, at any point in His career, of being condemned to death".¹⁹⁰ Some of the sharpness, then, needs to be taken off Schweitzer's interpretation of Jesus' intentions. What we may further say is that Jesus did not die to bring in the Kingdom. The Cross falls within the Kingdom. It is part of the redeeming Rule of God. Where do we find in scripture that the Reign of God involves a Cross? Hunter sees it in Second Isaiah, and especially chapter fifty-three.¹⁹¹

Albert Schweitzer's interpretation of the Cross is his own. He makes it a figment of the first century. Biblically speaking, we can say on good grounds that it is much more than that! It still, as it did in the first century, embodies the truth that "Christ died for us men and for our salvation".

III. THE RESURRECTION

Schweitzer has said a great deal on the Resurrection which

Jesus did not necessarily possess super-human powers so as to know the future; indeed the Gospels were written after most of the events He had predicted had taken place. How much in the prophecies attributed to Him we can ascribe to Jesus, and how much is clarification by the evangelist, must remain a very large question. See Raymond Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 59.

¹⁸⁹ D.M. Baillie, God was in Christ, p. 182.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 181.

¹⁹¹ A. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 77-8. But see footnote 177 above.

challenges our thinking. Some of the things he has said are really quite helpful. For example he takes note that the earliest Christian tradition knows of no appearances which speak of the material reality of His bodily presence.¹⁹² Such stories appear only in the later Gospels. And Paul confirms the spiritual nature of the appearances.

Many Biblical scholars today say much the same thing. William Barclay for example, says that the physical side of the resurrection is stressed in the later Gospels, "in the interests of underlining and emphasizing the reality of the Resurrection."¹⁹³ And certainly I Corinthians would be written before the Gospels. Here we have a reflection on how the Resurrection would be preached in the Primitive Church. Nothing is said which would infer physical appearances. It is only that He appeared, and Paul even puts his own visionary experience on the same level with the others. Thus Schweitzer could be helpful if it were not for the way he fits all this into his treatment of the Kingdom. He ends up with no apparent belief in the Resurrection at all.

Schweitzer feels that the Resurrection faith of the first disciples came in consequence of Jesus' promise that He would rise again. The clue to the primitive ecstatic experience is this promise. The disciples remained in Jerusalem in the expectation of going to Galilee with the Risen Master.¹⁹⁴ Of course, Schweitzer's Kingdom eschatology

¹⁹² A. Schweitzer, Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 131.

¹⁹³ William Barclay, Crucified and Crowned, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 153.

¹⁹⁴ That this is not the only possibility, see W. Pannenberg, Jesus — God and Man (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), pp. 104-6.

is part of his interpretation at this point. But we can very well treat the promise of Jesus separately, and the problem stems from the fact that Schweitzer does not use the Gospel of Matthew correctly.

Non-critical readers of the Gospels accept the words of Jesus on Resurrection literally. However, as we have seen, a Gospel like Matthew reflects some interpretation by the post-Resurrection Church. Explicitly, what we have with Jesus' promise of Resurrection after three days, is not a literal promise, but confidence that God would somehow vindicate Him. Jesus was confident of His ultimate vindication, says Professor Barclay. "It did not occur to Him that His work could be obliterated".¹⁹⁵

How did Jesus conceive the outcome of His mission? To ask that question is to enter a realm of uncertainty. Predictions found even in Mark (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f), do not give us cause to build with confidence. Clark says that "though these bear witness to the assurance of the Church, they are not necessarily evidence for the expectation of her Lord".¹⁹⁶ The Resurrection was not expected. What we can say is that Jesus' followers anticipated a death in which they would share, and a victory in which they would participate (Mark 10.39). In this context we can further say that the fate of their Master and their own immunity, left them confused and without hope. It would be difficult to conclude that the Resurrection had been explicitly announced, and then awaited. The term to use is the more indefinite term 'vindication'.¹⁹⁷ As the controversy over His ministry heightened the possibility of death, Jesus looked beyond suffering to triumph.

195 W. Barclay, Crucified and Crowned, p. 30.

196 N. Clark, Interpreting the Resurrection, p. 40-1.

197 Ibid., p. 43.

'Vindication' is the term Father Raymond Brown would use too, and it is along the lines of such an interpretation that he develops a very real understanding of the humanity of Jesus.

A Jesus who walked through the world knowing exactly what the morrow would bring, knowing with certainty that three days after his death his Father would raise him up, is a Jesus who can arouse our admiration, but still a Jesus far from us.¹⁹⁸

On the other hand, a Jesus for whom the future was as much a mystery, a dread, and a hope as it is for us and yet, at the same time, a Jesus who would say, "Not my will but yours" - this is a Jesus who could effectively teach us how to live, for this is a Jesus who would have gone through life's real trials.¹⁹⁹

If Jesus spoke in general terms of vindication, Schweitzer's theory on the Resurrection does not stand.

Let us return to Schweitzer's eschatology. If we accept Schweitzer's interpretation of Matthew 10:23b, then it is easy to see why he does not give much credit to the reality of the Resurrection. Commenting on The Quest of the Historical Jesus, Bishop Stephen Neill observes that the "implication is that from start to finish Jesus had been mistaken about himself, about his proclamation, and about the purpose of God".²⁰⁰ Yet Jesus was great enough to face His mistake. So Jesus died. History did not terminate. "What had gone wrong?" asks Neill. "Schweitzer does not tell us".²⁰¹ In The Quest of the Historical Jesus, Schweitzer's chapter on "Thoroughgoing Scepticism and Eschatology" ends simply with

¹⁹⁸ R. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 104.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 105.

²⁰⁰ S. Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, p. 198.

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 198.

the account of the Master's death.

The approach of The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity is basically akin to that of the "Quest", except that Schweitzer goes on to try to explain why the disciples came to have the resurrection experience. They had visions because they believed that Jesus would keep His promise of resurrection, and lead them victoriously into Galilee.

Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, in The Resurrection of Jesus puts the Resurrection into a very different historical context than that of Schweitzer. He points out that the Marcan record shows us "how complete was their (the disciples) perplexity before the Resurrection gave them the key".²⁰² Ramsey would say further that in Jesus the reign of God had come; that both the teaching and mighty works of the Messiah bore witness to it. However, the classic enemies of man (sin and death) had to be dealt an even mightier blow. This involved the death of the Messiah. Further, the righteousness of the Kingdom could not be perfected by a teaching and an example which men would simply follow. It involved rather, a personal union between men and Christ, that is to say, a sharing in His death and risen life.

Ramsey accepts the fact that the Form Critics have helped us to detect genuine story-forms, which would have been used in the early communities. However, the stories were learned, not as the biographical records of a dead hero, but as illustrations of a Gospel of God, living and active in His world.²⁰³

²⁰² Michael Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1956), p. 8.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 13.

All of this of course, is missing in Schweitzer. He was a great humanitarian, his life motivated by the ethic and spiritual presence of Jesus. For him it was not the Jesus who was historically known, but the Jesus spiritually risen within the life of a man, who was important for the twentieth century. Only in that sense did he share the resurrection faith of the first disciples. There was no reality however, to the resurrection events. Perhaps if we can untangle Jesus from Schweitzer's interpretation of eschatology, we may find a new sense of reality to the Resurrection of our Lord. For without the Resurrection we have much less to proclaim; indeed, little more than a religion of ethics (however important that may be). Summing it up, to preach the Gospel effectively to the man of the twentieth century, we must realize that

without the Resurrection, the Cross would be a past act...The Resurrection makes it possible to apply subjectively to each individual what the Cross has supplied objectively for all men.²⁰⁴

We must not rest content until we find a view which involves the Resurrection of Jesus in all the major Christian doctrines, and binds them together in a unity!

IV. BAPTISM AND EUCHARIST

Schweitzer considered that Baptism and the Lord's Supper were eschatological sacraments. Jesus never baptized, nor did He give the commission to baptize. For Jesus there was absolutely no question of Baptism;²⁰⁵ nor did He consider that following His death a sacrament

²⁰⁴ Rev. Michael C. Perry, "Preaching the Resurrection", Expository Times, LXXV, No. 2, (November 1963), p. 59.

²⁰⁵ A. Schweitzer, Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 140.

like that of John the Baptist would be necessary for the forgiveness of sins. He does not really reckon with the possibility of new believers. The end of time has come.

It is true that we have no evidence to say that Jesus baptized, or instituted a sacrament of Baptism. The New Testament was written in a missionary situation, so that it would be true to say that all New Testament statements about baptism, without any exception, relate to missionary baptism. Christian baptism and Jewish baptism of proselytes are both by complete immersion, upon the confession of sins.²⁰⁶ It is significant that these two types of baptism were identical, even with regard to technical details (such as the regulation that before baptism women should let down their hair and remove their ornaments).²⁰⁷

Baptism then came into prominence in the teaching and preaching ministry of the primitive Church, and is something other than a command of Jesus.

We can go further than that in our analysis of baptism and the gospel. Jeremias has pointed out that each incident in the Synoptic Gospels has a twofold historical context. One is a unique concrete situation in the life of Jesus, and the other the preaching and teaching of the primitive Church. He takes as an example Mark 10:13-16, where Jesus blesses the children. The intent of this passage would be, first of all, as guidance for Christian parents to lead children to Jesus by their godly example, and second, it would include "the command to give them to him through baptism".²⁰⁸ Making a comparison with John 3:5,

²⁰⁶ Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960), p. 31.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 31.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 50.

Jeremias concludes that Mark 10:15 parallels Luke 18:17, and was early interpreted as referring to baptism.

In this connection others would see John 3:5 as a direct reference to baptism. J. Duplacy feels the text says that "if we are to enter the kingdom, baptism is the necessary passageway".²⁰⁹ However, all expositors are not agreed on a baptismal interpretation of John, chapter three, so that we are not entitled to use it as a definite counter to Schweitzer.

On the other hand, the Gospels may very well be used in the Church's teaching ministry on baptism. This is something unknown to Schweitzer, simply because of his unique understanding of eschatology. His interpretation of Mark 10:13-16 can be stated thus,

To Jesus the young children of the final human generation are destined to enter the Kingdom as they are. They pass their existence in this world in innocence and freedom from anxiety, and will never know any other way of living here because the Kingdom will have come before they are grown up. They possess a unique privilege.²¹⁰

Schweitzer's statement that Jesus did not baptize because the end of time had come and that he therefore did not reckon with new believers, is inadequate. Let us see if we can reconstruct the picture. The Baptism which John proclaimed at the Jordan had its roots in contemporary Jewish proselyte Baptism. Jesus on the other hand used the term "baptism", but applied it to His passion. (Mark 10:38). In Mark 20:20-28 the

²⁰⁹ J. Duplacy, "Salvation by Faith and Baptism in the New Testament", Baptism in the New Testament, (Baltimore: Helicon Press Inc., 1964.), p. 118.

²¹⁰ A. Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, p. 96.

sacramental imagery of both the cup and baptism refer to Cross and Passion. Luke 12:50 also refers to His Passion and Cross. This was Jesus' "baptism". It was His life's work of salvation that would be fulfilled in His coming death and Resurrection. Thus we may make an interesting deduction!

...if this is so, it must throw back its meaning to the Baptism that he underwent in Jordan at the hands of John the Baptist, for that Baptism with its voluntary choice of the Servant's Messianic role and its divine acknowledgement could not mean anything other than this.²¹¹

At the deepest level the Baptism is Jesus' Cross, for at the Jordan Jesus not only received His calling as the Servant of the Lord, but also accepted His vocation of redemption through suffering.²¹² He acknowledged His baptism in terms of the cross.

Schweitzer then is right in saying that Jesus prescribed no form of Baptism for His adherents during the course of His ministry. However, His unwillingness to do so may very well be seen in the light of a completely different view of Kingdom and mission than that which arises in the exposition of Schweitzer. Once again then we are at the heart of the problem posed by Albert Schweitzer. Jesus' view of baptism is related to His total vocation.²¹³ The baptism he offers to men is radically different from the baptism of John, for in Jesus the

²¹¹ Robert S. Paul, The Atonement and the Sacraments, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1961), p. 332.

²¹² Ibid., p. 333.

²¹³ It is difficult to say whether any real revelation came to Jesus at His baptism. Raymond Brown points out that Matthew and Luke did not think of Jesus' baptism as a first revelation to Him. Further, Brown sees Mark filling a teacher's capacity, i.e., "the scene is not directed to Jesus but to the Christian reader of the Gospel. It is designed to tell him at the beginning of the Gospel and on the highest authority who

"eschaton toward which John pointed has already arrived, the kingdom has come on earth as it is in heaven",²¹⁴ and men will be invited to be baptized into the kingdom by the same baptism which Jesus Himself received. Thus we could plausibly conclude:

It would certainly be wrong to assume that because he did not baptize, he regarded Baptism as having no relevance to his proclamation of the Kingdom - that would be too violent a contradiction from his readiness to undergo the Baptism of John - but rather does it seem as if Jesus was waiting to give his own content to what Baptism into his name should mean, a significance that could be won for the Sacrament only by His Cross and Resurrection.²¹⁵

Let us proceed to the Eucharist. Schweitzer says of Jesus' last meal with His disciples that it did not signify anything about flesh and blood, but rather was a thanksgiving meal. Only in this sense was it to be repeatable, for no command is given in Matthew or Mark that it be repeated. The thanksgiving meal in expectancy of the Kingdom, is, in effect, the only worship service in the primitive Christian period. Once this expectation of an immanent return ceased, the meal became non-eschatological. It became a celebration using consecrated elements.

Once again Schweitzer challenges orthodox Christian faith. But how does his view fit the academic world of the New Testament?

There are scholars who would tend toward Schweitzer's position, and others who would tend toward the sacramental view. Among the former

Jesus is, namely, the Messiah..., and the Servant of Yahweh, and God's own Son." See Raymond E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 84-5. On the other hand, Jesus's disciples baptized, John 4:1-2.

214 Ibid., p. 333.

215 Ibid., p. 334.

group of scholars would be Vincent Taylor. Commenting on Schweitzer's earlier exposition, he says that Schweitzer is right in finding the historical basis of the meals described in Mark 6:35-44 and in Mark 8; and that they are 'eschatological sacraments'. Taylor does not exclude the suggestion that although Jesus would no longer drink with them, they would continue to keep the feast. But he says that it is to strain the meaning of the saying quite unwarrantably, "to see in it the equivalent of a command and a virtual institution of the Christian Eucharist".²¹⁶

Norman Perrin interprets the Last Supper along similar lines. The disciples gather together in the table-fellowship of the Kingdom; it is a meal in anticipation of that Kingdom. "The experience of the present is an anticipation of the future".²¹⁷ Perrin reflects, I think, the tension that exists in the Gospels with regard to the Kingdom being future or realized. He can say that the disciples also experience the Kingdom in the present.

We shall ultimately have to look at John. But first, to give us a little perspective, just one more author who, though he does not take Schweitzer's position, does not accept the Passover interpretation either. William Barclay feels that John simply theologizes with regard to Jesus as the Passover Lamb of God. The synoptics do not mention the lamb. He says that it is possible that the Gospels tell us about the Passover Kiddush, which always preceded the festival.²¹⁸ This interpretation would explain the absence of any reference to the lamb. Such an argument could be used to either support or refute Schweitzer's thesis. Perhaps

²¹⁶ V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 185.

²¹⁷ N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, p. 204.

²¹⁸ W. Barclay, Crucified and Crowned, p. 41

the picture will be clarified if we can make better use of the Gospel of John, which Schweitzer has written off.

Raymond E. Brown considers John's Passover to be historical.²¹⁹ He feels further that a close analysis of the discourse on the bread of life reveals that it reflects themes which would have been read to Galilean Jews at the Passover, in the synagogues.²²⁰ We have already considered that John, in the light of Qumran, must be accepted as a historic gospel tradition. Thus we were able to make a case for 'realized eschatology'. If we can establish John's Passover, then Schweitzer's treatment of the Last Supper will have to be considered. As a scholar who has worked over John and Qumran and established to his satisfaction that it is of Palestinian origin, Father Brown can say of the Last Supper,

Perhaps the best solution is that John's eye-witness chronology is correct. But in the meal (the evening before Passover) Jesus imitated the characteristics of the Passover meal, except the lamb, to show the connection between the Eucharistic sacrifice and the exodus.²²¹

It has been suggested further than Romans 6:5 may very well be a reference to the Johannine account of our Lord's words about the 'grain of wheat'. (John 12:24).²²² Paul would be familiar with some of Jesus' sayings, and it could be that He had knowledge of the tradition which

²¹⁹ R. Brown, Jesus God and Man, p. 193.

²²⁰ R. Brown, New Testament Essays, p. 193.

²²¹ Raymond E. Brown, S.S., "The Gospel of John, The Johannine Epistles", New Testament Reading Guide, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1965), p. 67.

²²² J.K. Howard, "'...into Christ': A Study of the Pauline Concept of Baptismal Union", Expository Times, LXXIX, No. 5, (February 1968), p. 149.

contained these words too. Jesus would be speaking of Himself in this saying, and He would be thinking of His approaching Passion. All of which is background to the Johannine Passover.

P. Benoit has submitted a very interesting essay on the accounts of the institution. Considering both Markan and Pauline traditions, he feels that the former is the better of the two. It is Aramaic and from a very ancient Palestinian source, whereas Paul's is Hellenistic.²²³ Both, says Benoit, are liturgical traditions so that the accounts we have are most likely the exact words spoken in the communities of Antioch or Jerusalem when they re-enacted the Lord's Supper.

Father Benoit has made a reconstruction of Mark 14. He does not feel that Mark 14:22-25 fits its present context, but rather that the first part of verse 22 makes a doublet with the first part of verse 18. The complete absence of any reference to the paschal lamb is surprising after the preparations recorded in verses 12-16. He concludes that "in both cases one has the impression of a bare, concise text, reduced to its essentials, making no claim to report all that actually happened at the last supper".²²⁴

Schweitzer has interpreted the Last Supper as a thanksgiving prayer referring to the passing away of the world and the coming of the Kingdom. All this is implied in the Aramaic invocation Maranatha. The prayers were handed down in Greek, but the concluding cry is in Aramaic, showing its early origin. Benoit puts Jesus' words and actions, however, back into the setting of the Jewish Pasch. The Master desired this

²²³ P. Benoit, O.P., "The Accounts of the Institution and what they Imply", The Eucharist in the New Testament, (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964), p. 72.

²²⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

setting and, further, made use of it to institute His new rite.

We can fit a number of events recorded in the gospels into the framework of the Passover rite. The announcement concerning Judas' betrayal fits into the course of the hors d'oeuvre (Matthew 26:20-25; Mark 14:17-21). The morsel given to Judas by Jesus (John 13:21-30) could very well have been the bitter herbs dipped in the salty sauce. It would appear further that the washing of feet which would have taken place at the beginning of the hors d'oeuvre.²²⁵ Father Benoit feels that the words pronounced over the bread and wine, which Jesus passed on to His disciples, appear to be taken from the "two solemn blessings which framed the main part of the meal".²²⁶ And he concludes that the eating of the lamb itself, has disappeared from the account because it disappeared from Christian practice!

The Markan saying, "Amen I say to you, that I shall drink of the fruit of the vine no more until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God", is authentic Aramaic. It concerns both Jesus' death and the coming of the Kingdom at the end of time, and the imagery is that of the messianic meal. Father Benoit admits that the well-known Jewish eschatological meal appears often in the ministry of Jesus (cf. Isaiah 65:13-14; Enoch 62:14-15). Jesus on a number of occasions showed that His death and the coming of the Kingdom were related (Matt. 9:2-13; 13; 14:62). So naturally it would find some expression in the farewell meal. Further, Mark does not give conclusive evidence that the meal was paschal. So we must turn to Luke for perspective. "Did Luke make up his account?"

²²⁵ Ibid., p. 75.

²²⁶ Ibid., p. 75.

asks Father Benoit. And he answers his question by saying that "some critics feel Luke wanted to correct Mark's perspective".²²⁷

The suggestion is therefore made that Luke rewrote an earlier account which would have been handed down by a tradition separate from that of Mark. Thus there would have been a tradition on the Last Supper preserved which would not have been passed on in the liturgical tradition. The liturgical tradition concerned itself with the first Lord's Supper, whereas the Lukan tradition concentrated on the theme of the last meal. Thus we could consider the details about the paschal aspect of the meal as original.

It was not a tradition governed by the needs of liturgy. Benoit therefore feels that only an exact recollection could lead to their introduction to the account, for the churches celebrated the last supper in independence of the paschal meal, "which the Jewish Christians were able to continue to celebrate each year in any case".²²⁸ The Pasch is not simply the external framework of the farewell meal. It is the beginning of a lesson; that is to say, it is 'this passover' which Jesus eats for the last time, and it is the Pasch which must be fulfilled in the Kingdom.

²²⁷ Ibid., p. 38.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 39.

The Pasch, which was a memorial of the past, was also turned in hope towards the eschatological liberation of Israel. It was in this spirit that even in Jesus' time, they were supposed to take the paschal meal. The Kingdom was expected as the fulfillment of everything to which the Pasch was pointing. And the classical picture of a messianic banquet must easily have been brought to mind by the paschal meal. Understood in this way, the thought expressed by the sentence in Luke 22:16 must be attributed to Jesus. His last paschal meal directed their thoughts to the fulfillment of all the promises of the Kingdom.²²⁹

Let us quickly recapitulate Luke's account. The eschatological words, with which Jesus anticipated the Kingdom, are placed by Matthew (26:29) and Mark (14:25) following the eucharistic words. But Luke (22:15-18) places them before the eucharistic words and in the form of a farewell to the rite of the Pasch. Jesus therefore would not eat the Pasch (lamb, vv. 15-16) any more, nor would He drink the wine again (vv. 17-18). The farewell, understood in this manner, would fit well the twofold blessing (feast and wine) which occurred at the beginning of the Paschal rite.²³⁰ The third gospel has therefore either rediscovered or preserved the original place of Jesus' words. Luke 22:15 uses the word "suffer", which does not mean a simple passing affliction, but rather the "Passion" which was to ultimately end in Jesus' death. So, says Father Benoit, Jesus "sets His forthcoming death before their eyes, by showing them his body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine."²³¹

Here we have then, rich symbolism. The bread is broken. The wine is the blood of the grape, pouring from the grapes as they are crushed,

²²⁹ Ibid., p. 41.

²³⁰ Ibid., p. 76.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 77.

just as blood flows from those who are defeated when trodden upon (Isaiah 63:1-6). So is the cup a symbol of tragic fate. It is the blood of the alliance (covenant) which in semitic thought had to be concluded in sacrifice of a victim.

Perhaps we have looked at the eucharist a little more extensively than some other problems raised by Schweitzer. However, I think it should be gone into even more fully. For if a position such as that outlined by Father Benoit, can be maintained, then Schweitzer's position on both the 'last meal' and the nature of the Kingdom, is totally inadequate. And just for the sake of perspective, Father Benoit is not alone in his interpretation of the Gospel. Such scholars as Michael Ramsey would adhere to a similar treatment of Luke.²³²

²³² Michael Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, p. 80.

CONCLUSION

While we have already material enough from which to draw conclusions, a summation is needed in order to find the place in Christian exposition and theology, to which Schweitzer belongs. First of all, if pushed to its logical conclusion, his exposition would do away with the Church as we know it. This is how Father Benoit would feel for example, with regard to the Eucharist; it is the centre of Christian life and salvation.²³³

Secondly, the book is a warning to be careful, in our quest for honesty in matters of religion. This book is written for the twentieth-century layman, who may not be aware of its deficiencies. Yet he may be prone to think it is the latest in Biblical scholarship. Who will tell him otherwise?

On the more positive side, Schweitzer has once and for all exploded the myth of the nineteenth-century liberal Christ. Monsignor Feuillet points out that both Weiss and Schweitzer were in accord on this point, and have shown us the essential place of eschatology in the message of Jesus.²³⁴ Where we have to face Schweitzer, of course, is in the arena of salvation history. Schweitzer feels salvation history was foreign to Jesus (as does Rudolf Bultmann).²³⁵

So then, while Schweitzer's work to most scholars is weak and

²³³ P. Benoit, The Eucharist in the New Testament, p. 71.

²³⁴ Andre Feuillet, "Les Origines et la Signification de Mt. 10,23b", The Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (1961), p. 197.

²³⁵ Oscar Cullman, Salvation in History, (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 29.

inadequate, his work paradoxically proved, in the words of Stephen Neill, to be a turning point.²³⁶ We can never go back behind the necessary recognition that apocalyptic is a real factor in Gospel proclamation. Jesus is not the civilized man of the nineteenth or twentieth century. We cannot separate His teaching from Jesus Himself. In all this, says Bishop Neill, we are largely indebted to Albert Schweitzer.

Neill cautions, however, that we have by no means arrived at all the answers. There is a tremendous diversity of the interpretation of apocalyptic in the Gospels. Some experts feel Jesus never spoke of His own return in glory (i.e., that what we have in the Gospels is the work of editors and the explanation supplied by the faith of the early Church).²³⁷ Others feel that the "Son of Man" was central to Jesus' message; and still others that eschatology is present, as though every moment were one of decision. We even have to ask whether Jesus Himself spoke clearly on this subject! "Evidently", says Neill, "New Testament scholars have enough on their hands to keep them occupied for a great many years".²³⁸

Our debate with Schweitzer must not become polemical. There is no place for that. Yet we have to consider his place in Christian tradition. He destroyed the "liberal Jesus" of the nineteenth century, yet as D.M. Baillie puts it, he has never been anything but a "liberal" in his theology. His friends and foes agree here, and "many would say that in his subsequent theologico-philosophical work he 'out-liberals the liberals'

²³⁶ Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, p. 200.

²³⁷ Ibid., p. 345.

²³⁸ Ibid., p. 345.

from an angle of his own", 239

The Quest of the Historical Jesus closed on a note of extremely deep Christian devotion. That book also left the world guessing as to Schweitzer's Christological position. The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity has made the Christology of Schweitzer clear. Nevertheless neither book leaves us with any doubt as to his discipleship - a discipleship which found its expression in tropical Africa. Perhaps it is in this sense that Albert Schweitzer belongs to the Ages!

239 D.M. Baillie, God was in Christ, p. 25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1957.
- Bernard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960.
- St. Augustine, On Christian Doctrine; The Enchiridion (Rev. S.D. Salmond, transl.), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1873.
- D. M. Baillie, God was in Christ, London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1958.
- William Barclay, Crucified and Crowned, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Hans Werner Bartsch, ed., Kerygma and Myth, a Theological Debate, London: S.P.C.K., 1960.
- P. Benoit, O.P., article "The Accounts of the Institution and what they imply," The Eucharist in the New Testament, Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.
- Raymond E. Brown, ss., Jesus God and Man, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967.
- Raymond E. Brown, S.S., New Testament Essays, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.
- Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John i-xii, The Anchor Bible, Vol. 29, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966.
- Raymond E. Brown, S.S., The Gospel of John, The Johannine Epistles, New Testament Reading Guide, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1965.
- Raymond E. Brown, et al., eds., The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Volume 2, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

- Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1964.
- Rudolf Bultmann, "The Study of The Synoptic Gospels," in Form Criticism, Two Essays on New Testament Research, (Frederick C. Grant, ed.), New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VII, New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 2, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- George A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Neville Clark, Interpreting the Resurrection, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Ind., 1958.
- Oscar Cullmann, Salvation in History, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- W. D. Davies & D. Daube, (eds.), The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, in honour of Charles Harold Dodd, Cambridge: The University Press, 1964.
- J. Delorme, et al., The Eucharist in the New Testament, Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.
- C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, Welwyn Herts: James Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1961.
- J. Duplacy, "Salvation by Faith and Baptism in the New Testament," in Baptism in the New Testament, (a symposium), Baltimore: Helicon Press, Inc., 1964.

- G. P. Gilmour, The Memoirs Called Gospels, Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited, 1959.
- Herbert Haag, Is Original Sin in Scripture? New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.
- Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark, Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.
- A. M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958.
- Joachim Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.
- Joachim Jeremias, The Central Message of the New Testament, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Howard Clark Kee and Franklin W. Young, Understanding the New Testament, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Ernst Lohmeyer, Our Father, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- John L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah, The Anchor Bible, Vol. 20, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.
- J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London: SCM Press, 1959.
- J. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1967.
- Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Lucetta Mowry, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- W. Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.
- Robert S. Paul, The Atonement and the Sacraments, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1961.
- Norman Perrin, Rediscovering The Teaching Of Jesus, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967.

- Michael Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, London: Geoffrey Bles, 1956.
- Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958
- Beda Rigaux, The Testimony of St. Mark, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1966.
- John A.T. Robinson, Honest to God, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.
- D. S. Russell, The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Rudolf Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom, New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Hugh J. Schonfield, The Passover Plot, Toronto: Bantam Books of Canada Ltd., 1967.
- Albert Schweitzer, Christianity and the Religions of the World, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939.
- Albert Schweitzer, The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.
- Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Gerald S. Sloyan, "The Gospel of Mark," in New Testament Reading Guide, Collegeville, Minn., The Liturgical Press, 1960.
- David M. Stanley, The Apostolic Church in the New Testament, Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1965.
- Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1951.
- Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1959.
- Paul Tillich, Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions, New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Gerhard Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Volume II, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

Articles

- Matthew Black "The Semitic Element in the New Testament," Expository Times, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Vol. LXXVII No. 1, October 1965.
- John Bligh, "C.H. Dodd on John and the Synoptics," The Heythrop Journal, July, 1964.
- John Bligh, review of Morna Hooker's "Jesus and the Servant" (London, 1959), in The Heythrop Journal 6, 1965
- Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in Alexander Altmann, ed., Biblical Motifs, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Andre Feuillet, "Les Origines et la Signification de Mt. 10, 23^b," in The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, April, 1961. Vol. XXIII, Number 2. Pp. 182-198.
- Charles H. Gibling, S.J., "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b," in Theological Studies (Dec. 1968) pp. 637-661. Vol. 29, Number 4.
- J. K. Howard, " '...into Christ': A Study of the Pauline Concept of Baptismal Union," in Expository Times, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Vol. LXXIX, No. 5, February 1968, pp. 147-151.
- Professor A. M. Hunter, "New Testament Survey 1937-1964," in Expository Times, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Vol. LXXVI, No. 1, October 1964. Pp. 15-20.
- Robert Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels," New Testament Studies 15, October, 1968.
- Rev. Michael C. Perry, "Preaching the Resurrection," in Expository Times, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Vol. LXXV No. 2, November, 1963. Pp. 58-61.
- "Talking Point from Books" in Expository Times, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, December 1968. Vol. LXXX, No. 3.
- Leopold Sabourin, "Les noms et les titres de Jesus" in The Heythrop Journal, April 1965.

VITA AUCTORIS

- 1933 Born: Windsor, Ontario
- 1952 Graduated: Patterson Collegiate Institute, Windsor
- 1952-54 Undergraduate theology, Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto, Ontario
- 1958 Bachelor of Arts Degree, Assumption University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario
Major in History
- 1962 Bachelor of Divinity Degree, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario
- 1965 Began studies at the University of Windsor, Graduate School, in History
- 1968 Began studies at the University of Windsor as a candidate for the Degree of Master of Arts in Theology